


UC-NRLF



5B 54 624



Rom. Leath.  
6

LIBRARY  
OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

GIFT OF

*A. S. Hallidie, Esq.*

Received *Sept.* 1885


Accessions No. *27544* Shelf No.





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2007 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation





# MILNER REFUTED;

OR,

PIOUS FRAUDS EXEMPLIFIED IN DR. MILNER'S

“END OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY.”

BEING A SERIES OF

Original, Selected, and Contributed Articles

EXPOSING

DR. MILNER'S FALLACIES AND FICTIONS.



CHARLES HASTINGS COLLETTE.

---

Πολλή τίς ἐστίν ἡ τῶν ἀνθρώπων πλάνη, διὰ ποικιλίας, καὶ πολλῶν προφάσεων ἐργασαμένη τὸ φαῦλον τῆ ἀνθρωπεία φύσει, καὶ πλανήσασα ἕκαστον διὰ προφάσεως ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας.—Epiphan. adv. Hæreses, tom. i. p. 507, § 2 (edit. 1682).

---

LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY WILLIAM PENNY,

57, LINCOLN'S-INN FIELDS;

SOLD ALSO BY

BOSWORTH & HARRISON, 115, REGENT STREET;

CURRY & CO. DUBLIN; J. NICHOL, EDINBURGH.

1856.

BX1765  
C6

---

LONDON:  
WILLIAM PENNY,  
PRINTER, ENGRAVER, AND LITHOGRAPHER,  
57, LINCOLN'S-INN FIELDS.

---

27544

Halle die

Sept. 1855



## PREFATORY REMARKS.

---

DR. MILNER'S Work, miscalled the "End of Religious Controversy" (in whatever sense the title may be construed),<sup>a</sup> is well known to all controversialists, though variously estimated by the contending parties. The late Charles Butler, a zealous lay advocate of the Roman Church, declared it to be "the ablest exposition of the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church on the articles contested with her by Protestants; and the ablest statement of the proofs by which they are supported, and of the historical facts with which they are connected, that has appeared in our language."<sup>b</sup> The same work has been put forward by Romanists as "the Herculean shield, which not only confounds, but fritters away the ingenious subtleties of the sophist, the specious distinctions of the critic, the empty theories of the sceptic, and all the impotent attacks of misguided reason against our holy religion."<sup>c</sup> By another editor it is styled "The golden work of the Right Rev. John Milner," &c. &c. It is recommended as a "book particularly adapted for the perusal of inquiring Protestants; the one of all others which the Catholic priest or layman wishes to place in the hands of such persons, as best able to assist their search after truth." Again, the same editor adds: "We may, in fact, safely say, that no other controversial work, of modern times, has had equal success in effecting conversions to our holy religion. Indeed, there are probably few converts who have arrived at it, without being, partly at least, indebted to this excellent work."<sup>d</sup>

While, on the other hand, Dr. Milner's work has been designated by Protestant writers of credit as the most unscrupulous production that has been put forward under the garb

<sup>a</sup> By the *the End of Controversy*, Dr. Milner could not mean *the legitimate object of controversy*, since the work can in no way bear out the idea; but from the positive tone assumed, we must presume that he meant *its complete termination*, thus intimating that his work was so potent as to put a complete end to all controversy between Protestants and Papists. Few readers, we think, will admit that the doctor has attained his desired object.

<sup>b</sup> "Book of the Roman Catholic Church," p. 10, quoted in the *Letters of the Bishop of Exeter*, 2nd edit. 1826, p. 16.

<sup>c</sup> In the Preface to the Edition of 1820, published by Rd. Coyne, Dublin.

<sup>d</sup> From the Preface of the Derby 8vo Edition, dated 1842.

of religion, and with the affectation of candour. The Rev. Joseph Mendham, in his "Literary Policy of the Church of Rome," writes:—"I cannot forbear adding, with respect to this plausible, because deceitful work, that the reflection which but a cursory examination of it most constantly and forcibly impresses upon the mind, is the facility with which, particularly when aided by opportune suppression, invention, and adjustment, Romanists may prove anything, since the authors and authorities respected by them have maintained everything." The Rev. G. S. Faber, in his "Difficulties of Romanism,"<sup>a</sup> with great reason asserts:—"In point of dexterity and plausibility, the work of Dr. Milner, which he has entitled 'the End of Religious Controversy,' has probably not been surpassed since the days of that prince of sophists, the wily Bossuet. It is, however, strongly marked by what I have noted to be the grand characteristics of productions written in favour of Popery, and in opposition to the Reformation. These are *unscrupulous misrepresentations* on the one hand, and bold allegation on the other." And Mr. M'Gavin, in his refutation of parts of the work in question, declares that Dr. Milner "has displayed an impudent disregard of historical truth;" that "his 'End of Religious Controversy' bears one of the most prominent marks of the beast in its very front; there is downright lying and imposition."

From these brief extracts, our readers will at once appreciate the estimation in which this work is held.

To the Roman Catholic controversialist, Dr. Milner's book has very extensively supplied weapons of attack, though very few have cared, either to test the value of the authority on which their favourite author relies, or to go further for materials; while, on the other hand, there is scarcely a writer on the Protestant side of the question, who has not, in one shape or another, been able to detect gross and palpable misrepresentations in Dr. Milner's assertions. We have, therefore, scattered about in different quarters, in chapters and notes, materials, ample (though not easily obtainable by the generality of readers) for exposing these various "pious frauds."

It is our purpose in the present work, without following any particular order, to bring before our readers illustrations of "PIOUS FRAUDS" of the REV. DR. MILNER, as exemplified in the work in question, availing ourselves, from time to time, of the labours of others, as well original as published; and, during this examination, we may occasionally refer to Dr. Milner's other work—"Letters to a Prebendary."

<sup>a</sup> In the preface, 3rd edit. p. xxxiv.

We shall confine ourselves as closely as possible to the exposure of Dr. Milner's misrepresentations, rather than enter on a general discussion or examination of the doctrines of the Roman Church. We are fully aware of the difficulty and extent of the task we have undertaken, arising from the wide range of subjects treated of by Dr. Milner, condensed into a small compass, without any attempt at accuracy, either in citation of historical facts, or quotations from other writers. Notwithstanding these difficulties, we feel confident that, though it may be impossible in a limited compass to expose *all* the misrepresentations of Dr. Milner, we shall be able to lay before our readers sufficient to destroy his credit, whether as a divine or a controversialist.

We may be reminded, by some of our readers, of Dr. Grier's, Dr. Jarvis', Bishop Hopkins', and Mr. McGavin's very able works on the same subject; but it has been universally admitted, that they do not present a full examination of the work; and, besides, having confined themselves (with the exception of Mr. McGavin) to what more particularly engaged them, as members of the Church of England, they are rather incomplete. For though ourselves sincere members of our time-honoured scriptural Church, we shall, in the course of our examination, refute the calumnies which Dr. Milner has heaped on the various other denominations of Protestants with an unsparing and unscrupulous hand, and to this part of our plan we particularly invite the attention of our dissenting brethren.

The greatest care has been taken to arrive at accuracy in the citations from authors.

C. H. C.

10th September, 1856.

NOTE.—*Except when another edition is expressly named, the edition of Milner's "End of Religious Controversy," from which we have quoted throughout the following pages, is the 12mo. stereotype edition printed at Derby, "for the [Roman] Catholic Book Society," without date. The editor's Preface bears date 1842.*

# CONTENTS.

## No. I.—INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER.

Issue raised by Milner between Protestants and Romanists, 2—His sophism of a supposed sudden corruption of the Christian Faith to Romanism, 3.

## RULE OF FAITH.

### No. II.—*The 14th Psalm.*

The alleged corruption of, and Milner's attempt to weaken the faith in, the Authorized Version, 5, 6—The Rhemish and Authorized Versions compared, 7—And Romish editions cited—Calmet's evidence—Various old versions cited, 12—Jerome's statements, 12, 13—The testimony of Estius, 12—Erasmus, Cajetan, &c., 13.

### No. III.—*Alleged Corruption of the Authorized Version, 1 John v. 7.*

Milner's statement, 15, 16—Authorized Version vindicated, 16.

### No. IV.—*Alleged Inaccuracies in the Authorized Translation.*

Milner's charge (1 Cor. xi. 27) stated, 17—19—The various Roman editions cited, 19, 20—As to Matt. xix. 11—Milner's case stated, 20—Dr. Lingard agrees with ours—The Authorized Translation vindicated, 21—Alleged obscure translator of the Authorized Version, 22.

### No. V.—*Protestant Rule of Faith and Private Judgment.*

Milner's definitions, 24—His perversion exposed, 25—The principle of Private Judgment stated, 25, 29, 34—The Canons of 1571 and 1559, 26—The Divines of the Reformation, 27.

### No. VI.—*The Objection that Christ himself never Wrote.*

Milner's argument stated, 34, 35—Replied to, 35—And also by Augustine (by anticipation), 35—Milner's *preaching* and *teaching* theory examined 36, 37.

### No. VII.—*Alleged limited Scope and insufficiency of the Gospels, and the Canonical Epistles of the New Testament as a Rule of Faith.*

Milner's *preaching* theory examined—Milner's statement, 37, 38—The sufficiency of Scriptures vindicated, 40—Patristic evidence—Irenæus, 42—Tertullian, 43—Ambrose—Jerome—Augustine, 44—Clement of Alexandria—Origen, 46—Hippolytus—Athanasius—Cyril of Jerusalem, 47—Basil—Theophilus of Alexandria—Gregory of Nyssa—Cyril of Alexandria, 48—Chrysostom, 49—Result of investigation—No Father questions sufficiency of Scriptures—Jeremy Taylor's opinion—Johannes, Damascenes, and Gerson maintain the Protestant rule, 50—As also the Tridentine Bishops Fanò and Chioggia, 51—Disagreement at the Council of Trent, 51, 52.

### No. VIII.—*Tradition, or the Roman Rule of Faith.*

Milner's definition, 52—His Patristic evidence in support examined—Ignatius, 53—57—*παράδοσις* and *traditio*, the meaning of these words as used by early Christian writers—Irenæus, 57 *et seq.*—Tradition as to the appointment of the first Bishop of Rome, 61—Tertullian, 64—69—Origen, 69—Cyprian, 70—Basil, 70, 71—Epiphanius, 72.

No. IX.—*The Canon of Scripture.*

The teaching of the Church of England, 73—The Trent Council, 74—Milner's arguments and authorities for establishing the Roman Canon, 75—The tradition of the Church examined before the date of the Council of Carthage, 75, 76—The Jewish Church, 76—Melito, Origen, Hilary, Cyprian, Cyril of Jerusalem, 76—Greg. Nazianzen, Jerome, Council of Laodicea (confirmed by subsequent councils), Epiphanius, 77—Augustine, 78—Explanation of the term "Canon" of Scripture as used by Augustine, 78—Confirmed by Cajetan, 79—The 74th Canon of the third Council of Carthage proved to be spurious, 80, 81—The tradition of, *after* the third Council of Carthage, 81—The Council objected to by Bellarmine, 81—Du Pin, 82—Evidence against the Tridentine decree in each successive century, from the sixth to the sixteenth, 82, 83—The List of Innocent I. examined, 83—Shown to be a forgery, 83, 84—Cajetan's opinion, 83—Milner's argument derived from Augustine, Hooker [175], Lardner, and Luther, 85, 87, 88—Augustine's supposed belief in the Gospel on the authority of the Church, 85—87.

## No. X.—REFORMERS AND THE REFORMATION.

Dr. Milner's historical misrepresentations in reference to the marriage of Prince Henry (afterwards Henry VIII.) with his brother's widow, Katharine of Arragon, and his subsequent marriage with Anne Boleyn—The Pope's alleged refusal to the divorce and second marriage stated to be the cause of the king abrogating the Pope's supremacy, 88—102—His further misrepresentations with reference to the Duke of Somerset, 102—105—Milner's misrepresentations in regard to Elizabeth, 105, 106—Milner's Theory of the causes of the Reformation, 107—The Politics of Princes and Statesmen, 107—The avarice of the Nobility and Gentry, 110—The irreligion and licentiousness of the People, 111.

## No. XI.—THE FRUITS OF SANCTITY.

*Rome and the Reformation.*

Milner's lamentation of Protestant slander on the "Church before Luther"—No necessity of employing Protestant testimony—Evidence from the Orations of the Council of Trent of the universal depravity of the Roman Church and Roman Catholic States, 112, 114, 116, 117, 120—Of Caranza—The Theologians of Louvain, 113—The like from Gravina—Erasmus' Letters, 114, 117, 121 (*notes*)—Milner's Protestant evidences, 115—Want of morality among the Roman converts in India, 118—The passage from Calvin's treatise "De Scandalis" examined, 119—Facilities granted by Rome to sin, 120, 121—Misquotation from Erasmus, 121—Rome itself the sink of iniquity, 122—The number of ecclesiastics at Rome, 122—The number of criminals from 1850 to 1854, 123.

## No. XII.—THE POPE'S SUPREMACY.

*On the Temporal and Spiritual Supremacy.*

Sec. I.—Milner disclaims for the Pope civil and temporal supremacy—Baronius holds the contrary—The decree of Boniface—Bull of Sixtus V. and Pius V. against Queen Elizabeth, 124—The teaching of Trent defined—The appellation of Pope (*Papa*) and Milner's perversion, 125.

Sec. II.—Evidence derived from the New Testament—The points to be proved—Peter's position among the Apostles, 125—Ambrose and Chrysostom on the equal worth of Paul, 127—Milner's Scriptural texts, Matt. x. 2—On placing Peter *first* when the Apostles were enumerated, 127—Peter first to confess Christ, 127—The first to whom Christ appeared after the Resurrection, 128—The first to preach the Resurrection and to convert the Gentiles, 129—

Philip's conversion of the Eunuch and the results, 130—"Feed my Sheep," 131—Cyprian and Augustine on, 131—Luke xxii. 32, 132—Chrysostom's interpretation of this text, 133—Luke v. 3, 10, 134—Matt. xvi. 17, 19, text examined, and various interpretations given by the Fathers, 135—Binding and Loosing, 137.

Sec. III.—Peter's alleged visit to Rome, arguments and proofs against, 138, 146—Milner's statements, 138—Admitted to be an historical point, 139—The idea discarded by Romanists, 139—Propositions considered—i. That the Fathers speak of Peter as having founded the Church at Rome, from which it is inferred that he went to Rome and lived there soon after our Lord's death, 141, 142—ii. That Eusebius and the rest of the Greek and Roman Fathers said that the word "Babylon" was used by Peter in his Epistle instead of the word Rome, from which it is inferred that the Apostle died in that city, 142, 143—iii. That St. Jerome describes Peter as being Bishop of Rome for twenty-five years in an exclusive and peculiar sense, from which it is inferred that Peter must have resided there during that time, 143, 144—iv. That St. Jerome, in his Latin Chronicon, and likewise Eusebius, in his Greek Chronicon, describe the Apostle as mainly residing in Europe for twenty-five years, 144—146.

Sec. IV.—Historical Evidence, 146—St. Paul, 147—151—Ignatius, 151—154—Clement of Rome, 154, 155—Irenæus, 155—160—Tertullian, 160—Origen, 163—Cyprian and Jerome, 168.

No. XIII.—*Dr. Milner's Unfairness in Quotations from Protestants.*

Chillingworth and Hooker misrepresented, 172—184.

---

#### No. XIV.—PERSECUTIONS.

Sec. I.—Introductory remarks, 184—Dr. Milner's sophistry, 185—The Rhemish notes, 189.

Sec. II.—Is the Church of Rome responsible for persecuting heretics? 191—201—Disclaimed by Milner, 191—But makes the *state* responsible, 193—Persecution taught by Romish doctors, 194, 195—Pope's decrees, 196—200.

Sec. III.—The persecuting spirit of Rome, 201—Persecuting councils, 201—208—Jerome and Huss, 209—Theologians of Trent, 211—The creed of Pope Pius IV. The Jews and Romanists compared, 215.

---

#### No. XV.—ALLEGED TOLERATION OF JAMES II.


Dr. Milner's apology examined; his statements refuted by evidence of James the Second's repeated acts of persecution, 216—227.

---

#### No. XVI.—THE REV. J. GARBETT'S LETTER TO DR. MILNER.

Erroneous statement and incorrect quotations affecting the character of certain eminent divines of the Church of England, viz., Archbishop Usher 238—Laud, 244—and Wake, 245—Bishops King, 233—Hallifax, 234—[Gordon, 236]—Goodman, 236—Cheyney, 237—Shipley, 237—Juxon, 242—Potter, 243—Moreton, 243—Douglas (his "Criterion" and Jesuit missions) and Tomlin, 252—Charge that the national Church is a prey to Socinianism, 251—On the Athanasian Creed, 252—The Non-Jurors, 253—That the clergy preach in churches in the morning, and in the meeting-houses in the evening, 254—Conclusion—Extracts referring to Dr. Milner's protestations of sincerity and charity, 255.

---



# MILNER REFUTED.

No. I.

## INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER.

“THE *faith* once delivered to the saints” is that which all denominations of Christians profess to maintain and teach. What that faith is, is the precise point in dispute between the Churches of Rome and England. We are not agreed on the subject: Protestants maintain that many of the doctrines taught by the Romish Church as points of faith were not thus delivered; while Romanists, on the other hand, maintain that her doctrines as now professed have been delivered to them by the Apostles, and are to this day professed and taught in their original purity, and which, says Dr. Milner, “the [Romish] Church has ever guarded as *the apple of her eye.*”<sup>a</sup>

In favour of the mass of doctrines, written and traditional, Scriptural and extra-scriptural, which the members of his Church are required to believe as equally and alike divine revelations, Dr. Milner propounds the following statements:—

“Most likely the [Roman] Catholic peasant learns the doctrine of the Church from his parish priest; but then he knows that the doctrine of this priest must be conformable to that of his bishop, and that otherwise he will soon be called to account for it. He knows also that the doctrine of the bishop himself must be conformable to that of the other bishops and the Pope; and that it is a fundamental maxim with them all never to admit of any tenet but such as is believed by all the bishops, and was believed by their predecessors *up to the apostles themselves.*”<sup>b</sup>

“It is proper to observe, that this Holy Church, in declaring her doctrine, does not profess to argue upon it in a controversial way, either from Scripture or tradition: much less does she pretend to make new articles of faith, or to expound the original articles in a different sense from that in which she

<sup>a</sup> Letter xi. p. 150.

<sup>b</sup> Letter xii. p. 166.

has always held them; though it is true that she sometimes adopts new terms, such as *consubstantial* and *transubstantiation*, as more energetical and expressive of her belief, in opposition to the rising heresies of the times. In short, her constant language is: *nil innovetur; nil nisi quod traditum est*. Such and such is the sense of Scripture: such and such is the doctrine of her predecessors, the pastors of the Church, *since the time of the apostles.*"<sup>a</sup>

The boldness of these *allegations* is equalled only by their explicitness: but their very explicitness brings the question to an abundantly easy solution.

Dr. Milner, we see, asserts: that *every* doctrine taught by the present Church of Rome has *invariably* been taught by the Catholic Church in every age *from the very time of the apostles*, who themselves originally delivered the entire system as it stands fully and authoritatively explained by the Council of Trent.

Now such language indisputably asserts a *naked historical fact*. Hence, like every other asserted historical fact, it can only be received upon *sufficient evidence*.

This, then, is the precise point upon which the Romish divines and ourselves are at issue.

They assert *an historical fact*: we deny, that the *asserted* fact can be established by *testimony*.

Nor is this all. We not only deny that the asserted fact can be established by testimony; but we furthermore maintain, that the *testimony of history* directly contradicts the assertion of the pretended fact.

Both these positions, we undertake to establish in the course of the following treatise, as the subjects present themselves for our examination.

If, then, the two positions can be established *negatively* and *positively*, a favourite quibble of Dr. Milner, even if it were incapable of an independent confutation, will perish by a death of mere inanition.

He contends: that if the Primitive Church, either in the way of difference or in the way of defect, taught any other scheme of Christianity than the precise scheme of the present Roman Church, the introduction of what was new must have been immediately perceived, and would have been immediately protested against.

"In a word," says Dr. Milner, citing the notable argument of an apostate divine, who, by some curious intellectual process, was led to desert the Church of England for the

<sup>a</sup> Letter lvi. p. 375, 8th edit. London.



Church of Rome, "there is but one way of accounting for alleged alterations in the doctrine of the Church; that mentioned by the learned Dr. Bailey: which is to suppose, that, on some one night, all the Christians of the world went to sleep sound Protestants, and awoke next morning rank Papists." <sup>a</sup>

Whatever seeming plausibility there may be in this argument, it assuredly cannot stand against direct historical evidence in opposition to Romish peculiarities. But, in truth, it is under every aspect, such a mere sophism, that an Anglo-Catholic can scarcely comprehend how a man of Dr. Milner's undoubted acuteness could ever in sober seriousness have adduced it. <sup>b</sup>

The very sophism itself is disingenuously built upon a pretended allegation, which no sane person ever made or ever thought of making: the allegation to wit, that "The departure from primitive purity to modern Romanism was at once *instantaneous* and *universal*; insomuch that the former was the standard faith of the Church on a Monday, and that the latter was found to be the standard faith of the Church by every mother's son when he awoke on the Tuesday morning."

Now, where is the person who ever asserted an *instantaneous* and *universal* change of this description? Where is the person whose language, by any fair construction, could ever have conjured up the phantom of such a ridiculous caricature?

Dr. Milner and his cherished apostate must alike have known, that no such extraordinary person ever existed. Consequently, they must alike, to serve their own ends, have been deliberately guilty of *misrepresentation prepense*.

The assertion—an assertion fully borne out by the stubbornness of history—is: not that "The departure from primitive truth was characterized at once by *suddenness* and *universality*," as these two unscrupulous individuals would misrepresent the matter; but that "It was *gradual* in its progress and *successive* as respects the introduction of this or that unscriptural superstition."

Dr. Bailey, therefore, and, after him, Dr. Milner, might just as reasonably have proved, on their wonderful principle of argumentation, that "A human being must *always* have existed in a state of adolescence; because, otherwise, there is but one way of accounting for his alleged alteration in stature: which is to suppose, that every full-grown son of

<sup>a</sup> Letter xi. p. 153.

<sup>b</sup> Has Dr. Milner adduced it in sober seriousness?

Adam went to sleep, on some one eventful night, a puling infant; and awoke, next morning, as proper a man as ever trod on neat's leather."

The *bold allegation*, however, runs: that "No opposition to pretended unscriptural innovation stands upon record." Whence it is argued: that "No such thing as any unscriptural innovation could ever have occurred."

Certainly, great wits *ought* to have, what they are proverbially said *not* to have, long memories.

Dr. Milner himself mentions the opposition which was made to prayers to the saints and veneration for their relics and constrained celibacy, by the excellent Vigilantius, at the latter end of the fourth century: but he, conveniently, in the true popish fashion, that is to say, through the medium of pronouncing him a *heretic*, would fain set aside his well-timed protestation; although, be it observed, this was re-echoed by the still uncorrupted bishops and members of the mountaineer churches, on that very account reviled by the furious Jerome. No doubt, if all who opposed *unscriptural innovations upon primitive Scriptural doctrine*, are to be promptly set down as *heretics*, Dr. Milner, on popish principles, will have made out a tolerable case for his bold assertion: for, of course, the innovators *themselves* would not protest against *their own* innovations. But Vigilantius does not stand alone. Various other instances of immediate opposition to *unscriptural novelties*, now unblushingly asserted by Rome to be *sound primeval apostolic doctrines*, will be noticed in the course of the present treatise. In short, nothing can be more unfounded than Dr. Milner's allegation: that "We have no historical intimation as to when any change of doctrine or doctrinal practice occurred;" and that "We have no recorded instance of any protestation against such change."<sup>a</sup>

These several matters we notice, in this introductory chapter, both as immediately bearing upon the plan, to a great extent, of the present work, and likewise as exhibiting the controversial management of a very ingenious but not very scrupulous Romish divine.

The remarkable facility with which Dr. Milner arrives at his conclusions, reminds us forcibly of the terse but true saying of the great Curran: that "*Error is in its nature flippant and compendious; it hops with airy and fastidious levity over proofs and arguments, and perches upon assertion, which it calls conclusion.*"

<sup>a</sup> The above is adapted from the Preface of Faber's "Difficulties of Romanism," pp. xxxix, xlii., 3rd edit., London, 1853.

## No. II.

## THE RULE OF FAITH.

The 14th Psalm.—The Alleged Corruption in the Authorized Version.

IN order to throw difficulties in the way of a Protestant who receives the BIBLE, and the Bible alone, as his rule of faith, and to unsettle this faith, the first step generally taken is to destroy confidence in the sacred book itself. Accordingly Dr. Milner commences Letter ix. by asking his imaginary correspondent, the too confiding Mr. Brown, "By what means have you learnt what is the Canon of Scripture?"—"Which are the books that have been written by Divine inspiration; or indeed, how have you ascertained that *any* books at all have been so written?" He then tries to make his dupe doubt altogether of the inspiration of the Bible. "It does not," he says, "of itself prove that they [the writers of the Bible] *always* wrote, or indeed that they ever wrote, under the influence of *inspiration*. [The italics are Dr. Milner's own.] They were by nature fallible men. How have you learnt that they were infallible writers?" Then the "genuineness" and completeness of the Scriptures are brought into question; and having thus led, as he supposes, his credulous reader into a fit state of bewilderment, he thinks it a proper opportunity to aim his death-blow at the Authorized version, and hopes to demolish it at once, by showing that when "the English Protestant gets possession of an English Bible," he not only has all these various difficulties to contend with, but that, after all, he has only a spurious Bible to rely on as his rule of faith! The assertion is conveyed in a most artful manner, without compromising himself to any particular or precise charge, but leaving his readers to infer that we are most indubitably under the curse conveyed in Revelation xxii. 18, 19, by either adding to or subtracting from "the words of the prophecy of this book."

The allegation rests on the fact that whereas, in the edition of the Psalms, as published with our liturgical service, verses in the 14th Psalm appear which do not appear in the corresponding Psalm in the Authorized version, and that therefore a suppression or addition is perpetrated. He thus hopes to throw the Established Church of England on the horns of a dilemma.

“Look then,” writes Dr. Milner (Letter ix.), “at Psalm xiv. as it occurs in the Book of Common Prayer, to which your clergy swear their ‘consent and assent;’ then look at the same Psalm in your Bible: you will find four whole verses in the former, which are left out in the latter! What will you here say, dear sir? You must say that your Church has added to, or else that she has *taken away* from, the words of this prophecy.”

And in a note is added:—

“These verses in question being quoted in St. Paul (Rom. iii. 13, &c.), there is no doubt but the common Bible is *defective* in this passage.”

Here, then, in a note which probably is not Dr. Milner’s, we gather that our Authorized version errs in consequence of a *suppression* of part of God’s word; and we are led to believe this to be the real charge that is urged, inasmuch as the English Douay versions *include* all the verses alleged to be suppressed.

To this charge, the offspring of folly, or malice, or both united, and which betrays an ignorance of the very rudiments of sacred criticism, it is easy to reply that the verses are in Scripture, but do not properly belong to the 14th Psalm. From the margin of an old Greek manuscript, as presently stated, they were introduced into the text. The old Latin version was made from the Greek, which likewise inserted, the three verses as part of the text. In the first English Bible authorized to be read in churches, published by Archbishop Cranmer in 1539-40, the three verses are printed in smaller letters than the rest, to denote that they are not in the Hebrew. From this Bible the Psalter was inserted, in 1549, in the first Prayer-book of King Edward VI., and has ever since been continued; and it has been deemed convenient to retain the old translation of the Psalms, with which our congregations have been so long familiar.<sup>a</sup> The verses are not found in the Hebrew original, and are therefore omitted in every version made directly from it. Among these is our authorized translation.

The question has to be considered in a twofold aspect:—

I. *Have we suppressed any portion of the Scriptures by the alleged omission of the verses in question in the 14th Psalm?*

II. *Have we any precedent admissible by Romanists them-*

<sup>a</sup> For the same reason the Latin churches did not adopt Jerome’s improved version of the Psalter from the Hebrew, but constantly retained in all offices the old translation from the Septuagint, not because the latter was more correct, but because the people were accustomed to it.

*selves, which justifies us in maintaining that the authorized version is correct?*

I. In the first place, we deny that the translators of our Authorized version have suppressed any portion of the WORD OF GOD.

The question, then, usually put by Romanists is, If St. Paul's words, which he uses in the 3rd chapter to the Romans, and which he prefaces by the significant words, "It is written," are not found (as in the Roman Catholic [modern] version) in the 14th [13th] Psalm,—where are they to be found?

In the celebrated Vatican manuscript, one of the oldest extant, these verses are written in the margin, with this note:—"These are placed nowhere in the Psalms; whence, therefore, the apostle took them must be subject of inquiry."<sup>a</sup> This is the question we propose to answer.

Let us first note down St. Paul's words as they appear in the respective translations (Rhemish and Authorized) of his Epistle to the Romans, iii. 10—18:—

*Rhemish Version.*

10. *As it is written:* There is not any man just.

11. There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God.

12. All have turned out of the way, they are become unprofitable together; there is none that doeth good, there is not so much as one.

13. Their throat is an open sepulchre, with their tongues they have dealt deceitfully: the venom of asps is under their lips:

14. Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness.

15. Their feet are swift to shed blood:

16. Destruction and misery are in their ways:

17. And the way of peace they have not known:

18. There is no fear of God before their eyes.

*Authorized Version.*

10. *As it is written:* There is none righteous, no not one.

11. There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God.

12. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no not one.

13. Their throat *is* an open sepulchre, with their tongues they have used deceit: the poison of asps is under their lips.

14. Whose mouth *is* full of cursing and bitterness.

15. Their feet are swift to shed blood:

16. Destruction and misery are in their ways:

17. And the way of peace have they not known:

18. There is no fear of God before their eyes.

Now it is asserted by Romanists that St. Paul quoted from the Psalms of David (Psalm xiii. Douay version; xiv. Authorized version). But as the words contained in the 13th to 18th verses, are not found in the Authorized version of this Psalm, therefore this version is defective in this respect; and

<sup>a</sup> Montfaucon, "Origenis Hexapla," tom. i. p. 492, quoted by Dr. Jarvis in his reply to Dr. Milner's "End of Religious Controversy," p. 54. New York, 1847.

they have not hesitated to charge us with the sin of corrupting the Holy Scriptures : as proof of this charge they bid us examine their translations with ours, and then the fact will become apparent.

To make the subject clear to the reader, we will quote from the Psalm as given in the Douay version :—

“ 3. They are all gone aside, they are become unprofitable together : there is none that doeth good, no not one.

[“ Their throat is an open sepulchre ; with their tongues they acted deceitfully ; the poison of asps is under their lips.

“ Their mouth is full of cursing and bitterness ; their feet are swift to shed blood.

“ Destruction and unhappiness in their ways ; and the way of peace they have not known : there is no fear of God before their eyes.]

“ 4. Shall not all they know that work iniquity, who devour my people as they eat bread ?” &c. &c.

Here, Protestants, it is asserted, have taken away from the Psalm all that part placed [ ] from the foot of verse 3.

The first peculiarity that presents itself is, that the verses alleged to have been suppressed by us, are not numbered in their version. Two distinct and entire verses stand without the usual, and, in fact, the otherwise invariable, numerical designation ; they correspond with the 13th to the 18th verses of the iii. Romans, as cited by St. Paul. The next verse commences with the reference “ 4,” and this corresponds exactly with the Protestant and Authorized division of numerals. St. Paul’s words contained in the 12th verse stand as the 3rd verse in both the versions of the Psalms. It is presumed by Romanists, therefore, that when St. Paul quoted the 13th to the 18th verses, he quoted from the 13th Psalm. But the extraordinary fact of the omission of the usual numerical divisions, raises our suspicion that some adjustment has been made by Romanists *after* the introduction of the numerical division, and that St. Paul *did not* quote from the 13th Psalm alone, *but from various parts of the writings of the Old Testament*, and the transfer of the entire quotation to the 13th Psalm is not warranted by the original Hebrew text. It is true that St. Paul said, “ It is written ;” but he does not say that it is written in one particular Psalm.

It is admitted by both parties that the Psalms of David were written originally in the Hebrew language. The Hebrew text in consequence should be our authority. That portion alleged to be suppressed in our versions is not (as before remarked) to be found in the Psalm in question in the Hebrew

text. It is for Romanists, therefore, to account for the appearance of these verses in their translations, or to prove that the original text has been falsified. We strictly follow the Hebrew version.

It may have escaped the observation of some; that the Psalm in question appears again in another part of the Book of Psalms in both versions; namely, Psalm lii. in the Douay version, and Psalm liii. in the Authorized. It is a remarkable fact, that in the Douay version the pretended omitted verses do not appear, and in all other respects the respective versions are similar to Psalm xiv., Authorized version, and to Psalm xiii., Douay version. We ask why have the Romanists omitted the verses in question from the lii. Psalm, and placed them in the xiii. ?

But St. Paul said, "It is written." We have now to show that the Apostle spoke truly, and where it was so written. We have, therefore, to account for the verses, 13th to 18th, so quoted by St. Paul in Romans iii.

1. Verse 13. *Their throat is an open sepulchre ; with their tongues they have used deceit,* is taken from Psalm v.

*Douay version* (verse 11). "Their throat is an open sepulchre ; they deal deceitfully with their tongues."

*Authorized version* (verse 9). "Their throat is an open sepulchre ; they flatter with their tongue."

2. Verse 13. *The poison of asps is under their lips,* is taken from Psalm cxl.

*Douay version* (verse 4). "The venom of asps is under their lips."

*Authorized version* (verse 3). "Adders' poison is under their lips."

3. Verse 14. *Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness,* is taken from Psalm x. 7.

*Douay version.* "His mouth is full of cursing and of bitterness and deceit."<sup>a</sup>

*Authorized version.* "His mouth is full of cursing and deceit."

4. Verse 15. *Their feet are swift to shed blood,* is taken from Isaiah lix. 7.

*Douay version.* "Their feet run to evil, and make haste to shed innocent blood."

<sup>a</sup> This Psalm in the Douay version has no number, but is headed "Psalm x., according to the Hebrews;" the fact being, that the Roman Catholic versions are not translated from the Hebrew, but from the Vulgate, and the Vulgate, in this case, follows the Septuagint. This is an acknowledgment that the Hebrew text is not followed, and accounts also for the difference in the numerical series, we following the Hebrew.

*Authorized version.* "Their feet run to evil, and they make haste to shed blood."

5. Verse 16. *Destruction and misery are in their way*, is also taken from Isaiah lix. 7.

*Douay version.* "Wasting and destruction are in their paths."

*Authorized version.* "Wasting and destruction are in their paths."

6. Verse 17. *And the way of peace have they not known*, is from Isaiah lix. 8.

*Douay version.* "They have not known the way of peace."

*Authorized version.* "The way of peace they know not."

7. Verse 18. *There is no fear of God before their eyes*, is from Psalm xxxvi. 1.

*Douay version* (xxxv. 2). "There is no fear of God before his eyes."

*Authorized version.* "There is no fear of God before his eyes."

Thus we perceive, that when St. Paul wrote "It is written," he wrote truly, and these words *are* recorded in various parts of Holy Scripture.

The origin of the interpolation, and how it was occasioned, is thus stated by Dr. Jarvis:—In the year 1587 appeared at Rome the printed edition of the Greek Septuagint, professing to be an *exact* copy of the celebrated Vatican manuscript of which we have spoken. But instead of placing the three interpolated verses in the margin, together with the note of the annotator, which clearly showed that they did not belong even to the Greek text, the Roman editors *suppressed the note entirely*, and *embodied the three verses in the text!* Unsuspecting of this *fraud*, the learned world received the *Vatican text* as the true text of the Septuagint. The old Latin Vulgate was made from the Greek; and *there* the three verses were inserted as a part of the text. The famous Alexandrine manuscript, however, which was presented to Charles I. in 1628 by Cyril Lucar, the Greek patriarch of Constantinople, and now in the British Museum, *does not contain the three interpolated verses.*

II. *Have we any precedent admissible by Romanists themselves for coming to the decision that we are justified in maintaining the correctness of the Authorized version?*

This question is as easily answered as the former; and if it be maintained that the Prayer-book is right and the Authorized version is wrong, then we retort the dilemma suggested by Dr. Milner, on members of his own church; for it must be borne in mind that the note to Milner's text avers that



there is *no doubt* but that the Authorized Bible is *defective* by the alleged omission.

There<sup>a</sup> are some scores of editions of the Hebrew Bible and Psalter published by Romanists; there are also many translations of the Psalms from the Hebrew executed by distinguished members of the Roman Church,—into Latin by St. Jerome,<sup>b</sup> Pagninus, Montanus, Felix Pratensis (whose version was approved by Leo X.), Cardinal Cajetan, Malvenda, and Simeon de Muis;—into French by Le Maitre, Dupin, and others;—and into Italian by Francesco del Pozzo:<sup>c</sup> and we fearlessly challenge the production of one of these which contains the passage in question. Have then the editors of Hebrew Bibles, and all the above translators (to whom many others might be added), executed their task with fidelity, or have they wilfully mutilated the sacred text with the sanction or connivance of their ecclesiastical superiors? Are we to trust their Hebrew Bibles or their vulgar Latin ones?<sup>d</sup> Did their canonized St. Jerome obtrude *too much* upon us in the version which he mended, or fraudulently give us *too little* in that which he laboriously made? Truly Dr. Milner was well advised to bring a charge against us, in which doctors, and cardinals, and saints, and popes of his own Church, are equally involved.

<sup>a</sup> The following is adapted from the "Protestant Guardian," 1828, vol. i. pp. 85—87.

<sup>b</sup> This is usually printed along with St. Jerome's works; it differs materially from that in the Latin Bible, which is the ancient translation from the Septuagint, revised and partially corrected by Jerome.

<sup>c</sup> There is also an anonymous Italian version of the Psalter from the Hebrew, executed under the auspices of Catherine de Medicis, of which several editions were printed.

<sup>d</sup> Among a multitude of passages in the Fathers relative to this question, the following are deserving of notice:—"Latinæ linguæ homines Ebraicæ et Græcæ linguæ cognitione opus habent, ut ad exemplaria præcedentia recurratur, si quam dubitationem intulerit Latinorum interpretum varietas."—Augustinus de Doctrina Christiana, 2, 11. "Cum diversum aliquid in utrisque codicibus invenitur, quandoquidem ad fidem rerum gestarum utrumque esse non potest verum, ei linguæ potius credatur unde est in aliam per interpretes facta translatio."—De Civitate Dei, 15, 13. "In Veteri Testamento siquando inter Græcos Latinosque diversitas est, ad Ebraicam recurrimus veritatem."—Hieron., Epist. ad Suniam et Fretellam. "Cogimur ad Hebræos recurrere et scientiæ veritatem de fonte magis quam de rivulis quærere."—Hieron., Comment. in cap. 8 Zachariæ. This last citation from St. Jerome is embodied in the Canon law. (Distinc. 76, cap. Jejunium). In the same Canon law we find the following sound and rational maxim:—"Ut veterum librorum fides de Ebræis voluminibus examinanda est, ita novorum veritas Græci sermonis normam desiderat."—Distinc. 9, cap. ut Veterum. This, by the way, is an excellent specimen of the boasted harmony and unity of the Romish Church. We have the Fathers and the Canon law referring us to the Hebrew Old Testament and the Greek New one, as the only authentic standard; and we have the Council of Trent anathematizing us if we refuse to give that honour to the Vulgar Latin.

We might content ourselves with thus turning this formidable two-horned argument upon Romanists, and leaving them to grapple with it as well as they can. But lest some of our readers should erroneously judge of all Roman Catholic divines by Dr. Milner, we will, for their information, produce one or two passages relating to this subject from Romish commentators of rather more reputation for learning and honesty than Dr. Milner and his modern copyists. Let us first hear Calmet, a commentator justly esteemed both by Romanists and Protestants. On the words “*Sepulchrum patens,*” &c. he observes:—“This verse and the two following as far as these words—‘*nonne cognoscent omnes qui operantur iniquitatem,*’ are not read in the Hebrew copies, neither here nor in the 52nd Psalm [*our 53rd*] which is parallel to this, nor in the Chaldee, nor the Syriac, *nor in the version of St. Jerome made from the Hebrew.* There are even several copies of the Septuagint where they are not found.<sup>a</sup> They were not read in the Complutensian edition, nor by Theodoret, nor St. Chrysostom, nor Euthymius, nor Arnobius, nor Apollinarius. Neither the authors of the Greek Catena, translated by Daniel Barbarus, nor Eusebius of Cæsarea, have given any explanation of them. In a word, St. Jerome affirms that ‘*all the Greek expositors* who have left us their learned commentaries upon the Psalms, mark these verses as spurious and pass them by, plainly acknowledging that they are not in the Hebrew, nor in the Seventy Interpreters, but in the Vulgate edition which the Greeks call *Κοινή*, and which differs in every part of the world.’”—Calmet, Comment. in Psalm xiii.

But perhaps it may be asserted that Calmet was so *liberal* as sometimes to overstep the bounds of orthodoxy. Let us then see whether objectors will gain anything by the testimony of Estius. Anything savouring of heresy will scarcely be suspected or advanced by Romanists from the Divinity Chair of the University of Douay; the great fountain where so many generations of English Romanists imbibed their theological knowledge. The following passage is an extract from his commentary on Romans iii. 10—18. “As to the texts here cited by the Apostle, though they have all been extant for some time *in the common Latin copies in one place*, namely,

<sup>a</sup> Calmet might have said that they are not found in *any one* good manuscript of the LXX. as an integral part of the text. In the famous Vatican MS. they are written in the *margin* with an annotation to this effect:—“These words do not occur *anywhere in the Psalms*; it remains therefore to be inquired whence the Apostle took them.” Nevertheless, Cardinal Caraffa, who superintended the Roman edition, thought proper to insert them in the body of the Psalm, in defiance of the MSS. and all the best critics.

in the 13th Psalm, even before the times of Jerome and Augustine, it must nevertheless be known that they are not all found in that Psalm in the Hebrew, nor in the translation of the Seventy. This is expressly testified by Jerome in the preface to the 16th book of his commentary upon Isaiah, and it is also confirmed by that commentary on the Psalms which bears the name of Jerome; neither does the Chaldee paraphrase acknowledge them in that place. Jerome also adds that all the Greek expositors who have published commentaries on the Psalms, plainly make the very same acknowledgment; and he says that *they who were ignorant of the Apostle's method of blending texts together*, when they looked out for a proper place for the testimony alleged by him—which they did not think was done without the authority of Scripture—*transferred them to that Psalm in which they found the first words*. There have indeed been some persons who maintained that those verses, discarded by Jerome, had been taken away from the Hebrew text of the Psalm referred to, and ought to be restored: in support of which they bring forward some Hebrew Psalter of the English Church. *But they are well and solidly refuted by Lucas Brugensis*, in his annotations on the Holy Bible, to which I refer the reader.”<sup>a</sup>

We could easily fortify the above testimonies by the additional ones of Erasmus, Cardinal Cajetan, Lucas Brugensis, Agellius, Jansenius, and the Jesuits Mariana and Emanuel Sa. The substance of their criticisms, which it would be tedious to transcribe at length, is, that the verses in question form no genuine portion of the Psalm where they appear; that the passage in Romans is, as we have shown, an assemblage of texts from different parts of the Old Testament, which some well-meaning but injudicious transcriber introduced at an early period into the Italic or ancient Latin version of the Psalms, apparently from an over-busy and needless wish of protecting St. Paul's reputation; that it is acknowledged neither by the original Hebrew<sup>b</sup> nor any other version, excepting a few copies of the *Koinē*, or Greek Vulgate, where it was evidently introduced from the Latin; and finally, that it is tacitly or expressly condemned by all the best ancient commentators.

And now we think our Roman Catholic readers will begin to perceive that Dr. Milner has thrown a stone at our church which recoils upon his own. The conclusion of the whole

<sup>a</sup> Estius, Comment. in Epist. ad Rom. p. 33, ed. Paris, 1653.

<sup>b</sup> Emanuel Sa says it is to be found also in the Ethiopic and Arabic Psalters. We suspect, however, that he relies upon those printed at Rome, which in many instances were altered according to the Vulgate.

matter is, that this passage, which is selected with such singular felicity to convict us of mutilating the word of God, turns out to be a manifest interpolation, for which the world is exclusively indebted to Dr. Milner's *authentic* Latin version ! This, it must be confessed, is a notable proof of the vigilance and fidelity with which the Church of Rome exercises the office which she arrogates to herself of *sole preserver* and *guardian* of the Holy Scriptures ! After all, though this corruption originally was caused by a reprehensible tampering with the sacred text, we freely admit that it is one in which no point of faith or morals is concerned. We do not blame the transcribers and printers of the Vulgate for giving us what they found in their manuscripts, nor are we disposed to be severe upon the simple and well-meaning Romanist who takes the passage in question as he finds it in his Psalter. But when it is made the vehicle of an atrocious and unfounded imputation upon our Church, and the honour and integrity of our most learned divines, we repel the charge with indignation, and confidently appeal to the wisest and best-informed members of their own communion for our vindication. We moreover assert, that they who are so ill-advised as to prefer this charge against us, are either grossly deficient in erudition and critical skill, or that they malevolently bring an accusation against us which they know to be groundless : and we doubt whether it will be found as easy to clear Dr. Milner of this reproach as it is to vindicate the fair-dealing of the Church of England.

---

### No. III.

#### THE RULE OF FAITH.

Alleged Corruption of the Authorized Version of the Bible.—1 John v. 7.

IN our last article we examined Dr. Milner's accusation against our Church for having *taken away* from the words of Scripture. The accusation is based on the supposed omission of certain verses from Psalm xiv. (Douay version, xiii.), which appear in the liturgical version of the Psalms. Our authorized version of the Bible was declared to be "without doubt *defective*" in this respect.

The object of this attack was sufficiently explained in the introductory remarks to the last article, to which we beg to refer our readers. With the same object in view, Dr. Milner

proceeds to insinuate that our version is “spurious” by an *addition* to God’s word. Thus in either way falling under the curse conveyed in Rev. xxii. 18, 19.

To establish his second point, it must be observed that Dr. Milner does not make the accusation in an unequivocal and open manner, as if conscious of its truth, but by an underhand insinuation, leaving the desired impression in the mind of the uninstructed reader, that the example given is *peculiar* to the Authorized Bible.

Our readers will better appreciate the artifice if we set out the entire passage :—

“Look, then, at Psalm xiv. as it occurs in the Book of Common Prayer, to which your clergy swear their ‘consent and assent;’ then look at the same psalm in your Bible: you will find four whole verses in the former which are left out in the latter. What will you here say, dear sir? You must say that your Church has added to, else that she has *taken away from, the words of this prophecy.*”

And in a note is added :—

“The verses in question being quoted by St. Paul, Rom. iii. &c., there is no doubt but the Common Bible is *defective* in this passage. On the other hand, Bishop Marsh has published his conviction that the most important passage in the New Testament, 1 John v. 7, for establishing the Divinity of Jesus, is ‘spurious.’”<sup>a</sup>

The italics, which are important to be observed, are as given in Milner.

Now the inference here intended to be conveyed is undoubtedly, that whereas in the first instance our Bible is *defective* by the subtraction or suppression of matter, so is it also “spurious” by the *addition* of a “most important passage in the New Testament for proving the Divinity of Christ.”

The first question we have already disposed of, we trust, satisfactorily.—(See Article II.)

As to the second charge, either our translation is spurious or it is not, in the case cited. If it be not, then there was no necessity for Dr. Milner to question the text at all. But by placing this last sentence of the above note immediately after that of charging us with subtracting from the Word of God, wherein our version was declared *defective*, we conclude that the present charge is that we *are* guilty of *adding* to the Word of God.

From the above extract, who would have had the slightest

<sup>a</sup> Letter ix. p. 116.

notion that the Roman Catholic versions in circulation in this country, *without exception*, have the verse in question, and that too without any comment or note throwing any doubt upon its genuineness? Such is the fact!

We give the text as it stands, word for word, in the two versions:—

*Authorized Version.*

For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.

*Rhemish Version.*

For there are three that give testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.

In another part of this book, Dr. Milner says, "The whole right to the Scriptures belongs to the [Roman] Church. She has preserved them—she vouches for them."—(Letter xii.) If this be true, we are quite at a loss to discover on what grounds Dr. Milner attempts to throw a doubt on the genuineness of a text which is thus emphatically vouched for by his own Church.

We think this a most apt illustration of the title we have chosen for our present series, being "a pious fraud," exemplified by Dr. Milner, in his "End of Religious Controversy." And thus we have a priest of Rome, for the sake of damaging the English Bible, casting aside all his exclusive notions about the "Church," "Councils," and "Tradition;" and accepting the opinion of a private doctor (whom, by the way, he misnames) as decisive at once of a long-litigated question, if it may but subserve a sectarian purpose; and this, too, concerning a doctrine which his own Church doctors expose to contradiction and degradation, by placing it upon a level (and the evidence supporting it) with the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

---

No. IV.

THE RULE OF FAITH.

Alleged Inaccuracies in the Authorized Translation of the Bible.—  
1 Cor. xi. 27; Matt. xix. 11.

Nor content with his endeavours to destroy the authority of, and unsettle our faith in, the Holy Scriptures, Dr. Milner represents Protestant readers as labouring under additional difficulties, since they are stated to rely on a translation "wilfully corrupted." The fidelity of the Authorized version is now assailed, and his correspondent, in Letter ix.,

is asked, "Can you consistently reject the authority of the great universal Church, and yet build upon that of *some obscure translator* in the reign of James I.?" Dr. Milner, however, gives credit to the "new translators" for having "corrected many wilful errors of their predecessors, most of which were levelled at the Catholic doctrines and discipline;" and then for particulars we are referred to "Ward's Errata:"—"yet [he continues] they have left a sufficient number of them behind, for which I do not find that their advocates offer any excuse whatever" (p. 117).

In the present instance Dr. Milner has not dealt in generalities, but furnishes us with two examples of retention of alleged wilful corruptions in our Authorized version:—"1 Cor. xi. 27, where the conjunction *and* is put for the disjunctive *or*; and Matt. xix. 11, where *cannot* is put for *do not*, to the altering of the sense in both instances." These "corruptions" are also stated to "stand in direct opposition to the originals."

And, in Letter xxxix., Dr. Milner writes more plainly on the text, 1 Cor. xi. 27: he says, "Another more important passage for communion under either kind, he [Bishop Porteus] unfairly suppresses, where the Apostle says, '*Whosoever shall eat this bread or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.*' True it is, that in the English Bible the text is here corrupted, the conjunction AND being put for the disjunctive OR, contrary to the original Greek, as well as the Latin Vulgate, to the version of Beza, &c.; but as his lordship could not be ignorant of this corruption, and the importance of the genuine text, it is inexcusable in him to have passed it over unnoticed."

And in a note is added:—

"The Rev. Mr. Grier, who has attempted to vindicate the purity of the English Protestant Bible, has nothing else to say for this alteration of St. Paul's Epistle, than that in what they falsely call the parallel texts of Luke and Matthew, the conjunction *and* occurs" (pp. 377, 378).

The reader will not fail to observe the positive manner in which Dr. Milner talks of the *original Greek*, the Latin Vulgate, and the *genuine text*, and of the equally positive term "corruption" as applied to the Authorized rendering; and though Grier's attempt may be summarily put down as a failure, it will be found that we have "something else to say in vindication of this (alleged) alteration of St. Paul's Epistle," than a reference to parallel texts; and we in turn declare it to be "inexcusable in Dr. Milner to have passed over unnoticed" authorized editions published by members of *his own*

Church, who claim as much respect at our hands as Dr. Milner, and who render one of the two texts, at least, as we do.

The two instances cited are taken from "Ward's Errata," and the alleged object of these corruptions is there also stated.

We will consider each text in turn.

I. The respective versions thus render 1 Cor. xi. 27 :—

*Rhemish Version.*

*Authorized Version.*

Now in Circulation.

Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread OR drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.

Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread AND drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.

The Protestant version has "*and* drink ;" all the modern Romish have "*or* drink ;" the Vulgate, it is alleged, following the Greek  $\eta$ , and consequently having *vel, or*. The English translators, however, selected the reading  $\kappa\alpha\iota$ , for which there is good MS. authority, and have accordingly rendered it by *and*.

The object of this alleged perversion is stated by Ward to be "on purpose to infer a necessity of communicating under both kinds, as the conjunction 'and' may seem to do: whereas, by the disjunctive 'or' it is evident that we may communicate in one kind only."<sup>a</sup> In alleging this reason Dr. Milner follows Ward.

1. We will first address ourselves to the alleged *object* of the perversion.

We assert, that this criticism gives no countenance to communion in one kind, because, by reference to all editions of the Greek, Latin, and English versions, put forth by Romanists, no less than five times they use the conjunction AND in joining the bread and cup together, to be *both* received in remembrance of Christ.<sup>b</sup> Therefore, to say that the cup is not necessary, is to make the Apostle contradict himself, as well as our Lord's institution. There was, therefore, no necessity for altering the 27th verse for any such alleged purpose. But we have no reason to ignore the rendering *or*, if well considered; for we find "*or* drink" placed immediately before and immediately after "*and* drink," which strengthens the cause of the Protestants by making the cup of equal necessity and importance with the bread; why then wilfully reject a text which is so much in our favour! The practice of the early Church of giving the cup to the laity is not denied. Besides, whatever may be the true reading, the doctrine of half-commu-

<sup>a</sup> Ward's "Errata of the Protestant Bible," p. 45. Dublin: 1841.

<sup>b</sup> 1 Cor. xi. 26, 28, 29; x. 16, 17.



nion gains nothing by it; because the Apostle teaches that either to eat or drink unworthily is wrong. That the Corinthians *drank* of the cup is plainly declared in the context.<sup>a</sup>

2. But, secondly, the Protestant rendering is by no means without a precedent, and has authority besides that of some alleged "obscure translator in the reign of James I."

To establish this assertion, the following, which we extract from Mr. Kennard's reply to the Rev. Paul Maclachlan, Roman priest in Falkirk, who brings the same accusations, borrowed from Milner and Ward, will amply suffice.<sup>b</sup>

We find it stated in Wolf's "*Curæ Philologicæ et Criticæ*,"<sup>c</sup> that more than thirty of the earliest printed editions of the Vulgate translation, between 1462 and 1569, have *et biberit* (and drink), agreeing with our own version. Again, Missals, both printed and MS., likewise read *et biberit*, which is proved by Le Brun, a late priest of the Oratory at Paris, in "*Continuat. Memoriarum Literariarum et Histor.*,"<sup>d</sup> and in the Paris "*Ephemerides*,"<sup>e</sup> quoted by Blair, "*Letters on the Revival of Popery*."<sup>f</sup> Mr. Blair also testifies that he had himself searched in numerous old editions, both MSS. and printed, of the Vulgate, and German and French translations, and found the rendering as given by our authorized translation, which is condemned as heretical. Among these is the very first Bible ever printed by Fust and Guttenburg, called the Mazarine Bible, about A.D. 1450, or soon after; that of Mentz, 1462; the Polyglott of Cardinal Ximenes, with the authority of Pope Leo X.; Eggestein's Bible, A.D. 1468; that of Nicolas de Lyra; Peter Comestor's "*Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle*," written in the middle of the twelfth century; the Bible of the Louvain Doctors; that of the Paris Doctors and the Benedictine editors; the grand Polyglott of Antwerp; the Bible of Salamanca University, and many others, all published before the time of Luther, Cranmer, &c. &c.

Again, "the reading *καὶ* is supported by the Uncial MSS., the Alexandrine, and the Clermont, with two others, and even the Vulgate in the Complutensian Polyglott."<sup>g</sup> To

<sup>a</sup> See Elliott's "*Delineation of Roman Catholicism*," book ii. cap. vi. p. 184. London, 1851.

<sup>b</sup> *Controversial Correspondence between the Rev. Paul Maclachlan and R. W. Kennard, Esq.* Partridge and Co., London, 1855, pp. 178-9.

<sup>c</sup> Edit. Basil. 1741, vol. iii. p. 492.

<sup>d</sup> Tom. viii. part i. n. iii.

<sup>e</sup> An. 1730, Dec. p. iv. 451, et seq. ed. Belg.

<sup>f</sup> London, 1819, pp. 244-252.

<sup>g</sup> Mendham's "*Literary Policy of the Church of Rome*," p. 359, App. London, 1830.

these let us add that the following three editions have *and*, and not *or*, in the text in question; the first printed at Nuremberg by Ant. *Koberger*, 1487; the second at Paris, 1504, by *Petit*; and the third at the same place by *Thielman Kerver*, 1526. And in referring to the edition of St. Jerome's works, edited by Erasmus, and printed at Basil, 1516, we find the same reading *et* in the text.<sup>a</sup>

It would be tedious to enumerate all the editions published by Roman Catholics; we shall therefore confine ourselves to a view of the most remarkable ones. 1. The Syriac New Testament, Vienna, 1556-62, patronized by the Emperor Ferdinand, and edited by Albert Widmanstad, the Imperial Chancellor. 2. The Antwerp Polyglott, 1569-72, patronized by the King of Spain, and approved by the Louvain divines, several cardinals, and Pope Gregory XIII. 3. The Paris Polyglott, 1628-45, approved in the General Assembly of the Gallican Church. 4. The Syriac and Arabic Testament, printed at Rome by the College of the Propaganda, 1703; and many others enumerated by Le Long, Boerner, and Masch, all of which render the text in question as we do.<sup>b</sup> And there is yet to notice "the curious and important fact," that "the jealous and sharp-sighted Spanish inquisitors, who ordered a few corrections to be made in the edition of the Latin Vulgate, printed by Colinaeus, 1541, wherein the passage stands 'ET biberit,' find no fault whatever with the above text."<sup>c</sup>

Now what becomes of Dr. Milner's false accusation against our Protestant Bible? His Roman Catholic readers and admirers will in future, we trust, have but little confidence in his assertions.

II. The second text, Matt. xix. 11, is thus rendered in the respective versions:—

*Roman Catholic.*

All receive not this word, but they to whom it is given.

*Protestant.*

All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given.

Ward's objection to our rendering is thus expressed: Vulgate, *Non omnes capiunt*; Greek, *Οὐ πάντες χωροῦσι*. "It

<sup>a</sup> Ingram's "Popish Doctrine of Transubstantiation Refuted," p. 36. London, 1840. "Here, by the way, on the words 'guilty of the body and blood of the Lord,' St. Jerome says nothing in the Commentary that will in the least favour the sense assumed by Mr. Brigham, but merely observes, '*Quia tanti mysterii sacramentum pro vili despexerit*' (tom. ix. fol. 156)." Again, "Qui enim indignè manducaverit ET biberit, reus erit violati corporis et sanguinis Christi."—Op. tom. iv. adv. Jovin. lib. 2, sec. 14.

<sup>b</sup> "Protestant Guardian," vol. i. 1827, p. 105.

<sup>c</sup> See the "Spanish Index Expurg. of 1667," pp. 126-9.

is against the profession of continency in priests and others, that they [Protestants] translate our Saviour's words respecting a 'single life,' and the unmarried state, thus, 'all men cannot,' &c., as though it were impossible to live continent, where Christ said not 'that all men cannot,' but 'all men do not receive this saying.'"<sup>a</sup>

Here let us note a strange inconsistency. "Ward's Errata" was edited by Dr. Lingard, the Romish historian, who wrote an introduction to this work in its defence. Dr. Lingard has since published a translation, which he has entitled "New Version of the Four Gospels, with Notes," &c. London, 1851; and he there renders this very text "All men are *not capable*." Wherein, then, consists the heresy of saying "All men *cannot*?"

The same objection was made by Daniel French, Esq., a Roman Catholic barrister, in his discussion with Dr. Cumming. We shall adopt the Doctor's reply.<sup>b</sup> The question is, whether of the two is, not the more literal, but the more faithful rendering; for every one acquainted with ancient languages must know that a *verbatim* rendering is not always correct. Which then is the real meaning? We read in the Douay version, at the end of the twelfth and next verse, "He that can receive it, let him receive it;" thereby explaining the meaning of the former verse to be, "All men cannot," and not "do not;" implying evidently that there are some who can, and others who cannot: and if there is any meaning in the passage at all, "all do not" means "all cannot," because the reason why a man does not a thing he wishes to do, must be that he cannot do it.<sup>c</sup>

To refer to another passage, Gal. v. 17, where the same thing occurs: "So that," it is in our version, "ye *cannot* do the things that ye would;" in the Rhemish edition it is, "So that you do not the things that you would." Now, it will be observed, that in our version it is, "ye cannot do;" in this (Rhemish) version it is, "do not." Now if one *will* to do a thing, the reason why he *do not* do it must be that he *cannot* do it; because two things are requisite to action: first, the *will*, or volition; secondly, the *power*. Now, if he have *volition*, or the *will*, but do not do the thing, the natural inference is, that he has not the power; and therefore our translators have faithfully given the *meaning of the passage*; and the Rhemish translators have given a sort of literality which ends in absolute mystification.

<sup>a</sup> P. 54, edit. Dublin, 1841.

<sup>b</sup> See, "Hammersmith Discussion," edit. 1852, p. 477.

<sup>c</sup> The same objection is taken to our rendering of 1 Cor. vii. 9.

So much then for the two alleged corrupt renderings, by "an obscure translator in the reign of James I.," in the Authorized version.

III. And, thirdly, this last expression of Dr. Milner will raise a smile indeed when we transcribe the list of names selected to perform the arduous and responsible task of accomplishing the king's desire, "that our intended translation may have the help and furtherance of all our principal men within this our kingdom."<sup>a</sup>

The work was assigned, according to Fuller, to forty-seven of the most illustrious men of the day, who spent on it three years. The Scriptures were allotted, in six portions, to individuals selected as best adapted for the particular labour assigned to them.

The names and numbers of the persons, the places where they met together, with the portions of Scripture assigned to each company, are as follows :<sup>b</sup>—

I. WESTMINSTER. Ten.—*The Pentateuch, and the history from Joshua to the First Book of the Chronicles exclusively.*—1. Dr. ANDREWS, fellow and master of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, then dean of Westminster, and afterwards bishop of Winchester. 2. Dr. OVERALL, fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, master of Katherine Hall, Cambridge, then dean of S. Paul's, afterwards bishop of Norwich. [He obtained his promotion from his great classical knowledge.] 3. Dr. SARAVIA, prebendary of Canterbury [the friend of Hooker and Whitgift]. 4. Dr. CLARKE, fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, vicar of Mynster and Monckton, in Thanet, and one of the six preachers in Canterbury. 5. Dr. LAYFIELD, fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and parson of St. Clement Danes. [Being skilled in architecture, his judgment was much relied on for the description of the tabernacle and the temple.] 6. Dr. LEIGH, archdeacon of Middlesex, and parson of All-Hallows, Barking [a profound linguist]. 7. Dr. BURGLEY. 8. Mr. KING. 9. Mr. THOMPSON. 10. Mr. BEDWELL, of Cambridge, probably of St. John's, and vicar of Tottenham, near London [the first Arabic scholar of his age].

II. CAMBRIDGE. Eight.—*From the First of the Chronicles, with the rest of the history and the hagiographa, viz., Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Canticles, Ecclesiastes.*—1. Mr. LIVELIE [professor of Hebrew, at Cambridge]. 2. Mr. RICHARDSON, fellow of Emanuel, afterwards D.D., master, first of Peter-house, then of Trinity College. 3. Mr. CHADDERTON, afterwards D.D., fellow first of Christ College, then master of Emanuel. [A Hebrew and Greek scholar, and versed in Rabbinical literature.] 4. Mr. DILLINGHAM, fellow of Christ College, benefited at —, in Bedfordshire, where he died. 5. Mr. ANDREWS, afterwards D.D., brother to the bishop of Winchester, and master of Jesus College. 6. Mr. HARRISON, the rev. vice-master of Trinity College [a first-rate linguist]. 7. Mr. SPALDING, fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and Hebrew professor there. 8. Mr. BING, fellow of Peter-house College, Cambridge, and Hebrew professor.

III. OXFORD. Seven.—*The Four Greater Prophets, with the Lamentations, and the Twelve Minor Prophets.*—1. Dr. Harding, president of Magdalen College. 2. Dr. REYNOLDS, president of Corpus Christi College. [Wood says that his

<sup>a</sup> King James's address to the Archbishop of Canterbury, dated 22nd July, 1604.

<sup>b</sup> See Hewlett's edition of the Holy Bible, in three vols. 4to. London, 1811, vol. i. p. 42.

knowledge of the Hebrew and Greek was almost marvellous.] 3. Dr. HOLLAND, rector of Exeter College, and King's professor of divinity. 4. Dr. KIRBY, rector of Lincoln College, and regius professor of Hebrew [an Orientalist of profound scholarship]. 5. Mr. [MILES] SMITH, afterwards D.D., and bishop of Gloucester. [Hebrew, Syriac, and Greek were to him as familiar as English.] He wrote the learned preface to the translation, and was one of those who revised the whole work when it was finished. 6. Mr. BRETT. He was eminently skilled in the Oriental languages, and was rector of Quanton, in Buckinghamshire, forty-two years. 7. Mr. FAIRCLOWE.

IV. CAMBRIDGE. Eight.—*The Prayer of Manasseh, and the rest of the Apocrypha.*—1. Dr. DUPONT, prebendary of Ely, and master of Jesus College. 2. Dr. BRAITHWAITE, first fellow of Emanuel, then master of Gonvil and Caius College. 3. Dr. RADCLIFFE, one of the senior fellows of Trinity College. 4. Mr. WARD, of Emanuel, afterwards D.D., master of Sidney College and Margaret professor. 5. Mr. DOWNES, fellow of St. John's College, and Greek professor. 6. Mr. BOYSE, fellow of St. John's College, prebendary of Ely, and parson of Boxworth, in Cambridgeshire. [The first Greek scholar of his age.] 7. Mr. WARD, fellow of King's College, afterwards D.D., prebendary of Chichester, and rector of Bishop Waltham, in Hampshire.

V. OXFORD. Eight.—*The four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and Apocalypse.*—1. Dr. RAVIS, dean of Christ Church, afterwards bishop of London. 2. Dr. ABBOT, master of University College, afterwards archbishop of Canterbury. 3. Dr. EEDES.\* 4. Mr. THOMPSON. 5. Mr. SAVILE. 6. Dr. PERYN. 7. Dr. RAVENS. 8. Mr. HARMER.

VI. WESTMINSTER. Seven.—*The Epistles of St. Paul, and the other canonical Epistles.*—1. Dr. BARLOWE, of Trinity Hall, in Cambridge, dean of Chester, afterwards bishop of Lincoln. 2. Dr. HUTCHINSON. 3. Dr. SPENCER. 4. Mr. FENTON. 5. Mr. RABBET. 6. Mr. SANDESON. 7. Mr. DAKINS.

Such, then, is the list of illustrious names who have given us our Authorized translation of the Bible, which Dr. MILNER asserts to be the production "of some obscure translator in the reign of James I."!! *But the bible present referred to the first Edition translated by Stindal*

## No. V.

### RULE OF FAITH.

#### The Protestant "Rule of Faith" and "Private Judgment."

THE burthen of Dr. Milner's book throughout is, that the Romish doctrines are misrepresented by Protestants. Suffering under this alleged injustice, the doctor should have been careful in not bringing upon himself a similar complaint when he undertakes to find fault with Protestant doctrines and teaching. We more particularly refer to Dr. Milner's remarks on the subject which forms the title of this article.

Dr. Milner pretends to divide the sects of "Christians" into three classes. The *first* are the "Montanists, Anabaptists,

\* Instead of Dr. Eedes, Mr. Lewis has James Montagu, Bishop of Bath and Wells.—"History of Translations of the Bible in English," pp. 310-11, ed. 1739.

the Family of Love, Quakers, Moravians, and different classes of Methodists." Their "Rule of Faith" is asserted to be, or to have been, "*private inspiration*, or an immediate light and motion of God's spirit, communicated to the individual."

The second class consists of the "more regular sects of Protestants, such as the Lutherans, the Calvinists, the Socinians, the Church-of-England-men;" and their "Rule of Faith" is represented to be "*the written Word of God*, or THE BIBLE, according as it is understood by each particular reader or hearer of it."

The third class are those of his own sect, whom he calls "Catholics." Their rule is stated to be "THE WORD OF GOD at large, whether written in the Bible, or handed down from the Apostles in continued succession by the Catholic Church, and as it is understood and explained by the Church. To speak more accurately, besides the rule of faith, which is *Scripture and Tradition*, Catholics acknowledge an *unerring judge of controversy*, or sure guide in all matters relating to salvation—namely, THE CHURCH."<sup>a</sup>

It is to that part of the second class referring to the "Church-of-England-men" that we shall for the present confine our remarks.


We have to thank the doctor for ranking "Church-of-England-men" among the "more regular sects of Protestants;" but we are placed in too close a proximity to "Socinians" to be agreeable. The intended compliment loses it value; for we have yet to learn that the "Socinians" are a sect of "Protestants" in the ordinary acceptation of the term, except that they *protest* against the fundamentals of Christianity, equally admitted by Protestants and Romanists.

From which of the authorized documents of the Church of England did Dr. Milner learn that *her* rule of faith is such as he has defined it to be? He gives no reference, and for this there is sufficient reason,—none exists.

In reply to Dr. Milner, we assert that the Church of England maintains the Rule of Faith to be THE BIBLE ALONE, not as it is understood by each particular reader of it, but according to the INTERPRETATION OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH, EMBODIED AND DISTINCTLY SET FORTH IN HER OWN ESTABLISHED STANDARD OF DOCTRINE AND WORSHIP, THE PRAYER BOOK.

For this assertion we appeal to the Thirty-nine Articles of our religion, of which the first declares our faith in the Holy Trinity; the second, in the Divinity, Incarnation, and Atonement.

<sup>a</sup> The Italics and Capitals are as given by Dr. Milner, Letter vi. pp. 79, 80.



ment of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; the third, His descent into Hades; the fourth, His resurrection; the fifth, the divinity of the Holy Ghost; the eighth, the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds; the sixth, the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures, as containing all things necessary for salvation; and the twentieth, the *authority of the Church in controversies of faith*, as well as in the ordinary rites and ceremonies; which authority is again declared in the thirty-fourth article; to say nothing of a large amount of doctrine in the other articles, on justification, original sin, the sacraments, &c. So that there is not a single topic decided by the councils and the fathers, in the pure and primitive ages of the Church, which is not here distinctly set forth with the most admirable exactness and precision, leaving no room for "heretical private judgment" in any important point of the Christian doctrine.

And next we appeal to the fixed order of the Liturgy and offices of the Church of England, which not only sets forth the creeds and all the cardinal tenets of the ancient faith in the plainest terms, but keeps them constantly before the eyes, and on the lips, of our people; not wrapping them up in Latin, which for the most part none but the priest pretends to understand, but proclaiming them in the language of the country; and thus giving regularly the decisions of the "*judge of controversy*, THE CHURCH," to every man, woman, and child belonging to the body of the faithful.<sup>a</sup>

The judgment, however, of that Church, touching the TRUE SENSE of Doctrinal Scripture, is in no wise a mere arbitrary judgment; nor can it be called the *Private Judgment of the Corporate Anglican Church*, as contradistinguished from the *Private Judgment of any other Corporate Church*.

On the contrary, it is laid down *on certain fixed and intelligible principles*, which at once approve themselves to the right reason of every thinking individual.

While her sixth article, as we have asserted, recognizes Scripture *alone* as her binding Rule of Faith, her eighth article recognizes the three Creeds, as containing a Doctrinal Summary of what may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture. Now these three Creeds are the only three out of the numerous cognate Creeds which collectively and harmoniously run up to the Apostolic Age. Hence, in recognizing them, as giving the TRUE SENSE of the Bible, the Anglican Church appeals, not to her own mere insulated and

<sup>a</sup> Bishop Hopkins's "Refutation of Milner's End of Controversy," vol. i. pp. 14, 15. New York, 1854.

arbitrary private judgment, which would be only one degree more respectable than the insulated and arbitrary private judgment of an individual, but to the recorded historical testimony afforded by the universal consent of the Church from the beginning, as to the SENSE in which her SOLE rule of faith ought to be understood.

Agreeably to this system, the whole of her articles and homilies are constructed.

Throughout, she studiously refers to concurring antiquity, as bearing witness to the *sense* in which the doctrinal parts of Scripture were understood and explained from the very beginning; and as she herself thus fully renounces the claim of being her own insulated and arbitrary judge of the SENSE of the Bible, so, both by the imposition of the articles, and even explicitly in her nineteenth canon of the year 1571, she wisely, to her clergy, and through them to her laity, prohibits the absurdity of licentious and independent private judgment:—

“In the first place, preachers shall take heed, that they teach nothing in the shape of a sermon which they may wish to be religiously held and believed by the people, except what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old or New Testament, and what from that very teaching the Catholic fathers and ancient bishops collected.”<sup>a</sup>

To the PRINCIPLE of the Anglican Church, thus distinctly set forth in her nineteenth canon, both Bishop Jewel and the learned Casaubon bear full and explicit testimony.<sup>b</sup> It may be added, what in some sort is still more important because directly *official*, that, in the year 1559, Queen Elizabeth similarly avowed this identical PRINCIPLE, as the TRUE PRINCIPLE of the Reformed Church of England, in her formal reply to the emperor and the other princes of the Romish persuasion.<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Imprimis, videbunt concionatores, ne quid unquam doceant pro concione, quod a populo religiosè teneri et credi velint, nisi quod consentaneum sit doctrinæ Veteris aut Novi Testamenti, quodque ex illa ipsa doctrina Catholici Patres et Veteres Episcopi collegerint.—Canon. Eccles. Anglican. xix. A.D. 1571.

<sup>b</sup> *Ista nos didicimus a Christo, ab Apostolis, et sanctis Patribus: et eadem bona fide docemus populum Dei.*—Juell. Apol. Eccles. Anglican. apud Enchir. Theol. vol. i. p. 228. Vide etiam pp. 295, 323, 340.

Opto, cum Melancthone et Ecclesia Anglicana, per canalem Antiquitatis diduci ad nos dogmata fidei e fonte Sacræ Scripturæ derivata. Alioquin, quis futurus est novandi finis?—Casaub. Epist. 744. Vide etiam Epist. 837, 838.

<sup>c</sup> Nec causam subesse ullam cur concederet, cum Anglia non novam aut alienam amplectatur religionem, sed eam, quam Christus jussit, prima et Catholica Ecclesia coluit, et vetustissimi Patres una voce et mente comprobant.—Camden. Rerum Anglican. et Hibern. Annal. regnant. Elisab. A.D. 1559, par. i. p. 28. Lugd. Batav. 1639.



The very propounding of the Articles in the year 1562, *for avoiding of diversities of opinions and for the establishment of consent touching true religion*, might surely have convinced Dr. Milner that the Anglican Church teaches no such absurdity as that which he has been pleased to ascribe to her.<sup>a</sup>

And yet, in the face of all this, Dr. Milner had the hardihood to publish the charge, that the Rule of Faith in the Church of England is *THE BIBLE according as it is understood by each particular reader of it!* We invite our Roman Catholic readers to point out a more glaring example of theological misrepresentation than this, which yet is but a specimen of the author's style of management throughout the whole volume.

In a later part of the book, and in a long note, Dr. Milner attributes to the Reformers and Reformation, sedition, rebellion, blasphemies; and after reciting history in his own fashion, which we will have hereafter to examine, he declares one of the *principles* of the Reformation *especially* to be "that of each man's explaining the Scripture for himself."<sup>b</sup>

Had this been one of the "especial principles" of the Reformation, we might reasonably look for its enunciation in the writings of the Reformers; we shall therefore supply a few extracts, which are borrowed from the Rev. Richard Gibbings' learned work, "Roman Forgeries and Falsifications,"<sup>c</sup> to prove how fallacious is the statement advanced by Dr. Milner.

Cranmer's belief was that "we ought to interpret the Scriptures in conformity to the sense of the antients."<sup>d</sup> This feeling was of course produced by his agreement with Ridley, that "we haue (hygh prayse be geuen to God therfore) moste playnly, euidently, and clearly on oure side, all the prophetes, all the apostles, and vndoubtedly all the aunciente ecclesiasticall writers whiche haue written vntyll of late yeares paste."<sup>e</sup> "The present question is," (says Stillingfleet,) "how far tradition is to be allowed in giving the sense of Scripture between us. Vincentius saith, we ought to follow it where there is antiquity, vniversality, and consent. This we are willing to be tryed by."<sup>f</sup> Instead of acknowledging that the Church of

<sup>a</sup> Faber's "Difficulties of Romanism," in Preface, 3rd edition, 1853.

<sup>b</sup> Letter xlvii. p. 436.

<sup>c</sup> London, 1849, p. xi. *et seq.*

<sup>d</sup> Collier's "Eccles. Hist.," ii. 56. London, 1714.

<sup>e</sup> "Letters of Martyrs," foll. 30, 31. London, 1564.

<sup>f</sup> "The Council of Trent examin'd and disprov'd by Catholick Tradition," Part i. p. 23. London, 1688.

Rome has "followed in the track of even the earliest fathers,"<sup>a</sup> or, with preposterous flippancy, granting that Popery "might fairly represent itself as *a reform upon early Christianity*,"<sup>b</sup> our Divines have continually rejoiced in the conviction that the fathers "must be trusted, but yet as men;"<sup>c</sup> that "the very doctrine of the Scriptures themselves, as they had been constantly understood and believed by all faithful Christians,"<sup>d</sup> "is at this day intirely professed in our Church,"<sup>e</sup> which founded "its Reformation on the prophets and apostles only, according to the explications and traditions of the ancient fathers."<sup>f</sup> It is certain "that we reverently receive the unanimous *tradition* or doctrine of the Church in all ages, which determines the *meaning* of the Holy Scripture, and makes it more clear and unquestionable in any point of faith wherein we can find it has declared its sense. For we look upon this *tradition* as nothing else but the *Scripture unfolded*: NOT A NEW THING, WHICH IS NOT IN THE SCRIPTURE, BUT THE SCRIPTURE EXPLAINED, AND MADE MORE EVIDENT."<sup>g</sup> "We believe the concurring judgment of antiquity to be, though not *infallible*, yet the *safest* comment upon Scripture,"<sup>h</sup> "which rule the Reformers of the Church of England proposed to themselves to follow:"<sup>i</sup> "nothing was more remote from their intention than indiscriminately to condemn all tradition;"<sup>k</sup> and "they who refuse to be tried by this rule . . . are justly to be suspected; nay, it is evident that they are broaching some novel doctrines which cannot stand this test;"<sup>l</sup> inasmuch as "where the question is concerning an obscure place of Scripture, the practice of the Catholic Church is the best commentary."<sup>m</sup> "The principle on which we separated from the Roman Church was, not that we had discovered any new views of Scripture doctrines, but that we

<sup>a</sup> "Perverted Tradition the bane of the Church." A Sermon, by the Rev. Josiah Pratt, B.D., p. 6. London, 1839.

<sup>b</sup> Taylor's "Ancient Christianity," l. 79. London, 1839.

<sup>c</sup> "Calfhill's Avnsweare to the Treatise of the Crosse," fol. 120. London, 1565.

<sup>d</sup> Sanderson's Sermons; ad Clerum, v. p. 6. London, 1681.

<sup>e</sup> Ussher's "Sermon preached before his Majestie," p. 27. London, 1631.

<sup>f</sup> Heylyn's "Histor. and Miscell. Tracts," p. 34. London, 1681.

<sup>g</sup> Patrick's "Discourse about Tradition," p. 11. London, 1685.

<sup>h</sup> Waterland's "Vindication of Christ's Divinity," p. 458. Cambridge, 1719.

<sup>i</sup> Chillingworth's Works, p. 285. London, 1742.

<sup>k</sup> Bishop Kaye's "Tertullian," p. 302. Cambridge, 1829.

<sup>l</sup> Leslie's Works, vol. i. pp. 71-2. Oxford, 1832. Compare "The Primitive Creed examined and explained," by Bishop Hopkins (of Vermont), Pref. p. vii. Burlington, 1834.

<sup>m</sup> Bishop Taylor's Works, by Heber, vi. 521. London, 1828. See his "Advice to his Clergy," in Randolph's "Enchir. Theol.," i. 348. Oxford, 1825.

desired to return to the primitive confession, the views held by the apostles and early fathers of the Church.”<sup>a</sup> “If we reject SCRIPTURE, we reject the very basis of theological belief; if we reject ANTIQUITY, we reject all historical evidence to soundness of interpretation.”<sup>b</sup> To these testimonies we may fitly add the command given to preachers by the Upper House of Convocation in the year 1571:—“They shall in the first place be careful not to teach anything in their sermons, to be religiously held and believed by the people, except that which is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old or New Testament, and which has been deduced from the same doctrine by the Catholic fathers and ancient bishops.”<sup>c</sup>

Dr. Milner proceeds to descant largely on the unhappy results of “private judgment,” leading, as he would be glad to have his readers understand, to utter lawlessness, confusion, and anarchy. We need scarcely inform our Protestant readers that this assertion is as fallacious as that just examined. We do claim the privilege of “private judgment,” but that “private judgment” is a very different thing from that which is attributed to us. Our work will not be complete without recording in our pages what we really mean by the right of private judgment, and for this purpose we cannot do better than transcribe the sentiments on this subject of the late talented Rev. J. E. Tyler, from his truly pious and learned work “Primitive Christian Worship.”<sup>d</sup>

The foundation on which, to be safe and beneficial, the duty of private judgment, as we maintain, must be built, is very far indeed removed from that common and mischievous notion of it which would encourage us to draw immediate and crude deductions from Holy Scripture, subject only to the control and the colouring of our own minds, responsible for nothing further than our own consciousness of an honest intention. Whilst we claim a release from that degrading

<sup>a</sup> Rose’s “State of the Protestant Religion in Germany,” p. 21. Cambridge, 1825. Compare Bretschneider’s “Apology for the modern Theology of Protestant Germany,” p. 46, London, 1827; and Mr. Rose’s Appendix to his work, pp. 78—81. London, 1828.

<sup>b</sup> Faber’s “Prim. Doctrine of Election,” p. 13. London, 1836.

<sup>c</sup> Sparrow’s “Collection,” p. 238. London, 1671. Vid. Strype’s “Annals,” vol. ii. part i. p. 107. Oxford, 1824. “Life of Parker,” ii. 57. Oxford, 1821. Cosin’s “Hist. of Transubstantiation,” p. 7. London, 1676. Scriveneri “Apolog. pro S. Patt.,” p. 57. London, 1672. Heylyn’s “Life of Laud,” p. 238. London, 1671. Patrick’s “Discourse about Tradition,” p. 15. London, 1685. Waterland’s Works, v. 317. Oxford, 1823. Routh, “Reliquiæ Sacræ,” vol. i. Præfat. p. xiv. Oxon. 1814. Bishop Mant, on the “Book of Common Prayer,” p. 340. Oxford, 1820.

<sup>d</sup> London: printed for the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1847, Part I. cap. i.

yoke which neither are we nor were our fathers able to bear, we deprecate for ourselves and for our fellow-believers that licentiousness which in doctrine and practice tempts a man to follow merely what is right in his own eyes, uninfluenced by the example, the precepts, and the authority of others, and owning no submissive allegiance to those laws which the wise and good have established for the benefit of the whole body. The freedom which we ask for ourselves, and desire to see imparted to all, is a rational liberty, tending to the good, not operating to the bane of its possessors; ministering to the general welfare, not to disorder and confusion. In the enjoyment of this liberty, or rather in the discharge of the duties and trusts which this liberty brings with it, we feel ourselves under an obligation to examine the foundations of our faith, to the very best of our abilities, according to our opportunities, and with the most faithful use of all the means afforded to us by its divine Author and Finisher. Among those means, whilst we regard the Holy Scripture as paramount and supreme, we appeal to the witness and mind of the Church as secondary and subsidiary; a witness not at all competing with Scripture, never to be balanced against it; but competing with our own less able and less pure apprehension of Scripture. In ascertaining the testimony of this witness, we examine the sentiments and practice of the ancient teachers of the Church; not as infallible guides, not as uniformly holding all of them the same opinions, but as most valuable helps in our examination of the evidence of the Church, who is, after all, our appointed instructor in the truths of the Gospel,—fallible in her individual members and branches, yet the sure witness and keeper of Holy Writ, and our safest guide on earth to the mind and will of God. When we have once satisfied ourselves that a doctrine is founded on Scripture, we receive it with implicit faith, and maintain it as a sacred deposit, intrusted to our keeping, to be delivered down whole and entire without our adding thereto what to us may seem needful, or taking away what we may think superfluous.

The state of the Christian thus employed, in acting for himself in a work peculiarly his own, is very far removed from the condition of one who labours in bondage, without any sense of liberty and responsibility, unconscious of the dignity of a free and accountable agent, and surrendering himself wholly to the control of a task-master. Equally is it distant from the conduct of one who indignantly casting off all regard for authority, and all deference to the opinions of others, boldly and proudly sets up his own will and pleasure as the only

standard to which he will submit. For the model which we would adopt, as members of the Church, in our pursuit of Christian truth, we find a parallel and analogous case in a well-principled and well-disciplined son, with his way of life before him, exercising a large and liberal discretion in the choice of his pursuits; not fettered by peremptory paternal mandates, but ever voluntarily referring to those principles of moral obligation and of practical wisdom with which his mind has been imbued; shaping his course with modest diffidence in himself, and habitual deference to others older and wiser than himself, yet acting with the firmness and intrepidity of conscious rectitude of principle, and integrity of purpose; and under a constant sense of his responsibility, as well for his principles as for his conduct.

Against the cogency of these maxims various objections have been urged from time to time. We have been told, that the exercise of private judgment in matters of religion tends to foster errors of every diversity of character, and leads to heresy, scepticism, and infidelity: it is represented as rending the Church of Christ, and totally subverting Christian unity, and snapping asunder at once the bond of peace. So also it has been often maintained, that the same cause robs individual Christians of that freedom from all disquietude and perplexity and anxious responsibility, that peace of mind, satisfaction, and content, which those personally enjoy who surrender themselves implicitly to a guide whom they believe to be unerring and infallible.

For a moment let us pause to ascertain the soundness of such objections. And here anticipating, for argument's sake, the worst result, let us suppose that the exercise of individual inquiry and judgment (such as the best teachers in the Anglican Church are wont to inculcate) may lead in some cases even to professed infidelity; is it right, and wise, and justifiable to be driven by an abuse of God's gifts to denounce the legitimate and faithful employment of them? What human faculty—which among the most precious of the Almighty's blessings—is not liable to perversion? What unquestionable moral duty can be found, which has not been transformed by man's waywardness into an instrument of evil? Nay, what doctrine of our holy faith has not the wickedness or the folly of unworthy men employed as a cloak for unrighteousness, and a vehicle for blasphemy? But by a consciousness of this liability in all things human, must we be tempted to suppress the truth? to disparage those moral duties? or discountenance the cultivation of those gifts and faculties? Rather would not sound philosophy and Christian

wisdom jointly enforce the necessity of improving the gifts zealously, of discharging the moral obligation to the full, and of maintaining the doctrine in all its integrity; but guarding withal, to the utmost of our power and watchfulness, against the abuses to which any of these things may be exposed? And we may trust in humble but assured confidence, that as it is the duty of a rational being, alive to his own responsibility, to inquire and judge for himself in things concerning the soul, with the most faithful exercise of his abilities and means; so the wise and merciful Ruler of our destinies will provide us with a sure way of escaping from all evils incident to the discharge of that duty, if, in reliance on his blessing, we honestly seek the truth, and perseveringly adhere to that way in which He will be our guide.

It is a question very generally and very reasonably entertained among us, whether the implicit submission and unrestrained surrender of ourselves to any human authority in matters of faith (though whilst it lasts, it of course affords an effectual check to open scepticism), does not ultimately and in very deed prove a far more prolific source of disguised infidelity. Doubts repressed as they arise, but not solved, silenced but not satisfied, gradually accumulate in spite of all external precaution; and at length (like streams pent back by some temporary barrier) break forth at once to an utter discarding of all authority, and an irrecoverable rejection of the Christian faith. From unlimited acquiescence in a guide whom our associations have invested with infallibility, the step is very short, and frequently taken, to entire apostasy and renunciation of all belief.

The state of undisturbed tranquillity and repose of the man who, having divested himself of all responsibility in matters of religious belief and practice, enjoys an entire immunity from the anxious and painful labour of trying for himself the purity and soundness of his faith, is often painted in strong contrast with the lamentable condition of those who are driven about by every wind of novelty. The condition of such a man may doubtless be far more enviable than theirs, who have no settled fixed principles, and who wander from creed to creed, and from sect to sect, just as their fickle and roving minds suggest some transitory preference. But the believer must not be driven by the evils of one extreme to take refuge in the opposite. The whirlpool may be the more perilous, but the Christian mariner must avoid the rock also, or he will equally make shipwreck of his faith. He must with all his skill, and all his might, keep to the middle course, shunning that presumptuous confidence which scorns all

authority, and boldly constitutes itself sole judge and legislator; but equally rescuing his mind from the thralldom which prostrates his reason, and paralyzes all the faculties of his judgment in a matter of indefeasible and awful responsibility.

Here, too, it is questioned, and not without cause, whether the satisfaction and comfort so often represented in warm and fascinating colours, be really a spiritual blessing; or whether it be not a deception and fallacy, frequently ending in lamentable perplexity and confusion, like guarantees in secular concerns, which as long as they maintain unsuspected credit, afford a most pleasing and happy security to any one who depends upon them, but which, when adverse fortune puts their responsibility to the test, may prove utterly worthless, and be traced only by losses and disappointments. Such a blind reliance on authority may doubtless be more easy and more free from care than it is to gird up the loins of our mind, and engage in toilsome spiritual labour. But with a view to our own ultimate safety, wisdom bids us look to our foundations in time, and assure ourselves of them; admonishing us, that if they are unsound, the spiritual edifice reared upon them, however pleasing to the eye, or abounding in present enjoyments, will at length fall, and bury our hopes in its ruin.

On these and similar principles, we maintain that it well becomes Christians, when the soundness of their faith, and the rectitude of their acts of worship, are called in question, "to prove all things, and hold fast that which is good." Thus, when the unbeliever charges us with credulity in receiving as a divine revelation what he scornfully rejects, it behoves us all (every one to the extent of his means and opportunities) to possess ourselves of the accumulated evidences of our holy faith, so that we may be able to give to our own minds, and to those who ask it of us, a reason for our hope. The result can assuredly be only the comfort of a still more unshaken conviction. Thus, too, when the misbeliever charges us with an undue and an unauthorized ascription of the Divine attributes to our Redeemer and to our Sanctifier, which he would confine to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, exclusively of the Eternal Son and the Blessed Spirit, it well becomes every Catholic Christian to assure himself of the evidence borne by the Scriptures to the divinity of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, together with the inseparable doctrines of redemption by the blood of Christ, and sanctification by the Spirit of grace; appealing also in this investigation to the tradition of the Church, and the testimony of her individual members

from the earliest times, as under God his surest and best guides. "In both these cases," writes the venerable author from whom we are quoting, "I can say for myself that I have acted upon my own principles, and to the very utmost of my faculties have scrutinized the foundations of my faith, and from each of those inquiries and researches I have risen with a satisfaction increased far beyond my first anticipations. What I had taken up in my youth on authority, I have been long assured of by a moral demonstration, which nothing can shake; and I cling to it with an affection, which, guarded by God's good providence, nothing in this world can dissolve or weaken."

It is to engage in a similar investigation that we now most earnestly invite the members of the Church of Rome, in order to ascertain for themselves the ground of their faith and practice in various matters of vast moment, and which involve the principles of separation between the Roman and Anglican branches of the universal Church. Were the subjects of minor importance, or what the ancient writers were wont to call "things indifferent," reason and charity would prescribe that we should bear with each other, allowing a free and large discretion in any body of Christians, and not severing ourselves from them because we deemed our views preferable to theirs. In such a case we might well walk in the house of God as friends, without any interruption of the harmony which should exist between those who worship the true God with one heart and one mind, ever striving to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. But when the points at issue are of so vast moment; when two persons agreeing in the general principles of belief in the Gospel and its chief characteristic doctrines, yet find it impossible to join conscientiously in the same prayer, or the same acts of faith and worship, then the necessity is imperative on all who would not be parties to the utter breaking up of Christian unity, nor assist in propagating error, to make sure of their foundations; and satisfy themselves, by an honest inquiry and upright judgment, that the fault does not rest with them.

---

## No. VI.

### THE RULE OF FAITH.

The objection that Christ himself wrote no part of the New Testament.

THE first objection made by Dr. Milner against the Bible being considered as the sole Rule of Faith, lies in the asser-



tion, that "if Christ had intended that all mankind should learn his religion from a *Book*, namely the *New Testament*, he himself would have written that book, and would have enjoined the obligation of learning to read it as the first and fundamental precept of religion; whereas, he never wrote anything at all, unless perhaps the sins of the Pharisees with his fingers upon the dust."<sup>a</sup>

This, observes Dr. Jarvis, is about as wise a remark as that of the unbeliever mentioned by Paley, that "if God had given a revelation, he would have written it in the skies."<sup>b</sup> Such remarks can operate only on the unreflecting and vulgar mind. We are willing to believe that our Blessed Lord knew better than Dr. Milner what was proper for HIM to do, when HE told His disciples that the "HOLY GHOST should bring all things to their remembrance, whatsoever He had said unto them." The learned polemic might as well say, that if our Lord had intended that all men should enter His Church, He would have remained on earth to found it. But why did not Dr. Milner speak of the OLD TESTAMENT? Did not Christ constantly appeal to the Scriptures, meaning of course the Scriptures of the Old Testament? "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."<sup>c</sup> And as God was the first Author of writing in the Old Law, so our Saviour Christ, God and Man, taught the same lesson by His own example and direction in the New. Dr. Milner's objection, foolish as it is, is not his own. It is as old at least as the days of Augustine, when it was refuted by this great writer, an admitted saint of his own church. "For when the disciples wrote [saith Augustine] what Christ showed and said unto them, it is not to be said that he did not write himself, inasmuch as the members wrote that which they learned by the inditing of the Head; for whatever He would have us to read of the things which He did and said, He gave in charge to them, as His hands, to write the same."<sup>d</sup>

It is a matter that should be particularly noted, that while Romanists express such great veneration for the early writers, known as the Fathers, when it suits their purpose, they do not hesitate to hold a line of argument which is not unfrequently in direct opposition to those early writers of the Christian Church. We have given one extract from St. Augustine's works completely opposed to Dr. Milner's views. To

<sup>a</sup> Letter viii. pp. 97, 98.

<sup>b</sup> Evidences, part ii. ch. vi.

<sup>c</sup> 2 Peter, i. 21; see Exodus, xxxii. 16.

<sup>d</sup> Cum illi scripserunt, quæ ille ostendit et dixit, nequaquam dicendum est, quod ipse non scripserit, &c.—Aug. de Consens. Evangel. lib. i. c. 35, p. 26, tom. iii. part ii. Paris, 1680.

this we will venture to add one other, from many at hand of a similar nature. We Protestants believe that nothing in the Old or New Testament was written by accident, but under the immediate Providence of God, so as to be entitled to as much credit as if Christ had written it with his own hand; and so Augustine himself believed:—

“For as many of His actions and sayings as Christ wished us to read, these He commanded to be written in a book, as if it were by His own hands. For whosoever understands this common bond of unity, and ministry of members actuated by one spirit, in different offices, under one head, will receive the narratives of Christ’s disciples in the Gospel no otherwise than if he saw the very hand of Christ writing it which was attached to His own body.”<sup>a</sup>

And thus one and the same spirit that prescribed the Old Law to Moses, gave also express charge to the Evangelist St. John to “write these things.”<sup>b</sup>

The object which Dr. Milner has in view is very apparent; he prefers the *preaching* to the *reading* for the people; for under the former those *traditions* of the Church can be maintained which cannot be *read* in the Word of God. The commission to *preach* is set above the commission to write and read.

Every effort is made by Rome to relieve itself from being subjected to the written word. If this grand rival to its own authority can but be displaced, so that it shall itself, under some pretext, be allowed to occupy the *first* place, the object is accomplished. There is then no appeal from the response of the managing priest; the ultimate authority is made to rest in that officer of the Church, and what he utters becomes law. Hence the eagerness of the Church of Rome to expose the insecurity, the evils, the calamities, the disasters, the follies, consequent upon the MERE use of the written Word; and to show how, *without a guide*, poor frail, fallible, erring man, must of course wander, and lose the grand object of his search, and all his pains. What can he know? and should any clergy, excepting those of Rome, pretend to instruct him, what can they do but mislead? Rome not being

<sup>a</sup> Quicquid enim ille de suis factis et dictis nos legere voluit, hoc scribendum illis tanquam suis manibus imperavit. Hoc unitatis consortium et in diversis officiis concordium membrorum sub uno capite ministerium quisquis intellexerit, non aliter accipiet quod narrantibus discipulis Christi in Evangelio legerit, quam si ipsam manum Domini, quam in proprio corpore gestabat, scribentem conspexerit.—August. De Consensu Evangelist., lib. i. cap. 35, edit. as above.

<sup>b</sup> Rev. i. 11, 19; see Sir H. Lynde’s “Via Devia,” sec. ix. p. 205. London, 1850.

sure of the meaning of that Word, from which she claims support for her teaching, there is no hope of succeeding properly; recourse must be had to a *teaching* and *preaching* church, properly authorized. These are some of Rome's notions, some of her assertions, some of the assumptions which must of course be involved in her setting aside the written Word in favour of a *teaching* and *preaching* company, under pretence that the one is empowered, and can act efficiently, while other courses can only mislead and delude; there being no order, especially for mere individuals, to read the Word.

But, if the absence of a direct unmistakable order to read is so much relied on, where have we, after all, any one word declaring, or so much as hinting, that this "teaching and preaching" is to be that of the Church of Rome? What one word appears either in the Holy Scriptures or the fathers of either church, Greek or Latin, to secure the Church of Rome in the grand privilege, of being sole teacher and preacher? or to declare from her fountain alone flowed all truth, all security, and all teaching of any value? Can no one read but herself? can no one see but herself? has no one any intellect but herself?

---

## No. VII.

### THE RULE OF FAITH.

The alleged limited scope and insufficiency of the Gospels and the Canonical Epistles of the New Testament as a Rule of Faith—Patristic Evidence.

WITH an instinctive dread of Holy Scriptures being considered as a Standard or Rule of Faith, Dr. Milner takes every occasion to place them in a secondary position. He informs us, that "only a part of them [the Apostles] wrote anything, and what these did write was, for the most part, addressed to particular persons or congregations, and on particular occasions.—St. Matthew wrote his Gospel at the particular request of the Christians of Palestine, and St. Mark composed his at the desire of those at Rome. St. Luke addressed his Gospel to an individual, Theophilus, having written it because it seemed good to him to do so. St. John wrote the last of the Gospels in compliance with the petition of the clergy and people of Lesser Asia. \* \* \* No doubt the Evangelists were moved by the Holy Ghost to listen to the requests of the faithful in writing their respective Gos-

pels ; nevertheless, there is nothing in these occasions, nor in the Gospels themselves, which indicates that any one of them, or all of them together, contain an *entire*, detailed, and *clear* exposition of the whole religion of Jesus Christ. The canonical epistles in the New Testament show the particular occasions on which they were written, and prove, as the Bishop of Lincoln observes, that ‘they are not to be considered as regular treatises on the Christian religion.’ ”—(Letter viii. p. 98.)

Nothing, says Bp. Hopkins, can manifest more plainly the real spirit of Popery, than the necessity which its unhappy priests are under to disparage, in this style, the Scriptures of divine truth, in order to draw away the confidence of mankind from the sacred oracles to their own corrupt teaching ; and therefore we must ask the attention of our readers to the various points which Dr. Milner puts in this most irreverent and blasphemous specimen of argumentation.

He had just before stated that the Saviour does not appear to have commanded His Apostles to *write*, though he repeatedly and emphatically commanded them to *preach* His Gospel. The inference desired to be conveyed of course is, that what they said *orally* is to be taken for our guide, as the Churches who heard them have handed it down by tradition, since in this mode Romish innovations may be imposed upon the world, under the pretence that they are derived from the *oral* teaching of the Apostles, notwithstanding there is not a trace of them to be found in the *written word*.

But does not the command to *preach* include every mode of teaching ? When, for example, the Apostle Paul addressed his epistles to the Churches, *commanding that they should be read by the disciples when they met together*, was not this the *PREACHING* to those Churches, with the single difference, that as writings are intended to remain as the permanent monuments of instruction, they are always expected to be more full and deserving of repetition than the oral teaching, which is confined to a single delivery ?

And what does Dr. Milner mean by saying that the Gospels and Epistles were addressed to particular persons or congregations, and on particular occasions ? Did he ever hear of any divine revelation that was *not* addressed to particular persons, and on particular occasions ? And, in the name of common sense, does that fact prevent its application to all other persons and occasions where there is equal need of it ? And on the same ground, what advantage would he gain for his *oral traditions*, which are pretended to be derived from the same source ? For we suppose that when the Apostles delivered the truth of God by the living voice, they

must have done it to particular persons or congregations, and on particular occasions, inasmuch as they certainly could not address the whole Church at once, except in writing, after they were dispersed throughout the world, in the fulfilment of their sacred mission.

He tells us, however, that the Christians of Palestine, and those at Rome, and those in Lesser Asia, requested that the Gospels might be written. He also says that "St. Luke addressed his Gospel to a single individual, *Theophilus*," apparently forgetting that this name cannot be shown to be the title of any particular man, since it signifies *a lover of God*; and hence it is at least as likely, if not much more so, that it was addressed to *every believer*, because each one of the faithful is a *Theophilus*, of necessity. But Dr. Milner takes care not to inform his readers *why* those requests were made, supposing, what cannot be proved, that the sacred writers did not prepare their several contributions until they had been requested. And yet it is most obvious that there could have been but one reason for such a request, viz., that the hearers desired to have a *permanent record of what had been delivered to them by the voice of the Apostles*, in order that they might be reminded of the truth by a lasting standard, and freed from the danger of distorting or losing any portion of the celestial revelation, through the inevitable infirmity of human memory. The ancient fathers state this expressly in the case of St. Mark's Gospel; and if it had not been stated, the slightest reflection would prove the necessity of such a course. And the history of the Church confirms it most painfully. Since if, *with the Scriptures*, so much falsehood and superstition have been added to the faith by a pretended apostolical tradition, what must have been the condition of the Church in case the wisdom of God had furnished no *fixed monuments of divine truth* as the standard of His will?

Neither is this the whole of Dr. Milner's sophistry. He informs us that the Gospels, taken altogether, do not contain an entire, detailed, and clear exposition of the whole religion of Jesus Christ. If he means by this that the rest of the New Testament, together with the Old, is supposed to be unnecessary, he treats his adversaries with the most absurd unfairness, because no one has ever undertaken to say that the rest of the Scriptures were superfluous, and that the whole religion of Christ is in the Gospels alone. If he means by an entire, detailed, and clear exposition of the religion of Jesus Christ, the system of the Papal Church, we fully agree with him, since it is very certain that the distinctive dogmas

of Popery, which the Church of England renounces, are not only unwarranted by the Scriptures, but are, in many respects, directly opposed to them. But if he means that the Scriptures of the New Testament do not contain all the doctrines of the Gospel faith, and all the morality of Christian practice, and, moreover, when taken in connection with the Old Testament, all the warrant required for the details of form and ceremony which the primitive Church adopted in worship and discipline, and which we have retained, we deny the assertion on the authority of the fathers, and on the ground of all sound argument. His quotation from the English Bishop of Lincoln, that "the epistles of the New Testament are not to be considered as *regular treatises* on the Christian religion," is nothing to the purpose. The question is, whether the divine Scriptures, as a whole, contain *a full and ample revelation of the Rule of Faith*, and not whether it has pleased the Spirit of God to put their instructions into the form of what Dr. Milner or any other uninspired man would call "a regular treatise."

The Church of Rome is compelled to acknowledge the Bible as THE WORD OF GOD, notwithstanding, like the ancient Pharisees, she makes it *void by her traditions*. Why, then, we ask, were these divine Scriptures given at all, if they were not designed to be the *standard for the Church of Christ*, just as the Books of Moses were the *standard for Israel* under the previous dispensation? For if, according to Milner's hypothesis, the faith of the Church was intended to rest on *oral tradition*, it is manifest that the written word would be of no real value. What can be more absurd than the idea that the Holy Spirit would dictate to the Church in this permanent shape an *incomplete, inconclusive, and unsatisfactory exposition*? That, while there are many things recorded there which are not strictly necessary to be known for our salvation, yet the Spirit of God *neglected to set forth the whole of the faith, without which no one could be saved!* That, while the Scriptures contain a rich abundance of fruits and flowers, yet they do not contain a sufficient amount of the Bread of Life! As well might they charge upon the Lord any other gross incongruity. As well might they persuade us, that although He has adorned our bodies with various members, and provided for the least among them the form of grace and the beauty of colour, yet He neglected to furnish the lungs to breathe, the brain to govern, or the heart to circulate the blood of their vitality! As well might they contend, that although His bounty had filled our lower world with an exuberance of light, and a vast variety of vegetation,

yet He had omitted the supplies of food which were essential to our being! Is it not an amazing proof of infatuation that the Papal Church will thus persist in attributing to God that which would be reproached as an absurdity in any human lawgiver? For who does not know that every earthly governor is chiefly careful to provide first what is most necessary? Or what mortal author ever sought to instruct the world, without giving his chief attention to that which he thought most important for his reader's information?

But such is the deplorable irreverence of Papal writers towards the Word of God, that they deny its chief office as *the Rule of Faith, the Guide to Heaven, the Light of the Church and of the world*. The Scriptures are indeed inspired, they admit; but the written dictates of the Holy Ghost are not of half so much importance as the debates of a Roman Council! The Evangelists and Apostles wrote the Gospels and Epistles by the direction of the Almighty; but the Pope and the Bishops of Trent are far better teachers than they! The Lord undertook to teach the way of life, but left out an essential portion of the lesson! The Redeemer placed His saving truth on permanent record in a Book, but the truth thus recorded was not worthy of being received as sufficient for salvation! He inspired His special messengers, and gave them holiness, and miracles, and tongues, and made them His organs to publish a written revelation, and called it, by pre-eminence, the Gospel. But he intended, notwithstanding, that their work should be full of fatal defects and express falsehoods, in order that a succession of uninspired men, many of them destitute of holiness, some of them monsters of crime, and all of them without miracles or any other supernatural gift, might accomplish the task of supplying and contradicting them!

Such is the fundamental proposition of Popery. The Bible must be cast down, in order to set up her traditions. The supremacy of the divine Scriptures must be dethroned, and the dictates of Popes and Councils must be invested with the crown and sceptre. And there is the head and front of her offence against Heaven. It is cunningly devised. It is artfully set forth. It is eloquently defended. But it comes to this at last, and no sophistry can disguise it. And hence we look upon the Papal system as involving a high and very awful, though a covert blasphemy against the majesty of God.—(Hopkins, pp. 289—295.)

Dr. Milner throughout his work is very profuse in his reference to the "Fathers" of the Church wherever he can, as he fancies, squeeze out an acknowledgment that may in any way bear out his modern Romish Tridentine views. But it is

remarkable how barren are his pages of patristic support when he comes to degrade the WORD OF GOD, by placing it on a level with the traditions of his Church. He does not advance one single name, but a bishop of Lincoln (whose meaning he perverts) to support his views. We have above advanced an assertion, that the Scriptures do contain all that is necessary to salvation in faith, morals, in worship, and in discipline; and in this we are amply borne out by the testimony of the early Christian writers.

The Church,<sup>a</sup> during a long succession of ages, beginning with the immediately post-apostolic times, is regarded by us, Protestants, as a valuable corroboration of the conclusion which, however, we deem sufficiently established by the testimony of Scripture itself, and by the reason of the case.<sup>b</sup> But to Roman Catholics, who professedly rest much of their belief on the authority of the Fathers, the argument now under consideration ought to be conclusive. We say, then, that a chain of evidence, bearing on the supreme importance and sufficiency of the *written* Word of God, can be drawn out from the works of the great Church Fathers, proving incontestably that the doctrine of the modern Church of Rome, regarding the *in-sufficiency* of Scripture, and the coordinate authority of an *independent* Tradition, was utterly unknown to the ancient Church either of the East or West. To exhibit all these testimonies in detail would far transcend our limits: we shall therefore content ourselves with adducing a few of them as specimens of the whole.

We begin with IRENÆUS, the Bishop of Lyons, and the disciple and friend of Polycarp, who again had been the companion and disciple of the Apostle John. This Father represents the opinion of both the Eastern and Western Churches towards the end of the second century. Disputing against the Gnostic heretics, who denied the perfection and sufficiency of Scripture, and maintained that the truth could not be discovered from it by those who were ignorant of Tradition,<sup>c</sup> Irenæus says—"We ought to leave such things as these

<sup>a</sup> We take the following from the *Catholic Layman*, October, 1852, p. 110, *et seq.*

<sup>b</sup> Augustine thought as we do on this subject of patristic authority. "Other authors," he says, "however excellent their sanctity and learning, I read so as not to credit their assertions merely because they say thus: but because they have been able to persuade me, either by means of those canonical authors or by probable reasons, that their statements are not repugnant to truth."—August. ad Hieron. tom. ii. 15, ed. Bened.

<sup>c</sup> "When they [the heretics] are confuted out of the Scriptures, they turn round and accuse the Scriptures themselves, as if they were not accurate, nor of authority, and because they are ambiguous, and *because the truth cannot be discovered from them by those who are ignorant of tradition: for that the truth*



to God, who also made us, most rightly knowing that *the Scriptures indeed are perfect*, as having been dictated by the word of God and his Spirit.”<sup>a</sup> Again—“For we have become acquainted with the dispensation of our salvation through no other men than those through whom the Gospel has come to us: which they then indeed preached, but afterwards, by the will of God, delivered to us in *the Scriptures, to be the foundation and pillar of our faith.*”<sup>b</sup> The last phrase, it will be remembered, is the very one applied by St. Paul to the Church—1 Tim. iii. 15. Irenæus, accordingly, here distinctly implies, that it was by the custody of the Sacred Scriptures that the Church was to sustain her office as “the pillar and ground of the truth.” Once more—“Read more diligently *the Gospel* given unto us by the Apostles, and read more diligently the prophets, and ye shall find the general mode of action, and *the whole teaching*, and the whole passion of our Lord predicted in them.”<sup>c</sup>

We come next to TERTULLIAN, who flourished a few years later than Irenæus—that is to say, about the end of the second century. This great writer, whom Vincentius of Lerins pronounces (Commonit., c. 24) to be, “*apud Latinos facile princeps*,” thus expresses himself regarding Scripture, when arguing against the heretic Hermogenes, who maintained the eternity of matter:—“I adore the fulness of Scripture, which manifests to me the Creator and his works. . . . But whether all things were made of some pre-existent matter, I have as yet nowhere read. Let the shop of Hermogenes show that it is written. *If it is not written, let him fear that woe which is destined for them that add or*

*was not delivered in writing but orally.*” (Cum enim ex Scripturis arguuntur, in accusationem convertuntur ipsarum Scripturarum, quasi non recte habeant, neque sint ex auctoritate, et quia varie sint dicta, et quia non possit ex his inveniri veritas ab his qui nesciant Traditionem: non enim per literas traditam illam, sed per vivam vocem.—Cont. Hær. lib. iii. c. 2.) It is scarcely necessary to direct attention to the truly remarkable resemblance here exhibited between the respective positions taken up by the Gnostic heretics and Irenæus in the second century, and those occupied by the Church of Rome and the Church of England in modern times.

<sup>a</sup> Cedere hæc talia debemus Deo, qui et nos fecit, rectissime scientes quia Scripturæ quidem perfectæ sunt, quippe a Verbo Dei et Spiritu ejus dictæ.—Cont. Hær. lib. ii. c. 47, edit. Grabe; cap. 28, ed. 1853.

<sup>b</sup> Non enim per alios dispositionem salutis nostræ cognovimus, quam per eos per quos Evangelium pervenit ad nos: quod quidem tunc præconiaverunt, postea vero per Dei voluntatem in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum et columnam fidei nostræ futurum.—Lib. iii. c. 1.

<sup>c</sup> Legite diligentius id quod ab Apostolis est Evangelium nobis datum, et legite diligentius Prophetas, et invenietis universam actionem, et omnem doctrinam, et omnem passionem Domini nostri prædictam in ipsis.—(Lib. iv. c. 34, ed. 1853; cap. 66, ed. Grabe.) The meaning obviously is, that in the Gospel the general tenor of our Lord’s actions and the whole of his doctrines were exhibited; whilst the prophets predicted all the circumstances connected with his passion.

take away.”<sup>a</sup> Again, when disputing against the heretic Marcion, he says—“*I do not admit what you bring forward of your own, extraneous to Scripture.*”<sup>b</sup>

The next witness whom we shall cite is AMBROSE, the famous bishop of Milan, who flourished circ. A. D. 374. This eminent Father recognized no authority as co-ordinate with and independent of Scripture—“*How,*” he says, “*can we use those things which we find not in Scripture?*”<sup>c</sup> And again—“*I read [in Scripture] that He [Christ] is the first, I read that he is not the second: let those who say He is the second, prove it by reading.*”<sup>d</sup>

Contemporaneously with Ambrose lived JEROME, unquestionably the most learned theologian of the Western Church. He thus expresses himself respecting the grounds upon which his belief was founded:—“*As we deny not those things that are written, so we reject those things that are not written.*”<sup>e</sup> The instance which he gives is peculiarly worthy of attention, when taken in connection with the various purely traditional notions entertained by the Church of Rome of the Virgin Mary—“*That God was born of a virgin we believe, because we read it. That Mary married after she gave birth to Him, we do not believe, because we read it not.*”<sup>f</sup>

A few years later—that is, towards the close of the fourth century—we come to AUGUSTINE. The writings of this Father have been always held in the highest esteem in the Western Church, and the Church of Rome, in particular, has ever regarded them with especial reverence. What, then, is Augustine’s opinion on the point under discussion? “*In those things,*” he says, “*which are plainly laid down in Scripture, all things are found which embrace faith and morals.*”<sup>g</sup> Again—“*Whatsoever ye shall hear thence [i.e. from Scripture], let this savour well with you: whatever is extraneous to*

<sup>a</sup> Adoro Scripturæ plenitudinem, quæ mihi et Factorem manifestat et facta. An autem de aliqua subjacenti materia facta sint omnia, nusquam adhuc legi. Scriptum esse doceat Hermogenis officina. Si non est scriptum, timeat *Væ* illud *adjicientibus aut detrahentibus* destinatum. —Tertull. adv. Hermog. c. 22.

<sup>b</sup> Non recipio quod extra Scripturam de tuo profers.—De Carn. Chris. c. 7.

<sup>c</sup> Quæ in Scripturis sanctis non reperimus, ea quemadmodum usurpare possumus?—Ambr. Offic. lib. i. c. 23.

<sup>d</sup> Lego quia primus est, lego quia non est secundus. Illi qui secundum aiunt, doceant lectione.—De Inst. Virg. c. 2.

<sup>e</sup> Ut hæc quæ scripta sunt non negamus, ita ea quæ non sunt scripta renuimus.—Hieron. adv. Helvid. tom. iv. pars ii. p. 141.

<sup>f</sup> Natum Deum esse de Virgine credimus, quia legimus. Mariam nupsisse post partum non credimus, quia non legimus.—Loc. cit.

<sup>g</sup> In iis, quæ aperte in Scriptura posita sunt, inveniuntur illa omnia quæ continent fidei moresque vivendi.—August. de Doctr. Christ. lib. ii. c. 9, tom. iii. 301, ed. Bened.

*it, reject, lest ye wander in a cloud.*"<sup>a</sup> Again—"Wherefore if, concerning Christ, or his Church, or anything else whatsoever pertaining to your faith and living, I do not say we (who are not to be compared to Him, who said—'Although we,' &c.—Gal. i. 8), but even as St. Paul adds, '*an angel from heaven were to preach to you aught besides (præterquam) what you have received in the legal and evangelical Scriptures [the Old and the new Testaments], let him be accursed.*'"<sup>b</sup> It should be particularly observed, that Augustine is here not condemning the inculcation of doctrine *contrary* to Scripture, but *in addition* to it (*præterquam quod in Scripturis accepistis*).<sup>c</sup> Will any candid Roman Catholic say, that the above is the language of one who believed, as the Council of Trent teaches,<sup>d</sup> that there are Church traditions, respecting faith and morals, not contained in Scripture, and which are to be received with the same sentiments of piety and virtue as the Scriptures themselves? If more evidence be required, the same Father elsewhere says—"Those things, however, which appertain to the investigation and preserving of *true religion, Divine Scripture is not silent about.*"<sup>e</sup> Again, speaking of the confutation of heresy, he says—"There can be *no proof of true Christianity, nor can there be any other refuge of Christians* wishing to know the truth of the faith, *except the Divine Scriptures.*"<sup>f</sup> And, to quote once more, writing against the Donatists, he says

<sup>a</sup> Quicquid inde audieritis, hæc vobis bene sapiat: quicquid extra est, respuite, ne erretis in nebula.—August. Serm. de Pastor. c. xi. tom. v. 238.

<sup>b</sup> Proinde sive de Christo, sive de ejus Ecclesia, sive de quacunque alia re quæ pertinet ad fidem vitamque vestram, non dicam nos (nequaquam comparandi ei qui dixit *Licet si nos*), sed omnino (quod secutus adjecit) *si angelus de celo vobis annuntiaverit præterquam quod in Scripturis legalibus et evangelicis accepistis, anathema sit.*—August. cont. Petilium, lib. iii. c. 6, tom. ix. 301.

<sup>c</sup> The Rhemish translators correctly render the Greek  $\pi\alpha\rho' \delta$  in the 8th and 9th verses by "besides." But whilst they felt themselves constrained to follow the Vulgate version (*præterquam quod, præter id quod*), they take care to inform their readers, in their note, that, according to St. Augustine, what St. Paul here condemns is "such teaching as is contrary and disagreeing to the rule of faith." Now, this remark is not only at variance with the words of Augustine above cited, but even to the very passage of that Father to which they themselves refer, where he says,—"*qui autem prætergreditur fidei regulam, non accedit in via, sed recedit de via.*"—(August. Trac'. in Johan. xcvi. 7.) We may add, that Theophylact and Ecumenius, in their commentaries on this passage of the Galatians, are also directly opposed to this Rhemish gloss. With respect to the Greek  $\pi\alpha\rho' \delta$  there seems to be no doubt that the correct translation is *besides* or *more than*, as the Rhemish translators themselves render it again in Rom. xii. 3.

<sup>d</sup> See the Decretum de Can. Scrip., Con. Trid. Sess. iv.

<sup>e</sup> Quæ tamen pertinent ad veram religionem quærendam et tenendam, divina Scriptura non tacet.—August. Ep. 42.

<sup>f</sup> Nulla probatio potest esse veræ Christianitatis, neque refugium potest esse Christianorum aliud, volentium cognoscere fidei veritatem, nisi Scripturæ Sacræ.—August. de Pastorib. c. 12, tom. ix. 279.

—“*Let them demonstrate their Church, if they can, not by discourses and rumours of the Africans, not by councils of their own bishops, not by the writings of any disputants whatsoever, not by deceitful signs and wonders, against which we have been prepared and warned by the Word of the Lord, but by the words of the one Shepherd himself, in the whole canonical authorities of the Sacred Books.*”<sup>a</sup> This remarkable passage is deserving of all attention from Roman Catholics.

Such are a few of the testimonies of the early Latin Fathers in favour of the Rule of Faith for which Protestants contend. When we turn to the Eastern Church, we find, if possible, even stronger statements upon the point.

CLEMENT of Alexandria, celebrated as one of the founders of the famous school of Alexandria, and the master of the renowned Origen, thus writes towards the close of the second century:—“They who are ready to labour for what is most excellent, will not desist in their search after truth *till they obtain demonstration from the Scriptures themselves.*”<sup>b</sup>

ORIGEN, the successor of Clement, in the beginning of the third century, says:—“In the two Testaments every word that appertaineth unto God may be sought and discussed, and out of them all knowledge of things may be derived. But *if anything remains which Divine Scripture does not determine, no other third Scripture ought to be received to authorize knowledge . . .* but let us commit to the fire what remains; that is, let us reserve it for God. For God has not willed that we should know all things in the present life.”<sup>c</sup> Could Origen have written thus if he had entertained the opinions put forward by Bellarmine respecting Tradition, which obviously represent it as a *third Scripture*? Again,—“Wherefore, it is necessary for us to call the Sacred *Scriptures* to

<sup>a</sup> *Ecclesiam suam demonstrent, si possunt, non in sermonibus et rumoribus Afrorum, non in conciliis episcoporum suorum, non in literis quorumlibet disputatorum, non in signis et prodigiis fallacibus, quia etiam contra ista Verbo Domini præparati et cauti redditi sumus, sed in ipsius unius Pastoris vocibus, in omnibus canonicis sanctorum librorum auctoritatibus.*—(August. de Unit. Eccles. c. 16, tom. ix. 371.) This is quite in harmony with what he says in the 3rd chapter of the same treatise—“Nolo humanis documentis sed divinis oraculis sanctam ecclesiam demonstrari.”

<sup>b</sup> Ἄλλ' οἱ πονεῖν ἔτοιμοι ἐπὶ τοῖς καλλίστοις, οὐ πρότερον ἀποστήσονται ζητοῦντες τὴν ἀληθείαν πρὶν ἂν τὴν ἀπόδειξιν ἀπ' αὐτῶν λάβωσι τῶν γραφῶν.—Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. vii. p. 889, ed. Potter.

<sup>c</sup> “In hoc biduo puto duo Testamenta posse intelligi, in quibus liceat omne verbum quod ad Deum pertinet requiri et discuti, atque ex ipsis omnem rerum scientiam capi. Si quid autem superfuerit, quod non Divina Scriptura decernat, nullam aliam tertiam Scripturam debere ad auctoritatem scientiæ suscipi . . . Sed igni tradamus quod superest, id est, Deo reservemus. Neque enim in præsentī vita Deus scire nos omnia voluit.—Origen. Homil. v. in Levit. tom. ii. 212.

give evidence: for our meanings and *interpretations, without these witnesses, have no credit.*"<sup>a</sup>

HIPPOLYTUS the Martyr, a contemporary and friend of Origen, and a disciple of Irenæus, thus writes:—"As he who would desire to exercise the wisdom of this world cannot otherwise attain it, unless he read the dogmas of the philosophers: so, whosoever of us will exercise *piety towards God* can learn it *from no other source than from the Divine Scriptures.*"<sup>b</sup>

ATHANASIUS, the famous Bishop of Alexandria, in the beginning of the fourth century, expresses himself as follows:—"The holy and divinely-inspired *Scriptures are sufficient* in themselves for the enunciation of truth."<sup>c</sup> Again,—“These [canonical books] are the fountains of salvation, so that he who thirsts may be satisfied with the oracles contained in them; *in these alone the school of religion preaches the Gospel*; let no man add to or take from them.”<sup>d</sup> These are the words of the man who spent his life in controversy with the Arians, and who was the great head of the Catholic party at the Œcumenical Synod of Nice. He obviously knew nothing of Traditions which were at the same time necessary to salvation and not contained in Scripture.

CYRIL, Bishop of Jerusalem, in the middle of the fourth century, after having given a summary of the doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit, says that he will now prove it in detail from Scripture:—"For," he adds, "concerning the divine and holy mysteries of the faith, *even the most casual remark ought not to be delivered without the Sacred Scriptures.* Do not implicitly believe me saying these things to you unless you receive proof of the statements from the Sacred Scriptures."<sup>e</sup> Again, speaking of the mode of the divine generation not being revealed in Scripture, he says:—"Why,

<sup>a</sup> Quapropter necesse nobis est Scripturas sanctas in testimonium vocare: sensus quippe nostri et enarrationes, sine his testibus, non habent fidem.—Orig. Hom. i. in Jer.

<sup>b</sup> Quemadmodum enim, si quis vellet sapientiam hujus sæculi exercere, non aliter hoc consequi poterit, nisi dogmata philosophorum legat; sic quicumque volumus pietatem in Deum exercere, non aliunde discemus quam ex Scripturis sacris.—Hippolyt. adv. Noetum, ch. ix.

<sup>c</sup> Ἀυταρκεῖς μὲν γὰρ εἰσὶν αἱ ἅγια καὶ θεόπνευστοι γραφαὶ πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπαγγελίαν.—Athan. cont. Gentes, tom. i. ed. Bened.

<sup>d</sup> Ταῦτα [βιβλία] πηγαὶ τοῦ σωτηρίου, ὥστε τὸν διψῶντα ἐμφορεῖσθαι τῶν ἐν τούτοις λογίων ἐν τούτοις μόνον τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας διδασκαλεῖον εὐαγγελίζεται· μηδεὶς τούτοις ἐπιβαλλέτω, μηδὲ τούτων ἀφαιρέσθω.—Ex Festali Epistola xxxix. tom. ii. 962.

<sup>e</sup> Δεῖ γὰρ περὶ τῶν θείων καὶ ἁγίων τῆς πίστεως μυστηρίων μηδὲ τὸ τύχον ἄνευ τῶν θείων παραδίδοσθαι γραφῶν . . . μηδὲ ἐμοὶ τῷ ταῦτά σοι λέγοντι ἀπλῶς πιστεύσης, ἐὰν τὴν ἀπόδειξιν τῶν καταγγελλομένων ἀπὸ τῶν θείων μὴ λάβῃς γραφῶν.—Cyril. Hierosol. Catech. iv. 17.

then, do you *busy yourself about what the Holy Spirit has not written* in the Scriptures?"<sup>a</sup>

BASIL the Great, Bishop of Cæsarea, and one of the most profound theologians of his age (circ. A. D. 370), thus writes:—"Believe those things that are written; the *things which are not written seek not after.*"<sup>b</sup> And again,—"*It is a manifest falling away from the faith, and arrogance, either to reject anything of what is written, or to introduce anything of what is not written.*"<sup>c</sup> We shall quote one passage more, as Basil is one of the authorities on whom Roman Catholic divines rely most in support of Tradition:—"Let, therefore, the inspired Scripture arbitrate between us; and *the sentence of truth shall be adjudged to those with whom are found doctrines consonant to the Divine oracles.*"<sup>d</sup> From these words it appears that, according to Basil, Scripture and Divine Oracles are one and the same thing; and that in every question their authority is supreme.

THEOPHILUS, Bishop of Alexandria, towards the close of the fourth century, believed it to be "*an instinct of the devil to follow the sophisms of human minds, and to think anything Divine without the authority of the Scriptures.*"<sup>e</sup> Roman Catholics will, of course, assent to the first clause of this sentence; but could the Tridentine Fathers, who asserted the existence of Divine traditions not contained in Scripture, fairly subscribe to the second?

GREGORY, Bishop of Nyssa, and brother of Basil, declares:—"Forasmuch as this is supported by no testimony of Scripture, we shall reject it as false."<sup>f</sup>

CYRIL, Bishop of Alexandria, in the beginning of the fifth century, to the very same effect asks:—"That which Holy Scripture hath not said, by what means, pray, shall we receive

<sup>a</sup> Τί τοίνυν πολυπραγμονεῖς ἄ μηδέ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον ἔγραψεν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς:—Cyril. Hierosol. Catech. xi. 12.

<sup>b</sup> Τοῖς γεγραμμένοις πιστεῦτε, τὰ μὴ γεγραμμένα μὴ ζῆτε.—Basil. Hom. xxix. adv. Calumn. S. Trin. The Benedictine editors (tom. ii. 611) put this into the Appendix of spurious passages; but it contains nothing that cannot be paralleled from contemporary writers (e. g., Cyril), and from Basil himself, as in the next extract.

<sup>c</sup> Φανερά ἐκπτώσις πίστεως καὶ ὑπερηφανίας κατηγορία ἢ ἀθετεῖν τι τῶν γεγραμμένων ἢ ἐπιεσάγειν τῶν μὴ γεγραμμένων.—Basil de Fide, c. i. tom. ii. 251, ed. Bened.

<sup>d</sup> Ἡ θεόπνευστος ἡμῖν διατησάτω γραφή. Καὶ παρ' οἷς ἂν εὔρεθῇ τὰ δόγματα συνῶδὰ τοῖς θείοις λόγοις, ἐπὶ τούτοις ἤξει τῆς ἀληθείας ἢ ψήφος.—Basil. Ep. 80, tom. ii. p. 901.

<sup>e</sup> Ignorans [Origenes] quod dæmoniaci spiritus esset instinctus sophismata humanarum mentium sequi, et aliquid extra Scripturarum auctoritatem putare divinum.—Theoph. Alex. Ep. Pasch. ii.

<sup>f</sup> Cum id nullo Scripturæ testimonio fultum sit, ut falsum improbavimus.—Lib. de Cognit. Dei, cit. ab Euthymio in Panoplia, pars i. tit. viii. n. 4.

and reckon it among those things that are true?<sup>a</sup> The force of the last two passages cannot be evaded by saying that they relate to things with which Tradition had nothing to do.<sup>b</sup> The writers would scarcely have expressed themselves so absolutely had they been aware of the existence, in their own day, of a source of proof equally certain and authoritative with Scripture, and yet independent of it.

CHRYSOSTOM, the famous Bishop of Constantinople, towards the close of the fifth century, thus speaks of Holy Scripture:—“*Look for no other teacher; thou hast the oracles of God, none teaches thee like these.*”<sup>c</sup> Is there any doubt here as to the sufficiency of Scripture? And again,—“*He who useth not the Scriptures, but climbeth up some other way—that is, cutteth out for himself another and an unlawful way—he is a thief.*”<sup>d</sup> Roman Catholics think it enough to reply, that Chrysostom is here speaking of antichrists and heretics. Certainly; but what he condemns them for is, not adhering solely to Scripture. Had he or they heard of the existence in the Church of Divine traditions not contained in Scripture, would he have ventured thus to apply the words “*ἀναβαίνων ἀλλαχόθεν?*” Once more,—“*Wherefore, I exhort and beseech you all, leaving aside what this man or that man thinks concerning these things, to learn all these things from the Scriptures.*”<sup>e</sup>

The above passages, taken from some of the most eminent writers of the first five centuries, may serve to convey a general idea of the light in which Holy Scripture, as the ultimate and sufficient basis of all essential truth, was regarded by the early Church. The ingenuity of controversialists has, in various ways, endeavoured to elude the direct force of some of those statements; but the general impression which they leave upon every unbiassed mind, no sophistry or special pleading can efface. Nor will that impression be impaired even after we have brought forward (as we shall do, when considering the Roman Catholic side of the argument) other passages from the same or different Fathers, in which the use and authority of Tradition are dwelt on. For

<sup>a</sup> “Ὁ γὰρ οὐκ εἶρηκεν ἡ θεία γραφή, τίνα δὴ τρόπον παραδεξόμεθα, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀληθῶς ἔχουσι καταλογιζόμεθα;—Cyril. Alex. Glaph. in Gen. lib. ii.

<sup>b</sup> Perrone, Loc. Theol. pars ii. sec. ii. c. 1.

<sup>c</sup> Μηδὲ περιμείνης ἕτερον διδάσκαλον ἔχεις τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ· οὐδεὶς σε διδάσκει ὡς ἐκεῖνα;—Chrysost. Hom. ix. in Ep. Coloss.

<sup>d</sup> Ὁ γὰρ μὴ ταῖς γραφαῖς χρώμενος, ἀλλὰ ἀναβαίνων ἀλλαχόθεν, τουτέστιν ἔτεραν ἑαυτῶ καὶ μὴ νενομισμένην τέμνων ὁδὸν, κλέπτῃς ἐστίν.—Chrys. Hom. lix. in Joh.

<sup>e</sup> Διὸ παρακαλῶ καὶ δέομαι πάντων ὑμῶν, ἀφεντές τι τῷ δεῖνι καὶ τῷ δεῖνι δοκεῖ περὶ τούτων, παρὰ τῶν γραφῶν ταῦτα ἅπαντα πυνθάνεσθε.—Chrys. Hom. ix. in Coloss. cap. 3.

it will, we trust, appear perfectly obvious, *first* that the Tridentine notion of Tradition, as an authoritative source of essential truths not contained in Scripture, was utterly unknown to the ancient Church; and, *secondly*, that even with respect to *inhesive* truths (*i. e.* doctrines either expressly or implicitly contained in Scripture), the first and last appeal was made to the *written* Word, the evidence of Church Tradition being referred to either as subordinate and simply corroborative; or else in controversy with heretics, who questioned the authenticity of the orthodox Scriptures; or, finally, under other very special circumstances.

As the result of our investigation, therefore, in the words of Jeremy Taylor, we assert "that there *never yet was any Catholic Father* that did *affirm* in terms, or in full or equivalent sense, *that the Scriptures are defective* in recording anything necessary to salvation, but that they all unanimously taught to the contrary."<sup>a</sup>

But the chain of evidence in favour of the sufficiency of the Scriptures, the Protestant rule of faith, does not terminate with the fifth, or indeed with any, century of the Church's history. We have upon our side the testimony of some of the greatest theologians of every age. For instance, JOHANNES DAMASCENUS, the great oracle of the Eastern Church in the eighth century, thus writes:—"All things that are delivered us by the Law, the Prophets, the Apostles, and the Evangelists, we receive, acknowledge, and reverence, *seeking for nothing beyond these.*"<sup>b</sup> In the beginning of the fifteenth century, the famous GERSON, Chancellor of the University of Paris, and the most learned man of his time, thus expresses himself:—"In the examination of doctrines, the first and chief thing to be attended to is if the doctrine be conformable to Holy Scripture, since *Scripture* has been delivered to us, as *a sufficient and infallible rule*, for the government of the whole ecclesiastical body and its members, to the end of the world. It is, therefore, such an art, such a rule or exemplar, that *any other doctrine which is not conformable to it* is either to be *rejected as heretical*, or is to be accounted altogether suspicious, or not appertaining to religion."<sup>c</sup> This is precisely the doctrine of the Church of England in her sixth article.

<sup>a</sup> Jeremy Taylor's "Dissuasive," p. 192, Oxford ed., 1836.

<sup>b</sup> Πάντα τὰ παραδεδομένα ἡμῖν διὰ τε νόμον καὶ προφητῶν καὶ ἀποστόλων καὶ εὐαγγελιστῶν, δεχόμεθα, καὶ γινώσκομεν, καὶ σέβομεν, οὐδὲν περαιτέρω τούτων ἐπιζητοῦντες.—Joh. Damasc. de Orthod. Fide, c. i.

<sup>c</sup> Attendendum in examinatione doctrinarum, primo et principaliter, si doctrina sit conformis Scripturæ . . . quoniam Scriptura nobis tradita est tanquam regula sufficiens et infallibilis, pro regimine totius ecclesiastici



Nay, more, it is an unquestionable fact, that in the Council of Trent itself, the opinions of the prelates were not unanimous respecting the famous decree, so often referred to, which placed Tradition on an equality with Scripture. The Bishops of Fano and Chioggia especially protested against this decree: and the latter went so far as to exclaim that it was impious to elevate Tradition to the level of Scripture.<sup>a</sup> Even in that very assembly, whose avowed object was to condemn the so-called heresies of the Reformers, there were found men honest and bold enough to proclaim and defend what had been the unquestioned doctrine of the Catholic Church during many ages, and had never ceased to be held by many of its greatest ornaments. Roman Catholics, and even Protestants themselves, seem to take it for granted, as a matter of course, that the decrees of the Council of Trent were passed with the full concurrence of all its members, and that the characteristic dogmas of the modern Church of Rome were then regarded as established verities, which only needed the authority of the Church to sanction them as essential to salvation. The fact, however, is far otherwise: many of those dogmas were then open questions, about which great diversity of opinion existed. But as any appearance of such diversity, in the formal definitions of the Council, would have furnished the "heretics" with a powerful argument against what they maintained to be innovations on the doctrines of the Primitive Church, it was arranged that, before each session, general "Congregations" should be held, in which the decrees to be proposed should be discussed, and the opinions of the prelates taken upon them; it being

corporis et membrorum, usque in finem sæculi. Est igitur talis ars, talis regula vel exemplar, cui se non conformans alia doctrina vel abjicienda est ut hæreticalis, aut suspecta, aut impertinens ad religionem prorsus est habenda.—Gerson, de Exam. Doctr. pars ii. con. 1.

<sup>a</sup> "This equality [sc. of Scripture and Tradition] was not approved of by some, and especially by Bertano (Bishop of Fano). For, he argued, although both might proceed from God, from whom all truths are ultimately derived, yet it did not follow that everything true should be regarded with the same veneration as the Sacred Scriptures. That, inasmuch as some traditions had failed, it was obvious that God was unwilling that so much stability, and, consequently, so much veneration, should be attributed to them as to Scripture. Nachianti, Bishop of Chioggia, inveighed still more bitterly against an equality of this kind, traditions being considered by him not as Divine revelations but as [human] laws, the weight of which he deemed insupportable. He exclaimed, when the question of their universal adoption was proposed, that that equality between the Sacred Writings and Traditions appeared to him impious."—(Pallavicino, Istoria del Concil. di Trento, lib. vi. cap. 3, 4.) The other bishops, more true to the principles of their Church, heard this protest, we are told, with wonder and horror; and, accordingly, he who dared to vindicate the supreme authority of Holy Scripture, was compelled to acquiesce in the decree which directly denied it.

understood that whatever was decided upon by the majority, in those preliminary meetings, should be passed in the following session with the unanimous consent of the Council, the dissentient minority tacitly acquiescing in the previous decision.<sup>a</sup> Such was the mode in which Tradition was placed upon a level with the written Word of God by the *unanimous* consent of the Catholic Church, as represented by the "Sacred Œcumenical Synod of Trent."

---

. No. VIII.

THE RULE OF FAITH.

Tradition ; or, the Roman Rule of Faith.

WE have seen that Dr. Milner has stated the Romish rule of Faith to be "the whole word of God, both written and unwritten, in other words, Scripture and Tradition, and these propounded and explained by the Catholic Church."—(Letter x. p. 125.)

No Protestant would ever reject the "unwritten word of God" wherever it can be heard or found. But who is to vouch for it? The meaning, however, which is attached to this definition is, that as a "Rule of Faith," the *written word* of God is insufficient, and that oral "Tradition" is equally part of the Christian's rule. What is this but to admit that there are doctrines taught by the Church of Rome, which she declares necessary to be believed for our salvation, but which are not in the *written* Word, but are founded on "Tradition?" We cannot admit into this discussion questions of *discipline* and *forms*, but matters of faith *alone*.

<sup>a</sup> "The 8th of February, Cardinal del Monte [afterwards Pope Julius III.] held a congregation, wherein he desired the Fathers of the Council to remember the prayer he had formerly made to them, not to give their opinions anew in the sessions upon the decrees that were published there; since, those decrees having been passed in the congregations by a majority of voices, this would only serve, as he had formerly told them, to *give the heretics an occasion of talking*, when they should see that *the decrees that were published in the sessions were contradicted by the Fathers of the Council themselves*."—(Du Pin, *Eccles. Hist.* 16th Cent. vol. iii. lib. iii. ch. 1.) In the discussions which took place in the subsequent congregations respecting the four articles that were extracted from Luther's writings, Antonio Marinari, a Carmelite, with reference to the first of these articles expressed himself of opinion that Traditions should not be spoken of at all, and that "it would be better to imitate the ancient Fathers, who had always made use of Scripture alone, except in cases of necessity, without ever daring to put Tradition in competition with it."—(P. Sarpi, *Hist. du Conc. de Trente*, liv. ii. ch. 46, edit. Courayer.) Cardinal Pallavicino attempts to throw discredit on this statement of Sarpi, but there seems to be no just ground for calling it in question.

Dr. Milner proposes to prove that the Scriptures are insufficient; and that we require the assistance of *oral* "Tradition." In support of this position he appeals to the testimony of the Fathers. These we will examine; but we here repeat that neither Dr. Milner nor any other Roman controversialist has been able to produce one single direct assertion from any early Christian writer which declares the insufficiency of the Scriptures as a "Rule of Faith," and the necessity of "Tradition" to make up any supposed deficiency in this respect; while, on the other hand, we have adduced "line upon line" from these writers directly asserting and maintaining the sufficiency of the *written Word* as the Christian's sole "Rule of Faith." This is an intelligible issue.

We will now take up each of Dr. Milner's references separately, and shall then be able to examine their value in establishing his position:—

"I begin," says Dr. Milner, "with the disciple of the Apostles, St. Ignatius of Antioch. It is recorded of him that, in his passage to Rome, where he was sentenced to be devoured by wild beasts, he exhorted the Christians who got access to him, 'to guard themselves against the rising heresies, and to adhere, with the utmost firmness, to the tradition of the Apostles.'" The reference is "Euseb. Hist. l. iii. c. 30." This "30" should be 36; but that is of little moment with Dr. Milner.

The passage from *Ignatius* is as follows: <sup>a</sup>—"He [Ignatius] exhorted them to hold firmly by the tradition of the Apostles, which, confirmed by *his own testimony for the sake of security, he judged it necessary to commit to writing.*" Eusebius goes on, in immediate continuation, "Arriving, therefore, at Smyrna, where Polycarp lived, he writes one epistle to the Church at Ephesus," &c., <sup>b</sup> and which we now possess. So that, agreeably to Ignatius, "the tradition of the Apostles," to which he exhorted the Asiatic Churches to adhere, is contained in the epistles, which he himself composed. But in making the quotation, Dr. Milner stops short at "the Traditions of the Apostles!" To Ignatius's own letters, therefore, recourse must be had, if we are desirous of learning what, according to the martyr-bishop of Antioch, is "the Tradition of the Apostles;" and here we in vain search for any of the Roman Traditions Apostolic, so called.

A learned professor, and editor of the writings of Ignatius, Vedelius, argues that nothing that this early Christian writer

<sup>a</sup> We should here observe that we follow the invaluable work "Pope's Roman Misquotations," p. 253, et seq. London, 1840.

<sup>b</sup> Euseb. Eccl. Hist. lib. iii. c. 36, curâ Vales. p. 106. Paris, 1659.

has recorded is other than what the Apostles themselves have put in writing: "It is not possible," he says, "to discover any apostolical tradition in the epistles of Ignatius (I mean in those which are genuine, and not spurious), which is not found in the writings of the Apostles, either in as many words, or at least in the same sense, and by necessary consequence."<sup>a</sup>

In this place it may not be without advantage to offer some remarks on the terms *παράδοσις* and *traditio*. Wherever these words occur, a member of the Church of Rome at once concludes, that they refer to some channel by which truth is handed down, *beside* the volume of Inspiration. But this is mere gratuitous assumption. The term *παράδοσις* is sometimes, observes Suicer, identical with the written Word, and signifies the Holy Scriptures themselves. For example, in Gregory of Nyssa:<sup>b</sup>—

"The Divine Books truly abound with instruction of this nature" (namely, as to the path which terminates in glory); "and many of the saints exhibit, as a lamp, their walk and conversation to those who live in conformity with the will of God. But it is in every one's power to gather, in rich copiousness, from both the Testaments of the divinely-inspired Scripture, the precepts which relate to this proposed end. For many may be collected, and that abundantly, in the Prophets and the Law, and many in the Evangelical and Apostolical Traditions [*ἀποστολικαῖς παραδόσει*]."

On this passage Suicer remarks: "What can be more evident? That which Gregory had before called 'both Testaments,' he afterwards describes as 'the Prophets and the Law,' also 'the Evangelical and Apostolical Traditions;' from whence even the blindest may perceive, that the written Word is designated by the Nyssene father, *tradition*."

The same profound scholar quotes another example from Gregory of Nyssa:<sup>c</sup>—

"We believe both from the common opinion and from the *tradition* [*παραδόσεως*] of the Scriptures," that there are unclean spirits.<sup>d</sup>

Suicer gives examples of the like use of the word *παράδοσις*, by other Greek fathers.

To these may be added the following passage from the V. Cat. of Cyril of Jerusalem:<sup>e</sup>—"But take thou and hold

<sup>a</sup> Ignat. *quæ exstant Omnia*, curâ Vedelii. Genev. 1623. Apol. cap. ii.

<sup>b</sup> De Virginitate, cap. xi. tom. iii. p. 147, Bened. edit.

<sup>c</sup> De Anima et Resurrectione, tom. iii. p. 212.

<sup>d</sup> Greg. Nyssen. cap. xi. de Virginitate, tom. iii. p. 147.

<sup>e</sup> This translation is taken from "A Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church," vol. ii. pp. 57, 58. Oxford, 1838.

that faith as a learner and in profession, which is by the Church delivered to thee, and is established from all Scripture. For since all cannot read the Scripture, but some, as being unlearned, others by business, are hindered from the knowledge of them; in order that the soul may not perish for lack of instruction, in the Articles which are few, we comprehend the whole doctrine of the Faith. This I wish you to remember in the very phrase, and to rehearse it with all diligence among yourselves, not writing it on paper,<sup>a</sup> but by memory graving it on your heart as on a monument: being watchful during your exercise, lest haply some of the Catechumens overhear the things delivered to you.<sup>b</sup> This I wish you to keep all through your life as a provision for the way, and besides this to receive no other for ever: whether we ourselves should change and contradict what we now teach; or some opposing angel, transformed into an angel of light, should aim at leading you astray (2 Cor. xi. 14): For, though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed (Gal. i. 8, 9). And for the present, commit to memory the Faith, merely listening to the words; and expect at the fitting season the proof of each of its parts from the Divine Scriptures. For the Articles of the Faith were not composed at the good pleasure of men: but the most important points chosen from all Scripture, make up the one teaching of the Faith. And as the mustard-seed in a little grain contains many branches, thus also this Faith, in a few words, hath enfolded in its bosom the whole knowledge of godliness contained both in the Old and New Testaments. Behold, therefore, brethren, and *hold the traditions* which ye now receive, and *write them on the table of your hearts* (2 Thess. ii. 15; Prov. vii. 3).<sup>c</sup>

“Here Cyril,” observes the Benedictine editor, “enunciates the Creed, which is given on a subsequent page.”<sup>d</sup> The Creed adverted to is a little shorter than the Nicene profession of

<sup>a</sup> The Bened. Editor of Cyril assigns as a reason which prompted this command—an unwillingness that the symbol of faith should fall into the hands of unbelievers:—“Norunt omnes severe cautum fuisse à Patribus, ne symbolum chartis mandaretur, atque ita in infidelium manus deveniret.”—Bened. in loc.

<sup>b</sup> Cyril in his Procat. num. 12, had before admonished the *Illuminandi*, that they should not repeat to the Catechumens any part of the matter which they were about to hear in the Catecheses:—“Jam superius monuerat Procat. num. 12, &c., ne quidquam Catechumenis repeterent de his quæ in Catechesibus audituri essent, &c.”—Bened. in loc.

<sup>c</sup> Cyril. Hieros. Opera, Bened. Paris, 1720. Cat. V. sec. xii. pp. 77-8. Oxon. 1703. Cat. V. sec. vii. pp. 75-6.

<sup>d</sup> Illic Cyrillus tradit symbolum, quod habetur infra, pag. 84.—Marg. Annot. ap. Ben. in loc.

faith; but accurately agrees with it. By *traditions*, therefore, it is evident that Cyril means the doctrines specified in the Creed he alludes to; which is “made up” of “the most important points chosen from all Scripture,”—to use the language of our author.<sup>a</sup>

Suicer also furnishes examples of *traditio* being used as “identical with the written word.”—“The word *traditio*,” he remarks, “is employed by Cyprian in this very sense: one or two instances taken from his works will suffice. When Stephen had observed, ‘*Let no new practice be introduced, except that which has been handed down,*’ Cyprian (Ep. lxxiv. ad Pompejum) thus writes: ‘*From whence is that tradition? Whether has it come down from the authority of the Lord and the Gospels, or from the commands and letters of the Apostles? For that those things which are written, are to be done, God testifies, and sets before Joshua, saying: The book of this law shall not depart out of thy mouth; but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do all things which are written therein*’ (Josh. chap. i. 8). Presently Cyprian remarks: ‘*If, therefore, it is either commanded in the Gospels, or contained in the Epistles or Acts,—that those abandoning heresy should not be baptized, but that hands should merely be laid on them in order to penitential discipline, let this divine and holy tradition be observed.*’ Thus, in the same Epistle: ‘*If truth shall in any respect be uncertain and fail, let us return to the fountain-head which is from the Lord, to the Gospels (ad originam Dominicam et Evangelicam), and to Apostolical tradition.*’<sup>b</sup> And a few lines after, he calls it *the sacrament of Divine tradition.*’”

On these passages, Suicer remarks: “According, therefore, to Cyprian, tradition is twofold: that of the Lord, and that of the Apostles;—of these, the former is transmitted in the Gospels; the latter is revealed in the Epistles.”

<sup>a</sup> “By *traditions*,” says Milles, “the Fathers often mean nothing else (as Cyril in this passage) than the doctrine of Faith, handed down by the Prophets and Apostles in the Old and New Testaments.” Milles, having cited the extract from Greg. Nyss. (De Anim. et Resurrect.) already given, quotes another example of the similar use of *παράδοσις*. “Cyril of Alexandria, on the lxvi. chapter of Isaiah, calls the doctrine of the Gospel *παράδοσιν*, a *tradition*. ‘He wishes them to be mild and patient according to the Evangelical traditions.’”

Per *παράδοσις* sæpe intelligunt Patres, uti hoc loco *Cyrillus*, nihil aliud quam doctrinam Fidei à Prophetis et Apostolis in Veteri Novoque Testamento posteris traditam. \* \* \* \* Et *Cyrillus Alexandrinus* in caput lxvi. *Isaiæ*, Evangelii doctrinam vocat *παράδοσιν*. Πραοὺς αὐτοὺς βούλεται, καὶ ἀνεξικακούς εἶναι, κατὰ γὰρ τὰς εὐαγγελικὰς παραδόσεις. *Vult eos mites, et malorum tolerantiores esse, juxta traditiones Evangelicas.*—Not. apud Oxon. edit. (1703) in loc.

<sup>b</sup> Edit. cur. Pamel. p. 195.

The preceding quotations clearly establish that the words *παράδοσις* and *traditio*, in the writings of the Fathers, do not necessarily mean oral Tradition, or allude to other dogmas *beside* those contained in the Inspired Volume; but that they are not unfrequently employed, either as synonymous with the Bible itself, or in reference to truths made known therein.

To return to Dr. Milner. He continues: "The same sentiment appears in the epistles of his [Ignatius's] fellow-martyr, St. Polycarp, the angel of the Church of Smyrna, Rev. ii. 8." Here neither passage nor reference is given. Polycarp suffered martyrdom by fire, at a very advanced age, in Smyrna, about 130 years after our Saviour's death, and only *one* epistle from his pen has survived; it is addressed to the Philippians. Not only does the "the same sentiment" *not* appear in this eminent martyr's epistle, but throughout the whole of it the word "Tradition" does not appear. So much, then, for the testimony of this "holy bishop."

*Irenæus*, we are told by Dr. Milner, "abounds with testimonies to the present purpose:"—"Nothing is more easy to those who seek for the truth, than to remark, in every Church *the tradition* which the Apostles have manifested to all the world. We can name the bishops appointed by the Apostles in the several churches, and the successors of those bishops down to our own time [A.D. 180], none of whom ever taught or heard of such doctrines as these heretics dream of.—(Adv. Hæret. lib. iii. c. 5.)" Now since Irenæus appealed, as we shall presently see, to the fulness and sufficiency of the written Scriptures, and bearing in mind what we have already observed in the use of the word "tradition," we have not the slightest hesitation in asserting that Irenæus never referred to any other "tradition which the Apostles have manifested," except as shown forth in their writings.<sup>a</sup> The Church of Rome preserved traditions, but not such as are *now* observed in that Church. They might have preserved them incorrupt to the days of Irenæus, who was "vir apostolicorum temporum." Rome was then famous for her faith (Rom. i. 8); but "*Quantum mutatus ab illo Hectore, qui quondam!*"

Again: we are told that "this holy Father emphatically affirms that 'In explaining the Scriptures, Christians are to attend to the *pastors of the Church*, who, by the ordinance of

<sup>a</sup> Ubi cumque Pontificii inveniunt vocabulum *Traditiones*, illud mox detorqueant ad *suas* traditiones, quæ ex Scriptura probari non possunt, ut cum Paulus dicit (1 Cor. xv.), *Tradidi vobis, &c.*, Hic statim exclamant, Audis traditiones? Audio, sed mox in eodem loco lego, Paulum *scripto* explicare quæ sunt illa quæ tradiderit, &c.—Chemnitz, Examen Conc. Trid. pars i. p. 110, edit. 1606.

God, have *received the inheritance of truth*, with the succession of their sees.'—(Lib. iv. c. 43.)” Well! what then? The question at issue is not as to the “explaining the Scriptures,” by the “pastors of the Church,” but whether these pastors, who “had received the inheritance of truth,” declared the insufficiency of the Scriptures as the sole “rule of faith,” and the absolute necessity of oral “tradition” to make up the short-comings of the Scriptures. As we do attend to the “*pastors of our Church*,” and do believe that “*they have received the inheritance of truth*” through the WRITTEN WORD, we cannot exactly see how this passage is a lesson to us. But in immediate connection with this passage Dr. Milner adds another:—“The tongues (Irenæus adds) of nations vary, but the virtue of *tradition is everywhere* one and the same; nor do the Churches believe or teach differently from those in Spain, Gaul, the East, Egypt, or Libya;” and the reference given is “L. i. c. 3.” It is strange indeed that Dr. Milner should select the very passage, of all others, which we were about to quote against him to refute his argument.<sup>a</sup> But in quoting this passage we did not intend to restrict ourselves to the few lines selected by Dr. Milner, but to give the whole context, which we now venture to do. From this it will be seen that Irenæus particularly defines what this universal tradition is; and having thus fixed it, he emphatically adds (sect. 2) that “neither will he who is strong in speech enlarge it, nor will he who is weak in speech diminish it. For this faith being one, neither has he who can say much respecting it amplified it, nor has he who can say little curtailed it.” When the reader has perused the entire passage, he will have no difficulty in declaring that Irenæus, in the passage above cited by Dr. Milner, from the 4th book, c. 43, means by the “inheritance of truth” received by the “pastors of the Church,” the *truths* exclusively derived and taught in the *written Word* only.

Irenæus, in the passage in question, writes:—

“For the Church, although she is extended throughout the universe, even to the ends of the earth, received the faith from the Apostles and their disciples, which faith is in one God, the Father Almighty, who made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all things which are in them; and in one Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who was incarnate for our salvation; and in the Holy Spirit, who predicted the dispensations of God

<sup>a</sup> We were misled by his reference. The passage will not, in all the editions, be found in the third chapter, which vary in the divisions. Dr. Milner follows the numbering of Grabe's edition; but in the Benedictine, printed at Paris, 1710, it ranks as cap. 10.



by the prophets, and the advent, and the generation from the Virgin, and the passion, and the resurrection from the dead, and the ascent in the flesh into heaven of Jesus Christ our beloved Lord, and His coming from heaven in the glory of the Father, to resume all things, and to raise the flesh of all mankind; so that, according to the good pleasure of the invisible Father, every knee, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth, should bow to Jesus Christ our Lord, and God, and Saviour, and King, and every tongue should confess Him, and that He should judge all things in righteousness, and that He should consign to eternal fire the spiritual things of iniquity, and angels that have transgressed and apostatized, and the impious and unjust, and the blasphemers among men; and granting, on the other hand, life and immortality and eternal glory to the just and righteous, and to those who keep his commandments and persevere in his love, some from the beginning, others after repentance.

“2. And the Church, albeit she is scattered throughout the whole world, having received this preaching and this faith, diligently keeps it as if she inhabited one house; and in like manner she believes in these things as having one soul and one heart, and she uniformly teaches them and hands them down as having one mouth. For although there are various languages in the world, yet the strength of tradition is one and the same. And neither do the churches that are founded in Germany believe or hand down otherwise; nor do the churches which are in Spain, or in Gaul, or in the East, or in Egypt, or in Libya, or those which are established in the middle of the world. But as the sun, the creation of God, is one and the same in the whole world, so also the light, which is the preaching of truth, everywhere shines and enlightens all men, who will come to the knowledge of the truth. And neither will he who is strong in speech enlarge it (for no one is above his master), nor will he who is weak in speech diminish it. For this faith being one, neither has he who can say much respecting it amplified it, nor has he who can say little curtailed it.”<sup>a</sup>

This passage needs no further remark than the observation, that the word *παραδόσεως*, used by Irenæus, exactly agrees with the explanation we have above given of the import of the word as not unfrequently used by the early Christian writers.

The next passage is given as follows, also as from Irenæus:

<sup>a</sup> Irenæus's "First Book against Heresies," ch. x. p. 50. Bened. edit., Paris, 1710.

—"Since it would be tedious to enumerate the succession of all the churches, we appeal to the faith and tradition of the greatest, most ancient, and best known Church, that of Rome, founded by the Apostles SS. Peter and Paul; for with this Church all others agree, inasmuch as in her is preserved the tradition which comes down from the Apostles." The reference is "Lib. iii. c. 2."

It must be remembered that Irenæus wrote at the latter end of the second century. He was born about A.D. 140, and suffered martyrdom in the year 202. The passage in question appears in the 3rd chapter, and not in the 2nd, in both Grabe's and Massuet's editions. It thus commences:—"The tradition of the Apostles, manifested throughout the whole world, may be seen in every church by all who wish to hear the truth." Now, here is a remarkable similarity to the sentiment enunciated in the former passage quoted, wherein he specifies these traditions universally received by all the churches, which no one dared to amplify or curtail, which was not a code of *unwritten doctrines*, supposed to be in the keeping of the pastors of the Church, and having the same divine authority as the written Word; but this "Tradition of the Apostles" was contained in, and rested on, that *written Word*. He then proceeds to say, that they "could reckon up both those who by the Apostles were appointed bishops in the churches, and their successors, down even to his own time.—But," he continues, "since, in such a volume as this, it would occupy too much space to enumerate the successions of *all* the churches, we shall confound all those persons who, from whatever bad motive, make their inferences differently from what they ought, simply indicating that Apostolic tradition and that declared faith of the greatest and most ancient and universally known Church, founded at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles Peter and Paul, which has come down even to us, through the succession of her bishops." Now, was the faith of the Church of Rome at that day such as required an alleged unwritten tradition—say, if you will, "Apostolical Tradition"—independent of, and of equal authority to, the *written Word*, to support the truth or orthodoxy of her doctrines? We challenge proof of this; let the reader run over the several doctrines set out by Irenæus, and which he declared to be "the faith received from the Apostles," and the "tradition" universally received, and which was not to be added to, or diminished from, and he will deduce from the language of Irenæus, that the *faith* of the Roman Church was founded on the tradition of the Apostles, derived from the written Word alone, since by the

written Word alone we are instructed in all those “*traditions*” enumerated by Irenæus.

But Dr. Milner quotes, or rather misquotes, this passage for the additional purpose of thrusting prominently forward the Church of Rome; and, in order to give that church the pre-eminence, he drops an important sentence; the passage proceeds: “For to this church, on account of the more potent principality (*propter potentio rem principalitatem*), it is necessary that every church should resort, that is to say, those faithful individuals who are on every side of it,<sup>a</sup> in which the tradition descending from the Apostles, has always been preserved by those around it.”

Here we may remark, that the Church of Rome, relying on her “tradition,” does not now hold the same belief as did the Church in the time of Irenæus. The latter declared that the adjoining faithful individuals on every side of the Church at Rome, should resort to that church “on account of its more potent principality;” whereas the former claims authority for her by direct “divine” appointment, as successor of St. Peter, the alleged first Bishop of Rome. On this latter tradition, again, the passage referred to by Dr. Milner, strange enough, throws some further light, showing that the *tradition* now held varies from that recorded by Irenæus. Dr. Milner repeatedly calls Peter the first Bishop of Rome,<sup>b</sup> whereas Irenæus continues to say, “The blessed Apostles (*viz.*, Peter and Paul), then founding and building up that church, delivered to *Linus* the episcopate of administering it;” and he then enumerates the succession of the Bishops of Rome up to his day, twelve in number, counting from Linus inclusively. According to the *tradition*, therefore, of the Church in his day, Peter was not the first Bishop of Rome; but he and Paul together appointed Linus as the first Bishop of that see. That there should be no misunderstanding, we add in a note the entire passage from Irenæus.<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> The word here used is “*undique*,” that is, those who were dependent on this Metropolitan Mother Church. Each bishop of a Metropolitan Church had a separate and independent jurisdiction, and this independent authority was confirmed by the Sixth Canon of the First Council of Nice held many years after, namely, A.D. 345.

<sup>b</sup> Letters xlv. pp. 437—440, and xxviii. p. 284.

<sup>c</sup> Traditionem itaque Apostolorum, in toto mundo manifestatum, adest perspicere omnibus, qui vera velint audire: et habemus annumerare eos, qui ab Apostolis instituti sunt Episcopi in Ecclesiis, et successores eorum usque ad nos. Sed quoniam valde longum est, in hoc tali volumine, omnium Ecclesiarum enumerare successiones; maximæ et antiquissimæ et omnibus cognitæ a gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis Petro et Paulo Romæ fundatæ et constitutæ Ecclesiæ, eam quam habet ab Apostolis traditionem et annunciatam hominibus fidem, per successiones Episcoporum pervenientem usque ad nos,—indicantes, confundimus omnes eos, qui, quoquo modo, vel per sui placentium malam vel

It is further to be observed, that while Dr. Milner is producing this passage as illustrating the value (to put the easiest construction on his motives) of oral "Tradition," in contradistinction to the written Word, he is affording the strongest argument against its adoption as a "Rule of Faith." The doctor upholds the theory that Peter was the first bishop of Rome; on which point not only is Irenæus wholly silent, but is by implication of a contrary opinion. But Dr. Milner agrees with Irenæus in the statement that the episcopate was delivered directly to Linus, as the first bishop, but is silent on the co-operation of *Paul*. Dr. Milner's words are: "He [Peter] afterwards removed his own See to Rome, the capital of Europe and the world. Here, having with Paul, sealed the Gospel with his blood, he [Peter] transmitted his prerogative to St. Linus, from which it descended in succession to St. Cletus and St. Clement;"<sup>a</sup> thus making Linus succeed to the episcopate *after the death* of Peter; *Cletus* then succeeded in the second, and *Clement* in the third place. That is one Tradition. Another Tradition, recorded in what is called the "Apostolic Constitutions," informs us that "Linus was the *first* ordained bishop of the Roman Church by *Paul*, but *Clement* *after* the death of Linus, by Peter in the *second* place;"<sup>b</sup> and Tertullian also declares that *Clement* was ordained by Peter.<sup>c</sup>

Here then Tradition is at fault on one, to Rome at least, of the most important of her tenets. How idle then is it for Dr. Milner to strive to place his "Traditions" on a level with Scripture, and call Irenæus to support his assertion?

Dr. Milner keeps, however, what he considers the most "crushing" sentence from Irenæus for his last quotation, giving it in most legible type as follows:—"SUPPOSING THE APOSTLES HAD NOT LEFT US THE SCRIPTURES, OUGHT WE NOT

vanam gloriam, vel per cæcitatem et malam sententiam, præterquam oportet colligunt. Ad hanc enim Ecclesiam, propter potentio rem principalitatem, necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam; hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles: in qua semper, ab his qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quæ est ab Apostolis traditio. Fundantes, igitur, et instructes, beati Apostoli, Ecclesiam, Lino Episcopatum administrandæ Ecclesiæ tradiderunt.—Succedit autem ei Anacleus: post eum, tertio loco ab Apostolis, Episcopatum sortitur Clemens.—Huic autem Clementi succedit Euaristus: et Euaristo Alexander. Ac deinceps, sextus ab Apostolis, constitutus est Sixtus: et ab hoc, Telesphorus: ac deinceps, Hyginus: post, Pius: post quem, Anicetus. Cum autem successisset Aniceto Soter: nunc duodecimo loco, Episcopatum, ab Apostolis, habet Eleutherius.—Irenæ adv. Hær. lib. iii. c. 3.

<sup>a</sup> Letter xxviii. p. 284.

<sup>b</sup> Τῆς δὲ Ῥωμαίων Ἐκκλησίας, Λίνος μὲν ὁ Κλαυδίας πρῶτος ὑπὸ Παύλου, Κλήμης δὲ μετὰ τοῦ Λίνου θάνατον ὑπ' ἐμοῦ Πέτρου δεύτερος χειροτόνηται.—Const. Apost. lib. vii. c. 46, in Le Clerc's Patres Apost. tom. i. Edit. Amst. 1724.

<sup>c</sup> De Præscript. adv. Hæret. cap. 36, p. 216. Paris, 1675.

STILL TO HAVE FOLLOWED THE ORDINANCE OF TRADITION, which they consigned to those to whom they committed the Churches? It is this ordinance of *tradition* which many nations of barbarians, believing in Christ, follow without the use of letters or ink." The reference given is "L. iv. c. 64," being a false one, as will shortly appear.

Here, again, for the better understanding of the author quoted, we will give a literal translation of his own words, such at least as are handed down to us, and we place the text itself in a foot-note:<sup>a</sup>—

"If it had so happened that the Apostles had left us no Scriptures, must we not then have followed the order of tradition, which they committed to those with whom they intrusted the Churches? To this course many nations of illiterate barbarians, who believe in Christ, do assent, having salvation written in their hearts by the Holy Spirit, without writing or ink, and thus preserving the ancient tradition, believing in one God, the Maker of heaven and earth," &c.

And this passage is quoted to prove that the primitive Church recognized an authority, "unwritten tradition," as well as the written Word; that oral instruction is amply sufficient for the laity; and that, in point of obligation, the written Word need not be communicated to them by the priesthood. To ourselves the passage appears decidedly to establish the contrary. For doubtless, as Irenæus remarks, *if* it had so happened that the Apostles had left us *no* written Scriptures, we should *then* have been necessitated, like believers in the patriarchal ages, to follow the order of tradition, either purely oral, or some other sufficiently recognized authority. But through the good providence of God, the Apostles *have* left us the Scriptures. Therefore, by intrusting us with them, they have practically demonstrated to us the insufficiency and insecurity of tradition; for had oral tradition from age to age been *sufficient*, the written Word would have been *superfluous*, and would not have been given. But it is insinuated that Irenæus, in the case of the barbarians, speaks of oral tradition in terms of approbation; be it so. It was only *if* they had no copies of the Scripture, or could not read. But was the oral Tradition commended by him the *same*, or the tenets the same, as advocated by

<sup>a</sup> Quid autem, si neque Apostoli quidem scripturas reliquissent nobis, nonne oportebat ordinem sequi traditionis, quam tradiderunt iis quibus committebant ecclesias? Cui ordinationi assentiunt multæ gentes barbarorum, eorum qui in Christum credunt, sine caractere et atramento scriptam habentes per Spiritum in cordibus suis salutem, et veterem traditionem diligenter custodientes, in unum Deum credentes, Fabricatorem cœli et terræ, &c.—Irenæus adv. Hær. lib. iii. cap. iv. p. 172, fol. Edit. Basil., 1570.

Dr. Milner, such as that which the Council of Trent placed upon an equal footing with Scripture? Nothing of the kind. What can be found instructing them in Purgatory, prayers to saints and angels, St. Peter's supremacy, indulgences, &c.? The tradition commended by Irenæus was simply an oral catechumenical communication of such truths as those contained in the written Word, the Articles of their Faith or creed; for of such only he especially speaks:—"In unum Deum credentes, Fabricatorem cœli et terræ;" whereas that enforced by the Council of *Trent* sets forth sundry matters, *not only not contained* in the Bible, but directly contrary to it.<sup>a</sup>

Such, then, is the evidence adduced by Dr. Milner from Irenæus on one side of the question, but he has wholly omitted to notice the passages we have before quoted in a former article (p. 42, *suprà*), which to all candid readers must decide the question against Dr. Milner's one-sided views.

*Tertullian* is the next valuable witness quoted, and the manner in which he handles this venerable writer might well astonish the Rev. Mr. Jackson in his review of the passages selected by Dr. Milner. "I must confess," he says, "that I do not understand Dr. Milner." After reading the passages cited by him,<sup>b</sup> and comparing them with the original, we are utterly at a loss in what terms to describe his procedure. The only supposition which we can make, consistent with his good faith, is this—that he found the passages, as he has given them, in some Romish selection of *Tertullian's* sayings, and that he was wholly ignorant of their connection and import, as they stand in the original. To us it appears incredible, that any intelligent man, moderately skilled in the Latin language, *with a copy of Tertullian before him*, should with honesty of intention have so misrepresented the drift of that Father's reasoning, as Dr. Milner has taken the liberty of doing.

It is impossible, in any short compass, to convey an adequate notion of the extent to which misrepresentation has been here carried. We must confine ourselves to a few leading points; but we entreat the reader to consult the *De Præscript. Hæret.* for himself, that he may learn to appreciate the accuracy of Dr. Milner, in describing the opinions of the Fathers.

The passages alluded to, which are of considerable length,

<sup>a</sup> Elliott's "Delineation," &c., p. 45. London, 1851.

<sup>b</sup> We now quote from Mr. Jackson's work, "The Two Main Questions in Controversy between the Churches of England and Rome," p. 172. Dublin, 1825.

are given in Letter x. pp. 132-3, as two distinct portions of Tertullian's work. The reference to the first is thus marked:—"Præscrip. advers. Hæres. edit. Rhenan, pp. 36, 37;" the reference to the second, "Ibid. 36, 37."—"pp. 36, 37," is manifestly a misprint for cap. or sect. 36, 37. The treatise itself is also miscalled.<sup>a</sup> But, instead of the two extracts being found in chapters 36, 37, or in any other chapters of the *De Præscript. Hæret. in the consecutive form* in which Dr. Milner has chosen to exhibit them, the reader will be surprised to learn, that they are ingenious pieces of patchwork, made up of detached sentences forcibly torn from their context, out of no less than seven different chapters, some of them pretty distant from each other; namely, out of ch. 15, 16, 19, 31, 32, 36, 37. The rendering is as unfaithful as this dislocation is unwarrantable; and the sentences are so artfully dovetailed into each other, as to present the appearance of a connected set of propositions which produce a conclusion at perfect variance with the general bearing of Tertullian's argument. That argument is similar to the line adopted by Irenæus; whose work *Adv. Hæres.* it is manifest Tertullian made use of in the composition of his own. The adversaries of both these Fathers held much in common, whilst they equally rejected the *genuine* Scriptures, either wholly, or in part; and appealed to the pretended *secret* Traditions of their own sects, in opposition to the Traditions of the Apostolic Churches, which were in that age consentient with Scripture on the points in question. The heretics in Tertullian's day, as appears from cap. 22 and 25 of the *De Præscript. Hæret.*, accounted for these traditive doctrines, by which they had corrupted the simplicity of the Christian faith, being unknown to the Universal Church, by supposing that all truth had either not been revealed to the Apostles themselves, or had not been communicated by them to Christians in general.<sup>b</sup> In addition to these silly and even impious pretences, these heretics, it seems, made *a show of appealing to the written word*, thus improving upon the adversaries of Irenæus, who rejected the Scriptures altogether. But *to what kind of writings* they appealed as the inspired Word is the main question: on the answer to it, the whole force of

<sup>a</sup> It deserves to be remarked, once for all, that the references throughout Dr. Milner's work are so vague and inaccurate, as to be nearly useless to the reader.

<sup>b</sup> Solent dicere [hæretici] non omnia Apostolos scisse, eâdem dementiâ quâ rursus convertunt, omnia quidem Apostolos scisse, sed non omnia omnibus tradidisse; in utroque Christum reprehensioni subjicientes, qui aut minus instructos, aut parum simplices Apostolos miserit.—*De Præscript. Hæret. cap. 22.*

the quotation depends, as far as it is applicable to the principles of Protestants. That answer will be soon furnished: meanwhile, let us follow Tertullian step by step. “Sed *ipsi* de Scripturis agunt, et de Scripturis suadent!” The *ipsi* is emphatical, and implies a contradiction between their real principles, and their affected appeal to Scripture as a test which could be consistently resorted to by the orthodox alone, and which was in fact *their* standard of opinion. It is as if Tertullian had said, these very heretics feel, that in order to give a specious colour to their tenets, the Scriptures must not be wholly disregarded. *Ipsi* de Scripturis agunt, &c.—“They, as well as we, appeal to the Scriptures.” “For with what plausibility,” asks he, “could men presume to speak of matters of faith, without reference to the written documents in which that faith is contained?”

In this sense, we think it is plain, as the only one agreeing with the context, that the following sentence is to be understood:—“Aliunde scilicet suadere possent de rebus fidei, nisi ex litteris fidei?”—(Ib. c. 14.<sup>a</sup>) “By *the very impudence of this appeal*,” he afterwards goes on to say, “they advance their cause: they exhaust the patience of the strong, they impose upon the weak, they raise doubts in the minds of the wavering.”<sup>b</sup> *The prescription*, therefore, or general rule, which he lays down for managing controversy with persons of so artful a character, is this:—that they should not be permitted to argue the matter on *their alleged* Scriptural grounds; for before the question could be decided in such a way of conducting the inquiry, it was manifest, that the genuineness of the Scriptures to which the parties appealed, must be previously ascertained.<sup>c</sup> And now the question is to be answered, —To what sort of Scriptures did these heretics appeal? to the genuine and undoubted Scriptures? No; neither Tertullian nor Irenæus would have disallowed an appeal to them; but to *spurious writings*, or copies of the Scriptures *mutilated and interpolated*, to serve their own purpose. An appeal to Scripture, whilst men were not agreed as to what was to be taken as Scripture, could lead to no concord; it was an idle

<sup>a</sup> In Semler's edition, it stands thus:—“Aliunde scilicet suadere non possent, &c.,” without the note of interrogation. The sense is still the same. Dr. Milner's translation of this passage will be shortly seen.

<sup>b</sup> Scripturas obtundunt, et hac sua audacia statim quosdam movent: in ipso vero congressu, firmos quidem fatigant, infirmos capiunt, medios cum scrupulo dimittunt.—De Præscript. Hæret. cap. 15.

<sup>c</sup> Hunc igitur potissimum gradum obstruimus, non admittendos eos ad ullam de Scripturis disputationem. Si hæ illæ sunt vires eorum, uti eas habere possint, dispici debet, cui competat possessio Scripturarum. Ib. cap. 15.



disputation, "calculated only to disorder the stomach, or to distract the brain."<sup>a</sup>

Such is the scope of these passages in Tertullian when viewed in their context, which Dr. Milner, after having mis-translated and compounded according to his own purpose, has adduced to establish this conclusion; for this is the only one which can be drawn from them, as they are put together by him; that Protestants, in appealing to the Bible, resemble the heretics confuted by Tertullian; of whom that Father is represented by him as saying, in terms of the strongest disapprobation, "They meddle with the Scriptures and adduce arguments from them; for in treating of faith *they pretend that they ought not to argue upon any other grounds than the written documents of faith.*"<sup>b</sup>—(Letter x. p. 132.) The artifice consists in making Tertullian deny the legitimacy of an appeal to the *genuine* Scriptures; whereas he denied only the possibility of determining the question by an appeal to *spurious* Scriptures, the heretics making use of *forgeries* and *corrupted copies*, and resorting to a mode of interpretation accommodated solely to their own hypothesis.<sup>c</sup>

Dr. Milner's effrontery in producing these passages of Tertullian as making for his own purpose, is to be equalled only by the unwarrantable freedom which he has taken in translating them.

To complete his perversion of Tertullian, he uses these words: "In another of his works this eloquent Father proves at great length the absolute necessity of admitting Tradition no less than Scripture as the Rule of Faith; inasmuch as many important points, which he mentions, cannot be proved without it" (p. 134).

The work alluded to is the "De Corona Militis," but no reference to the passage is given. Throughout this performance Tertullian is weak and declamatory, though in some passages not ineloquent. In the third and fourth chapters are enumerated "the *important* points," which cannot be proved without Tradition; and they turn out to be ceremonial

<sup>a</sup> Quoniam nihil proficiat congressio Scripturarum, nisi plane aut stomachi quæ ineat, eversionem, aut cerebri.—(Ib. cap. 16). In the next sentence he assigns the reason:—*Ista hæresis non recipit quasdam Scripturas; et si quas recipit, adjectionibus et detractationibus ad dispositionem instituti sui intervertit: et si recipit, non recipit integras.*—Ib. cap. 17.

<sup>b</sup> This he gives as the translation of Tertullian's ironical word:—*Sed ipsi de Scripturis agunt et de Scripturis suadent! aliunde scilicet suadere possent de rebus fidei, nisi ex literis fidei?*—Ib. cap. 14.

<sup>c</sup> His nituntur, quæ ex falso composuerunt, et quæ de ambiguitate ceperunt. Quid promovebis, exercitatissime Scripturarum? cum si quid defenderis, negetur ex diverso. Si quid negaveris, defendatur. Et tu quidem nihil perdes nisi vocem in contentione.—Ib. cap. 17.

practices and observances not indeed enjoined in Scripture; but which Tertullian rightly insists upon, as deriving sufficient authority from express appointment and ecclesiastical usage.<sup>a</sup> Dr. Milner makes Tertullian appeal to them, as a part of the Rule of Faith, and consequently as emanating from Jesus Christ and his Apostles. Tertullian says of these, and of similar appointments: "Annon putas, omni fidei licere concipere et constituere, duntaxat quod Deo congruat, quod disciplinæ conducat, quod saluti proficiat, dicente Domino, cur autem non et a vobis ipsis quod justum est judicatis?" (c. 4).

But, we shall be the better enabled to judge of the origin of these Traditions, by enumerating some of them. They are such as these: the form of renouncing the devil and his angels, used in the rite of baptism; the practice of trine immersion observed in that rite; the tasting of a mixture of milk and honey on coming out of the baptismal bath, and the abstaining afterwards from the use of the common bath for a whole week; the partaking of the sacrament fasting; oblations for the dead (very different, it should be recollected, from masses for the dead); the not fasting, and not kneeling in prayer, on the Lord's day, and between Easter and Whitsuntide; with others of a similar description: most of which "*important*" practices, the Romish Church has herself disused, in virtue of that authority for regulating matters of ceremony and discipline which every church possesses, and by which they had been at first established.

Besides these ingenious perversions of Tertullian's arguments, the doctor has also further accommodated the passages from chapters (not pages, as Dr. Milner strangely misprints it) 36, 37, of the treatise De Præscript. Hæret. most comfortably to his own use, by omitting Tertullian's reference to, and arguments from, the other Catholic Churches, and citing merely the instance of the Church of Rome. "Percurre," says the Father, "Ecclesias Apostolicas," directing inquirers after the truth for confirmation in it to Corinth, Philippi, Thessalonica, Ephesus, and, last of all, to Rome, "if you are in its neighbourhood;" and here it is that Dr. Milner commences his quotations, appropriating all the praise of the Church Catholic to that local Church alone. But are the Roman priests prepared to show that Tertullian is in this passage speaking of the Roman Church at all? Whoever will be at the pains of reading the treatise in the original, will be of opinion that he is not, or that this is at least a very doubtful matter, and that there is quite as much, if not more, reason to suppose that he

<sup>a</sup> Quas sine ullius Scripturæ instrumento, solius Traditionis titulo, et exinde *consuetudinis patrocínio*, vindicamus.—De Cor. Mil. c. 3.

is speaking of the whole Catholic Church, in contradistinction to the heretics. It was obligatory also on Dr. Milner, referring to as he does (we can hardly say making use of) the edition of Rhenanus, to establish the reading "*ista Ecclesia*," which he has adopted, but which the copy of that edition to which we have access (Basil, 1521) does not exhibit (p. 102). That reading tends to help out, in the hands of modern sectarians, a more special application to Rome herself alone, and may enable her to fancy she can adopt Tertullian's language towards the Churches of Marcion and similar communities, and demand, "Who are you, and where did you come from, and what business have you here in *my* vineyard?—This is *my* farm," &c. &c. All this may sound very grand, but, like the notions of the old *Apostolics*, it is in Rome's mouth equally arrogant. It cannot appear to any one so very evident that this passage applies to the local Church of Rome. To many it must be evident, for various reasons, that it does not. No one, for instance, has pretended that it was at Rome that the heresies, here condemned by Tertullian, took their rise; and the Roman priests show that they also have their misgivings, for they introduce the word *Rome* or *Roman* in the passage, where it is not in the original, in order to fasten this sense on the words.<sup>a</sup>

Dr. Milner, after these testimonies, can afford—so rich he fancies himself in Patristic testimony—"to pass over the shining lights of the third century, such as St. Clement of Alexandria, St. Cyprian, Origen, &c., all of whom place Apostolic Tradition on a level with Scripture" (p. 134). Here is an abandonment of the question at issue. Dr. Milner should have shown that some one of these held doctrines which they declared to be "*Apostolical Traditions*," which were not contained in the Scriptures, or that some one of them deemed the Scriptures insufficient as a rule of faith. A passage is given as from Origen, but without any reference, and which we cannot find. On the other hand we have to refer the reader to the extracts already produced from that writer (p. 46, *suprà*).

To this we might add several of a similar nature, but shall content ourselves with the two following:—

"As all gold, whatsoever it be, that is without the temple, is not holy, even so every sense which is without the divine Scripture, however admirable it may appear to some, is not holy, because it is foreign to the Scriptures."<sup>b</sup> And again: "Consider how eminent their danger is who neglect to study

<sup>a</sup> Simons's "Mission and Martyrdom of Peter," p. 115. London, 1852. The reader will consult this book with advantage on this subject.

<sup>b</sup> Origen in Hom. xxx. in Matt. Latin edit. Basil, 1571.

the Scriptures, through which alone a judgment as to the soundness of their instructors can be formed."<sup>a</sup>

There is a passage in Cyprian which refers to *Tradition*. It is in a letter written to Pompeius against Stephen, Bishop of Rome, and we must from this conclude that it was Stephen who pleaded custom and tradition, to which Cyprian replied in the following words:—"Whence comes this tradition? Doth it descend from the Lord's authority, or from the commands and Epistles of the Apostles? For those things are to be done which are there written," &c. "*If it be commanded in the Epistles and Acts of the Apostles, then let this holy tradition be observed.*"<sup>b</sup> Evidently considering those traditions apostolical only which are recorded in the Scriptures. With regard to Clement of Alexandria, Dr. Milner avoids citing any extract to establish his position; the passage, however, to which he doubtless alludes, is that cited by Messrs. Kirk and Berington, in their popular work, entitled "*The Faith of Catholics,*" under the heading "*The Church is the Expounder of the Scriptures,*" pp. 12 and 114 of the first edition, and p. 101 of the second edition. The fraud has been so ably exposed by the Rev. R. T. Pope, in his "*Roman Misquotations,*" cap. i. p. 7, *et seq.* (edit. London, 1840), that the reader will do well to consult that excellent work, should the passage from Clement of Alexandria be quoted against him.

We then are introduced to Basil and Epiphanius, as "illustrious witnesses of the fourth age."

The former is represented as saying, "There are many doctrines preserved and preached in the Church, derived partly from apostolical *tradition*, which have equally *the same force* in religion, and which no one contradicts who has the least knowledge of the Christian laws." The reference is "In Lib. de Spir. Sanc.," one of the most ordinary supports of Papal and Tractarian writers:

It is really a sickening task to be compelled to doubt every statement advanced by a Romish divine, until a careful examination of the originals be instituted. "Really," exclaimed the Rev. Joseph Mendham, while occupied in a similar task as our own, "these papal writers require to be watched at every step, and to be suspected, till they can verify their affidavits, like a felon or a swindler."<sup>c</sup> Who, on reading Dr. Milner's version of St. Basil could doubt but that he was referring to *doctrines* necessary to be believed as matters of *faith*? There is not in the extract, as given by Dr. Milner, the most distant allusion to *rites* and *ceremonies* of the

<sup>a</sup> Lib. x. cap. xvi. sec. 35, in Rom. tom. iv. p. 684. Paris edit.

<sup>b</sup> Cypr. Oper. Epist. 73, ad Pompeium, p. 211. Oxon. 1682.

<sup>c</sup> Mendham's "Life of Pius V.," p. 217. London, 1832.

Church, to which, in fact this “illustrious witness” does refer: the passage is taken from the 27th chapter of the work cited. Basil’s own words are—

Ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πεφυλαγμένων δογμάτων καὶ κηρυγμάτων, τὰ μὲν ἐκ τῆς ἐγγράφου διδασκαλίας ἔχομεν, τὰ δὲ ἐκ τῆς τῶν Ἀποστόλων παραδόσεως (p. 351, tom. ii. edit. Paris, 1637.)

A more proper rendering of this would be: “There being both written and preached ordinances preserved in the Church; the first we have from the teaching of the Scripture, the latter from the tradition of the Apostles.” Dr. Milner translates the two words *δόγματα* and *κηρύγματα*, by the single word “doctrines.” Neither the one nor the other bears that sense. *Δόγμα*, in the original, is by no means equivalent to the modern sense in which the word “dogma” is used. Basil himself says, “Ἄλλο γὰρ δόγμα καὶ ἄλλο κήρυγμα,—“a written ordinance is one thing, a preached ordinance is another;” because the *δόγμα*, or written ordinance, remains silent, while the *κήρυγμα* is spread among the people. *Δόγματα* are the rites, customs, and ceremonies of religious worship. Thus it is employed to signify the Jewish “ordinances” (Ephes. ii. 15); and see Luke ii. 1; and see Schleusner’s Lexicon, *ad loc.* And Basil says that many such are handed down unwritten in the Church, lest, if written, they should be thought trifling and petty; but still ought equally to be observed: and he proceeds to enumerate more than a dozen instances, not one of which comes near the modern meaning of the word “doctrine,” which Dr. Milner has chosen to employ; *e. g.*, signing with the cross, praying towards the east, standing in prayer between Easter and Pentecost, thrice dipping the party baptized; as to which no man will say that they have *τὴν αὐτὴν ἰσχὺν ἔχειν πρὸς τὴν εὐσέβειαν*,—conduce equally unto godliness with points of faith; nor does the Church of Rome at this day practise them. Now, if these be not necessary to be observed at all, how can they be of equal service unto godliness? How can they be of equal importance with doctrinal points, such as the Articles of our Belief?<sup>a</sup> But, again, Basil was here writing in the heat of disputation, and standing in defence of the rites, ceremonies, and orders of the Church, and spoke indeed very hyperbolically of them; but if we take him in his calmer mood, we shall find no reason to doubt as to his real sentiments on the all-sufficiency of the Scriptures as the sole “rule of faith” of the true believer; and for these his expressed opinions we refer the reader to the passages we have before given, in p. 48.

*Epiphanius* is quoted as saying, “with equal brevity and

<sup>a</sup> See Birckbek’s “Protestant’s Evidence,” vol. i. p. 206. Edit. London, 1849.

force (as Basil), ‘ We must make use of *tradition*: for all things are not to be found in Scripture.’—De Hæres. N. 61” [p. 511, tom. i. ed. 1682]. Epiphanius—a great admirer of tradition—backs his opinion with the usual citation from St. Paul, “ as I delivered unto you.” But neither the Church of England, it should be understood, nor any other Church, refuses tradition, as seems to be constantly assumed. They avail themselves of its testimony with all willingness ; but they do not (as Rome) “ palter with a double sense,” and when putting out, century after century, the same arguments and the same quotations, and the same accusations, employ the term *tradition* in one sense, when their opponents are using it in another. The Papal sect, with two strings to its bow, pulls one or other, as may be most convenient, and ever and anon, reiterates the question, How do you *know*, without tradition, that the Scriptures can be allowed their claim to a divine character or authority? and how do you account for the change of the day for observing Sabbath, and for baptism of infants, &c. ? As if all these things were dependent upon the same kind of tradition, equally full, equally important, and equally unquestioned. The points for which tradition, as Papally understood, is thus made to plead, or to supplement the written Scripture, are little else than such customs, rites, and ordinances as those for which St. Paul has been quoted, and are here yoked in the same advocacy with Epiphanius. In the particular portion of the latter author, to which it might have been supposed Rome would not have been very ready to send us, but that the passage forms a link in the ordinary round<sup>a</sup> of quotation on the subject of Tradition ; Epiphanius is here combating the *Apostolici*, who, as Augustine observes,<sup>b</sup> most *arrogantly* assumed this name to *themselves*—how closely resembling in this respect another sect, which proclaims herself, on all sides, “ holy, Catholic, and *Apostolic*,” need not be pointed out—and their opinions on the subjects of marriage and a right to private property. Epiphanius thinks (sect. 6) that the *apparently* contradictory teachings of the Saviour and St. Paul (Luke, xiv. 26 ; 1 Tim. v. 11)—having himself misapplied and misinterpreted the former—are to be settled from tradition ; and affirms that to marry after vows of celibacy borders on sin, and that the Church has so received from the Apostles. But as Chemnitz observes on an allied subject,<sup>c</sup> we

<sup>a</sup> See Perrone’s “ Prælectiones Theol.” de Necess. et Exist. Tradit. sec. 350, and notes.

<sup>b</sup> De Hæresibus, cap. 40.

<sup>c</sup> Examen Conc. Trid. de Cœlibatu, pars iii. p. 100, ed. 1606.

have nothing but his own assertion of the fact; nothing reliable is produced to support either the statement or the doctrine. Epiphanius *himself* proceeds to *argue* on the subject, which were surely unnecessary, if there were any *Apostolic* tradition extant to sanction the opinion, and authoritatively decide the point. As Mr. Goode<sup>a</sup> remarks, Epiphanius "is not speaking of any Christian doctrine," and in other passages frequently bears witness to the satisfying fulness of Scripture for the refutation of false doctrine. Thus, when writing against the *Valentinians*, he says, "Their idle fables are destitute of confirmation, the *Scripture* nowhere mentioning them, neither the law of Moses, nor any prophet; nor, moreover the Saviour, nor his Evangelists, nor the Apostles," &c.

Not to weary our readers by a too long continuance of the same subject, we will defer our further observations on the other authorities quoted by Dr. Milner to another time, and proceed to another subject.

---

## No. IX.

### THE RULE OF FAITH.

#### The Canon of Scripture.

THE Church of England, in her Sixth Article, declares, that "In the name of the Holy Scriptures, we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church." These books are then enumerated in the order in which they appear in our authorized version. The other books, which are ordinarily called THE APOCRYPHA, "The Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine;" and the names of these books are also set out; but "all the books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive, and account them canonical."

Thus, it will be seen, that we admit such books in our canon of the Old Testament, "of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church."

At its fourth session, the Papal Council of *Trent* "judged proper, lest any doubt should arise in any one what are the sacred books which are received by the Council [and consequently by the Church of Rome], to annex a list of them to

<sup>a</sup> "Divine Rule of Faith and Practice," vol. iii. pp. 123-4. Edit. 1853.

the [then] present decree:" and to that decree is added a list of the books which the Council declared canonical; and the decree concludes as follows:—"If any one shall not receive as sacred and canonical all those books, with every part of them, as they are commonly read in the Catholic Church, and are contained in the OLD VULGATE LATIN EDITION:—let him be accursed."

The Council appealed to antiquity in support of its views of what it declared to be the true canon; for throughout its proceedings, an unchanged and unbroken tradition and consent of the early fathers is constantly appealed to; and the 25th, or last, session is thus brought to a close by the united assembly exclaiming—"The sacred and holy œcumenical Council of Trent: let us confess its Faith; let us ever keep its Decrees.—We all thus believe; we all think the very same; we all, consenting and embracing them, subscribe—*This is the faith of blessed Peter, and of the Apostles: this is the faith of the Fathers: this is the faith of the orthodox.* Thus we believe; thus we think; thus we subscribe. So be it—so be it, Amen, amen! Anathema to all heretics! Anathema—*anathema!*"

And thus this Council closed with a reiterated CURSE!

In comparing the two canons of Scripture as admitted by the two Churches, we find, regarding the New Testament, as before observed, a perfect agreement between the Churches of England and Rome; but they differ in their enumeration of the Old Testament Books; the Church of Rome admits all those acknowledged as canonical by us, but to these are added the following, which we call APOCRYPHAL,—the Books of *Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch*, and the *First and Second Books of Maccabees*; all which are specially named: and this list *includes*, in the Books of Esther and Daniel, what are called "the Rest of the Book of Esther and Daniel"—that is, from after the third verse of the 10th chapter of Esther to the end of the 16th chapter, and from and including the 13th and 14th chapter of Daniel, as appears in the present Douay version (the *Story of Susanna*, and of *Bel and the Dragon*)—and the *Song of the Three Children*.

We have now to examine what Dr. Milner has to say on this subject. He commences by throwing ridicule on the confidence which Protestants feel when they "get possession of an English Bible printed by the king's printer" (Thomas Basket, for instance), as though received immediately from the Almighty; but as the Bible cannot bear testimony of itself, this confidence, he alleges, is vain; and sneeringly and triumphantly asks, "By what means have we learnt what is



the *Canon* of Scripture? that is to say, which are the books that have been written by Divine inspiration? or, indeed, how have we ascertained that *any* books, at all, have been so written?"—(Letter ix. p. 113.) And after suggesting against the inspiration of the Scriptures several of the leading arguments of the sceptic or atheist,—particularly that numerous apocryphal prophecies, and spurious gospels and epistles were circulated in the Church during its early ages, and accredited by different *learned writers and holy fathers*: while some of the really canonical books were rejected or doubted by them,—he concludes with these words:—

“In short, it was not until the end of the fourth century, that the genuine Canon of the Holy Scriptures was fixed: and then it was fixed by the *tradition and authority of the Church*, declared in the third Council of Carthage, and a decretal of Pope Innocent I.” In Letter xliii. p. 411, he refers in a note to the Canon of Pope Gelasius as an authority. And again, in Letter xlvi., to the objection that Romanists “rank the apocryphal with the canonical books of Scriptures,” he answers:—

“That the same authority, namely, that of the Catholic Church, in the fifth century, and which decided on the canonical character of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Revelations [Revelation?], and five other books of the New Testament, on which character, till that time, the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers were not agreed, decided also on the canonicity of the books of Toby, Judith, and five other books of the Old Testament, being those alluded to as apocryphal. If the Church of the fifth century deserves to be heard on one part of her testimony, she evidently deserves to be heard on the other.”

The period, “the Church of the fifth century,” last referred to by Dr. Milner, points to the decision of the third Council of Carthage, A.D. 397. He pretends that the third Council of Carthage declared on authority of the tradition of the Church the genuine Canon of Scripture. Three questions at once suggest themselves:—*First*, Have we any evidence in existence showing what was the tradition of the Church previous to the alleged decision of the third Council of Carthage on the subject of the apocryphal books? *secondly*, Is the *Canon*, on which reliance is placed, genuine? and *thirdly*, If genuine, was the alleged tradition fixed by the authority of this Council, and accepted by the Church?

I. On the question of *Tradition* up to the date of this Council.

St. Paul informs us that “unto the Jews were committed

the oracles of God.”<sup>a</sup> Cardinal Bellarmine, the great Roman controversialist, admitted that the Jews rejected all those books which we call apocryphal;<sup>b</sup> and it is a very significant fact that neither Christ nor any of the inspired writers of the New Testament, quote from, or refer to, any of these books; and in the first century of the Church, there is not one *iota* of evidence to show that any one of these books was admitted into the Canon, as inspired writings.

In the second century we have the testimony of *Melito*, the Bishop of Sardis, who, in an epistle to Onesimus, enumerates the Canon of the Old Testament,<sup>c</sup> from which the apocryphal books are omitted. Bellarmine, in fact, admits that Melito followed the Jewish Canon;<sup>d</sup> and, indeed, Eusebius, to whom we are much indebted for the history of the Church in those days, in his “*Ecclesiastical History*” quotes directly from Melito himself a letter, signifying that he had inquired what the books of Scripture consisted of, and gives a list of them; but among these appear none of the apocryphal class.<sup>e</sup>

In the third century we have the testimony of *Origen* against the alleged *Tradition*. Of him, Eusebius likewise testifies, that as Origen received the Canon of the Jews, he rejected the Apocrypha.<sup>f</sup>

In the fourth century we have the testimony of *Saint Hilary*, Bishop of Poitiers, and *Saint Cyprian* (or as some say, *Ruffinus*),<sup>g</sup> who also enumerate the Canon of Scripture, as held in their day, being the same as was admitted by the Jews; this testimony of Hilary is acknowledged by Bellarmine.<sup>h</sup> *Saint Cyril* of Jerusalem also reckoned according to the Jewish Canon, and directed his catechumens to peruse the twenty-two books (the number into which the Jews divided the Canon), but not to meddle with the Apocrypha; and he exhorted them “to meditate diligently upon those Scriptures, which the Church doth confidently read, and use no other.”<sup>i</sup> In this century we have also the testimony of

<sup>a</sup> Rom. iii. 12.

<sup>b</sup> Bell. de Verb. Dei, lib. i. cap. 1, sec. i. tom. i. p. 18. Edit. Prag. 1721.

<sup>c</sup> Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. cap. 26, p. 191. Edit. Cantab. 1720.

<sup>d</sup> Bell. de Verb. Dei, lib. i. cap. 20, sec. xv. tom. i. p. 38. Prag. 1721.

<sup>e</sup> Euseb. lib. iv. cap. 26, p. 191. Edit. Cantab. 1720.

<sup>f</sup> Ib. lib. vi. c. 16. p. 289, ut supra.

<sup>g</sup> Apud Hieron. Oper. Ben. tom. v. col. 141. Paris, 1693.

<sup>h</sup> Bell. de Verb. Dei, lib. ii. cap. 1, sec. xv. tom. i. p. 38. Edit. Prag. 1721.

<sup>i</sup> Cyril, Catech. 4, sec. xx. Edit. Oxon. 1703. It appears, however, that Cyril admitted the Book of Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah; but it is not at all improbable that, as he refers to the Jewish standard of computation, he refers to these in the sense in which Augustine speaks of the apocryphal

*Gregory of Nazianzus*, who expressly gives a catalogue of the canonical Scripture agreeing with our own.<sup>a</sup> To *Saint Jerome*, we are informed by Romanists, was intrusted the revision of the translation of the Old Testament by Damasus, the Bishop of Rome, and it appears that he was occupied on this work during the very sitting of the Council of Carthage, cited above. He distinctly adheres to the books constituting the Jewish Canon, and expressly rejects the several apocryphal books by name;<sup>b</sup> and this, too, is admitted by Cardinal Bellarmine.<sup>c</sup> The reader will not have failed to remark the appeal to the "old Vulgate Latin edition," as the authority in which we are to find the books to be deemed "sacred and canonical," and which are to be adopted and received under the penalty of a curse. Now the term "Vetus editio Vulgata Latina" was used after the publication of Jerome's version, which was called "Editio Nova Vulgata," the *New Latin Vulgate*, to denote that which was made from the Greek Canon. So that, while Jerome's translation, established by the authority of Damasus (in the Western Church) is *ostensibly* retained in the Roman Communion, all those parts which Jerome rejected as apocryphal, are brought in again on the authority of the old Latin Vulgate!<sup>d</sup>

In this century we have likewise a council, namely that of Laodicea, held A. D. 357. In the 60th canon of this council the canonical books are recited just as we accept them;<sup>e</sup> and this canon was confirmed by the General Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451;<sup>f</sup> as also by the Council of Constantinople, in Trullo, A. D. 692, by two hundred and eleven bishops.<sup>g</sup>

In the fifth century we have the testimony of *Saint Epiphanius*, Bishop of Salamis, in the island of Cyprus, who reckoned up the canon of twenty-two books, as we do, and

books as after explained. A very able critique on the passage from Cyril will be found in Pope's "Roman Misquotations," p. 39, et seq. London, 1840.

<sup>a</sup> Greg. Naz. ad Seleucum, tom. ii. p. 194. Paris, 1630.

<sup>b</sup> Hier. Ep. ad Paulinum; Oper. Ben. 1693, et seq. tom. iv. sec. pars col. 571-4, et Præ. in Libros Salomonis, tom. i. pp. 938-9.

<sup>c</sup> Bell. de Verbo Dei, lib. i. cap. 10, sec. xx. tom. i. p. 20. Prag. 1721.

<sup>d</sup> See Dr. Jarvis's "Reply to Milner's End of Religious Controversy," p. 51. New York, 1847.

<sup>e</sup> Bin. Concill. Conc. Laodiceen. can. 60, tom. i. p. 304. Lutet. Paris. 1636. "Let it be observed, that though they [*Baruch* and the Epistle of *Jeremiah*] are in some copies [of the Laodicean Canons], yet not in all; that Aristenus in his transcript has them not, nor *Caranza*."—See Beveridge's Synodicon, tom. i. p. 481; and Carran. Summa Concill. Paris, 1677. Cum approbat. et permiss. p. 140 (quoted by R. T. P. Pope, in his "Roman Misquotations").

<sup>f</sup> See Cosin's "Scholast. Hist. of the Canon," sect. lxxxv. London, 1672.

<sup>g</sup> Labbe et Coss. tom. iv. col. 1140, can. 2. Edit. Paris, 1671.

in express words declares that the books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus are to be excluded.<sup>a</sup>

And lastly, we have the testimony of *Saint* Augustine, who, it is alleged, assisted at the Council of Carthage, and sanctioned the Canon in question. Now there is not the slightest doubt but that Augustine expressly excluded the books of Maccabees from the Canon of Scripture;<sup>b</sup> and notwithstanding this express exclusion of these books, he elsewhere *includes* these books when he enumerates a *Canon* of Scripture;<sup>c</sup> but he made, nevertheless, a marked difference between the term *Canon* of Scripture and *inspired* Scripture; he used the word *Canon* as denoting the books which were held in reverence and read in the churches, under which title, besides the *inspired* books, the apocryphal were also contained. That the word *Canon*, as employed by him, must be understood with this latitude of meaning, is obvious, from what he says as to the *preference* to be given to some of the canonical books over others. In the case of *inspired* Scripture, it would be absurd to talk of preference. Inspiration does not admit of degrees. The divine element of the Scriptures is not a quantitative thing, conferring different values on different parts of the Scriptures, in proportion to the amount of it that may be found or thought to exist in them. The above is no new explanation of Augustine's words in the passage under consideration; it was given by one of the most renowned Roman doctors, and one, moreover, who was the personal antagonist of Luther,—Cardinal Cajetan. We shall quote his own words, as they occur at the close of his Commentary on the Book of Esther. The whole passage is most remarkable, and therefore we will make no apology for giving it at length:—"Here we end our commentaries on the historical books of the Old Testament; for the remainder—viz., Judith, Tobit, and the Books of Maccabees—are not included by St. Jerome among the canonical books, but are placed, along with Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, among the Apocrypha. Do not be uneasy, tyro, if you should anywhere find those [apocryphal] books enumerated amongst the canonical, either by holy councils or by holy doctors; for the words both of councils and of doctors must be brought to accord with the rule of Jerome; and, according to his decision, *those books* [the apocryphal books enumerated], and if there

<sup>a</sup> Epiph. tom. ii. p. 161. Edit. Colon. 1682.

<sup>b</sup> Aug. de Mirab. Sacræ Scrip. p. 26, tom. iii. part i., and in De Civ. Dei, lib. xviii. cap. 36, p. 519, tom. vii. Paris, 1685; and Cont. Secundam Ep. Gaud. lib. i. cap. 31. p. 821. Edit. Bass. 1797.

<sup>c</sup> De Doctrina Christiana, lib. ii. cap. 8.

be any others like them in the Canon of the Bible, are *not canonical*—that is to say, do not contain rules *for confirming articles of faith*; they may, however, be called *canonical*, as containing rules for the edification of the faithful, inasmuch as they have been admitted into the Canon of the Bible and authorized for this very purpose. With *this distinction* you will be able to discern the meaning of the *words of Augustine* (de Doctr. Christ., lib. ii.), as, also, of the decrees of the Council of Florence, under Eugenius IV., and of the provincial Councils of Carthage and Laodicea, and of Popes Innocent and Gelasius.”<sup>a</sup>

Now, Cardinal Cajetan lived so late as the sixteenth century, and is described by his contemporaries as an “incomparable theologian, to whom, as to a common oracle, men were wont to resort in all difficult questions of theology;” and he had the benefit of *Saint Augustine’s* writings when he thus expressed himself on the question now at issue. His works abound with statements of a similar kind to those above quoted. We will here quote two more, if possible stronger than those which have been referred to. One occurs in his commentary on the first chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews:—“We have adopted Jerome’s rule, to prevent us from error in the determination of the canonical books; for we esteem as canonical those which he delivered as such, and those which he separated from the canonical books we hold to be outside the Canon.”<sup>b</sup> The other passage is found in the Dedicatory Epistle to Pope Clement VII., prefixed to Cajetan’s Commentaries on the Historical Books of the Old Testament. “Most blessed father,” he writes, “the universal Latin Church is most deeply indebted to St. Jerome, not only on account of his annotations on the Scriptures, but

<sup>a</sup> Hoc in loco terminamus Commentaria Librorum Histor. Vet. Test. Nam reliqui—viz., Judith, Tobiaë, et Maccabæorum, libri a B. Hieronymo *extra canonicos libros* supputantur, et inter *Apocrypha* locantur, cum libro Sapientiaë et Ecclesiastico. Nec turberis, novitie, si alicubi repereris libros istos inter *canonicos* supputari, vel in sacris conciliis, vel in sacris doctoribus. Nam ad Hieronymi limam reducenda sunt tam verba conciliorum, quam doctorum; et juxta illius sententiam, libri isti, et si qui alii sunt in *Canone Bibliæ* similes, *non sunt canonici*, hoc est, non sunt *regulares* ad firmandum ea quæ sunt *fidei*; possunt tamen dici canonici, hoc est *regulares* ad ædificationem fidelium, utpote in Canone Bibliæ ad hoc recepti et autoritati. Cum hac enim distinctione discernere poteris et *dicta Augustini* in lib. ii. de Doctr. Christ. et Scripta in Conc. Flor. sub Eugen. IV., Script. que in provincialibus Conciliis Carthag. et Laodic., et ab Innocentio ac Gelasio Pontificibus.—Cajetan. in omnes authenticos Vet. Test. hist. libr. Comment. p. 482. Parisiis, 1546. We extract the above from the “Catholic Layman,” vol. iv. p. 69. Dublin, 1855.

<sup>b</sup> Cajetani comment. in 1 cap. Ep. ad Heb.—Hieronymi sortiti sumus regulam, ne erremus in discretione librorum canonicorum; nam quos ille canonicos tradidit, canonicos habemus; et quos ille a canonicis discrevit, extra canonem habemus.

also because he distinguished the canonical books from the non-canonical, inasmuch as he thereby freed us from the reproach of the Hebrews, who otherwise might say that we were *forging* for ourselves books or parts of books belonging to the ancient Canon, which they never received.”<sup>a</sup> Cajetan’s work appeared but twelve years before the Council of Trent, and was dedicated to Pope Clement VII., and received his approbation. Consequently, Jerome’s rule, relative to the broad distinction between the canonical books (properly so called) and the apocryphal, was then recognized by the Roman Pontiff himself.<sup>b</sup>

We can now fully appreciate Dr. Milner’s appeal to the “tradition and authority of the Church,” according to which the bishops assembled at the third Council of Carthage, in the fifth century, are said to have been regulated in fixing the Canon of Scripture.

II. The second point we proposed for our consideration is whether the decree of the third Council of Carthage, on which reliance is placed as an authority for fixing the Canon of Scripture for the whole Catholic Church is genuine. We have several grave objections to urge, to which satisfactory replies must be given before the authority of this decree can be conceded to Dr. Milner.

1. The forty-seventh canon is *the* canon that is cited. It purports to give a list of *canonical* Scriptures.<sup>c</sup> By a strange blunder; the council has enumerated “FIVE Books of Solomon;” that is, besides Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs, which are in the Hebrew Canon, not only what is called, in the Septuagint, the Wisdom of Solomon, but also the Book of Jesus the son of Sirach, written 800 years after the death of Solomon, are also attributed to him!<sup>d</sup>

2. In not one of the Greek copies or manuscripts of this canon are to be found enumerated the Books of Maccabees,<sup>e</sup> which raises a strong suspicion that the canon itself is forged.<sup>f</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Cajetani Ep. dedic. ad P. Clem. VII., ante Comm. in Lib. Hist. V. T.—S. Hieronymo, Pater beatissime, universa ecclesia Latina plurimum debet, non solum ob annotatas Scripturas, sed etiam propter discretos ab eodem Libros canonicos a non canonicis. Liberavit siquidem nos ab Hebræorum opprobrio, quod fingamus nobis antiqui canonis libros aut librorum partes, quibus ipsi penitus carent,—in Cousin on the Canon, sec. 173.

<sup>b</sup> “Catholic Layman,” as above.

<sup>c</sup> Labbe et Coss. Concil. tom. ii. col. 117. Edit. Paris, 1671.

<sup>d</sup> See Dr. Jarvis, ut supra, p. 50.

<sup>e</sup> Justellus, Cod. Can. Eccles. Afric. can. 24, note; and Synod. Carthag. apud Balsam. in editione Joh. Tilii.

<sup>f</sup> See Sir H. Lynde’s “Via Devia,” in supplement to Gibson’s “Preservative from Popery,” p. 166. London, 1850.

And Dr. Milner should explain why the Latin copy should be adopted in preference to the Greek.

3. Cardinal Baronius,<sup>a</sup> the Roman Annalist, and Binius,<sup>b</sup> admit that this particular canon was not confirmed by this council, but by some other subsequent council of Carthage.

4. As a further proof that the canon is spurious, and that the list of canonical books was inserted by some forger of later date, we may observe that the council was held in the year 397, Cæsarius and Atticus being consuls, as the Council itself relates, and yet the canon which contains the list of canonical books refers to Pope Boniface, who was not Pope until 418, or twenty years after.<sup>c</sup> It is therefore clear that this list was made and put in by some one who lived so long after the council, that he had forgotten who was Pope at the time it was held.<sup>d</sup>

5. We have said that the canon, as appears in the decree of the Council of Laodicea, agrees with our list, but differs from the list given by the later council, the third of Carthage; we have also seen that the Council of Constantinople, in Trullo, A.D. 692, confirmed the canons of the former council, which *rejected* the Apocrypha, but it also confirmed the canons of the latter council,<sup>e</sup> which is said to have *admitted* the Apocrypha as canonical Scripture. Now, did the Council in Trullo, of 211 Bishops, intend to confirm both lists? This is very unlikely. But if there was no list issued by the later Council (of Carthage), which we think our readers will agree in declaring most probable, then those 211 Bishops confirmed only that list which is now admitted by us Protestants as the only true list; and we have not yet heard the canon of the Council of Laodicea called in question on the score of genuineness.

III. The third proposition is, that supposing the canon to be genuine, was the alleged tradition of the Church, with regard to the Canon of Scripture, fixed by the decree of the third Council of Carthage, and universally observed by members of the Roman Catholic Church?

It so happens that when this same council was cited as opposed to the authority of the Bishop of Rome—the twenty-sixth canon declaring that the Bishop of that see was not to be called the chief priest—Cardinal Bellarmine, ever foremost in defence of his church, with more zeal than judgment

<sup>a</sup> Baron. An. 397, num. 56, p. 249. Lucae, 1740.

<sup>b</sup> Bin. in Concil. Carth. 3, p. 722, tom. i. Paris, 1636.

<sup>c</sup> See a list of the Popes in Labbe and Coss. Conc. Gen. tom. xvi. p. 130. Paris, 1671.

<sup>d</sup> See "Catholic Layman," vol. ii. p. 112.

<sup>e</sup> Labb. Coss. Concil. tom. vi. p. 1140, can. 2. Paris, 1671.

declared that "this *provincial council* ought not to bind the Bishop of Rome, nor the bishops of other provinces."<sup>a</sup> Then why should it be binding on us? Shortly after the meeting of this Council of Carthage, a General Council of the Church was held, at which, as we have seen, the canons of Laodicea were confirmed. And further, this same third Council of Carthage places the third and fourth books of Esdras in the Canon, which Bellarmine places among the Apocrypha, so that, in fact, the Church of Rome does not follow this Council.

Again, so far from dogmatically fixing the tradition of the Church, Du Pin, taking the decree to be genuine, tells us that the books in question were introduced into the Canon only provisionally, "upon condition that the church beyond sea should be consulted for its confirmation, as is implied in an ancient note on that canon, which runs thus, *De confirmando isto canone transmarina ecclesia consulatur*. And this very canon is repeated in the Council of Carthage, held in the year 419, with a clause much like the former."<sup>b</sup>

But we have ample evidence that the alleged tradition was not fixed by this provincial council, even in the Roman Church. We propose to cite the names of some leading members of that church in each successive century, all of whom rejected, in whole or in part, the apocryphal books, up to the holding of the Council of Trent; and should the reader require evidence of what we assert, he will find it set out in Sir H. Lynde's "*Via Devia*,"<sup>c</sup> and Birekbek's "*Protestant Evidence*."<sup>d</sup>

In the *sixth* century, Junilius, an African bishop.

In the *seventh* century, Pope Gregory I.

In the *eighth*, *Saint* Damascene, and Alcuin, Abbot of St. Martin of Tours.

In the ninth, Nicephorus, Patriarch of Constantinople.

In the tenth, Ælfrick, Abbot of Malmesbury; and Radulphus Flaviacensis, the monk.

In the eleventh, Peter, Abbot of Clugni.

In the twelfth, Hugo de Sancto Victore, Richardus de Sancto Victore, and Rupert of Duyts.

In the thirteenth, Hugo Cardinalis and *Saint* Bonaventure.

In the fourteenth, William Occham and Nicholas de Lyra.

In the fifteenth, Alphonsus Tostatus, Thomas Waldensis, Dionysius Carthusianus.

<sup>a</sup> Bell. de Rom. Pont. lib. ii. c. 31, sec. viii. p. 387, tom. i. Edit. Prag. 1721.

<sup>b</sup> Du Pin, Hist. of the Canon, &c. fol. vol. i. pp. 8, 9. London, 1699.

<sup>c</sup> Sect. iv. pp. 142—171. London, 1840.

<sup>d</sup> Edit. 1849, title, "Canon of Scripture."



And in the sixteenth, we have Cardinal Cajetan.

So much then for the alleged tradition which the modern Tridentine Church professes to follow.

The next authority appealed to by Dr. Milner is a Decretal of Pope Innocent I.

The alleged list of canonical books is contained in an epistle which pretends to have been written by Pope Innocent I., in the year 405. The list stands at the end—just the place where the forger would add it in after-times. No one appears ever to have heard of that list of Pope Innocent's for FOUR HUNDRED AND SIXTY years after the date of that letter! of this we have proof. Cresconius, who wrote at the end of the seventh century, professed to show the agreement between the canons of the councils and the epistles of the Popes: he quotes that very letter of Pope Innocent *six* times, to show its agreement with the canons of the councils in *six* points; but when he comes to speak of the list of canonical books, he says nothing at all of any list made by Pope Innocent, clearly showing that no such list was in that letter in his time.

We hear of Pope Innocent's list, *for the first time*, in the ninth century, AFTER a great mass of forgeries of letters of Popes had been published and imposed upon the Church. *Even in that age*, Pope Nicholas says there was no list yet in the canons of the Church, and he then produces the list of Pope Innocent *for the first time*, and that too in a letter written for the very purpose of imposing those forged letters on the Church as true and genuine documents.<sup>a</sup>

Such then is the further *authority* on which Dr. Milner relies for establishing the tradition of his Church on the canonical list.

Cardinal Cajetan, of the sixteenth century, who evidently believed this list to be genuine, places the same interpretation on the word "canonical," used by Pope Innocent, as employed by Augustine, classing the two in the very same passage, which we have before quoted, where Cajetan states that Augustine, in arranging these books with the *inspired* Canon, did not place them on the same footing. But how can Romanists appeal to Innocent's list, when the earliest copies contained no book of "Tobit!"<sup>b</sup> And, lastly, in another part of the

<sup>a</sup> The reader is referred to a series of papers containing a critical and minute examination of these forged decretals in the "Catholic Layman," Dublin, 1853-4, from the December number, 1853. Pope Nicholas's letter is fully and critically examined in the January number of 1854, pp. 2-4. The above also is borrowed from the same source, p. 126, vol. ii. 1853.

<sup>b</sup> Merlin's Councils; Colon. 1530, fol. clxxxv. Paris, 1535.

book,<sup>a</sup> Dr. Milner cites Pope Gelasius as admitting the book of Maccabees in the Canon of Scripture; this is supposed to be in a council held at Rome, A.D. 494.<sup>b</sup> This council is a manifest forgery wholly unworthy of credit. It rests altogether on the authority of Isidore Mercator, who lived in the ninth century, and who is now acknowledged by all Roman Catholics of learning to have been the most impudent and audacious forger that the world has ever seen. No writer before his time has mentioned this council or list of Gelasius. There are no authentic records that can be relied on. Some say it was held by Pope Damasus, some by Pope Gelasius, some by Hormisdas. The copies differ so much that the Roman cardinals appointed by the Pope to correct the Decretum of Gratian, when they came to a passage quoted from this council, had to say, "It cannot be known which is the pure and true reading."<sup>c</sup>

The records of this council contain long passages, word for word the same with the decretal epistle of Pope Anacletus, which it is now confessed that this Isidore forged along with about sixty other epistles from the early Popes.<sup>d</sup> There is set forth a list of the patriarchal sees, also exactly agreeing with that forged epistle, making Alexandria the second; which list is directly opposed to the second general council,<sup>e</sup> and is not found in any genuine writing of antiquity. The whole thing rests on the credit of that infamous forger. It is enough to have the Canon Law filled with his forgeries;<sup>f</sup> why should we have him corrupting our Bibles too? Richter, the learned editor of the Canon Law, says of this council, "They are not wanting who consider the whole apocryphal." And well they may, when it is traced to Isidore.<sup>g</sup> And, after all, it is more doubtful whether Isidore ever put any list of the canonical books into this council at all. One of the oldest copies in existence (that in the Pope's own library) gives the council without any list of the books of Scripture in it.<sup>h</sup> So it would seem the list was appended by some later forger in still later times.<sup>i</sup>

With the above well-authenticated facts before us, we cannot but admire the confident tone with which Dr. Milner

<sup>a</sup> Letter xlvii. p. 411.

<sup>b</sup> Labbe and Coss. tom. iv. col. 1260. Paris, 1672.

<sup>c</sup> Note of the Correctors on Dist. xv. c. 3.

<sup>d</sup> Compare with Decret. Dist. xxii. c. 2.

<sup>e</sup> Labbe and Coss. tom. ii. p. 948, can. 3. Paris, 1671.

<sup>f</sup> See the series of articles in the "Catholic Layman."

<sup>g</sup> Leipsic ed. 1839, vol. i. p. 31.

<sup>h</sup> Bernhard, in *Canones Gratiani*, vol. ii. p. 316.

<sup>i</sup> "Catholic Layman," October, 1853, p. 112.

sums up his observations on the subject under consideration.

“ Indeed, it is so clear that the Canon of Scripture is built on the tradition of the Church, that most learned Protestants, with Luther himself, have been forced to acknowledge it, in terms almost as strong as those in the well-known declaration of St. Augustine—‘ I should not believe the Gospel itself, if the authority of the Catholic Church did not oblige me to do so.’—(Contra Epist. Fundam.)” The Protestants referred to are—“ Hooker, Eccl. Polit. c. iii. s. 8; Dr. Lardner, in Bishop Watson’s Col., vol. ii. p. 20.” And, as a reference to Luther, is added the following note :—“ We are obliged to yield many things to Papists—that with them is the Word of God, which we received from them, otherwise we should have known nothing at all about it.—(Comment. on John xvi.)”

Here, then, by a side wind, as it were, is the Tridentine Canon brought under the patronage of Augustine, Hooker, Lardner, and Luther.

With regard to Luther, we may for the present observe (the quotation we propose to examine more at length in another article), that he wrote no “ Comment. on John xvi. ;” but he did write examinations or homilies on the Gospels and Epistles for the year; but the reference is too vague to test the truth of the assertion of Dr. Milner. Dr. Grier has sufficiently exposed his quotations alleged to be from Luther, to warrant us in disbelieving anything the doctor may say unaccompanied by *precise references*; but supposing the quotations to be accurate, what weight can the assertion have with us? The statement is not true, for the *Greek Church* and *Greek fathers*, not the *Latin Church* nor *Latin fathers*, claim first our obligations. The statement with reference to Augustine, Hooker, and Lardner deserves our consideration.

Augustine’s words are, “ *Ego verò Evangelio non crederem nisi me Catholicæ Ecclesiæ commoveret auctoritas;*”<sup>a</sup> which, literally is, “ I should not have believed the Gospel, except the authority of the Church had moved me thereunto;” which Dr. Milner very artfully converts into, “ I should not believe the Gospel itself, if the authority of the Catholic Church did not oblige me to do so;” and this rendering, coming immediately in juxta-position with the alleged concession from Luther, that “ we are obliged to yield many things to *Papists*,” Dr. Milner would have us believe that Augustine was here pointing to the authority of the *Roman Church*; and since the modern Roman Church does admit the

<sup>a</sup> Aug. contr. Ep. Fund. c. 6, tom. viii. col. 154, Benedict. edit.

Apocrypha, therefore, as a natural sequence, *we* must admit the Canon of Scripture which includes these books, on the authority of the Roman Church. The whole is a fallacy. We have shown that Augustine did not admit the same Canon as does the modern Tridentine Roman Church. He expressly excluded the Maccabees, if he did not reject the others also; but it is most clear, as admitted by eminent Romanists,<sup>a</sup> that Augustine's words, quoted by Dr. Milner, had relation to the primitive Church, which both saw Christ's person and his miracles, and heard his doctrine; to this very same authority we also appeal for our guide. What Christian is not, let us ask, induced or moved as a *first motive* to receive the Canon of Scripture as now handed down to us, by the fact that the Christian Church from the most primitive times has admitted with common consent certain books as inspired?

Are not the books of Scripture, as well as the various articles of Faith, when inquiry is made into the authority that presents them for acceptance, made to rest upon the reception of them in succession from the earliest times? No branch of the Catholic Church either can or desires to set aside the corroborative external testimony afforded by what is understood under the term "the Church." Dr. Milner, indeed, fancies that the Protestant Churches cannot avail themselves of this evidence; takes "the Church" to be of course his own Church; repeats for the thousandth time, and as inapplicably as ever, the truly "well-known declaration" from St. Augustine, how he was led by the Church to receive the Gospel; and then thinks the cause is settled, and that the Protestants being outlawed, they can never enjoy the rights and privileges of true and honest citizens.

But are the churches of Europe all this while denying the testimony of the Church? By no means! They only deny the Church of Rome to be "the Church." They assent to the *dictum* of Augustine; but they question Rome's peculiar, or indeed any, property in the title.

But Dr. Milner and similar citers of Augustine might agree about the meaning of these words, before using them, or expecting such effects to follow the producing of them. Augustine was dealing with the Manichæans, who, as Bishop Canus<sup>b</sup> has shown, would have a certain Gospel of their own, admitted without further dispute; in this case, he says

<sup>a</sup> Durand, 1, 3. Dist. 24, 9, 1, fo. cxcxi. Paris, 1508. Driedo, de Eccl. Script. et Dogm., lib. iv. c. 4. Gerson, de Vita Spir. Animæ, lect. 2, Coroll. 7, p. 24, tom. iii. pars 1. Paris, 1706.

<sup>b</sup> Canus, Loc. Theol. lib. ii. c. 8, p. 52. Colon. 1605.

Augustine puts the question, "What if you meet with one who doth not believe the Gospel? what motive would you use to such an one to bring him to your belief? I, for my part," he says, "should not have been brought to embrace the Gospel, if the Church's authority had not swayed with me." And then goes on to show, that though the Church may induce a person to accept with confidence the books presented to him as Scripture, yet it cannot secure him the possession of the "*fidem* Evangelii:" the external material instrument it can produce and vouch for, but can do no more. So that this Romish bishop gives a very different interpretation to Augustine's words from that of Dr. Milner.<sup>a</sup> "By the mouth of God," said Augustine, "which is the truth, I know the Church of God, which is partaker of the truth."<sup>b</sup> The Church, in fact, with him is known from the Word of God.

Hooker does indeed admit the high value of the evidence which, not the Church of Rome, but the Church Catholic, affords to the Bible being the Word of God. He thus writes:—"The voice and testimony of the Church, acknowledging Scripture to be the law of the living God, is for the truth and certainty thereof no mean evidence. For if with reason we may presume upon things which a few men's dispositions do testify, suppose we that the minds of men are not both at their first access to the school of Christ exceedingly moved, yea, and for ever afterwards also confirmed much, when they consider the main consent of all the churches in the whole world witnessing the sacred authority of Scriptures, ever since the first publication thereof even till this present day and hour? And that they all have always so testified, I see not how we should possibly wish a proof more palpable, than this manifest, received, and everywhere continued custom of reading them publicly as the Scriptures. The reading therefore of the Word of God, as the use hath ever been, in open audience, is the plainest evidence we have of the Church's assent and acknowledgment that it is His Word." [Hooker, *Eccles. Polit.* Book v. c. xxii. § 2, p. 114, edit. Oxon. 1836. The reference given by Dr. Milner, "c. iii. § 8," is rather unintelligible. We propose to return to this reference to Hooker.] This language is too plain to need any explanation from us; the sentiment is so appropriate to the explanation of Augustine, as given by the Romish Bishop Canus. But a reader unacquainted with Hooker's "*Ecclesiastical Polity*" would suppose that this justly esteemed writer admitted the apocryphal works into the Canon of Scripture, based on the

<sup>a</sup> See Sir H. Lynde's "*Via Devia*," sect. xviii. p. 279. London, 1850.

<sup>b</sup> Aug. in *Psal.* 57, p. 545, tom. iv. Paris, 1681.

imaginary *tradition of the Church of Rome*: on the contrary, Hooker most clearly places all these works *out* of the Canon.—(See Book v. c. xx.)

We have consulted Dr. Lardner in Bishop Watson's collection, vol. ii. p. 20, and can meet with no such a sentiment as intimated by Dr. Milner. Whether Dr. Lardner ever wrote such a passage or not, is of little consequence. Both Hooker and Lardner do, of course, accept *historical tradition*, as is well known, as one of the main proofs of the present Canon of Scripture, apart from the Apocrypha; and though we have many arguments to support our views, and many additional *reasons* for refusing to accept the apocryphal books, we have based our proofs in opposition to Dr. Milner wholly on the *historical tradition* of the Church.

---

## No. X.

### REFORMERS AND THE REFORMATION.

Historical Misrepresentations with reference to the Reformation—Henry VIII.  
—Duke of Somerset—Queen Elizabeth—The Reformation attributed to  
Political causes: the avarice of the nobility and gentry, and the irreligion and licentiousness of the people.<sup>a</sup>

THE Reformation of the Church of England, in the sixteenth century, threw off the usurpation of the Pope, together with the whole mass of perilous innovations in faith and practice which had grown up in the Church of Rome during a thousand years before. It was the result, under the favouring providence of God, of a general awakening of the minds of men throughout Europe, forced into reluctant action by an accumulation of abuses and oppression on the part of the priesthood, of which the last was the issuing of indulgences by Pope Leo X., whose agents roused the indignant eloquence of Luther. The movement, however, had its real commencement in the latter part of the fourteenth century, when the famous Wickliffe boldly attacked the authority of the Pope, the jurisdiction of the bishops, and the temporalities of the Church. He also assailed the doctrine of transubstantiation; but his most important work was the translation of the Bible into English, after it had been, for so many ages, a sealed book to the great body of the priests and to all the laity.

The preachings and the writings of this extraordinary man, aided by his translation of the Scriptures, bore fruit

<sup>a</sup> The whole of this article is adapted from Bishop Hopkins's "Reply to Milner."—Letter III.

far and wide. Not only did he succeed in gathering around him a numerous body of adherents, amongst the nobles as well as the middling class in England, whom the Romanists stigmatized with the name of Lollards, but he was the origin of the effort towards reform in Bohemia, for which John Huss and Jerome of Prague were condemned by the Council of Constance, and suffered the agonies of martyrdom. Wickliffe himself, of course, was adjudged to be a heretic, and the sword of Rome was raised against his followers with its usual persecuting vigour. The *Lollards' Tower* yet remains, attached to the Archiepiscopal palace at Lambeth, where may still be seen the time-worn monuments of the cruelties which gave it that name. As we gaze upon the gloomy walls which imprisoned so many of the martyrs of the Bible, and see the iron rings bolted in the oaken floor, to which they had been chained in the bloody ages of Papal supremacy, we cannot but feel, with an emotion of unspeakable gratitude, the contrast between the mild and gentle government of the Church of England and the savage and crushing despotism which [in England] has passed away.

But although Rome succeeded, apparently, in extirpating the influence of Wickliffe by her favourite weapons of the dungeon and the stake, yet it can hardly be doubted that a lasting impression had been made upon many thousand minds, which contributed largely to the ultimate triumph of the true Reformation in the sixteenth century. In many respects, the notions of that eminent man were crude and erroneous, and the thorough and effectual work required the co-operation of various labourers before it could be brought to a mature result. Luther, in Germany, led the way, followed by Zuinglius and Calvin; and, far from wondering that their views were in some respects mistaken and defective, we are rather disposed to wonder that they should have been so nearly right, and, in most points, so harmonious. The reformers of England had the vast advantage of being last in the field. From the commencement of Luther, in A.D. 1517, to the accession of Edward VI., in A.D. 1547, thirty years elapsed, during which they were gradually finding their way to the ground of the primitive Church, in doctrine, worship, and discipline; and several years in addition were spent before the true system of Christianity, recovered from the corrupt innovations of past ages, was prepared for the adoption of Parliament. In A.D. 1553, Edward VI. was succeeded by the bigoted and persecuting Mary, who laboured hard to overthrow their work and re-establish the old bondage of the Papacy. But the good providence of the Almighty made

use of her bloody reign to fasten the heart of the nation more strongly to the principles of the Reformation; so that when Elizabeth came to the throne, in A.D. 1558, the establishment of the pure Gospel of Christ as laid down in the Scriptures, and the system set forth by the Apostles as it existed in the primitive Church, were hailed with general joy and acclamation.

To impeach this Reformation, therefore, and persuade his readers that it was in all respects an unjustifiable and even execrable violation of the laws of religious truth and duty, is one of the great objects of Dr. Milner's book; and it must be confessed that he assails it with a dexterity and hardihood which prove him to be a master in the art of reckless vituperation. To trace him in his more important misrepresentations, and vindicate the truth of history and religion from his attacks, is a weary and ungrateful task, but one which bears its own reward in the highest sense of duty.

We proceed, therefore, to our author's mode of assigning the cause, and describing the instruments and results, of the British Reformation. And this is his statement of what he considers the commencement of the work by Henry VIII., in his eighth letter, p. 106:—"Becoming enamoured of Ann Boleyn, one of the maids of honour to the queen, and the reigning Pope refusing to sanction an adulterous marriage with her, he caused a statute to be passed abrogating the Pope's supremacy, and declaring himself the *supreme head of the Church in England*. Thus he plunged the nation into schism, and opened a way for every kind of heresy and impiety. In short, *nothing is more evident than that the king's inordinate passion, and not the Word of God, was the rule followed in this first important change of our national religion.*"

And in another place he writes,<sup>a</sup> "Such was his [Henry VIII.'s] doctrine, till, becoming amorous of his queen's maid of honour, Ann Boleyn, and finding the Pope conscientiously inflexible in refusing to grant him a divorce from the former, and to sanction an adulterous connection with the latter, he set himself up as Supreme head of the Church of England, and maintained his claim by the arguments of halters, knives, and axes."

Saving only the facts that the English Parliament abolished the supremacy of the Pope, and declared the king to be the supreme head of all estates in England, whether civil or ecclesiastical, this whole statement is utterly false from

<sup>a</sup> Letter xlvi. p. 445.



beginning to end. But to demonstrate this falsehood will require a little patient attention to the truth of history.

The real aspect of the matter is as follows:—Queen Katherine, who was the first consort of Henry VIII., was the daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella, and was married, from motives of state policy, to Prince Arthur, the eldest son of Henry VII., a youth of sixteen years of age, who died soon afterwards. This marriage had no issue, and King Henry VII., in order to keep up his alliance with Spain, and prevent the widow from carrying her rich jointure out of England, resolved to have her wedded to his next son, Henry. The ecclesiastical law, however, was opposed to such a union, and there was no remedy for this but the obtaining the Pope's dispensation. The Pontiff, Julius II., who was much more of a soldier and a politician than of a divine, made no difficulty about granting the king's request, and the marriage between Henry and Katherine was solemnized accordingly, while he was yet in his minority.

But the validity of the whole proceeding was denied at the time by many. Not only several of the cardinals, but also Warham, who was then Archbishop of Canterbury, and as eminent for his learning as for his office, dissented from it openly, as did others of the English bishops and divines, on the ground that the marriage of a brother's wife was forbidden by the law of God in the Book of Leviticus, and therefore the Pope had no power to give such a dispensation. These objections made the young prince uneasy, and his father also. Indeed, the king became so convinced of the unlawfulness of the marriage, that he commanded his son, in the presence of many of the nobility, to protest against it when he came of age. In compliance with his wishes, the protestation was drawn up, the prince read it himself before a public notary, June 27th, 1505, and it was lodged in the hands of Fox, the Bishop of Winchester. By this instrument, the prince declared, "that whereas he, being under age, was married to the Princess Katherine; yet now, coming to be of age, he did not confirm that marriage, but annulled it, and would not proceed in it, but intended, in full form of law, to avoid it and break it off; which he declared that he did freely, and of his own accord."<sup>a</sup> The affection which he had for his consort, however, induced him to postpone any further measures, until the death of his father, and his consequent accession to the crown, again brought up the question. It was debated warmly before the Council, where the

<sup>a</sup> Burnet's "History of the Reformation," b. 2, vol. i. p. 45 [p. 71, edit. Oxford, 1829].

majority decided that the marriage should not be dissolved. And as this decision accorded with Henry's personal feelings at the time, they were again married publicly, and both crowned soon afterwards.

This union, disputed from the first, had several issue, of which two were sons, who died at an early age, and the third was Mary, the same who was afterwards queen, and the only offspring of Henry and Katherine who came to maturity. It so happened, however, that her father, having entered into a negotiation with the King of France to marry this, his only child, either to Francis himself, or to his son, the Duke of Orleans, was struck with mortification and alarm when the Bishop of Tarbes, who was the French ambassador, objected that the Princess Mary was illegitimate, being the fruit of a marriage contracted against the divine law, from which no human authority could grant a dispensation.<sup>a</sup> This revived the former scruples of Henry. Those scruples were further strengthened by his favourite, Cardinal Wolsey, and by Longland, the Bishop of Lincoln, who was the king's confessor. He examined the Book of Leviticus, and found it there recorded, that if a man took his brother's wife, he should die childless; and he began to look upon the untimely death of his two sons as a punishment, according to this very menace, for his unlawful marriage. He read the most learned casuists, and especially Thomas Aquinas, and saw that they were against him. He then commanded the Archbishop of Canterbury to take the opinion of the bishops of England upon the question. And the result was that *all, with the solitary exception of Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, declared in writing, under their hands and seals, that the marriage was null and void from the beginning*, since the Pope, although he had full power to grant a dispensation from the laws of the Church, had no warrant to authorize the violation of the law of God, which, as they maintained, expressly forbade the taking of a brother's widow.<sup>b</sup>

The king being now completely convinced that the French bishop was right, and that his marriage was illegal, his next movement was to apply to the Pope, through Cardinal Wolsey, for a decree to annul it, or to grant him a divorce. For this, the arguments chiefly insisted on were the unlawfulness of the marriage, and the manifest fact that the question affected the succession of the English throne, since it was evident that the Princess Mary, if illegitimate, might

<sup>a</sup> Burnet's "History of the Reformation," vol. i. p. 49 [p. 74. Oxford, 1829].

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. vol. i. p. 50 [p. 76]. See Turner's "Modern Hist. of England," vol. ii. pp. 142—153. London, 1828.

have her title disputed, and Henry, in his present circumstances, could have no other issue. Such an application was certainly just and reasonable. We all know that Napoleon, the first French emperor, found it an easy matter to obtain a divorce from Josephine, in order that he might marry an Austrian princess, on the mere ground that he might thus have a hope of an heir to his imperial sceptre, although, in that case, there was no question as to the validity of his marriage. Why, then, should the request of Henry VIII. have met with so much difficulty? He had hitherto proved himself a devoted servant to the Papacy. He had even published a book against Luther, in return for which act of royal authorship the Pope had sent him the golden rose, which was the chief compliment to princes, and had added to his other titles the new and flattering appellation of "Defender of the Faith." How therefore, did it happen, that the Pontiff adopted a course so unaccommodating towards this his favourite son in the sixteenth century?

The answer is perfectly plain upon the face of history. Clement VII., the reigning Pope, had been engaged in a war against Charles V., the Emperor of Germany, and was actually, at the very time, a prisoner in the monarch's hands, negotiating for his own release, and for a treaty of pacification. And Charles was the nephew of Queen Katherine, and held that the honour of her powerful house was implicated in the question. Her own pride of character, and that of all her kindred, naturally revolted at the idea that her marriage should be pronounced unlawful from the beginning, thus bringing an ineffaceable stain upon her own wedded life, and through her, casting humiliation upon the majesty of Arragon. And hence the emperor was violently opposed to the course of Henry VIII., and the Pope was at the mercy of the emperor. If Katherine of Arragon had been unprotected, as was Josephine of France, or if Henry VIII. had been the virtual master of the Pope's dominions, as was the Emperor Napoleon, the question would probably have been settled in his favour at once, without the slightest prevarication.

As it was, however, the evidence is sufficiently complete that the Pope was well inclined towards Henry's application. He had effected his escape from confinement, but still felt himself obliged to temporize, delay, and evade a direct decision of the main question, from policy, lest he should provoke the resentment of Charles, and involve himself in new troubles. Nevertheless, he went very far in favour of the king's request. This is fully proved by the Papal historian, Lingard, notwithstanding the decided bias towards his Church

which is apparent through his whole elaborate work. We need hardly say, that his testimony, even to the mind of our Roman Catholic readers, ought to be conclusive. We pray, them to observe, therefore, particularly, his distinct statement, "that the Pope signed two instruments presented to him by the envoys of King Henry—the one *authorizing Cardinal Wolsey to decide the question of the divorce in England*, as the Papal legate, and the other '*granting to Henry a dispensation to marry, in the place of Katherine, any other woman whomsoever, even if she were already promised to another, or related to himself within the first degree of affinity.*'" The Pontiff further expressed his opinion in favour of this latter course in these extraordinary terms: "The king is said by some to have chosen a most circuitous route. *If he be convinced in his conscience, as he affirms, that his present marriage is null, HE MIGHT MARRY AGAIN. This would enable me or the legate to decide the question at once. Otherwise it is plain that by appeals, exceptions, and adjournments, the case must be protracted for many years.*"<sup>a</sup>

Here, then, we beg our Roman Catholic readers to mark how completely their reckless partisan, Milner, is contradicted by the Pope himself, on the clear testimony of their own historian. "Becoming enamoured," saith this favourite author, "of Ann Boleyn, one of the maids of honour of the queen, and the reigning Pope *refusing to sanction an adulterous marriage with her,*" &c. But, in fact, the Pope was so far from refusing the application of Henry, that, on the contrary, he *authorized Cardinal Wolsey to decide the question of the divorce*, as the Papal legate in England, being perfectly aware at the time that Wolsey held the marriage to be invalid, and was, besides, the obsequious and devoted servant of the king. And moreover, he sent a dispensation to Henry, *allowing him to marry, in the place of Katherine, any woman whomsoever*, even if she were already promised to another! Did that look like a refusal of the Pope to sanction his marriage to Anne Boleyn?

This, however, is not the only evidence which the same Pontiff has furnished on the particular point of Milner's calumny. "It had been intimated to Pope Clement," saith the Romish historian Lingard, "that the real object of the king was to gratify the ambition of a woman who had sacrificed her honour to his passion, on condition that he should raise her to the throne. But after the perusal of a letter from Wolsey, *the Pontiff believed, or at least professed to believe, that Ann Boleyn was a lady of unimpeachable character, and*

<sup>a</sup> Lingard's "History of England," Dunigan's edition of 1848, vol. vi. pp. 128-9.

*that the suit of Henry proceeded from sincere and conscientious scruples."*<sup>a</sup>

Thus we have this favourite Dr. Milner presenting the action of the Pope in one light, while the Pope himself presents the very contrary! What sense of truth or decency could have governed a writer who was thus ready to blacken the character of the dead in the face of the highest testimony, if, by so doing, he thought that he could stain, directly or indirectly, the Reformed Church of England? For no ingenuity can reconcile his statements with the facts. According to Milner, the king desired the Pope to sanction an adulterous marriage: according to the Pope, the application of Henry proceeded from sincere and conscientious scruples. According to Milner, Ann Boleyn was accessory to the monarch's sin: according to the Pope, she was a lady of unimpeachable character. According to Milner, the Pope refused the request of Henry: according to Lingard, he was so far from refusing, that he authorized Cardinal Wolsey, the king's most zealous partisan, to decide the case, as Papal legate. According to Milner, the Pope would not sanction Henry's marriage with Anne Boleyn: according to the historian, the Pontiff gave him a dispensation to marry, instead of Katherine, any woman he chose, and even advised him to take that course, as the quickest and easiest mode of settling the question! How plainly does this prove that the Pontiff, at this time, felt confident of a final decision in favour of Henry, and how utterly impossible to justify his own course, if he had doubted the substantial justice and propriety of the monarch's application!

But however cordial the Pontiff may have been, the critical circumstances in which he found himself, with reference to the emperor, effectually deterred him from a firm or decided course of action. His cardinals were divided in opinion, and many of the more influential insisted that he must delay and temporize until the imperial troops should be driven out of Italy. Wolsey himself shrunk from the responsibility of deciding the question of divorce without a colleague, and requested that Cardinal Campeggio might be united with him in the Papal commission. The application was granted. After a considerable delay, Campeggio arrived. The Court opened their sessions, and the queen being summoned, refused to answer any authority below that of the Pope himself, and appealed. The cause was evoked to Rome, on the demand of the emperor, and thus three years were wasted, and the king found himself no nearer to a

<sup>a</sup> *Ib.* vol. vi. p. 133.

decision than he was at the beginning. About this time, Cranmer suggested that the opinion of the foreign universities should be taken; and as it had now become apparent that the Pope, influenced by political expediency, had changed his course, and united his interests with the emperor, Henry resolved to submit the question to the principal learned Faculties and Canonists of Europe, and abide by their decision.

The result was as follows:—The judgment of the English Bishops (all of whom, except Fisher, had affirmed, under their hands and seals, the nullity of the king's marriage with Katherine) was ratified and approved—

1. By the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.
2. By the celebrated Faculty of the Sorbonne, at Paris.
3. By the divines of Bologna.
4. By the University of Padua.
5. By the divines of Ferrara.
6. By the University of Orleans.
7. By the Faculty of Canon Law at Paris.
8. By the Faculties of the Civil and Canon Law at Angiers.

9. By the Faculty of divines at Bourges.

10. By the University of Toulouse.

11. By the most famous Jewish Rabbins. These were consulted because the question involved the construction of Leviticus, which was a portion of the Jewish law. And they all decided that the Mosaic rule, by which a man should marry his deceased brother's wife, in case there was no issue by her former husband (the main argument of the imperial party), was a *local law*, confined to Judea on account of its connection with the original division of the land, and therefore not operative upon the Jews who resided in any other country; while the law forbidding the marriage of a brother's wife, on the contrary, was a *general law*, which bound them everywhere.

12. And lastly; the same judgment was given, on their individual responsibility, by a large number of eminent canonists and divines in Rome itself, in Venice, and many other places.

Such being the result, the king determined at length to pursue the course advised by the Pope himself at the beginning, and married Ann Boleyn privately on the 14th day of November, 1532. But neither did this marriage, nor the consultation of the universities, nor the refusal of Henry to obey the citation of the Pontiff personally to appear at Rome, in the still pending matter of the divorce, produce, as yet, any open rupture. Hence, the Pope made no objec-

tions against Cranmer, who was appointed Archbishop of Canterbury on the death of Warham. And the usual bull for his consecration, together with the *pallium*, was sent from Rome without delay, notwithstanding the perfect knowledge that the king's course had been prompted by this favourite counsellor's suggestions.

The declaration of the king's supremacy, however, followed soon afterwards, and annihilated, at one blow, the Papal power in England. Yet *all the English bishops consented to it*, except Fisher, the bishop of Rochester, and *all the English laymen* of eminence, except Sir Thomas More. Nor can it be censured on any ground of Scripture or of reason. Neither can it be truly denied that the act was justifiable, according to the practice of the primitive Church. To understand it rightly, however, it is necessary to advert to the state of matters under the Papacy.

For a long period prior to this assertion of the king's prerogative, the clergy enjoyed a complete immunity from the administration of secular justice. They were only amenable to the Church, and the courts of the king could not call them personally to account for any enormity. Whatever crimes they might perpetrate, whatever disorders they might commit, whatever evil example they might set before the community, they could laugh to scorn the powers of national law so long as they enjoyed the Papal favour. Not only were they thus secure in their own persons, but they were the guardians of all the villains in the land; for every church, with a certain space around it, was a sanctuary of refuge, and if the thief, the murderer, or the robber, could get within the line of its protection, the officers of justice were set at naught; and thus the priests became the standing obstacles to right, and the safeguard of the grossest iniquity. We shall see, by-and-by, the application which had been made by Henry VII. to the Pope to have this nuisance done away, and the very small success which attended his urgent petition.

Besides these evils, the supremacy of the Pope operated directly upon the wealth and the safety of the nation. Enormous sums were annually carried out of the kingdom to Rome, in the shape of Peter-pence, first-fruits, offerings, and presents, to say nothing of the frequent demands of subsidies, and the expenses of parties and witnesses who were obliged to submit to the appellate jurisdiction of the Pontiff. The prerogatives claimed by the Pope, moreover, gave him the power of filling the English sees with foreigners, and the expenses attendant upon the legatine authority were often oppressive and severe.

For all this there was not a particle of real authority in the Bible, in reason, or in the primitive Church. It was perfectly undeniable that the whole despotic system was a usurpation, which came in after the time of William the Conqueror. It was certain that the Christian bishops of the early ages were subject to the civil ruler, to the emperors and magistrates, in all the temporal relations of their lives and properties. It was demonstrable that they held the sovereign to be the supreme head of the clergy as well as of the laity in all the ordinary interests of law and justice, and that even in matters of faith, from the time of Constantine, the monarch's assent was necessary to give practical validity to the decrees of Councils. Such was the supremacy which Henry VIII. determined to reclaim: the same supremacy which was exercised by the kings of ancient Israel—the same supremacy which was exercised by the Christian emperors for more than ten centuries. And therefore he was clearly right, on every ground of argument which stands properly connected with the question.

Thus, then, we trust that we have fully disproved the assertions of Dr. Milner, in reference to the acts of Henry VIII. We have shown that the Pope did not refuse to sanction the marriage of the king with Ann Boleyn, but sent him, on the contrary, a dispensation to marry any woman whatever; that instead of the Pontiff imputing to either of them an adulterous design, he expressed himself satisfied that Henry's scruples were sincere and conscientious, and that Ann Boleyn was a lady of unimpeachable character; that instead of the *refusal of the Pope* producing the Act declaring the king's supremacy, the application for the divorce was still pending at Rome at the time when that Act was passed, and thus far the Pope had *refused* nothing, but had only put off the decision, by policy and prevarication; that instead of the king's "inordinate passion" being the cause which induced Henry to insist on his supremacy, as Milner so positively asserts, he had actually married Ann Boleyn after the judgment of the universities had been pronounced in his favour, A.D. 1532; and this marriage produced no rupture with the Pope, who showed his desire to accommodate the king by forwarding, at his request, the bull for Cranmer's consecration the year after.<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> The dates, as given by the historian Burnet, will show the course of the whole matter precisely:—

A. D. 1501, Nov. 14. Prince Arthur married Katherine of Arragon.—[Vol. i. p. 71. Edit. Oxford, 1828.]

1502, April 2. He died.—(Ib.)



But in the face of all historical evidence, Milner boldly insists that the conduct of Henry VIII. was the sole result of an adulterous attachment to Ann Boleyn. "Nothing is more evident," saith he, "than that the king's inordinate passion, and not the Word of God, was the rule followed in this first important change of our national religion." How marvellous that he could not see how such a charge, if true, rebounded against his own infallible Church! For the course of Henry was approved, 1st, by all the English bishops except Fisher; 2nd, by the Pope himself at the beginning, though two years afterwards he was gained over by the emperor; 3rd, by the foreign universities, faculties, divines, and canonists of Europe; 4th, by many of the Roman cardinals. And Henry all this time was a devoted Romanist, and all who concurred with him belonged to the same communion! Did Milner's anxiety to blacken the Reformation blind his eyes to the

- A. D. 1503, Dec. 26. Pope Julius granted the bull of dispensation, in order that Prince Henry might marry the widow, and they were united accordingly.
- 1505, June 27. Prince Henry, by his father's command, protested against the marriage, being then of age.—[p. 71.]
- 1509, April 22. The old king died, advising his son to break off the marriage.—(Ib.)
- „ June 3. The Council advise the contrary, and the king preferring that course, he was married again publicly.—(Ib.)
- 1527, April. The French king's ambassador demurs about the Princess Mary's legitimacy.—[p. 73.]
- „ „ Cardinal Wolsey and Longland, the king's confessor, revive the old scruples of the king, who examines the question for himself.—[p. 74.]
- „ „ The English bishops, except Fisher, all concur against the marriage.—[p. 76.]
- „ Dec. 5. The application for the divorce sent to the Pope [p. 90], but the king's agent could not gain admission to him, as he was the emperor's prisoner [p. 94; but by corrupting some of the guards the king's demands were made known, when the Pope sent word that the dispensation should be granted.]
- „ „ 9. The Pope escapes to Orvieto.—(Ib.)
- 1528, January. About the beginning of the next month, the Pope signs the documents referred to by Lingard.
- 1529, July 25. The cause evoked to Rome.
- 1530, ——— The Universities consulted.
- 1532, Nov. 14. The king married Ann Boleyn.—[p. 255.]
- 1533, Feb. 21. The bulls signed at Rome for Cranmer's consecration.—[p. 259.]
- „ Sept. 7. Queen Elizabeth born.—[p. 271.]
- 1534, Mar. 20. Act abolishing the Pope's power passed in Parliament [p. 292.] King's supremacy declared.—[p. 318.]
- „ „ 23. Sentence of the Pope against the divorce in Rome.—[p. 275.]

Burnet, moreover, states expressly, that Henry "was beforehand with the Court of Rome;" that "*the Pope's power had then been for four years together much examined and disputed,*" and therefore the subject was thoroughly canvassed before the Parliament decided upon the act of abolition.—[p. 277.]

inevitable consequence of his own assertion? Did he forget that if Henry VIII. pursued his course without any just ground, and only to gratify an inordinate passion, the whole of these bishops, cardinals, divines, universities, canonists, and even the Pope himself, were guilty as his accomplices? Did he forget that all this took place several years before the Reformation? That all the actors in it were the members and the clergy of his own Church? That Henry VIII., in every point except the supremacy of the Pope in England, remained a bigoted and persecuting adherent to Romanism to his dying day? That, in fact, the true work which restored the Church of England to the privileges of the primitive apostolic faith did not begin until the accession of Edward VI., in A. D. 1547; so that thirteen years elapsed after the Act of Supremacy, in 1534, during which all the Romanists in England, save Fisher and More, submitted to Henry's dictation.

And now, although we have occupied so large a space in proving the falsehood of Milner's statements, as well for the sake of historical truth as to demonstrate the utter treachery of the guide who is so strongly recommended by Roman Catholics, yet we do not hold Henry VIII., in any proper sense, as a reformer of the Church of England. In the matter of his divorce from Katherine the general sense of Rome was with him. In the matter of his supremacy, to the exclusion of the Pope, it was not so much a point of religion as a point of government. All the bishops, save Fisher, took the new oath without scruple, and all the clergy, save the Franciscans, did the same. Hence, Fisher and More did not suffer as *heretics*, but as *traitors*, under the Act of Parliament; and the whole charge against them was confined to the secular offence of opposing what was now the established law of the land.

We fully admit, however, that although Henry VIII. was no reformer, he was undoubtedly an instrument in the hand of God to *prepare the way* for the Reformation. To this end, he overthrew the supremacy of the Pope and the monastic system in England. As Jehu was appointed to execute the judgment of Heaven against the house of Ahab and the worshippers of Baal, and executed the task, while he was himself a friend to idolatry: so Henry was appointed to destroy the usurped power of the Pope and the superstitious influence of the monasteries, notwithstanding he was, in all things else, the friend and patron of Romanism. The Church of Christ, as planted by the Apostles, was like a noble temple, round which the hand of barbarous and wanton innovation had erected an unsightly pile, thus spoiling its effect, and

concealing its fair proportions. To tear down the walls of this, and bear away the rubbish, would be the first step towards the restoration of the original fabric. And such was the work which, in part, was assigned to Henry. The repairing and refitting the temple itself, so as to exhibit to every eye its pristine beauty, was a very different task, and was committed, in the wisdom of God, to a very different instrumentality.

We have already said that the act of Henry VIII., in abolishing the Pope's supremacy in England, and taking possession of the monasteries, produced no reformation. He may have been, as Romish writers paint him, a lustful and bloody tyrant. But with that we have nothing to do. He was bred and educated in the school of Romanism. He was even more than commonly well read in the religion of his day, and exhibited his erudition, to the admiration of the Pope and the bishops, in his book against Luther, which gained him the title of "Defender of the Faith." We doubt not that if he had continued, in all respects, an obedient son of Rome, the world would have heard very little of his cruelty or his despotism. As to the first, it was a small matter in comparison with the tortures and fiery death inflicted by the Romish Inquisition, and universally sanctioned throughout Europe previous to the Reformation. And as to the second, it did not exceed the common measure of sovereigns in that age, and for centuries before. Towards his wives his conduct was only severe when he believed them to be faithless. None of them, from Katherine of Arragon down to Katherine Parr, ever complained of his ill-treatment. The famous Charlemagne had four wives at once, and yet his name was inserted by many churches on the catalogue of saints. Louis XIV. kept mistresses constantly under the eyes of his queen, yet he was a prodigious favourite with Romish bishops and clergy. Compared with either of them, or with the ordinary list of Roman Catholic sovereign princes, Henry VIII. was a pattern of continence and decorum. With all this, it must be granted that he had an extraordinary power of gaining and keeping the affection and confidence of his subjects; so that the sole motive to which we must attribute the pre-eminence of his evil character amongst writers of the Church of Rome, must be their determination to stigmatize him because he broke the bands and yokes of Papal domination.

The true work of reformation, however, was reserved for the reign of his son, Edward VI., who came to the crown when he was only eleven years old, and died at the early age

of sixteen. Against him Milner can say nothing, save that he was a boy! But this boy was a prodigy of learning, wisdom, and piety, which we might defy the history of Europe to equal. We all know that many cases have occurred of boys, whose precocious development of intellect in mathematics, music, and dramatic skill, has astonished the oldest and most accomplished minds of their time. We all know that it has sometimes pleased the Almighty to manifest His grace to children in a manner quite as wonderful, of which the youthful Samuel, called to be a prophet at an earlier age than Edward was called to be a king, was a marked example. We even find the principle recorded in Scripture, where the Psalmist, addressing the Deity, saith: "In the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise,"—a passage which the great Redeemer rendered memorable by employing it in His stern rebuke of the Pharisees, when they found fault with the children crying in the temple, "Hosanna to the Son of David." The sneers of Milner, therefore, with respect to Edward's youth, are not merely absurd, but savour of impiety. That surprising boy was a man in intellect, and a saint in virtue. Precocious in all respects, the victim of consumption, which cut him off so soon, and which is well known to be usually connected with a premature unfolding of the reasoning faculties, his attainments and his character were the constant subjects of astonishment and delight to all around him. And as his name has thus far bid defiance to the calumny of Romanists, we doubt not that it will shine as a bright star upon the page of history long after the memory of those who mock his youth shall have sunk into oblivion.<sup>a</sup>

The leading men amongst the reformers who carried on the work under the patronage of their saint-like young sovereign, were Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and Hooper. And although there may be some flaws found by an ingenious and unscrupulous adversary, like Milner, in their personal consistency, yet we may safely challenge their enemies to name an equal number of English Romanists in their day who stood upon the same exalted height of Christian virtue.

We come now to another tissue of misrepresentations, which this bold and reckless advocate has crowded, with his usual skill, into a single paragraph, although it will require many paragraphs to expose their falsity. Thus he avers that "the unprincipled Duke of Somerset," who was the uncle of the youthful king, and held the highest office in the government, "pushed on the Reformation, so called, much further

<sup>a</sup> Burnet, "History of the Reformation," vol. iii. pp. 2, 3.

than it had yet been carried, with a view to the gratification of his own ambitious and avaricious purposes. He suppressed the remaining colleges and hospitals which the profligacy of Henry had spared, converting their revenues to his own use, and that of his associates. He forced Cranmer and the other Bishops to take out fresh commissions for governing their dioceses during his nephew's—that is to say, his own—*good pleasure*. He made a great number of important changes in the public worship by his own authority, or that of his visitors; and when he employed certain Bishops and divines in forming fresh Articles and a new Liturgy, he punished them with imprisonment if they were not obedient to his orders.<sup>a</sup> He even took upon him to alter their work, when sanctioned by Parliament, in compliment to the Church's greatest enemy, Calvin.”—[Letter viii. pp. 106-7.]

The whole of this, however, is a mere string of misrepresentations. For, 1st, the Reformation was prosecuted vigorously, says Burnet in his history, by CRANMER, who had upon his side several of the Bishops—Hogate, of York; Holbeck, of Lincoln; Goodrick, of Ely; and, above all, Ridley, of Rochester, afterwards of London. Old Latimer was discharged from imprisonment, to which Henry VIII. had consigned him on account of his opposition to the Six Articles of the Papal doctrine which that monarch had resolved to maintain, but declined any public station, and employed himself solely in preaching the doctrines of the Reformation. Somerset was “firmly *united with Cranmer in his design*,” says the same historian; but Milner's statement makes him the *leader*, instead of the Bishops, to whose office it belonged. This fabrication, therefore, was set forth by this favourite champion in order to deceive his ignorant or careless readers into the false idea that the work was the mere product of an ambitious and avaricious politician. Yet nothing can be more contrary to the truth of history.<sup>b</sup>

2nd. The remaining *colleges and hospitals* which Milner states to have been suppressed by Somerset, and the revenues applied to his own uses, must be an allusion, not to the act of Somerset, but to the Act of the first Parliament, which gave the CHANTRIES, COLLEGES, AND CHAPELS, to the king, to be applied “to the maintenance of grammar-schools, to the support of preachers, and the increase of vicarages.”<sup>c</sup> This act was opposed by Cranmer and seven other Bishops; but it passed, notwithstanding. It is a manifest perversion, how-

<sup>a</sup> Here Dr. Milner adds as a note, “The Bishops Heath and Gardiner were both imprisoned for non-compliance.”

<sup>b</sup> Burnet, vol. iii. p. 32.

<sup>c</sup> *Ib.* p. 60-1.

ever, to represent it as if it were the work of Somerset's single authority.

3rd. The third fabrication of Milner states, that "he forced Cranmer and the other Bishops to take out fresh commissions for governing their dioceses during his nephew's—that is, his own—*good pleasure*;" the truth being, that the act passed by the whole Privy Council, appointed by the will of Henry VIII., in pursuance of the course adopted during the reign of that monarch, Cranmer being one of the Council, and recommending the measure, both by precept and example, as a prudent precaution under present circumstances. But it was intended only as a temporary thing, and it was neither, as Milner asserts, the *single act of Somerset*, nor was it forced at all.<sup>a</sup>

4th. The appointment of visitors, with injunctions, the preparation of the first Book of Homilies to supply the lack of sermons to the people, the order to read publicly certain portions of Scripture, &c., were also the work of the whole Privy Council, under Cranmer's advice, and in no respect the act of Somerset's sole authority;<sup>b</sup> and the imprisonment of Bonner and Gardiner was rendered necessary by their resistance to these injunctions, with which all the other bishops had complied.

5th. And the last of these statements is equally untrue, that "Somerset took upon him to alter the work of the bishops, *in compliment to Calvin, the Church's greatest enemy*." What is meant by Calvin's being the greatest enemy of the Church, is indeed ambiguous. If the word Church be referred to the *Church of Rome*, the epithet may be consistent with the idea of Romanists, who suppose their Church to be incapable of improvement; but certainly quite inconsistent with those even among themselves (and there are, thank God, many such) who earnestly long to see her reformed. If, on the other hand, our author intended to say that Calvin was the greatest enemy of the *Church of England*, it is a very gross mistake; for he was in friendly correspondence with the reformers throughout. He even thought seriously of uniting all the Reformed Churches to that of England, and is reported to have proposed the measure to King Edward in a letter, which the Papal party suppressed. But it was Cranmer, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and his episcopal colleagues, who were the leading persons in the whole work, according to their office; and the resolutions of the Privy Council, under the will of the late king, together with the

<sup>a</sup> Burnet, "History of the Reformation," vol. iii. p. 7

<sup>b</sup> *Ib.* pp. 35-7.

hearty assent of Edward himself, were the authority by which they acted in every change of the existing system.

A few specimens of this, as given by the historian Burnet, may be here set down by way of illustration. There were in the Churches some images of the blessed Trinity, in which the Father was represented sitting on the one hand, as an old man, with a triple crown, and rays about him; the Son on the other hand, as a young man, with a crown and rays; and the Blessed Virgin between them, and the emblem of the Holy Ghost, a Dove, spread over her head. And there was a great variety of other images, all which the Council resolved should be removed; and Somerset, who was the Lord Protector during the king's minority, and, by virtue of this office, the President of the Council, *wrote to Cranmer*, that *he* might give order accordingly.<sup>a</sup> Again, we find that *Cranmer* compiled a Catechism.<sup>b</sup> And again, the Parliament, A.D. 1548, in order that there might be a perfect uniformity throughout the whole kingdom, gave their sanction to the Liturgy and offices which *the king, by the advice of the Lord Protector, and the Council, had appointed the Archbishop of Canterbury, with other learned and discreet bishops and divines*, to draw up.<sup>c</sup> We see, therefore, throughout, the utter falsehood of the statement that the Reformation, in Edward's time, was the *work of Somerset, for his own ambitious and avaricious purposes*. And thus we have another specimen of the reckless spirit of this FAVOURITE AUTHOR.

From this tissue of misrepresentations Milner proceeds to another. "When Elizabeth came to the throne," says he, "a new Reformation, different in its Articles and Liturgy from that of Edward VI., was set on foot, and moulded, not according to Scripture, but to her orders. She deposed all the bishops except one, \* \* \* and she required the new ones, whom she appointed, to renounce certain exercises which they declared to be agreeable to the Word of God, but which she found not to agree with her system of politics."— [Letter viii. p. 107.]

Of this set of assertions thus much is true, viz., that Elizabeth deprived every bishop save one, the reason being, that only one would consent to her coronation; and hence the rest exposed themselves to be dealt with as traitors. Under those circumstances, they should have been thankful that their lives were spared; and the notion that she should have allowed them to continue as bishops is simply ridiculous. But it is perfectly false that the Reformation, re-established

<sup>a</sup> Burnet, vol. iii. p. 79.

<sup>b</sup> *Ib.* p. 93.

<sup>c</sup> *Ib.* p. 122.

under Elizabeth, differed from that which was finally settled under Edward VI., in a single doctrine or principle. The few alterations which were made were mere matters of verbal expediency, designed to remove needless offence to the remaining Romanists, who had shown a general willingness to attend the Church, and who would doubtless have soon conformed entirely, if the Pope's excommunication of the queen, together with the strenuous efforts of Jesuit missionaries,<sup>a</sup> had not roused their zeal into opposition.

As to the "*exercises*" which Dr. Milner says she required the new bishops to "*renounce*," they were not exercises authorized by the bishops at any time, but were mere irregular meetings, got up among some of the laity, conducted in the Puritan style, under the name of *Prophesyings*, and of course liable, in that day, to produce disorder. Archbishop Grindal thought them likely to be edifying, or at least harmless; but most of the other bishops, as well as Elizabeth herself, were of a different opinion, and therefore he was requested to discourage them. With what propriety, then, could this be called a *renunciation* required of the new bishops? How could they *renounce* what they *never had adopted*?

These examples exhibit the character of Milner's book throughout. He seems to have been utterly incapable of writing with candour or truth, when the facts or instruments of the Reformation were in question. And there is an easy, dashing, confident air in his style of falsification, which shows him to have been a perfect master in the art. But yet his effrontery is astonishing, when we look at the contrast between the treatment of bishops under the Romish kings, and that which they received under the reformed sovereigns of England. When Charles V. seized the person of the Pope himself, and held him a prisoner—when Henry VIII. successfully insisted that all his Romish bishops should agree to abolish the Papal supremacy, and substitute his own, and suppress monasteries—when Queen Mary, instead of being content with deposing Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and Hooper, and confining them for a season, burned them alive at the stake, with more than two hundred other victims—the despotism of princely power does not draw a single remark from this determined partisan. But when Elizabeth deprives the bishops who refused to acknowledge her right to the crown, and orders Archbishop Grindal to execute his office in putting a stop to an irregular exercise of the laymen, which neither the Church nor her bishops had ever authorized—these are

<sup>a</sup> See Turner's "Mod. Hist. of England," vol. iv. pp. 192, 375; and Kenard's and McLachlan's "Controversial Correspondence," Lond. 1855, pp. 498, 500.



shocking proofs of the despotism which produced the Reformation! Yea, they demonstrate that the poor bishops were not allowed to have any voice at all in questions of religious doctrine or worship, but that the mere dictation of royalty regulated the whole! And yet Milner must have known that the entire preparation of the work was in the hands of the bishops, and that not a single instance can be found in which any point of doctrine or worship was changed or established, unless it was done by their express judgment and sanction.

But, to sum up the hypothesis of this favourite completely, we must quote another passage where he puts forth his view of the Reformation:—"The more strictly the subject is examined," says Dr. Milner, "the more clearly it will appear, that it was not in consequence of any investigation of the Scriptures, either public or private, that the ancient Catholic" (*i.e.* Roman) "religion was abolished, and one or other of the new Protestant religions set up, in the different northern kingdoms and states of Europe, but in consequence of the *politics of princes and statesmen, the avarice of the nobility and gentry, and the irreligion and licentiousness of the people.*" (Letter viii. pp. 107-8.) Here is the theory of the Reformation, as represented by all Romanists, with a few rare and candid exceptions. We pronounce it utterly untrue, as we could prove from the testimony of their own witnesses. We shall only for the present point out its historical absurdity, and total inconsistency with common sense and reason.

This bold and unscrupulous author assigns, as his first cause of the change, "*the politics of princes and statesmen.*" But what political motive could have influenced Luther in Germany, Zuinglius in Zurich, Calvin in Geneva and France, Cranmer in England, Knox in Scotland? Were they politicians, princes, or statesmen? What political motive could have induced those who were the rulers of those nations to quarrel with the Pope, with the emperor, with the vast internal force of the priests and monks, and with the large body of their own subjects, at the imminent risk of a fearful civil war, if they should fail to convince the majority of the people that their cause was just and righteous? What single instance can be pointed out, where the Reformation was connected, directly or indirectly, with the field of politics, with the overthrow of any existing dynasty, or with a proposed change of civil government? On the contrary, it is manifest to the slightest reflection that every motive of earthly policy must have been hostile to the effort which sought to overthrow the established religious system of all Europe. As at the beginning of the Gospel dispensation "the rulers and

kings took counsel together against the Lord and against His anointed," so it was in the great movement of the sixteenth century. And if the mighty hand of God had not roused up, in a wonderful manner, the slumbering consciences of men, the *politics of princes and statesmen* would have trampled on the preachers of His truth, and consigned them all, for the sake of temporal peace, to the flames of martyrdom.

But leaving the question of policy with respect to the other branches of the work, and confining ourselves to our proper field of the Reformation in England, we ask for the evidence that this could have been carried forward by such a motive. What earthly interest could have prevailed on Henry VIII. to cast off the Pope's supremacy in the year 1534? Was it the privilege of marrying Anne Boleyn? The Pope had given him a dispensation, and even advised him to take any woman he pleased, and he had actually married her two years before. Was it the wealth to be derived from the suppression of the monasteries? The Pope had granted his bull to Cardinal Wolsey for this very act, and there was no obstacle in the way of the king's good pleasure. Was it to stop the drain by which the Papal exactions and subsidies drew off so much of the wealth of England? This could have been effected by act of Parliament, without any difficulty. No earthly policy, therefore, can possibly account for Henry's course. It was the work of Divine Providence, who raised up this man of energy and passion to prepare the way for the restoration of His truth, in mercy to mankind.

And where is the argument derived from the politics of princes and statesmen, in the genuine Reformation established under Edward VI. by Cranmer, Ridley, and their colleagues? The body of the whole nation was devoted [externally] to all the doctrines and practices of Romanism, which Henry VIII. had left, saving the Papal supremacy, in their full vigour. The worship of the Virgin and the saints, of images and relics, purgatory, priestly celibacy, transubstantiation, communion in one kind, masses for the dead,—all was there, and all defended by the strongest arguments of positive law, and vested rights, and worldly expediency. Moreover, Edward VI. was in his minority, and the main powers of government rested, until he should be of age, in the Council, to whom the will of Henry had committed them. Was this a time which the *politics of princes and statesmen* would choose for such an undertaking? Or could the whole range of earthly policy point out a single advantage to be gained by such an effort? When, since the world began, did it ever enter the head of a politician, that a direct assault upon the established religion of a nation was the most likely way to advance his temporal

power? Most absurd and preposterous, therefore, is the attempt to account for the facts by an hypothesis like this. It was the work of God, and He raised up His chosen instruments to accomplish it, not by earthly policy, but in the face of it.

Equally manifest it is that Cranmer and his colleagues had nothing to gain, of this world's treasures, by venturing their all in such a cause. What interest had they in reducing to the Scriptural standard the inordinate privileges of their own order? Was it the desire, as the Romanists would tell us, of having a wife? The Church of Rome was far more liberal than the Reformed Church of England has ever been in allowing the pleasures of female intercourse to her clergy, provided only that it was not in the lawful way of marriage.<sup>a</sup> Was it the enlargement of their official power? The Reformation did not enlarge, but diminished it. Was it the increase of their wealth? The Reformation dried up many of the old sources of priestly profit, and did not open a single new one to replace them. Under the rule of Romanism, they might look forward to the princely rank of the cardinals, the rich rewards of legatine authority, or even the splendid majesty of the Papal throne. And the Reformation cut off all these dazzling prizes of ambition, with no earthly hope of a higher advancement before them. How plain, therefore, the result, that their motives must needs have been derived from the spiritual power of the faith, which not only purifies the heart, but overcomes the world!

And surely the argument loses nothing of its force, when we come to the reign of Elizabeth. For the cause of the Reformation seemed hopelessly lost under the reign of her predecessor, Mary. The Pope was reinstated in his old prerogatives. Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper, and more than two hundred others, had endured the agonies of a fiery martyrdom. The Parliament had submitted the whole nation to the Roman yoke, and the general acquiescence proved, to all appearance, that the people, at heart, had received but little benefit from the measures adopted in the reign of Edward, and were rather disposed to be content with their old attractive superstition. On what ground, therefore, under these circumstances, could the *policy of princes and statesmen* rest the attempt to re-establish the Reformation? What argument of worldly wisdom could induce Elizabeth to incur the Papal sentence of deposition, which the immense resources of Philip of Spain stood prepared to make effectual? What advantage could she reap from embroiling herself with her

<sup>a</sup> See Fleury's "Hist. Eccl. Cont." tom. xxiii. p. 17.

subjects, especially as the decision of the Pope, in the case of her father's marriage to Katherine of Arragon, made her of necessity illegitimate, and she might be sure that this defect in her title to the throne would be urged against her, if she excited the hostility of Rome?

This consideration alone must have determined her to do nothing in favour of the Reformation, if she had really been disposed to settle the choice of her religion by *the policy of princes*. Our readers will not fail to remember how one of Elizabeth's contemporaries, Henry IV. of France, abjured the Protestant Church in which he was educated, and became a Romanist, in order that he might put at end to the civil war in which a powerful Papal faction had involved him. Much more might Elizabeth, who had been brought up by Henry VIII., and found the kingdom fully committed to Rome, have held that her safety required her to favour no change in the existing system. So manifest, indeed, in every point of view, is the absurdity of Milner's hypothesis, that it is impossible to account for his venturing to palm it upon the merest tyros in English history, if he had not already learned, by experience and observation, that any falsehood, well told and firmly adhered to, will gain some belief from the easy credulity of mankind.

The next motive assigned by this favourite author, which induced Elizabeth to re-establish the Reformation, is "*the avarice of the nobility and gentry.*" But how could that argument apply, when there were no more monasteries to suppress, and no more abbey-lands to surrender? It is admitted, on all hands, that this part of the work was done by Henry VIII., under the Papal sanction, and the remaining chantries, colleges, and chapels, were swept away by act of Parliament, in the reign of Edward. It is also unquestionable that when the nation returned to Romanism in the reign of Mary, the titles of those who had come into possession of what had formerly been Church property, were all solemnly confirmed. On what, then, was the avarice of the nobility and gentry to speculate? At no period, indeed, could such an inducement have produced a religious change, because the retention of these lands might have been secured just as easily, without renouncing Romanism. Many monasteries have been suppressed in France and Spain, although those countries still continued wedded to the Papal system. But the allegation loses even the semblance of support from history in the time of Elizabeth, although that is the very point where proof is most necessary to sustain the statement of Dr. Milner.

The last reason which Milner assigns for the Reformation, is "*the irreligion and licentiousness of the people.*" He does not seem to have reflected upon the evidence thus given by himself, to the results of the Romish system. For here, he is speaking of the *causes* which produced the change in the national faith; namely, "*the politics of princes and statesmen, the avarice of the nobility and gentry, and the irreligion and licentiousness of the people.*" And it is very certain that the *causes* of the Reformation must have been in existence before the Reformation itself. If, then, such was the fact—if the people were, as he describes them, irreligious and licentious—should not the Church of Rome take the responsibility? And does not this very admission prove, though unwittingly, that there was abundant need of a thorough reformation?

And yet it is perfectly absurd to suppose that wicked princes, and an avaricious and unprincipled nobility, and a licentious people, would ever, of themselves, seek to exchange the yoke of Romanism for the doctrines of the Bible, because the priests of Rome were far more indulgent to moral iniquity than the Word of God, and therefore an alteration like this would never have been agreeable to the lovers of transgression. Hence it is obvious that the prevailing corruption could only be assigned as the cause of the Reformation in one way; and that is the very way which we assert, and which Milner could never have consistently admitted. We doubt not that the dreadful state of Christendom was operative, in the mercy of the Most High, who raised up the instruments for the work, and gave them success, in the face of difficulties and opposition. The author takes good care to pass by the irreligion and licentiousness of the priests and monks, which exposed them to the contempt and hatred of the people. He gives no place to the knowledge of the Scriptures, which had been translated into English by Wickliffe, more than a century before, and, through the latter part of the reign of Henry VIII. and the whole of Edward's, had been allowed to be read without restraint. Light from the Word of God had thus become widely disseminated in many quarters. The doctrines of the Reformation were openly preached on the Continent, by Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, and their followers, and with a large measure of success. A multitude of hearts and minds in England were well prepared to receive them. And therefore, when the hand of Divine Providence had opened the way, and raised up the instruments, the pure principles of religious truth were enabled to achieve the victory, not through the *policy of princes*, nor through the *licentiousness of the people*, but in despite of them.

## No. XI.

## "ON THE FRUITS OF SANCTITY."

Rome and the Reformation.

"PROTESTANTS are accustomed to paint in the most frightful colours the alleged depravity of the Church when Luther erected his standard."—(Letter xxi. p. 228.) So writes Dr. Milner. There is no necessity for employing Protestant testimony on this point: an orator at the Council of Trent, in the year 1546, supplies evidence, later than the commencement of Luther's campaign, and in the most unrestrained terms, as to the utterly disorganized state of the Church when under Rome's general tutelage. The plan of putting persons into conventual pens, and then exhibiting them, as fit occasion may offer, as proofs of the Church's "sanctity" is indeed needful to be adopted. "The farther I launch out into this deep," he exclaims, "wider and wider does it extend, and seems shoreless: there is no esteem put upon reason amongst us, its authority is overturned and lies prostrate; like brute beasts we are hurried on recklessly to right or wrong, without any thought of consequences, and shamelessly, just as every man lists; so that we have come at last to this, that men are *ashamed* of being good; the more licentious any one is, the more credit does he secure; fathers are imbrued in the blood of their sons; sons (O, horrible and foul deed!) in the blood of their parents; as though, O God, Thou wast asleep, or payedst no attention to the course of events, or as if the announcement of a hell was all idle talk. In former ages you might hear of one or two parricides in a century: the perpetrators of such deeds were banished society as monsters; it was then the common opinion that such beings should be lashed by the furies remorselessly. But now, what city can be mentioned that does not *abound* in such characters? Is not every place crowded with the headstrong, with the unclean, with the impure, dicers, drunkards? Cast your eyes upon *Rome*, which, placed in the centre of the nations, ought to shine as a star! Look at Italy, France, Spain—you will discover no sex, no age, no member in fact, that is not corrupted, rotten, putrid. But why enlarge; Scythians, Africans, Thracians live as cleanly, as free from flagrant vice." <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Le Plat's "Monumentt. ad Conc. Tridentinum illustrand. Collectio," tom. i. pp. 33, 34.

Or hear, again, another eminent member of the Spanish Church, Barth. Carranza, a Dominican; and recollect that these words were addressed to the Council of Trent, March 14, 1546:—"Grievous," says he, "is it to have to repeat, O Fathers, that faith, piety, religion, have in our days become so lukewarm, or rather have so wasted away, that scarce are there any remains of them left; and that the fervour which once animated our ancestors has so chilled down, that we are compelled, with Jeremy, to say:—*From the daughter of Sion all her beauty is departed: her princes are become like rams that find no pastures; and they are gone away without strength before the face of the pursuer. ... The enemies have seen her, and have mocked at her sabbaths.*—Lament. i. 6, 7 [Douay version]. The rules, moreover, and regulations enjoined to be observed by our ancestors are now left unregarded; the transgressors of divine law, the despisers of ecclesiastical rules, stalk abroad, with head all aloft; faith, as regards a large portion of our world, is extinct, and the little that does manifest itself is so faint that scarcely any true marks of it are discernible. Love is everywhere gone cold—abuses increase on every side; yea, abuses follow hard one upon another, and men's minds are so bound down by perversions and wickedness that a separation is almost impossible." <sup>a</sup>

Then take the lamentations of the theological faculty of Louvain, addressed to Philip II. of Spain, some years later (May, 1558):—

"But in order to provide for the well-being of the residue of the Church, and that the pious may not have reason for grieving and mourning over such abominable and scandalous offences, and that not of ordinary individuals, but among those of rank; we consider that there is a pressing necessity for an entire and determined reform of *morals*; that neither avarice be longer suffered to lord it almost uncontrolled over the Church, so that from the crown of the head to the sole of the foot there is no soundness in it; everything consequently, both sacred and profane, being publicly put up for sale, and laws, excellently framed and altogether necessary, being everywhere set aside for money's sake; nor that an impure and debauched life be permitted any longer to disgrace the Church, the priests who wait upon the Lord, and offer up the holy mass, going through their duties with great indifference and want of propriety; living most disgracefully, just as if they were married, with their

<sup>a</sup> Idem, *ibid.* pp. 60, 61; "Concilia studio Labbei," tom. xiv. col. 1839. Paris, 1671.

concubines and children; while, at the same time, monks and nuns break the vows they have taken, and live full wantonly.<sup>a</sup> Then again the patrimony of the Church is shamefully wasted in worldly pomp, grand entertainments, dress, building palaces, playing at cards, in buying dogs and birds, and hiring jugglers and buffoons; the poor—the members and heirs of Christ—being in the mean while left to starve: these and similar evils we are of opinion ought to receive immediate correction.”<sup>b</sup>

Then, towards the close of the Council, in 1562, the same lamentation as to the degraded state, to which the Church, proclaiming itself to be “holy, Catholic, Apostolic,” had abandoned its unhappy subjects, and, what is more, sunk itself with them, are dwelt upon; and a contrast drawn, little in favour of Romish assumptions of an undoubted superiority over the Reformed Church.

“What, then,” asks Lewis M. Gravina,<sup>c</sup> “was the object of our predecessors, our fathers, those heroes of our Church, from whom we have so sadly degenerated, whose time-honoured praises we have worn away by our evil deeds, to whom we are indeed a disgrace: what did those holy men, I say, design in planting and cultivating the vineyard of the Lord? what did they? Why, this was their sole object, not to be seeking their own profit, but the things which are Jesus Christ’s. This was their grand aim, not to be pleasing men, but God. They were ambitious not of honours, but of toil; did not look to be masters, but ministers; they were lords not of mere animals, but of souls; supervisors not of wealth, but of men. They did, indeed, abound in wealth, but were poor in vice; they found their pleasures in de-

<sup>a</sup> The inhuman Church is *herself* the cause of these offences. In his “Letters to a Prebendary,” No. V. (p. 149, edit. Derby, 1843), Dr. Milner affirms that an epistle of Erasmus, addressed to a Carthusian monk, is quoted by Surius [Commentarius rerum gest. ab anno 1500; p. 290, edit. Colon. 1586], describing “in the most odious colours the profligacy of the apostate and married priests, who overran Germany.” Now, considering the very liberal expression of sentiment, appearing in the huge collection of the Epistles of Erasmus, as regards *monks* (see col. 1227, edit. Lug. Bat. 1706, for instance), a *manuscript* letter merely, and to some unknown correspondent (for such is the “Epistle” relied upon), can weigh but little; and if placed in the scale against the descriptions given in public and before public assemblies of the anything but sacrosanct behaviour of adherents of the “holy Catholic Roman Church,” about the same period, what can it avail? And if the “profligacy of married priests” were so “odious” as to make the writer sigh for the peaceful abode of the Carthusian, what “boundless contiguity of shade” must he have panted for, to escape, and for good, from the profligacy of his own “unmarried” monks and nuns here depicted. How unsuccessful are Rome’s efforts to maintain the supremacy which she is constantly reaching after, in *every* thing.

<sup>b</sup> Le Plat’s “Monumentorum ad Hist. Concil. Trident. illustr. Collectio,” tom. iv. 611.

<sup>c</sup> Concilia studio Labbei, tom. xiv. col. 1862-63. Paris, 1671.



erving well, not in worldly wealth; in the clothing of their minds, not of their bodies; they busied themselves in tending not their horses and dogs, but the poor and needy; they did not merely glitter before the world, they were truly *ministers of Christ and dispensers of the mysteries of God.*

. . . . . But, oh, how truly wretched is the condition of *our* time!—and what other reason can be given for evils such as these, such calamities and such changes, than that we have administered this office so differently from our ancestors? what other cause be assigned than that we have altogether abandoned the course which our fathers trod? . . . . The Church would still, however, have maintained her position and authority, if the exercises of true piety, the admirable pursuits of true religion, upon which it had been founded and established, and also been widely extended, had not been relaxed, and then cast aside. For now, in a total corruption of *morals*, and with true religion, as regards the generality, utterly lost, what wonder is it if Christians, caught on every side by varied attractions, have sunk from their high estate? if the greater part of them have foundered? and the remainder are anything but water-tight?"

"I adduced," says the honest Doctor—by the help probably of Brerely, in whose books heaps of such matter have long been shovelled together—"the testimony not only of Erasmus and other Catholics, but also of the Reformers themselves, in proof that the morals of the people, so far from being changed for the better by embracing the new religion, were greatly changed for the worse."<sup>a</sup> The work in which these evidences are collected, is the "Letters to a Prebendary."<sup>b</sup> They consist mainly of just such lamentations as might be obtained by even moderate inquirers, acquainted with the population of a country, at almost any period—such as confession-receivers could predicate of any papally-ruled region down to the present day. But will the Church of Rome shine by contrast, especially at that period, when the management of the population was under her own more complete control, and the light of her ministrations shed its rays free from the pestilential vapours raised up by intrusive Reformers, at a time when, it is asserted, but for the desolations caused by Luther and his contemporaries, the same peaceful<sup>c</sup> reign of righteousness and truth would have continued to bless the earth to the present day?

With the passages to which we have alluded, Dr. Milner,

<sup>a</sup> Letter xxi. p. 229.

<sup>b</sup> No. V. pp. 147-50, edit. Derby, 1843.

<sup>c</sup> Miss Read states in her "Six Months in a Convent" (p. 10, edit. Edinb. 1835), that on visiting Mrs. G.'s (a Romanist's), she saw a fine drawing,

and similar writers from the days of the Reformation downward, have pleased themselves in the quoting, supposing that they had the evidence of the founders of the Reformation themselves in testimony of the evil effects of that grand revolution. The regrets of Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, and others, are marshalled out, as if to be classed amongst admissions and confessions; but just letting these passages be viewed in that light, what shall we say to the avowed confessions and lamentations of members of the Church of Rome; as, for instance, of *Antonio Marinari*, the Carmelite (Dec. 20, 1545), one of those with whose addresses the Council of Trent was opened:—"Now," says he, "the Church is limited to a corner of Europe, and where Christ was once in the highest honour, there is he despised.<sup>a</sup> And that no description of assault should be wanting on every hand, foes of our own household have sprung up, assailing even this poor reduced Church, laid open as it is to the hatred and attacks of the infidels: some pastors are asleep, or are mere mercenaries (to say nothing worse); then there are princes engaged in furious war, and in gratifying their insatiable ambition: many doctors teach but with the mouth; very many, who profess a more spiritual life than ordinary, are filling every place with *scandal*; men and women of every age, exhibiting the character of heathens and Turks rather than that of Christians; and what is most injurious, so many ministers of Satan transfigured into angels of light, who despise, reject, and in fact abominate, the laws of their country, the approved opinions of the Fathers, the customs of Christian society, the sacraments, and, in short, everything holy."<sup>b</sup>

Then, again, hear the *confessions* of Cor. Martirani, Bishop of St. Marco<sup>c</sup> (Jan. 7, 1546), long subsequent to the period at which the Reformation commenced, and when the dominant Church had had the general population under its own peculiar teaching. "There are two points," says he, "most honourable Fathers, wherein especially the state of Christendom is grievously suffering—religion and morals; and unless some remedy is applied, and that speedily, you will have them falling into utter ruin: there is yet remaining some little light; we have not as yet sunk irrecoverably—but delay, and all things will revert to a state of 'chaos

exhibiting the peaceful and flourishing condition of the Church until the Reformation under Martin Luther.

<sup>a</sup> Alluding probably to the countries overrun by Mahomet and his disciples.

<sup>b</sup> Le Plat's "Monumentt. ad Conc. Trid. illustrand. Collectio," tom. i. p. 30. *Concilia studio Labbei*, tom. xiv. col. 1005. Paris, 1671.

<sup>c</sup> See the list of prelates who attended at Trent, in the sixth volume of Pallavicino's "Istoria del Concil. di Trento." Faenza, 1797.

and ancient night.' For, to refer in the first place to *morals*, nothing can be plainer than that the *morality* and discipline of Churchmen are so degraded, that there is nothing worse for posterity to venture upon or invent—if people are disposed to be wicked, it is impossible they can sink lower than the men of the present generation. For what conceivable crime is there so atrocious, so outrageous and monstrous, in which this adulterous and sinful generation is not wallowing. Look at their cupidity, cruelty, and general licentiousness! Do not rapine, plunderings, sacrileges, abound everywhere? Do not churches, courts, cities, villages, resound aloud with horrid curses and oaths? And as if it argued a want of manliness and courage, Heaven itself is daringly assailed, and that daily, with every kind of blasphemy; so that I am astonished that we are not struck with the thunderbolts of Heaven. When were poisonings and stabbings<sup>a</sup> more common? and who is secure, whether among the priesthood or laity, from assassins? Before the very altars, during the performance of mass itself, are men stabbed and murdered: our very confidants—such is the thirst for gold—murder us in our bedrooms: in cheating one another, in waylaying one another, in slaughtering one another, we fairly revel [*perbacchamur*]; impure, vicious, rapacious, without common humanity, to whom cruelty is amusement, thievery is a mere joke, shedding blood mere sport: indeed, it is impossible to mention all our ways and descriptions of sinning. The farther I launch out into this sea, the wider it extends, and seems shoreless," &c. And thus this bishop of this "Holy Catholic Church" (as imagined) testifies; next bringing before his auditors in Council assembled the Holy City, Rome herself, and declaring its bishops—why should he not?—to be the cause and origin of all evil; and as regarded Italy, France, Spain, affirming the corruption to be universal; bidding the Fathers in Council assembled, unless utterly stupid (*nisi plumbei estis*), to rouse themselves to effect some alteration in a state of affairs so deplorable in the vineyard of the Church,—if it be, indeed, a vineyard, and not a lair of wild beasts.<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> This crime bears its glory in Rome even now; see below.

<sup>b</sup> Le Plat's "Monumentt. ad Conc. Trid. illustrand. Collectio," tom. i. pp. 33, 34, 38. With regard to the letter of *Erasmus* written to the men of Strasburgh, in 1529, and from which Surius ("Commentarius brevis rerum gestarum ab an. 1500;" Colon. 1586, p. 181) thinks that Sleidan would have cited more largely had it been in favour of the Reformed Churches, which is doubtless probable, and would have been nothing wonderful; *Jortin* remarks: "The good man (*Erasmus*) did not consider that if he had been seized himself as a heretic, and the monks had sat in judgment upon him, he would infallibly have been pronounced one of the heretics who deserves death. This treatise [the letter from which Dr. M. has quoted] is written with great acrimony, and the system of religious politics which it contains is

Such was the state of an ecclesiastical institution which had contrived to make itself dominant by the same means as are now employed to keep it in existence; and for which its sworn adherents of the present day demand an eminent "moral" superiority, especially in the days of Luther, Calvin, Cranmer, and Knox, on the score of being "Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic;" but over which one of her own bishops, with more honesty and wisdom, mourned, as sunk in depravity, as having reached the lowest depths of vice, as raging in iniquity, as unapproachable in wickedness! "The appearance of the Gospel [viz., the Reformation]" was not needed to "drive piety out of the world," as Dr. Milner would have Luther confess it had! (Letters to a Prebendary, No. V. p. 147, edit. 1843). The modern writers who circulate and recommend Dr. Milner's works, and rely thus fully on the *Protestant* testimony of the Lutheran period, may please to accept, from a similar hand, "another statement in illustration of the little effect of Popery upon a people who receive it, in civilizing and Christianizing them. There is on the St. Lawrence, and in sight of Montreal, an Indian village, containing a fraction of a once powerful tribe, famous for its daring and cruelty in the old Indian wars. They speak the French language—they are all Papists—they have a fine stone church—they go to mass on Sunday morning—they are regular in their attendance at the confession-box, and yet they are as thoroughly Indian now as they were before they ever saw a pale face. They spend the afternoon of Sabbath at their old Indian games and sports, in which their priest is generally their leader. They are ignorant, degraded—they wear their old costume, and are intemperate. An intelligent French Canadian said to me, 'They are good Catholics, they go to mass on Sunday morning, then go to their sports on Sunday afternoon, and you ought to go over and see them at them. In the fall of the year we make them join the Temperance Society, and they keep the pledge as long as they can get no money to buy whiskey. But when the ice breaks away, and they can make money by piloting the rafts over the rapids, they break their pledge, and they all get drunk.' And there are those Indians, who are entirely French in language and religion, and good Papists, with their own resident priest, and at as low a point in the scale of civilization as

good for nothing."—(Life of Erasmus, vol. i. 435, edit. 1808.) The single quotation made by Surius (why did he not himself enlarge the quotation?) shows the soundness of this judgment upon the Letter: "Et nihil quidem verius dixit Erasmus, quam ex istis novatoribus nullum meliorem, omnes deteriores esse factos;" an opinion as disgraceful to the utterer, as suitable to the quoter, a Carthusian monk.—See *Erasmi Epistolæ*, col. 1227, edit. Lug. Bat. 1706; and Waddington's "Hist. of the Reformation," ii. 192.

when the priests first went among them to teach them the religion of God! And such is the uniform testimony as to the effect of Papal missions upon heathen and savage tribes. They baptize them—they teach them to say prayers to the saints and the Virgin—they fill their minds with superstitious fears; but they neither educate, civilize, nor Christianize them. There are districts in India, Dr. Duff being witness, where Papal priests have been manipulating the people for 300 years, and yet they are as ignorant of the religion of Christ as the heathens around them. But why need we wonder at the state of the Indians on the rivers of Canada, or at that of the tribes in India or China, when Ireland at home, and its children in all their dispersion, proclaim the utter worthlessness of Popery as an institution for civilizing and Christianizing the race.”<sup>a</sup>

Among the passages selected to prove the inefficiency of Protestant reform, one from Calvin’s treatise “De Scandalis,” ranks as a particular favourite; but from the style of reference, “l. vi. De Scandalis,” the citators owe their reference, it would seem, to Mr. Scavenger Brerely, or to some of his successors. We find it in “Dr. Milner’s Letters to a Prebendary;”<sup>b</sup> in Lingard’s “Tracts;”<sup>c</sup> in Pastorini’s “General History of the Christian Church;”<sup>d</sup> and, almost as a matter of course, among a heap of similar quotations in the “Hammersmith Discussion,”<sup>e</sup> and is doubtless to be found in scores of other Romish publications. The passage upon which so much value is put occurs in p. 71 of the Amsterdam edition of Calvin’s “Theological Tracts,” 1667, p. 71; and in the translations furnished for their readers all the citators make it a positive object, with these perverters of the freedom opened to them by the Reformation, to give themselves up to licentiousness without any restraint. “What else did the greater part *pretend* to?” as Drs. Walmsley, Lingard, and Milner put it; whereas Calvin represents them as so acting *as if* the main point with them was to avail themselves of better opportunities for all licentiousness. They had them already, in the very choice society of Rome; more laxity would seem to be aimed at in Protestant freedom from the martinets of Rome. This, it is not improbable, was to some extent the case: the same mode of action, and in Papal countries too, is discernible at the present day. Opposition to Rome is in many cases almost confined to a dislike of the ceaseless prying of Jesuit and other agencies of Rome,<sup>f</sup> and annoyance at being DRIVEN to engage in services incessantly,

<sup>a</sup> Kirwan, in “The Record,” Nov. 16, 1855.

<sup>c</sup> P. 169, ed. Dublin, 1822.

<sup>e</sup> P. 621, ed. 1852.

<sup>b</sup> P. 148, ed. Derby, 1843.

<sup>d</sup> P. 229, ed. 1793.

<sup>f</sup> See Michelet’s Works.

about which they care but little, and in which they can find no pleasure, and in which no interest is created except occasionally on the score of *opposition* and to *outshine* the poor heretics. Hence a wide-spread desire of casting off the yoke, in order mainly to avail themselves of the benefits of civil society, such as is afforded in Protestant countries. There is nothing very wonderful in all this: let the ordinary members of the Church of Rome have the same opportunities (or anything approaching to it) that other churches afford for individuals to leave their former communion, and the desertions would prove not unfrequently utter desolation to Rome; not probably under a desire in many cases of better teaching, but of simple indifference.

But how stands the case with Rome and her internal proceedings? Are there no *scandals* there? Does this very treatise of Calvin intimate any superiority in that church, as if men would improve themselves by *going back* to her, and seeking once more the privileges of that severe sect? Is there any indication that the licentious behaviour so painful to the reformer was, or was likely to be, any offence in Rome? Nothing of the kind! Calvin knew that the direct contrary was the truth; and that, as Sir Edwin Sandys says,<sup>a</sup> "with respective attendance of her pleasure, no law almost of God or nature so sacred, which one way or other they find not means to dispense with, or at leastwise permit the breach of, by connivance, and without disturbance."<sup>b</sup>

The same charges, and in more than twofold measure, might be meted out to Rome, and on the very points in which she judges adherents of the Reformed Churches to be so peculiarly reprehensible. There is no reason to fear any comparison with Rome on that score: in licentiousness of living, discords, and above all the abominations of monkery; in idleness, quarrelling, perfidiousness, absence of bare humanity;<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> "Survey of State of Religion," p. 40, ed. 1687.

<sup>b</sup> The Bavarian envoy, at the Council of Trent, in 1562, declared "That Bavaria was overrun with heresy of every description, that the contagion was not confined to the lower orders, but had seized the nobility and middle ranks, so that scarcely a city or town was uninfected. He affirmed that the evil was *greatly aggravated* by the shameful conduct of the clergy, great numbers of whom indulged in gluttony, drunkenness, and *all kinds of vice*, as if in open contempt of God and man, and lived in flagrant violation of their vows of chastity," &c.—Le Plat, vol. v. 338; Cramp's "Text-book of Popery," p. 284, edit. 1851.

<sup>c</sup> This state of being "lost to the feelings of human nature," is one of the consequences which Erasmus is quoted, in "Letters to a Prebendary" (p. 148), to show followed the becoming an "Evangelical." It flourished, however, under Papal rule; see *suprà*, p. 118, note. In the selections which Dr. M. has made from the writings of Erasmus (p. 148), in order to discredit the Reformer, is one from which, besides giving a false reference, he has omitted a sentence of some little consequence, showing that the offences, which Erasmus conceived chargeable upon the Lutherans, were just as rife among the

&c. &c., she far eclipsed any evil proceedings amongst the easy members of Protestant communities: in the one case the proceedings were a scandal to the community to which the individuals professed to belong; in the other money was made of them, seeing that "where there is muck, there is money," in spirituals as in temporals. But can the offences have been considered as any *scandal* by the dominant priesthood? As Calvin argues (p. 86), there was no great necessity for persons to join the Reformed Church in order to escape (as was imagined) from the *severity* of Papal discipline. The *austerity* of that church offered no check to intemperate living of any description; they might eat and drink, and be recklessly dissolute all the year round, if only it was all cleared off by confession and cash. The attempt to recommend the Church of Rome for its Spartan discipline, and to lower the Lutheran and Genevan Churches for alleged laxity as to moral teaching, Calvin affirms—and he knew them well—to be truly ridiculous; and mentions as a pretty conclusive proof the vexation of parties who had joined those communities, at finding themselves cut off, or at all events checked in, the enjoyment of their former "liberty;" and as for the great body of the clergy, the masters of the people and their authorized instructors, "vasta lacuna est" (he asserts) "omne genus scelerum," poisoning whole neighbourhoods!—a very natural consequence of Rome's disciplinary rule of celibacy, and her doctrines of penance, of indulgences, of confession, &c. &c.

Could people well "become worse" in such a church as this, and be any proper *scandal* to it? The testimonies before cited as to the *moral* condition of the Papally taught population were given, it should be observed, just about the time

so-called Catholics: "Circumspice populum illum evangelicum, et observatum minus illic indulgeatur luxui, libidini, et pecuniæ, quam faciunt ii quos detestamini."—(Opera, tom. ix. p. 1296, ed. 1540.) The latter sentence Dr. M. has thought better dropped; and well (in one view) he might, intimating, as it does, that those under Papal instruction were as much given to pleasure, licentiousness, and money-making, as those whom the writer terms Evangelicals. And the concession has been made even in the present day, of the liability of the *chiefs* of the system to sin, and that there is no proud superiority to be claimed on the above grounds even in their *holinesses*. "There is no article of the Catholic [Romish] faith which teaches that Popes are either immaculate or infallible. Sinners like ourselves [!], they have been even deposed by that Church of which they formed the head." So M. Gandolphy, a priest, overcome by evidence, instructed his London flock (see his "Sermons," 1814, vol. ii. 321-2), and correctly enough. But the supervisors thought such honest announcements not exactly the thing: the flock probably felt rather queer at this descent of their *Holinesses*, and their becoming "one of us;" and accordingly, in *approved* copies of the "Sermons," this sentence is placed among *errata*—a revised judgment mounts his holiness in the clouds again, and there he is set to reign in the foggy majesty of *ex-cathedral* infallibility. Gregory XVI. used to get drunk two or three times a week;—see Nicoline's "Hist. of the Pontificate of Pius IX.," p. 6.

of Luther's death, and some twenty years subsequently; when, as the Bishop of St. Marco affirms, it was impossible that any future sinners could outmatch those of his day; and that the Church of Rome was herself the grand *cause* of the horrible state of morals—not Luther, nor Calvin, nor their teachings! How can the crimes, which raised the indignation and lamentations of Luther, and the other "patriarchs" of the Reformation, be otherwise now used by Rome than as a convenient tool to damage that interest, when she herself at the present day can argue for their allowance, and under consideration easily tolerate them! But perhaps the so-called "old religion"—being of course older now than in the days of Luther and Calvin, &c.—exhibits its effects upon the populations of the world all the more brightly from having got rid of those deformationists, and especially at the fountain-head. Let us see. The *Dublin Daily Express* gives, in a recent impression, the following appalling picture of the immorality of the Eternal City itself:—

Few persons have an idea of the immense apparatus that exists at *Rome* for the spiritual training of the citizens. The whole of the Papal States contain rather more than three millions of inhabitants, and yet in the city of Rome itself, according to the statistical returns made by the Vicar-general, there are 36 bishops, 1,226 secular priests, 2,213 monks, 1,919 nuns, 689 seminarists, making a total of 6,083 ecclesiastics and *religious*, all devoted by profession to the spiritual edification of the people of this one city. The population of Rome is only 177,500, while that of Dublin is 258,361. Imagine the Irish metropolis, though much larger than Rome, blessed with thirty prelates like Dr. Cullen! Rome certainly ought to merit the epithet *holy*, as she has a spiritual teacher of some kind for every twenty-five inhabitants, including the children.

This vast amount of spiritual agency has everything to aid and facilitate its action in *Rome*, because the civil power is all in the hands of the clergy. Every possible condition, therefore, requisite for the full development and complete effect of the Roman religion, is there present. It ought, consequently, to be a perfect paradise—a model farm of intellectual, industrial, and spiritual husbandry. Of all the cities that ever existed, Rome ought to be the most free from ignorance, vice, and crime.

Let us see, then, whether the Church of *Rome*, favoured as it is, possesses what Roman doctrines teach is one of the marks of the true Church—*sanctity*. There is one crime which above all others indicates the moral condition of any country. It is the first that was committed by man, and it



is the foulest that man can commit. That crime is murder. Should we not infer that this crime was altogether unknown in the Holy City? Would it not be a fair conclusion from the premises we have laid down, that there should be no crime in Rome at all—no violence, no bloodshed, no robbery, no theft; that there should be no need for police, or prisons, or courts of justice, or any species of carnal coercion and temporal punishment? Most certainly it would.

But how stands the case? The following table shows the number of prisoners in the Roman States during a period of five years:—

In 1850 .....	10,436 persons.	In 1853 .....	12,035 persons.
In 1851 .....	11,279     ,,	In 1854 .....	13,006     ,,
In 1852 .....	11,767     ,,		

Thus it appears there has been a steady increase in the number of prisoners, indicating an increase of discontent, misery, and crime among the people. The statistics of crime do not include the numerous bands of brigands who infest the road and elude the police. Of the total number of criminals in the Roman prisons, *one-third* were guilty of the crime of *murder*; that is, there was one murderer in every 750 of the population. Compare this with an "heretical" country, Scotland, where there is one murderer only in every 270,000 of the population. How suggestive is this contrast!

Murder prevails to a fearful extent in Rome. It is the greatest of all crimes, and it seems to be attended with the most impunity and the least infamy. Every church is a sanctuary for the assassin, where he may abide in safety. Other criminals are reviled as thieves and rascals; but the murderer is comparatively honourable, and is distinguished from viler offenders by his prison dress. If you ask why, the answer is, "Oh, sir! he was only guilty of the *colpo di stiletto*." The honourable man treacherously inflicted a mortal stab on his neighbour. That is all.<sup>a</sup>

---

## No. XII.

### THE POPE'S SUPREMACY.

#### SEC. I.—On the Temporal and Spiritual Supremacy.

THE discussion of the question of the Pope's supremacy at the present day can only be compared to a man fighting

<sup>a</sup> The "Achill Herald," 1856, p. 68; and for the state of affairs in England by one who knew and lived amongst them, just prior to or about Mr. Brerely's days, see White's "Way to the True Church," sec. 38, 1, p. 210, edit. 1616.

with a shadow. Whatever power the Popes arrogated to themselves, and indeed enjoyed, in the middle ages, it is very clear that they were not possessed of any such dominion in the early days of the Christian Church, nor at the present time.

In direct opposition to his general opinions and disposition, Dr. Milner disclaims for the Pope all "civil and temporal supremacy, by virtue of which he can depose princes, or give or take away the property of other persons out of his own domain."—(Letter xlv. p. 434.) It is true, he admits, that different Popes in former ages have assumed arbitrary temporal power, and that such powers have been defended by various theologians, "*though not as a matter of faith.*" This may be merely the temporary *opinion* of a private doctor, adopted for a purpose, for Baronius, the Roman chronicler, says, "that there can be no doubt of it, but that the civil headship is subject to the sacerdotal," and "that God hath made the political governor subject to the head of the Spiritual Church;"<sup>a</sup> and accordingly Pope Boniface by decree, as recorded, and now extant, in the Canon Law of the Roman Church, said, "We declare, say, define, pronounce it to be *necessary to salvation*, for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff."<sup>b</sup> That which is here claimed refers to *temporal* as well as *spiritual* supremacy; for this Pope goes on in the same decree to declare that "the one sword must be under the other, and the temporal authority must be subject to the spiritual power—hence, if the earthly power go astray, it must be judged by the spiritual;" and all this he pretends to prove by the authority of the Scriptures! Again, Pope Sixtus V. issued his Bull against Henry, King of Navarre, and the Prince of Condé, "depriving them and their posterity for ever of their dominions and kingdoms." This he declares to be "God's ordinance;" and he exercised his assumed right by "the authority given to St. Peter and his successors," &c. And the Bull of excommunication against Queen Elizabeth by Pius V. begins with these words:—"He that reigneth on high, to whom is given all power in heaven and in earth, hath committed the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, out of which there is no salvation, to one alone on earth, &c., to Peter, prince of the Apostles, and to the Roman Pontiff, successor of Peter, to be governed with a plenitude

<sup>a</sup> Politicum Principatum Sacerdotali esse subjectum nulla potest esse dubitatio.—Baron. Annal. Ann. 57, sec. 32, tom. i. p. 453, edit. Antv. 1612. Politicum Imperium subjecti Spirituality Ecclesie domino.—Ib. sec. 33.

<sup>b</sup> Subesse Romano Pontifici omni humanæ creaturæ declaramus, dicimus, definimus, et pronunciamus omnino esse de necessitate salutis.—Corp. Juris Canonici a Pithoæo Extrav. Com., lib. i. tit. 8, cap. 1, tom. ii. Paris, 1695.

of power; this one He hath constituted prince over all nations, and all kingdoms, that he might pluck up, destroy, dissipate, ruinate, plant, and build," &c.<sup>a</sup> Thus, then, it is clear that this temporal power was claimed, not only by *divine right*, but "*as a matter of faith.*"

Dr. Milner, therefore, begins his chapter on "the Pope's Supremacy" with a misrepresentation.

As, however, Dr. Milner tacitly gives up this ground, and in so doing has, we must admit, exercised a wise discretion, he is nevertheless bound, on the authority of the Council of Trent and Pope Pius IV., to admit the following propositions:—

*The Church of Rome is the Mother and Mistress of all Churches.*

*Patriarchs, primates, archbishops, bishops, and all others, are bound to pledge and profess true obedience to the sovereign Roman Pontiff.*

*The Pope is the Vicar of God upon Earth: and he possesses supreme authority delivered to him in the Universal Church.*

*The Roman Pontiff must be acknowledged and obeyed, as the successor of the blessed Peter the prince of the Apostles and the Vicar of Jesus Christ.*<sup>b</sup>

Dr. Milner undertakes to solve the question, "Whether the Bishop of Rome, who by pre-eminence is called *Papa (Pope, or Father of the Faithful)*,"<sup>c</sup> is, or is not, entitled to a superior rank and jurisdiction above other bishops of the Christian

<sup>a</sup> Mag. Bullar. tom. ii. p. 324, edit. Luxemb. 1727.

<sup>b</sup> *Ecclesia Romana, quæ omnium Ecclesiarum Mater est et Magistra.*—Concil. Trident. sess. vii. de Baptism. can. iii. p. 87, edit. Antverp. 1644.

*Præcipit, igitur, Sancta Synodus, Patriarchis, Primatibus, Archiepiscopis, Episcopis, et omnibus aliis, ut . . . veram obedientiam Summo Romano Pontifici spondeant et profiteantur.*—Ib. sess. xxv. p. 573.

*Ipsius Dei in terris Vicarii.*—Ib. sess. vi. p. 61.

*Merito Pontifices Maximi, pro Suprema Potestate sibi in Ecclesia Universali tradita, causas aliquas criminum graviore suo potuerunt peculiari judicio reservare.*—Ib. sess. xiv. p. 163.

*Sanctam Catholicam et Apostolicam Romanam Ecclesiam, omnium Ecclesiarum matrem et magistram, agnosco: Romanoque Pontifici, beati Petri Apostolorum principis successori, ac Jesu Christi vicario, veram obedientiam spondeo ac juro.*—Prof. Fid. Trident. ex Bull. Pap. Pii IV. Syllog. Confess. p. 5.

<sup>c</sup> Dr. Milner would have us infer, or the explanation is not pertinent, that that very title imports a concession of the claim. So common a book as Suicer would have told him, that so far from the appellation *Παπα* being appropriated to the Bishop of Rome, as Father of the Faithful, it was, down to the fifth century, assigned in common to all the bishops of the Western Churches; that even priests were called by this name; and that in the acts of the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 448, Eutyches, the heretic, is designated *Papa*. The bishops of the Greek Church are still called Popes.—"Two Main Questions Stated," &c., p. 248. Dublin, 1825.

Church, so as to be its *Spiritual Head* upon earth, and his see the centre of Catholic unity?"<sup>a</sup>

The question is not whether the Pope of Rome is entitled to a superior rank, but *the* superior dominancy claimed for him by the Council of Trent?

We must now follow Dr. Milner step by step in his "proofs" in support of this asserted supremacy.

He commences as follows:—

"Let us begin with consulting the New Testament, in order to see whether or no the first Pope or Bishop of Rome, Saint Peter, was any way superior to the other apostles."<sup>b</sup>

Here, in the very outset, Dr. Milner makes a leap, and at once takes for granted that St. Peter *was* the first Pope or Bishop of Rome. As this is a subject of some considerable interest, we will consider it under a distinct head, in its proper place;—but first, we must follow him in his own order, and examine the

---

SEC. II.—Evidence of Pope's Supremacy derived from the New Testament.

He has to prove from the New Testament—

1. That Christ constituted St. Peter Supreme Head, both of the Universal Church, and likewise of all the other Apostles; thus erecting an absolute monarchy in the Church of which He was Founder.

2. That St. Peter was the first Pope or Diocesan Bishop of Rome.

3. That all the paramount authority, originally vested in St. Peter, has from him rightfully (and by Divine right) descended to the Roman Church and Bishop.<sup>c</sup>

Here again, Dr. Milner gives the real question the "go-by," by pretending that all he has to prove is, that "St. Peter was superior in any way to the other Apostles." When Dr. Milner made this statement, he must have had Barrow's "Treatise of the Supremacy" in his possession and under his consideration, for he refers to it several times. Now Barrow declares,<sup>d</sup> that "we may well admit that St. Peter had a primacy of worth, or that in personal accomplishments he was most eminent among the Apostles, although afterwards there did spring up one who hardly in any of these respects would yield to him; who could confidently say 'that he did not

<sup>a</sup> Letter xlv. p. 437.

<sup>b</sup> *Ib.* p. 437.

<sup>c</sup> See Faber's "Difficulties of Romanism," book i. cap. 3, p. 52, edit. London, 1853.

<sup>d</sup> In the "Pope's Supremacy," pp. 45-6, edit. London, 1849.

come behind the very chiefest of the Apostles;’<sup>a</sup> and of whom St. Ambrose said, ‘Neither was Paul inferior to Peter, being well to be compared even with the first, and second to none;’<sup>b</sup> and St. Chrysostom, ‘For what was greater than Peter, and what equal to Paul.’<sup>c</sup> This is the primacy which Eusebius attributeth to him, when he calleth him ‘the excellent and great Apostle, who for his virtue was the prolocutor of all the rest.’<sup>d</sup>

Dr. Barrow willingly ceded to St. Peter a primacy of “repute” or of “order,” *i. e.* “bare dignity,” imputing that commonly, in the meetings of the Apostles, they yielded to him a precedence or privilege as chairman.

But Dr. Milner has to establish the Tridentine assumption, founded, as affirmed, on divine right, provable from the New Testament.—(Letter xlvi. p. 437.)

1. “St. Matthew, in numbering up the Apostles, expressly says of him, ‘The first, Simon, who is called Peter’ (Matt. x. 2); in like manner the other Evangelists, while they class the rest of the Apostles differently, still give the first place to Peter (Mark iii. 16; Luke vi. 14; Acts i. 13).” It is absurd to argue for such a primacy in St. Peter as is claimed by the Church of Rome at the present day; for had there been any great object in view, this order would have been maintained, whereas such is far from being the case. John, while referring to the “call” of the Apostles, names Peter after Andrew.<sup>e</sup> St. Paul knew of no such distinction; in Gal. ii. 9, he writes “James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars,” &c.; and again, in 1 Cor. iii. 22, “Whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas;” and again, in 1 Cor. ix. 5, he places Peter last. It is further worthy of remark, that in what are called the “Apostolic Constitutions” St. Paul and St. Peter are introduced jointly prescribing orders; they begin, “I, Paul, and I, Peter, do appoint.”<sup>f</sup>

2. “St. Peter was the *first* to confess his faith in Christ (Matt. xvi. 16),” referring to Peter’s acknowledgment “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God” (p. 438).

This assertion, borrowed from Bossuet, will not bear examination. There was nothing in this acknowledgment exclusively to merit Peter’s promotion; for already, before him, had “Nathanael answered and said unto him, Rabbi, Thou art

<sup>a</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 20; 2 Cor. xi. 23; 2 Cor. xi. 5, xii. 11.

<sup>b</sup> Amb. de Sp. S. lib. ii. cap. 12, tom. iv. p. 254. Paris, 1661.

<sup>c</sup> Chrysostom, tom. v. Orat. 167, vol. ii. p. 568, edit. Paris, 1837.

<sup>d</sup> Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. ii. cap. 14, p. 46, edit. Oxon. 1845.

<sup>e</sup> John i. 44.

<sup>f</sup> Ἐγὼ Παῦλος καὶ ἐγὼ Πέτρος διατασσόμεθα. Const. Apost. lib. 8, cap. 33. Lab. Concil. tom. i. col. 498. Paris, 1671.

the Son of the true God; Thou art the King of Israel" (John i. 49). And Martha made the like confession, "I believe that Thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world" (John xi. 27). As also did all the other Apostles: "And they that were in the ship came and worshipped him, saying, Of a truth Thou art the Son of God" (Matt. xvi. 33). Even one possessed with devils "fell down before him, and with a loud voice said, What hast Thou to do with me, Jesus, Thou Son of God Most High" (Luke viii. 28).

3. "The *first* to whom Christ appeared after his resurrection (Luke xxiv. 34)." The text cited is "The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon" (p. 438).

The word "*first*" is unwarrantably added; but how is the fact recorded by all the four Evangelists.

Matthew informs us that "Christ appeared to Mary Magdalene and the other Mary" (xxviii. 9): this is the first interview. The second appearance is recorded in the 16th verse, when "the *eleven* disciples went away into Galilee, where Jesus had appointed them;" no mention is made of Peter in particular. Mark (xvi. 9) expressly states, "Now when Jesus was risen, early in the first day of the week, He appeared *first* to Mary Magdalene;" and, in the 12th verse, we read, "After that He appeared in another form unto *two of them* as they walked and went into the country;" and "AFTERWARDS *He appeared unto the eleven*" (v. 14). Luke omits to name the first appearance of our Saviour to Mary Magdalene, but records the second appearance to the two named by Mark (Luke xiv. 13). One of these, we are told, was Cleopas; that the other was not Peter is evident from the conversation that then took place between our Saviour and the two. Cleopas, not recognizing Jesus, relates the circumstance of the visit by the women to the sepulchre, and the angels, "which said, he was alive and *certain of them* [viz. Peter and John] which were with *us*, went to the sepulchre, and found it even so as the women had said, but Him [Christ] *they saw not.*" It is not likely that Cleopas would have said, "Certain of *them* which were with *us* went to the sepulchre," if Peter had been with him at the time. St. John is more explicit: in chapter xx. he first relates the interview with Mary Magdalene, who then told the disciples of the resurrection; and in verse 19 he states, that in the same day, at evening, when the disciples were assembled, Jesus stood in the *midst of them*, which is the *first* time He appeared to the disciples; and at the 26th verse, "that after eight days, then came Jesus and stood in the midst," which

is the second appearance. He then relates the circumstance of the great draught of fishes (xxi. 14), when Christ again appeared. "This is now the *third* time that Jesus showed himself to his disciples, after that he was risen from the dead." No particular mention whatever is made of Peter. We may be referred to the text from St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians, wherein he says, "And that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve" (1 Cor. xv. 5), which is the parallel text to Luke, cited by Dr. Milner. As we cannot suppose that Paul contradicted Luke or John, we must be driven to the necessity of believing that one of the two named by Luke (xxv. 13), and Mark (xvi. 12) was Peter, notwithstanding the very peculiar manner in which Cleopas addressed our Lord. In this case the other Apostle, Cleopas, saw the Lord as soon as Peter did.<sup>a</sup>

Neither Dr. Milner nor Bossuet, therefore, has any ground for asserting that Christ appeared *first* unto Peter.

4. "The *first* to preach the belief of this (the resurrection) to the people."—(Acts ii. 14.) "And first to convert the Jews."—(ii. 37.) Dr. Milner seems to have forgotten that, previous to this act of St. Peter, our Lord expressly conferred on each of the Apostles the like privilege in this respect. "But *ye* shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you; and *ye* shall be witness unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and unto the uttermost part of the earth."—(Acts i. 8; and see Luke xxiv. 49, &c.)

5. "The *first* to convert the Gentiles."—(Acts x. 47.)

The circumstance here referred to has reference to St. Peter's vision and the subsequent conversion of Cornelius. It is very evident that St. Peter himself was ignorant of his supposed prerogatives, for he did not venture to go to Cornelius without a special command. He did not act on his own authority, as ruler of the Church, as is attempted to be here established, for he even doubted whether it were lawful to preach to the Gentiles. It is supposed by Dr. Milner that he acted by virtue of the precedency given him over the other Apostles. That no such authority in Peter existed, the circumstances connected with the very event amply testify, for we are subsequently told that "when Peter was come up to Jerusalem, they [the other Christians] that were of the circumcision [calling him to account for his actions] contended with him, saying, Thou wentest in unto men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them."—(Acts xi. 2, 3.) Peter, in reply, did not plead his plenary powers, or authority as Christ's

<sup>a</sup> Collette's "Pope's Supremacy," p. 82. London, 1852.

vicar, but "rehearsed the matter from the beginning, and expounded it by order unto them;—and when they heard it, they glorified God." They were convinced by his reasoning and narration, not by his authority; and though Peter may have converted Cornelius, and had a special commission among the Jews, Paul had an equally independent commission, and was appointed to preach to the Gentiles; and we have his direct testimony that he did not hold this commission from any superior or temporal head of the Church, but immediately by divine revelation, by divine permission of the Lord Jesus Christ,<sup>a</sup> and to whom was intrusted the daily care of *all* the churches.—(2 Cor. xi. 28.) Had this been recorded of her fancied head, St. Peter, Dr. Milner would not have failed to parade the text with confident exultation.

Dr. Milner should be reminded that the events to which he alludes (Acts x.) occurred subsequent to those related in Acts viii. Philip was selected by a special messenger from heaven to preach to the Ethiopian eunuch, and convert him to the Lord Jesus, and also performed the ceremony of baptism, on which occasion a miracle was performed; but we deduce from this no proof of a primacy in Philip.<sup>b</sup> Indeed, it is asserted that Philip, before this, preached Christ, did many miracles, and baptized many, and among others converted Simon the sorcerer. The Apostles at Jerusalem, hearing of his success, *sent* John and Peter to assist him.—(Acts viii. 14.) Peter being *sent* by the other Apostles "implies" that he was not superior to them.—(John xiii. 16.) It is a favourite argument, repeated again and again, as if it carried some weight, that in the order of the Apostles' names that of Peter stands first. But if this superiority were always assigned, which it is not, it would prove nothing to the purpose. No authority can be inferred from this circumstance, nor anything beyond bare precedence. Reuben was first in the numbering, but Judah was chief in rank. Chrysostom, in his homilies on St. Matthew, assigns certain grounds of preference; if there were any superiority involved, he certainly knew nothing of it.<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Galat. i. 11—20; ii. 1, 2, 6, 19.

<sup>b</sup> It may be observed, that the Ethiopic Church has, at the present day, a tradition that, when the eunuch was baptized by Philip, he went home and converted the queen to the faith, and baptized her and her family, and this Church has since maintained the Christian faith; to this effect their Emperor David wrote to the Bishop of Rome (See Geddes' "Church History of Ethiopia," and "Damian a Goes. de Morib. Æthiop.," pp. 484, 582. Col. Agrip. 1574); and that "this was done *before* Peter went to Cornelius to preach the faith unto him."

<sup>c</sup> Robins's "Whole Evidence against the Claims of the Roman Church," p. 47. London, 1855. An excellent volume.



6. Referring to John xxi. 15, 17, Dr. Milner proceeds with his supposed Scriptural proofs: "Again I would ask, is there no distinction implied in St. Peter's being called upon by Christ to declare three several times, that he *loved* him, and, in the end, that he *loved him more than his fellow-Apostles*; as likewise in his being each time charged to *feed Christ's lambs*, and, at length, to *feed his sheep also*."

It must be a sorry case indeed that relies on very weak presumptive evidence (if it can be called evidence at all). All that Dr. Milner can draw from this occurrence is, that there was an "*implied distinction*." We think that we ought to have far more than an "*implied distinction*" in favour of Peter, to warrant us in believing that our Lord appointed this Apostle as the Supreme Head of the Church. It is a great stretch of the imagination to suppose that this grant is substantiated by a thrice-repeated injunction from Christ that *Peter should feed his flock*. It is evident that such a charge was not considered by the early Christian writers peculiar to Peter, or the Bishop of Rome, his alleged successor.<sup>a</sup> Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, writing to Stephen, Bishop of Rome, said: "*We, being many shepherds, do feed one flock, and all the sheep of Christ.*"<sup>b</sup> "What is said to Peter [according to St. Augustine], is said to all, Feed my sheep."<sup>c</sup>

The thrice-repeated command evidently alludes to Peter's previous thrice-repeated denial of his Lord. Hence we are very naturally told that Peter was *grieved* because Christ said to him the *third* time, *Lovest thou me?* On this Augustine remarks: "He recompenseth a threefold denial with a threefold confession, that his tongue might not appear less accessible to love, than it had been to fear."<sup>d</sup> And again, "Peter straightway received pardon from the Lord, when he had most bitterly bewailed the sin of his threefold denial."<sup>e</sup> Yet,

<sup>a</sup> Casaubon, to whom Dr. Milner refers occasionally (Letter x. p. 131, and xxvi. p. 275) as being so frightened at the overwhelming evidence in the writings of the Fathers, both on general topics and on St. Peter being head of the Papal Church, and the Roman Pontiffs his successors, states in the plainest terms that such notions as those entertained by Baronius on that head, and of course by Dr. Milner, are the vainest of the vain:—"Scripturæ ac primorum sæculorum praxis, et metum Baronii et conjecturam illius pariter atque illationem *vanissimæ vanitatis* arguunt."—Exercitt. ad Annales Eccles. Baronii, p. 663, edit. Geneva, 1655.

<sup>b</sup> Epist. 68, ad P. Steph. p. 188, edit. Lipsiæ, 1838.

<sup>c</sup> Aug. de Agone Christ. 30, tom. vi. p. 439. Paris, 1837.

<sup>d</sup> Aug. in Johan. Tract. 123, tom. iii. pars 2, col. 817, sec. 5. Paris, 1690.

<sup>e</sup> "Petrus mox a Domino indulgentiam accepit, qui amarissime flevit trinæ negationis culpam."—Aug. de Tempor. Serm. 66.

by some inconceivable process, the Latin doctors transmute what Peter *himself*, with much mortification, deemed an implied reproof, into a glorious grant of universal dominant supremacy!

7. Luke xxii. 32 is then cited to prove that Peter was "to act the part of the shepherd, not only with respect to the flock in general, but also with respect to the pastors themselves:" in other words, to act as the supreme head or minister of the Church of Christ, by Christ's special appointment. This, we are told, "is plainly signified by the Lord's prayer for the faith of this Apostle in *particular*, and the charge he subsequently gave him: *Simon, Simon, behold Satan has desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat; but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not; and thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren.*"

Surely Dr. Milner must have considered that his Protestant readers knew as little about the Bible as the members of *his* communion. He commences at the 32nd verse; but if we go back a little, we shall find sufficient evidence that our Lord did not intend to confer any peculiar dignity on Peter; on the contrary, the words of Christ were evidently uttered in rebuke. We read from the 24th verse in the same chapter, that there was a strife among the Apostles who should be accounted the greatest. Here was an opportunity presented to our Lord to declare his intention of conferring a supremacy or primacy of order on Peter. Christ, on the contrary, rebuked them saying, "The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors. *But ye shall not be so: but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve.*"

Here Christ's instruction was addressed to them all. But the reproof was addressed to Peter alone, because, as Chrysostom says, of his two offences; first, because he contradicted his master; and, secondly, because he put himself before the others. Immediately after this reproof, we have Christ's address to Peter that his faith should not fail. On this Peter replied by protestations of the firmness of his faith, declaring his readiness to follow him even to prison and to death; and then the Lord foretold that Peter should thrice deny him before hardly a day had run its course. And then we have in the *same chapter* the prophecy fulfilled; Peter, denying his Lord thrice,—yes, even (as Matthew relates, xxvi. 74), "he began to curse and to swear, saying, I know not the man."

How Dr. Milner can have the hardihood to refer to this chapter at all, and more especially to the particular fact of the prayer that Peter's faith should not fail, is almost unaccountable, for the text has direct reference to Peter's subsequent denial, not to Peter's own supremacy.

But Dr. Milner seems to have altogether overlooked the fact, that though our Saviour did not, at this time, include the other Apostles in his prayer—the circumstance did not then require it—he did so at other times. In John xvii. 6—9, in particular, we find that Christ prayed for all the Apostles, and expressly said (verse 20), “Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe in me through their word.”

We cannot better close our remarks on this text than by giving the interpretation of the illustrious Father, Chrysostom, which is peculiarly corroborative of the foregoing observations; the more especially as Dr. Milner appears at all times to profess a great reverence for the early Christian writers, and never omits an opportunity of appealing to them as authoritative.

“Christ, therefore, wishing to repress such feelings, assented to the denial [*i. e.* permitted it to come to pass that Peter should deny him]. For since he (Peter) would not endure either His (Christ's) words nor the words of the Prophet (and yet it was for this reason that he assumed the character of a prophet that he might not contradict), he is taught by deeds. For that he assented to the trial just in order that this tendency in him might be corrected, listen to what he says: ‘But I have prayed for thee that thy faith may not fail.’ Now he uttered these words sharply reproving him (Peter), and to intimate that his fall would be more serious than that of the other disciples, and would need more help. For his offences were twofold; first, in contradicting [his Master]; secondly, in putting himself before the others; but, thirdly and mainly, his assuming the whole [responsibility] to himself. With a view of curing these things, therefore, he permitted the fall to take place, and on this ground, passing by the others, he addressed himself to him (Peter) alone. For says He, ‘Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath requested to winnow you as wheat;’ that is, to disturb, agitate, and try you. ‘But I have prayed on thy behalf that thy faith may not be wanting.’ But why, if he prayed for all, does he not say, I have besought on behalf of all? Is it not very evident that this is just what I before mentioned, that he is reproving Peter particularly, and *showing that as his fall would be worse than that of*

the others, he therefore addressed the conversation to him especially." <sup>a</sup>

8. "Is there no mysterious meaning," continues Dr. Milner, "in the circumstance, marked by the Evangelist, of Christ's *entering into Simon's ship* in preference to that of James and John, in order to *teach the people out of it*; and in the subsequent miraculous *draught of fishes*, together with our Lord's prophetic declaration to Simon: *Fear not, from henceforth thou shalt catch men?* (Luke v. 3, 10.)"

We confess that we are perfectly at a loss to discover any mysterious meaning in the circumstance of our Saviour being pressed by the people when he stood by the borders of the lake, and seeing *two ships* at hand, the fishermen having gone out of them, being engaged washing their nets, that he should enter into one of the ships, which happened to be Simon's, and sit down and teach the people out of this ship. When he had done speaking, he told Simon to launch out into the deep; and then is related the miraculous draught of fishes, Simon's astonishment, and his exclamation requesting Jesus to depart from him, for that he was a sinful man. Dr. Milner does not, however, unfold the mysterious covering which here envelops Peter's supremacy by divine right, and that of the Bishops of Rome, as his successors.

We cannot inform our readers how this "miraculous draught of fishes," together with our Lord's declaration to Simon, that from henceforth he "should catch men," tend in any way to establish his case; but had Dr. Milner taken the ordinary precaution of looking to the parallel text in Matthew iv. 19, and Mark i. 17, he would have found exactly the same "prophetic declaration" applied by our Saviour to Andrew by name, together *with Peter*.

9. "But the strongest proof," writes Dr. Milner, "of St. Peter's superior dignity and jurisdiction, consists in the explicit and energetical declaration of our Saviour to him, in the quarters of Cesarea Philippi, upon his making that glorious confession of our Lord's divinity: *Thou art Christ the Son of the living God*.—Our Lord had mysteriously changed his name, at his first interview with him, when Jesus, looking upon him, said, *Thou art Simon, the son of Jona; thou shalt be called Cephas, which is interpreted Peter* (John i. 42); and on the present occasion he explains the mystery, where he says, *Blessed art thou, Simon, Bar-jona,*" &c. &c.; see Matt. xvi. 17—19."

In the first place, we have already shown that the "glorious

<sup>a</sup> Hom. in Matth. lxxxii. or lxxxiii. tom. vii. pp. 886-7, edit. Paris, 1837.

confession of our Lord's Divinity was not *peculiar* to Peter, nor was he the first to make this important declaration (pp. 127-8, *suprà*); and in the second place, we can discover nothing "mysterious" in the change of name from Simon to Peter, or a *stone*. Nor was there anything peculiar in the circumstance, for it is also related of our Lord that he surnamed James and John, Boanerges, which is, the Sons of Thunder (Mark iii. 17); and this immediately after the text in which is recorded the change of name of "Simon" to "Peter."

If this text conveys any grant of that supremacy for which Romanists contend, the grant can only be comprehended in the supposed allegation on the part of Christ that *Peter is the Rock upon which he will build his Church*; and in the special, exclusive conveyance of what is called *the binding and loosing power of the keys*: for nowhere else in the entire text can we discover a vestige of any grant of a Universal Dominant Supremacy. That Dr. Milner relies on this interpretation is evident from the manner in which the text is quoted.

We shall not weary our readers with any attempt at an interpretation of the text in question: we could only advance an *opinion*, which, while it differed from Dr. Milner's interpretation, might not agree with that of all our readers. We believe that the *Rock* on which the Church was to be built was *Christ*, and that an express distinction was made by our Saviour between the words *πέτρος*, a *Stone*, Peter (John i. 42), and *πέτρα*, a *Rock*, CHRIST (Eph. ii. 20, 1 Cor. x. 4), on which the Church was to be built.

But how can Dr. Milner or any Romanist attempt to put a precise construction on this text, when they cannot present to us anything like a "unanimous agreement of the Fathers" in the interpretation of it? The truth is, the early theologians are anything but agreed as to the import of this part of the text. Justin, the oldest Father who notices the text, contends, that the *Rock*, upon which our Lord promised to build his Church, is not Peter individually, but Peter's Confession of Faith.<sup>a</sup> Athanasius, Jerome, and Augustine, maintain that the *Rock* is Christ himself.<sup>b</sup> Chrysostom, in one place, supposes Peter individually to have been the *Rock*, but, in another place, he pronounces, with Justin Martyr, that the *Rock* was Peter's Confession; and explicitly condemns the

<sup>a</sup> Justin. Dial. cum Tryph. Oper. p. 255. Sylburg. 1593.

<sup>b</sup> Athan. Unum esse Christ. Orat. Oper. vol. i. pp. 519, 520. Commel. 1600. Hieron. Comment. in Matt. xvi. 18, lib. iii. Oper. vol. vi. p. 33. Colon. 1616. August. Expos. in Evan. Johan. Tract. cxxiv. Oper. vol. ix. p. 206. Colon. 1616.

idea, that Peter *himself* could have been intended.<sup>a</sup> Hilary also agrees with our oldest interpreter extant: for, like Justin, he states, that the Church was built upon the Rock of the Confession of Peter.<sup>b</sup> From the very beginning, then, different interpretations have been given of the clause; and the most ancient, and, as such, the most probably authentic interpretation, is NOT that for which modern Romanists contend, and on which Dr. Milner undauntedly relies to support his theory.

Such being the simple matter of fact, a clause, the import of which has been differently defined by different theologians even from the days of Justin Martyr, who became a convert to Christianity little more than thirty years after the death of St. John, is no specially secure foundation for a grant of Universal Dominant Supremacy to the Apostle Peter. Had the early theologians, from the beginning, *invariably* or *uniformly* understood the clause as the modern Romanists would have us understand it, we admit that a tolerably strong case would have been made out for at least a *personal* Supremacy in Peter: but gravely to build a most important historical FACT upon a palpably uncertain interpretation is surely the very apex of unhesitating fatuity.

The other clause in the text, which confers upon Peter the power of binding and of loosing, is not more satisfactory than that which we have last considered.

To elicit anything from this clause in favour of Peter's Universal Dominant Supremacy, it ought to have been demonstrated, that the power was given to Peter **EXCLUSIVELY**. But exactly the same power of binding and of loosing is subsequently given to *all* the Apostles: nor is the grant attended with the slightest intimation, either that the power was given to Peter in some special though undefined manner above his brethren, or that his brethren were to receive it only *ultimately* from Christ inasmuch as it was *directly* conveyed to them solely through the authoritative medium of their divinely-constituted monarch, the Arch-apostle St. Peter.<sup>c</sup> Origen, indeed, contends for something peculiar in the grant to Peter above all other persons: but Origen is not borne out by the inspired narrative. Tertullian, on the contrary, declared expressly that it was a personal gift to Peter, declaring the Bishop of Rome to be a

<sup>a</sup> Chrysost. Homil. lxxix. in Petr. Apost. et Eliam Proph. Oper. vol. i. p. 856. Serm. de Pentecost. Oper. vol. vi. p. 233. Commel. 1603.

<sup>b</sup> Hilar. de Trin. lib. vi. Oper. p. 903. Paris, 1693. The same view of the text, so far as we can understand him, seems to have been taken by Cyril of Jerusalem. See Cyril Catech. xi. p. 93. Paris, 1631.

<sup>c</sup> Matt. xviii. 18. John xx. 21-23.

usurper for arrogating to himself this special privilege.<sup>a</sup> When Jesus finally, after His resurrection, communicated the power, whatever the *precise* nature of that power might be, He communicated it, *indifferently* to all the Apostles, and *immediately* from Himself.<sup>b</sup> Hence, though Cyprian maintains that unity commences from Peter, building that notion upon his own arbitrary and gratuitous interpretation of *the rock*, he fully admits that the other Apostles were what Peter was; he fully admits that they were endowed with an *equal* partnership both of honour and of power:<sup>c</sup> and, in truth, the whole history of Paul and his fellow-Apostles, as given in the inspired writings, clearly shows their perfect mutual independence; while it is quite silent as to any fancied absolute monarchy of Peter.<sup>d</sup>

Does any Roman Catholic at the present day believe the Pope of Rome has any such power as is here supposed to be conveyed by the gift of the *keys*? Is there one who believes that the Pope of Rome has any such power vested in him? *Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven*, are our Saviour's words to Peter, without any restriction or reservation. Let him realize the thought, and he will at once discard the idea as most impious. Christ gave to Peter, not to Peter only, but also to the other Apostles, the gift of healing the sick and of performing miracles. Why do they claim to be successors of St. Peter in part only of his "prerogatives?" The solution of the question is easy; but as no one can believe in the vain pretensions, it is useless to discuss the question further.

Having now examined every single text separately adduced by Dr. Milner for the doctrine of St. Peter's dominant authority, we unhesitatingly affirm, that not only do these texts afford no testimony that Christ appointed Peter to be the Supreme Head of His Church on earth, but utterly fail in supporting any claim made for him to that lofty position—one, indeed, to which the Apostle himself would never have aspired;<sup>e</sup> and are also as inapplicable in proving that the Bishops of Rome are divinely constituted heirs of the prerogatives of Peter (whatever we may fancy those prerogatives to have been), for it must be borne in mind that it is the title of the "BISHOP OF ROME" and of his "See" for which Dr. Milner is arguing.<sup>f</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Tert. de Pudicitia, cap. 21, tom. iv. p. 434. Halæ Magd. 1771.

<sup>b</sup> John xxi. 21—23.

<sup>c</sup> Epist. Quint. lxxi. Oper. vol. ii. pp. 194, 195. Edit. Oxon. 1632.

<sup>d</sup> See more especially, for Paul's distinctly specified *rationale* of the Apostleship, Galat. i. 11—22; ii. 1—19. Faber's "Difficulties of Romanism," b. i. c. iii.

<sup>e</sup> See Prot. Journal for 1836, p. 583.

<sup>f</sup> See Letter xlvi. p. 437.

We must now direct our attention to the consideration whether, after all, Peter was ever Bishop of Rome. We find Dr. Milner's "Peter-boat" gently gliding down the stream, without affording any notion how he managed to get her off the stocks. He at once introduces us, without a single "by your leave," to St. Peter, as "*The first Pope or Bishop of Rome;*" and this subject we propose to consider in a separate article.

---

SEC. III.—St. Peter's alleged visit to Rome.<sup>a</sup>

Dr. Milner, with his accustomed hardihood, declares "that St. Peter (after governing for a time the Patriarchate of Antioch, the capital of the East, and thence sending his disciple Mark to establish that of Africa at Alexandria) finally fixed his own see at Rome, the capital of the world;" and that Saint Peter was "the first Pope or Bishop of Rome," and that "his successor in the see of Rome succeeds to his primacy and jurisdiction."<sup>b</sup>

The above and one or two other passages of this work are intended to convey to those who are not versed in Ecclesiastical history, the impression that St. Peter lived and died in Europe—that he lived there for the greater part of twenty-five years, and that it was for the sake of the principal Gentile Church that the Apostle thus set at nought the express command of Jesus, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles" (Matt. x. 5).

It is admitted by the Roman clergy, that if St. Peter occupied himself with the see of Rome only in the same general sense in which he is known to have occupied himself with the sees of Alexandria, Carthage, Lyons, Britain, and all the other Gentile cities or countries of his time,—if he did not devote himself to the great Gentile capital in some exclusive manner in which he did not devote himself to any other city, there would be no grounds for the pretensions of their Church to a universal supremacy. Their Church is, they all admit, neither so much older than any other Church, nor so much purer, nor so much more enlightened, nor so much more in accordance with Scripture, nor so much less a Gentile Church, than other Churches, as to entitle it upon such grounds to

<sup>a</sup> We are indebted for this article to Thomas Collins Simon, Esq., the talented author of "The Mission and Martyrdom of St. Peter:" Seeley, London, 1852. We most confidently recommend this book, as it embraces a critical examination of every passage usually adduced from the Fathers in support of the assertion that St. Peter personally went to Rome.

<sup>b</sup> Letter xlvi. pp. 440, 437, 439.



have assumed authority over other cities or other Churches. They therefore insist upon the importance to them of the Apostle's European residence; and happily this grand point is not with them an article of faith. They admit that it is a mere matter of fact, which must stand or fall by whatever evidence there exists respecting it. "It is an historical fact, which we have to prove (says Father McCorry, in his tract upon the subject), and that fact, like every other fact, must be proved by the weight of testimony" (p. 4).

The strongest evidence by which the Roman priesthood have sought to conciliate the belief of uninformed Protestants to this strange notion of Peter's having lived twenty-five years in Europe, consists of the following separate propositions:—

1. That the Fathers speak of Peter as having founded the Church at Rome; from which it is inferred that he went to Rome and lived there soon after our Lord's death.
2. That Eusebius and the rest of the Greek and Roman Fathers said that the word "Babylon" was used by Peter in his Epistle instead of the word Rome; from which it is inferred that the Apostle died in that city.
3. That St. Jerome describes Peter as being Bishop of Rome for twenty-five years in an exclusive and peculiar sense; from which it is inferred that Peter must have resided there during that time.
4. That St. Jerome, in his Latin Chronicon, and likewise Eusebius, in his Greek Chronicon, describe the Apostle as mainly residing in Europe for twenty-five years.

We shall examine each of these propositions, but it may be of use to premise, that the story in question was first put forward by Cardinal Baronius, about the time of the Reformation, and was long believed to exist in the writings of Eusebius and Jerome, although (as is now well known to the learned) neither of these writers affords the slightest foundation for it. However piously intended, the fraud—never cordially supported—became at length so manifest, that it was disclaimed even long before Milner's time by the most zealous of the Papal writers, and with no small amount of indignation by some of them. Charles Du Moulin, the great ecclesiastical lawyer, whom Father Calmet describes as a steadfast Roman Catholic, writes thus:—"Even when, after the breaking up of the empire, the Bishops of Rome began to extend their authority over other churches, they never alleged or put forward this story of Peter's having left the East, which they would not have omitted to do if there had been any such thing to put forward,—a clear proof that there was not, the story not having been yet invented" (vol. iv. p. 460).

Father Hardouin, a learned Jesuit, and zealous partisan of the Papal pretensions, well aware how little historical support the story had, writes to the same effect: "We Roman Catholics hold that at least Peter's head was brought to Rome after his crucifixion, and that it ought to be duly worshipped there; but that the Pope is Christ's substitute and Peter's successor is clear enough, without our being bound to suppose that Peter himself ever came to Rome." The celebrated Father Antonio Pagi, a Franciscan monk, and the most learned as well as partial of Baronius's commentators, honestly declares that the story is "contrary to Scripture."—(See Baronii Annales, vol. i. A.D. 45, note.) And as this fatal objection to it is admitted by all the more learned of the Roman Catholics, we shall here observe what the Scripture information amounts to:—1. Our Lord's command that Peter should not go to the towns or cities in which the Gentiles prevailed, but that he should go to the towns and cities in which there were the greatest number of Jews (Matt. x. 5, 6). 2. Peter's account of himself as resident at Babylon, when his death was at hand (1 Pet. v. 13; 2 Pet. i. 14), Babylon having at that time some hundred thousand Jewish inhabitants, while Rome often had none at all, and never more than a few thousand. 3. Peter's residence in Judea and Syria until Agrippa's death, which took place in the fourth year of the Roman Emperor Claudius, whereas the story reports him to have gone to found the Roman Church in the second year of Claudius. 4. Paul's residence at Rome for two years, without having seen Peter there, nor even heard of his having been there. Such is the Scripture upon this point. Stephen Baluze, a learned and zealous Papist, who died in 1718, says of this story of Baronius: "How preposterous (*absurda*) such a supposition as this is, when no ancient writer states it, those well know who are acquainted with this subject."—(Baluze in Lactant. de Mort. Persecut. cap. 2.) In adverting to this remark of Baluze, Father Ceillier says: "And this also is the view of the matter that I adopt."—(Ceill. vol. i. c. 9.) Father Calmet, who died in 1757, says that even before his time, the supposition of Baronius had been abandoned by the Roman clergy as utterly untenable: "As to saying that Peter lived twenty-five years at Rome as bishop, that is a notion that people do not now pretend to justify."—(Prel. Diss. on 1 Peter.) The amiable and learned Roman Catholic Archbishop De Marca says (De Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii, lib. vi. cap. 1, § 4), in utter contempt of the pious fraud of Baronius: "St. Peter went from Jerusalem to Antioch, and thence to Babylon, where the hereditary

patriarch of the first dispersion of the Jews resided. When established in that city, he wrote his first Epistle."

We see then that the story put forward by Milner is not believed by the Roman Catholics themselves—at least, if by any of them, only by the more ignorant and uninformed; and this would be perhaps enough to make clear respecting it. We shall now, however, proceed to explain, for the satisfaction of our readers, the four propositions above given, out of which Cardinal Baronius was tempted to invent the story, in the hope of thereby arresting the Reformation.

*Proposition 1.*—All the Fathers unite in saying that it was at Jerusalem that St. Peter laid the foundations of the Roman Church, there being Romans among his first converts (Acts ii. 10), who subsequently returned home, "preaching the word" (viii. 4), after the death of Stephen. Thus Gregory of Nyssa, in his sermon upon Stephen, says, "From this time the disciples of the twelve began to traverse the whole world, and this was the beginning of the diffusion of the Gospel in all quarters. In this way it was that Samaria received the word. Thus also the Egyptians, Syrians, Parthians [*i.e.* Babylonians,] and the Mesopotamians, *the Italians* also, and the Illyrians, and the Macedonians began to have their churches."

Irenæus also, after quoting portions of Peter's address from the second chapter of the Acts, says, "These are the words of that church [at Jerusalem], by which *every other church was founded*. These are the words of the parent church—the words of the Apostles, &c., after the ascension of the Lord."—(B. iii. ch. xii. sect. 5.)

St. Athanasius says of these early converts, in his sermon "De Sementi:"—"For they were scattered in this way, in order that in their travels over the world they might diffuse and, as it were, plant the Christian churches."

St. Chrysostom speaks thus of this sudden creation of the Christian churches everywhere:—"For though it is a little thing to say, 'I shall build my Church,' do not hasten over the words as if they were nothing, but unfold them to your understanding, and reflect how immense an act it was in this rapid manner to fill with so many churches every portion of the earth that is inhabited by mankind, and to erect altars everywhere,—in the country of the *Romans*, and of the Persians [*i.e.* Babylonians], in Scythia, in Mauritania, and upon the Indus. But what am I saying? The thing went even beyond this world of ours; for the British Isles, which are situated beyond our sea—which lie, in fact, in the very ocean—these felt the power of those mighty words. Even there, even in

those islands, churches and altars were then erected and the words so spoken were realized in every heart. *Thus it was that His Apostles founded our Lord's churches everywhere.*"<sup>a</sup>

And what says Cardinal Baronius himself? "In the thirty-fifth year after the birth of Christ"—these are his words—"all the Christians except the Apostles were compelled to leave Jerusalem on Stephen's death, when they proceeded into different countries the most widely separated from one another. In these countries they preached the Gospel, and *enabled the Apostles in this manner to multiply under favourable circumstances the churches of God.*"—(Annal. A.D. 35, *init.*)

But Baronius often admits that Peter's presence is not implied in his foundation of a church. "For what does it mean," he asks (A.D. 39, para. 16), "when Peter is said to have founded the Church of Antioch? They are quite wrong who think that Peter must have gone to Antioch for that purpose." And, again: "As Peter's chair at Alexandria, in which it cannot be made to appear that Peter ever was, was founded by that Apostle, it is quite evident that his presence was not necessary to found even a patriarchal see."—(Ibid.)

Thus, though Peter is said to have founded the Church of Rome, there is no reason whatever for supposing him to have gone to that city.

*Proposition 2.*—This is now well known by those versed in Church literature to be altogether a mistake. Neither Eusebius nor any other of the Greek or Latin Fathers have said that "Babylon" meant "Rome" in Peter's First Epistle. Eusebius, indeed, mentions a conjecture to that effect as current among some of the Jewish converts in his day, but that is all; and Eusebius is the only one who mentions even this; no other Greek or Latin Father has even alluded to it. He does not say, however, that a conjecture of that description (formed, moreover, 300 years after the event) appeared to him sufficient foundation for rejecting the information of the Scriptures. He says the contrary; he says the proposed metaphor was too bold (*τροπικώτερον*).—(B. ii. chap. xv.)

What gave credibility for a short time to the story of Baronius was that Jerome, a Latin writer, who, although he himself acknowledged that he was a very bad Greek scholar, yet professed to translate this Greek passage of Eusebius, in his work on Ecclesiastical Authors, simply wrote down, upon the authority of Eusebius, that Peter had used one name for the other, not that there was a rumour of his having done

<sup>a</sup> Chrysost. vol. i. edit. Paris, 1834, p. 702.

so. But even on the supposed authority of Eusebius, Jerome did not reject the Scripture statement, but distinctly states that it was from Babylon Peter wrote.—(Comment. on Haggai, chap. ii.) In Jerome's own Commentary also on Peter's Epistle, he does not so much as mention what his ignorance of Greek led him to suppose was the opinion of Eusebius.

We have observed that none of the Fathers have *sanc-tioned* the rumour recorded by Eusebius any more than Eusebius himself. They have not even recorded it. It is to this that Father Tillemont adverts, when he says, "Bishop Pearson attributes this notion to many of the Fathers. It is to be regretted that he has not mentioned who they were. He did not, however, himself entertain it."<sup>a</sup> And scarcely any of the more enlightened Roman Catholic writers have adopted the practice of the few Jewish converts alluded to by Eusebius, even though they supposed that they had the authority of Eusebius and other Fathers to uphold them in doing so. "Peter's First Epistle," says Father Dupin, "was written from Babylon. Some of the ancients were of opinion that Rome was meant by this name, but this interpretation would not be natural. We cannot precisely assign the time when it was written; but we may consider that it was written at Babylon, A.D. 45."—(Prelim. Diss. sect. 4.) We have already seen what was the opinion of the Roman Catholic Archbishop De Marca; and Father Calmet says, that several other distinguished Romanists had long given up the rumour, as a frivolous innovation upon Scripture. But in fact, all now, except the more ignorant Romanists, find themselves reduced to the necessity of abandoning this rumour, however vaguely they may choose to express themselves on the subject: for they are all agreed that the Epistle was written about A.D. 45, while Claudius was Emperor; so that supposing it written in Europe, is supposing Peter to have left the East in the reign of Claudius, that notion of Baronius which (as we have already shown) all the learned in communion with the Church of Rome now acknowledge to be utterly untenable. Upon what grounds then is it, we ask, that enlightened Protestants are expected to listen to a Roman story, which Romanists themselves do not believe?

*Proposition 3.*—It is quite a mistake to suppose that Jerome describes Peter as being Bishop of Rome for twenty-five years in any other sense than as he was Bishop of Carthage, Canterbury, or Alexandria for the same time. Jerome has said exactly the contrary: "Peter did not fix his see in any

<sup>a</sup> Till. art. Peter, note 31, vol. i. part 2, 749, edit. Bruxelles, 1706.

single city only. The whole world was Peter's see."—(Jer. adv. Vigilantium.) And that was the view that all the Fathers took of this matter. St. Augustine says, that "Peter received the whole world as his diocese."—(Aug. in Psalm ciii. serm. iii. sec. 16, vol. iv. p. 1161.) Gregory the Great says that Alexandria was as much Peter's see as any other church, and that the Bishop of Alexandria was then sitting in Peter's chair as well as himself.—(Lib. vi. Epist. 40.) In the same spirit St. Gildas speaks of Peter as bishop of these islands.—(Gild. De Excid. Brit. p. 2.) Thus we see that though some of the Fathers speak of Peter as the bishop of single countries or cities, as Alexandria, England, Antioch, Rome, &c., they considered it untrue as well as unorthodox to speak of him in the way modern Romanists do, as having *fixed* his see anywhere; and we further perceive from the above references, as well as many others, that even if it were true that Peter was exclusively Bishop of Alexandria, Britain, or Rome, his having been bishop of a place would not imply his having gone to that place, as Cardinal Bellarmine frankly admits, arguing that "many who were Bishops of Rome never resided at Rome; such as Clement V., John XXII., Benedict XII., Clement VI., and Innocent VI., who were ordained in France, and in France lived all their lives."—(Bell. De Summ. Pontif. lib. ii. chap. 1). And Father Hardouin, as we have seen, argues to the same effect. But we may here observe, that it was not until a very late period that any of the Fathers spoke of Peter as a bishop at all. Even up to the time of Eusebius this was not done. "The Apostles," says De Valois, the learned Roman Catholic commentator upon Eusebius, "had a rank peculiar to themselves, nor were they reckoned among the bishops" (On Eusebius, iii. 14); and again,— "It must not be forgotten that Eusebius never reckons the Apostles among the bishops of the Churches. . . . Irenæus, as well as Eusebius, says that Peter and Paul laid the first foundations of the Church of Rome, but these writers nowhere reckon them among the bishops of that church."—(iii. 21.) But this point is unimportant. What it is really of moment to remember is, that even if Peter was Bishop of Rome thirty-five years, as some say, or twenty-five, as others inform us, that fact does not prove him to have been at Rome at all, or to have been its bishop in other sense than as St. Gildas said he was Bishop of Britain, or as Gregory the Great said he was Bishop of Alexandria, or as Augustine and Jerome say he was bishop of the whole world.

*Proposition 4.*—It remains that we should now show upon

what grounds all well-informed Roman Catholics reject this fourth portion of the historical evidence adduced by Baronius. The chief facts to be here stated are, that Eusebius wrote in Greek, and Jerome in Latin,—the one being a Greek, the other a Latin Father; that Eusebius first wrote his Chronicon and then his History; that his Chronicon is now wholly lost; that Jerome was an indifferent Greek scholar; that what is now sometimes erroneously called his Translation of Eusebius's Greek Chronicon, he himself admitted was not a translation of that work, but a compilation from various writers, from Eusebius among the rest; that the MSS. of Jerome's Chronicon reached the first editors full of interpolations and changes; that it appeared to Baronius and others that it must have been even altered in form and arrangement from what Jerome originally wrote; that we have now, therefore, no clue as to what there was or was not in the original Greek Chronicon of Eusebius—no clue even as to what there was or was not in the original Latin Chronicon of Jerome,—Baronius and all the Roman clergy admitting that it cannot be relied upon *per se* for any one statement that it contains; that the passage in it about Peter's having lived twenty-five years at Rome is nevertheless not unlikely to have really originated with Jerome, as there is a somewhat similar passage in Jerome's Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Authors, which work he acknowledges that he compiled from Eusebius; that if it really did originate with Jerome, it is very uncertain whether Jerome used the terms of this passage in any other than their ecclesiastical sense; that in their mere ecclesiastical sense they neither denote a journey to Rome nor a residence there; that if they are to be looked upon in any other light, the passage is a mere mistranslation from Eusebius (B. ii. c. 14); that Jerome, however, has nowhere, even upon the supposed authority of Eusebius, incorporated this statement with his own original writings, although these writings are extremely voluminous; that none of the other Greek or Latin Fathers, except two, ever noticed it; and that these two only noticed it as a statement of Jerome's.

The passage from Jerome's Chronicon runs thus:—"In the second year of Claudius, Peter, as soon as he had founded the Church of Antioch, is given the mission of Rome (*Romam mittitur*), where he promulgated the Gospel, and he was also the bishop of that church for twenty-five years, without cessation."

It has already been shown that, in ecclesiastical language, "to found a church," or "to be its bishop," does not imply a person's presence. Those Apostles were also said "to pro-

mulgate" the Gospel anywhere, who caused it to be preached there; and "to have the mission" of a city, or "to proceed" to it, who occupied themselves about its church. Thus, Nicephorus (xiv. 39) says that "when Peter had arranged the Church of Rome, he next *proceeded* (*μετέβαινεν*) to Alexandria," although it was well known that he never went there. The ancient Latin translator here uses *transit* to express this ecclesiastical sense. So that we see there is a great probability of Jerome's having only used these words in an ecclesiastical acceptation in his passage; but if we prefer to attach the ordinary meaning to the word, we see that this naturally resulted from the attempt of one little versed in Greek literature to translate the passage in Eusebius ii. 14, where the Apostle is said to have had his exertions directed against the Samaritan heresy at Rome, while he was still residing at Jerusalem.

Jerome's ignorance of Greek he himself acknowledges in his preface to his Latin Chronicon.

The interpolations, alterations and errors, of which the Chronicon almost wholly consists, are attested by Baronius (A.D. 325, para. 215), where he speaks of it as a "labyrinth of error."

Father Ceillier (vol. iv. p. 256) explains how Eusebius wrote his Chronicon before his History, which was the larger and completer work; and that the Chronicon was wholly lost. He also explains (p. 221) the fictitious character of a work which passed for some time under the name of Eusebius's Chronicon; but which was a mere mass of extracts, compiled by Scaliger from recent writers.

The reader will now see what substantial reasons induced the enlightened Roman Catholics to refuse to defend their church by so frivolous and groundless a story as that brought forward by Baronius, and here repeated by Dr. Milner for circulation among uninformed Protestants. But why, we again ask, should Roman Catholics now call upon the latter to believe what the better informed among themselves have long ago regarded as a groundless and even an absurd story?

---

SEC. IV.—Historical Evidence.—St. Paul.—Ignatius.—Clement of Rome.  
—Irenæus.—Tertullian.—Origen.—Cyprian.—Jerome.

Having comfortably established St. Peter as the Bishop of Rome, by the mere power of assertion unsupported by any proof whatever, Dr. Milner proceeds to affirm that "his successors there [at Rome] have each of them exercised the power of supreme pastor; and that they have been acknowledged by



all Christians, except by notorious heretics and schismatics, from the apostolic age down to the present, the writers, and doctors, historians of the church unanimously testify." <sup>a</sup> Here there is a direct appeal to the testimony of history, and by which Dr. Milner seems to be willing to test the claim raised by his church for the supremacy and presidency of her chief bishop. We now propose to examine these authorities.

1. ST. PAUL.—The first authority appealed to is St. Paul, "who (we are told), having been converted and raised to the apostleship in a miraculous manner, thought it necessary to go up to Jerusalem to see Peter, where he abode with him fifteen days (Galat. i. 18)."—(p. 440.) It is strange that Dr. Milner should force the meaning of a writer so accessible to every one. That St. Paul *thought it necessary* to go to Jerusalem to visit Peter is a stretch of the doctor's imagination: his own translation of the Testament tells him simply, "Then three years after [he had gone to Arabia and again returned to Damascus] I came to Jerusalem to see Peter, and stayed with him fifteen days." It is natural that St. Paul, "being called to the grace of Christ," should be desirous to see Peter, one of the foremost, if not the chief, of the Apostles, and certainly, according to tradition, the eldest of them. But how this can prove a Supremacy in Peter is quite beyond our comprehension. This took place about A.D. 38.<sup>b</sup> St. Luke, in his history of the "Acts of the Apostles," in the ninth chapter, describes St. Paul's journey to Damascus, and afterwards to Jerusalem at this time. It is wholly impossible to trace any hint or allusion in the circumstance related by him, from which we can deduce any such inference as Dr. Milner desires to convey from the fact of St. Paul's visit; on the contrary, he does not even so much as name St. Peter, though he enters into various circumstances which occurred to himself while at Jerusalem.

Chrysostom, commenting on the fact of St. Paul's visit, is very far from drawing any argument in favour of St. Peter's primacy from it; indeed, had such a primacy been acknowledged by Chrysostom, he would, like Dr. Milner and other modern Romanists, have taken this opportunity of asserting the fact; but Chrysostom seems to make it a condescension on the part of St. Paul. He says, "What can indicate more humility than this intention ( $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta\sigma$ )? After so many and so great exploits, having no need at all of Peter, or of his discourses, *but being in dignity equal to him* (for I will now say no more), he yet doth go up to him, as to one greater

<sup>a</sup> Letter xlvi. p. 440.

<sup>b</sup> Acts ix. 26, is considered the parallel passage.

and more ancient ; and a sight alone of Peter is the cause of his journey thither.”—“ He went, not to learn anything of him, nor to receive any correction from him, but for this only, that he might see him and honour him with his presence.”<sup>a</sup>

But why did not Dr. Milner pass on to the subject narrated by St. Paul in the second chapter to the Galatians? Fourteen years after, namely A.D. 52, St. Paul went up again to Jerusalem, because “ of false brethren ” having preached erroneously with reference to circumcision.—(Acts xv.) Here he expressly informs us that he was the chosen Apostle to preach to the Gentiles, while Peter was chosen for the “ apostleship of the circumcision.” The subject was discussed at Jerusalem among the Apostles there ; but when St. Peter subsequently went to Antioch, St. Paul “ withstood him to his face (before them all), because he was to be blamed.”—(Gal. ii. 11, 14.)

But if St. Paul be appealed to as bearing testimony on the subjects, *first*, as to St. Peter’s having occupied the See of Rome ; and, *second*, of his recognized position as Supreme Bishop of the whole Christian Church, and consequently that St. Paul was subject to him, we could briefly reply, that no such conclusion can be gathered from his writings ; the negative evidence, on the contrary, may be strongly urged :—

I. St. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans, as the Rhemish Testament acknowledges, “ about twenty-four years after our Lord’s ascension,” viz. A.D. 57. He nowhere in this Epistle so much as names Peter as being at Rome, though he sends his salutations to numerous persons there, and mentions twenty-six by name. Perrone, the Jesuit Lecturer at Rome,<sup>b</sup> is sadly incommoded by the inference so fairly deducible from the *silence* of St. Paul, against any residence of St. Peter in that city, when *some* mention of him at least would have been so natural. Perrone thinks that the omission may be paralleled by the absence of any reference to the bishops of other sees in other Epistles ; but after having endeavoured to squeeze an argument for St. Peter’s chieftainship out of nearly all his public actions,<sup>c</sup> and making all of them bear witness to his having had a dominant superiority conferred upon him, and which he began to exercise in the first Council ; how utterly inconsistent to imagine him placed in actual possession of the throne of his glory, and yet that nothing should be heard of him, not a single recognition of his giving any *order*,

<sup>a</sup> Chrysost. in Gal. i. 18, p. 804, tom. x. Paris, 1837.

<sup>b</sup> Prælectiones Theologicæ, tom. ii. de Primatu, sec. 556, edit. Mediol. 1845.

<sup>c</sup> See Elliott’s “ Delineation of Romanism,” p. 615. London, 1851.

no sign of presence. Whether he had, unfortunately, just gone off to his country seat at Albano, we cannot say; there is no trace of him anywhere. Tradition is, in short, confessedly needed (see Perrone *ut suprà*, § 540 and note), to act as an interpreter in an obscure matter, and to explain to us that the supremacy is there to be found; and it being thus plain (so they say) from *tradition* why the primacy was instituted, it is evident that this article of faith is founded on *Scripture*. St. Paul himself proceeded to Rome, from whence he wrote several Epistles. The same Rhemish translation—the edition now in general use in England—informs us that he wrote his Epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians, from Rome, about A.D. 64. In these he names several persons then at Rome, who desired their salutation, but Peter is not named. His Second Epistle to Timothy was also written from Rome in the time of his last imprisonment at Rome, and not long before his martyrdom; namely, A. D. 66, when he was brought before Nero the second time. And here we have very strong presumptive evidence, that Peter was not there at that period. Paul complained that all but Luke had forsaken him. “At my first answer no man stood with me, but all forsook me. I pray God that it may not be laid to their charge.”<sup>a</sup> Had Peter been there, would he have left Paul to suffer alone?<sup>b</sup>

Tradition informs us that St. Peter boldly faced death; if at Rome then, why should he have forsaken Paul in the hour of need? And, if so, either as bishop or otherwise, how very remiss he must have been in his duty as shepherd of his sheep; for, in addition to the above facts, Paul states, that at this time, when Onesiphorus “was in Rome he, sought me out very *diligently*, and found me.” Had the supposed “Supreme Pontiff,” Peter, been there, he would have had no difficulty in finding out through him so important an Apostle.

II. And, secondly, we can discover no allusion whatever to the supposition of Paul being in any way *subject* to Peter. If any inference of this kind is to be drawn from the New Testament, we should be led to consider that Paul was more favoured than Peter. We expressly read, that upon Paul devolved “the care of all the Churches.”<sup>c</sup> How conclusive would this have appeared to Romanists had thus much been affirmed of Peter! Besides, Paul himself declared, that “in nothing [no

<sup>a</sup> 2 Tim. iv. 11 and 16.

<sup>b</sup> See this subject ably followed out in a pamphlet entitled “The See of Rome, its Claims to Supremacy examined,” being an extract and translation from the “Recueil Catholique.” London and Edinburgh, 1852.

<sup>c</sup> 2 Cor. xi. 23; and see Acts ix. 15, xiii. 2.

gift, endowment, privilege, or right] am I behind the very chiefest of the Apostles."—(2 Cor. xii. 11.) Again, he said of himself, that he "was not a whit behind the very chiefest of the Apostles."—(2 Cor. xi. 5.) And this declaration he made upwards of thirty years after St. Peter is supposed to have assumed the supreme government of the Church, as Christ's representative. Peter's mission was destined to be among the Jews. We find him, therefore, as the Apostle of the circumcision, carrying out his mission in Jerusalem, Cæsarea, Lydda, and Joppa, at which latter place he remained some time. After this he preached to the Jews dispersed through Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia; and, lastly (as is generally supposed), in Babylon, in Assyria.—(1 Peter v. 13.) It was not his office, therefore, as far as we can learn from the Scriptures, to preach to the Gentiles in their own country, much less to exercise any primacy over the Gentile churches. While, on the contrary, Paul was called to preach to the uncircumcised.—(Rom. xi. 13; Gal. i. 6, 7.) And Rome came under his especial care, and was therefore appointed by God to a special and independent charge, irrespective of Peter or any other supposed supreme Pontiff of Christ's Church. And this is borne out by the testimony of Gregory of Nazianzum, esteemed by Romanists a Father of the Church, who in the Thirty-third Oration, sec. 11 (attributed to him), distinctly confined Peter's sphere of action to Judea.

In no one passage do we find related of Peter, as of Paul, "that he had received grace and apostleship for obedience to the faith among all nations, for His [Christ's] name."—(Rom. i. 5.) And further, we have Scriptural evidence that Paul resided at Rome for a considerable period of time, but none at all respecting Peter; the evidence is against such a supposition.

Ambrose, bishop of Milan, A.D. 390, another Father and a saint canonized by the Roman Catholic Church, recorded his opinion that "neither was Paul inferior to Peter—being well to be compared even with the first, and second to none."<sup>a</sup> And another Father, also a canonized saint, St. Chrysostom (A.D. 400), said, "For what was greater than Peter, what equal to Paul?"<sup>b</sup> And again he says, "Christ committed the Jews to Peter, but set Paul over the Gentiles;"—"he [Paul] doth further show himself to be equal to them in dignity, and compared himself not only to others, but even

<sup>a</sup> Nec Paulus inferior Petro, cum primo quoque facile conferendus, et nulli secundus.—Amb. Oper. vol. iv. De Spiritu Sancto, lib. ii. cap. 12, col. 254. Paris, 1661.

<sup>b</sup> Chrys. tom. v. Orat. 167.

to the ringleader, showing that *each did enjoy equal dignity.*"<sup>a</sup> His work, "The Praises of Paul," is replete with such passages as the following:—"He was the light of the churches, the foundation of faith, the pillar and ground of truth;" "Nothing was more bright, nothing more illustrious than he;" "None was greater than he, yea, none equal to him;" "He had the whole patronage committed unto his hands." Peter, it is very evident, did not hold the primacy in the estimation of *Saint Chrysostom*. All the Apostles with him were equal, for while extolling Paul, he included Peter and the others: "But when I speak of Paul, I mean not only him, but also Peter and James and John, and all their choir. For as in a lyre there are different strings, but one harmony; so, too, in the choir of the Apostles, there were different persons, but one teaching; since one, too, was the musician, even the Holy Spirit, who moved their souls. And Paul, signifying this, said, 'Whether, therefore, it were they or I, so we preach.'"<sup>b</sup>

Even Pope Gregory I. acknowledged that Paul "was made head of the nations, because he obtained the principate of the whole world."<sup>c</sup>

2. IGNATIUS.—His second witness is "St. Ignatius" (p. 440).

"St. Ignatius, who was a disciple of the Apostles, and next successor, after Evodius, of St. Peter in the see of Antioch, addresses his most celebrated Epistle to the church, which he says 'PRESIDES in the country of the Romans.'"

It is difficult to comprehend what these few words, "presides in the country of the Romans," have to do with Peter's primacy, or the supremacy of the Pope of Rome over the whole Christian Church. Ignatius wrote about the year 100. Six Epistles are attributed to him, which are said to have been written very shortly before his martyrdom: he refers to the approaching event frequently. The six Epistles were written to the Ephesians, Magnesians, Trallians, Romans, Philadelphians, and Smyrnæans. In his Epistle to the Romans, he says, "Ignatius, who is also called Theophorus, to the church which has obtained mercy from the most Holy Father, and his only begotten Son Jesus Christ; beloved and illuminated through the will of Him who willeth all things which are according to the love of Jesus Christ our God; which also presides in the place of the region of the Romans; and which I salute in the name of Jesus Christ, as being united both in

<sup>a</sup> p. 440, vol. iii., Paris, 1835; and p. 811, vol. x., Paris, 1837.

<sup>b</sup> And see St. Chrys. Oper. tom. ii. p. 594, B. Bened. edit. Paris.

<sup>c</sup> "Caput effectus est nationum, quia obtinuit totius Ecclesiæ principatum."—(Greg. M. in I. Reg. lib. iv. Videsis.) "Paulus Apostolorum Princeps."—(Epist. Spalat. in Lat. Syn. sub P. Jul. II. sess. 1, p. 25, quoted by Barrow.)

flesh and spirit to all His commands, and filled with the grace of God in Jesus Christ," &c.<sup>a</sup>

In addressing his letter to this church, he refers to it most naturally as presiding in the place of the region of the Romans; we shall presently see that he uses the same manner of speech to the other churches, and far from conferring any precedence or universal government centred in this church, his words clearly indicate a *limited* jurisdiction to that peculiar region. There is nothing in the entire Epistle which could by any possibility denote any superiority in this particular church; on the contrary, he says, "I write to the *churches*, and signify to them all, that I am willing to die for God!" Again, he says (sec. 9), "Remember in your prayers the Church of Syria, which now enjoys God for its shepherd, instead of me: let Jesus Christ alone oversee it, and your love."

Ignatius was bishop of Antioch, and, as Dr. Milner intimates, next successor, after Evodius, to St. Peter himself, who is supposed to have been the first bishop of that place. Milner, a few lines before, says, that "St. Peter, after governing for a time the Patriarchate of Antioch, finally fixed his own see at Rome, the capital of the world." Peter's martyrdom is said to have taken place A. D. 61; so that at the time when St. Ignatius wrote this Epistle, Peter must have already occupied his see, then in his alleged successor's possession. It would be natural to suppose that Ignatius would have referred to so peculiar a privilege, but nothing of the sort appears. The only reference to St. Peter is in the following: "Pray, therefore, unto Christ for me, that by these instruments [wild beasts, referring to his approaching death] I may be made the sacrifice of God. I do not, as Peter and Paul command you. They were Apostles, I a condemned man," &c.

We shall now see that his language towards the Church of Rome was nothing peculiar. In his Epistle to the Ephesians, he writes, "Ignatius, who is called Theophorus, to the church which is at *Ephesus*, in Asia, most deservedly happy, being blessed through the greatness and fulness of God the Father, and predestinated before the world began, that it should be always unto an enduring and unchangeable glory, being united and chosen through his true passion according to the will of the Father," &c. He calls them "much beloved in God," that they had "perfectly accomplished the work that was co-natural unto you," and "famous throughout the

<sup>a</sup> Archbishop Wake's Translation from the text of Vossius.

world." He exhorts them to be "subject," not to the see or Bishop of Rome, but to their own "bishop and presbytery, that they might be wholly and thoroughly sanctified;" "for your famous presbytery, worthy of God [he said] is fitted as exactly to the bishop, as the strings are to the harp." He refers frequently to the excellency of their bishop, as enjoying in this respect a peculiar privilege. Is it not strange that he did not refer to the greater privilege which the see of Rome is pretended to have enjoyed, as being presided over by the "Chief Apostle," and then his legitimate successor! and as Dr. Milner adds, then exercising "the power of Supreme Pastor, and acknowledged as such by all Christians?" In this Epistle he nowhere names Peter, but he speaks of Paul as "The holy, the martyr, the deservedly most happy Paul."

To the Magnesians he writes, "To the blessed [Church of Magnesia], by the grace of God the Father in Jesus Christ our Saviour: in whom I salute the church which is at Magnesia." He speaks much of their bishops and presbyters, he urges them, "as becomes those who are prudent in God, submitting to him [their bishop], or rather not to him." Does he here then refer to the Bishop of *Rome* as Supreme Pastor? No; "but to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Bishop of us all."

The Pope of Rome modern Romanists declare to be "Vicar or Representative of Christ." Here Ignatius calls the Bishop of Magnesia "bishop presiding in the place of God," their presbyters as presiding "in the place of the Council of the Apostles," and exhorts them all to "study to be confirmed in the doctrine of our Lord and of His Apostles."

To the *Trallians* he writes, "To the holy church which is at Tralles, in Asia, beloved of God the Father of Jesus Christ, elect and worthy of God, having peace through the flesh and blood and passion of Jesus Christ, &c." He speaks of them as continuing in the apostolical character; he also refers to their bishops.

And to the like effect he wrote to the *Philadelphians*.

To the Smyrnæans he writes in a similar manner:—"To the church of God the Father, and of the beloved Jesus Christ, blessed with every good gift; being filled with faith and love, and being wanting in no gift; most worthy of God, and fruitful in saints; the church which is in Smyrna, in Asia;" and declares them to be "settled in an immovable faith." Romanists assert, Where the Pope of Rome is, there is the Catholic Church. Ignatius, in this Epistle, says, "Where Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church" (§ 8).

We have been particular in going through all the six Epistles, for it will satisfy any candid reader that the fact of Ignatius stating that the Church of Rome "presided in the place of the region of the Romans," when compared with a like reference to the other churches, did not disclose any acknowledgment on his part that the Bishop of Rome "exercised a supreme power" over other churches *out* of the "place of the region of the Romans." Nor did his praises of that church place it above other churches, for his language, if anything, is more laudatory when writing to other churches. Unless it were to make a vain display of the name of a Christian martyr, we are at a loss to perceive why Ignatius should be cited as a witness to the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome over the primitive Church.

3. CLEMENT OF ROME.—The third witness is thus introduced:—"About the same time, dissensions taking place in the Church of Corinth, the case was referred to the Church of Rome, to which the holy Pope Clement, *whose name is written in the Book of Life* (Philip. iv. 3), returned an Apostolical answer of exhortation and instruction" (p. 440). We cannot discover under what authority, except his own, Dr. Milner asserts that the case of the Corinthians was referred to the Church of Rome. It is true that Clement wrote an Epistle, full of love and Christian feeling, to the Corinthians; but he neither wrote as an Apostle, nor as one in authority, nor was his Epistle addressed as from one holding supreme authority, or any authority at all, over all churches, and certainly not in the form or on the pattern of a modern Pope's letter. It did not go forth as from himself; but he writes, "The church of God which is at Rome, to the church of God which is at Corinth, elect, sanctified by the will of God through Jesus Christ our Lord." Each he acknowledges "a church of God;" nor does he place his own church higher than that of Corinth. There is not one word throughout the whole of these two Epistles to indicate that Clement assumed to himself any such position as Dr. Milner would fain make out for him. On the contrary, he says, "Christ is theirs, who are humble, and who do not exalt themselves over the flock" (§ 16). The Epistle runs altogether in the same strain. Nor is there the slightest historical evidence extant to warrant the supposition that either the Church of Corinth or any other church recognized in the Bishop of Rome a superior ecclesiastical jurisdiction; and were it the subject of the present discussion, we might show that there is a large portion in this Epistle of pure and unadulterated Christianity, which would ill accord with modern Romish teaching. If the fact



of writing a letter of "exhortation and instruction" to the Corinthians conferred any peculiar privilege on the writer, Paul had already occupied the ground, in having first written a truly Apostolic exhortation to these same Corinthians; and yet no person would say that *therefore* Paul had a superior jurisdiction over them. We might refer to other Epistles of a similar nature, if it were any argument to the point.

There was not wanting an opportunity, in this Epistle to the Corinthians, for Clement to assert or refer to his supposed privilege as Supreme Pastor. He writes at some length concerning the ministry; and there are many remarkable passages in which he could not have omitted mentioning so important an office as that of the one Supreme Bishop of the Church, had any such then been recognized, particularly as successor of one particular Apostle, specially appointed by Christ to that peculiar office.

Again, as he had special reason to refer to Peter, as also to Paul, the following extract will show in what way he referred to each of them and their work in the ministry for Christ's sake; and where also he might have availed himself, as the supposed successor of St. Peter, to have referred to his peculiar office and jurisdiction; but, on the contrary, his attention was more forcibly directed to Paul; and this as Bishop of Rome was natural enough, as Paul was most certainly at Rome, and laboured there for two years, and died there; while there is not one line of historical evidence, as we have proved, that St. Peter was ever at Rome at all.

"Let us set before our eyes the holy Apostles. Peter, by unjust envy, underwent not one or two, but many sufferings; till at last, being martyred, he went to the place of glory that was due unto him. For the same cause, did Paul, in like manner, receive the reward of his patience. Seven times he was in bonds; he was banished, was stoned; *he preached both in the East and the West*, leaving behind him the glorious report of his faith; and so having taught the whole world righteousness, and for that end travelled even to the utmost bounds of the West, he at last suffered martyrdom by the command of the governors, and departed out of the world, and went unto his holy place; being become a most eminent pattern of patience unto all ages" (§ 5).<sup>a</sup>

Clement, in the same First Epistle to the Corinthians, quoted by Dr. Milner (though apocryphal), is made to call James, our Lord's brother, "the Bishop of Bishops."<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> We have here adopted Archbishop Wake's Translation.

<sup>b</sup> "Episcopo Episcoporum."—See Concil. Lab. tom. i. col. 32E. Paris, 1671. Epist. Clement. Papæ I. ad Jacobum Fratrem Domini.

4. IRENÆUS.—The fourth witness cited is Irenæus:—"In the second century St. Irenæus, who had been instructed by St. Polycarp, the disciple of St. John the Evangelist, referring to the tradition of the Apostles preserved in the Church of Rome, calls it 'the greatest, most ancient, and most universally known, as having been founded by St. Peter and St. Paul; to which (he says) every church is bound to conform, by reason of its superior authority;'" and as a note is added,—*"Ad hanc ecclesiam convenire necesse est omnem ecclesiam. —Contra Hæres. l. iii. c. 3."*—(Letter xlvi. p. 441.)

As Irenæus lived at the latter half of the second century, his testimony as historical evidence deserves particular attention. By giving a garbled, truncated citation, which has not the merit of being even a translation, Dr. Milner hopes to press the respected name of this bishop into his rank of witnesses in proof of Peter's episcopate of Rome, and of his having the supremacy over all others. Irenæus wrote in Greek; but we rely almost solely on a Latin translation, and we have few means of testing its accuracy. The entire passage, so far as is applicable to the point in issue, is as follows:—

"The tradition of the Apostles, manifested throughout the whole world, may be seen in the Church by all who wish to hear the truth: and we can reckon up, both those who by the Apostles were appointed bishops in the churches, and the successors of those bishops down even to our own times.—But, since in such a volume as this it would occupy too much space to enumerate the successions of all the churches, we shall confound all those persons who, from whatever bad motive, make their deductions thus inaccurately, by simply indicating that apostolic tradition and that declared faith of the greatest and most ancient and universally known church, founded at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles Peter and Paul, which has come down even to us through the succession of her bishops. For to this church, on account of the more potent principality, it is necessary that every church should resort; that is to say, those faithful individuals who are on every side of it: in which church, by those who are on every side of it, the tradition, which is from the Apostles, has always been preserved. The blessed Apostles, then, founding and building up that church, delivered to Linus the office of administering it.—But to him succeeded Anacletus; and, after him, in the third place from the Apostles, Clement received the episcopate.—The successor of Clement was Euaristus; and, of Euaristus, Alexander. Next to him, the sixth from the Apostles, Sixtus was appointed; after him, Telesphorus:—next, Hyginus: then, Pius:

and then, Anicetus. But, when Soter had succeeded Anicetus, Eleutherius now holds the episcopate, in the twelfth place from the Apostles.”<sup>a</sup>

With the entire passage before us, we have no difficulty in ascertaining the true value of the evidence adduced. We may safely admit, though it has not been satisfactorily proved, that at this time the Roman bishopric was a most potent see. Rome was the seat of the empire, and the most important city; but this is no reason for declaring that she had any ecclesiastical authority or jurisdiction over other churches. No such deduction can be drawn from the words of Irenæus. The deception lies in the insufficiency of the quotation of Dr. Milner; the words immediately following give the key to the passage, “For to this church, on account of the more potent principality, it is necessary that every church should resort.” Now here Irenæus proceeds to explain his meaning, “that is to say, those faithful individuals who are on every side of it:” “eos qui sunt undique” cannot mean “every church,” according to the sense Dr. Milner would desire to convey. To serve his own purpose, the doctor has thought proper to express the phrase of Irenæus by the English words *its superior authority*, thus compelling this venerable father to ascribe to the Roman Church a universal dominant supremacy; and in order that the context may fitly correspond with his somewhat diffuse rendering, he makes Irenæus state that every church is bound to conform “to the see of Rome.”

The true sense of the passage is evident when compared with parallel passages from Tertullian and Jerome.

The passage from Tertullian is as follows:—

“Let heretics, then, produce the origin of their churches; let them evolve the order of their bishops, so running through successions from the beginning, that the first bishop should have for his author and predecessor some one either of the Apostles themselves, or of *apostolical men*, their contemporaries. For, in this manner, the *apostolical churches* carry down their enrolments. Thus, the church of the Smyrnæans relates itself to have Polycarp there placed by John. Thus the church of the Romans adduces Clement *ordained* by Peter [he does not say that Peter himself was bishop]. Thus, likewise, other churches exhibit those whom, being appointed by the Apostles to the episcopate, they have as the channels of the apostolic seed.”—“Come now, thou who shalt wish better to exercise thy curiosity in the business of thy salvation; run through the

<sup>a</sup> The original text of this passage we have given above, pp. 61-2, note c.

*apostolic churches* in which the very *chairs of the apostles* are still in their own places occupied, in which their identical authentic letters are recited, sounding forth the voice, and representing the face, of each one. *Is Achaia near to thee? Thou hast Corinth. If thou art not far from Macedonia, thou hast Philippi, thou hast Thessalonica. If thou canst go into Asia, thou hast Ephesus. Or if thou art adjacent to Italy, thou hast Rome; whence also, to us Africans, there is an authority near at hand. Happy Church, to which the Apostles, along with their own blood, poured out their whole doctrine!*"<sup>a</sup>

We shall presently see that Tertullian considered all churches "conspiring in the same faith were accounted by him as apostolical churches, because of the consanguinity of doctrine;" and, with respect to churches planted by the Apostles, he considered them all of equal worth.

Jerome, of the Latin Church, writing to Pope Damasus, stated that he followed none as first but Christ, and was associated in communion with the Bishop of Rome (probably his own bishop, and certainly his intimate friend), but, being absent, and not being able to have recourse to him, he held to that bishop to whom he was nearest, namely, the "faithful Egyptians."<sup>b</sup> In fact, he declares that all bishops, in point of merit and dignity, are equal, and all of them are successors of the Apostles: "Wheresoever a bishop is, whether at Rome, or Eugubium, or Constantinople, or Alexandria, he is of the same worth and the same priesthood."<sup>c</sup> Irenæus himself bears testimony with regard to other churches to the following effect:—"This is a most full demonstration, that there is one and the same vivifying faith, which, in the Church, has been preserved and handed down in truth, from the Apostles even to the present time:—for the Church at Ephesus, founded, indeed, originally by Paul, but having John permanently residing among its members, even so late as the days of Trajan, is a true witness of that which was delivered by the Apostles."<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> —Age jam, qui, vales curiositatem melius exercere in negotio salutis tuæ, percurrere ecclesias apostolicas, apud quas ipsæ adhuc cathedræ Apostolorum suis locis præsentur, apud quas ipsæ authenticæ literæ eorum recitantur, sonantes vocem et repræsentantes faciem uniuscujusque. Proxima est tibi Achaia? Habes Corinthum. Si non longe es a Macedonia: habes Philippos; habes Thessalonicenses. Si potes in Asiam tendere: habes Ephesum. Si autem Italiæ adjaces: habes Romam; unde nobis quoque autoritas præsto est. Felix ecclesia, cui totam doctrinam Apostoli cum sanguine suo profuderunt, &c. —Tertull. Præscript. adv. Hæret. sec. 11, 14. Oper. pp. 107, 108, 109, edit. Bea. Rhenani, 1550; and capp. 32, 36, p. 216, Paris, 1675.

<sup>b</sup> Epist. ad Damas. lvii. tom. ii. p. 175. Paris, 1602. See *infra*, title "Jerome."

<sup>c</sup> Hier. ad Evag. vol. iv. par. 2, Ep. ci. alias lxxxv. p. 803. Paris, 1706. See *infra*, "Jerome."

<sup>d</sup> Et est plenissima hæc ostensio, unam et eandem vivificatricem fidem esse,

With these extracts before us, it is abundantly evident, that in any question of doctrine or discipline arising among the members of adjacent churches, or in the provinces, Irenæus recommends that appeal should be made to the nearest apostolically founded Metropolitan Mother-Church, to which the "faithful who are on every side of it should resort."

This passage, therefore, can in no way assist the cause of "Papal Supremacy."

But Dr. Milner, in order yet further to establish his position from Irenæus, adduces (after others) the supposed exercise of a predominant authority in the case of the Roman Bishop Victor—the circumstances attendant on which we should otherwise have viewed as supplying proof sufficient that the Bishop of Rome had *not* any rightful ecclesiastical jurisdiction over other churches.

"I must add," writes Dr. Milner, "that, at this early period, Pope Victor exerted his superior authority, by threatening the bishops of Asia with excommunication for their irregularity in celebrating Easter, with the other moveable feasts; from which rigorous measure he was deterred chiefly by St. Irenæus (Euseb. Eccl. Hist. l. v. c. 24)."—(p. 441.)

The following is shortly the history of the matter. Victor was the first bishop who appears to have interfered with the liberties of other Churches. He wrote to the bishops of the East, desiring them to keep Easter-day on the Sunday, and unable to answer their arguments in favour of their view of the subject, who, following the old Jewish custom, kept the day on the fourteenth day after the first new moon that followed the vernal equinox: cut short the dispute, by withdrawing himself from their communion, or, if the Romanists prefer the expression, excommunicating the churches of the East; and thus the guilt of the first schism lies at his door. But the Eastern bishops wholly disregarded his threats, for the quarrel continued for 120 years after, when the question was settled at the Council of Nice, A.D. 325.

Victor, Bishop of Rome, on this occasion, took upon himself, with overbearing assumption, to act for the Western bishops: and although he held the largest and a most important see, the other Western bishops exhorted (Rufinus says

*quæ in Ecclesia ab Apostolis usque nunc sit conservata et tradita in veritate. —Sed et quæ est Ephesi Ecclesia a Paulo quidem fundata, Ioanne autem permanente apud eos usque ad Trajani tempora, testis est verus Apostolorum traditionis. —Iren. adv. Hær. lib. iii. c. 3, pp. 171, 172, edit. Genevæ, 1570.*

*jubebant*, commanded) him to desist, but rather to seek the peace and unity of the Church. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, on the part of the bishops of Gaul, wrote to the Bishop of Rome, rebuking him most severely. The following extract is a literal translation of the transaction as related by Eusebius himself, to whom Dr. Milner pretends to refer us :—

“ Upon this, Victor, Bishop of Rome, immediately attempted to cut off from the communion, the whole of Asia with the neighbouring churches, as having given their assent to heterodox opinions, and he notified it in letters proclaiming all the brethren who dwelt there to be excommunicated. But this did not please all the bishops. They exhorted him rather to consult peace, and neighbourly unity and love. And their letters are now extant, wherein *they have sharply rebuked* Victor. (Φέρονται δὲ καὶ αἱ τουτῶν φωναὶ, πληκτικώτερον καθαπτομένων τοῦ Βίκτορος.) Among whom Irenæus, having written in the name of the brethren of Gaul, over whom he presided, maintains indeed that the mystery of our Lord's resurrection ought to be celebrated only upon a Sunday, but admonishes Victor in many other words not to cut off whole churches of God for observing an ancient custom, handed down to them by tradition.”<sup>a</sup>

5. TERTULLIAN.—As the fifth witness we have Tertullian : Dr. Milner thus introduces him (Letter xlvi. p. 441) :—

“ Tertullian, a priest of the Roman Church, who flourished near the same time [namely, the latter end of the second century], calls St. Peter ‘ the Rock of the Church,’ and says, ‘ that the Church was built upon him.’—(Prescript. l. i. c. 22. De Monagam.) Speaking of the Bishop of Rome, he terms him in different places, ‘ the Blessed Pope, the High Priest, the Apostolic Prelate.’” And to this latter portion of the quotation no reference is vouchsafed.

Dr. Milner certainly relied on good Mr. Brown, of the “ New Cottage,” being unprovided with a Tertullian ; but we, out of the circle of that little happy *coterie*, are well provided with copies of all the Fathers of the Church, and what is more, we know a little of their contents, and are therefore in no way dismayed, when we see arrayed against us so many learned references. Now the fact is, that Tertullian, so far from admitting the Pope's superior jurisdiction or primacy, on the plea of his being the successor of St. Peter, directly and most distinctly opposed him ; he declared him to be a *usurper* ; that whatever privilege Peter may have received of Christ, it was a *personal* grant to him, and not in

<sup>a</sup> Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. lib. v. c. 24. Colonæ, 1612.

any way to be inherited by his successors. His words are, "Concerning this opinion of yours, I ask whence dost thou arrogate this authority to your church? If because our Lord said to Peter, 'On this rock I will build my Church; *to thee* have I given the keys of the kingdom of heaven; *or* whatsoever ye shall bind or loose on earth shall be bound or loosed in heaven;' therefore thou presumest to have acquired the power of binding and loosing to thyself, that is, to all the churches allied to Peter (*Petri propinquam*).—Who art thou overturning and changing the manifest intention of our Lord, conferring this *personally* (*personaliter*) to Peter, 'ON THEE,' he says, 'I will build my Church, and will give *to thee* the keys (not to the Church); and whatsoever *thou* shalt bind and loose,' not what *they* shall bind and loose?"<sup>a</sup>

With respect to *personal* succession, Tertullian had no particular regard, if succession of *doctrine* were maintained; "as the doctrine of a church when it is diverse from, or contrary unto, that of the Apostles, shows it not to be an apostolic church, though it pretend to be founded by an Apostle; so those churches that cannot produce any of the Apostles, or apostolic men, for their founders (being much later, and newly constituted), yet conspiring in the same faith, are nevertheless to be accounted apostolical churches, because of the *consanguinity of doctrine*."<sup>b</sup>

Again, Tertullian clearly expresses himself on the meaning of "Apostolic Church." He had no idea of confining that title to any peculiar church. "Immediately after, therefore, the Apostles, . . . first having through Judæa borne witness to the faith in Jesus Christ, and established churches, next went forth into the world, and preached the same doctrine of the same faith to the nations, and forthwith founded churches in every city, from whence the other churches thenceforward borrowed the tradition and the seeds of doctrine, and are daily borrowing them, that they have become churches. And from *this cause* they are themselves also accounted apostolical, as being the offspring of apostolical churches. The whole kind must needs be classed under their

<sup>a</sup> De tua nunc sententia, quæro, unde hoc jus Ecclesiæ usurpes? Si, quia dixerit Petro Dominus; *Super hanc petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam, tibi dedi claves regni celestis; vel Quæcunque alligaveritis vel solveritis in terra, erunt alligata vel soluta in cælis*: idcirco præsumis, et ad te derivasse solvendi et alligandi potestatem, id est, ad omnem Ecclesiam Petri propinquam: qualis es, evertens atque commutans manifestam Domini intentionem PERSONALITER hoc Petro conferentem. *Super TE*, inquit, *ædificabo Ecclesiam meam: et dabo TIBI claves (non ecclesiæ)*: et, *quæcunque SOLVERIS vel ALLIGAVERIS, non quæ solverint vel alligaverint*.—Tertull. de Pudic. Oper. pp. 767, 768, edit. Beat. Rhenan.; and cap. 21, tom. iv. p. 432, Halæ Magd. 1771.

<sup>b</sup> Lib. de Præscript. cap. 32, p. 213. Paris, 1695.

original. Wherefore these churches, so many and so great, are but that one primitive Church from the *Apostles* [not from the Apostle Peter], whence they all spring. Thus all are primitive, all are apostolical, all are one. The communion of peace, the title of brotherhood, and the token of hospitality, prove this unity, which right no other principle directeth than the unity of the tradition of the same mystery (*viz.*, faith in Jesus Christ)."<sup>a</sup> What can be more plain than this acknowledgment? How inconsistent with the idea that the Church of Rome was the mother and mistress of all churches, the source of unity, *the* Apostolic Church—to the exclusion of all other churches, as is pretended at the present day!

With regard to churches planted by the Apostles, he considers them all of equal worth: "They are all first and all apostolic."<sup>b</sup>

These sentiments, if uttered by a modern Romanist, would be considered rank heresy.

We have already seen that Tertullian did not consider the Roman Church the Apostolic Church. He named several others, which were to be consulted and appealed to by those in their respective and immediate districts, in matters of faith as well as morals—an admission completely at variance with any idea of a dominant supremacy in the Church of Rome, had such existed. If Tertullian held any person as supreme in the Church, it was not the Bishop of Rome, but the Emperor. "We reverence [he says] and worship the Emperor, as a man inferior only to God; we offer sacrifice for the health of the Emperor; we pray for his health."<sup>c</sup> "We in the Emperors reverence the judgment of God, who has set them over the nations; we know that in them is that which God hath willed," &c.<sup>d</sup>

Dr. Milner informs us that Tertullian called the Bishop of Rome "Blessed Pope, the High Priest, the Apostolic Prelate." In reply, we quote the following extract from Barrow: "Clement, Bishop of Rome, in his Epistle to St. James, calls St. James 'The Bishop of Bishops;' the Clementine Recognitions call him 'the Prince of Bishops;' Rufinus, in his translation of Eusebius, calls James 'the Bishop of the

<sup>a</sup> De Præscript. Hær. cap. 20, edit. as above.

<sup>b</sup> Omnes primæ, omnes apostolicæ.—Tert. de Præscript. cap. 20, and see edit. Patr. Caill. tom. v. p. 376. Paris, 1842.

<sup>c</sup> Colimus imperatorem,—ut hominem a Deo secundum;—sacrificamus pro salute imperatoris;—oramus pro salute imperatoris, &c.—Tertull. ad Scapulum, cap. 2.

<sup>d</sup> Tertull. Apol. sec. xxxii.



Apostles,' &c.”<sup>a</sup> The title “Bishop of Bishops” was a common appellation among the early Christians. Many instances might be adduced. Rufinus (lib. ii. cap. 26) called Athanasius “Pontificem Maximum,” chief Bishop; and Adrian, Bishop of Rome, wrote to Tharadius, Bishop of Constantinople, and addressed him, “To my well-beloved brother Tharadius, universal patriarch.”<sup>b</sup> But how does Tertullian introduce this epithet of “Bishop of Bishops?” In the commencement of the treatise *De Pudicitia* he exclaims, “Audio etiam edictum esse propositum, et quidem peremptorium. Pontifex scilicet Maximus, Episcopus Episcoporum, edicit: *Ego et mœchie et fornicationis delicta pœnitentia functis dimitto. O edictum, cui adscribi non poterit.—Bonum factum!*”<sup>c</sup> I very much doubt whether any Romanist, with this passage before him, will say that Tertullian was speaking in *praise* of the Bishop of Rome when he designated him “Bishop of Bishops!”

Tertullian had fallen into the heresy of the Montanists when this was written, but this will not assist Dr. Milner, for it is he who quotes him as an authority.

5. ORIGEN.—With a brevity usually adopted by those who tread on uncertain ground, all that Dr. Milner says of this Father is, “In the third century, we hear Origen,” and his reference is “Hom. 5, in Exod.; Hom. 17, in Luc.”

These references are indeed showy enough, but are most unfortunate, if intended to supply evidence of inerrability or infallibility, and then in due order, of the supreme authority of the occupant of the Papal See. In the one case, the Apostle is certainly spoken of as a “Princeps Apostolorum,” a phrase easily explainable, but in immediate connection with, and as if to heighten the guilt of, his denial of the Saviour—“*tertio denagarit;*”<sup>d</sup> and in the other, though termed a “*petra solidissima,*” yet here cited as an instance of weak faith—*modicæ fidei* (Matt. xiv. 31);<sup>e</sup> the Apostle thus, as it were, showing that he too, as if refusing the inerrability, which Rome would thrust upon him for her own interest, and to secure dominion by quoting his name, “was himself also a man” (Acts x. 26). Any way, what possible resemblance is to be found to the Apostle—a most solid rock, a pillar of the Church—in the time-serving, trading, managing, persecuting sectarianism of Rome!

<sup>a</sup> Barrow, on the Supremacy, p. 111. London, 1849, wherein the references are fully given and verified.

<sup>b</sup> Surlus, Concil. tom. iii. p. 72. Col. Agr. 1567.

<sup>c</sup> Tertul. de Pudic. Leipsic edit. 1839, Part ii. p. 135; and edit. Rhenan. cap. 1, p. 742; and Halæ Magd. 1771, p. 365.

<sup>d</sup> Tom. iii. p. 952, edit. Paris, 1733.

<sup>e</sup> Tom. ii. 145.

6. "ST. CYPRIAN," Dr. Milner tells us, "repeatedly affirms that the Church was 'founded on Peter,' that he 'fixed his chair at Rome,' that this is 'the Mother Church,' and 'the root of Catholicity;'" the references for all being sufficiently vague, viz., "Ep. ad Cornel., Ep. ad Anton., De Unit., &c."

Besides the convenient generality of these references, the meaning to be attached to such metaphorical expressions as "the root of Catholicity," &c. (Cypr. Ep. 44 or 45), is by no means settled amongst adherents of Rome itself, among those at least who are not mere partisans.<sup>a</sup> Tertullian makes use of the same language (De Præscript. cap. 21), but in a way that rescues the term altogether from the exclusive use of modern Rome. His words are quite Catholic: "Si hæc ita sunt, constat proinde omnem doctrinam, quæ cum illis Ecclesiis Apostolicis, *matricibus*, et originalibus fidei conspiret veritati deputandam." And yet Perrone,<sup>b</sup> the Jesuit lecturer of Rome, refers to this very chapter of the "Prescriptions," as, though not directly mentioning the primacy of Peter, yet implying it! There is not a word leading in that direction, and it is a base imposition on the reader to let him imagine anything of the kind; it is to the Catholic churches, not the mere local Church of Rome, that the language is applicable. So little, however, is there, in fact, honestly to be used for the special elevation of the Roman See by quotations from *Cyprian*, that it is a notorious fact, proved beyond dispute, that the later Roman edition of Cyprian's works, 1563, and those which are reprinted from it, have been most shamefully corrupted, in order to introduce Peter's primacy, and the chair of Peter, in just that particular treatise to which Dr. Milner has bravely referred, in order to support the claim of the Roman Pontiff;<sup>c</sup> and Rigault, a Roman commentator on Cyprian's works, admits that they have in these places been corrupted by interpolation.<sup>d</sup> Of what value, then, are Dr. Milner's references, particularly when the exclusive applicability of the words to Papal Rome is left unproved. Were we to go to any armoury in the third century, which, either by plain inference, or direct statement, furnishes weapons against the supremacy of the Roman See, we should have recourse to the letters of Cyprian.<sup>e</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Lumper, "Hist. Theologico-Critica de Vitis Patrum," Aug. Vind. 1798, tom. xii. p. 537.

<sup>b</sup> Prælectiones Theologicæ, tom. ii. 217, ed. Mediolani, 1845, sec. 503.

<sup>c</sup> See James's treatise on the "Corruption of the Fathers," &c., reprint, London, 1843, pp. 75 and 82.

<sup>d</sup> See the Oxford edition of the works of Cyprian, 1682, vol. i. p. 106, where the whole subject is examined.

<sup>e</sup> "Journal of Sacred Literature," July, 1856, p. 284. Perrone and others

But before we dismiss this Roman edition of Cyprian—we mean that which was “corrected” by order of Pius IV., under the superintendence of four Cardinals, printed by Paulus Manutius, and from which, and other editions, expressions have been copied—let us remark, that in order to make Cyprian speak in favour of the Pope’s supremacy, passages have been introduced which do not appear to have been in the original or early copies, while other passages directly against the idea of a Papal supremacy are expunged; for instance, in the epistle written by Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea, to Cyprian, and which Pamelius himself acknowledges that Cyprian translated into Latin; when speaking of the arrogance of Stephen, bishop of Rome, in the claim to be supreme, as the successor of Peter, he expresses his “just indignation at the manifest folly of Stephen, that boasting so much of his bishopric, and that he hath the succession of Peter, upon whom the foundations of the Church were set, brings in many other rocks,” &c.; and adds, “What a mighty sin hast thou heaped up to thyself, in that thou hast cut thyself off from so many flocks! For do not deceive thyself: it is thou that hast cut off thine own self. He, verily, is the real schismatic, who has made himself an apostate from the communion of ecclesiastical unity. For, while thou thinkest that all may be separated from thee, thou hast merely separated thyself from all.”<sup>a</sup> This passage is omitted from many editions.<sup>b</sup>

We are told that Cyprian calls Rome “the Mother Church,” and “the root of Catholicity.” In these expressions Dr. Milner finds an acknowledgment of the universal jurisdiction of that see; and he can discover no denial of it in Cyprian’s resolute refusal to conform with its ordinances.

Cyprian, it is well known, is claimed by both parties. Dr. Milner, however, in adducing passages from this Father, which may seem at first sight to support the Papal supremacy, has, according to his usual practice, entirely omitted to take notice of those which make against his hypothesis, or to endeavour to reconcile the seeming discrepancy of this

strive to make up for the loss of these surreptitiously introduced passages, by affirming that other parts of Cyprian’s writings testify as liberally to St. Peter’s dominant authority, and that the letter of Pelagius II., a bishop of Rome in 580, helps to verify the identical passage objected to. But we, with Baluze, ask (note on Cyprian de Unitat. Eccles. cap. 2), what is the character and age of the MS. containing the Epistle of Pelagius?

<sup>a</sup> And yet Perrone, the Jesuit lecturer at Rome, refers to this very letter as furnishing indirect proof of St. Peter’s dominion over the Church Universal.—See Prælect. Theolog. tom. ii. p. 218 (ed. Mediolani, 1845), sec. 503.

<sup>b</sup> See, among other editions, edit. Oxon. 1682; Firmil. Epist. 75, in Oper. Cyprian. vol. ii. pp. 218, 224, 225, 228, &c.; Col. Agrip. Epist. 75, pp. 114, 117, for these passages.

Father's testimony. "One of these things, however," says Mosheim, "must be true; either that one of the parties misunderstands Cyprian, or that Cyprian was at variance with himself, and had no clear notions of the nature of Church authority." For the candid exposition of this Father's real opinion respecting the precedency which he attributed to the successors of St. Peter in the See of Rome, and for the most probable mode of reconciling his various assertions, the reader will do well to consult Mosheim's sensible remarks, in a note on the *De Reb. Christianor. ante Constant. sec. 3, s. 23*. From that work we shall content ourselves with bringing together a few passages, in which Cyprian, in the most express terms, denies all jurisdiction in the Roman bishop over the Church of Carthage; leaving them with this observation, that if the authority of this writer is to be appealed to, the more obscure and doubtful expressions of his meaning, such as are those alleged by the Romanists, are, on every just principle of interpretation, to be explained by those which are perspicuous and explicit.

The general reason assigned by the African bishop for the superiority of the Roman See, is this:—"Rome for its magnitude ought to precede Carthage"<sup>a</sup> (*Ep. 49*). Hence he calls it, "*Ecclesia principalis*,"—that is, says Rigaltius himself, "*Ecclesia in urbe principali constituta*,"—in *Ep. 55* (quoted by Dr. Milner). In his letters to Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, he addresses him on a footing of perfect equality, and freely reproves his errors; which affords a strong presumption, until removed by positive proof, that he admitted no superiority of jurisdiction. In the question of rebaptizing heretics, he acquaints Stephanus with the decree passed in the African synod, not for the purpose of approval and ratification; but, as he expressly says, "*pro honore communi et pro simplici dilectione*" (*Epist. 72*). And when Stephanus disapproves the sentence, and returns an imperious answer, Cyprian, so far from submitting, procures the confirmation of the decree in still stronger terms, in another synod convened for that very purpose. The excommunication issued in consequence, by Stephanus, was nothing more, in point of fact, than a separation of himself and his church from the communion of Cyprian and the African bishops; and not, as the comparatively modern sense of the word imports, the pretence of separating Cyprian from the Church of Christ. To this pitch of arrogance the Roman bishops had not then arrived. But, whatever it might have been, it was contemned

<sup>a</sup> Quoniam pro magnitudine sua debeat Carthaginem Roma præcedere.—*Epist. 49.*

by the Father and his Church. The principle of Cyprian's resistance is best explained by his words. In Epist. 71, ad Quintum, he denies that Peter himself had any primacy of jurisdiction, and if not Peter, much less his successors; for he wrote:—"Nor did Peter, whom the Lord first chose, and upon whom he built his Church, when afterward Paul disputed with him concerning circumcision, claim or assume anything to himself insolently or arrogantly; so as to say, that he himself held the primacy, and that by posterity obedience ought to be paid to him rather than to Paul.<sup>a</sup> So far from deferring to the authority of the Roman Pontiff, he extravagantly exalts the rights and independence of the episcopal order. In his address to the Carthaginian Council, he uses these words:—"For none of us has set himself up as the bishop of bishops, or has driven, by tyrannical fear, his colleagues to the necessity of obeying him, since every bishop has his own will for the exercise of his liberty and power, and can be no more judged by another than he can judge another. But let us all wait for the judgment of our universal Lord Jesus Christ, who *alone* has the power both to place us in the government of his Church and to judge of the quality of our actions."<sup>b</sup> Agreeably to these high notions of the episcopal office, he severely reprimands Cornelius for interfering in behalf of the schismatics Fortunatus and Felicissimus, who had been condemned by the African bishops. After these, and similar passages which might be adduced, Dr. Milner's quotations from Cyprian may be safely passed over unnoticed.

It is alleged, however, that where Cyprian was not himself concerned, he fully acknowledged the Pope's supremacy, by advising him "to depose Marcian, a schismatical bishop of Gaul, and to appoint another bishop in his place" (Letter xlv. p. 441). The words of Cyprian are here misrepresented, or misunderstood. He does but advise Stephanus to write to the bishops of Gaul *in the fullest manner*; "ut

<sup>a</sup> Nam nec Petrus, quem primum Dominus elegit, et super quem ædificavit Ecclesiam suam, cum secum Paulus de circuncisione postmodum disceptaret, vindicavit sibi aliquid insolenter aut arroganter assumpsit: ut diceret se primatum tenere; et obtemperari, a novellis et posteris, sibi potius oportere.—Cyprian. Epist. Quint. lxxi. Oper. vol. ii. pp. 194, 195, Oxon. 1682, and Col. Agrip. 1617, p. 102.

<sup>b</sup> Neque enim quisquam nostrum Episcopum se esse Episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendum necessitatem collegas suos adigit; quando *habeat omnis Episcopus pro licentia libertatis et potestatis sue arbitrium proprium*; tanque judicari ab alio non possit, quam nec ipse potest alterum judicare. Sed expectemus universi judicium Domini nostri J. C., qui *unus et solus habet potestatem et præponendi nos in Ecclesiæ sue gubernatione et de actu nostro judicandi*.—Sententia 87, Episcop. Synod. Carthag. Labbe et Coss. tom. i. col. 786, Paris, 1671; and Oper. Cyp. tom. i. p. 229, Oxon. 1682.

plenissimas litteras ad Galliarum episcopos faciat," exhorting them no longer to suffer Marcian, the friend of Novatian, to insult the episcopal college.<sup>a</sup> He does not suggest to the Bishop of Rome to depose him by his own authority; and if he had, it would not make for the Romanists' purpose; as in that case, Cyprian must have supposed that the jurisdiction of Rome extended over Gaul, although we find him denying, which is sufficient for our purpose, that it extended to Carthage. He bids him stir up the bishops of Gaul to the act of deposition:—"And who knows not," observes Mosheim, "that we daily exhort others to do acts, when we possess no power or authority over them, to enforce obedience?"<sup>b</sup>

7. JEROME.—As we propose to return to this part of Dr. Milner's work, and in order not to weary our readers by a continuation of the same subject, we shall conclude for the present our examination of the evidence of "the Fathers," with the testimony of Jerome;—the last Father appealed to; and of St. Jerome, whom Dr. Milner introduces as follows:—

"Finally, the learned St. Jerome, being distracted with the disputes among three parties which divided the Church of Antioch, to which church he was then subject, wrote for directions on this head to Pope Damasus, as follows:—'I, who am but a sheep, apply to my shepherd for succour. I am united in communion with your holiness, that is to say, with the Chair of Peter. I know that the Church is built upon that rock. He who eats the paschal lamb out of that house is profane. Whoever is not in Noah's Ark, will perish by the deluge. I know nothing of Vitalis, I reject Meletius, I am ignorant of Paulinus; c he who does not gather with thee, scatters.'—*Ep. ad Damas.*"<sup>d</sup>

Being pressed by the Bishop of Antioch respecting the persons of the Trinity, Jerome thus addressed the Pontiff:—"A sacerdote victimam salutis, a pastore præsidium ovis flagito. Facessat invidia, Romani culminis recedat ambitio; cum successore piscatoris et discipulo crucis loquor. *Ego nullum primum, nisi Christum, sequens; beatitudini tuæ, id est, cathe-*

<sup>a</sup> Ne ultra Marcianum, Novatiani amicum, Collegio Episcoporum insultare patiantur.—Epist. 67.

<sup>b</sup> "The two Main Questions," &c., p. 285: Jackson. Dublin, 1825.

<sup>c</sup> Dr. Wiseman, with his usual infelicity, says that these three claimants were "men of suspected faith."—Moorfield Lectures, VIII., p. 284, edit. London, 1836. He was apparently ignorant that while the faith of Vitalis was more than suspected, Paulinus was supported, throughout the struggle, by the See of Rome, and that the name of Meletius stands for worship in the Latin Martyrology, Feb. 12, p. 27.—Robins's "Whole Evidence against the Church of Rome," p. 119, a volume well deserving the reader's best attention.

<sup>d</sup> Letter xlvi. 443.

dræ Petri, communionē consocior. Super illam Petram ædificatam Ecclesiam scio," &c.<sup>a</sup>

The learned reader will be surprised when he is told that the above extract is the original from Jerome, of which Dr. Milner purports to give a *perfect* translation. According to him the Pope is identified with the shepherd, and his *Holiness* and *St. Peter's Chair* are represented as the foundation of the Church? No allusion whatever is made to Christ,—the Shepherd to whose flock this Father said he belonged,—the Leader *whom alone* Jerome would follow, and the *Rock* on which the Church was built; yet this is the true import of his words. And what proves it to be so is this, that Jerome speaks in the sequel of attaching himself to the Egyptian confessors, whom he calls Damasus's *colleagues*, which he certainly would not have done had he considered him as the alone supreme governor and director of the Church. "As I cannot [he writes] always have recourse to you, I hold to the Egyptians, who present the same faith as Rome;" evidently considering *doctrine* as a test of the true Church, as he says in another place, "The Church does not consist of walls, but of true doctrine. Wherever the true faith is, there is the Church."<sup>b</sup> He paid due deference, it is true, to the Bishop of Rome, but this was no acknowledgment of the absolute superiority of the occupier of the see; since, after desiring him to lay aside the fancied importance of his rank (*Romani culminis ambitio*), he brings him down to a level with himself, when he addresses him as the successor of the fisherman, and a disciple of the Cross.

But the gist of the extract consists in the epithet "*beatitudini tuæ*" (translated by Dr. Milner, "your holiness"), as addressed to the Bishop of Rome. This and similar titles were most common among the early Christians. John, patriarch of Constantinople, was addressed as "the *most holy* and blessed universal patriarch."<sup>c</sup> Cornelius, bishop of Rome (in the fabricated Epist. ii.), writing to Bishop Rufus, is made to call him "*tuæ sanctitati*," *literally*, "your holiness." Augustine, writing to a priest, and even to a layman, uses the same expression.<sup>d</sup>

This letter of Jerome, written from Antioch (whither he had gone, as he says of himself, "*pro meis facinoribus*") to

<sup>a</sup> Hier. Oper. tom. ii. Epist. lvii. p. 175. Paris edit. 1602.

<sup>b</sup> Jerome in Psalm cxxxiii. tom. vii. p. 388. Paris, 1602.

<sup>c</sup> Sanctissimo atque beatissimo œcumenico Patriarchæ Joh. Const., &c.—Surius Concil. tom. ii. p. 436. Col. Agrip. 1567.

<sup>d</sup> Ad sanctitatem tuam scripsit.—(Aug. de Orig. Anim. lib. ii. cap. 1, tom. x., edit. Ben.) Hinc angor, quod sanctitati tuæ minus quam vellem cognitus sum.—Ibid. lib. i. cap. 2.

Damasus, Bishop of Rome, in whose Church he had been baptized, and in communion with which he remained, "unde olim Christi vestimenta suscepi," was, in fact, one of *mere consultation* respecting the propriety of adopting the new and insidious mode, introduced by the Arians, of expressing the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity. "Ideo mihi Cathedram Petri . . . . *censui consulendam.*" The Roman faith was at that time incorrupt; the Eastern tainted with Arianism. "Nunc in Occidente sol justitiæ oritur; in Oriente, Lucifer ille," &c. Wherefore, Jerome makes it his boast, "*Ego nullum primum, nisi Christum, sequens, beatitudini tuæ, id est, Cathedræ Petri, communione consocior.*"

He disavows all connection with the heretical churches of the East, and describes himself, *in following Christ alone*, to be joined in communion with the See of St. Peter; "upon which rock" ("non super Petram, ut arbitror," says the Romish scholiast, "sed super fidem quam Petrus professus est"), or upon Peter's ministry, "the Church of Christ itself had been originally built." *This universal Church of Christ*, founded on Peter, and not the particular Church of Rome, was "the Noah's ark" into which whoever entered not must perish—the temple in which whoever ate not the Lamb was profane; and it was a fair consequence, drawn by Jerome, that they "who gathered not with Damasus and his church, scattered;" because Damasus and his church held, *in that age*, the genuine faith of the Church of Christ.

But, says the same scholiast, "Fieri potest, ut Roma quoque degeneret." In which case Jerome would no longer have boasted that he was joined in communion with her bishop; he, who says of himself, "*Nullum primum, nisi Christum, sequens.*" THESE IMPORTANT WORDS, WHICH GIVE A NEW TURN TO THE QUOTATION, ARE WHOLLY OMITTED BY DR. MILNER.<sup>a</sup>

That<sup>b</sup> Jerome pointed to CHRIST as the *Rock* on which the Church was built, is evident from other parts of his writings. He says:—"But the Catholic Church which is founded with a firm root upon the Rock Christ stands," &c.<sup>c</sup> "Christ is the Rock who granted to the Apostles (*Apostolis*) that they also should be called rocks."<sup>d</sup> "We are all built upon the foundation of the Apostles, Jesus Christ our Lord the cornerstone holding us together;—and as we are founded on the

<sup>a</sup> Jackson's "Two Main Questions stated in controversy between the Churches of England and Rome," &c., p. 244. Dublin, 1825.

<sup>b</sup> The following is taken from Collette's "Pope's Supremacy, a Thing of Priestcraft," p. 118. London, 1852.

<sup>c</sup> Jerome, "Ad Principiam Virginem," tom. iii. p. 173. Paris, 1602.

<sup>d</sup> In Amos, lib. iii. cap. 6, tom. v. p. 263.



Prophets, so did the Patriarchs stand upon the foundation of the Apostles.”<sup>a</sup> He is still more explicit in his commentary on the 60th Psalm:—“He” [David], says he, “is exalted in Christ, who, according to the Apostles, is called both the firm Hope and the Rock of believers. Thou hast exalted me upon a rock, that is to say upon Thyself, as the following passage declares. ‘But the rock was Christ?’ *Petrus*, Peter, was derived from *Petra*, the rock; whence the Lord said, ‘Thou art Peter (*Petrus*), and upon this rock (*Petram*) I will build my Church.’ And in another place. The floods came and the winds blew, and they beat upon that house, and it did not fall; for it was founded upon the firm rock (*quæ est Christus*) which is Christ.”<sup>b</sup>

Again, in alluding to “the Church” he did not mean the Roman Church, for, as we have seen, he considered that wherever the *true faith* was to be found, “there is the Church.” “The Church,” he says, “is collected from many persons, and yet she is called one, on account of the *unity of faith*.”<sup>c</sup> “The Church is an assemblage of various nations.”<sup>d</sup> And though he believed Peter to have been the founder of the Church, yet he gives him no precedence over the other Apostles; all enjoyed, he remarks, the same eminence, and that *equally*, though one was selected as a head man, and to guard against divisions; and that such precedence was, in St. Peter’s case, owing to his age.<sup>e</sup> Not a word here, so far as we can discern, of *Lord Peter*.

Admitting, then, that Jerome considered the Bishop of Rome to be the successor of St. Peter, Dr. Milner does not advance his cause one *iota* by an appeal to his writings, for he is directly opposed to the idea of a Bishop of Bishops, or one Supreme Bishop in the Church. The title Pope was not at that period peculiar to the Bishop of Rome, for Jerome himself, writing to Theophilus, Bishop of Alexandria, addresses<sup>f</sup> him as “most blessed Pope” (*amantissime et beatissime Papa*). According to his doctrine, all bishops of the Church were equal. “Bishops,” he writes, “should recollect that they are superior to elders, rather by custom than by virtue of the Lord’s appointment (*et in communi debere Ecclesiam regere*), and that they ought to rule the Church in common.”<sup>g</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Comment. lib. ii. in Epist. ad Galat. cap. 4, tom. vi. p. 308.

<sup>b</sup> Comment. in Psalm lx. tom. vii. p. 178.

<sup>c</sup> Ib. Psalm xxiii. p. 76.

<sup>d</sup> Ib. Psalm xx. p. 67.

<sup>e</sup> *Ætati delatum est, quia Petrus senior erat.*—Hieron. contra Jovin. lib. i. cap. 14, vol. iv. p. 168, ed. Paris, 1706.

<sup>f</sup> Ep. 71, tom. i. 250, ed. Col. Agrip. 1616.

<sup>g</sup> Epist. ad Titum, lib. i. cap. 1, tom. vi. Paris, 1706.

We shall conclude by quoting the following well-known passage, which is conclusive evidence that Jerome was opposed to the doctrine of "supremacy :"—

"With the exception of ordination, what does a bishop do which an elder does not? The church of the Roman city is not to be deemed one thing, and the Church of the whole world another. Gaul, and *Britain*, and Africa, and Persia, and India, and all foreign nations adore one Christ, and observe one rule of truth. If you look for authority, the world is greater than a city. WHERESOEVER A BISHOP IS, WHETHER AT ROME, or Eugubium, or Constantinople, or Alexandria, or Tmuis, he is of the same worth, and the same priesthood (*ejusdem meriti, ejusdem sacerdotii*). Neither the power of riches nor the inferior outward condition of poverty makes a bishop either higher or lower. But all are the successors of the Apostles. Why do you quote to me the custom of one city merely?"<sup>a</sup>

So much then for the testimony of *Saint Jerome*.

---

### No. XIII.

#### CHILLINGWORTH AND HOOKER MISREPRESENTED.

Dr. Milner's unfairness in quotations from Protestants.

THE "End of Religious Controversy" contains passages from Chillingworth and Hooker, almost every one of which is either garbled or misrepresented. To a consideration of these we shall confine the present article, and trust that it may prove instrumental in leading some of our readers to the study of those masterly divines.

It will be proper to notice, in the first place, the manner in which Dr. Milner has introduced the "inconstant Chillingworth," as he has been pleased to term him, to the readers of his work of equivocal celebrity :—

"Chillingworth," says Dr. Milner, "was first a Protestant of the Establishment : he next became a Catholic, and studied in one of our seminaries. He then returned, *in part*, to his former creed : and last of all, he gave in to Socinianism, which his writings greatly promoted."<sup>b</sup>

Surely, when the learned prelate laid this heavy charge upon the memory of a departed Christian, it was incumbent on him to have substantiated it with some degree of evidence ;

<sup>a</sup> Jerome, ad Evag. tom. ii. p. 512, edit. Paris, 1602 ; and tom. iv. ep. 101, p. 803, Paris, 1706. Epist. 146, Vallarsii.

<sup>b</sup> Letter viii. p. 97.

how far it is supported by fact will be seen by an appeal to these "writings" themselves.

When Knot, the Jesuit, accused our great divine of Socinian heresy, his reply was, "that he believed the doctrine of the Trinity, the deity of our Saviour, and all other supernatural verities revealed in Scripture, as *heartily as any man.*"<sup>a</sup>

"To clear myself once for all," he adds, "from all imputations of this nature, which charge me injuriously with denial of supernatural verities, I profess sincerely, that I believe all those books of Scripture which the Church of England accounts canonical to be the infallible Word of God; I believe all things evidently contained in them; all things evidently, or even probably deducible from them: I acknowledge all that to be heresy, which by the Act of Parliament primo of Queen Elizabeth is declared to be so, and only to be so. And though in such points which may be held diversely by divers men *salvâ Fidei compage*, I would not take any man's liberty from him, and humbly beseech all men that they would not take mine from me; yet thus much I can say (which I hope will satisfy any man of reason), that whatsoever hath been held necessary to salvation, either by the Catholic Church of all ages, or by the consent of Fathers, measured by Vincentius Lirinensis his rule, or is held necessary, either by the Catholic Church of this age, or by the consent of Protestants, or even by the Church of England, that, *against the Socinians*, and all others whatsoever, I do verily believe and embrace."<sup>b</sup>

The above is taken from the preface to his "Religion of Protestants, a safe way to Salvation," where more to the same purport occurs; and where he condescends to prove, that even his adversary could not have believed the things which he had alleged against him. But we trust here is enough to convince our readers that the work above named is quite guiltless of Socinianism; for no man who values his character for consistency a rush, would *advocate* a doctrine in his *book*, which he had just *abjured* in his *preface*.

Moreover the work was licensed, and its orthodoxy avouched by Doctors Prideaux, Fell, and Potter; three sound and learned divines of the Church of England.

We have also the valuable testimony of Dr. Cheynell, a bigoted fanatic of the parliamentary party, and one of Chillingworth's most bitter opponents during the heat of the civil wars, that the latter adhered to the doctrines and principles of his book to the last. For proof of this, we refer our readers to Cheynell's "Chillingworthi Novissima," from whence the following passages are taken:—

"You that were the licensors of his [Chillingworth's] subtle atheism," says Cheynell, "repent, repent; for he was so hardened by your flattery, that (for

<sup>a</sup> The reader should understand that Chillingworth was threatened with having this stigma fixed on his character, if he should attempt to refute the Jesuit author of "Charity Maintained," and in his reply to that author in which he contradicts the slander.

<sup>b</sup> Chillingworth's Rel. of Prot., Pref. sec. 5 and 28.

ought the most charitable man can judge) he perished by your approbation; *he ever appealed to his works even to his dying day*, and what was it which made him dote upon them but your licence and approbation?"

Cheynell persecuted Chillingworth with his efforts to convert him to Puritanism upon his very death-bed, till at last, finding all his efforts, as might have been expected, useless, he—

"Desired him that he would now take off his thoughts from all matters of speculation, and fix them upon some practical point which might make for his edification."—"He thanked me," continues Cheynell, "very heartily, and told me that *in all points of religion he was settled, and had fully expressed himself for the satisfaction of others in his book, which was approved and licenced by the very learned and judicious divines.*"

Cheynell adds, in his funeral oration over the body of his illustrious victim (for such we may also designate him),—

"He hath left that phantasie which he called his religion, *upon record in this subtle book.*"

To that immortal work then we confidently appeal, and defy the admirers of Dr. Milner to prove from it, that "Chillingworth last of all gave in to Socinianism," or that "his writings greatly promoted it."

We shall now notice Dr. Milner's introduction to his first citation from Hooker:—

"I shall have occasion," writes the learned doctor, "hereafter to notice the claims of the Established Church to *authority*, in determining the *sense of Scripture*, as well as in other religious controversies: in the mean time, I cannot but observe, that her most able defenders are frequently obliged to *abandon their own, and adopt the Catholic rule of Faith*. The judicious Hooker, in his defence of the Church of England, writes thus: 'Of this we are right sure, that nature, Scripture, and experience itself have taught the world to seek for the ending of contentions by submitting to some judicial and definite sentence, whereunto neither party that contendeth, may, under any pretence or colour, refuse to stand. This must needs be effectual and strong. As for other means, without this they seldom prevail.'"<sup>b</sup>

It is not improbable that Dr. Milner borrowed this quotation from the Jesuit Knot, who long ago applied it in much the same way. Had the doctor ever read the preface himself, he would have known that Hooker is neither speaking of the *sense of Scripture*, nor of anything appertaining to Christian faith, but merely concerning *ecclesiastical ordinances of themselves indifferent*; and he adds in the very same section of his preface:—

"Not that I judge it a thing allowable for men to observe those laws, which in their hearts they are steadfastly persuaded to be against the law of God. But," continues he, "your persuasion in this case ye are all bound for the time to *suspend*, and in otherwise doing, ye offend against God, by troubling His Church without any just or necessary cause. Be it that there

<sup>a</sup> Hooker's Eccl. Polity, Pref. art. 6.

<sup>b</sup> Letter viii. ad fin.

are some reasons inducing you to think hardly of our laws : are those reasons demonstrative ? are they necessary, or mere probabilities only ? An argument necessary or demonstrative is such, as being propounded unto any man, and understood, the mind cannot choose but inwardly assent. Any one such reason dischargeth, I grant, the conscience, and setteth it at full liberty. For the public approbation given by the body of the whole church unto those things which are established, doth make it probable but that they are good ; and therefore unto a necessary proof that they are not good, it must give place. But if the skilfullest amongst you can show, that all the books ye have hitherto written, be able to afford any one argument of this nature, let the instance be given."<sup>a</sup>

All this is evidently in strict accordance with what he elsewhere teaches ; namely, that—

“ Although ten thousand general councils would set down one and the same definitive sentence concerning any point of religion whatsoever, yet one demonstrative reason alleged, or one manifest testimony cited from the mouth of God himself to the contrary, could not choose but outweigh them all.”

And his reason is this—

“ Inasmuch as for them to have been deceived, it is not impossible ; it is, that demonstrative reason, or testimony divine should deceive.”<sup>b</sup>

In the next place of Hooker referred to by Dr. Milner, that prelate has abused us with the old misconstruction of Knot, Brerely, and others before them. Dr. Milner is the more inexcusable for this, because the work of Chillingworth, which he occasionally quotes, has amply vindicated this very passage, if indeed it can be said to have needed vindication. We will first allege what Dr. Milner advances, and then give the passage of Hooker, illustrated by Chillingworth's exposition :—

DR. MILNER.—“ It was not until the end of the fourth century, that the genuine canon of Holy Scripture was fixed ; and then it was fixed by the *tradition and authority of the Church*, declared in the third council of Carthage, and a decretal of Pope Innocent I. Indeed it is so clear, that the *canon of Scripture is built on the tradition of the Church*, that most learned Protestants ” here a foot-note refers us to Hooker's Ecc. Pol. B. 3, s. 8., “ with Luther himself, have been forced to acknowledge it, in terms almost as strong as those in the well-known declaration of St. Augustine.”<sup>c</sup>

HOOKE.—“ Scripture teacheth us that saving truth which God hath discovered unto the world by revelation, and it presumeth us taught otherwise, that itself is divine and sacred. The question then being, by what means we are taught this ; some answer, that to learn it we have no other way than tradition.”

CHILLINGWORTH.—“ Some answer so, but he doth not.”

HOOKE.—“ As namely, that so we believe, because we from our predecessors, and they from theirs have so received. But is this enough ? that which all men's experience teacheth them, may not in any wise be denied ; and by experience we all know, that the first outward motive leading men to esteem of the Scripture, is the authority of God's Church.”

<sup>a</sup> Hooker's Eccl. Polity, Pref. art. 6.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. lib. ii. sec. 7.

<sup>c</sup> Letter ix. p. 114 ; and see *antè* p. 87.

CHILLINGWORTH.—“The first outward motive, not the last assurance whereon we rest.”

HOOKE.—“For when we know the whole Church of God hath that opinion of the Scripture, we judge it at the first an impudent thing for any man, bred and brought up in the Church, to be of a contrary mind without cause.”

CHILLINGWORTH.—“The whole Church that he speaks of, seems to be that particular Church wherein a man is bred and brought up, and the authority of this he makes an argument, which presseth a man’s modesty more than his reason. And in saying, it seems impudent to be of a contrary mind without cause, he implies, there may be a just cause to be of a contrary mind, and that then it were no impudence to be so.”

HOOKE.—“Afterwards, the more we bestow our labour upon reading or hearing the mysteries thereof, the more we find that the thing itself doth answer our received opinion concerning it.”

CHILLINGWORTH.—“Therefore the authority of the Church is not the pause whereon we rest; we had need of more assurance, and the intrinsical arguments afford it.”

HOOKE.—“So that the former inducement prevailing somewhat with us before, doth now much more prevail, when the very thing hath ministered farther reason.”

CHILLINGWORTH.—“Somewhat, but not much, until it be backed and enforced by farther reason; itself, therefore, is not the farthest reason, and last resolution.”

HOOKE.—“If infidels or atheists chance at any time to call it in question, this giveth us occasion to sift what reason there is whereby the testimony of the Church, concerning Scripture, and our own persuasion, which Scripture itself hath settled, may be proved a truth infallible.”

CHILLINGWORTH.—“Observe, I pray, our persuasion, and the testimony of the Church concerning Scripture, may be proved true; therefore neither of them was, in his account, the farthest proof.”

HOOKE.—“In which case the ancient Fathers, being often constrained to show what warrant they had so much to rely upon the Scriptures, endeavoured still to maintain the authority of the books of God, by arguments, such as the unbelievers themselves must needs think reasonable, if they judge thereof as they should.—Neither is it a thing impossible or greatly hard, even by such kind of proofs, so to manifest and clear that point, that no man living shall be able so deny it, without denying some apparent principle, such as all men acknowledge to be true.”

CHILLINGWORTH.—“Natural reason then, built on principles common to all men, is the last resolution, unto which the Church’s authority is but the first inducement.”<sup>a</sup>

We shall now direct the attention of our readers to a groundless imputation against Chillingworth, elicited by his reasoning upon the obscurities of Holy Writ.

“You may indeed answer,” says Dr. Milner, “with Chillingworth and Bishop Porteus, that whatever obscurities there may be in certain parts of Scripture, it is clear in all that is necessary to be known. But on what authority do these writers ground this maxim? They have *none at all*; but they *beg the question*, as logicians express it, to extricate themselves from an absurdity, and in so doing they overturn their fundamental Rule. They profess to gather their articles of faith and morals from mere Scripture; nevertheless, confessing that they understand only a part of it, they presume to make a distinction in it, and to say, *this part is necessary to be known, the other part is not necessary.*”<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Hooker’s *Eccl. Polity*, lib. iii. sec. 8; and Chillingworth, cap. 2, sec. 30, and note.

<sup>b</sup> Letter ix. p. 120.

Whether Chillingworth has really begged the question, or Dr. Milner unjustly imputed this to him, we will leave to be collected from the reasoning pursued by the former.

“I say,” argues he, maintaining the perspicuity of Scripture—

“I say sufficiently perfect, and sufficiently intelligible, in things necessary, to all that have understanding, whether they be learned or unlearned. And my reason hereof is convincing and *demonstrative*, because nothing is necessary to be believed, but what is plainly revealed. For to say that when a place of Scripture, by reason of ambiguous terms lies indifferent between divers senses, whereof one is true, and the other is false, that God obliges men under pain of damnation, not to mistake through error and human frailty, is to make God a tyrant; and to say that He requires us certainly to attain that end, for the attaining whereof we have no certain means; which is to say, that, like Pharaoh, He gives no straw, and requires brick; that He reaps where He sows not; that He gathers where He strews not; that He will not be pleased with our utmost endeavours to please Him, without full, exact, and never-failing performance; that His will is, we should do what He knows we cannot do; that He will not accept of us according to that which we have, but requireth of us what we have not. Which, whether it can consist with His goodness, with His wisdom, and with His word, I leave it to honest men to judge.”<sup>a</sup>

He says, moreover, in another place,—

“If you say, that *the obscure places of Scripture contain matters of faith*; I answer, that it is a matter of faith to believe that the sense of them, whatsoever it is, which was intended by God, is true; for he that doth not so, calls God’s truth in question. But to believe this or that to be the true sense of them, or to believe the true sense of them and to avoid the false, is not necessary either to faith or salvation. For if God would have had His meaning in these places certainly known, how could it stand with His wisdom, to be so wanting to His own will and end, as to speak obscurely? Or how can it consist with His justice to require of men to know certainly the meaning of those words which He Himself hath not revealed.”<sup>b</sup>

In another part of his work, Dr. Milner discovers (and perhaps he is indebted for the discovery to Cheynell), that

“Chillingworth, in his ‘Religion of Protestants,’ cap. iii., expressly teaches, that ‘the books of Scripture are not the *objects* of our faith,’ and that ‘a man may be saved, who should not believe them to be the Word of God.’”<sup>c</sup>

Now these words, taken by themselves without rational qualification, have a sound of disparaging the Holy Scriptures. But let them be taken in connection with the context, and they say no more than Dr. Milner himself would probably have said:—

“If a man should believe Christian religion wholly and entirely,” argues Chillingworth, “and live according to it, such a man, though he should not know, or not believe the Scripture to be a rule of faith, no, nor to be the Word of God, my opinion is, he may be saved; and my reason is, because he performs the entire condition of the new covenant, which is, that we believe

<sup>a</sup> Chillingworth, cap. 2, sec. 104.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. cap. 2, sec. 127.

<sup>c</sup> Letter xi. p. 154, in a note.

the matter of the Gospel, and not that it is contained in those or these books. So that the books of Scripture are not so much the *objects* of our faith, as the *instruments* of conveying it to our understanding; and not so much of the being of the Christian doctrine, as requisite to the well-being of it."

He, however, adds—

"Not but that it were now very strange and unreasonable, if a man should believe the *matter* of these books, and not the *authority* of the books; and, therefore, if a man should profess the not-believing of this, I should have reason to fear he did not believe that. But there is not always an equal necessity for the belief of those things, for the belief whereof there is an equal reason."<sup>a</sup>

Consonant to this is the short but magnificent 13th section of the first book of Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity. There our great divine does not deny that it is "a matter *merely accidental* unto the Law of God to be written."

He confesses that "writing" is

"Not that which addeth authority and strength thereunto."

That

"His laws do require at our hands the same obedience howsoever they be delivered."

But he adds,—

"His providence notwithstanding, which hath made principal choice of this way to deliver them, who seeth not what cause we have to admire and magnify?"

The truth is, we reject not the peculiar doctrine of Rome simply because it is not in Scripture, but because it is neither in Scripture, nor can be otherwise proved to be the Word of God. We refuse it, not because it is *tradition*, but because we have reason to fear that it is *not tradition*. Were it once proved to be *res tradita non inventa*, we should embrace it as heartily as the Scripture itself.

Hitherto we have seen Dr. Milner contenting himself with the petty artifice of abstracting partial sentences from the authors with whom we have confronted him, no doubt with a view to lessen the deserved esteem in which these writers are held, by forcing them to *seem* to say that which they never intended, and which contradicts the obvious tendency of their works. This indeed is bad enough, but it had been happy for the posthumous fame of the learned prelate, if he had abstained from bolder and baser deceptions. How his devoted admirers will extenuate even this, we know not. Far less can we conceive what garment they will contrive broad enough to hide the deformity of that which follows; unless, indeed, they will say, that a reader who can take the assertions of a controversialist of their Church upon trust deserves to reap the fruits of such egregious folly. Such a one only

<sup>a</sup> Chillingworth, Rel. of Prot. cap. 2, sec. 159.



could ever be deceived by them, and to such a one might their author have said, with honest Davus in the play,

“Certe, hercle, nunc hic se ipsus fallit, haud ego.”—TERENCE.

Dr. Milner is writing upon the “Real Presence,” which he considers as synonymous with the “Corporal Presence,” although the doctrines are in reality very distinct. He brings many examples of “eminent bishops and divines of the Establishment in this country,” who firmly believed in the “Real Presence.” The last of these is Hooker; from whose immortal work he garbles a passage, as follows:—

“Lastly, the profound Hooker expresses himself thus: ‘I wish men would give themselves more to meditate with silence on what we have *in* the Sacrament, and less to dispute of the manner *how*. Since we all agree that Christ, by the Sacrament, doth really and truly perform in us his promise, why do we vainly trouble ourselves with so fierce contentions, whether by consubstantiation, or else by transubstantiation?’—(Eccles. Pol., B. v. 67.)”<sup>a</sup>

The place, as quoted by Dr. Milner, seems to describe the manner of Christ’s presence in the Sacrament, to be either by consubstantiation, or else by transubstantiation; and contains an exhortation to peace, upon the ground that this doctrine of his actual presence being received, the mode of it is but of minor importance.

First, Dr. Milner *begins* his citation in the middle of a sentence; secondly, he delivers that as spoken *affirmatively*, which his author delivers *interrogatively*; thirdly, he helps the dice by substituting “*in*,” for “*by*,”; fourthly, he *omits one whole folio page, and about a third of another*, which occurs between the “*how*” which terminates the first, and the “*since*,” which begins the second sentence of his quotation; and he does this without an ellipsis, or the slightest intimation of this grand omission, although the matter which he has overlooked contains some very pregnant and convincing arguments against the doctrine which his citation is brought to support; fifthly, he again corrupts the sense, by *beginning* his second sentence with a word, which falls in the *course* of that of his author; sixthly, he perverts his author’s meaning, by *closing* his quotation with a *period*, where his author makes *no stop*, and before his sense has been fully developed.

Hooker’s doctrine was briefly this:—that Christ, *by* the Sacrament, imparts Himself, as a mystical head, to every member of His mystical body, the Church; and that the consecrated elements instrumentally communicate to worthy receivers the grace of that body and blood which were given

<sup>a</sup> Letter xxxvii. p. 367, note.

for the life of the world. But that a literal, corporal manducation of the very substance of His flesh and blood is necessary in order to this, he disproves and utterly denies.

As it would occupy too much space to give all that is contained between the first and second sentences of the learned prelate's quotation, we must refer our readers to the original for their entire satisfaction. However we will restore the true reading of the passages, and adduce so much of the intervening matter as may suffice to vindicate Hooker's doctrine:—

“All things considered,” says our judicious divine, in allusion to what had gone before, “and compared with that success, which *truth* hath hitherto had by so bitter conflicts with *errors* in this point, shall I wish that men would more give themselves to meditate with silence, what we have *by* the Sacrament, and less to dispute of the manner *how?*”

Nevertheless Hooker undoubtedly never meant to deny the utility of rational inquiry into this, more than in other religious matters, otherwise he would not have gone on in the prosecution of it, as he immediately did. It remains then that we discover what he considered that *truth* to be, which he describes as having had hitherto so little success. In exposition of the words, “Take, eat, this is my body,” &c., he says (a considerable way farther on, but still between the sentences of Dr. Milner's quotation):—

“If we doubt what those admirable words may import, let him be our teacher, to whom Christ was Himself a schoolmaster; let our Lord's Apostle be His interpreter, content we ourselves with his explication: My body, *the communion of my body*; My blood, *the communion of my blood*. Is there any thing more expedite, clear, and easy, than that as Christ is termed our life, because through Him we obtain life; so the parts of this Sacrament are called His body and blood, for that they are so to us; who receiving them, receive that *by* them which they are termed? The bread and cup are His body and blood, because they are causes instrumental upon the receipt whereof the participation of his body and blood ensueth. For that which produceth any certain effect, is not vainly nor improperly said to be that very effect wherunto it tendeth.”

And again:—

“The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not therefore to be sought for *in the Sacrament*, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament. And with this the very order of our Saviour's words agreeth; first, ‘Take and eat;’ then, ‘This is my body which was broken for you;’ first, ‘Drink ye all of this;’ then followeth, ‘This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many, for the remission of sins.’ I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ, when and where the bread is His body, or the cup His blood, but only in the very *heart* and *soul* of him which receiveth them. As for the Sacraments, they really *exhibit*, but, for ought we can gather out of that which is written of them, *they are not really, nor do really contain in themselves, that grace which with them, or by them, it pleaseth God to bestow*. If on all sides be confessed, that the grace of baptism is poured into the soul of man; that by water we receive it, although it be neither seated in

the water, nor the water changed into it; what should induce men to think that the grace of the Eucharist must needs be *in* the Eucharist, before it can be in us that receive it? The fruit of the Eucharist is the participation of the body and blood of Christ. There is no sentence of Holy Scripture which saith, that we cannot by this Sacrament be made partakers of his body and blood, except they be first contained in the Sacrament, or the Sacrament converted into them. 'This is my body,' and 'This my blood,' being words of promise, *sith we all agree, that by the Sacrament, Christ doth really and truly in us perform his promise; why do we vainly trouble ourselves with so fierce contentions, whether by consubstantiation, or else by transubstantiation the Sacrament itself be first possessed with Christ or no?*"<sup>a</sup>

Upon a case so clear, we will not insult our readers with note or comment.

We will now advert to confession; where we shall find Dr. Milner, *ut semper*, misrepresenting the admirable Chillingworth.

"Let the persons alluded to" (viz. who are deterred from embracing the Roman Catholic faith, from a dread of Sacramental confession)—

"Let the persons alluded to," says the learned prelate, "humbly and fervently pray," &c.—"and let them be persuaded of the truth of what an unexceptionable witness (Chillingworth) says, *who had experienced, while he was a Catholic, the interior joy he describes; where, persuading the penitent to go to his confessor, 'not as one that can speak comfortable and quieting words to him, but as to one that hath authority delegated to him from God himself, to absolve and acquit him of his sins,' he goes on: 'If you shall do this, assure your souls, that the understanding of man is not able to conceive that transport and excess of joy and comfort, which shall accrue to that man's heart who is persuaded he hath been made partaker of this blessing.'*—(Chillingworth, Sermon vii.)"<sup>b</sup>

Here Milner applies to one sort of confession what Chillingworth says of another. That whereof the former speaks is the *sacramental* confession of Rome; this to which the latter alludes is the *reformed* confession of England. For, first, Chillingworth quotes the following passage from Bishop Usher's answer to the Jesuit:—

"Be it known to our adversaries of Rome (I add also to our adversaries of Great Britain, who sell their private fancies for the doctrine of our Church), that no kind of confession, either public or private, is disallowed by our Church, that is any way requisite for the due execution of that ancient *power of the Keys*, which Christ bestowed upon his Church. The thing which we reject, is that new picklock of *sacramental confession* obruded upon men's consciences, as a matter necessary to salvation, by the canons of the late conventicle of Trent, in the 14th session."

Secondly; he calls the "Sacramental, necessary, universal confession" of the Church of Rome, "an *intolerable burden*;" and, lastly, he thus prefaces the passage cited by the learned prelate:—

"Therefore, in obedience to his gracious will, and as I am warranted, and even enjoined, by my holy mother the Church of England expressly, in the Book of

<sup>a</sup> Hooker, Eccl. Pol. lib. v. sec. 67, § 5.

<sup>b</sup> Letter xli. ad fin. p. 401.

Common Prayer, in the Rubrick of visiting the sick (which doctrine this Church hath likewise embraced so far), I beseech you, that by your practice and use you will not suffer that commission which Christ hath given to his ministers, to be a vain form of words, without any sense under them, not to be an antiquated expired commission, of no use nor validity in these days: But whensoever you find yourselves charged and oppressed, especially with such crimes as they call *peccata vastantia conscientiam*, such as do lay waste and depopulate the conscience, that you would have recourse to your spiritual physician, and freely disclose the nature and malignancy of your disease, that he may be able, as the cause shall require, either to search it with corrosives, or comfort and temper it with oil. And come not to him, only with such a mind as you would go to a learned man experienced in the Scriptures, as one that can speak comfortable quieting words," &c.<sup>a</sup>

The bold deceit which we have been detecting in Dr. Milner's celebrated work, may be traced to its very last page. There we read, that

"The most eminent Protestant divines"—

amongst whom he enumerates Hooker and Chillingworth—

"All acknowledge that *salvation may be found in the original Catholic Church*" (he means of Rome); "but" that "no divine of this Church, consistently with her characteristical unity and the constant doctrine of the holy Fathers and of the Scripture itself, can allow that salvation is to be found out of this communion, *except in the case of invincible ignorance.*"<sup>b</sup>

This is the common bugbear wherewith Roman Catholic writers strive to terrify those whom they fail to convince. But for Dr. Milner, if he had hopes of salvation for those amongst us who err through "invincible ignorance," our chance for heaven was as good in his estimation, as was that of Roman Catholics in the estimation of Hooker and Chillingworth: for it is a calumny to say that those writers thought Popish heresies to be pardonable without that plea. Hooker, indeed, charitably held, that "God was merciful to save thousands of our fathers, living in Popish superstitions;" but mark the sequel—"inasmuch as they sinned ignorantly!" "Their ignorance did make me hope they did find mercy, and so were saved!" Again: "If I be deceived in this point," says he, "not they, but the blessed Apostle hath deceived me. What I said of others, the same he said of himself: 'I obtained mercy, for I did it ignorantly.' Construe his words, and you cannot misconstrue mine. I speak no otherwise, I mean no otherwise, than he did." He, however, adds,—

"I must needs say that their case is fearful, their estate dangerous, which harden themselves, presuming on the mercy of God towards others. It is true, that God is merciful, but let us beware of presumptuous sins. God delivered Jonah from the bottom of the sea; will you therefore cast yourselves headlong from the tops of rocks, and say in your hearts, God shall deliver us!

<sup>a</sup> Chillingworth, Serm. vii. secs. 10, 12, 14.

<sup>b</sup> Letter i. p. 493.

He pitieth the blind that would gladly see; but will He pity him that may see, and hardeneth himself in blindness? *No; Christ hath spoken too much unto you to claim the privilege of your fathers!*"<sup>a</sup>

As for Chillingworth, it is plain that he had hopes for those Roman Catholics, *qui sequuntur Absolonem in simplicitate cordis*,—that they may be saved, "*yet, so as by fire.*"<sup>b</sup> "We hope," says he "(and *spes est rei incertæ nomen*), that *some* of you may *possibly* be saved, by occasion of their *unaffected ignorance.*"<sup>c</sup> But his hopes were scarcely equal to his fears.

"It were a thing much to be desired," he admits, "that there were no divisions; yet difference of opinions touching points controverted, is rather to be chosen than *unanimous concord in damned errors*. As it is better for men to go to heaven by divers ways, or rather by divers paths of the same way, than in the same path to go on *peaceably to hell*. *Amica pax, magis amica veritas!*"<sup>d</sup>

Such is the candid treatment which two of the most eminent divines that this country could ever boast, have received at the hands of the ingenuous Dr. Milner,—a prelate who (it is recorded by his *own* pen) would have "despised himself if he had *knowingly* published any falsehood, or hesitated to *retract* any one that he was proved to have fallen into."<sup>e</sup> One who could exclaim in the language of antiquity<sup>f</sup>—

"Heu prisca fides!—Heu, candida veritas!"

One who dare accuse even a Jewel of "deliberate impugning of the known truth," of "hypocrisy," and of shameful falsification of the Fathers;"<sup>g</sup> and a Barrow of "chicanery," and "shameful misrepresentation."<sup>h</sup> Yet could Dr. Milner, without attempting the slightest proof, brand an illustrious Christian with the odious mark of Socinianism, who had from the pulpit designated the Socinians "heretics," and pronounced their doctrine "blasphemous."<sup>i</sup> And of whom his most determined theological opponent had borne unimpeachable testimony, that "he ever appealed to his works even to his dying day"—he appealed to that work in which he had professed the doctrines of the Church of England "against the Socinian and all others whatsoever"—to that invaluable work which had been "approved and licensed by very learned and judicious divines."<sup>k</sup>

Shall we be told that we have been profaning the sacred

<sup>a</sup> Hooker's Serm. on Justification, secs. 36, 38.

<sup>b</sup> Chillingworth, Rel. of Prot. cap. 2, sec. 158.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid. cap. 5. sec. 76.

<sup>d</sup> In address, note, p. 30.

<sup>e</sup> Letter xxvi. ad fin. p. 274.

<sup>f</sup> Chillingworth, Serm. v. sec. 29.

<sup>d</sup> Ibid. cap. 5, sec. 72.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid. postscript.

<sup>h</sup> Letter xlvi. in a note, p. 436.

<sup>k</sup> Vide places above quoted.

dead? Not, we hope, by the followers of a Milner. Of him we have said only the truth. We have not aspersed his fame, nor tainted his memory with the breath of calumny. Would he had done equal justice to the names of the great men who preceded him to the grave. Neither the wisdom of Hooker—the reason of Chillingworth—the acuteness of Barrow—nor the learning of Jewel could protect them from the touch of this moth. The insect at last is fled; the filth it has left behind it must be brushed away.<sup>a</sup>

---

## No. XIV.

### PERSECUTIONS.

#### SEC. I.—Introductory Remarks.

THE grand desire of the Church of Rome is, and ever has been, to obtain accession to her numbers, and thus acquire—whatever the ostensible object put forward may be—temporal dominion and wealth. Persecution grows out of, and almost naturally accompanies the system. Having attained in a country her darling desire, supremacy, she has dared almost anything in the determination, when endangered, to retain that position. *Rule I will*, is her motto; and the readers of this volume will learn, if not already acquainted with the fact, something as to the means to which she is prepared to have recourse in carrying that point; never hesitating to smear her escutcheon even with blood, in making good her claim to that motto, in such kingdoms of Europe as furnished a sufficient body of ruffianism, to be moulded, or in any way moved, for her defence.

Still with all this ferocity of determination (the securing of numbers being one of her main objects), the hideous aspect of her shield having been found, in a predominantly Protestant country, to present a sad obstacle to the working out of her schemes for making “progress;” she has taken the utmost pains, notwithstanding this settled determination, to wash out, or in any way to paint over, the “damned spot.” That Church has accordingly made or adopted rules, which she finds very convenient for occasional use in gaining credit at

<sup>a</sup> The Protestant Journal, Nov. 1831, pp. 683—694.

one time, or sheltering herself from disgrace at another, when she would not appear *exactly* in the character of a

“Milk-white hind.”

On the subject of Persecution for Religion, Dr. Milner in Letter xlix. sets out with stating: that, so far from the Church of Rome being a persecuting Church, as the Reformed have been wont fondly to imagine, she actually determines, that her clergy shall have no hand in the putting heretics to death, that their authority goes no further than the pronouncing those persons to *be* heretics, and that, when they have so pronounced them, they shall even pray for their pardon from the secular powers of the State.

Was there ever a more shameless mixture of sophistry and effrontery?

The assertion is, that *the Church of Rome is NOT a persecuting Church*: and the proof of the assertion consists in the statement, that *the clergy are forbidden to embroil their hands in the blood of heretics*.

According to the necessary tenor of this proof, the laity, it seems, are not to be deemed *any* portion of the Roman Church.

Protestants, on the ground of historical testimony, charge the *Roman Church* with the guilt of murderous persecution.

Dr. Milner replies, that the charge must needs be false, because the *Romish clergy* are forbidden to put heretics to death.

Now, most plainly, this is no answer to the charge, unless the Romish priesthood are prepared to deny that the Romish laity form any part of the Romish Church. The charge was brought against the Romish Church *collectively*, not against the Romish clergy *exclusively*. To say, therefore, that the *Romish clergy* only pronounce persons to be heretics, while the laity undertake the executioner's office of *burning* them; and on *that* ground to frame a proof that the *Romish Church* is NOT a persecuting Church, amounts to a gross paralogism, unworthy of a very tyro in logic, UNLESS the Romish clergy *exclusively* form the Romish Church.

It might seem as if Dr. Milner had not observed the inevitable *consequence* of the singular defence which he has set up. The charge was: that *the Romish Church is a persecuting Church*. This charge he thinks it necessary to *repel*.

Now, unless the charge involved an accusation of what *he himself* admitted to be most disgraceful and most unchristian, any defence, on *his* part, which altogether rested on an indig-

nant denial of the truth of the accusation, would have been absurdly superfluous.

Thus the very defence, which he has set up for the Romish clergy, condemns, *vi consequentiæ*, the practice of the Romish laity.

So much for Dr. Milner's Sophistry: and it is well matched by his unblushing effrontery.

The Romish laity are guilty of murderous persecution. But who are their teachers and instigators?

Dr. Milner would actually have us believe, that the Romish clergy (for to *them* his argument confines the Romish Church) stand clear of persecution, simply because, with their own personal hands, they do not grossly play the butcher, and simply because they hypocritically beseech their miserable laic tools to be merciful and to spare the pronounced heretical delinquents.

Thus, in despite of the maxim, *Qui facit per alium, facit per se*, we are to account the *presiding* demons of the Inquisition quite exempt from any *just* charge of persecution and quite innocent of that incautiously *admitted* wickedness, because they *only* turned over their victims to be tortured and burned by their *laic* instruments; and thus we are liberally to reckon the *Romish priesthood* quite clear of guilt, because they go through the farce of beseeching the *lay power* to be merciful: when, all the while, Dr. Milner knew full well, that a single inhibition of the Pope and his clergy, a single declaration that every layman who put a heretic to death perpetrated a grievous sin, and should be excommunicated accordingly; would *enforce* and *secure* the mercy, which, with loathsome grimace, these sacerdotal mummers affected to *pray* for.

To put forth, by way of rebutting a just charge of murderous persecution against the whole Romish Church, a simulated *prayer* for mercy, when not an effort was made to *enforce* that prayer, nay, when the *granting* of the prayed-for mercy would have been itself deemed a proof of heretical predilection on the part of the layman who granted it, as we may see from the persecuting Canon of the Fourth Lateran Council, recognized and established by subsequent Councils and Synods down to the Council of Trent—to put forth *such* a prayer by way of *exculpation*, when the *laudatory* name of an *act of faith*, bestowed upon a wholesale butchery of the Inquisition, distinctly showed that no *exculpation* was really thought necessary, save to gull some heedless Protestant dupe—to argue thus is a specimen of shameless effrontery, which none but a double-dipped Romish priest could have ventured to exhibit.



This very obvious retort, Dr. Milner endeavours to meet by anticipation.

“Whereas,” says he, “many heresies are subversive of the established governments, the public peace, and natural morality, it does not belong to the Church to *prevent* princes and states from exercising their just authority in repressing and punishing them, when this is judged to be the case: nor would any clergyman incur irregularity by exhorting princes and magistrates to provide for those important objects and the safety of the Church itself, by repressing its disturbers, provided he did not concur to the death or mutilation of any particular disturber. Thus it appears, that though there have been persecuting laws in many [Roman] Catholic States, the Church itself, so far from claiming, actually disclaims, the power of persecuting.” (Letter xlix. p. 466.)

Here again shines forth the sophist, though certainly the quite *transparent* sophist.

Who ever denied, that persons, in *faith* heretics, may be punished, when, in *practice*, they are guilty of treason and conspiracy? But who can so grievously lack either common sense or common honesty, as not to perceive that individuals so punished are punished for their *treason*, not for their *heresy*?

On this principle it was, that our own glorious Elizabeth justly punished the Popish traitors, who, under the lawless influence of the Church of Rome, were plotting against her life and her crown. But they were punished as *traitors*, with the death of traitors, not as *heretics*, with what the Romanists deem the appropriate death of heretics. The question before us respects heretics *quoad* heretics, not heretics *quoad* traitors: and it will still be asked, notwithstanding Dr. Milner’s wish to elude such an unpleasant interrogation: “Why did not the Pope and his clergy interfere to prevent the laity from putting to a cruel death, as heretics, men who had never been implicated in the guilt of high treason?”<sup>a</sup>

If the Church of Rome deems the murder of heretics a *crime*, in which her clergy are forbidden to participate, how shall we estimate the guilt of those very clergy, who, *believing* the slaughter of heretics to be criminal, yet never interfered to *prevent* her laity from perpetrating an acknowledged crime?

If she *approve* of the bloody deed in her laity, though she hypocritically forbids its actual perpetration by her clergy, what becomes of Dr. Milner’s pretended exculpation?

<sup>a</sup> We shall, in another Article, prove that the priests, and not the laity, are in fact responsible for the persecution of alleged heretics.

The burning of heretics she must inevitably esteem either a *heinous crime*, or *no crime at all*.

If the *former*, she wickedly, in direct opposition to the word of the Lord by the prophet Ezekiel, allows her laity to perpetrate crime without any attempt to prevent it by her solemn protest and warning (Ezek. iii. 17, 18, 20).

If the *latter*, she stands self-convicted of that very persecution, from which Dr. Milner would disingenuously exculpate her.

But, in truth (to carry on an argument which we have already employed), the exculpation, attempted by Dr. Milner, is, under the precise aspect of an *exculpation*, nothing less than a virtual acknowledgment, that *the putting individuals to death, whether by priesthood or laity, on the score of heresy, is a grievous sin*.

For, if it be *not* a sin and a scandal, why should Dr. Milner wish to prove that his Church is *not* a persecuting Church? Why should he wish to exhibit his clergy, as inculcating mercy, rather than as inflicting punishment?

His very attempt shows, either his real consciousness that persecution *is* a sin, or his desire to impose upon unwary Protestants by exhibiting his Church under an aspect which does not belong to her.

Meanwhile, whatever may have been the inward working of his mind, his outward allegations are strangely at variance, both with the *recorded practice* of his Church, and likewise with her *avowed sentiments*.

In *practice*, we need only look to the FACTS, of the Inquisition, of the wholesale barbarities of Alva in the Netherlands, of the relentless and enduring persecution of the blameless Albigenes and Valdenses, of the reign of the well-known Mary of England, of the massacre of St. Bartholomew approved of and exulted over by the Pope and his clergy, of the parallel massacre of the year 1641 in Ireland, and even of the persecution still carried on in the present day against the Reformed of that unhappy country, and against all such as dare conscientiously to repudiate the deadly superstition of Rome.

With *practice* exactly tallies *precept*. Dr. Milner vainly attempts to get over the third Canon of the fourth Council of Lateran.<sup>a</sup> Like a millstone, it hangs, and ever will hang, about the neck of his apostate and blood-stained Church. How it has ever been understood, is quite clear from the notes to the Rhemish Testament: and the stealthy suppres-

<sup>a</sup> The proofs of the authenticity of this decree will form the subject of a separate Article.

sion of those particular notes in some copies of the modern edition of Macnamara serves only to show a deep consciousness of what the Romish Church really is. In these notes, which form an admirable comment upon the Lateran Canon, bishops are warned to be zealous and stout against false prophets and heretics, of what sort soever, after the *example* of holy Elias, that in zeal *killed* four hundred and fifty false prophets of Jezabel: Protestants are censured, for foolishly expounding of Rome the Apocalyptic Harlot, because Romanists *put heretics to death* and *allow* of their punishment in other countries; whereas no commonwealth shall answer for *shedding the blood of heretics*, any more than for shedding the blood of thieves, men-killers, and other malefactors: the good (meaning, of course, the Papists) are authorized to tolerate the evil when it is so strong that it cannot be redressed without danger and disturbance of the whole Church; otherwise, where ill men (be they *heretics* or other malefactors) may be punished or suppressed without disturbance and hazard of the good, they may and *ought*, by public authority, either *spiritual* or temporal, to be chastised or *executed*: and, to crown all, by a daring and impious perversion of our Blessed Lord's own decision, the wretched dupes of Popery are assured, that neither the *Church* nor Christian princes are blamed *for putting heretics to death*.<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Of these awful notes the following may serve as specimens:—

"A heretic may be excommunicated, and so made as an heathen or a publican was to the Jews, by the discipline of the Church, casting him out of the fellowship of Catholics: which excommunication is a greater punishment than if he were executed by sword, fire, and wild beasts." (Note on Matt. xviii. 17.)

"St. Augustine also referreth this compelling to the penal laws which Catholic princes do justly use against heretics and schismatics, proving that they who are by their former profession in baptism subject to the Catholic Church, and are departed from the same afterwards, may and ought to be compelled into the unity and society of the universal Church again." (Note on Luke xiv. 23.)

"Not justice nor all rigorous punishment of sinners is here forbidden, nor the Church or Christian princes blamed for putting heretics to death; but that none of these should be done for desire of our particular revenge, or without discretion, and regard of their amendment, and example to others." (Note on Luke ix. 55.)

"The Protestants foolishly expound it of Rome, for that there they put heretics to death, and allow their punishment in other countries; but their blood is not called the blood of saints, no more than the blood of thieves, man-killers, and other malefactors, for the shedding of which, by order of justice, no commonwealth shall answer." (Note on Rev. xvii. 6.)

"You may see hereby, that the spiritual power of bishops—hath authority to punish, judge, and condemn heretics and other like rebels." (Note on 2 Cor. x. 6.)

"Where ill men (be they heretics or other malefactors) may be punished or suppressed without disturbance and hazard of the good, they may and ought,

In the face both of *fact* and of *precept*, Dr. Milner seems to have imagined, that he could readily persuade those men of straw, his friends at New Cottage, that his Church was specially remarkable for its great meekness and its exemplary hatred of persecution! Nay, truly, in absolute contradiction to his exculpation of the clergy, or the Church (for so he seems exclusively to denominate the clergy), and to his intimation that any persecution on the part of the laity was their own unauthorized act and deed, the notes before us vindicate the *putting heretics to death* whether by the *Church* or by Christian princes, and roundly declare that heretics *ought* to be chastised or *executed* by public authority either *spiritual* or temporal.

*Thus it appears*, says Dr. Milner, in the very fulness of logical self-satisfaction: *thus it appears, that though there have been persecuting laws in many (Roman) Catholic states, the Church itself, so far from claiming, actually disclaims, the power of persecuting!*

He would, however, in the way of a retort courteous, throw back upon Protestants themselves the charge of blood-stained persecution: just as if the guilt of one party could whitewash the guilt of another party.

We confess with grief, that Protestants have not been altogether exempt from this murderous abomination: but, to say nothing of the mitigating abatement, that, where Protestantism has burned her units, Popery has burned her myriads, we venture to account for the reprobated fact on principles which are anything rather than flattering to the Church of Rome.

The progress of reform was gradual: nor was the whole evil of Popery either perceived or rejected instantaneously. They who had been trained in a school of persecution did not immediately unlearn its diabolical lessons; and, for a season, they unhappily bore upon them the ancient brand of the sanguinary harlot out of whose polluted communion they had obediently withdrawn themselves. It has often been said, that the Christian principle of toleration was not then understood: an assertion, which, if it means anything definite, means only, that the theological world did not instantaneously forget the instructions of the pretended mother and mistress of all churches.

by public authority, either spiritual or temporal, to be chastised or executed." (Note on Matt. xiii. 29, 30.)

For a full history of this edition of the Rhemish Testament, see "The Complete Notes to the Douay Bible and Rhemish Testament; with a Preface, embodying the Facts and Documents connected with the publication of both editions," &c. &c. By the Rev. R. J. M'Ghee. Dublin, 1837.

But how stands the matter in the present day?

Protestants universally reprobate the judicial murder of either real heretics or alleged heretics: but Papists have never renounced the black badge of their community.

The *authentic* third Canon of the fourth Lateran still stands unrepealed.<sup>a</sup> Nay, even in the midst of his sophistical attempt at denial and exculpation, it is vindicated and defended by Dr. Milner: and, in the authorized notes of the Rhemish Testament, we are still taught, that persecution is a duty, and that, when it is not actually carried into practice, the defect springs, not from want of will, but from want of power.<sup>b</sup>

---

SEC. II.—Is the Church of Rome responsible for Persecutions of Heretics?

One of the questions which were reserved for further consideration, is that which stands at the head of the present article.

In letter xlix. Dr. Milner labours hard to prove that the Church of Rome is not responsible for the persecution of heretics, and that she does not take upon herself or even sanction "religious persecutions." He expressly denies that she "*maintains a claim* of punishing heretics with penalties, imprisonment, tortures, and death;" but, on the contrary, "*she disclaims the power* of so doing" (the italics are his own). In support of this assertion he quotes a passage from an epistle attributed to Pope "Leo the Great," Bishop of Rome between the years 440 and 461; when "writing about the Manichean heretics,—who, as he asserted, laid all modesty aside, prohibiting the matrimonial connection, and subverting all law human and divine,—says, that the ecclesiastical lenity was content even in this case, with the sacerdotal judgment, and avoided all sanguinary punishments. However," continues Dr. Milner, "the secular emperors might inflict them for reasons of state" (p. 465). Among other *ancient* writers he quotes Tertullian as saying that "It does not belong to religion to force religion." He then declares, that the "Canon Law [of the Church of Rome] as it stood in ancient times, and as it still stands, renders all those who have actively concurred in the death or mutilation of any human being, whether Catholic or heretic, Jew or Pagan,

<sup>a</sup> The *authenticity* of this famous third Canon, of which some modern Papists, in very shame, would fain get rid, is fully established by the Rev. John Evans, in his "Statutes of the Fourth Council of Lateran." Seeley, Fleet Street.

<sup>b</sup> Faber's "Difficulties of Romanism," in Preface of third edition.

even in a just war, or by exercising the art of surgery, or by judicial proceedings, *irregular*; that is to say, such persons cannot be promoted to Holy Orders, or exercise those orders if they have actually received them. Nay, when an ecclesiastical judge or tribunal has, after due examination, pronounced that any person accused of obstinate heresy is actually guilty of it, he is required by the Church expressly to declare in her name, that her power extends no further than such decision: and, in case the obstinate heretic is liable, by the laws of the State, to suffer death or mutilation, the judge is required to pray for his pardon" (p. 466). For all this *original* matter, Dr. Milner gives no authority, because, in fact, none is producible, though he is not very particular in appending an ambiguous reference when it suits his convenience.

Dr. Milner then proceeds to state that "Whereas many heresies are subversive of the established governments, the public peace, and of national morality, it [nevertheless] does not belong to the Church to *prevent* princes and states from exercising their just authority in repressing and punishing them, when this is judged to be actually the case; nor would any clergyman incur irregularity by exhorting princes and magistrates to provide for those important objects, and the safety of the Church itself, by repressing its disturbers, provided he did not concur to the death or mutilation of any particular disturber. Thus it appears [but Dr. Milner's representation, be it remembered, is unsupported by any authority], that though there have been persecuting laws in many [Roman] Catholic states, the Church itself, so far from *claiming*, actually *disclaims*, the power of persecuting" (p. 466). (The italics are Dr. Milner's.)

It appears, therefore, by the statement of Dr. Milner, that the Roman Church not only does not sanction persecution, but disclaims the power of persecuting; and further, that should a person be condemned of heresy, it can only declare the person to be such, while the judge is dutifully enjoined to pray for his pardon. Since, however, hundreds of thousands have been tortured and put to death for the so-called crime of heresy, in fact, for not thinking and believing as the Church of Rome thinks and believes, the *State* and not the *Church* is guilty, if any guilt attaches to the act.

Dr. Milner, moreover, has an excuse at hand for the *State*. In the same Letter, p. 486, he says: "In the first place, whenever Catholic states and princes have persecuted Protestants, it was always in favour of *an ancient religion*, which had been established in their country, perhaps, a thousand or fifteen hundred years, and had, during that time, preserved

its peace, order, and morality, while they clearly saw, that an attempt to alter this religion would, unavoidably, produce incalculable disorders and sanguinary contests." And, in the second place, "if Catholic states and princes have enforced submission to their Church by persecution, they were fully persuaded that there is a *Divine authority in this Church to decide controversies of religion*, and that those Christians who refuse to hear her voice, when she pronounces upon them, are obstinate heretics."

We will now inquire how far Dr. Milner's assertions can be borne out by historical facts. We will take first the opinion of private doctors of the Church of Rome.

Eckius, the celebrated opponent of Luther, devotes a whole chapter to this subject in his "Enchiridion," and conducts his inquiry in a very systematic and business-like manner. He first proves from Scripture that "obstinate or relapsed heretics are *justly* put to death;" then he notices several objections, on the part of Lutherans, to this doctrine; and lastly, answers the said objections. The following is a specimen of his mode of reasoning on this subject:—"And the man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken to the priest (that standeth there to minister before the Lord thy God), or unto the judge, even that man shall die: and thou shalt put away the evil from Israel' (Deut. xvii. 12). The reason for this law is still in force, *that we should take away the evil from the midst of the Church*. 'But the earth which beareth thorns and briars is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing; *whose end is to be burned*' (Heb. v. 8). *An heretic is earth of this sort.*"<sup>a</sup>

Let us now see how he deals with the objections of the Lutherans. "The Lutherans object that the Lord commanded His servants to let the tares grow together with the wheat, and that by *tares* are signified *heretics*." To this objection Eckius thus replies—"To root out heretics by death is *not* contrary to the command of the Lord (as being limited to) when the tares cannot be extirpated without the extirpation of the wheat; wherefore He (the Lord) adds, 'Lest, perhaps, ye also root up the wheat together with them: *when there is no fear of that, let not the severity of discipline sleep.*'"

Eckius seems to lose no opportunity of enforcing the doctrine that "*hæretici obstinati aut relapsi juste per mortem e medio tolluntur*," for, in his "Second Homily for St. George the Martyr's Day," he says, "Heretics are wont to inquire

<sup>a</sup> "De Hæreticis comburendis." See "Enchiridion Locorum Communium adversus Lutherum et alios Hostes Ecclesiæ." Coloniae, 1567.

‘why they are burned?’ Behold the reason even to the letter, *because they do not remain in the vine.*”<sup>a</sup>

From Eckius we proceed to Alphonsus à Castro, who says: “The last punishment to be considered is that of the body, viz. DEATH—a punishment with which we will prove, by God’s assistance, that heretics ought to be visited.”—“From which words it is abundantly plain, that it is not a modern invention, but a very old opinion of wise Christians, that heretics should be burned with fire.”<sup>b</sup> It will be perceived that à Castro claims antiquity, as sanctioning his view of the teaching of his Church, while Dr. Milner laboured to show that the Church, in early days, abhorred persecution on account of religion.

The next doctor we quote is the canonized “seraphic doctor,” Saint Thomas Aquinas. He first argues that heretics are to be tolerated,—and this opinion is founded on 2 Tim. ii. 24, and 1 Cor. xi. 19. On the other hand he argues, from the text Titus iii. 10, that persecutions are justifiable, and having thus weighed the two sides of the argument, founded on Scripture, he then sums up his own opinion as to what the Church does or should teach. He says,—

“Although heretics are not to be tolerated, by reason of their delinquency, they are to be waited for until the second reproof, in order that they may return to the sound faith of the Church; but those who continue obstinate in their error after the second reproof, are not only to be consigned to the sentence of excommunication, but also to the secular princes TO BE EXTERMINATED (*exterminandi*).”—“If falsifiers of money, or other malefactors, are justly consigned to immediate death by secular princes, much more do heretics, immediately after they are convicted of heresy, deserve not only to be excommunicated, but also JUSTLY TO BE KILLED (*sed et juste occidi*).”<sup>c</sup>

To come nearer home, Dens declares it to be the accepted doctrine in the Roman Church that the rites of heretics should not be tolerated; <sup>d</sup> that they ought to be *compelled* by

<sup>a</sup> (Quintæ partis Joannis Eckii in Lutherum et alios. MDXXXVI. fol. 94.) “Tomus tertius Homiliarum de Sanctis.” For these quotations from Eckius, we are indebted to the Rev. John Evans’s “Letters on the Papal Aggression,” letter vii.; and his “Papal Aggression and Concessions to Rome.” Painter, London, p. 13, whose text we have followed.

<sup>b</sup> “Ultima se jam offert corporis pœna; mors scilicet, qua hæreticos, nisi tempestive resipiscant, juste puniendos esse apertissime, Deo favente, demonstrabimus.”—“Ex quibus verbis apertissime constat non esse recentem inventionem, sed antiquissimam sapientium Christianorum sententiam hæreticos esse igne cremandos.”—Alph. à Castro de Hæret. Punitione. Madrid, 1773. Lib. ii. cap. 12, pp. 123, 128. This à Castro was lately quoted from the pulpit of St. George’s Cathedral, Southwark, as an example to be followed.

<sup>c</sup> “Secunda secundæ partis Summ. Theolog. S. Tho. Aquinatis.” Romæ, 1586, Quæst. xi. Art. iii. p. 93.

<sup>d</sup> “Resp. 2<sup>o</sup>. Ritus aliorum infidelium, nempe paganorum et hæreticorum, per se non sunt tolerandi: quia ita sunt mali, ut nihil veritatis aut utilitatis in bonum Ecclesiæ inde derivetur.”—Dens, Tractatus de Virtutibus. De Ritibus Infid. tolerandis. Tom. ii. pp. 82, 83. Dublin, 1832.



*corporeal punishments* to adopt the Roman faith,<sup>a</sup> and that if they refuse, they are justly punishable by *death*; and for these opinions he appeals to Thomas Aquinas as an authority, and to the burning of John Huss as a precedent.<sup>b</sup>

To come nearer still to our own times. The following remarkable passages we extract from the Roman Catholic monthly journal, entitled the "Rambler." In the January number of 1854, we read as follows:—

"We have no intention of entering now upon the general question of religious persecution; but this we will say, that those who believe the Old Testament to be the word of God cannot deny that he has sanctioned the crushing of falsehood by material means. To make a great outcry about a Christian having put into practice the same principles which were enjoined by God as rules of action upon Moses, Josue, and Samuel,—which were applauded in David, and which St. Peter was inspired to put into practice, may be good policy in one who wishes simply to protest against Rome, caring little what becomes of Christianity, but is suicidal in the Protestant who wishes at the same time to uphold 'the whole Bible' as the pure and exclusive revelation of God. The Church has persecuted, and on principle—there is no denying the fact;—but the principle is one of policy and prudence, not of dogma, and, in the present state of the world, she rarely acts upon it; not that in itself the principle is indefensible even on modern grounds, for the punishment of a religious offence by *imprisonment* and *DEATH* is in itself no more incompatible with reason, or with the Christian spirit, than the infliction of the same punishment on the thief and murderer."—p. 2.

Again, in the June number for 1849:—

"For our own selves, we are prepared to maintain that it is no more morally wrong to put a man to death for *heresy* than for *murder*!—that in many cases *persecution for religious opinions* is not only permissible, but highly advisable and necessary; and further, that no nation on earth, Catholic or Protestant, ever did, ever does, or ever will, consistently, act upon the idea that such persecution is forbidden by the laws of God or the Gospel (!) . . . Instances do incessantly occur in which *persecution*, in some form or other, is both wise, merciful, necessary, and Christian."

But it may be said these are but private opinions of doctors of the Church, and are of no authority. We shall then pass on to the Bulls of Popes, and the decrees of Councils, registered in this same body of Canon Law, to which Dr. Milner has the hardihood to refer us.<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> "Resp. 2<sup>o</sup> ad quæstionem infideles baptizati, quales esse solent hæretici et apostatæ, item schismatici baptizati cogi possunt, etiam pœnis corporalibus, ut revertantur ad fidem Catholicam et unitatem Ecclesiæ."—Dens, Tract. de Virtutibus. An Infideles sint compellendi ad Fidem? Tom. ii. p. 79. Dublin, 1832.

<sup>b</sup> "An heretici rectè puniuntur morte? Respondet S. Thomas, 2. 2, quæst. xi. art. 3, in corp. affirmativè: quia falsarii pecuniæ, vel alii rempublicam turbantes, justè morte puniantur: ergo etiam heretici, qui sunt falsarii fidei, et, experientiâ teste, rempublicam gravitèr perturbant. . . . Idem probatur ex condemnatione articuli 14. Joan. Hus. in concilio Constantiensi."—Dens, Tract. de Virtutibus. De Pœnis Criminis Hæresis. Tom. ii. p. 89. Dublin, 1832.

<sup>c</sup> For this collection of authorities we are indebted to the Controversial correspondence with Rev. Paul Maclachlan. Partridge & Co. London, 1855, p. 253 *et seq.*

Turning then to the Canon Law, or "*Corpus Juris Canonici*," we find ample material at hand. The edition to which we at present refer is that of "*Coloniæ Munatianæ*," 1779, a reprint of the text of Gregory XIII. We have only room for the heading of the various decrees, which are sufficiently indicative of their contents.

Decret. ii. pars, causa xxiii. q. 4, § 38, p. 315, *et seq.* This decree is headed "Heretics are to be *forced* to salvation." Again, another heading is, "Heretics profitably suffer what the Catholics profitably inflict." (§ 39.) A third, "The Church rightly persecutes heretics." At p. 317 we read, "The Church may seek the aid of kings." Under Pope Gregory I., cap. 48, we read, "Earthly powers ought to war against the enemies of the Church." Again, "What the *priests* cannot effect by teaching, *power* must exact." (Isidorus, in Quæst. v. c. xx.) "Let secular powers *coerce* schismatics and heretics." (Pope Pelagius, c. xliii.) "They are not homicides who, from zeal for Mother Church, are armed against the excommunicated." (Pope Urban II., c. xlvi.)

In the Decretals of Pope Gregory IX., p. 238, under the title "*De Hæreticis*," we read, by order of Pope Lucius III., that heretics are to be handed over to the secular powers to be punished, and their goods confiscated to the Church. And the like is decreed by Innocent III. (p. 239), who adds that advocates and notaries are not to give advice to heretics. The fourth (General) Council of Lateran, under this same Innocent III., as we shall presently see, decreed the general extermination of all heretics. Pope Gregory IX. (p. 241) also decreed the same, and absolved all persons from their oath of allegiance to heretics.

The "*Magnum Bullarium Romanum*" (Luxemburg edit. 1727), a book of undoubted authority, furnishes us with useful information on the subject in hand. In the first volume, under the title of Pope Honorius III., A.D. 1216, we find this Pope issuing a Bull confirming the laws of the Emperor Frederick II. for the extermination of heretics. In 1243 Innocent IV. issued a Bull to the same effect, and in the same year (see tom. i. p. 103) he issued another Bull directing a crusade against heretics. Alexander IV., A.D. 1254 (tom. i. p. 122), issued a similar exterminating Bull, and appointed the Inquisitors; and in 1262 Pope Urban IV. instructed these Inquisitors to exterminate heretics. Pope Clement IV., in 1265 (p. 140), confirmed the constitution of Pope Innocent IV. against heretics. Pope Nicholas III., by Bull dated 1278, further decreed the excommunica-

tion of heretics, and for handing them over to the secular arm.

In 1317 Pope John XXII. decreed the extermination of all the "enemies of the orthodox faith;" and Pope Boniface IX., in 1391, like Honorius III., reconfirmed the exterminating laws of the Emperor Frederick II.

In 1418 Martin V. ("Mag. Bull. Rom." fol. 289; Luxemb. 1727) issued his famous Bull against Wickliffe, Huss, and Jerome of Prague, and condemned them and their followers for holding heretical opinions, and handed them over to the secular courts for punishment. We shall presently see that these secular courts were by the Canon Law *compelled* to inflict the ordered punishments.

Dr. Milner says, that "The Council of Constance, in condemning John Huss of heresy, declared that its power extended to nothing further."<sup>a</sup> And does Dr. Milner and his retailers expect that we are to be amused with this exhibition of prudish abstinence! The Council no doubt imagined that, by merely leaving Huss to the course of the law, they were themselves exempt from any blood-guiltiness. But what was the result of their proceedings? During the 15th session Huss, and during the 21st Jerome of Prague, were condemned to the flames for holding so-called heretical opinions, notwithstanding the safe-conduct which had been vouchsafed by the Council, and on which they relied; and it was at the 45th session of this Council that Martin V. issued the last-named Bull, thus approving of the previous decree of the Council; and Bellarmine (Book i. On Councils, cap. 7) says, "This Council, with respect to its last session, and of all those things which Martin V. approved, is admitted by all Catholics" as general, and therefore infallibly binding. The fate of these martyrs is well known. They were burnt alive. The murders were the result of the decree of a Popish Council, and enacted by Popes; for John XXIII. in 1414, had already exhorted the King of Bohemia to "root out" the errors of Wickliffe.

The Council expressly declared that no safe-conduct given to presumed heretics by princes or others should be a protection, however binding the instrument might be considered, and that the proper *ecclesiastical* authority should inquire into the errors of the party, and otherwise proceed against them.<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> P. 466, Letter xlix. In Von der Hardt's "Rerum Conc. Constantiensis," tom. iv. part 6, p. 440.

<sup>b</sup> Labb. Concil. ed. Mansi, tom. xxvii. p. 799. See Cramp's "Text-book of Popery," p. 485. London, 1851.

Bzovius, the Romish historian, who continued the annals of Baronius, admits that armies of 500,000 men were raised to exterminate the unoffending Albigenes "at the command and exhortation of Pope Innocent III.;"<sup>a</sup> and Innocent VIII., by a Bull, enjoined the secular powers, under pain of anathema, to take up arms to extirpate these simple-hearted followers of Christ, "wherever they could be found."<sup>b</sup> And Bzovius again says, that "innumerable heretics were burnt alive" for "persisting in their obstinacy." Romanists shrink from taking the responsibility of the Inquisition on their Church, but hear what Bzovius further says:<sup>c</sup> "About that time, Pope Innocent III. (as Sixtus V. relates in his diploma for the institution of the festival of St. Peter the Martyr) authorized the godlike Dominick to distinguish himself against the heretics, by constant preaching and meetings for discussion, and by *the office of the Inquisition, which he first intrusted to him*; and that he should either reconcile them to the Church, if they were willing to be reconciled, *or strike them with a just sentence if they were unwilling to return.*"

But to continue to quote the persecuting decrees of successive Popes. After Martin, we have, in 1486, Innocent VIII., and Pope Julius II. in 1511, who each issued similar Bulls for the anathematizing and the punishment of heretics. Leo X., in 1520, issued his Bull wherein, among other so-called errors of Martin Luther, he condemned his assertion that the burning of heretics was contrary to the will of the Holy Spirit; and this same Leo declared that the exter-

<sup>a</sup> Bzovii Annales Eccl., tom. xiii. p. 156. An. Chr. 1209. Innoc. III. 12 and 14.

<sup>b</sup> We here add an extract from the Bull itself, *to prove* that the secular authorities were compelled, by *anathema* of the Popes, to execute the judgments against heretics (tom. i. p. 453, ed. Lugd. 1655):—

"Inquisitorum hæreticæ pravitatæ sententiæ contra hæreticos promulgatæ, a magistratibus sæcularibus executioni demandentur absque aliquâ processuum revisione.

"Innocentius Papa VIII. venerabili fratri nostro episcopo Brixien. et dilecto filio Inquisitori in partibus Lombardiæ.

"2. At cum hujusmodi crimen hæresis sit merè ecclesiasticum, et delicta nullo pacto impunita remanere debeant, tenore præsentium vobis committimus atque mandamus, ut si est ita, eisdem officialibus sæcularibus civitatis Brixienensis, sub excommunicationis pœna, et aliis censuris ecclesiasticis, præcipiatis atque mandetis, ut infra sex dies, postquam legitime fuerint requisiti, sine aliquâ dictorum processuum per vos agitatorum visione, sententias per vos latas contra hujusmodi hæreticos promptè exequantur, appellatione remota. Quam excommunicationis pœnam ipso factò volumus, et tenore præsentium declaramus incurrisse, si, quod mandatum fuerit, infra dictum sex dierum spatium, cessante legitimo impedimento, cum effectu non impleverint, &c.

"Datum Romæ apud Sanctum Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris, die trigesimo Septemb. 1486, Pontif. nost. an. tertio."—(Innocentius Octavus, Magnum Bullarium Romanum. Luxemburgi, 1727.)

<sup>c</sup> Ibid. Inquisitio. An. Ch. 1215. Innoc. III. c. 19.

minating constitutions of the German emperors were laudable.<sup>a</sup>

“In 1527, about forty years previous to the massacre of St. Bartholomew, the bishops and clergy assembled at the Council of Sens or Paris, and issued a missive exhorting all *Christian princes* to exterminate heretics, and this was aimed more particularly against the Lutherans.<sup>b</sup>

Clement VII. in the following year then issued his Bull for the extermination of heretics. Paul III., in 1536, reissued the Bull known as the Bull “*In Cœna Domini*,” which was directed against the followers of Luther; and this same Pope, in 1542, after giving authority to the Inquisitors in matters concerning heresy, declares that the secular arm is to be called in to assist in the persecutions. And the Bull of Julius III., A.D. 1550, was issued against all those who opposed these Inquisitors. We then have the comprehensive Bull of Paul IV., A.D. 1559, which concentrates and calls into exercise *all* the persecuting decrees, acts of councils, and bulls that had ever been enacted or issued against heretics. Pope Pius V., ever ready for such services, in 1569 addressed a special letter to Charles IX. of France, previous to the massacre of St. Bartholomew, urging him on to the persecution of heretics.<sup>c</sup> Shortly after followed the massacre of St. Bartholomew.

We cannot, however, pass over this enumeration, without giving prominence, more particularly to the famous decree of Innocent III. passed at the fourth Council of Lateran, which Gregory IX. inserted in the Canon Law of the Church of Rome, or Decretals, and which to this day stands unrepealed:—

“We excommunicate and anathematize every heresy exalting itself against that holy orthodox and Catholic faith, which we have above set forth; condemning all heretics, by whatever names they may be denominated.—having, indeed, different faces, but tails tied together, because they all agree in the same folly. Let those persons, when condemned, be abandoned to the secular authorities being present, or to their officers, in order that they may be *duly punished*—those who are clergymen being degraded; so that the *property* of persons thus condemned, if laymen, shall be *confiscated*,—and in the case of clergymen, applied to the Churches from which they drew their stipends. But let those who are discovered as only notably suspected—unless, according to the nature of the suspicion and the quality of the person, they show their innocence by a suitable purgation—be *struck with the sword of anathema*. . . . Let the secular powers, whatever offices they may hold, be advised and instructed, and, if need be, *compelled* by ecclesiastical censure, and as they desire to be reputed and held faithful, to take a public oath for the defence of the faith, that they will study to the utmost to *exterminate* from all territories subject to their jurisdiction all heretics so marked by the Church. . . . And

<sup>a</sup> Bulla Leonis Papæ X. advs. Lutherum, An. Chr. 1520; in Labb. et Coss. Concil. tom. xiv. Paris, 1672.

<sup>b</sup> Labb. et Coss., tom. xiv. coll. 432 and 440, and see col. 461. Paris, 1672.

<sup>c</sup> Pii Quinti, Pont. Max. Epist. lib. iii. Epist. 45, à Goubau, Antvp. 1640.

if the secular power refuse to comply, let it be signified to the sovereign pontiff, that he may declare the *vassals released from their fealty, and give the country to Catholics, who, having exterminated the heretics, may peaceably possess it.*

“We add, moreover, that every archbishop, by himself or by his archdeacons, or other *honest* (?) and fit (!) persons, should traverse, at least once or twice a year, every parish in which it is rumoured that heretics reside; and there compel three or four men of good repute—or, if expedient, the whole neighbourhood—to make known to him any heretics, or person holding secret conventicles, or dissenters from the life and manners of the faithful.”<sup>a</sup>

In conformity with this Bull, every bishop is compelled to swear, “All heretics, schismatics, and rebels against the same our lord (the Pope), or aforesaid successors, I will, *to the utmost of my power, persecute and attack.*”<sup>b</sup>

In a late Roman work on the Canon Law, Devoti’s “*Jus Canonicum*,” a publication now in use, and of authority in England, it is laid down, that everything contained in the Decretals of Gregory IX. *is law.*<sup>c</sup>

In this last decree we find a full and sufficient reply to all the arguments and assertions of Dr. Milner. The *Church*, he says, does not persecute, but heretics are to be struck with the sword of anathema, and when condemned, they are to be abandoned to the *secular* power, which in turn is to be compelled by *ecclesiastical* censure to carry out the *Church’s* condemnation.

Truly this is a pitiful and paltry manœuvre, but it will not hold good. “*Qui facit per alios facit per se,*” is an old legal

<sup>a</sup> Decret., headed Innocent III., in Concilio Generali, reprinted in the Corp. Juris Can., tom. ii. p. 758, edit. Lips. 1839.

<sup>b</sup> “*Hæreticos, schismaticos, et rebelles, eidem Domino nostro, vel successoribus prædictis, PRO POSSE, PERSEQUI ET IMPUGNABO.*”—Pontificale Romanum, p. 88, edit. Paris 1664. This edition is in use by Dr. Wiseman; and see Decretum Greg. IX. lib. ii. tit. 24.

Titulars in Roman Ireland, on being examined before a committee of the House of Lords, were bold enough to declare that the persecuting canon of the fourth Lateran Council was spurious, and not found in the original. But this decree of the fourth Lateran Council, held by Innocent III., is to be found at the present day in the Canon Law of the Roman Church, as above quoted and referred to.

The decree of the fourth Lateran Council, commanding the extermination of heretics, is to be found also in Labb. and Coss. Concil., tom. xi. ab anno 1188 ad annum 1284, Paris. edit. 1671—Title “*III. de Hæreticis*,” and see p. 423. The decree of the Council of Constance, that heretics are to be burnt alive, is found in the same edition of “*Councils*,” tom. xxvii. p. 1196. In the “*Concilium Oxoniense*,” sec. 13, anno Dom. 1408, we find a decree that heretics in England should be burnt alive.

<sup>c</sup> “*Hodie Corpus Juris Canonici, quo in scholis, et in foro utimur, constat ex Gratiani Decreto, decretalibus Greg. IX., Sexto Decretalium Bonifacii VIII., Clementinis, Extravagantibus; Gratiani Decretum, uti supra ostendimus, nullam per se habet publicam auctoritatem; sed ea donatæ sunt cæteræ collectiones, quarum nunc facta mentio est: quidquid igitur in iis comprehenditur legem facit: contra quæ in Decreto continentur tantum valent, quantum per se ipsa extra Decretum valerent.*”—(Devoti, “*Jus Canonicum*,” tom i. p. 379, ed. Rom. 1837.)

axiom, which is equally applicable to the Church of Rome as to secular communities, and we unhesitatingly assert that the Church of Rome *is* responsible for the persecution of (so-called) heretics.

---

SEC. III.—The Persecuting Spirit of Rome.\*

Though we should give up the authenticity and genuineness of the atrocious third canon of the fourth Lateran Council, or even of the whole of the seventy statutes of that celebrated synod, we should still be in possession of ample materials, wherewith to make good against the Church of Rome the charge of *teaching* and carrying into effect, whenever and wherever she can, the doctrine of persecution.

The charge is, indeed, a grave one, and should not be advanced upon slight grounds; for it involves a far greater degree of guilt than the mere *act* of persecution, which, if not in accordance with the *teaching* of the Church, affects not the *Church*, but simply the *perpetrators* of that act. Of this the modern champions of Rome are fully aware, and, whilst they admit that persecution has taken place to a great extent, endeavour to remove all responsibility from the *Church*, by asserting that such persecution was not in accordance with the spirit of Rome's teaching, but, on the contrary, altogether opposed to it.

On this point we are content to join issue, and, in order that the whole proceeding may be fairly conducted, we are further content that the decision of the question shall rest entirely on the accredited witnesses of Rome herself. Let us distinctly state the charge, which is as follows:—That "Rome has embodied such a principle in her system, so as to make herself responsible for the deeds of cruelty which her sons have perpetrated under the pretence of religion."<sup>b</sup>

Such is the charge; let us now proceed to examine the evidence, and we shall discover traces of this persecuting spirit at a very early period.

A remarkable instance of it occurs in the "Conventus Aquisgranensis" (Aix-la-Chapelle) in the year 797 or 799.

\* The following paper was furnished to us after the former had been prepared. Though on the same subject, we feel sure that our readers will not regret that we have given it a place in our pages. For this and the following article, "King James II.," we are indebted to the Rev. John Evans, the author of the "Statutes of the Fourth Council of Lateran."

<sup>b</sup> See "The Persecuting Spirit of Rome," a Lecture delivered at St. Chad's Church, Shrewsbury, March 20, 1851, by the Rev. John Evans, M.A.

What is termed a "Capitulatio Caroli Magni," is given, wherein we find the following clause:—"If any one among the Saxons has inadvertently not been baptized, and chooses still to hide himself away, and shall despise coming to be baptized, preferring to continue a pagan, let him die the death."<sup>a</sup>

The Rev. David O'Croly cites a passage from Becanus to the following effect: <sup>b</sup>—"If the Church in the first ages did not subject heretics to the punishment of death, it was because she was weak and impotent—unconnected with civil power and civil authority; in proof of which, it is sufficient to remark, that she no sooner became powerful and strong, than she began to exercise severity towards all those who had the hardihood to gainsay her doctrines. She first inflicted the penalty of banishment; afterwards pecuniary fines; then confiscation of all their goods; until at length, exasperated by their obstinacy and insolence, she proceeded to the last extremities, and subjected them to all the horrors of capital punishment, as we may read in the laws of Valentinian and Marcian, *lib. quicumque*." Here we find no attempt to shift the responsibility from the Church to the civil power! The whole *merit* of the proceeding is claimed for the CHURCH, and an apology is offered for her shortcomings "in the first ages;" she did not *then* persecute, because, forsooth, "she was weak and impotent." As she grew in power she amply redeemed the faults of her early days; and Becanus, as cited by Mr. O'Croly, assigns the reason which, according to Romish theology, justified the proceedings of the Church. "In fine," writes Becanus, <sup>c</sup> "*religious liberty*, being directly opposed to unity of faith, and ruinous to the commonwealth, is by no means to be sanctioned; and it is *lawful and requisite* to protect orthodoxy by the infliction of pains and penalties, by the persecution of heretics, and the extinction of heresy." Whether we agree with Becanus, that persecution is "lawful and requisite," or not, we shall find ample reason to acknowledge the truth of his statement respecting the *doings* of his Church as Rome increased in power. Time, most assuredly, did not soften the spirit displayed in the "Capitulatio" above cited, and we find it in after-days raging in all its fury against

<sup>a</sup> "Conventus Aquisgranensis. Caroli Magni Capitulatio de Partibus Saxonie, A.D. 797." Labbe and Cossart, tom. vii. col. 1132. Paris, 1671.

"VII. Si quis deinceps in Gente Saxonum inter eos latens non baptizatus se abscondere voluerit, et ad baptismum venire contempserit, paganusque permanere voluerit, morte moriatur."

<sup>b</sup> "An Inquiry into the Principal Points of Difference, Real or Imaginary, between the Two Churches," p. 236. Dublin, Milliken and Son; London, B. Fellowes, 1835.

<sup>c</sup> Or Van der Beeck, of the Jesuit Order, who wrote "Manuale Controversiarum hujus Temporis," Antverpiæ, 1624; often reprinted.



the followers of Peter Waldus, with regard to whom even Reinerius Sacco, an Inquisitor General, who wrote about the year 1254, bears this testimony: "They have a show of piety in their life and conversation; they repose their belief in God, and in all the articles of the creed, and only blaspheme the Roman Church and clergy." "For blasphemy like this," observes Grier, "they were hunted down like wild beasts, and for an adherence to their Christian principles their virtuous descendants of the present day are exposed to the unmitigated severity of Popish persecution." <sup>a</sup> What had the *temporal* powers to do with these poor people? Their conduct as *citizens* was faultless, their creed even correct; their only fault, according to the Inquisitor's own testimony, was, that they "*blasphemed*"—a strong term, by the way—"the Roman Church and clergy." For *what*, then, and at *whose* instigation were they so cruelly persecuted? Becanus, as we have seen, can answer the question: "In fine, *religious liberty* being directly opposed to the unity of faith, and ruinous to the commonwealth, is by no means to be sanctioned;" although nothing in the creed of these unfortunate people was discovered contrary to "the unity of faith," nor anything in their conduct "ruinous to the commonwealth," yet they claimed "*religious liberty*," and Rome judged that this was "by no means to be sanctioned;" assuredly her policy was prudent, if not of a Christian character, for *religious liberty* would be like the fabled upas-tree in the paradise of Rome; her fairest flowers would wither and die beneath its destructive influence.

The *motive* appealed to in the decree of Aix-la-Chapelle is distinctly avowed in the well-known canon of the third General Council of Lateran, A.D. 1179, under Pope Alexander III. This celebrated canon <sup>b</sup> was directed against the Albigenses, under which name, it would appear, were denominated all who were opposed to the Roman Pontiff. The canon commences thus: "Although ecclesiastical discipline, as the blessed Leo saith, being content with the judgment of priests, does not take sanguinary revenge, yet it is assisted by the decrees of Catholic princes, that men may often seek a saving remedy through fear of corporal punishment." After enumerating the titles by which these heretics were called, the canon proceeds to subject to "a curse both themselves,

<sup>a</sup> "Hæc secta magnam habet speciem pietatis, eò quod coram hominibus juste vivant, et bene omnia de Deo credant, et omnes articulos qui in symbolo continentur: solummodo *Romanam Ecclesiam* blasphemant et *clerum*."—Reiner Sac., cap. iv. p. 54. See Grier's "Epitome of the Councils," p. 175. Dublin, 1828.

<sup>b</sup> Labbe and Cossart, tom. x. col. 1522, sec. 27. Paris, 1671.

their protectors or harbourers, and all persons who admit them into their houses or lands, or have any dealings with them. But if they depart in this sin, let not the oblation be made for them (under any pretext of privileges granted to any from us, or on any other ground), nor let them receive burial among Christians." The canon then names the Brabançons, and the people of Arragon, Navarre, and the Basque provinces, charging them with paying no respect to churches, sparing neither age nor sex, but, "after the manner of heathens," wasting and destroying everything; it directs that they "be considered bound by the same sentence and penalty as the fore-mentioned heretics, nor be admitted to the communion of the Church, until they have abjured that pestilent company and heresy." . . . "And let their goods be confiscated, and let it be free for princes to subject such persons to slavery." . . . "We also, out of Divine mercy, and relying on the authority of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, grant to the faithful Christians, who have taken arms against them, and, at the advice of the bishops and other prelates, have contended to drive them out, a relaxation of two years from enjoined penance." We need not here enter into the truth or falsehood of the charge brought against the Brabançons and others, but merely remark that, if *true*, then the canon interferes with the civil laws, and that the Albigenses, against whom the canon was directed, as said in the commencement, are not charged with open outrages, but merely a hint given of their practising "secret wickedness." All that we are *now* concerned with is the *spirit* of the canon; and the *avowed* principle of *forcing* men to "seek a saving remedy through *fear of corporal punishment*."

Whatever may be the merit of this exterminating canon, it was confirmed by the reigning Pontiff, and forms a part of the Canon Law of Rome to this day. In the year 1209, the Provincial Council of Avignon<sup>a</sup> made a more general provision for the extermination of heretics. In the second canon (which is headed "That heretics be exterminated and punished; that Jews be deprived of all administration") the necessity of calling in the aid "of the material sword" is declared, and directions given that every bishop cause his subjects, counts, castellans, soldiers, and other parishioners to *swear*, if need be, respecting the extirpation of heretics. The canon further establishes "an inquisition of two or three, or more if necessary, laymen of good character, to be sworn to discover heretics," &c. If the twenty-seventh canon of the third Lateran Council was not sufficiently general in the denuncia-

<sup>a</sup> Labbe and Cossart, tom. xi. col. 41, *et seq.* Edit. Paris, 1671.

tion of heretics, and if the decree of Avignon, as that of a Provincial Council, might seem wanting in authority to enforce the more general denunciation, the deficiency in both respects was amply atoned for by a document, for the conciliar character of which we need not, for our present purpose, contend. We may consider the third canon of the fourth Lateran Council simply as a constitution of Pope Innocent III., and as such breathing the spirit of the Church of Rome; being concerted and issued by the supreme head of that Church, and bearing out the observations of Becanus, that in proportion as the Church gained power, she exhibited that power in persecuting all gainsayers. Must we remind our readers, that, in order to prevent mistakes, and to take away all excuse for negligence in carrying out the provisions of the canon, decree, or constitution—call it what you will—a *creed* is given, to which reference is made, and an anathema thundered forth against all who shall dare to exalt themselves against such creed? Here, too, we have no enumeration of crimes, as was the case in the twenty-seventh canon of the third Lateran Council, but simply the crime of heresy, to which the most fearful penalties are attached!—an ample vindication of the Albigenes, if, as Lingard chooses to assert, those people were contemplated by the decree.

“We<sup>a</sup> excommunicate and anathematize every heresy which exalteth itself against this holy, orthodox, and Catholic faith, *which we have set forth above*: condemning all heretics, by whatsoever name they may be called; who have, indeed, diverse faces, but their tails are bound together, for they make agreement in the same folly.”.....“Let such persons, when condemned, be left to the secular powers who may be present, or to their officers, to be punished in a fitting manner; those of the clergy first being degraded from their orders: so that the goods of such condemned persons, if they shall be laymen, be confiscated; but in the case of clerks be applied to the churches from which they derived their stipends.” “But let those who are only marked with suspicion, be smitten with the sword of anathema, and be shunned by all men until they make proper satisfaction; unless, according to the grounds of suspicion and the quality of the person, they shall have demonstrated their innocence by a proportionate purgation. So that if they shall remain under excommunication for a twelvemonth, thenceforth let them be condemned as heretics. And let the secular powers, whatever offices they may discharge, be admonished and induced,

<sup>a</sup> Labbe and Cossart, tom. xi. p. i. col. 147-9. Paris, 1671. We repeat this decree here as coming under the title of “Persecuting Councils.”

and, if need be, compelled by ecclesiastical censure, that as they desire to be reported and accounted faithful, they publicly set forth an oath, that to the utmost of their power they will, *bond fide*, strive to exterminate from the lands subject to their jurisdiction all heretics pointed out by the Church; so that whensoever any person is advanced, either to spiritual or temporal power, he be bound to confirm this decree with an oath." And so, according to Dr. Milner, this is a *temporal* decree! The *crime* is *heresy*, a *spiritual* offence; the *moving power* to stir up the *temporal* powers to *exterminate heretics* is *excommunication, anathema, ecclesiastical censure!* for the decree thus proceeds: "But if any temporal lord, *being required and admonished by the Church*, shall neglect to cleanse his country of this heretical filth, let him be bound with the chain of *excommunication* by the metropolitan and the other co-provincial bishops. And if he shall scorn to make satisfaction within a year, let this be signified to the Supreme Pontiff, that thenceforth he may declare his vassals to be absolved from their fidelity to him, and may expose his land to be occupied by the Catholics, who, the heretics being exterminated, may, without contradiction, take possession of it, and possess it in the purity of the faith; saving the right of the chief lord, so long as he himself presents no obstacle, and offers no hindrance in this matter; the same law, nevertheless, being observed concerning those who have not lords in chief." "But let the Catholics who, having taken the sign of the cross, have girded themselves for the extermination of the heretics, enjoy the same indulgence, and be armed with the same holy privilege as is conceded to those who go to the assistance of the Holy Land." So then, the *temporal* power, "the secular arm," is called in and urged to *exterminate* the heretics: but, whatever violence may be used, whatever tortures inflicted, whatever blood may be shed, in carrying into effect the behests of the CHURCH; that Church, with unblushing effrontery, when charged with the deed, exclaims, "Thou canst not say *I did it.*" Oh, no! the Church merely cheers on, and rewards with an "*indulgence,*" the assassin whose arm strikes the blow! The spirit of this exterminating decree was speedily and extensively carried out, and its provisions echoed by numerous provincial councils, such as that of Cremona, A.D. 1226; Narbonne, A.D. 1127; Toulouse, A.D. 1229; Beziers, A.D. 1233, and others. How sincere is the prayer of Rome, when she delivers over her victims to the "secular arm," that *mercy* may be shown to them, is proved by the nineteenth decree of the Council of Narbonne, "Ut a carcere nemo excusetur propter senium,"—"That no

one be excused from prison on account of old age.”<sup>a</sup> “With regard,” says the decree, “to those who are to be imprisoned, we have also thought right to add, that neither the husband on account of his wife, although young, nor any one on account of their children or parents, or of those otherwise related, or on account of infirmity, or age, or any other like cause, be excused from imprisonment without the special indulgence of the Apostolic See.” Here the temporal power is *forbidden* to show mercy!

The reiterated threats of ecclesiastical censures against those temporal lords who showed no alacrity in carrying out the decrees against the heretics, prove it to have been an ungracious task; that the *temporal* powers would have let the work of extermination alone, if they had not been urged on by the *spiritual* authorities! That this inference is not an incorrect one, we have no less a testimony than that of Pope Innocent IV. He writes to the authorities of Lombardy,<sup>b</sup> *approving* and *enforcing* the laws of Frederick II. against heretics, and in case of their demur, tells them that he will cause the Inquisitors to *compel* them to carry out the laws, which he recites *verbatim*: at the end of those laws, thus approved and sought to be enforced, are these words:—“And we order that those who are marked by this inquisition, although but slight proof of superstition attach to them, be examined by ecclesiastics and prelates; by whom, if they shall be found to deviate from the Catholic faith at least in an article [of faith], and being by them admonished in a pastoral manner, shall be unwilling, forsaking the devil of darkness, to acknowledge the God of light, but persevere in their conceited obstinacy of error: we decree that the Patareni and other heretics, by whatsoever name they may be reckoned [or called], being condemned by the edict of our present law, suffer the death which they affect: that, being consigned to the trial of flames, they be publicly burned alive.” “Nor do we grieve that in this particular, from which they obtain punishment only, and no other fruit of their error, we satisfy their own wish.” Such is the law, and such the sentiment approved by Pope Innocent IV. (A.D. 1243). Nearly 300 years afterwards we find the Council of Sens making the test of heresy equally strict. “Moreover, those who have been guilty of *one* species of heresy, or have erred in *one article* of faith, and have afterwards simply or generally abjured heresy, if they are guilty

<sup>a</sup> Tom. xi. part i. col. 493. Paris, 1671.

<sup>b</sup> “XIII. Ad Lombardiæ, Romaniolæ et Marchiæ Tarvisinæ Rectores.” Labbe and Cossart, tom. xi. p. i. col. 621. Paris, 1671.

of another species of heresy, we decree to be judged as lapsed into heresy.”<sup>a</sup> This Council treats the enactments of the third canon of the fourth Lateran Council as *well known*, and enforces the provisions of that canon almost in its very words. However ungracious the work of “exterminating heretics” may have seemed to those “temporal powers,” whose zeal the Pope found it necessary to quicken by threats of *compulsion*, should they appear slack in bringing “the secular arm” to his assistance, it was to the Pope himself a “pleasant work,” if we may judge from the concluding words of the document above cited:—“We, king of kings, utterly execrate, pursue with vengeance, despoil of all their goods, those apostatizing from the Catholic faith; and restrain them by laws, as making shipwreck of profession and of life. We cut off their successors, and take away from them every legitimate right.”<sup>b</sup> If such be the sentiment of the *head* of the Roman Catholic Church, and if such be the terms in which that sentiment is expressed, can we wonder to find a spirit of persecution pervading the whole of the Canon Law of Rome? It would be strange indeed if it did not so pervade it, especially when we remember the boast of Rome that she is “*Semper eadem!*” Whatever miracles her advocates may claim for her, there is yet *one* which she has not attempted to perform; “the leopard” has not *yet* attempted to “change her spots!” To suppose that Innocent IV., when speaking *ex cathedrâ* (though *we* do not admit the claim of infallibility, either on the part of Pope or Council), spoke merely as an individual, and not as the organ of the Church, would indeed be a grievous error, and, should we fall into it, we should find ourselves quickly and sternly corrected by the most eminent divines of the Romish communion. In citing the opinions of such writers, we may have occasion to repeat passages from their works already cited; but it will be necessary to do so, as such passages not only prove the authenticity and genuineness of the documents in support of which we quoted them, but also prove those documents to be a necessary and inseparable portion of the system to which they belong. The reader also will have the advantage of being familiarized with a number of proofs,

<sup>a</sup> “*Insuper eos qui in una specie hæresis commiserunt aut in uno fidei articulo erraverunt,*” &c.—Labbe and Cossart, tom. xiv. col. 440, *et seq.* Paris, 1671; see p. 199, *antè.*

<sup>b</sup> “*Rex Regum Apostantes à fide Catholicâ penitus execramur, insequimur ultionibus, bonis omnibus spoliamus. Et ut a professione vel vitâ naufragantes legibus coarctamus. Successiones tollimus, ab eis omne jus legitimum abdicamus.*”—Datum Perusii, Secundo Kal. Novemb. Pontificatus Nostri Anno Primo.—*Ibid.* col. 623.

which, whilst in point of *succession* they furnish a *catena*, have yet the advantage of cumulative evidence; for, if we may so speak, each link of the chain thus presented is fully sufficient for the stress it has to sustain—quite strong enough to form an indissoluble connection between Rome and her *doctrine* of persecution, as well as her *practice*.

So imperative a duty did the Council of Constance, in 1414, consider the extirpation of heretics, that it condemned to the flames Jerome of Prague and John Huss; in *both* cases, but more especially in the latter instance, adding treachery to cruelty, by violating the safe-conduct on the strength of which Jerome and Huss had been induced to attend the Council. At whose instance Jerome and Huss were *burned*, we have the testimony of Æneas Sylvius, afterwards Pius II., who tells us “sentence was passed [against Huss and Jerome] in the assembly of the fathers, that those who should refuse the doctrine of the Church *were to be burned*.”<sup>a</sup>

It is worth our while to remark, how every attempt to evade the charges of cruelty or treachery against the Church of Rome defeats itself: thus Delahogue, in his zeal to exonerate the Council of Constance, confirms all that has been said respecting the persecuting spirit of the whole system of Rome!

“The defence,” says Grier, “he sets up for it is this, that Jerome, having relapsed into the heresy which he had abjured,—‘excidit ab omni salvi conductus privilegio.’”<sup>b</sup> Unless there had been a standing law of Rome awarding the penalty of death in such cases, how could Delahogue affirm that Jerome, by relapsing into heresy, had “forfeited all privilege of a safe-conduct?” The very force of his justification of the *Council* rests upon the *guilt* of his *Church* in this matter. Spondanus, as cited by Grier, still more strongly, if possible, brings the charge home to the *ecclesiastical* authorities; in defending the emperor, he tells us “that the *emperor* could not compel the *ecclesiastical* power to respect the faith he had pledged [to Huss,] as it was *beyond* his jurisdiction.”<sup>c</sup> We must not omit the defence, by Simanca, a learned Spaniard, of part of the proceedings at Constance against Huss; Simanca maintains,<sup>d</sup> “that faith given to heretics is

<sup>a</sup> “*Lata est in consessu patrum adversus contumaces sententia, CREMANDOS ESSE qui doctrinam Ecclesiæ respuerint.*”—Hist. Bohem. c. 36, cited in Grier's Epitome of the Councils, p. 231. Dublin, 1828. The *subjunctive* form, “qui respuerint,” might, perhaps, be more correctly translated “for rejecting.” See Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, vol. iii. pp. 493, 524, edit. 1853.

<sup>b</sup> Grier's Epitome, pp. 227, 228. Dublin, 1828.

<sup>c</sup> Annal. Compend. xiv. cap. 15—45. Grier, p. 228.

<sup>d</sup> Simanca De Catholicis Institutionibus, tit. xlvi. sec. 52, 1569. Grier, pp. 231, 232.

*not to be kept*; for if faith is not to be kept with tyrants, pirates, and other public robbers, because they slay the body, *much less* is it to be kept with obstinate heretics, who slay the soul." . . . "RIGHTLY, therefore, were certain heretics consigned to *lawful flames* by the most weighty judgment of the Council of Constance, *although safety had been promised to them*; and blessed Thomas [the angelic doctor] likewise holds that an intractable heretic is to be delivered up to the judges, *notwithstanding the faith and oath*, by which he may have bound a Catholic." Let us not be told that the Council of Constance is only *partly* acknowledged by the Church of Rome, for the *part* we are now concerned with is fully acknowledged; as Bellarmine says,<sup>a</sup> "This Council, as far as its first session, where it defines that *a Council is above the Pope*, was reprobated in the Councils of Florence and fifth Lateran; the remainder was approved." The only matter rejected is the *defining the authority of a Council as above the Pope's authority*. The very circumstance of a safe-conduct being at all necessary implies the existence of those laws, whose operation the safe-conduct was intended, "pro hac vice," to suspend; and so also did the Council of Trent, by three times granting a safe-conduct, three times establish the existence of the persecuting decrees of the Church, and acknowledge them to be in force! That the attention of the Council of Trent was called to the subject, is proved, also, by the very same circumstance; and we may, therefore, justly infer the *approbation* of such decrees, when she did not repudiate a single clause of any of them, but, on the contrary, *extended their operation* by the canons on baptism. These canons allow the baptism of children by *heretics*, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, to be *valid*; and by virtue of such baptism claim the right of *compelling* all persons, so baptized, to join the communion of Rome!<sup>b</sup> But we have been told that all this is merely a "matter of *discipline*," and, as such, may be altered; that the circumstances which required such severity have passed away, and, therefore, these persecuting canons may be considered as in a state of abeyance. We may, then, fairly ask, "Why has no alteration taken place? Why are laws which are no longer required by the circumstances which called them into existence, not only retained, but retained without a single modification?" The only ground, which can be reasonably urged for their being retained, is, that they contain a *principle*, and that *principle* requires that the laws

<sup>a</sup> De Conc. lib. i. cap. 7, p. 12, ed. Paris, 1613.

<sup>b</sup> Canons iv. viii. xiv. "On Baptism."



should still be retained, as circumstances similar to those which called the said laws into existence may *again* arise, and *then* that *principle* would again require the laws to be put in force. Such reasoning is just and conclusive, and if the principle be a wholesome one, it is right that the laws which embody it should remain in force. Be it remembered, however, that if such a *principle*, wholesome or unwholesome, be found to exist, then it becomes a matter of *doctrine*; and if we find that doctrine sought to be deduced from *Scripture*, then, so long as Rome receives the *Scripture*, even as a partial rule of faith, and so long as INFALLIBILITY is claimed for her, she *cannot* abandon nor alter those laws; nay, if true to her own creed, she must, as an IMPERATIVE DUTY, enforce them when circumstances require, and her position will permit such enforcement. So thought the divines of the Faculty of Theology of Paris; and so they *honestly* stated in their censure on Erasmus's Commentary on the New Testament:—“Whereas it is a *Catholic principle*, and to be held faithfully, that it is not only lawful, but a DUTY, to inflict *death* on obstinate heretics, when it can be done without endangering the State,” &c.<sup>a</sup>

So, too, thought the reverend theologues who attended the Council of Trent, if we may judge by the sentiments they have left on record for our guidance in this matter. Fontidonius says: “If this kind of punishment, which the Church *now uses*, seem to you to be cruel, condemn at the same time, in this charge of cruelty, those most holy Fathers who thought that the safety of the Church was to be provided for by the utter *destruction* of heretics; condemn that most keen champion of the Church, Jerome, the thunderbolt of heretics, who decided that putrid flesh must be cut away; . . . condemn that *glorious* speech of Dioscorus of Alexandria, uttered in the Council of Chalcedon, applauded by the judgment of all, in which he exclaimed that heretics were worthy not only of *punishment*, but of *flames*.”<sup>b</sup>

Villalpandus, after justifying, in his way, the conduct of his Church in putting heretics to death, thus concludes: “Heretics, therefore, without doubt, when, being admonished, they refuse to return to a better mind, are deservedly punished with bonds and *fire*.”<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> “Declarationes ad Censuras Facultatis Theologiæ Parisiensis.”—Le Clerc's edition of Erasmus's works, vol. i. col. 905. Lug. Bat. fol. 1706.

<sup>b</sup> “Petri Fontidonii Doctoris Theologi, pro Sacro Œcumenico Concilio Tridentino, adversus Joannem Fabricium Montanum ad Germanos Oratio.”—Labbe and Cossart, tom. xiv. col. 1700 *et seq.* Paris, 1671.

<sup>c</sup> “Apologia Indictionis Concilii Tridentini factæ à Pio Quarto Pontifice Maximo. Adversus Joannem Fabricium Montanum. Autore Gasparo Cardillo

We have here no attempt to make the *secular* powers responsible for putting heretics to death; the whole merit is claimed for the *Church*, and we are told respecting the *burning*, also, of heretics, that it is a kind of punishment which "*the Church now uses.*" We fear had such a work as Dr. Milner's "*End of Controversy*" appeared in those days, the author would scarcely have escaped the charge of heresy; for we still find in all its vigour the spirit of Leo X., who, in a bull of 1520, condemned as erroneous the opinion—"That heretics should be burned is contrary to the will of the Spirit." In vain would Dr. Milner have looked for support to Aquinas, who would have told him that heretics are rightly punished with death, "because forgers of money, and others who disturb the State, are justly punished with death: therefore also heretics, who are forgers of faith, and, as experience testifies, grievously disturb the State." As little comfort would he have received from Eckius, who, in his "*Manual of Common Places, against Luther and other enemies of the Church,*" deduces the doctrine from *Scripture*; and would, doubtless, have referred Dr. Milner to his "*Second Homily for St. George the Martyr's Day.*" Gregory IX., who inserted the third canon of the fourth Lateran Council in the Decretals, would not have commended an assertion so derogatory to the character and claims of Papal Rome; and had Benedict XIV. seen Dr. Milner's book, his holiness would have replied very briefly to the statement in question, "that we may not uselessly waste our time in illustrating a matter *undoubted among all*; it will be abundantly sufficient to allege one sanction of Innocent III. in the fourth General Council of Lateran, an. 1215, in the third canon of which 'De Hæreticis,' bishops are ordered," &c.<sup>a</sup> That the reverend theologues, whose sentiments we have given above, spake not simply their own private opinions, may be gathered from the storm of anathemas poured forth by the assembled fathers at the conclusion of the Council of Trent:—

Cardinal—"Anathema to all heretics!"  
 Response—"Anathema, Anathema!"<sup>b</sup>

Nor was this a *momentary* feeling, a mere occasional outburst of *holy* zeal, for, in the 2nd chapter of the 25th session, it is directed that, in the first Provincial Council to be held after the closing of the Council of Trent, "all heresies condemned by the *Sacred Canons and General Councils*, and

Villalpandeo Hispano Segobiense Doctore Theologo."—Ibid. tom. xiv. col. 1885 *et seq.*

<sup>a</sup> See M'Ghee's "*Laws of the Papacy,*" pp. 97 *et seq.*; or p. 242, edit. 1841.

<sup>b</sup> Labbe and Cossart, tom. xiv. col. 921. Paris, 1671.

especially condemned by this same synod, they publicly detest and anathematize;" which is echoed in the clause of the creed of Pius IV. "I also profess and undoubtedly receive all other things delivered, defined, and declared by *the Sacred Canons and General Councils*, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent; and likewise I also condemn, reject, and anathematize, all things contrary thereto, *all heresies whatsoever* condemned, rejected, and anathematized by the Church." Now, as this creed concludes with a solemn oath which binds those who receive it, not only to live and die in the Romish faith, but also to *compel* every one, over whom they have influence, to hold, teach, and preach, "this true Catholic faith, out of which, [it affirms,] no one can be saved," we can easily discern the mind of "the Church" by a reference to canons and decretals, already cited. These persecuting canons, and the doctrine upon which they are based, are made as permanent as an oath can make them. The Tridentine Fathers, as we have seen, were full of the fiery zeal which glowed in the breast of the Jesuit *Tirinus*, when he wrote the following comment on Zech. xiii. 3:—"Whence Lutherans may learn that heretics are to be punished with death, as well in the new law as in the old. For even the very parents, *if they glow with zeal for the divine honour*, acting at once as judges and executioners, will thrust through a son so apostatizing."<sup>a</sup> And lest the spirit which the concluding words of the Tridentine Fathers breathed should pass away, those words were, so to speak, echoed every Maundy Thursday, when the Bull "*In Cœna Domini*" was read in the Pope's presence:—"We excommunicate and anathematize, on the part of Almighty God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and also by the authority of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and by our own, all Wicliffites, Hussites, Lutherans, Calvinists, Anabaptists, and all other heretics, by whatsoever name they are called, and of whatsoever sect they may be, and also all schismatics, and those who withdraw themselves, or obstinately depart from obedience to the Bishop of Rome." Good care is taken, we see, in this Bull to prevent the sons of Rome from supposing that it is the *heresy* only, and not the *person* of the heretic also, whom they are bound to detest and anathematize!<sup>b</sup> When, therefore, Dr. Milner tells us

<sup>a</sup> See "R. P. Jacobi Tirini . . . Commentariorum in Sacram Scripturam Tomus Secundus," p. 56, col. 2. Venetiis, 1738, folio.

<sup>b</sup> "In a work, written by a Roman Catholic, Count FERDINAND DAL POZZO, '*Catholicism in Austria*,' &c., occurs the following passage:—"The Bull *In Cœna Domini* contains a host of the most absurd pretensions. The reading of this Bull, which was usually performed every year at Rome on Holy Thursday,

that "if Catholic states and princes have enforced submission to their Church by persecution, they were fully persuaded that there is a divine authority in this Church to decide all controversies in religion, and those who refuse to hear her voice, when she pronounces upon them, are obstinate heretics," we can only say, that if the states and princes really were so "persuaded," they only believed what they were told, and did as they were bidden. When he asks us, "On what grounds can Protestants persecute Christians of any description whatever?" we answer, "*On no grounds whatever.* We have no canons, no laws to justify such a proceeding." But when he goes on to tell us that the *Church* never persecuted at all! nay, so far from it, that "when an ecclesiastical judge or tribunal has, after due examination, pronounced that any person accused of obstinate heresy is actually guilty of it, he is required by the Church expressly to declare, in her name, that her power extends no further than such decision; and in case the obstinate heretic is liable by the laws of the State, to death or mutilation, the judge is required to pray for his pardon"<sup>a</sup>—When Dr. Milner tells us this, we cannot but feel that he has done his Church the greatest injury it was in his power to do her; he reminds us that she can add *mockery* to *cruelty*! Forsooth, the ecclesiastical judge, when he hands over the condemned heretic to the secular powers, "is required by the Church *expressly* to declare that *her power* extends no further than such decision." Indeed! why this was the very plea urged by the Jews to Pilate for delivering up Jesus to be dealt with by "the secular power;" though the Jews did not add the cruel hypocrisy of praying that Pilate would not injure the innocent victim of their malice. The Jews, it is true, were not permitted by their Roman conquerors "to put any man

was suspended by order of Clement XIV., to avoid offending crowned heads." (See Mendham's "Literary Policy of Rome," p. 260. London, 1830.) A rather curious and illustrative incident, in connection with this "suspended" Bull, appears in a recent pamphlet—"Boyle versus Wiseman," Lond. 1855, pp. 10, 12; where Dr. Burgess, of Bristol, will be found instructing another priest, Mr. T. M. M'Donnell, from *this very* Bull, as promulgated by Pope Martin V., "that all ecclesiastical persons, secular or regular, who shall presume, directly or indirectly, to drag an ecclesiastical person before a lay court shall, for so doing, incur sentence of excommunication *ipso facto*." The ready adoption of *this* sword of authority was discerned to be very "inexpedient." It would not be safe to employ a weapon, privately, which had been publicly declared now to be "of no authority in England," and the "error was—recognised." But how instructive the use of it! Mr. Boyle will surely abandon a Church, in which "people may accommodate themselves and consciences either to bless or to curse, to save or to ruin, just as it may suit their selfish passions."—See M'Ghee's "Law of the Papacy," pp. 41, 66, 216, 297, 302, edit. 1841.

<sup>a</sup> Letter xlix. p. 466.

to death,"<sup>a</sup> and we are told that the Church of modern Rome forbids the ecclesiastic to dip his hands in blood; but how complete is the parallel, when she delivers up the victim she has pronounced worthy of death, "declaring, We have a law, and by *our law he ought to die.*"<sup>b</sup> Nor does the parallel cease here; if the Jews reminded the hesitating Pilate, that "if thou let this man go, thou art not Cæsar's friend,"<sup>c</sup> so those princes who should be negligent in the work of exterminating heretics are plainly told that they will be deemed no friends of Papal Rome!<sup>d</sup> Rome has indeed proved herself rightful heir-at-law of the debased Jewish Church.

Before we dismiss this subject, we should record the fact that the old leaven that worked in the time of Innocent III., in exciting the massacre of the helpless Albigenes, still worked in the breast of Dr. Milner; and as if fearing that Protestants should think that the spirit of his Church had suffered an abatement, he exclaimed, "Thus, to *my judgment*, am I and the whole Catholic body, *without consenting to it*, pledged in the face of the legislature to condemn the wars of Charlemagne and the *crusade* against the infamous Albigenes."<sup>e</sup> We trust we are all children of mercy, trained and educated in the benevolence and charity which Christ has taught and enforced, and if we have read the history of that infernal and murderous persecution of the devoted Albigenes (whose *chief* crime was their determined opposition and resistance of the Papal tyranny), what opinion, or what comment shall we form on this merciless priest, who, after the lapse of *centuries*, feels the *same* passions and the same thirst of blood against those innocent victims of Popish and arbitrary violence? *Crimine ab uno DISCE OMNES!*<sup>f</sup>

<sup>a</sup> John xviii. 31.

<sup>b</sup> John xix. 7.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid. 12.

<sup>d</sup> "Let the secular powers, whatever office they may discharge, be admonished and induced, and, if need be, compelled by ecclesiastical censure, that as they desire to be reputed and accounted faithful, so for the defence of the faith they publicly set forth an oath, that they will endeavour, to the utmost of their power, *bonâ fide*, to *exterminate* from the lands subject to their jurisdiction all heretics denounced by the Church."—Concil. Lat. iv. canon iii. Concil. Arles. 1534, canon iii. &c. &c.

<sup>e</sup> A Réply to the Report published by the Cisalpine Club on the Authenticity of the Protestation, &c., by the Rev. John Milner. London, 1795, p. 28.

<sup>f</sup> The Pursuits of Literature, Dialog. iv. note to line 210, p. 322. London, 1799.

## No. XV.

## ALLEGED TOLERATION OF JAMES II.

CHARLES XII., King of Sweden, as we read in the history of that chivalrous sovereign, on one occasion undertook, with a few devoted followers, to defend a house against an overwhelming mass of the Turks: during the assault the house caught fire, and the king, in the hurry of the moment, seizing a small cask which was at hand, with the assistance of two of his attendants, poured its contents upon the advancing flames; the contents, alas! proved to be brandy, and, as may readily be supposed, the fury of the fire, instead of being allayed, was increased by the inconsiderate proceeding of the king. The above anecdote was recalled to our mind by the attempt of Dr. Milner to repel the charge of intolerance, brought against the Church of Rome, by selecting for this purpose King James II. as a miracle of toleration! All who know anything of that most unfortunate monarch's reign, are well aware that the Papists, finding that the established Church of England was the grand obstacle to their regaining power in this kingdom, left no means untried to alienate the minds of the people from the Church; and, the more effectually to attain their object, endeavoured to draw in the Dissenters to make common cause with them: all this was to be effected by repealing those Acts of Parliament which, by requiring certain tests, prevented Roman Catholics from occupying positions of power or influence in the country. The repeal, therefore, of such statutes was a necessary preliminary to further proceeding, and, as the Popish party conceived, would be highly gratifying to Dissenters, whose feelings must naturally, they fancied, be conciliated towards the promoters of such *liberal* measures; we must not, therefore, be surprised to find James (who was a devoted Papist) either as Duke of York, or as King of England, zealously supporting any and every measure, calculated to serve the purposes of the party of which he was the ready tool; whilst his zeal for *religious liberty* was, like that of its modern advocates, mercenary, temporary, and delusive. The scheme of inducing Dissenters to make common cause with the Papists was not thought of, in the reign of James II., for the first time; for in the year 1663 we read that "It was certainly the strength of Popery that now chiefly made the separation of Protestants

from the Church of England; the Papists laboured for a liberty which they knew not how to enjoy without a *common relaxation* of the laws against all other Dissenters.”<sup>a</sup> Again, in the year 1672, “The Commons in this Parliament were by long experience more and more sensible that the Papists were, for their own pleasure and advantage, playing and striking the Churchmen and Dissenters one against another. At one time the patrons of indulgence, to break the established Communion, and for their own sakes to let in a universal toleration; at another time the pushers on of severity and persecution, to exasperate the Nonconformists against the laws and the Church, and make them fly towards Popery and a dispensing power for refuge and protection.”<sup>b</sup> The apprehensions of the Parliament were confirmed by the circumstance of an army, “pretended to be designed for service against the Dutch,” being encamped at Blackheath, and of which “*many of the officers were Papists.*” This circumstance led to the passing of “an Act for Preventing Dangers which may happen from Popish Recusants,” in consequence of which Act “the Duke of York, who was general of the army, and the Lord Treasurer Clifford, laid down all their places.” When we remember that the said Act contained a clause which imposed the following oath on all persons taking the oaths of supremacy and allegiance: “*I, A. B., do declare, that I do believe there is not any transubstantiation in the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, or in the elements of bread and wine, at or after the consecration thereof, by any person whatsoever,*”—we cannot wonder that James, Duke of York, or James II., King of England, should labour to set aside such an Act under any colourable pretence, and claim a toleration for Dissenters and Papists—which Papists, when in power, are bound by their own Canon Law to allow to none who dissent from Popery. The Church of England was the grand barrier, and that once removed, the Popish party well knew that there was no denomination of Dissenters sufficiently numerous or powerful to make head against the Church of Rome! These considerations will enable us to judge of the value of Dr. Milner’s position—“Whatever may be said of the intolerance of Mary, I trust that this charge will not be brought against the next Catholic sovereign, James II. I have elsewhere shown, that, when Duke of York, he used his best endeavours to get the Act *De Hæretico Comburendo*, repealed, and to afford an asylum to the Protestant exiles who flocked to England from France on

<sup>a</sup> Compleat History of England, vol. iii. p. 248.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. pp. 294, 321, edit. 1719.

the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and, in short, that, when king, he lost his crown in the cause of toleration: his declaration of Liberty of Conscience being the determining cause of his deposition." Whatever share the Duke of York might have in repealing the Act *De Hæretico Comburendo*, in 1677, we can scarcely, when we consider his conduct as King James II. (to be noticed hereafter), give him credit for a real love of "*Religious Liberty*;" but we can easily understand, that if credit for a tolerant spirit could thereby be gained for his party, he would readily promote the repeal of the said Act. History, however, tells us a different tale:—"Under the apprehensions of Popery, it was thought to be some wisdom of prevention, to make an Act for taking away the Writ *De Hæretico Comburendo*, whereby it was enacted *That the Writ commonly called Breve de Hæretico Comburendo, with all Proofs and Proceedings thereupon, in order to executing such Writ, or following or depending thereupon, and all punishment by Death, in pursuance of any Ecclesiastical Censures, be from henceforth utterly taken away and abolished.*" A wise and prudent enactment; for should Rome gain the ascendancy, she would find no parallel in the laws of the kingdom to justify her own exterminating statutes, and would therefore have the greater difficulty in calling them into action. Every Protestant must rejoice that such a disgrace to any kingdom as the Writ *De Hæretico Comburendo* was removed from the statute-book, be the motive of the repealers what it may; and great cause, indeed, is there for thankfulness that it has never been replaced by any statute or canon of Rome "*De Hæreticis Exterminandis.*" The key to James's apparent love of "*Religious Liberty*" may, perhaps, be found in his speech to the Parliament, November 9, 1685: "Let no man," said the king, "take exception, that there are some officers in the army not qualified, according to the late *Tests*, for their employment: the gentlemen, I must tell you, are most of them well known to me; and having formerly served with me on several occasions, and always approved the loyalty of their principles by their practices, I now think them fit to be employed under me; and will deal plainly with you, that after having had the benefit of their services in such time of need and danger, I will neither expose them to disgrace, nor myself to the want of them, if there should be another rebellion, to make them necessary to me." <sup>a</sup> How well the intention of James was understood, by persons well qualified to judge of it, at

<sup>a</sup> Compleat History of England, pp. 434, 439, edit. 1719.



the time, we may gather from the speech of a member of the House of Commons. "And pray let us not forget that there was a *Bill of Exclusion* debated in this House; I was there and showed myself *against* it: the arguments *for* it were, *that we should, in case of a Popish successor, have a Popish army.* You see the *Act* of the *Test* already broken: but pray remember what the late Lord Chancellor told you, when the late king (of blessed memory) passed that *Act* (the words were to this effect):—*By this Act you are provided against Popery, that no Papist can possibly creep into employment.* I am afflicted greatly at this breach on our liberties; and seeing so great difference betwixt this speech and those heretofore made, cannot but believe this was by some other's advice. This struck at here is our all. And I wonder that there have been any men so desperate as to take employment, not qualified for it, and would have, therefore, the question, that a *standing army* is destructive to the country." Here we have a member declaring how he has, by the king's proceeding, been compelled to recede from his former liberal opinions, and to arrive at the conclusion that a standing army, because officered by men thrust in by the king contrary to the law of the land, would be "destructive to the country." Some such change of opinion has been avowed in our own time by men who advocated the admission of Papists into Parliament, not supposing that any men would have been "so desperate" as to vote in direct opposition to the oath they had taken! Here it may be worth while to notice that whatever ridicule may have been thrown by historians from time to time on the celebrated plot of "Titus Oates," far different opinions have been entertained on that matter. The severe punishment inflicted upon Oates, though he was declared to be "convicted, upon full evidence, of two horrid perjuries, excited the pity of the spectators, and so much the more, they thought, that he had, perhaps, committed some mistakes in the circumstances of time and place, *but the substance* of his evidence was undoubtedly true; for the main of his *depositions* was demonstrated by the *papers* of *Coleman*, and by a concurrence of many other acts and deeds. And it is much to be feared, that the truth of his evidence had given much more offence to the Court than any mistakes in it." <sup>a</sup> With every wish to give James credit for kindness of heart, the heaping of honours on such a man as the infamous Judge Jeffreys, makes us not unreasonably suspect him of hypocrisy when, on a former

<sup>a</sup> Ibid. p. 442.

occasion, he expressed his disapprobation of that monster's proceedings; had the king's abhorrence of the severity of Jeffreys been real, he would scarcely have appointed him, in 1685, "Lord Chancellor." That the king's motives, in disregarding the Test Act, were not misconstrued by the member of the House of Commons whose opinion we have cited, we have full proof in the king's own subsequent speech to the Lords and Commons; he told them "that he would dispense with the *Test Act*, which was the greatest legal barrier against Popery; that he would keep up a standing army, to be commanded by Popish officers, whom he expressly recommended, *in approving the loyalty of their principles by their practices.*"<sup>a</sup> The love for "Religious Liberty" was shown in the prosecution of Richard Baxter, and the way in which the trial was conducted by Jeffreys.<sup>b</sup> The same game of alternate severity and relaxation was played in Scotland, but with a more open avowal of the royal intentions. The Lord High Commissioner Murray, in his speech to the Scottish Parliament in 1686, thus openly declares the meaning of James:—"And now, my Lords and Gentlemen, after so great and excellent designs for promoting the honour, the ease and wealth of this kingdom; after his resolution to pardon so many enemies, and to free so many of the guilty from further severe but just prosecutions; his Majesty believeth that none will wonder, if he desire, by the advice and consent of his Great Council, to give ease and security to some of his good subjects of the Roman Catholic Religion, who have been in all times firm to the Monarchy, and ready to sacrifice their lives and fortunes for the service and security of the Crown."<sup>c</sup> The creatures of the Court were for immediately passing an Act, but "the wiser part" prevailed to have a committee appointed to examine the laws touching the Papists, which committee, after a full inquiry, drew up a Bill, whereby "Papists were to be allowed the exercise of their religion in private, without repealing those former *Acts*, which made them liable to penalties for publickly assembling together." A warm debate ensuing, the king sent orders to dissolve, or at least to prorogue, the Parliament. The spirit of toleration, the real love for "Religious Liberty," which moved James in all these matters, may be judged of from his letter, in the following February, to the Privy Council of Scotland, which letter was accompanied by "*a Proclamation for Liberty of Conscience and Suspension of the Laws against Papists.*" The letter plainly tells us whose "*tender consciences*" are to be

<sup>a</sup> Compleat History of England, p. 445, edit. 1719.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. pp. 446, 447.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid. p. 448.

cared for ; it runs thus :—“ *Whereas by Our Letter of the 21st of August last past, We were Graciously Pleas'd to Inform you of Our Designs, in order to the Ease of Our Roman Catholic Subjects (unto which We had your Dutiful Answer in some Days thereafter): We have now thought fit to Publish these our Royal Intentions, and to give an additional Ease to those of Tender Consciences : So to convince the World of our Inclinations to Moderation ; and to evidence, that those of the Clergy who have been Regular, are our most particular Care. And though We have given some Ease to those whose Principles We can with any safety trust ; We have at the same time expressed Our highest Indignation against those Enemies of Christianity, as well as Government and Humane Society, the Field-Conventiclers, whom we recommend to you to Root out with all the Severity of our Laws, and with the most vigorous Prosecution of our Force ; it being equally Our and Our People's Concern to be rid of them,*” &c.<sup>a</sup> Tolerant, indeed ! Whilst the “ *tender consciences*” of Papists are to be respected, the poor Field-Conventiclers must be “ *ROOTED OUT,*” and that, too, without mercy ! What a pity that Dr. Milner had not the above before his eyes when he ventured to hold up James as an example of toleration ! But we shall see much more of this kind of “ *toleration*” before we have done with the unfortunate James.

With regard to the reception by James of the Huguenots, who were flying from the persecution in France, consequent upon the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, “ *it soon,*” observes Mr. Macaulay, “ *became clear that all this compassion was simulated merely for the purpose of cajoling his Parliament, that he regarded the refugees with mortal hatred, and that he regretted nothing so much as his own inability to do what Louis had done.*”<sup>b</sup> According to Hume, no one was deceived by the proceedings of James : “ *When a prince of so much humanity, and of such signal prudence as Louis, could be engaged, by the bigotry of his religion alone, without any provocation, to embrace such sanguinary and impolitic measures, what might be dreaded, they asked, from James, who was so much his inferior in these virtues, and who had already been irritated by such obstinate and violent opposition ? In vain did the king affect to throw the highest blame on the persecutions in France : in vain did he afford the most real protection and assistance to the distressed Huguenots. All these symptoms of toleration were regarded as insidious ; opposite to the avowed principles of his sect,*

<sup>a</sup> Ibid. p. 448.

<sup>b</sup> Macaulay's Hist. of England, ii. 18.

and belied by the severe administration which he had himself exercised against the Nonconformists in Scotland.”<sup>a</sup> If James were sincere in his pity for the persecuted Huguenots, then Dr. Milner fails the more signally in referring to his reign to vindicate the Church of Rome from the charge of persecution; for, in such case, the guilt of those undoubted acts of intolerance which James allowed to be perpetrated, is only removed from the person of the monarch to rest with all its weight upon that system which compelled him to the perpetration of such enormities.<sup>b</sup> As there seems to be a disposition, even in the present day, judging from the concordats of which we have lately heard so much, to imitate Louis XIV. in his Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, it may be as well to give a brief description of the Revocation. We take the following account from the “*Catholic Layman*,” April, 1854:—“It now remains to notice, what the Revocation actually was, and its results. From 1662 down to 1685, a series of measures were adopted, all tending to the injury of the Protestants. They were gradually excluded from all public employment; prohibited from entering any profession, and assailed in the daily exercise of their religion, in the education of their children, and in the management of their families. In 1680 a royal declaration forbade Romanists to embrace the Reformed religion under penalty of the galleys for life. An edict of 1681 allowed children to abjure at the age of seven years; and if a child of that age could be induced to enter a church, to kiss an image of the Virgin, or to make the sign of the cross, any of these acts was sufficient to justify the taking the child from its parent, and compelling them to make allowance for its maintenance proportionate to their supposed ability. In the same year, 1681, began the *Dragonnades*, which meant the quartering of soldiers upon the Protestants, with an unlimited licence to plunder and oppress them; and to this treatment all the provinces of the kingdom were, in turn, subjected. At last, in October, 1685, the Edict of Nantes was revoked. By the Edict of Revocation, the temples of the Protestants were directed to be demolished, and the exercise of their worship to cease, as well in private houses as in the castles of the nobles, under pain of confiscation of body and goods. Ministers who refused to be converted, were ordered to quit the kingdom within fifteen days,

<sup>a</sup> Hume’s “*Hist. of England*,” vol. viii. pp. 241, 242. London, MDCLXXXVI.

<sup>b</sup> Burnet, vol. i. p. 583 (cited by Hume), says that the Duke of York, when in Scotland, assisted personally at the torture of criminals; whilst Woodrow mentions only one instance, that of Spreul,—vol. ii. p. 169, vol. iii. p. 253, edit. 1830. See Hume’s *Hist. of England*, vol. viii. pp. 172, 173.

under pain of the galleys. Protestant schools were to be closed;<sup>a</sup> children born after the publication of the edict were to be baptized by a Romish priest, and brought up in the religion of Rome. A period of four months was granted to refugees to return to France and abjure;—that term expired, their property was to be confiscated. All the provisions of the law regarding relapsed heretics were confirmed; and to complete the iniquity of the decree, it was also ordered, under pain of the galleys for men, and imprisonment and confiscation of goods for the women, that no Protestant should quit the kingdom, or carry their goods abroad.<sup>b</sup> Such were the terms of the edict which revoked the Edict of Nantes.”

James’s proceedings in Ireland, in 1687, bear a great similarity in many points to the above Edict of Revocation: for instance, because the Provost and Fellows of the University of Dublin refused to receive a vicious, ignorant person, a new convert to Popery, into a vacant fellowship, although such reception would have been contrary to their statutes and oaths, Tyrconnel stopped their salaries; and “it was not thought enough, upon King James’s arrival, to take away their maintenance, but they were further proceeded against, and the vice-president, fellows, and scholars, all turned out; their furniture, library, and communion-plate seized, and everything that belonged to the college and to the private fellows and scholars taken away. All this was done, notwithstanding that when they waited upon King James, at his first arrival in Dublin, he was pleased to promise them, *that he would preserve them in their liberties and properties, and rather augment than diminish the privileges and immunities that had been granted them by his predecessors.* In the house they placed a garrison, and turned the chapel into a magazine, and the chambers into prisons for the Protestants. One Moore, a Popish priest, was made *provost*; one Mackarty, also a priest, was made *library-keeper*, and the whole designed for them and their *fraternity.*” . . . . “At length things came to that height, after King James was in Ireland, that most of the churches in and about Dublin were seized upon by the Government; and at last, Lutterell, governor of Dublin,

<sup>a</sup> In James II.’s reign, too, schools were opened; “but it was for this purpose, not of training up Popish youth, but rather of stealing Protestant children, that a Free School, under A. Pulton, a Jesuit, was opened at the Savoy, assisted by Thomas Parker, another Jesuit.”—Compleat Hist. of England, vol. iii. p. 488, edit. 1719. Just the same scheme is in operation now! Every one knows how common is the invitation to attend such and such a school, where *no difference is made*, it is affirmed, and the religion of the children is not interfered with. *Semper eadem Roma!*

<sup>b</sup> See Bishop Burnet’s “Account of his own Times,” iii. 80, 81, ed. Oxford, 1833.

issued out his order, *forbidding more than five Protestants to meet together, under pain of death*. Being asked, whether this was designed to hinder meeting in churches?—he answered, it was designed to hinder their meeting there, as well as in other places: and accordingly the churches were shut up, and all religious assemblies through the whole kingdom forbidden under pain of death.”<sup>a</sup>

“But to give a decisive blow, there was an *Act of Attainder* pass’d in Parliament; in order to which every member of the House of Commons returned the names of all such Protestant gentlemen as lived near them, or in the county or borough for which he served; and if he was a stranger to any of them, he sent to the country for information about them. When this *Bill* was presented to the King, for his *assent*, the Speaker of the Commons told him, *That many were attainted in that Act, upon such evidence as satisfy’d the House; and the rest upon common fame.*”

“In this *Act* there were no fewer attainted than two *Archbishops*, one *Duke*, seventeen *Earls*, seven *Countesses*, twenty-eight *Viscounts*, two *Viscountesses*, seven *Bishops*, eighteen *Barons*, thirty-three *Baronets*, fifty-one *Knights*, eighty-three *Clergymen*, two thousand one hundred eighty-two *Esquires* and *Gentlemen*; and all of them (unheard) *declared and adjudged traytors, convicted and attainted of High Treason, and adjudged to suffer the pains of Death and Forfeiture*. The famous *Proscription of Rome*, during the last *Triumvirate*, came not up, in some respects, to the horror of this; for there were condemn’d in this little Kingdom more than double the number that were *proscribed* through the vast bounds of the *Roman Empire*. And to make this in *Ireland* yet the more terrible, and to put the persons attainted out of a possibility of escaping, the *Act* itself was conceal’d, and no Protestant allowed a copy of it till four months after it was passed. Whereas in that of *Rome*, the names of the persons *proscribed* were affixed upon all the publick places of the city, the very day the *Proscription* was concerted; and thereby opportunity was given to many of the noblest families in *Rome* to preserve themselves by a speedy flight for better times.”<sup>b</sup> In England, too, matters were fast approaching to the same state. Dr. Peachey, the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge, for refusing to break his oath by admitting one Alban Francis, a Benedictine Monk, to the degree of M.A. without taking the oaths prescribed,

<sup>a</sup> Dr. King, cited in the “Compleat History of England,” vol. iii. pp. 474, 475, edit. 1719.

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.* p. 475.

was deprived of his office of Vice-Chancellor and suspended “*ab officio et beneficio* of his headship of Magdalen College!”<sup>a</sup> The infamous treatment of the Fellows of Magdalen College, Oxford, because they refused to perjure themselves, by electing as their president a man of such infamous character that even his own party were ashamed of him and gave him up.<sup>b</sup> The Fellows of Magdalen, however, were to be punished, and, because they would not consent to forego their oaths, were finally expelled. “After the expulsion of the Fellows, most of the *Demies* were likewise turned out of Magdalen College by the Bishop of *Oxford* and Mr. *Charnock*, his Vice-President, and *Roman Catholicks* put in their places. To acknowledge the King’s favours, the Bishop of Oxford publish’d a book containing Reasons for abrogating the *Test* and *Penal Laws*, and his Majesty commanded the *Stationers* not to print any answer to the same.”<sup>c</sup> The object of all the King’s ostentatious display, or rather *talk*, of *Toleration*, must by this time be apparent to every one capable of drawing a conclusion from *facts*. How beautifully is the spirit of “*toleration*,” and a respect for “*tender consciences*,” shown by the attempt to *compel* men of education to *perjure* themselves, and then visiting with the heaviest punishments in his power those noble-minded men who chose, at all risks, to “obey God rather than man.”

The atrocious Act of Attainder, passed in the Parliament of Ireland, has already been noticed; but we must not forget that the above Act was preceded by a repeal of the Act of Settlement.

“This iniquitous Bill,” says Smollett, “was framed in such a manner, that no regard was paid to such Protestant owners as had purchased their estates for valuable consideration: no allowance was made for improvements, nor any provision for Protestant widows: the possessor and tenants were not even allowed to remove their stock and corn. When the Bill was sent up to the Lords, Dr. Dopping, Bishop of Meath, opposed it with equal courage and ability; and an address on behalf of the purchasers under the Act of Settlement was presented to the King by the Earl of Granard; but, notwithstanding these remonstrances, it received the Royal Assent; and the Protestants of Ireland were mostly ruined.”<sup>d</sup>

Dr. Milner, when he referred to James’s celebrated “Declaration” as a proof of his love for “Liberty of Conscience,”

<sup>a</sup> Ibid. p. 475.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. p. 477.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid. p. 481.

<sup>d</sup> Smollett’s Continuation of Hume’s “History of England,” vol. i. p. 45. Lond. MDCCLXXXVIII.

must have supposed that the people of England, of the present day, are totally unacquainted with the history of by-gone days. Our forefathers were not so easily deceived. "Not only the Church of *England* men were abundantly satisfied that the King's *Declaration of Indulgence* was to prepare the way to *Popery*, but the very Dissenters themselves began to be convinced that this alone was the design of it. Nay, the King himself was now conscious that his Protestant subjects generally understood his meaning, and expected no liberty, either to the Church or to separate congregations, any longer than till the Papists were able to exercise their full and absolute will and power. To take away this jealousy of the people, the King repeated and confirmed his former *Declaration* in a manner that did but increase the fears of *Popery*." <sup>a</sup> So far Dr. Milner may be right when he assigns the said "*Declaration*" as a cause of James's loss of the throne; but then it was not on account of the king's love of toleration expressed in that document; it was because the people fully understood that the said "*Declaration*" was merely a delusion, and put forth simply to render the introduction of *Popery* more easy. That the people of England were correct in their estimate of this specious document, the king's conduct in Ireland fully proved; indeed, a letter was found in the pocket of Viscount Dundee, who fell in the battle of Killiecrankie, signed by Melfort, James's "most trusted minister, to tell him 'that a declaration of indemnity and toleration, then preparing, was couched in such terms that James could break through it when he pleased.'" Upon another occasion, in 1693, Lord Middleton obtained his [James's] consent "to have a *Declaration* issued containing an entire amnesty and ample promises of consenting to every measure which Parliament mighty carry, for the security of the court and religious liberty of the kingdom. But it was too late; the previous *Declaration* had made too great an impression on men's minds to be so easily effaced. It was not doubted that he had spoken his real feelings, and if so, this could not be sincere (*we know now, that at the very time that it was issued, Melfort wrote to the minister of the Pope that it was meant as a delusion*), and accordingly it gained over no one in England, while it disgusted his adherents in Ireland, who looked upon it as an open desertion of them." <sup>b</sup> Could James have read such a defence of his character and conduct as that set up for him by Dr. Milner, especially so far as it is grounded on his celebrated *Declaration*, if he were really the kind-hearted

<sup>a</sup> Compleat History of England, vol. iii. p. 481. London, 1706.

<sup>b</sup> London Quarterly Review, Jan. 1856, pp. 250, 255.



man Dr. Milner would have us believe him to be, his rebuke of the writer might have extended no further than this: "If an enemy had done this, I could have borne it." For, most assuredly, no one can read the account of James's proceedings, either in England, Scotland, or Ireland, without coming to the conclusion that the much-vaunted Declaration was of about the same value as the money which King James caused to be coined in Ireland "for his majesty's occasions."<sup>a</sup> Let us not be told that he was influenced in his conduct by evil counsellors, and that he really intended to act up to this "*Declaration*;" for such a defence only serves to shift, as before noticed, the guilt of his intolerant proceedings from the *king* to the *religion* he professed. Could any proof be adduced of the rectitude of King James's intentions, so much the worse for Popery! Had the power of Rome become dominant in England during the reign of James, and had the king appealed to his "Declaration" in behalf of his Protestant subjects, he would have been told by the Romish bishops of England (as the Romish bishops of Belgium told their sovereign, in 1815): "We do not hesitate to declare to your majesty, that the *canonical laws*, which are sanctioned by the ancient constitutions of the country, are inconsistent with the *Declaration* which would give to *England* equal favour and protection to all religions."<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> "The king's old stores were ransacked, the shops of tradesmen and the kitchens of burghers were pillaged to supply the mint with a quantity of brass, which was converted into current coin for his Majesty's occasions; *an arbitrary value was set upon it*, and all persons were required and commanded to take it in payment, under the severest penalties, though the proportion between its intrinsic worth and currency was nearly as *one to three hundred*. A vast sum of this counterfeit coin was issued in the course of one year, and forced upon the Protestants in payment of merchandise, provisions, and necessaries for the king's service." \* \* \* \* \*

"Understanding that the Protestants had laid out all their brass money in purchasing great quantities of hides, tallow, wood, and corn, he assumed the despotic power of fixing the prices of these commodities, and then bought them for his own use."—Smollett's Continuation of Hume's History of England, vol. i. p. 47, edit. 1783.

<sup>b</sup> See Annual Register, 1815, p. 399. In the text, "Declaration" is substituted for "projected constitution," and "England" for "Belgium."

## No. XVI.

## THE REV. J. GARBETT'S LETTER TO DR. MILNER.

Erroneous Statement and Incorrect Quotations affecting the character of certain eminent Divines of the Church of England, viz., Archbishops Usher, Laud, and Wake; Bishops King, Hallifax, [Gordon,] Goodman, Cheyney, Shipley, Juxon, Potter, Douglas (his "Criterion" and Jesuit Missions), and Tomlin.—Charge that the National Church is a prey to Socinianism.—On the Athanasian Creed.—The Non-Jurors.—That the Clergy preach in Churches in the Morning, and in the Meeting-houses in the Evening.

THOUGH we do not undertake to defend or justify all that may be written or said by or of the divines, either of the Established Church, or of that of our Dissenting brethren, we nevertheless think that the following examination of Dr. Milner's perversions will not be considered unimportant, as showing how little credit can be given to Dr. Milner's assertions.

The present article is a transcript of a letter addressed, in March, 1826, to Dr. Milner, by the REV. JOHN GARBETT, M.A., Vicar of Harborne, Staffordshire, Honorary Canon of Worcester, and formerly Rector of St. George's and Rural Dean, Birmingham. It is with the kind permission of Mr. Garbett that we present our readers with this admirable Letter. The whole of it is so excellent that we give it unabridged.

In the 33rd Letter, p. 331, Dr. Milner writes—"We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, to be examined in our observance of that commandment, among the rest, *Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.*"

Mr. Garbett selects this passage as his motto. We cannot envy the feelings of one who could so quote Scripture, while himself transgressing the moral precept and command of the Lord thus referred to by himself.

RIGHT REVEREND SIR,—It is an old complaint against controversial writers, that they often sacrifice truth to party zeal, and appear more intent upon acquiring a conquest over their adversaries, than upon preserving accuracy in their statements, and fidelity in the use of their authorities.

Few modern works have been deemed more deservedly obnoxious to accusations of this kind than your book, entitled "The End of Religious Controversy," which, in the *fifth edition*, has recently fallen into my hands. Presuming,

from the circumstances under which it was composed, and from the popular form of its publication, that it was especially designed to produce an effect upon general readers—conscious, also, that the proposed effect has, in no inconsiderable degree, resulted from it—I am induced to trouble you with a few remarks upon certain statements contained therein, affecting the reputation of eminent members of the Church of England, and which do not appear to have attracted the attention of those by whom many other of your mis-statements have been animadverted upon and exposed. My motive in addressing you originates with the conviction, that not a few defer to your seeming erudition, and are entangled by your ingenuity of reasoning, who want either the qualifications or disposition to enter into an inquiry, the result of which, I affirm, without a moment's hesitation, would discover to them that your main assumptions are derived from presumed facts, many of which are more than doubtful, and many destitute of foundation, and sustained by arguments often inconsequential in themselves, not seldom equally conclusive against the Church of Rome, and generally either irrelevant or powerless in respect to the objects against which they are levelled.

For the furtherance of your purpose,—the exaltation of the Roman Catholic upon the ruins of the Protestant community,—you trace, with partial eye, the page of history, enlarging upon every incident, and renewing every trite objection which has a tendency, however remote, to dishonour the doctrine, discipline, and practice of the Reformed Churches. When, therefore, in your researches you meet with any tale injurious to Protestants, you revive it in its most offensive form, be the authority ever so vague, or the confutation ever so decisive; and when different details of an allowed narrative present themselves, you invariably adopt, and not uncommonly exaggerate, that which is the most disgraceful to the objects of your dislike; that which may best expose the mere natural infirmities of which we all partake, and of which those who are most sensible will ever judge with the most moderation and forbearance.

Demanding that the members of your own religion should be viewed with candour and allowance,—to which I cheerfully accede their claims,—you estimate Protestants by a criterion which nothing less than perfect virtue can sustain. Thus, complaining of illiberality in the advocates and writers of the Reformed communities, you feel no reluctance in branding our ablest and most pious divines as liars and hypocrites, asserting what they do not believe, for the sake of temporal

advantage, and maintaining intentional falsehood by the detestable engines of fraud and persecution. The divisions amongst us you expatiate upon more than is consistent with ingenuousness; whilst you cast a veil over the direful and sanguinary contentions of the Church of Rome. You narrate, in high-wrought terms, the sad effects which you suppose the Reformation to have produced, and the profaneness and immorality which obtain in countries subject to its influence; but you maintain a cautious silence upon the vice and wickedness, upon the deep and awful ignorance which prevailed for ages before, and with invectives against which the pages of your ablest writer abound; and you glide over the notorious infidelity and vice, the debasing slavery of mind and body, which yet reign in countries beneath the Papal dominion, and the most intensely in those nations which are most devoted to its sway. You ruminate, with unrestrained delight, upon every moral obliquity which appears in the lives of the Reformers, though conscious that a similar mode of arguing will uncanonize the holiest martyrs of the Christian calendar; but you suppress the horridly wicked characters of the Popes and their satellites; and the iniquities which, for many ages, rendered the city and see of Rome so foul a nest of sensual abomination, as to impress upon the minds of not a few of her faithful members an enforced conviction of her identity with the mystical Babylon of the Apocalypse.

In the same unequal spirit, you constantly adduce the excellences (which I should blush to disown or depreciate) of many who have lived and died in your communion: you dwell, with commendable pleasure, upon their edifying departure from the turbulent and harassed stage of life; and adduce it as an argument perfectly unanswerable of the superior influence of your religion in that trying and all-important moment which you, somewhat rashly, assume as invariably setting the seal to sincerity:—but, on the other hand, you take not the slightest notice of numbers of holy Protestants, who yielded, with glowing joy, their departing spirits into the hands of a merciful Redeemer, after a life too brightly exemplifying the influence of His faith upon the mind, to originate a doubt of the principle from whence it flowed, or of its assured acceptance with Him, “unto whom all hearts are open.”

The holy zeal, the sacrifice of earthly good, the scorn of deliverance at the price of conscience, which marked the cruel death of thousands whom the insatiate vengeance of the Roman hierarchy hurried to the flames, elicit no meed of

approbation from your pen, excite no sentence of reprobation towards their ferocious persecutors, and appear to kindle in your mind no warmer emotion than that of contemptuous scorn for the darkness of fanatical delusion.

In animadverting upon the Church of England, truth forces from you the cold admission, that "she has better pretensions to unity, and the other marks of the Church, than any other Protestant society has" (Letter xv. p. 182<sup>a</sup>); and conscious that her doctrine, discipline, and formulas—grounded upon, and strictly reduced to, the rule of the apostolical and primitive ages—afford an invincible reply to every argument not levelled at the purest era of the Christian annals, you attempt to wound her partly through the sides of individual members, as though your own community were insusceptible of private error; and partly, by alleging the opinions of parties who have seceded from her, as though a government were accountable for the proceedings of revolted subjects. Whilst, at one moment, you represent her as a bigoted and persecuting sect; at another, you exhibit her as so loose and careless in her notions, as to allow and sanction every adverse tenet, inclusive even of the wide extremes of Antinomianism and infidelity;—and her clergy you describe as a body of clashing inconsistency with the doctrines of their Church; but for the most part, as the more odious opposition to their engagements, involved in the guilt of the Socinian heresy.

It is obvious, from the limits of the letter now addressed to you, that no discussion is intended upon so wide a field as even a small portion of the topics above alluded to would necessarily open to the controvertist. I allude to them merely to warn the incautious and uninformed reader, not hastily to infer that your statements are so trustworthy and your arguments so conclusive as the plausibility of your terms, and the boldness of your allegations, may, at first, lead him to imagine. A few examples, too, of your peculiar mode of statement and quotation, may tend to cast light upon the validity of certain positions of your book, and place him upon his guard with respect to others. He will, perhaps, be led to perceive that you have, not seldom, relied upon the ignorance of those into whose hands your work would fall; and inferred, with at least as much acumen as integrity, that it would be no unsafe basis whereon to build, in an age when theological research appears almost out of

\* These references are altered so as to apply to the same edition as before quoted by us.

taste, and when fearlessness of assertion becomes identified with truth.

It is but a small part of your references, the correctness of which I have attempted to ascertain; but the truth compels me to state, that in the majority of instances which I have collated, your readers have just cause to complain of unfairness and partiality. During the whole period of your controversial career, accusations of literary disingenuousness have been levelled against you by your opponents, Roman Catholic as well as Protestant; and epithets have been applied to characterize your probity and candour, of which, although I should be unwilling to adopt them, it would be improper to blame their application, for it would be difficult to confute their justice.<sup>a</sup>

Allow me to repeat, that the popularity your book has acquired, and the importance thus derived to its positions, are the motive for troubling yourself and the world with these remarks, dictated by no unkind feeling towards you or any member of your Church, but simply by a desire to aid the cause of truth, and do to justice to the violated memory of piety and learning.

Lest, however, it may be supposed, that to attacks upon individual character, and to historical incident, your injustice is confined; and that your doctrinal assertions remain invulnerable; it must be added, that many of your interpretations of Scripture are strained and far-fetched; your mode of quoting that and the Fathers, partial and perverse; your statement of Protestant tenets, often erroneous and unjust; and, in brief, your account of persons and transactions, generally at variance with the fact. For the truth of parts of this assertion, an appeal may be made, with safety, to the pages of those who have already encountered you; and it would not require much leisure or research to make good the whole.

Reflecting upon the severe and bitter spirit in which your volume is composed, it is impossible not to feel perpetually hurt and indignant in the perusal of it. Trusting that I have imbibed no portion of its temper, and cheerfully rendering to your learning and talents the deference to which they are entitled, and to your station every respect which it can claim, it will be a subject of sincere regret if my pen shall be found to have given utterance to any rashness of expression indecorous towards you, and as such, unbecoming to myself. Whatever may be thought of the course you have adopted, as most serviceable to the *Roman* End of Con-

<sup>a</sup> See *Prot. Guardian*, 1828, p. 345.

trovery, I hope not to forget that these lines are addressed to a scholar, a divine, and a prelate of the Church of Christ, though of what I must deem its most corrupted branch.

I. Permit me, then, in the first place, to recall your attention to a passage, which has recently been brought before the public in several ways, and which forms a note in Letter ix. p. 124 of your book.

“Some bishops of the Established Church, for instance, Goodman and Cheyney, of Gloucester; and Gordon, of Glasgow; probably also King, of London; and Hallifax, of St. Asaph, died Catholics.”

As it is with reference to the two last-named prelates that the passage is especially quoted, I will postpone to them a few observations which occur upon the three first.

The report you have revived against *King, Bishop of London*, is an ancient and long-suppressed calumny, fabricated in the hotbed of Papal sedition at Douay,<sup>a</sup> and transplanted into England, where, as is known to no one better than yourself, it received, immediately upon its importation, the most satisfactory and decisive contradiction. It was promptly and circumstantially denied by his own son, Henry King, afterwards Bishop of Chichester, in a discourse at St. Paul's Cross. The denial was echoed, in very strong and indignant terms, within two years of the calumniated prelate's decease, by the eminent Bishop Hall, then Dean of Worcester, in a sermon before the Convocation, wherein he appeals to his own personal knowledge, and that of many whom he addressed.<sup>b</sup> The whole circumstances of the refutation are likewise formally detailed by another contemporary prelate, Dr. Godwin, who occupied the see of Hereford at the time, and was on close terms of friendship with Bishop King. The actual evidence *against the statement* is that of Archbishop Abbot and three other bishops, Morton, Lake, and Felton, who regularly visited him in his last illness; of his household, who attended him; of his chaplain, who administered

<sup>a</sup> [“But of all fowle mouths that have slandered that blessed soul, he that wrote the *Bp. of London's Legacie*, is the most shameful and slanderous lier. In the year 1622, when he first divulged this libell, he made the worthy bishop to speak those silly motives, which his worthy self had devised.—And then, in 1623, he made a new publication of the same work, changing only the title-leaf and the preface to the reader; and whereas, throughout the whole book, he maketh the bp. speak what himself had forged; he now giveth his reader leave, with his full consent and allowance, to suppose all these passages to be *fictiones personarum*, and warranted by the figure *Prosopopeia*.”—See more in Mason's “*New Art of Lying*, covered by Jesuites under the veil of Equivocation,” London, 1624, pp. 64, 66; and also “*A Sermon at Paul's Cross on a Scandalous Report that the late Bishop of London was reconciled to the Church of Rome*,” by H. King, his eldest Son; 4to. London, 1621.]

<sup>b</sup> See his sermon “*Columba Noë*.”

to him the Holy Eucharist ("the last bread," says Bishop Hall, "that ever he received in this world, even the bread of the Lord"); and of his family, who, with Sir Henry Martin and other friends, participated with him in the blessed memorials of his Redeemer's sacrifice. And, if this Protestant evidence may not suffice to counterbalance an anonymous Popish story from Flanders, we have also the testimony of Preston, the very Roman priest who was said to have reconciled him to the Church; but who made oath, first before the primate, and afterwards before two lay privy councillors, that he had never spoken to, corresponded with, or even seen the deceased prelate.

With the whole of this, sir, you are well acquainted, for Bishop Godwin's book is quoted in your volume. Yet thus condescending to revive this confuted falsehood, you cannot be displeased if I repeat the forcible axiom of Bishop Hall on the occasion, "*Veritas non est, quæ mendaciorum fulcris indiget:*"—and if I call to your memory the closing observations of the former bishop. The language of both these divines is certainly strong: not stronger than the case deserved; not so strong as your own style upon much slighter occasions. Solicitous as we are, in this age of refinement, to qualify truth by inoffensive phraseology, let, at least, convicted slander retain its proper designation. Both prelates would deem their language as applicable to the reviver as the original inventor of the story.

"It might seem," says Bishop Godwin, "to be now an ordinance of the Papal religion, and a Catholic doctrine, to calumniate boldly, that something, at least, may stick. \* \* We leave such aids to the votaries of falsehood. It behoves the followers of truth to cultivate sincerity. I wonder not at their anxiety to enrol amongst them a man eminent for his learning, piety, extraordinary eloquence, and assiduity in preaching. But, ever abhorring Popish superstitions, from early youth to his latest breath, and certainly altogether ours, he died on that day which the Church consecrates to the Passion of our Lord, as he had lived, so piously in Christ, that I pray it may be my lot so to live and so to die." <sup>a</sup>

II. To the equally unfounded accusation against Bishop Hallifax, it seems scarcely necessary to say much, since the recent appearance of the late Dr. Samuel Parr's Letter on the subject. Unwilling to weaken the force of this appeal, addressed as well to the sincerity of your religious profession, as to your moral probity and love of truth; and the manly

<sup>a</sup> De Præsulibus (Richardson's), p. 195.



firmness of which is powerfully contrasted with the shrinking evasiveness and sophistry of your reply ;—I will but make a few brief remarks on the correspondence between yourself and the bishop's son, judiciously annexed to Dr. Parr's tract by its respectable editor.

Mr. Hallifax having requested you to name your authority for the assertion that his Father died a Papist, you inform him, in reply, that you relied on the testimony of a "certain Catholic," since deceased, who had access to the bishop in his illness ; and, as if conscious that your tale was perfectly untenable,—yet, as you say of your opponents, "wanting the rare grace of acknowledging error" (Letter xxxii. p. 330), you add, "I spoke of the fact barely as *probable*."—This is not strictly the case. For though, in the first instance, the calumny is qualified with a "probably," you introduce it, a second time, as resting "*on good authority*" (p. 329) ; and finally discuss it, a third time, as *an indubitable fact*. For, in making the illiberal assertion, "that you have sufficient reason to affirm," that Protestant writers "do not really believe what they declare," you bring forward, amongst others, "a late Warburtonian Lecturer," Bishop Hallifax, "lamenting on his death-bed that he could not return" to the Pope (Letter xlv. pp. 432, 433).

That Mr. Hallifax should deem your reply unsatisfactory will surprise no one who reads it. In another letter, therefore, as moderate and respectful as the first, he entreats you to acquaint him with the name of your informant, at what place, and when he had access to the bishop, &c. To this communication *you gave no reply*. You have, however, recently designated it as a "fishing letter." Contemptible ! Is it "fishing" for a son to entreat the name of one who he believes has calumniated his father's memory ? Is it "fishing" to ask a prelate of the Church of Christ, who loudly proclaims himself the advocate of truth, to assist him in ascertaining the veracity of an important fact ? It does not appear why you should hesitate to reply, conscious that silence admits but of one interpretation. If your informant spake true, the incident carries no discredit to him, however dishonourable to Dr. Hallifax. If false, you ought not to desire that your name should be the instrument, on the one side, of handing down a slander from generation to generation ; and enumerated, on the other, amongst the many who, by universal admission, have sustained the papal cause by forgery and defamation. What, sir, is your own vehement language against many Protestants, whose offence, if guilty, is trivial compared to this ? And to what amounts your declaration,

that "you should despise yourself if you knowingly published any falsehood, or hesitated to retract any one that you were proved to have fallen into?" (p. 30, in Address, note).

In one part of your book you remark, that "Wilful infidelity and heresy involve greater guilt than moral frailty" (Letter xviii. p. 178). The truth of this proposition few, I presume, will question; though the humble mind will hesitate to decide what obliquities of faith may appear to the Omniscient Judge voluntary or involuntary;—being content meanwhile to maintain, that actual disbelief is manifested as well in rejecting a portion of God's revealed word, as in renouncing the whole. There is, then, one important axiom of Holy Writ, so little obnoxious to dispute or sophistry, that the violation of it appears unquestionably to involve the sin of WILFUL infidelity. It is this—"HE SHALL NOT REST UPON GOD'S HOLY HILL, WHO SLANDERETH HIS NEIGHBOUR," and "MAKETH OR LOVETH A LIE."

III. Of the three other prelates, Goodman, Cheyney, and Gordon, who are said to have "died Catholics," the correctness of the assertion is of less importance; I believe the statement to be true of the first alone. Of Gordon, Archbishop of Glasgow, it does not appear why you should name him among the prelates of the Established Church.

To such a convert as Goodman, Bishop of Gloucester, the Church of Rome is fully welcome. The sole apology for his conduct must be found in his admitted weakness of intellect. When you say he "died" a Romanist, you express the least important part of the fact. He lived in the Church of England Papist in heart; and, as such, enjoyed, without compunction, her dignities and emoluments. At a time when, from his more than suspected principles, he had well nigh incurred a penalty of deposition, "he took the oath enjoined in the sixth canon, for preserving the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England against all Popish doctrines which were thereunto repugnant."<sup>a</sup> Under this, he conformed as long as the Establishment had wealth and honour to bestow; but when her inveterate foes had accomplished her destruction, he threw off the mask of hypocrisy and equivocation; and died avowedly, as he had lived secretly, a Roman Catholic. "A scandal so unreasonably given," says the testy Dr. Heylin, "as if the devil himself had watched an opportunity to despise this Church."

Allow me to direct your attention to the observations of certain contemporary writers upon this circumstance; the

<sup>a</sup> Heylin's "Life of Archbishop Laud," p. 446.

two latter of which will be found to convey a direct denial of your assertion of the apostasy of the other English prelates.

Walker speaks of Bishop Goodman as "one of those weak minds whom the vile and detestable practices of the Puritans had scandalized into Popery."<sup>a</sup> Now it is very true, that the frantic excesses of that distracted age made Papists of some, and infidels of more. But this author is not happy in selecting the apostate Bishop of Gloucester as an illustration of the fact; for Goodman had been long a Romanist in principle. The remarks of Fuller, who was upon terms of intimacy with him, are more worthy of notice. "The adversaries of our hierarchy," says this writer, "have no cause to triumph thereat, who slanderously charge Popish compliance on all his order; being able to produce, of two hundred bishops since Queen Elizabeth, but THIS ONLY INSTANCE, and him a person of no great eminence."<sup>b</sup> "It is no scandal to the Church of England," says Bishop Kennett, "that this man was the only bishop who made his addresses to Cromwell, and dedicated a book to 'his Excellence,' with flattery and a servile petition 'for hearing his cause, and doing justice' to him. It is further remarkable, that as he was the ONLY apostate bishop of our Church since the Reformation, so he was the only one who left children to beg their bread. I saw the example at my own doors."<sup>c</sup>

IV. The two latter quotations include a direct denial of the apostasy (not only of Bishop King, but also) of Bishop Cheyney; which rests, in the main, on the suspicious evidence of this same Goodman, who was his successor in the see of Gloucester. That Cheyney was a consistent member of the Church of England cannot, perhaps, be affirmed; but that he died a Papist is adverse to the testimony of the learned Camden, and of Bishop Godwin; authorities in every respect superior to Goodman. Both these writers characterize Cheyney as "too much a Lutheran;" and this explains his conduct in Queen Mary's days, when, being Archdeacon of Hereford, he powerfully argued against transubstantiation, yet readily assented to the belief of the corporal presence. It is unnecessary to observe upon the consistency of this conduct with the Lutheran notion of the Eucharist, and its irreconcilableness with the Romish tenet.

V. I proceed to another act of injustice against an English Bishop, Dr. Shipley, whom you place "in the first rank of

<sup>a</sup> Sufferings of the Clergy, p. ii. p. 33.

<sup>b</sup> Worthies of England (Denbighshire).

<sup>c</sup> Life of Charles II. in the "Complete History of England," vol. iii. p. 215.

complete Socinianism" (Letter xv. p. 185). This accusation you have condescended to borrow from a Unitarian writer, Mr. Belsham; heedless of the positive contradiction given to it by the Bishop of Calcutta, Dr. Heber, who, from his alliance with the family of Dr. Shipley, must be well acquainted with his opinions, and who, upon the authority of his son, the Dean of St. Asaph, the father of Mrs. Heber, denied the imputation which you maintain. The following is Bishop Heber's reply to Mr. Belsham's statement.

"On what evidence it is that he ascribes a dissembling of their faith to men of unblemished character, whose writings, doubtless, may be searched in vain for anything on which to found the charge of heresy, he has not deigned to let us know. For Bishop Shipley, whose memory I respect at least as much as Mr. Belsham can, and whose private sentiments I have better means of knowing than Mr. Belsham can possibly possess, I can answer, on the authority of his son, that the *charge is as false as it is injurious*. Had Dr. Shipley's faith been inconsistent with that of the Church to which he belonged, those who know his utter disregard of worldly interest, and his characteristic frankness, know that he would not have retained his preferments a single hour. In truth, however, his daily devotions and his confidential intercourse were in perfect consonance with his public professions. . . . Mr. Belsham," concludes his lordship, "might have known all this, *had he thought it worth his while to be accurate.*"<sup>a</sup>

VI. I have next to animadvert upon your injustice towards a more illustrious character than either of the preceding, Archbishop Usher; in common with his brethren, Juxon, Bishop of London; Morton, of Durham; and Potter, of Carlisle; for these are the "three other Anglican bishops" referred to in the following passage:—

"The enemies of Church and State, having hunted down the Earl of Strafford, and procured him to be attainted of high treason, the king, Charles I., declared *that he could not, in conscience, concur to his death*; when the case being referred to the archbishops, Usher and Williams, and three other Anglican bishops, they decided (in spite of his majesty's conscience, and his oath to administer justice in mercy) that he might, *in conscience, send an innocent man to the block*, which he did, accordingly, in the person of Strafford."—(Letter xlvi. p. 461.)

For this narrative you refer to Collier's Church History, vol. ii. p. 801, who certainly relates something of the kind;

<sup>a</sup> Bampton Lectures; notes to Lecture II.

but first expressly acquits Juxon, one of the "three;" and in the very next paragraph, gives a different account of the whole business, which account harmonizes with that of Usher himself; but of which you, of course, take no notice.

It would be idle to appeal to your sense of impartiality in stating, after due improvement, a narrative which stands in direct opposition to accounts pointed out and abstracted in the self-same page where you met with it. Not that, as in the preceding and too many other cases, you have no respectable authority for the story; but that authority labours under so many difficulties, and is so opposed by other and more credible testimony, that no candid writer would have adopted it in the peremptory manner in which it is given by you. There are three conflicting statements of this transaction, resting upon the respective evidence of Bishop Hacket, Lord Clarendon, and Archbishop Usher himself. The first account of Collier, which you profess to receive, is derived from the former of these distinguished witnesses; and as the book in which it occurs is not very common, I will here transcribe the passage.

Having mentioned the proceedings in Parliament, the outrages of the people, the advice of the Privy Council, the formation of a conspiracy for the private assassination of Strafford, in case the royal assent to the execution was withheld, and the memorable letter of the noble culprit to the king, Dr. Hacket proceeds thus:—

"It being, therefore, to no purpose to dispute what was the best remedy to save this lord, when there was none at all, the House of Lords nominate four prelates to go to his Majesty, to propound how the tenderness of his conscience might safely wade through this insuperable difficulty. These were Lord Primate Usher, with the Bishops Morton, Williams, Potter. There was none of these four but would have gone through fire and water, as we say, to save the party; which being now a thing beyond wit and power, they state the question thus to the king (sure I am of the truth, because I had it from the three former). Whether, as his Majesty refers his own judgment to his judges, in whose person they act, in Court of Oyer, King's Bench, Assize, and in cause of life and death, and it lies on them if an innocent man suffer;—so why may not his Majesty satisfy his conscience in the present matter, that, since competent judges in law had awarded that they found guilt of treason in the earl, he may suffer that judgment to stand, though in his private mind he was not satisfied that the Lord Strafford was criminous, for that juggling and corrupt dealing which he suspected in

the proofs at the trial ; and let the blame lie upon them who sat upon the tribunal of life and death ? The four bishops were all for the affirmative.”<sup>a</sup>

This account differs importantly from your version of it. It is, however, sufficiently unfavourable to the prelates concerned: But, in the first place, it does not coincide with Lord Clarendon’s statement of the business, who, Williams excepted, implicates the bishops no farther than by suggesting that they did not fortify the conscience of the king with so much confidence as he thought political regard to the delicate situation of their order required. Secondly, the above narrative contradicts a twofold statement of Archbishop Usher, given, under his own hand, to Dr. Bernard, preacher at Gray’s Inn ; and, by word of mouth, at the moment of expected dissolution, to his chaplain, Dr. Richard Parr ; and corroborated by the explicit evidence of King Charles himself : all which testimonies are noticed by Collier in the same page ; but, with characteristic candour, unnoticed by you.

The memory of Bishop Hacket is more venerable for piety and erudition than for deep judgment or extreme accuracy. His work, from which the above is quoted, is one of the most learned and gossiping pieces of biography in the language ; and his excessive partiality to the subject of it, his patron and benefactor, gives to every character and event in it that kind of colouring which it may have been the desire of so profound a politician as Archbishop Williams that it should bear, and whose conduct is placed by his grateful biographer in a light different from that in which it appears to other writers, to whom, at least, he was less confidently known.

Respectable, then, as is the name of Hacket, no one will venture to exalt his authority above that of Usher, especially in a case where the latter was the party present. The aged biographer probably retained no very perfect recollection of the details of an interview, the importance of which must have been but slight in his mind, when compared with the convulsions which so soon burst forth, and terminated only in the destruction of Church and State. When he published the “*Life of Williams*,” sixteen years had elapsed, and he was rapidly advancing to the eightieth year of his age. He candidly tells us also, that he did not write down at the time the events of those two years, in the earlier part of which this incident occurred ; and he had been sufficiently harassed to render an imperfect recollection of it more than

<sup>a</sup> *Life of Archbishop Williams*, p. ii. p. 161.

venial. That his statement is incorrect in some points, there is internal evidence. He says, the "*House of Lords nominated these prelates to go to the king;*" whereas it appears the king *sent for them, by advice of the council and judges.* He says "FOUR" bishops only were consulted; whereas we know there were FIVE, the name of Juxon having escaped his memory.

Your friend Mr. Charles Butler has said, with justice, that "a fairer, a more learned, or a more honourable name than that of Archbishop Usher the Church of England cannot produce."<sup>a</sup> I account, sir, my pen not slightly honoured in the endeavour to rescue from obloquy this exalted name. Strong must be the evidence to convict such a man of the Jesuitical casuistry which your statement conveys. There is, as I lately observed, a twofold contradiction, delivered by the primate to his chaplains, Drs. Bernard <sup>b</sup> and Parr, and a corroborating testimony from the king. The latter of these narratives is here subjoined.

Dr. Parr, having spoken of a dangerous illness of the archbishop, and of the edifying manner in which he prepared to close a life of toil and perturbation, tells us:—

"After some other discourse, I then made bold to ask him if he had advised the king to pass the bill against the Earl of Strafford, as it had been reported. To which he replied—'I know there is such a thing *most falsely laid to my charge, for I neither gave nor approved* of any such advice, as that the king should assent to the bill against the earl; but, on the contrary, told his majesty, that if he was satisfied, by what he had heard at his trial, that the earl was not guilty of treason, he ought NOT, IN CONSCIENCE, to consent to his condemnation; and this the king knows well enough, and can clear me, if he pleases.' Nor was my lord primate mistaken in this. For when, not long after, it was told his majesty that the Archbishop of Armagh was dead, he spake to Colonel William Legge and Mr. Kirk, then of his bedchamber (as they were since to his late majesty), to this effect, viz., that 'he was very sorry for it;' together with high expressions of his piety and merits. But when one there present replied that he believed 'he might be so, were it not for his persuading your majesty to the Earl of Strafford's execution.'

<sup>a</sup> Book of the Roman Church, p. 302.

<sup>b</sup> In his Funeral Sermon, p. 106, Dr. Bernard says, that the Archbishop "gave him a charge" to contradict a scandal raised against him, as "if he had made use of a pretended distinction between a personal and a political conscience" to satisfy the king. Yet this "contradicted scandal" is the account which the Roman Catholic historian, Dr. Lingard, chooses to give of the business, excepting Juxon alone from the guilt.—(Hist. of Eng. vol. vi.)

To which the king, in a great passion, replied, that IT WAS FALSE. 'For,' said the king, 'after the bill was passed, the archbishop came to me, with tears in his eyes, saying, 'Oh, sir! what have you done? I fear that this act may prove a great trouble to your conscience, and pray God your majesty may never suffer by the passing of this bill;' or words to that effect."—"This," adds the doctor, "is the substance of two certificates, taken, at divers times, under the hands of these two gentlemen of unquestionable credit, both of which, since they agree in substance, I thought fit to contract into one testimony, which I have inserted here, having the originals by me to produce, if occasion be. And now, I hope, after what has been said to justify my lord primate of this calumny, that no honest or charitable person can believe it. But as for those who are so ill-natured and censorious as to think and speak ill of all men that do not fully comply with their notions and opinions, it is no great matter what they either believe or report."<sup>a</sup>

With respect to Archbishop Williams, the question is perhaps of less importance. It has generally been taken for granted, that he recommended the death of Strafford. Lord Clarendon, for instance, charges him with advising the king in a manner far more worthy of a Jesuitical confessor than of a Protestant divine. This, however, is not asserted by any of the parties present. The only ascertained fact is, that, *at the end of the conference* between the king and the prelates, Williams put a paper into his majesty's hands, which was *supposed* to contain reasons for the execution. If so, it would be an additional proof, if that were wanted, that the opinion of his brethren was adverse to his own. But the archbishop averred to Bishop Hacket, that the paper did not refer to Strafford, but contained a strong dissuasive against passing an Act of still greater importance, which was then before the king, viz., to render the Parliament perpetual, by assenting to which Charles sealed his fate, and, it is said, the same pen confirmed both bills, as it were signing his own death-warrant with that of his unhappy friend.

Of Juxon, it seems to be universally admitted, except by Oldmixon and other violent writers, with whom truth is nothing, and party everything, that he was so far from uniting in such Jesuitical advice, as even to be of opinion that the king, having positively promised Strafford to carry him through his trial with safety,<sup>b</sup> was bound to pardon him,

<sup>a</sup> Life of Usher, p. 61.

<sup>b</sup> In a letter to the earl, only sixteen days before the Bill was signed, Charles thus expresses himself:—"I cannot satisfy myself without assuring you, in



guilty or innocent. At this interview, therefore, says Dr. Usher, "the Bishop of London spake nothing at all." With the royal promise the prelates had no concern. It was not submitted to their judgment. The question proposed to them was simply this,—Whether the king ought or ought not to assent to a Bill of Attainder, which had not only passed both Houses of Parliament, but also received the express sanction of the judges of the land? It does not appear, after all the clamour raised against them, how they could answer other than they did. They left the decision to rest upon a matter of fact of which his majesty could be solely the witness to himself, viz., Whether, having personally attended the trial every day, and knowing the facts on which the attainder rested better than any other person possibly could, he really believed the earl guilty of those deeds which the legal expounders of the law had declared to be treason? that if, in Archbishop Usher's words, "upon hearing of the allegations on either side, he did not conceive him guilty of the crime wherewith he was charged, he could not condemn him."<sup>a</sup> If, then, we are to believe the testimony of this unreproached and irreproachable ornament of the Christian Church, united to the declaration of the king, the calumniated prelates decided, in direct opposition to your assertion, that the king was bound, "in conscience," NOT "to send an innocent man to the block."

The narrative which vindicates Usher, includes of course the vindication of Potter and Morton also. But I cannot allow the last-mentioned name to pass by without noticing the conduct of a late Roman prelate, enrolled by you amongst the beatified spirits of the just: I mean Bishop Challoner, who laboured to revive an old stigma against a man whom the testimony of Izaak Walton pronounces to have been a "pattern of apostolical charity and more than human patience;"<sup>b</sup> but whose profound learning, employed in opposition to Roman corruptions, renders his name, of course, an object of opprobrium.

Having lived to see the eventful fall and restoration of the Church he loved, and of which he was a distinguished ornament; having been reduced from the principality of Durham to a state of actual poverty and want; having sustained, with primitive endurance, the fiery trial of persecution and distress; and hoping, at length, to pass the relics of a long

the midst of your troubles, that, upon the word of a king, you shall not suffer in life, honour, or fortune."—(Strafford's Letters, vol. ii. p. 416.)

<sup>a</sup> Dr. Bernard's Sermon, p. 108.

<sup>b</sup> See this writer's character of Bishop Morton in the "Life of Dr. Donne."

and tumultuous life in pious repose and peace; Bishop Morton was dragged forward, by the unceasing vigilance of Popish slander, at the age of ninety-four, as an authority for the authenticity of the absurd and malignant fable of the Nag's Head consecration; a fable which remains on record as a striking proof of what bigotry can invent, and prejudice believe. The aged bishop replied promptly, with a solemn denial, on oath, of the falsehood imputed to him; which he affirms to be "a most notorious untruth;" adding, "that he always believed that Nag's story to have proceeded from the father of lies." "For," says he, on his death-bed—and his unshaken adherence to the Church in her severe trials gives peculiar interest to his words—"if I had not believed, upon sufficient evidence, that the succession of bishops in the Church of England had been legally derived from the Apostles, I had never entered into that high calling, much less continued in it thus long." <sup>a</sup> Yet, in despite of the venerable bishop's solemn oath and dying words, corroborated by the declaration of lay peers, bishops, &c. does Dr. Challoner, after the lapse of a century and a half, in one of his popular works, renew the charge, accompanied with all the refuted details of the Nag's Head slander. <sup>b</sup> He would have done well to remember the observation of Dr. Barwick upon the whole transaction:—"So little do they consider, that none do more disturb the unity or weaken the faith of the Church, for which they would appear so much concerned, than such as endeavour by fraud or falsehood to support and maintain them." <sup>c</sup>

VII. I have next to notice, in your work, a statement of less importance, but worthy of remark, as tending to illustrate your peculiar mode of citing authorities, and the implicit deference paid to the correctness of his spiritual guides, by your respectable lay advocate, the author of the "Book of the Roman Catholic Church." In a note to page 396 [edit. 1842], you give us this reference:—"See the defence of Bancroft's successor in the See of Canterbury, Dr. Laud, who endeavoured to enforce Auricular Confession, in Heylin's Life of Laud, p. ii. p. 415." This note Mr. Butler copies verbatim in p. 107 of his volume.

Doubtful that Laud, however indiscreet, could have been guilty of such excessive imprudence, and that Heylin, how-

<sup>a</sup> See Archbishop Bramhall's Works, p. 432, and Lindsay's edition Mason's Vindication, &c. (preface, p. xcvi.)

<sup>b</sup> "Grounds of the Old Religion."

<sup>c</sup> Life of his brother, Dean Barwick, who was Morton's agent in this business.

ever partial, could have committed the still greater absurdity of defending such attempt, I complied with your direction; and having referred to Heylin's "Life of Laud," I found, as I suspected, the contrary to have been the case. So far is Heylin from "defending" any such attempt,—so far is he even from hinting that Laud endeavoured to "enforce" anything of the kind,—that he treats the imputation with contempt. He allows that the *king, not the archbishop*, had been accused of such a design; and he dismisses the accusation as an unauthorized anonymous calumny. I will quote the passage, and leave it to the reader. It occurs in a defence of Laud against divers allegations of two writers of the day.

"If," says Heylin, "he approved of auricular confession, and wished to introduce it into the Church (as both authors say he did), it is no more than what the Liturgy commends (though we find not the word auricular in it),<sup>a</sup> or what the canons have provided for such as shall be willing to confess themselves. But whereas we are told, by one of our authors, that the king should say, he would 'use force to make it be received, were it not for fear of sedition amongst the people;' yet it is but in one of our authors neither, who hath *no other authority for it but a nameless doctor.*" Such is the passage from which you and Mr. Butler inform your readers, that Archbishop Laud "endeavoured to enforce auricular confession;" and that Dr. Heylin "defended" the attempt.

VIII. My next observations are elicited by your use of the name of Archbishop Wake. His correspondence with Dupin has been so often discussed that it seems superfluous to renew the subject; were it not that, although his declarations are too explicit to be misunderstood by any unprejudiced mind, his authority is constantly alleged in direct opposition to his sentiments. Thus, for instance, his opinions were adduced, not long since, by a clergyman of our communion, to sustain the project of a union between the Churches of England and Rome. The inconsistency of this project with the intentions of Archbishop Wake, and with the principles of our own Church have been so forcibly stated by the learned and truly Protestant prelate to whom your volume is addressed,<sup>b</sup> that I should deem it presumption to enlarge farther on the subject than your employment of his name requires. I cannot, however, refrain from expressing an

<sup>a</sup> And surely as little the thing intended by the word.

<sup>b</sup> See Bishop Burgess's "Popery incapable of Union with a Protestant Church," in reply to Rev. S. Wix.

opinion, that of the many theories of improvement with which the world is every day favoured, in some form or other, the practicability of union between the Churches of England and Rome is either one of the most irrational, or one of the most dangerous. Your own testimony is sufficient to satisfy us, that a project of this kind could not be carried into effect without an entire surrender of Christian liberty, and an essential sacrifice of Christian truth, on the part of Protestants. What, then, ought to be expected from the success of such a plan, but a return to that state of spiritual and intellectual darkness, from which the benign hand of Providence mercifully rescued us, through seas of martyred blood? What ought to be anticipated, but a descent from the moral and religious eminence upon which we have been elevated, by the blessings of the Reformation, to that debasing and slavish superstition which still overhangs the countries most devoted to the Roman See?

But to return to Archbishop Wake. In Letter xxxii. pp. 329, 330, you comment upon certain remarks of Bishops Hallifax, Porteus, Watson, Barrington, &c., and coolly and deliberately conclude by pronouncing them, one and all, guilty of wilful and intentional hypocrisy, perjury, falsehood, and slander. You affirm, that they did "not seriously believe" the writings which they gave to the world; but that, knowing the superior purity of the Roman creed, and "wanting the rare grace of acknowledging their error at the expense of temporal advantage, they had no other defence for themselves but in clamour and calumny." As an exemplification of this most unprincipled band, you place the venerable name of Archbishop Wake.

Leaving all this invective, equally gross and rancorous, to carry its own reply, I will not ascribe, as might fairly be done, such unfounded imputations to the operation of similar principles within your own bosom; nor will I ask how you stand justified to God and man, and to the dictates of an enlightened conscience, in calumnious invective against men whose integrity will not lose by comparison with the sincerest members of the Church of Rome. I cannot, however, withhold the offering of fervent gratitude to the Author of all good, that neither our temporal peace, still less our eternal destiny, is consigned to the fiat of erring mortals, blinded by prejudice, and intoxicated by bigotry and passion.

You remark (p. 329, note), that Dr. Wake, "having entered into correspondence with Dr. Dupin, for the purpose of uniting their respective churches together, he assures the Catholic divine, in his last letter to him, as follows:—' In

dogmatibus, prout a te candide proponuntur, non admodum dissentimus; in regimine ecclesiastico minus; in fundamentalibus, sive doctrinam, sive disciplinam spectemus, vix omnino.'” Here, you say, “he acknowledged to Dupin, that there was no fundamental difference between his doctrine and that of Catholics.”—(Letter xxxiii. p. 333.)

This, and a subsequent remark of the same kind, is to imply, that the archbishop was as unprincipled as the other prelates and divines with whom his name is conjoined; and that, having passed a laborious life in stemming Popish opinions, with a view to “temporal advantage,” and thereby attained the summit of human dignity, he was now ready to be reconciled to a Church, the religion of which, you say, he had “so foully misrepresented:” which “foul misrepresentation,” I presume, consisted in tearing away the veil that covered the specious exposition of the deep and crafty Bossuet; in whose steps Roman writers have since deemed it safer to tread, than allow their tenets to be viewed in that primitive grossness by which they so easily extended their empire in ages of simple ignorance and darkness; by which they still retain dominion over the blinded and superstitious populace; and in which they are candidly exhibited by earlier and not less able, though more ingenuous, members of your Church, than it is now deemed prudent to authorize and avow.

Ignorance and prejudice have constantly given a false colouring to the correspondence of our learned primate with Dupin. During the rupture between Pope Clement XI. and the Church of France, which threatened to terminate in the complete secession of the latter from the See of Rome, Dr. Wake, in his zeal for Protestantism, as well as in that spirit of peace which peculiarly marked his character, made an attempt to unite in one communion the Anglican and Gallican Churches. But the very basis of this union was laid in a renunciation of the Pope's dominion by the latter. When you assert that “he acknowledged there was no fundamental difference between his doctrine and that of Catholics,” you assert that which (with *your* interpretation of the term “Catholic,” and *your* view of “fundamentals”) is not warranted by the passage before you. He neither speaks of the doctrines of the Roman Church in general;—nor yet of those of the Gallican Church in the abstract; but *according as they were frankly expounded* by a particular divine, “prout a te candide proponuntur;” and that divine never allowed to be an orthodox expositor of Popish doctrines, but esteemed little better in his day than half a Protestant. The Gallican

Church herself was always accounted the most heretical and refractory daughter of the Roman See. Among her other heterodoxies, for instance, she maintained that the Pope's supremacy is a mere arrangement of ecclesiastical expediency. Yet every consistent Romanist asserts, that this supremacy is not only *jure divino*, but that a denial of it includes a denial of the fundamentals of Christianity. When, then, the archbishop says, that between the liberal exposition of this heterodox expounder of the most heterodox branch of the Romish Church, and his own opinions, there was no "fundamental difference," he makes a statement importantly at variance with that which you derive from his words.

Yet, even for a conclusion thus imperfect, you deem it necessary to garble the archbishop's language. To prove that he was ready to shake hands with Rome, it was certainly more needful than candid to omit the words by which your quotation is immediately preceded; which sufficiently evince what kind of union he contemplated. "I had believed," says his grace to Dupin, "that the time was arrived, in which, having *shaken off the yoke of Roman tyranny*, you would unite with us in the same communion: in dogmatibus, prout a te candide," &c.

Again, you observe, "The late Archbishop Wake, after all his bitter writings against the Pope and the Catholic Church, coming to discuss the terms of a proposed union between this Church and that of England, expressed himself willing to allow a certain superiority to the Roman Pontiff."—(Letter xlv. p. 445.) How wearisome it is to be repeating the same thing. He never proposed a union with what you call "the Catholic Church," controlled by the Pope; but with the Gallican Church, when she had "shaken off the yoke of Roman tyranny." A "certain superiority" he was, indeed, willing to allow, not to the "Roman Pontiff," but to the Bishop of Rome; and what that superiority was will best be understood by his own words.

Having challenged the Pope to establish any supremacy whatever from Holy Writ, he subjoins, in that spirit of peace which led him to the discussion—"If Councils have conceded any prerogative to the bishop of the imperial see (although, with the fall of the Empire, that prerogative may justly be deemed extinct; nevertheless) for my part, the rights of nations, the liberties of churches, and the dignity of bishops, being always preserved, let him, with my good will, enjoy his primacy, such as it is. I envy him not this first rank, nor the empty title of honour. But, to lord it over other churches; to claim to himself alone the episcopal office entire, a part of

which Christ left entire to every bishop ;<sup>a</sup> and to stir up heaven and earth for the destruction of every one who opposes his unjust tyranny ;—this, we never could, nor ought ye to bear.” And, finally, his opinion having been demanded by Jablonski, upon the lawfulness of seeking a union with that Church to which you represent him as so ready to conform, he demands, in accents of indignant surprise, “ Are any of us so unacquainted with, or inexperienced in the tyranny of the Romanists, as to imagine, that, for our sakes, they will descend from the height of infallibility and dominion? or that we should, on their account, voluntarily return again to a slavery so long renounced? May God far avert from the minds of all a design so infamous, so destructive!”—He asserts, that if ever an attempt is made to reconcile Protestants and Papists, it must be commenced on terms of complete equality ; that, as a necessary preparative, Rome must recede from her pretence of infallibility, and allow her tenets and practices to be judged by the Word of God. “ Without a previous stipulation of this kind,” are his words, “ we shall treat with them to no purpose ; unless, under pretext of conciliating peace, we decide upon renouncing the truth. God grant, that, in considering these points, we may seek, not so much our own, as the things of Jesus Christ ; nor so love the peace of this world, as to forfeit the rewards of that which is to come.”<sup>b</sup>

It is needless to animadvert upon the above language. None knew better than Dr. Wake, that with the renunciation of Papal authority alone is a door opened to union between the churches : he, therefore, made such renunciation the basis of his proposal. This dogma is the keystone which yet keeps together the heterogeneous and unwieldy mass of Roman error.

The candour with which you have viewed the design of the learned primate will be more apparent by referring to a statement of your own, given to the world some years ago. You then asserted, that no plan of union was ever proposed to Protestants, by Dupin, “ upon any other footing, than that they should admit the the authority of the Catholic Church, the Pope’s Supremacy, the Seven Sacraments, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Invocation of Saints,” &c.<sup>c</sup> Admitting the accuracy of this statement, I leave the reader to decide what would have been the sentiments of Archbishop Wake upon

<sup>a</sup> For the correct understanding of this phraseology, we must bear in mind that it is borrowed from the definition of episcopacy by that early foe of Papal usurpation, St. Cyprian. “ *Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur.*”—*De Unitate Ecc.* cap. 2.

<sup>b</sup> Appendix to vol. vi. of Maclaine’s *Mosheim*.

<sup>c</sup> Instructions addressed to the Catholics.

such a proposition:—nor can I forbear recommending it to the serious consideration of any well-meaning projector of ecclesiastical unity; and bid him ask his faith, his reason, and his conscience, what he is doing, when he is solicitous to promote a reconciliation with the Romish Church?

IX. I proceed next to vindicate a very learned and acute defender of Christianity from the charge of falsely translating one of his authorities.

In the "Criterion" of Bishop Douglas, a negative argument is drawn against the genuineness of the miracles imputed by your Church to Francis Xavier, from the silence of the Jesuit missionary Acosta, in whose book, says his lordship, "we find an express acknowledgment that no miracles had ever been performed by missionaries amongst the Indians." Thus far you quote the bishop; but the pith of his argument consists in the words immediately following. "For," he adds, "Acosta assigns it as one reason why the Gospel was not propagated by them with the same success as it was by the Apostles, that the power of working miracles did not subsist among the missionaries, who, not being able to excite the admiration or the fear of the barbarians, by the majesty of any such works, were, consequently, despised by reason of their mean appearance." This is the passage, upon quoting the former part of which, you exclaim, "What will the admirers of this detector say, if it should appear that Acosta barely says, 'that there was not the same *faculty* or *facility* of working miracles among the missionaries which there was among the Apostles?'"—(Letter xxiv. p. 260.) The best reply to this demand will be to produce the words of Acosta, as I find them in the "Criterion," not having the book itself at hand to consult. You give us only the first part of the passage, omitting that which would clear all ambiguity, if any such there were, in your extract: "Altera causa in nobis est, cur apostolica prædicatio institui omnino non possit apostolice, quod miraculorum nulla facultas sit;—nostri nunc temporis cum talium operum majestate sese barbaris admirandos et timendos non præbeant, nihil restat nisi ut reliqua vitæ inopia et impotentia penitus contemnatur."<sup>a</sup> No one can for an instant doubt of the strict accuracy of the Bishop's version. Acosta explicitly declares, first, that the preaching of the gospel could not be carried on by them with the success of the Apostles, because they had "not any power of doing miracles,—*miraculorum nulla facultas*." Secondly, that they could not render themselves objects of terror or admiration to the barbarians, by the "majesty of such works," and were

<sup>a</sup> Lib. ii. cap. 8. See Brit. Mag. vi. 482-3.



therefore utterly despised, which he could scarcely have said, if they had any miraculous powers, much less if he believed, as you tell us, that Xavier himself performed miracles "too numerous to be related."<sup>a</sup>

X. Proceeding in the same uncandid course, you diligently strive to represent the National Church as a complete prey to the Socinian heresy. Thus, as a specimen of the mode by which this calumny is sustained, you allege the objections of certain divines to what are called the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed, and hence infer the disbelief of the whole body of the Church, in the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity; an inference worthy to be cited for its correctness and liberality.

I cannot forbear remarking, that, a charge of indifference towards the creed of St. Athanasius does not come with a peculiar good grace from the members of a Church whose infallible head, Pope Liberius, not only subscribed to the Arian heresy, against which the creed was originally composed, but also united in the condemnation of Athanasius himself;—a fact demonstrative, even if it stood alone, upon how tottering a basis the boasted indefectibility of the Roman See is placed. As this, however, rather belongs to a wider subject than the present letter undertakes to discuss, I will return to your assertions.

In a note to Letter xv. p. 186, you tell the world—to gratify, I presume, the popular love of novelty—that the omission of this Creed "so often took place in public service, that an Act of Parliament has just been passed to enforce the repetition of it." Upon this extraordinary statement, I would only observe, that if you really are aware of the existence of such an Act—of which no one in the kingdom, except yourself, has ever heard,—you might possibly render a kindness to some persons who may unwarily transgress any of its enactments, by informing them where this secret piece of legislation is to be found. A Bill to enforce the use of the Athanasian Creed is as unlikely to pass the Legislature, *sub silentio*, as any Act that can well be conceived. This, however, must have been the case, if your account be correct:—its enactment was certainly unknown even to the enactors. It is not easy to conjecture in what possible misapprehension you were involved, when the above sentence escaped your pen.

<sup>a</sup> The Rev. R. C. Trench, in his "Notes on the Miracles of our Lord," has some remarks "on the later or ecclesiastical miracles" (p. 49), where, referring to those imputed to St. Xavier, he says, that in the numerous epistles written by him, "of miracles wrought by himself, there occurs not a single word."

As to the "omission of the Creed in public service," there seems to be as much foundation for the allegation as for this Utopian Act of Parliament, designed to remedy the evil. Allegation against allegation is but tiresome, and carries little weight. As, however, you have condescended to admit Unitarian authority against the Church, you may not reject its testimony on the opposite side. Probably, then, the fact stated in the following extract from one of their theologians, is as correct as the phraseology is coarse and injurious. It is not quoted from respect for the sophistical production in which I met with it; but as a specimen of the temper by which we are assailed. "Still that vile compound of impiety and nonsense, commonly, but falsely, called the Creed of St. Athanasius, continues to be read in all the churches and chapels of the dominant sect."<sup>a</sup> These are the allegations, and this the strain, of our conflicting foes, united on no point but hostility to us. Such is the intemperate virulence by which we are attacked, on the one hand, as senseless and impious bigots, for systematic conformity to obligations the most solemn that human beings can contract; and such the harsh and groundless imputations with which we are loaded, on the other, as perjured and apostate heretics, for systematic violation of them.—"THEY BARE FALSE WITNESS AGAINST HIM, BUT NEITHER DID THEIR WITNESS AGREE TOGETHER."

Returning to the charge, you say (Letter xvi. p. 192, *note*), "I have not met with a Protestant bishop or other eminent divine, from Archbishop Tillotson to the present Bishop of Lincoln [Tomline] who approves altogether of the Athanasian Creed." This is intended to imply that there is a universal disinclination on the part of our divines to the *doctrines* of this creed. If the defection be so general, why are not a few of them named? They are, I suppose, to be ranked with those many "titled or otherwise distinguished" converts to Popery, of whom you boast; but whose names you tell us it is not "prudent" to mention (Letter ix. p. 124, *note*).

Highly disingenuous is it to infer, that, because a person may not be entirely pleased with the anathemas affixed to a peculiar exposition, therefore he is an unbeliever of the fundamental articles of Christian faith. To go no farther than the two prelates whose names you introduce, the orthodoxy of Bishop Tomline remains unquestioned; his well-known objection is introduced by a solemn asseveration of his entire belief in the doctrine of that creed; and his abstract of Scripture evidence to the Holy Trinity is full and satis-

<sup>a</sup> Discourse on the meaning of the term "Saviour," by James Yates.

factory. And, without referring to the works of Tillotson, there is a book quoted in your volume, Dr. Birch's life of this prelate, which records the confession of a Socinian writer, who, having often discussed the controversy with the archbishop, testifies that "he was the best reasoner, and had most to say for himself of any adversary he had ever encountered."

There is a time, Dr. Milner, when forbearance becomes criminal. I cannot, therefore, refrain from observing, that, of your uniform illiberality towards those who differ from you, no part is more gross, for none is more self-evidently groundless, than your reiterated attempts to fasten the stigma of Unitarianism on the Church of England. Assuredly, no worthy object can be attained by persisting in this most false and most offensive imputation. It can only procure converts among the misguided and uninformed, and must be followed by disgust in every well-principled mind. Unquestionably, also, it affords to your opponents more than sufficient justification for continuing to charge your Church with deeming no means unworthy to extend her dominion; when they behold an individual, respectable for attainments and venerable by years, still rejecting the legitimate weapons of Christian warfare, and cherishing arms so unworthy of his character and cause.

XI. The same indiscriminating spirit of hostility induces you to point out the Non-jurors, as forming, at this day, a schism in the bosom of the Church (Letter xv. p. 187). The Non-jurors have, for many years past, been totally extinct. And their secession, as all are aware, arose from no hostility to the doctrines of the Church. Whatever their peculiar views, the Church of Rome experienced among them some of its ablest opponents.

XII. The paragraph which conveys the above statement, includes another yet less justifiable. It scarcely, of itself, deserves attention; although it has been noticed by a learned living prelate as an "unfounded calumny."<sup>a</sup> You inform your correspondent, that "even now, it is notorious that

<sup>a</sup> Bishop Blomfield's letter to C. Butler, Esq. It is strange, that this gentleman should complain of undue warmth in his lordship, when replying to his feeble defence of a most unprovoked slander upon the whole body of the clergy. Judge of us as uncharitably as you please, and let the decision rest with the Searcher of all hearts. But where is the privilege, to you or Mr. Butler, of obstructing the labour, and rendering odious the persons, of the authorized guardians of religion and morality, by foul accusations of perjury and hypocrisy?—I believe the opinion is general, that Mr. Butler has sacrificed a portion of his credibility, by relying upon your authority, when he ought to have searched for himself.

many clergymen preach in the churches in the morning, and in the meeting-houses in the evening" (Letter xv. p. 188). Were I to adopt your own language, this should be termed an "utter disregard of charity and truth." The statement is unworthy a serious reply.

It seems impossible to rescue the two last-quoted specimens of controversial energy from the charge of intentional misrepresentation. With these, I close the present observations; leaving them to their due effect upon every impartial mind.

Whatever may be thought of the course you have pursued towards Protestantism and Protestants, I only speak in accordance with the spirit of the *truly Catholic* Church to which I belong, when I give utterance to a sincere and fervent prayer for yourself, and every member of your creed, that, holding, on earth, the great essentials of our common faith, "in the bond of peace and in righteousness of life,"—you may, finally, with us, be united "in one fold, under one Shepherd," in heaven.

I have the honour to remain, &c.

(Signed) JOHN GARBETT.

---

---

## CONCLUSION.

WE have brought before our readers a few—few in comparison with the numerous—perversions of Dr. Milner, fair samples, nevertheless, of a mass of similar “*pious frauds.*” Dr. Milner without doubt was (if not a learned man) at least well stored with material, which he dressed up in the most attractive and plausible form. We cannot but admire the dexterity with which this writer has endeavoured to pass base for current coin. Dr. Milner declares to us the motives which actuate him. These he gives us to understand are “sentiments of charity,” and that he has “no other interest than that of Jesus Christ, no other wish but for our salvation.”<sup>a</sup> He does not fail to impress upon his readers that he is thoroughly convinced of the truth of what he asserts. “Though far from claiming inerrancy,” he says, “he should despise himself, if he *knowingly* published any falsehood, or hesitated to *retract* any one that he was proved to have fallen into” (p. 30). And he further declares that “there can be no excuse for persons in religious matters, of his [Dr. Milner’s] profession and situation, should they, for their temporal advantage, or from their prejudices, go astray to mislead others in a matter of eternal consequence. Such conduct” (he says) “would be hypocritical and doubly perfidious and ruinous. It would be *perfidious* to the individual so misguided, and to the church or sect which he professes to serve; since nothing can injure it so much as the appearance of insincerity and human passions in its official defenders” (p. 50). And he appeals with awful solemnity “to the great day of universal trial,” and the condemnation awaiting “the faithless guides who have led astray—poor bewildered souls.” And he professes to “follow *truth* wheresoever she might lead him, with the utmost sincerity and ardour of his soul.” But how we are to reconcile all these protestations with the perversions patent to all who will take the trouble to examine for themselves, is a question which we will leave to the consideration and solution of our readers.

<sup>a</sup> Letter i. p. 54.

ANTI-ROMISH WORKS

BY

CHARLES HASTINGS COLLETTE.

---

Second Edition, enlarged and improved, price 2s. 6d.

ROMANISM IN ENGLAND EXPOSED.

---

Price 1s.

POPISH INFALLIBILITY.

---

Also, price 6d. pp. 104.

POPISH FRAUDS EXEMPLIFIED

BY

DR. WISEMAN'S LECTURES.

No. 1.—PURGATORY.

---

Price 1d.

A TRACT FOR CARDINAL WISEMAN

ON CHAP. V. OF ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL.

---

Also, price 2s. 6d., demy 8vo., 152 pp.

THE POPE'S SUPREMACY

A THING OF PRIESTCRAFT ALIKE UNWARRANTED  
BY HOLY SCRIPTURE OR TRADITION.

This work is an examination and exposure of the Abbé Miel's Pamphlets on *the Pope and the Holy Scriptures*, and *the Pope and the Primitive Church*.

[Mr. Collette is happy to announce this controversy has led to the conversion of the Abbé Miel. See "Catholic Layman" for October, 1854, p. 119.]

---

N.B.—*The above can be had by order from WILLIAM PENNY, 57, Lincoln's-Inn Fields, and all Booksellers.*

# MILNER REFUTED;

OR,

PIOUS FRAUDS EXEMPLIFIED IN DR. MILNER'S

“END OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSIES.”

BEING A SERIES OF

Original, Selected, and Contributed Articles

EXPOSING

DR. MILNER'S FALLACIES AND FICTIONS.

---

## PART II.

---

EDITED BY

CHARLES HASTINGS COLLETTE.



Error is in its nature flippant and compendious: it hops with airy and fastidious levity over proofs and arguments, and perches upon assertion, which it calls conclusion.—*Curran.*

---

LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY WILLIAM PENNY,

57, LINCOLN'S-INN FIELDS;

SOLD ALSO BY

BOSWORTH & HARRISON, 115, REGENT STREET;

CURRY & CO. DUBLIN; J. NICHOL, EDINBURGH.

1857.

---

LONDON:  
WILLIAM PENNY,  
PRINTER, ENGRAVER, AND LITHOGRAPHER,  
57, LINCOLN'S-INN FIELDS.

---



## PREFATORY REMARKS.

---

THE Preface to Part I. sufficiently explains the object and scope of the present work. The editor thinks it now only necessary to observe that, in replying to Dr. Milner's statements, he has freely availed himself of the labours of others where he has deemed them applicable; his occupation is rather that of a compiler than an author. The greatest care has however been taken to obtain accuracy. He has to thank the Rev. JOHN EVANS, of Whixall, Prees, Shrewsbury, for his valuable assistance in furnishing two most interesting papers on the "Fourth Lateran Council" and "Indulgences."

NOTE.—*Except when another edition is expressly named, the edition of Milner's "End of Religious Controversy," from which we have quoted throughout the following pages, is the 12mo. stereotype edition, printed at Derby "for the [Roman] Catholic Book Society," without date, but the editor's Preface being dated 1842.*

## ERRATA TO PART I.

---

Page 25, lines 14 and 15, for "heretical private judgment" read "*heretical*"  
private judgment.

" 61, end of note <sup>a</sup>, for "345" read "325."

" 72, line 24, for "Paul" read "Basil."

" 144, line 1. The passage from Jerome has been quoted in error.

# CONTENTS.

---

## No. XVII.—PERSECUTIONS.

The Fourth Council of Lateran, its Canons and Decrees—Dr. Milner's excuse for the third Canon—An act of a *temporal* congress—Inconsistent with other Romanists, who deny that the Canon was passed, 2—The Canons stated, 3—Not simply against the Albigenses, 4—Proved to be general—The Conciliar character of the Council, 5—Recognised by Popes and Councils, 6—Evidence of those who deny the Conciliar character examined, 9—The third Canon examined, 10—Alleged omission from the Mazarine copy, 11—Canons of the Council of Lateran, Arles, and Sens compared, 13, 15—Cardinal Pole's admission, 16.

---

## No. XVIII.—PURGATORY.

SECT. I.—Dr. Milner's definition examined, 18—The doctrine stated, 19.

SECT. II.—Alleged Scriptural evidence, 23—Dr. Milner's case stated, 24—2 Macc. xii. 46, 27—1 Cor. xv. 29, 33—(The present belief of the Jews, 34)—Luke xvi. 22, 35—1 Peter iii. 18, 20, 36—Luke xii. 58, 59, 39—1 Cor. iii. 13, 15, 45—Matt. xii. 32, 51.

SECT. III.—Origin and progress of the belief in Purgatory—Founded on the custom of praying for the dead, 55.

SECT. IV.—Alleged traditional evidence founded on the Fathers, 69—Chrysostom, 70—Tertullian, 71—Cyprian, 74—Augustine, 75.

SECT. V.—Alleged concessions of "Eminent Protestant divines," 77—Luther—Melancthon, 78—Cranmer, 79—Usher—Montague—Taylor, 80—Forbes—Sheldon—Barrow, 81—Blandford, 82—Andrews, 83.

---

## No. XIX.—INDULGENCES.

SECT. I.—Milner's statement and definitions, stating what Indulgences are not, 85—Pardon of sin granted, 86, 89—Technical expressions, 86—Alleged conditions attached—Contrition and confession, 88, 102—Object of retaining absolution, 89—Admitted to be a *pious fraud*, 90—Not to exempt repentance—Answered, 91—When confession not necessary, 92, 102, 106—Sanctification and justification as referring to Indulgences, 92, 94—Denies the right to buy and sell, 94.

SECT. II.—Scriptural evidence, 95—The case of Adam, the eternal punishment due to sin remitted, 95—Case of David (2 Sam. xii. 14), 95—Matt. xviii. 95—2 Cor. ii. 10, 96—Case of Acacius, 97.

SECT. III.—Extraordinary admissions of Romanists as to Indulgences, 97—Heathen origin, 98—Admission by Milner of the uncertainty, 99—The effect when gained stated, 99, 108.

SECT. IV.—Its origin and progress in the Church, 100—Reasons for maintaining the doctrine, 101—Different kinds of Indulgences, 103—Their duration, 104—The uncertainty as to the power of the dispenser, and as to the time when dispensed, 105—How the Pope or Bishop obtains an Indulgence, 105—Conditions attached to Indulgences, 105—Requirements—For what end granted, 106—Its value and effects, 107—Uncertainties on this head, 108—Granted to the dead, nature of, 108—Jubilees, 108—The Trent decree, 109—The important admission, and as to "gains," 111—Confessionalia, 112—Alleged parallel between Protestant and Popish Indulgences—Charles I.—The Anabaptists, 114.

SECT. V.—The "Taxæ Cancellariæ Apostolicæ," and "Taxæ Sacræ Pœnitentiariæ Apostolicæ"—The distinction explained, and Milner's sophisms and misrepresentations exposed, 115, 127—The table of taxes, 125—Conclusions, 126—Passage from Bucer examined, 127.

## No. XX.—COMMUNION IN ONE KIND.

SECT. I.—Milner's false definition, 128—Decree of Constance, 129—Cardinal Bona, Aquinas, Cassander, Bellarmine's admissions on the early Christian custom, 130—Milner's subtleties exposed—Founded on tradition—Answered, 131.

SECT. II.—Alleged Scriptural evidence, 136—Luke xxiv. 30, 31, 136—Acts ii. 42, and xx. 7, 137—1 Cor. xi. 27, 138.

SECT. III.—Alleged traditional evidence, 139—Milner's statement, 140—Ingatius, 140—Clement of Alexandria—Irenæus, 141—Tertullian—Dennis of Alexandria, 142—Cyprian, 143—Basil—Story of Satyrus, 144—Chrysostom, 145—Ambrose—Gregory Nazianzen, 146—Athanasius, 147—Popes Leo I. and Gelasius I., the passages from their epistles critically examined, 147, 152—Council of Toledo, 153—Matter of discipline, 153—Jerome—Augustine, 154—Hugo St. Victor, 155—The alleged dangers and scandals, 156.

SECT. IV.—Alleged modern concessions, case of Pius IV. and the Hungarians, 157—Luther, 158—Synod of Poitiers, 159—Proclamation of Edward VI., 159—Conclusions, 160.

## No. XXI.—ON THE INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

SECT. I.—Dr. Milner's definition—Complaints of misrepresentations by Protestants, 161—Gother's propositions and curses, 163—Worship and office of *Demons*, 165.

SECT. II.—The practical and licensed teaching of the Roman Church, 166—The Roman Breviary, 167—Milner's edition of the "Devotion of the Sacred Heart," 167—"The Catholic School Book," 169—Liguori's "Glories of Mary," 170—Authority of the work, 175—Glories of St. Joseph, 176—Bonaventura's Psalter, 181.

SECT. III.—Dr. Milner's alleged Protestant apologists, 185—Bishop Montague, 185—Bishop Thorndike, 186—Archbishop Sheldon, 187—Bishop Blandford, 187—Bishop Gunning, 188—Duke of Somerset—Luther, 189.

SECT. IV.—Alleged Scriptural evidence, 191—Rom. xv. 30, Job xlii. 8—Gen. xxxii. 26, xlviii. 16, xviii. 2, Jos. v. 14, 192—Rev. v. 8, 194—Luke xv. 10, 196.

SECT. V.—Dr. Milner's proofs founded on tradition, and his alleged Patristic evidence examined—Irenæus, 198—Polycarp, 199—Justin Martyr, 201—Basil, 204.

SECT. VI.—The genuine testimony of the Fathers adduced, 206—Tertullian—Clement Alexand., 206—Origen—Basil—Gregory Nyssen—Chrysostom—Damascen—Athanasius—Novatian—Ambrose, 207—Irenæus—Origen—Council of Laodicea, 208—Augustin—Epiphanius, 209.

SECT. VII.—Dr. Milner's inconsistencies and speculative theories in his vain endeavour to make us believe that this Popish doctrine is a "sublime and consoling" doctrine, 210—220.

## No. XXII.—CONCLUSION.

MILNER REFUTED.

---

PART THE SECOND.





## PART II.

No. XVII.

PERSECUTIONS.

The Fourth Council of Lateran, its Canons and Decrees.<sup>a</sup>

DR. MILNER, in his "End of Religious Controversy," devotes a whole letter (letter xlix.) to the subject of "Religious Persecution," in which he attempts to vindicate the Church of Rome from the heavy charges which history has brought against her. According to Dr. Milner's statement of the case, Rome is so far from manifesting, or entertaining even, a persecuting spirit, that the "Canon law, as it stood in ancient times, and as it still stands, renders all those who have actively concurred to the death or mutilation of any human being, whether Catholic or heretic, Jew or Pagan, even in a just war, or by exercising the art of surgery, or by judicial proceedings, irregular; that is to say, such persons cannot be promoted to Holy Orders, or exercise those orders if they have actually received them."

If such be the "canon law as it stood in ancient times, and *as it now stands*," truly, as Dr. Jarvis remarks, "in Rome, canons are mere paper barriers, when occasion serves."<sup>b</sup> "I asked," says Dr. Jarvis, "a prelate in Rome, who was a judge in a criminal court, how he could possibly sit on trials of life and death when the Canon law so strictly forbade it. 'So I told his Holiness,' said he, 'when he appointed me; but he answered, *Can I not absolve you?*'" The celebrated Daniel O'Connell is reported to have said that there never was an act of parliament framed "through which he could not drive a coach and six;" and it appears that "his Holiness" entertains a similar opinion of his own skilfulness as respects "the Canon law." Dr. Milner, however, seems to have had some misgivings as to the facility with which his statement

<sup>a</sup> We are indebted for this article to the Rev. John Evans, of Whixall, Prees, near Shrewsbury.

<sup>b</sup> "A Reply to Dr. Milner's 'End of Religious Controversy,'" by Samuel Farmer Jarvis, D.D., LL.D., p. 248. New York, 1847.

might be received, inasmuch as certain parts of this same "Canon law" appear, to the uninitiated at least, sadly at variance with such amiable provisions. Accordingly, the doctor selects a portion of the Canon law which had attracted the notice of Protestants, and endeavours to show that the Church of Rome is by no means responsible for such an atrocious enactment.

This troublesome statute, viz., the third Canon of the Fourth General Council of Lateran, Dr. Milner tries to get rid of in the following manner:—"But it must first be observed *who were present at this Council*, and by *whose authority* these decrees of a temporal nature were passed. There were then present, besides the Pope and the Bishops, either in person or by their ambassadors, the Greek and the Latin emperors; the kings of England, France, Hungary, the Sicilies, Arragon, Cyprus, and Jerusalem; and the representatives of a vast many other principalities and states—so that, in fact, this council was a congress of Christendom, temporal as well as spiritual." Now, here it is worthy of remark, that Dr. Milner rests the vindication of the Church of Rome upon the fact that the exterminating canon in question was the act of "*a congress of Christendom, TEMPORAL as well as spiritual.*" His vindication rests upon the *fact* that the Fourth General Council of Lateran (we cannot too often repeat it) *did* pass the statute in question; indeed, it *must* rest upon this fact, otherwise the presence of emperors or kings, "either in person or by their ambassadors," could not affect the statute in any way whatever. The whole force of the doctor's argument lies in this, that the third Canon of the Fourth General Council of Lateran was a *temporal* enactment by a congress "*temporal as well as spiritual!*" Let us contrast Dr. Milner's argument with the defence of succeeding champions of Rome, and observe how different is the ground assumed. In the "Hereford Discussion,"<sup>a</sup> we find Mr. Waterworth denying that the statutes of the Fourth General Council of Lateran were ever passed at all! "I defy," says Mr. Waterworth, "Mr. Venn to prove that they ever were. I say *they never were passed at all by the Council*, and I will give him some authentic evidence in proof of my assertion." . . . "I, therefore, say that *that Canon was never passed in the Council*. It is put in the Decretals, not as being *passed*, but as having been *proposed* in the Council, by Innocent III. Thus, then, by this alone, I might

<sup>a</sup> "Authenticated Report of the Discussion which took place between the Rev. John Venn and the Rev. James Waterworth, &c.," p. 16. London: Seeley, Burnside, and Seeley, 1844.



take the ground from under him. The canon never was *passed*, much less *received*, by the Catholic Church." True, it never *was* "passed" nor "*received*" by the *Catholic Church*; but there is no difficulty in proving that it was, with the remainder of the seventy Canons of the Fourth Lateran Council, both *passed*, *received*, and *acted upon*, by the *Church of Rome*. At present, however, we have only to do with the difference between Dr. Milner and Mr. Waterworth; the former says that the Canon in question must needs be a *temporal* enactment; and he rests the proof of this upon the *temporal* elements of the Council which passed it. Now, if the Council did *not* pass it, then the argument fails which rests upon the presence of temporal elements; those temporal elements could not affect a statute which the Council did *not* pass! Though Mr. Waterworth's assertions fail to "take the ground" from under Mr. Venn, they assuredly "take the ground from under" Dr. Milner, whose argument rests upon no other ground but that which Mr. Waterworth says that he has demolished! So far is Mr. Waterworth from treating the Canon as a mere *temporal* matter, emanating from *temporal* authority, that he lays the responsibility of the said Canon entirely upon Innocent III! Dr. Milner is *right* when he attributes the Canon to the Council, and wrong when he asserts that it was a merely *temporal* enactment. Mr. Waterworth is right in allowing its Papal character, but wrong in denying that the Council passed it; and Dr. Milner and Mr. Waterworth are both wrong in considering it as merely contemplating the so-called heresies of the Albigenses. Of its *theological* origin and nature, the very words of the Canon furnish sufficient and irrefragable evidence. The first Canon of the Fourth General Council of Lateran propounds a *creed*, among the articles of which appears one making the doctrine of Transubstantiation an *article of faith*; the third Canon opens with a reference to the creed propounded in the first Canon: "we excommunicate and anathematize every heresy which exalteth itself against this holy, orthodox, and Catholic faith, which *we have set forth above*; condemning all heretics, by whatsoever name they may be reckoned; who have diverse faces, but their tails are bound together, for they make agreement in the same folly." Dr. Milner was quite right in asserting that the Council passed this most atrocious Canon; but when were *temporal* princes authorized to "excommunicate and anathematize?" When were temporal princes permitted to be judges of orthodoxy? As to its being confined to the heresies of the Albigenses, a glance at the Canon will show that they are not once named; and

what the heresies are, which it *does* contemplate, is made clear by the reference to the creed propounded in the first Canon. Now, as the first Canon establishes the doctrine of *transubstantiation* as an article of faith, it clearly follows that all who repudiate that doctrine come within the scope of the Canon! Dr. Milner says, "Nor was this exterminating Canon ever put in force against any other heretics, except the Albigenses; nor was it enforced even against them, except in the case of the above-named counts.<sup>a</sup> It has never been even published, or talked of in these Islands; so little have Protestants to fear from their Catholic fellow subjects, by reason of the third Canon of the Council of Lateran." Milner goes on to assert that in Mary's reign, during the first two years, "no Protestant was molested on account of his religion; that, in the instructions which the Pope sent for her conduct on the throne, there is not a word to recommend persecution; nor is there in the Synod, which the Pope's legate (Cardinal Pole) held at that time, one word, as Burnet remarks, 'in its favour.'" We have just seen how Mr. Waterworth "takes the ground" from under Dr. Milner, and now we have a remarkable instance how an ingenious man can contrive to cut the ground from under himself! Not a word to recommend persecution, in the Synod held by Cardinal Pole "at that time!" Let Cardinal Pole speak for himself. The Cardinal, in his preface to the decrees of the Synod held at Lambeth, A.D. 1556,<sup>b</sup> exhorts the Archbishops and Bishops and other prelates to enforce the Constitutions by ecclesiastical censure on the contumacious, and, if need be, to call in the *secular arm*. In the second decree, the books to be used by the clergy are pointed out, and the decree of the *Fifth* Lateran Council, "De Libris imprimendis," is enforced; the decree [alas for Dr. Milner!] afterwards proceeds thus, "But that people may know, every error of former times being taken away, what doctrine to follow and what they ought to avoid, together with this same Synod we reverently take up and embrace, according to the rules and dogmas of the holy Fathers, all that faith which the Holy and Apostolic Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all Churches, teaches, and we decree that the same be done by all and openly professed; and, according to the decrees of the General Council celebrated under Pope Innocent III., of happy memory, and of other Councils and

<sup>a</sup> "Of Thoulouse, Comminges, Foix, and other Feudatory Princes:" see Milman's "Latin Christianity," vol. iv.

<sup>b</sup> "Reformatio Angliæ, ex decretis Reginaldi Poli, Cardinalis, Sedis Apostolicæ Legati." Labbé et Cossart, tom. xiv., col. 1784, et seq. Paris, 1671.

Roman Pontiffs and traditions, and the very letters which are wont to be read 'IN DIE CENÆ DOMINI.' We condemn, and altogether reject, *every heresy exalting itself against this holy, orthodox, and Catholic faith*;<sup>a</sup> and whatever is different from it, every dogma which is at variance with the same faith, we prohibit and forbid to be believed, practised, or taught; all heretics, of whatever name and kind, who otherwise believe, hold, and teach, than the same Roman Church believes, holds, and teaches, we condemn and anathematize; *also all censures and punishments enacted against heretics and favourers of them*, and against ordinaries and all others to whom the office belongs, negligent in extirpating heresies, we *renew* and enjoin to be fully executed!" Are we, in the face of the above, to be told that the Albigenses alone were aimed at in the Canon in question? that the said Canon was never published, or talked of, in these islands? and that not a word is said to encourage religious persecution in the decrees of the Lambeth Synod?

Dr. Milner tells us that the Council had *temporal* elements, and the third Canon, by virtue of being passed by a council so composed, is, *therefore, temporal*. Mr. Waterworth tells us that the Council had *nothing to do with it*, and, *therefore*, the Church of Rome is not responsible for it. Milner and Waterworth, *both*, tell us that it only concerned the Albigenses, and Milner says that it was never talked about in these islands, nor a word recommending persecution contained in the Lambeth decrees! The statute itself never mentions the Albigenses once, but condemns *all* who oppose "*this holy, orthodox, and Catholic faith!*" So does Pole, in the very words of the third Canon, and, moreover, calls into action and renews "*all censures and punishmentants enacted against heretics, and the favourers of them*"!!!

We now proceed to consider the conciliar character of the Fourth Lateran Council.

Dr. Milner rested his assertion, of the *temporal* character of the third Canon of the Fourth General Council of Lateran, on the ground that the said Canon *was passed by a Council in which there was a temporal element!* The evidence, however, furnished by the very wording of the Canon in question, soon made it apparent, even to the most cursory reader, that there was nothing *temporal* about the document, except the announcement of the superiority of the *spiritual* to the *temporal* powers, and the threat of both *spiritual* and tem-

<sup>a</sup> The very words of the third Canon of the Fourth Lateran Council!

*poral* punishment to such rulers as should venture to disobey or neglect the behests of the *spiritual* authorities. Consequently, in order to relieve the *Church* from the responsibility attaching to the enactment of such an atrocious statute, it was necessary to adopt another mode of defence. As the ecclesiastical character of the Canon could not be denied, nor its cruel atrocity be disguised, an attempt must be made to deny its *genuineness*; but here, again, a difficulty presented itself, for the Canon was one of a *series*, and betrayed too many signs of relationship to its fellows to permit that relationship to be doubted. Hopeless as the attempt must necessarily be, nevertheless, the attempt *was* made to deny that the Council passed any Canons at all—that the documents, hitherto popularly known as “Statutes of the Fourth General Council of Lateran,” were never heard of till the year 1535! How utterly untenable such a position must be, will at once appear from the evidence we are about to produce; and our readers will, probably, be of opinion, that such a position would never have been taken up, had the champions of Rome for a moment supposed that Protestants were either able or willing to trouble their heads about it.

Our readers are aware that the Fourth General Council of Lateran, under Pope Innocent III., was held in the year 1215, and, so far from its enactments being unheard of until 1535, we are enabled to trace the recognition of them through a series of documents down to the celebrated Council of Trent.

We find the statutes of the Council in question fully recognised in the year 1223, only *eight years* after it was held, in the “Constitutions of Richard Poore, Bishop of Sarum.”<sup>a</sup> We can scarcely suppose that Bishop Poore would be so reckless as to appeal to an authority which did not exist, to statutes which were never passed, and that, too, at a time when there must have been abundance of *living* witnesses to prove the futility of his appeal. Again, in the year 1234, just *eleven years* after their recognition by Poore, we find them acknowledged by the Council of Arles; the *first* Canon of which Council is thus headed:—“That the Statutes of the Fourth Lateran Council be diligently observed.”<sup>b</sup> If the Fourth Lateran Council passed no statutes, how could the Council of Arles, within the short space of *nineteen years*, venture to use such language? The Canon, whose heading is given above, thus speaks:—“Since we are

<sup>a</sup> Labbé et Cossart, tom. xi. p. 1, col. 161. Paris, 1671. Also Wilkins’s “Concilia Magnæ Britannicæ,” tom. i. pp. 599, 600. Edit. London, 1737.

<sup>b</sup> Labbé et Cossart, tom. xi. p. 2, col. 2339, et seq. Paris, 1671.

bound by a debt of obedience faithfully to observe the constitutions of the Roman Pontiffs, we command all our suffragans, and strictly direct, that they diligently observe the Canonical rules, and the statutes of the fourth Lateran Council promulgated by our Lord the Pope Innocent III., and cause them to be observed by their subjects."

In the above we have a full answer to those who tell us that "the so called statutes of Lateran were compiled by Innocent and only read to the Council, who determined nothing concerning them." That they were composed or compiled by Innocent, no one will dispute, nor that he read them to the Council, but in the above Canon they are spoken of as "Statutes of the Lateran Council," and as "*promulgated* by Pope Innocent III.;" as such, too, they are recognised in the decretals of Gregory IX., according to Vincentius Bellocensis. "Many things," says he, "are determined concerning the coercion and punishment of heretics, and concerning the Greeks, who had returned to the Catholic faith. Also many other things very useful to the Catholic Church, all which are distributed in seventy Canons, and are contained in the decretals of Gregory IX."<sup>a</sup> But, supposing that the statutes in question be merely the Constitutions of Innocent III., how does the attributing them to the *head of the Church* remove the obloquy attaching to them from the Church itself? The matter is really so simple and so plain, that no comment is required, nor should we give ourselves the trouble to rebut such feeble arguments, but that, by showing the nature of the defence, we also show how reckless is the character of those who attempt it, and how fully conscious they are that no *sound* arguments can be brought forward wherewith to defend their cause. Such a mode of defence forcibly reminds us of a *ruse*, sometimes practised by soldiers, when they would secretly abandon a position, and wish the enemy to believe that they have not retired; the utmost care is taken that all may appear unchanged, but, upon a nearer approach, the enemy discover that the seeming sentinels are *literally men of straw!*

But to proceed with our evidence. Just *one* year later than the Council of Arles, in the year 1235,<sup>b</sup> we find a reference to the statutes of the Fourth Lateran Council in the Constitutions of the Abbot of St. Albans; and, in 1236, they are referred to by Edmund, Archbishop of Canterbury.<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Labbé et Cossart, tom. xi. p. 1, col. 119. Edit. Paris, 1671.

<sup>b</sup> Wilkins's "Concilia Magnæ Britanniae," tom. i. p. 631. London, 1737.

Labbé and Cossart, tom. xi. p. 1, col. 481. Paris, 1671.

<sup>c</sup> Wilkins's "Conc. Mag. Brit.," tom. i. p. 639. London, 1737.

The foregoing testimonies are fully sufficient to prove the existence of the seventy statutes of the Fourth Lateran Council, and that they were well known and recognised as such, at a time when an imposition *could* not have been successfully attempted. We are able, however, to trace references to the disputed statutes, at short intervals, in the Ordinances of Otho, Archbishop of Tusculum, A.D. 1248; Nicosian Constitutions, A.D. 1252 to 1255; Council of Sens, A.D. 1269; Constitutions of Peckham, Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Council of Pont Audomar, A.D. 1279; Constitutions of Peckham; the Epistle of Pope Martin IV., and the Council of Saltzburg, A.D. 1281; Council of Bourges, A.D. 1286; Synod of Exeter, A.D. 1287; Synod of Bayeux, A.D. 1300; Synodal Constitutions of Woodloke, Bishop of Winchester, A.D. 1308; Council of Palentia, 1322; Council of Avignon, 1337; Council of Beziers, 1351; Articles concerning the Reformation of the Universal Church, put forth by the University of Oxford, A.D. 1414; Council of Constance, Session XIX., A.D. 1415; Council of Tortosa, in Catalonia, A.D. 1429; Council of Frisengen, A.D. 1440; Council of Rouen, A.D. 1445; Council of Sens, A.D. 1528. Thus we have, down to the year 1528, a complete chain of evidence as to the genuineness and authenticity of the statutes of the Fourth Lateran Council; a chain, too, of such a texture, that any single link of it is sufficient for our purpose!—especially any link preceding the year 1535. The testimony of the celebrated Council of Trent is especially decisive, and *ought* to be sufficient to silence the cavils of every *obedient* son of Rome. The Council of Trent treats the Canons of the Fourth Lateran Council as *the Voice of the Church!*<sup>a</sup>

In the “*Decretum de Reformatione Matrimonii*,” cap. i., we read, “Therefore adhering to the steps of the sacred Lateran Council, celebrated under Innocent III.”<sup>b</sup> Again, in cap. v. *De Reformatione*, we find, “And the constitution of Innocent III., in the GENERAL COUNCIL, which begins, ‘*Qualiter et quando*,’”<sup>c</sup> and in cap. viii. of the following session, *De Regularibus et monialibus*, “According to the form of the Constitution of Innocent III., IN THE GENERAL COUNCIL, which begins, ‘*In singulis*.’”<sup>d</sup>

We might stop here, for the ground of those who affect to

<sup>a</sup> Sessio XIV. cap. v. “*Neque enim per Lateranense Concilium Ecclesia statuit*,” &c.

<sup>b</sup> Sessio XIV. cap. i., *Decretum de Ref. Mat.*

<sup>c</sup> Sessio XXIV. cap. v. *De Reformatione*.

<sup>d</sup> Sessio XXV. cap. viii. *De Reg. et Mon.*

question the validity of the *third* Canon, on the supposition that, the Fourth Lateran Council passed no Canons at all, is completely cut from under their feet; but as there are others who admit the conciliar character of the Canons *generally*, yet attempt to exclude the *third* Canon, we will proceed to examine the claim of that particular Canon, and we shall find that it has not met with that injustice at the hands of those who were fully competent to judge of its merits, which it has found among some modern advocates of Rome.

Before entering upon the subject of the third Canon, we may briefly notice the evidence adduced by those who affect to deny the conciliar character of the Lateran statutes generally. Platina and Nauclerus have been cited, as stating that nothing was done by the Council, whereas Nauclerus only says that nothing could be "*fitly* determined," and Platina, whose words appear to be echoed by Nauclerus, tells us that nothing could be "*openly* determined;" a very different thing from saying that "*nothing* was determined." So forcibly must the qualifications "*apte*" and "*aperte*" have struck those who cited Nauclerus and Platina as witnesses, that they very *prudently*, if deceit can be so characterized, left out the qualifying words! They *knew* that those words must be fatal to the purpose for which the passages containing them were cited. Much stress, however, has been laid upon the testimony of Du Pin, especially that contained in a passage quoted from his treatise, "*De Antiquâ Ecclesiæ Disciplinâ.*"<sup>a</sup>

"Therefore no Canons were established by this Council; but some things were prepared by the Roman Pontiff, some of which seemed to some persons convenient, and to others burdensome. But even on reading the Canons themselves it is evident that they were *not passed by the Council*, or, at least, not in the manner in which we have them." There is a hesitancy in the above passage which cannot fail to strike the reader; there is no straightforward bold assertion, and the "*at least*" of Du Pin seems to have been introduced as a saving clause; for as he was about to publish a history, he felt that, as an *honest* historian, he must publish statements wholly at variance with such an assertion, as he actually did when he came to mention the Council of Arles, held in the year 1234; he tells us that "John Baussanus, Archbishop of Arles, held a Provincial Council in the year 1234, wherein he made twenty-four Constitutions. In the first *he orders that the Canons of the Fourth Lateran Council shall be put in*

<sup>a</sup> Diss. 7, c. 3, l.c. See Hereford Discussion, p. 24. London, 1844.

*execution.*"<sup>a</sup> Again, "In the year 1246, William De Broa, Archbishop of Narbonne, held a Council of the Bishops of his province in the town of Beziers, wherein he made a collection of forty-six Canons extracted out of the preceding Councils: namely, the Fourth General Lateran Council," &c. Why Du Pin should throw any doubt at all, or at any time, upon the authority of the Lateran statutes, will be easily understood when we remember that he was the active champion of the liberties of the Gallican Church, against the overbearing authority of Rome, and that he opposed other documents of equal importance, in the eyes of Rome, at least, with the statutes in question; so much so as to cause himself to be characterized as a *hasty* and *inaccurate* writer; he was even deposed from his professor's chair for the boldness of some of his opinions. Would the champions of Rome adduce his authority on these points? Moreri, in his "Grand Historical Dictionary," gives him the character above mentioned, and, moreover, tells us that Du Pin was "the soul and organ of all that was done in the Sorbonne against the Bull *Unigenitus!*"<sup>b</sup> Collier, too, has been cited to disparage the authority of the third Canon, as will be more particularly noticed hereafter; but his testimony at once, so far as the testimony of a single historian can, demolishes the assertion that the Fourth Lateran Council passed no Canons at all, for the whole force of the argument, sought to be drawn from the words of Collier, lies in his mistaken statement that the *third* Canon is not found with the *other* Canons; and where does he say that *they* are to be found? Why, forsooth, in the "*Mazarine copy, coeval WITH THE COUNCIL!*" If the testimony of Collier, therefore, be worth anything, it fully establishes the conciliar character of the disputed Canons; at all events it would ill become the partisans of Rome to discredit the testimony of their own witness! It is in truth waste of time to attempt seriously to refute such trifling, for of what consequence would it be, could Du Pin, Collier, Platina, Nauclerus, or even Matthew Paris, be shown to deny in honest earnestness, the genuineness of the Lateran statutes, when we find the highest official authorities of Rome not only *referring* but *deferring* to them?

We shall conclude this article by an examination of the famous third Canon.

<sup>a</sup> Vol. xi. pp. 109, 115.

<sup>b</sup> "Si on ne peut pas disconvenir qu'il n'ait travaillé avec *trop de rapidité* et *trop peu d'exactitude,*" &c. . . . M. Du Pin a joué un grand rôle dans les affaires de la Bulle *Unigenitus*. On sait qu'il a été *l'ame et l'organe* de tout ce qui s'est fait en Sorbonne contre elle."



In examining the case of the third Canon we will first take the evidence of Collier, which, whilst it establishes, so far as such evidence can, the evidence of the Lateran statutes in the Mazarine copy, presents us with a blunder of no ordinary character. "But here," writes Collier, "it must be said that this chapter or Canon is not to be found in the Mazarine copy, coeval with the Council, but was transcribed from a later record." That Collier, though guilty of a gross blunder, did not doubt the genuineness of the third Canon is clear from the way in which he speaks of the Council: "This year [1215], the General Council of Lateran was held under Pope Innocent III.; 'twas opened in November, the Pope having some time before sent a general summons to all the prelates in Christendom; under this denomination Matthew Paris reckons patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops, archdeacons, deans, abbots, priors, templars, and hospitallers. There were four hundred and twelve bishops of the Council, of which number Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, was one; whether there were any more of the English prelates there is not mentioned by historians; though 'tis probable there might be four in all, it not being unusual to send that number to the Roman synods." "The great design of the meeting was to encourage the crusade and send succours to the Christians in Palestine."

"The English *Church* being represented at this Council, I shall lay two or three of the most remarkable *Canons* before the reader." "There were seventy of these Canons in all, which being read in full council, were disliked by several of the Fathers, as Matthew Paris reports; his words are these: 'Facto prius ab ipso Papa exhortationis sermone, recitata sunt in pleno Concilio capitula septuaginta, quæ aliis placabilia, aliis videbantur onerosa.'" When Collier tells us that there were "seventy Canons in all," if he had doubted the genuineness of the third Canon, he surely would have said something about the Canon whose place it usurped! All that he really says, is, that "it is not to be found in the *Mazarine copy* coeval with the Council, but is transcribed from a later record;" not a word about its want of authenticity; not a syllable of any inaccuracy in the transcript. Collier, however, was mistaken as to its non-existence in the *Mazarine copy*; and we can only account for his blunder by the supposition that he had not an opportunity of inspecting that copy, or that he neglected to do so. The *Mazarine copy* has indeed been *mutilated*, and a *portion* of the leaves containing the third Canon been destroyed; but very important

parts of this Canon remain to prove its existence in the Mazarine copy; and an inspection of the Canon, as given in Labbé and Cossart, will show that the defects are, so to speak, *mechanical*, and not owing to the original absence of the Canon. This plainly appears, in the marginal references which are given, sometimes to the *MS. Maz.* and sometimes to *MS. Dacherianum*; and, occasionally, the readings of the two manuscripts are contrasted, whilst evidently the preference is given to the *MS. Maz.* For example, by the side of the text, respecting preachers, the following note is given in the margin, "*In MS. Dacheriano quartum capitulum est cum hoc titulo: De eo ne quis prædicet nisi missus. Sequens autem capitulum, quod hic quartum est, ibi est quintum atque ita deinceps.*" Here the manuscripts are contrasted, and we are told that, in the *Dacherian* manuscript, "The following head, which *here* is the fourth, is *there* the fifth." As but *two* manuscripts were used, the *Mazarine* and the *Dacherian*, and the word "*there*" clearly refers to the *Dacherian* text, it is equally clear that the word "*here*" must refer to the *Mazarine* text. Collier's blunder, then, is sufficiently manifest. But even had the Canon been absent from the Mazarine copy, it would signify nothing, so long as the said Canon is duly acknowledged by competent authority; nor would the loss of the Canon itself exonerate Rome from the charge of persecution, so long as every provision of the disputed Canon is repeated, over and over again, in the unrepealed Canon Law of the Romish Church. The presence or absence of the Canon, with respect to any particular manuscript, is therefore but an *idle* question, and only raised, by way of special pleading, to draw off the attention of Protestants from the real question at issue. Of this we may be sure, that, had the third Canon of the Fourth Lateran Council been the *only* authority for exterminating heretics, Rome would have guarded it "as the apple of her eye." In the very same year, 1234, Gregory IX., nephew of Innocent III., published, in his decretals, the third Canon of Lateran, as being enacted "*IN CONCILIO GENERALI,*" and the Council of Arles determined that "the statutes of the Fourth Lateran Council be *diligently observed.*" The Council, in its zeal for the due observance of the Lateran Statutes did not forget the *third*, as we shall perceive by comparing that Canon with the third, fourth, and fifth Canons of Arles; it was but just to recapitulate those parts of the Lateran laws which were especially to be observed, as otherwise people might be lost in the long story contained in *seventy* Canons. We will

place the Lateran and Arlesian enactments side by side, and thus enable the reader to judge for himself.

*Lateran IV., Canon III.*

*Moneantur autem et inducantur, et, si necesse fuerit, per censuram ecclesiasticam compellantur seculares potestates, quibuscunque fungantur officiis, ut sicut reputari cupiunt et haberi fideles, ita pro defensione fidei præsent publice juramentum, quod de terris suæ jurisdictioni subjectis universos hereticos ab ecclesia denotatos bona fide pro viribus exterminare studebunt.*

The words printed in italics show that not only was the sense of the *third* Canon of Lateran to be observed, but it must be adhered to, even to the very *letter*! We subjoin the Canons in an English dress, though this will scarcely make the matter plainer.

*Lateran IV., Canon III.*

And let the secular powers, *whatever office they may discharge*, be admonished and induced, and, *if need be*, compelled by ecclesiastical censure; *that as they desire to be reputed and accounted faithful, so for the defence of the faith they publicly set forth an oath that to the utmost of their power, they will bond fide strive to exterminate from the lands subject to their jurisdiction, all heretics pointed out by the Church.*

The only difference in the above extracts is exactly what would be looked for in the Canons of a General Council and those of a Provincial Council acting in obedience to the General and Superior Synod. "Let the *secular powers* be admonished," says the General Council, without particularizing, because that was unnecessary in the case of a Council with the Pope at its head; on the other hand, the Provincial Council *enumerates* the temporal authorities *within its jurisdiction*! A complete answer *this*, to those who would try to make us believe that the Council of Lateran did not contemplate *sovereign princes as within its jurisdiction.*

*Arles, Canon III. — "Ut quilibet compellantur hæreticos de terris suis exterminare."*

Item statuimus quod quilibet episcopus moneat et efficaciter inducat, et, si necesse fuerit, per censuras compellat, potentes, castellanos, consules, et civitatum et aliorum locorum dominos, quibuscunque fungantur officiis, ut sicut reputari cupiunt et haberi fideles, ita pro defensione fidei præsent publice juramentum, quod de terris suæ jurisdictioni subjectis universos hereticos ab ecclesia denotatos bona fide pro viribus exterminare studebunt.

*Arles, Canon III.*

We also decree that every bishop admonish and effectually induce, and, *if need be*, compel by censure, those in power, castellans, consuls, and the lords and rulers, both of cities and other places, *whatever offices they may discharge, that as they desire to be reputed and accounted faithful, so, for the defence of the faith, they publicly set forth an oath, that, to the utmost of their power, they will bond fide strive to exterminate from the lands subject to their jurisdiction, all heretics pointed out by the Church.*

*Lateran IV., Canon III.*

*Credentes* vero præterea receptores, defensores, et fautores hæreticorum excommunicationi decernimus subjacere.<sup>a</sup>

*Arles, IV.*—“*Ut singulis Dominicis et festis publice excommunicentur hæretici et eorum fautores.*”

Item statuimus, ut singulis diebus Dominicis et festivis publice excommunicentur et anathematizentur pulsatis campanis et extinctis candelis, omnes hæreticorum, quibuscunque nominibus censeantur, *credentes, receptatores, defensores et fautores eorundem.*<sup>b</sup>

Here we have again just the difference between the *general order* and the particular words of command given by those whose duty it is to see that the general order is carried into effect. The word “*credentes*” is erroneously translated in Perceval’s “*Roman Schism,*” p. 136, “*But we who believe,*” &c.; the translator not being aware that the term “*credentes*” was used, by way of reproach, and applied to those who held heretical opinions; this is clear from its use in such passages as the following: “*At nemo puniatur tanquam credens vel hæreticus.*”<sup>c</sup> The adoption of this peculiar term of reproach identifies the source whence it was derived. We have still further evidence afforded by the Council of Arles of this identity.

*Lateran, Canon III.*

Adjicimus insuper, ut quilibet archiepiscopus vel episcopus, per se, aut per archidiaconum suum, vel idoneas personas honestas, bis aut saltem semel in anno propriam parochiam, in qua fama fuerit hæreticos habitare, circumeat; et ibi tres vel plures boni testimonii viros, vel etiam si expedire videbitur totam viciniam, jurare compellat si quis ibidem hæreticos sciverit, vel aliquos occulta conventicula celebrantes, seu a communi conversatione, vita et moribus dissidentes, episcopo studeat indicare.<sup>d</sup>

*Arles, Canon V.*—“*Ut inquerantur hæretica et denunciarentur.*”

Item ut plenius exterminari valeat hæretica pravitas, statuimus ut in singulis parochiis, tam in civitate quam extra, quilibet episcopus sacerdotem unum vel duos, vel tres bonæ opinionis laicos vel plures, si opus fuerit, juramenti religione constringat, quod diligenter et solcite investigent, si quos ibi reperint hæreticos, *credentes, fautores, defensores, et receptatores eorum, ut ipsi episcopo et rectoribus civitatum, et dominis locorum, et bajulis eorum, cum omni studeant festinantia intimare, ut eos puniant*

<sup>a</sup> But adherents and receivers also, and maintainers, and favourers of heretics, we decide to lie under excommunication.

<sup>b</sup> That heretics and their supporters are to be excommunicated on Sundays and holy days.

Also we decree, that upon each Sunday and holiday, that all heretics, under whatever name they be classed, and all their adherents, receivers, maintainers, and fautors be, with toll of bell and extinction of candle, *excommunicated and anathematized.*

<sup>c</sup> Concil. Tolos. cap. viii.; Labbé et Cossart, tom. xi., p. 1, col. 42. Paris, 1671.

<sup>d</sup> We add, moreover, that each archbishop or bishop either in person or

secundum canonicas et legitimas sanctiones: nihilominus bona hæreticorum confiscantes, qui incarcerationi debent ad arbitrium episcopi sufficiente provisione reddenda.<sup>a</sup>

Here again we have the order given by the superior, and the inferior officer issuing the necessary directions to carry the said order into effect. No recognition can be more complete.

The Canons of the Council of Arles, with the exception of the twenty-fourth, were renewed in A.D. 1236.

Not less remarkable than the above is the testimony afforded by a "General Decree" of the Council of Sens, A.D. 1527, 1528, to the genuineness of the third Lateran Canon. The whole of the decree is too long to extract, but we give portions of it which amply bear out what we have just said.

*Lateran, Canon III.*

*Excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnem hæresim extolentem se adversus hanc Catholicam fidem quam superius exposuimus; credentes vero præterea, receptores, defensores, et fautores hæreticorum excommunicationi decernimus subjacere.*

*General Decree of Sens.*

*In primis juxta Lateranense Concilium, excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnem hæresim extolentem se adversus orthodoxam et Catholicam ecclesiam. . . ejusdem Concilii autoritate credentes, receptatores, defensores et fautores hæreticorum excommunicationi subjacere decernimus.*

We have not only the very words of the third Lateran Canon given in the above extract, but we are plainly told that the intention is to carry out the behests of the Lateran Council. Equally plain declarations are made in other portions of the decree,—“hinc est quod *districte juxta sacrum generale Lateranense Concilium* prohibemus;”<sup>b</sup> and these provisions of the *third* Canon are enjoined to be carried into effect. So

by his own archdeacon, or fit and respectable persons, should twice, or any way once each year, go through any parish in which it is reported that heretics are living; and there lay some three or more individuals of good report, or if need be, the whole neighbourhood under oath, that if any one learns that any heretics, or other persons are holding their meetings there, or not joining in the ordinary ways and manner of living, he take care to make the bishop acquainted therewith.

<sup>a</sup> Wherefore that heretical parties may the more completely be got rid of, we ordain that in every parish, both within the city and without, every bishop put one or more priests, if need be, under oath, that they carefully and diligently look after any heretics who may be found there, or adherents, favourers, maintainers, and receivers of the same, and acquaint the bishop himself as soon as possible, and the rector of the cities, the principal lord of the place, and their bailiffs, in order to have them punished according to canonical and proper orders, &c.—Labbé and Cossart, tom. xi. p. 11, col. 2341.

<sup>b</sup> *I.e.*, Hence it is that following most carefully the holy general Lateran Council.

again we read, “. . . . et si in expurgando hujusmodi fermento fuerint remissi aut negligentes intelligant se pœnas incururos quæ sacro generali Lateranensi Concilio continentur.”<sup>a</sup>

In which of the Lateran Councils and in what particular Canon the threatened penalties “are contained,” is clearly shown by the extracts given above. The Canon, too, is treated as a well known document, otherwise the bishops would scarcely understand the penalties which negligence or remissness on their part would incur.

The above testimonies might be deemed fully sufficient to rescue the Canon from the unhandsome treatment it has received at the hands of those, who, in all honesty and duty, were bound to support its most just claims. We will, however, appeal to the testimony of a witness of whom Rome ought to be very proud, and especially those of her children who reside in the British dominions, as he completely exonerates England from treating so important a document with the disrespect insinuated by Dr. Milner,<sup>b</sup>—who writes, “*It has never been even published or talked of in these islands!*”

Cardinal Pole, in a Council assembled at Lambeth, A.D. 1556, called into notice and into *action* the third Canon of the Fourth General Council of Lateran!<sup>c</sup> The cardinal, in his preface to the decrees, exhorts the archbishops and other prelates to enforce the Constitutions by ecclesiastical censure on the contumacious, and, if need be, to call in the *secular arm*. In the second decree the books to be used by the clergy are pointed out, and the decree of the *Fifth* Lateran Council, “*De Libris imprimendis*,” is enforced; the decree afterwards proceeds thus:—“But that the people may know, every error of former times being taken away, what doctrines to follow, what they ought to avoid, together with this same Synod we reverently take up and embrace, according to the rules and dogmas of the holy fathers, all that faith which the Holy and Apostolic Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all Churches, holds and teaches, and we decree that the same be done by all, and openly professed: and, *according to the decrees of the General Council celebrated under Pope Innocent III., of happy memory*, and of other Councils and Roman Pontiffs, and traditions, and the very letters Apostolical, which are wont to be read ‘*IN DIE CENÆ DOMINI*,’ we condemn and altogether

<sup>a</sup> That is—If they manifest any carelessness or want of care in getting rid of this adulteration, they are to be informed that they will incur the same punishment, as decreed by the Holy General Lateran Council.

<sup>b</sup> Letter xlix.

<sup>c</sup> *Reformatio Angliæ, ex decretis Reginaldi Poli, Cardinalis, Sedis Apostolicæ Legati.*—Labbé et Cossart, tom. xiv. col. 1784, et seq. Paris, 1671.

reject, every heresy exalting itself against this holy, orthodox, and Catholic faith, and whatever is different from it: every dogma which is at variance with the same faith, or does not agree with it, we prohibit and forbid to be believed, practised, or taught: all heretics, of whatever name and kind, who otherwise believe, hold, and teach, than the same Roman Church believes, holds, and teaches, we condemn and anathematize: also all censures and punishments enacted against heretics and favourers of them, and against ordinaries and all others, to whom the office belongs, negligent in extirpating heresies, we renew and enjoin to be fully executed.”<sup>a</sup> The internal evidence furnished by the decree of the Lambeth Synod indicates its source too clearly to admit of a doubt, even had not the cardinal himself told us what Canons he intended should be put in force. Should any one contend that the cardinal did not refer to the third Canon of the Fourth Lateran Council, he would be reduced to the necessity of admitting, what we have before stated, *that it is of little consequence whether the genuineness of the disputed Canon be established or not*, as far as Rome has the will, and asserts her right, to persecute those who dissent from her creed! Let the reader bear in mind that Dr. Milner’s defence amounts to nothing, unless the Council *did* pass this atrocious Canon; that Collier’s blunder can only be urged by those who admit that *sixty-nine* Canons of the Fourth Lateran Council are to be found in the “*Mazarine copy coeval with the Council*,”—whilst the authenticity and genuineness of the document in question is amply proved by the decrees of other Councils *which have never been impugned!* We might, as far as relates to the charge of maintaining the doctrine of persecution, safely consign the whole seventy decrees of the Council at once to the flames; but, it might be said, as the editor of “*Instructions secrètes des Jesuites*” observes, when speaking of a certain work condemned, by the Parliament of Paris, to be burnt, “*Brûler le livre n’était pas brûler la doctrine.*”

<sup>a</sup> See “Statutes of the Fourth General Council of Lateran,” by the Rev. John Evans, A.M. London, Seeleys, 1843. p. 65, 66. [We especially recommend this work to our readers.—ED.]

## No. XVIII.

## P U R G A T O R Y.

“Et quæ necessitas est pro Purgatorio sic tumultuari, nisi quod Papistica ecclesia lucro suo timet, quod inæstimabile trahit ex Purgatorio?”—LUTHERI Opera, tom. ii. fol. 119, ed. Witt.

## SECT. I.—Dr. Milner's Definitions of Purgatory Examined.

It is a remarkable fact that a Church which proclaims itself to be infallible should not have put forward a clear and defined exposition or explanation of her belief on the subject of *Purgatory*. This doctrine is left very much to the discretion of the Bishops to explain as they best may. The Synod of Trent “enjoined on Bishops that they diligently strive that the *sound* doctrine touching Purgatory, delivered by the Holy Fathers and sacred councils, be believed, held, and taught, and everywhere proclaimed, by the faithful of Christ; but that the more difficult and subtle questions, and those which tend not to edification, and from which for the most part there is no increase of piety, should be excluded from popular discourses specially before the uneducated multitude. In like manner, such things *as are uncertain*, or which seem to border on error, they are not to be made subjects of public discussion.” But the holy Synod, having an eye to the commercial value of the doctrine, directs the clergy to be careful that “the suffrages of the faithful—to wit, sacrifices of masses, prayers, *almsgiving*, &c., which are wont to be performed by the faithful for the other faithful departed—be piously rendered; and whatsoever things are due on their behalf from the *endowments of testators*, or in any other way” (and here is the whole *morale* of the question), that “these are to be discharged in a proper manner.” [Sess. xxv. Decree touching Purgatory.]

Dr. Milner declares “that all which is necessary to be believed by [Roman] Catholics on this subject, is contained in the following brief declaration of the Council of Trent:—‘There is a Purgatory, and the souls detained there are helped by the prayers of the faithful, and particularly by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar.’”<sup>a</sup> And in the next page he would make out that the Romish Church has defined only

<sup>a</sup> Letter xlv. p. 414. 8vo. Edit. Derby, 1842.



two points connected with this doctrine, "namely, as to there being a middle state, which we call *purgatory*; and as to the souls detained in it being helped by the prayers of the living faithful. True it is, they do not generally believe that these souls are punished by a *material fire*; but neither does our Church require a belief of this opinion."<sup>a</sup>

The Council of Trent, at the 25th session, declared that the "Catholic Church" on this head, "instructed by the Holy Ghost," derives this doctrine from "the sacred writings and the ancient traditions of the Fathers."

In laying out this doctrine, Dr. Milner finds it needful to tread very lightly; and he has accordingly furnished as meagre an explanation and detail as possible, in order to render the work he has undertaken more easy, namely, to make this modern Tridentine doctrine accord with the teaching of "the sacred writings and the ancient traditions of the Fathers." But we would remind Dr. Milner and the circulators of his book, that there is a little more to be learned on this subject, which "is necessary to be believed by [Roman] Catholics."

In order, therefore, fully to appreciate Dr. Milner's arguments, we beg to fill up the little hiatus which he has left.

The "brief declaration," rendered briefer still by his manner of quoting it, refers to a Canon then recently passed by the Synod on the same subject.

The Canon referred to was passed at the 6th session of the same Council of Trent in January, 1547. By the thirtieth Canon on Justification, it is decreed, "If any one shall affirm that, after the grace of justification received, unto every penitent sinner the guilt is so remitted, and the penalty of eternal punishment so blotted out, that there remains not any *penalty* of temporal *punishments* to be discharged, either in this world or in the next in *Purgatory*, before the entrance to the kingdom of heaven can be laid open, let him be accursed." And in the 22nd session (chap. ii.), it is declared that the Romish sacrifice of the Mass is not only "propitiatory," but what the minister offers on the altar is the "one and the same victim which was offered on the cross;" whereby they tell us that this modern sacrifice, this crucifying our Saviour anew, "agreeable to the traditions of the apostles," "is rightly offered—not only for the sins, *punishments*, satisfactions, and other necessities of the faithful who are alive, but also for those who are departed in Christ, who are not as yet *fully purified and purged*."

<sup>a</sup> Letter xlv. p. 415.

Here we have, under the same authority, the additional information that the Romish Purgatory is a place of *punishment*; but the Catechism of the Council of Trent goes further still.

“ Besides this (namely, hell) there is a *purgatorial fire*, in which the souls of the pious, after suffering for a time, are cleansed, and thereby admission obtained to the eternal abodes, into which nothing unclean can enter.”<sup>a</sup>

The authority of this Catechism is undoubted. The well-known Dr. Doyle, on his examination before a committee of the Lords, declared it to be the most approved and authentic summary of the creed, faith, and morals of the Roman Church.<sup>b</sup>

The same Catechism, a little further on (part i., sec. x.), again refers to “*expiation by the fire of Purgatory.*”

From other Catechisms, however, we obtain still further information; for instance,—

Dr. Challoner describes Purgatory as “*a middle state of souls which depart this life in God’s grace, yet not without some lesser stains of guilt of punishment which retard them from entering heaven:*” and the Christians who go to Purgatory are, “*1st, such as die guilty of lesser sins, which we commonly call venial; as many Christians do, who, either by sudden death or otherwise, are taken out of this life before they have repented of these ordinary failings; 2nd, such as, having been formerly guilty of greater sins, have not made full satisfaction for them to the divine justice.*”<sup>c</sup>

And in a similar strain Cardinal Bellarmine writes:—

“*By the pains of Purgatory, venial sin is expiated in respect of its guilt.*”<sup>d</sup>

And again, “*Purgatory exists for those only who die in venial sin, and for those who depart this life with liability to punishment, their guilt having been already remitted.*”<sup>e</sup>

And Thomas Aquinas, a canonized saint of the Church of Rome, asserts that “*it is inconsistent with the Catholic faith to deny a Purgatory of faithful souls, which have de-*

<sup>a</sup> “*Præterea est purgatorius ignis, quo piorum animæ ad definitum tempus cruciatæ expiantur, ut eis in æternam patriam ingressus patere possit, in quam nihil coinquinatum ingreditur.*”—Catech. Concil. Trid. part. i. v. Purg. Ignis, p. 61. Paris, 1848.

<sup>b</sup> Digest, Lords, March 21, 1825, part i. p. 176.

<sup>c</sup> “*The Grounds of the Catholic Doctrine,*” &c. By Rev. Rich. Challoner, D.D., Vic. Ap. 15th Edition. London, 1843. Pp. 39, 40.

<sup>d</sup> *Per pœnas purgatorii peccatum veniale expiatur etiam quoad culpam.*—Bell. Oper. tom. ii., De Purg. lib. ii. cap. 6. Colon. edit. 1628.

<sup>e</sup> “*Purgatorium pro iis tantum esse, qui cum venialibus culpis moriuntur, et pro illis qui decedunt cum reatu pœnæ, culpis jam remissis.*”—Idem, lib. ii. c. 1.

parted hence *in a state of grace.*"<sup>a</sup> And Cardinal Cabassutius declares: "There is a certain place of Purgatory in which the souls of the *faithful, departing in the favour of Christ,* which have not yet made complete and adequate satisfaction for their faults by works worthy of repentance, are purified by temporary tortures."<sup>b</sup>

That the fire is believed to be a *material fire*, is plain from Cardinal Bellarmine, who states that "it is the general opinion of theologians, that the fire of Purgatory is a *true and proper fire*, and of the same *quality with our elementary fire*;"<sup>c</sup> and that "almost all theologians teach that the *dammned* and the souls in *Purgatory* are in the same place, and *tortured in the same fire*,"<sup>d</sup> and he certifies to and approves of the saying of Cardinal Cajetan, "that the punishment, which remains to be undergone *after the remission of the guilt*, is that very same *sensible* punishment which the sinner ought to suffer in hell, its permanent endurance alone excepted."<sup>e</sup>

To this it is important to add that the soul supposed to be *viz.* in Purgatory can be freed, or the duration of the sufferings can be shortened, otherwise than by the sacrifice of the Mass; in this life by repeating certain prayers and going through certain penitential works, and after this life by Indulgences; and again by others in this life taking upon themselves to satisfy, and by prayers and mortifications to obtain relief for those who are suffering in Purgatory. We are told in the "Hours of the Blessed Virgin, according to the ritual of the Church of Salisbury," that "whosoever in the state of grace shall say seven prayers before the crucifix, and seven Paternosters, and seven Ave Marias, shall attain fifty-six thousand years' pardon; fourteen thousand granted by St. Gregory, fourteen thousand by Nicholas I., and twenty-eight thousand by Sixtus IV."<sup>f</sup> Souls, it appears, are liberated from

<sup>a</sup> "Est a fide Catholica alienum negare fidelium animarum, quæ hinc in statu gratiæ decesserint."—Thom. Aquinat. Summa Theol. Suppl. quæst. 100. De Purg. Duaii, 1614.

<sup>b</sup> "Aliquem esse purgatorii locum, in quo fidelium in Christi gratia decedentium animæ, quæ necum dignis pœnitentiæ operibus pro culpis de integro et ex æquo satisfecerunt, cruciatibus ad tempus expurgantur."—Cabassutii Notit. Concil. Flor. c. xcii. p. 645. Lugd. 1670.

<sup>c</sup> "Communis sententia theologorum est *verum et proprium* esse ignem (purgatorii), et ejusdem speciei cum nostro elementari."—Bellarm. Opera, tom. ii., De Purgat. lib. ii. c. 11. Colon. 1628.

<sup>d</sup> "Theologi fere omnes docent eodem in loco esse et eodem igne torqueri damnatos et animas purgatorii."—Idem, c. 6.

<sup>e</sup> "Nam (ut recte explicat Card. Cajetan. in Tract. de Contritione, quæst. 4) pœna illa quæ luenda restat post culpæ remissionem est illa ipsa pœna sensus, quam in Gehenna pati debuisse peccator, remota solum æternitate."—Bellarm. Opera, tom. iii., De Pœnitentia, lib. iv. c. 1. Colon. 1628.

<sup>f</sup> See further extracts from this, with the references, in Tyler's Primitive Christian Worship, part ii. chap. 1. London, 1847.

Purgatory by the act of the Pope, and, when duly delegated, by bishops and priests. This is effected by the application to the suffering souls of a portion of the "treasures of the Church,"<sup>a</sup> which sacred treasure consists "of the superabundant merits, sufferings, and virtues of Christ our Lord, and of his Virgin Mother, and of all the saints."

"We have resolved," says Pope Leo XII., "*by virtue of the authority given to us from heaven, fully to unlock that sacred treasure, composed of the merits, sufferings, and virtues of Christ our Lord, and of his Virgin Mother, and of all the saints, which the Author of human salvation has intrusted to our dispensation.*—To you, therefore, venerable brethren, Patriarchs, Primate, Archbishops, Bishops, it belongs to explain with perspicuity the power of Indulgences; what is their efficacy in the remission, not only of the canonical penance, but also of the temporal punishment due to the divine justice for past sin; and what succour is afforded, *out of this heavenly treasure*, from the merits of Christ and his saints, to such as have departed real penitents in God's love, yet before they had duly satisfied, by fruits worthy of penance, for sins of commission and omission, and are *now purifying in the fire of Purgatory*, that an entrance may be opened for them into their eternal country, where nothing defiled is admissible!"<sup>b</sup>

On these imaginary treasures they pretend to draw from time to time, and apply them to the necessities of the less fortunate brethren "purifying in the fire of Purgatory, that an entrance may be opened for them" to heaven. This presupposes the truth of the doctrine of Supererogation; *i.e.* that we can do more good works than are necessary for our salvation, and that these superabundant good works are treasured up and reserved by the Church, to be applied to make up the deficiency of others.

In this spirit, while enlarging on the wondrous virtues of a saint of his Church, St. Pacificus of San Saverino, Dr. Wiseman describes one of the occupations of this individual, "whose heart," he tells us, "burned with the desire of freeing the souls that are afflicted in Purgatory *from the most cruel and bitter torments*; as cheerfully taking upon himself to satisfy, both by prayer and mortification, some portion of the punishment which the souls of the members of the suffering Church are doomed to endure."<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Bell. de Indulg. sec. 3, p. 657, tom. iii. Prag. 1721.

<sup>b</sup> Bull of Pope Leo XII. Laity's Directory; Keating & Brown, London, 1825.

<sup>c</sup> Lives of St. Alphonsus, &c., edited by Dr. Wiseman, p. 202. London, 1847.

All this is confirmatory of the teaching of the Church of Rome as defined by the Catechism of the Council of Trent, where we find it laid down under the chapter on Penance and Satisfaction, founded on the text Gal. vi. 2, under the title, "*One person can make satisfaction to God for another.*"

"Herein, indeed, must we magnify, with the greatest praises and thanksgivings, the great goodness and mercy of God, who has granted this indulgence to human weakness, namely, that one person should be able to make satisfaction for another; which, indeed, is, in a pre-eminent sense, a property of this part of penance. . . . Those who are endowed with divine grace can, in the name of another, fully pay to God what is owed to God (by the other)."<sup>a</sup>

Thus then it appears that Purgatory is represented by Romanists to be a *place* and not merely a *state* of suffering, where external *torture* is undergone from *material fire*; that those only who die in *venial sins*, who have not made sufficient satisfaction in this life, go there; that it is a place for the souls of the *pious* only—"the truly penitent and justified sinner"—for those whose sins have been *forgiven*, but who have to undergo punishment for those sins though forgiven; and that the souls there detained can be assisted or relieved by certain acts done in this life by survivors.

This explanation is necessary, in order to enable us to judge of the value of Dr. Milner's *evidence*, adduced to prove that the doctrine is sanctioned by Scripture and the tradition of the Fathers; and we shall be able also fully to admire his summary decision in defining, in three lines, all "that is necessary to be believed by [Roman] Catholics on this subject."

---

SECT. II.—Alleged Scriptural Evidence.

DR. MILNER, in Letter xliii., quotes a passage from the Confutation of Dr. Porteus, wherein he is represented as saying "There is no scriptural proof of the existence of Purgatory. Heaven and hell we read of perpetually in the Bible,

<sup>a</sup> Catech. Concil. Trid. I. pars ii. De Pœnitentiæ Sacramento, Nos. cix. and cx. p. 312. Paris, 1848.

<sup>cix.</sup> *Satisfacere potest unus pro alio.* In eo vero summa Dei bonitas et clementia maximis laudibus et gratiarum actionibus prædicanda est, qui

but Purgatory we never meet with ; though surely if there be such a place, Christ and his Apostles would not have concealed it from us."

This is a fair issue, and Dr. Milner, contrary to his usual manner, meets the objection with a bold front. This he thinks he can afford to do, if his simple definition of the Papal doctrine is to pass: "there is a Purgatory," *i.e.* a middle state. Dr. Milner asserts, "First, the Apostles did teach their converts the doctrine of Purgatory among their other doctrines, as St. Chrysostom testifies [no reference] and the tradition of the Church proves; secondly, that the same is *demonstratively* evinced from both the Old and New Testament."<sup>a</sup>

The doctor, however, objects to the conclusiveness of Bishop Porteus's argument, and produces an alleged parallel case. We are informed that "Scripture nowhere commands us to keep the *first day of the week* holy. We perpetually read of sanctifying the *Sabbath*, or Saturday, but never meet with the Sunday as a day of obligation; though, if there be such an obligation, Christ and his Apostles would not have concealed it from us!" But on reference to the Rhemish Testament now in circulation in Great Britain, edited by Dr. Challoner, and circulated with the written approval of Dr. Wiseman, in a note to Acts xx. 7, we find Chrysostom, the very authority appealed to by Dr. Milner, brought forward to testify against him. The note runs: "*And on the first day of the week.* Here St. Chrysostom with many other interpreters of the Scriptures explain, that the Christians, even at this time, must have changed the Sabbath into the first day of the week (the Lord's day) as all Christians now keep it." If this be so, the change of Sabbath can be proved by Scripture, *and the Apostles did not conceal it from us.*

The Scriptural texts on which Dr. Milner relies to prove *demonstratively* the divine origin of Purgatory are thus introduced and commented upon by him:—

\* To begin with the Old Testament, I claim a right of considering the two first books of Machabees as an integral part of them; because the Catholic Church so considers

humanæ imbecillitati hoc condonavit, ut unus posset pro altero satisfacere; quod quidem hujus partis pœnitentiæ maxime proprium est.

"cx. . . . Ita qui divina gratia præditi sunt, alterius nomine possunt, quod Deo debetur persolvere; quare fit ut quodam pacto (Gal. vi. 2) alter alterius onera portare videatur."

<sup>a</sup> Dr. Wiseman, in his *Moorfields* "Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church," lecture xi. vol. ii. p. 53 (London, 1851), is by no means so bold: he bases the authority of Purgatory on Tradition, "yet not but that its principle is laid down, *indirectly* at least, in the Word of God."

them,<sup>a</sup> from whose traditions, and not from that of the Jews, as St. Augustin<sup>b</sup> signifies, our sacred canon is formed. Now in the second of these books, it is related that the pious general, Judas Machabeus, sent 12,000 drachmas to Jerusalem, for sacrifices to be offered for his soldiers slain in battle; after which narration the inspired writer concludes thus: *It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins* (2 Mach. xii. 46). I need not point out the inseparable connection there is between the practice of praying for the dead, and the belief of an intermediate state of souls; since it is evidently needless to pray for the saints in heaven, and useless to pray for the reprobate in hell. But even Protestants, who do not receive the books of Machabees as *Canonical Scripture*, venerate them as *authentic* and *holy records*: as such, then, they bear conclusive testimony of the belief of God's people on this head, 150 years before Christ. That the Jews were in the habit of practising some religious rites for the relief of the departed, at the beginning of Christianity, is clear from St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians, where he mentions them, without any censure of them;<sup>c</sup> and that this people continue to pray for their deceased brethren, at the present time, may be learned from any living Jew.

"To come to the New Testament: What place, I ask, must that be which our Saviour calls *Abraham's bosom*, where the soul of Lazarus reposed (Luke xvi. 22) among the other just souls, till, by his sacred passion, he paid their ransom? Not heaven, otherwise Dives would have addressed himself to God instead of Abraham; but evidently a middle state, as St. Augustin teaches.<sup>d</sup> Again, of what place is it that St. Peter speaks, where he says, *Christ died for our sins, being put to death in the flesh, but enlivened in the spirit, in which also coming, he preached to those spirits that were in prison* (1 Peter iii. 19). It is evidently the same which is mentioned in the Apostle's Creed: *He descended into hell*; not the hell of the damned, to suffer their torments, as the blasphemous Calvin asserts,<sup>e</sup> but the *prison* above mentioned, or Abraham's bosom; in short, a middle state. It is of this prison, according to the holy Fathers,<sup>f</sup> our blessed Master speaks, where

<sup>a</sup> "Concil. Carthag. iii., St. Cyp., St. Aug., Innocent I., Gelas., &c."

<sup>b</sup> "Lib. xviii. De Civ. Dei."

<sup>c</sup> "*Else what shall they do, who are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? why are they then baptized for them?*—1 Cor. xv. 29."

<sup>d</sup> "De Civit. Dei, l. xv. c. 20."

<sup>e</sup> "Instit. l. ii. c. 16."

<sup>f</sup> "Tertul., St. Cyp., Origen, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, &c."

he says, *I tell thee thou shalt not depart thence till thou hast paid the very last mite* (Luke xii. 59). Lastly, what other sense can that passage of St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians bear than that which the holy Fathers<sup>a</sup> affix to it, where the Apostle says, *The day of the Lord shall be revealed by fire, and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide he shall receive a reward. If any man's work be burnt he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire* (1 Cor. iii. 13—15)? The prelate's diversified attempts to explain away these scriptural proofs of Purgatory are really too feeble and inconsistent to merit that I should even mention them. I might here add, as a further proof of a Purgatory, the denunciation of Christ concerning *blasphemy against the Holy Ghost*, namely, that this sin *shall not be forgiven either in this world or the world to come* (Matt. xii. 32); which words clearly imply that *some sins* are forgiven in the world to come, as the ancient Fathers show."<sup>b</sup> (Letter xliii. pp. 411—413.)

If the reader will take this scriptural explanation and compare it with the teaching of the Church of Rome as we have shown it, derived from their own documents, he will search in vain for the clear *demonstration* alleged by Dr. Milner. It amounts to this, according to his own showing: That a celebrated Jew wrote that it was a holy and wholesome thing to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins; and on this Dr. Milner takes for granted that the connection between the practice of praying for the dead and a belief of an intermediate state is inseparable. That Lazarus was in a middle state when he was in *Abraham's bosom*; and that Christ preached to spirits that were in prison, which was the same place as when He "descended into hell," from which prison no person can depart till he has paid the last mite. That the day of the Lord shall be revealed by fire, and that fire shall try *every man's work* of what sort it is. If any man's work abide he shall receive a reward. If any man's work be burnt he shall suffer loss, but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire. And lastly, that blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven either in this world or the world to come, which clearly implies that *some sins* are forgiven in the world to come.

<sup>a</sup> "Origen, Hom. 14 in Levit., &c.; St. Ambrose in Ps. cxviii.; St. Jerom. lib. ii. contra Jovin.; St. Aug. in Ps. xxxvii., where he prays thus: 'Purify me, O Lord, in this life, that I may not need the chastising fire of those *who will be saved, yet so as by fire.*'"

<sup>b</sup> "St. Aug. de Civit. Dei, lib. xxi. c. 24; St. Greg. lib. iv.; Dialog. Bed. in cap. iii. Marc."



We would ask any impartial reader whether Dr. Milner's alleged *demonstrative proofs* are not merely arbitrary interpretations and assertions; and that, from his own showing, the Popish doctrine of Purgatory is not even hinted at in these several texts. If Dr. Milner fails to prove his case on his own showing, it is scarcely necessary to continue the examination. The plan of our work, however, compels us to follow up his line of argument.

I. (2 Macc. xii. 46.)—Dr. Milner claims the books of Maccabees as an integral part of the Old Testament, because “the Catholic Church so considered them.” His authorities are, “Concil. Carthag. iii., St. Cyp., St. Aug., Innoc. I., Gelas., &c.” Among these references, which are certainly very meager, we have already fully examined the alleged authority of the Council of Carthage and of Innocent I. (See No. IX. Part I. pp. 81—3.) We cannot account for the appearance of the name of the Bishop of Carthage, Cyprian, in Dr. Milner's list; for Rufinus, in his explanation of the Creed which is found among Cyprian's works, and formerly attributed to him, actually by name excludes the two books of Maccabees from the list of Canonical Scriptures. And this is fully admitted by Cardinal Bellarmine,<sup>a</sup> as also by Bishop Canus,<sup>b</sup> though afterwards asserting gratuitously (cap. xi. Respons. ad. 2.) that Rufinus so decided from his ignorance of patristic tradition. The reference to Augustine we have also considered very fully (Part I. No. IX. p. 78). Dr. Milner, however, adds, as from lib. xviii., *De Civitate Dei*, that Augustine stated that “the Sacred Canon of Scripture is to be formed from the traditions of the Church and not from the Jews;” giving us thereby to understand that Augustine considered the books of Maccabees as included in the “*Sacred Canon of Scriptures*,” whereas we have clearly shown that Augustine did not include these books in the “*Sacred Canon*,” properly so called; and this is further evident from the following passage from Augustine:—

“Although there may something be found in the book of Maccabees meet for this order of writing, and worthy to be joined with the number of miracles, yet we will not weary ourselves with any care thereof, for that we have intended only to touch a short rehearsal of miracles contained in the *Divine Canon*.”<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Bell. de Verbo Dei, lib. i. c. 20, p. 38, tom. i., edit. Prag. 1721.

<sup>b</sup> Can. Loc. Theolog. lib. ii. c. 10, p. 67. Colon. 1605.

<sup>c</sup> Aug. de Mirab. Sacræ Scrip. lib. ii. c. 34; tom. 3, pars i. p. 26. Paris, 1686.

Evidently intending to exclude these books from the true canon.

In the eighteenth book of the "City of God," cited by Dr. Milner, chap. xxxvi., Augustine does admit that these books are excluded from the Jewish Canon, but admitted in an "Ecclesiastical Canon:" "Hos libros non Judæi sed Ecclesia pro canonicis habet." But here he was speaking of example of life and instruction of manners, and as forming no part of the divine rule of faith, as he clearly explains; for in the very same book and chapter he opens his meaning in a passage which Dr. Milner has found it convenient to suppress;—

"This reckoning," he says, "is not found in the *Holy Scriptures that are called Canonical*, but in certain other books, amongst which are the books of Maccabees."<sup>a</sup>

So much then for the testimony of Augustine.

The testimony of Pope Gelasius we have already fully considered [pp. 79—84. Part I.]. His opinion is evidently based on a forged and apocryphal epistle of Isidore. But Du Pin, the Roman Catholic historian, who strangely enough treated this Canon as genuine, admits that mention is made in it of only one book of the Maccabees,<sup>b</sup> and adds that "these determinations were *not* followed by all authors and all churches, until the matter was at last [namely, in 1546] fully decided upon by the Council of Trent!"<sup>c</sup>

We will now examine the story itself, as it stands recorded in the 2nd book of Maccabees.

It appears that on the day after the battle, when Judas and his men were collecting the dead bodies, in order to bury them in the graves of their fathers, they found, under the coats of every one that was slain, things that had been consecrated to the idols of the Jamnites; and this circumstance is expressly stated to have been the cause of their death. Hereupon Judas and his men besought God by prayer that the sin might not be remembered, and also exhorted the people to abstain from any repetition of the offence; and having made a collection of money, sent it to Jerusalem to offer a sin-offering before the Lord. The Romanist asserts that the expression here rendered (both by the Septuagint and in our translation) *a sin-offering*, indicates—and so rendered in the Douay version—a *sacrifice for the sins of the*

<sup>a</sup> "Hæc supputatio non in scripturis sanctis quæ appellantur canonicæ, sed in aliis invenitur, in quibus sunt et Machabæorum libri."—*De Civ. Dei*, lib. xviii. c. 36, p. 519, tom. 7. Paris, 1685.

<sup>b</sup> Du Pin's *Hist. of the Canon*, &c. fol., vol. i. p. 13. London, 1699.

<sup>c</sup> For the successive witnesses of the "Catholic Church," considered as a matter of traditional evidence, see No. IX., p. 76, part i. *et seq.*

*dead*; <sup>a</sup> who, according to modern Romish notions, must be in Hell, and therefore were not in Purgatory.

<sup>a</sup> The following excellent remarks we borrow from the "Catholic Layman," Dublin, August, 1854, p. 94 :—

"Before we can rely on this writer's 'historical testimony,' we must know exactly what his testimony is. We cannot be bound by an erroneous translation; the writer wrote in Greek, and we must look to the Greek which he wrote, to learn his testimony with accuracy.

"We look anxiously for the most authentic copy of the Greek, and we have no hesitation in adopting, for this purpose, an ancient manuscript, belonging to the Pope, which is carefully preserved in the Pope's library in the Vatican. This book is at least 1,200 years old, if not more. There is no copy that can compare with it in point of authority, except the Alexandrian Manuscript now in the British Museum; and the two copies agree in the place in question, and every other Greek copy of Maccabees agrees with them too; so we have no room to doubt what the writer did really write in the Greek. And we are able to make use of that valuable manuscript in the Pope's library, because an exact copy of it was printed in the year 1587, by the authority of Pope Sixtus the Fifth.

"We now give an exact translation from the Greek as then published by Pope Sixtus; and we place beside it the translation in the Douay Bible, that our readers may compare the two. 2 Macc. xii. 43, &c. :—

*Douay Translation.*

43. And making a gathering he sent twelve thousand drachms of silver to Jerusalem, *for sacrifice to be offered for the sins of the dead*, thinking well and religiously concerning the resurrection.

44. (For if he had not hoped that they that were slain should rise again, it would have seemed superfluous and vain to pray for the dead.)

45. And because he considered that they who had fallen asleep with godliness had great grace laid up for them.

46. *It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from sins.*

*Correct Translation.*

43. And having made a preparation of two thousand drachms of silver, according to a collection man by man, he sent to Jerusalem *to offer a sacrifice on account of sin*, acting altogether well and correctly, reasoning concerning the resurrection.

44. For if he did not expect that the slain should rise, it would have been superfluous and trifling to pray for the dead.

45. Besides seeing that a most excellent reward is reserved for those falling asleep with piety, *a holy and pious thought*. Wherefore concerning the dead, he made atonement, to be loosed from sin.

"We have printed in Italics the places in which the difference is important; and we give here the corresponding Greek words, that those learned in that language may satisfy themselves which translation is correct. In ver. 43, the Greek words are, Προσαγαγειν περι αμαρτιας θυσιαν. In ver. 46, οσια και ευσεβης η επινοια. οθεν περι των τεθνηκοτων τον εξιλασμον εποιησατο, της αμαρτιας απολυθηναι. We appeal to all Greek scholars if we have not translated this correctly.

"Observe, now, in verse 43, the historian does *not* say in the Greek (what the Douay version is thought to say), that Judas Maccabeus offered the sacrifice *for the benefit of the dead*. He says *nothing* of the dead; he only says that it was offered on account of sin.

"Observe, next, in verse 46, what the writer says about *a holy and pious thought* is not spoken of what follows (as the Douay translation makes it appear), but of what goes before. Every Greek scholar will see that it is *impossible* to connect these words in; he Greek *with what follows*. It was the belief in a reward for those who die the death of the righteous, that the author of this book called a holy and pious thought.

Now let us look back to the sentence in Dr. Milner's letter above quoted, in which he brings this history as a proof, to the effect that the practice of praying for the dead

“Observe, lastly, that the Douay Bible, in verse 46, again applies the benefit to the *dead*—‘to pray for the dead, that *they* may be loosed from sins.’ But the writer in the Greek does not say so. He does not say that *the dead* might be loosed; he does not say *who* were to be loosed, but he says that Judas made an atonement concerning, or on account of, the dead; he does not say *for* the dead, for then he would have written *ὑπερ*, whereas he has written *περι*, concerning the dead; and he does not say that *they* should be loosed, but ‘to be loosed,’ which might be for Judas himself, and for others, if living: *for if the sins of the dead had brought the living under sin*, an atonement would be required for the living because of the dead.

“We observe here that Dr. Milner has argued only from verses 43 and 46; he has not referred to ver. 44. We, therefore, answer here only from the verses he relies on, and we will consider ver. 44 separately.

“From verses 43 and 46, *rightly translated*, our answer is clear. The sacrifice was offered, and the atonement was made, not for the dead but for the living.

“It is a fact that, according to the law of Moses, the sin of those who were slain had brought guilt upon the whole nation of the living, which required to be atoned for by sacrifice, according to the Jewish law.

“We have a clear instance of such a case in the book of Joshua, chap. vii. v. 1.—‘But the children of Israel transgressed the commandment, and took to their own use of the anathema. For Achan, the son of Charmi, &c., took something of the anathema, and the Lord was angry against the *children of Israel*.’ Here observe that *one man only* committed the sin, and it was unknown to the rest, for he hid the thing in the ground (ver. 21), and yet it brought God's anger on the whole people.

“Now, the sin on account of which Judas Maccabeus offered sacrifice was exactly of the same kind. ‘They found under the coats of the slain some of the donaries of the idols of Jamnia, which the law forbiddeth to the Jews’ (2 Macc. xii. 40). This was the anathema or accursed thing, which they, like Achan, had taken; and in the same way it brought God's anger on the nation.

“And the punishment was like in both cases. In Achan's case, the people, after a succession of victories, in which none of them were killed, were put to flight before their enemies, and many of them killed, because of what Achan had done. Just so, Judas Maccabeus, after many victories, met with a check, and some of his soldiers were killed; and when they came to bury them, they found the reason, that they had taken of the cursed thing.

“There was this difference in the two cases:—In Achan's case, the guilty man was not killed. The atonement consisted in putting him to death, by God's command; but there was sacrifice too, for all his sheep and oxen were burned (Joshua vii. 24, 25, 26). But in the case before us, the idolaters were slain. Judas, therefore, could not make atonement for the guilt that had been brought upon the nation, by putting them to death; and it was his duty to look to the law of Moses and see what atonement was directed for such a case. This he would find exactly prescribed in the book of Leviticus, chapter iv., from verse 13 to 31, inclusive. In those circumstances it was the duty of Judas Maccabeus to have such a sacrifice offered at Jerusalem, not for the benefit of the dead, but *that the living might be delivered from the sin or guilt* which the wickedness of the slain had brought upon the whole people. And on looking back to the correct translation which we have given of verses 43 and 46, it will be seen that every word is exactly suitable to such a sacrifice: for instance, when Judas provided the sacrifice, by a ‘collection made man by man,’ it was evidently that each of the people should contribute to the atonement, which was made for the people as a whole; if the sacrifice had been for the benefit of the dead, it would have been enough to collect from those who desired to give.

was the same among the ancient Jews 150 years before Christ as among the early Christians, and Roman Catholics of the present day. If that history of the Maccabees prove

“This is the true account of what is related in those two verses, because this is what Judas was bound to do, according to the law of Moses, *which was the only rule that it was lawful for him to follow in that matter*. Romanists will, no doubt, acknowledge that Jews were strictly bound by the law of Moses, both as to the manner of offering sacrifice and the purpose for which it was to be offered; excepting only in the case of persons inspired and directed by God, which no one supposes was the case with Judas.

“Now, we have shown that, according to that law, it was his duty to offer that sacrifice for the living; and we have shown that the two verses on which Dr. Milner relies, *when rightly translated*, are most appropriate to that sacrifice which the law required for the living, and that those verses do *not* say it was for the dead. Now, can any one show us, *from the law of Moses*, that it was Judas’s duty to offer sacrifice for the dead?<sup>a</sup> We urge this upon him. If he *cannot* (and we know he cannot), will he not agree with us that Judas offered his sacrifice *according to the law*, and not contrary to the law, seeing that Judas was bound by that law, and was a most strict observer of it? The Jewish law commanded idolatry to be punished with death (Num. xv. 30, 31), without any sacrifices.

“We have now given a full answer, as respects those two verses which Dr. Milner argues from. We will now go on and consider v. 44, which he has not introduced into his argument.

“It has been most plainly proved that the writer of that book was an uninspired historian,—he admits it himself.<sup>b</sup> It is a rule, in judging

<sup>a</sup> [Josephus is silent as to any act of this kind on the part of Judas.—Antiq. lib. xii. c. 12.—ED.]

<sup>b</sup> [See Macc. xv. 38, 39. But we have several reasons for objecting to the writer of the books of Maccabees being considered even an historian of unimpeachable credit. We will cite a few cases to the point. In Macc. i. 6, 7, it is said that Alexander, on his death-bed, divided his kingdom among his ministers, whereas it is stated by historians that he died at Babylon, without having made any division of his empire, and that it was not till after his death that the principal officers of his army divided it among themselves. In chapter vi., Antiochus is said to have died at Babylon of an illness caused by a deep melancholy; but in book 2, chap. i. verses 15, 16, it is affirmed that he was stoned, and torn in pieces, at Nanea. And again, in chapter ix. verse 28, he is represented as having died on the mountains, of a dreadful complaint. In book 1, chap. viii. verse 7, it is said that Antiochus was taken alive by the Romans, who presented Eumenes with the sovereignty of India, whereas it is asserted by historians that they defeated Antiochus in three battles, but never took him prisoner; and as to India, the Roman empire never extended so far as to that country. In verse 15, it is said that the Romans had established a senate, and that every year they intrusted the supreme authority to one individual. Now, it is well known that they every year elected two consuls with sovereign power. As to what is said in book 2, chap. i. verse 19, about fire being taken from the altar secretly, this is evidently a mere fable; and one is astonished to hear Razias commended for what he did, which he is in chapter xiv. verse 46, for, as St. Augustine says well, it was a folly in Razias to put himself to death, and no mark of wisdom or virtue. The same Father, in another place, affirms, that to pretend to become a martyr to Jesus Christ by destroying oneself, is to borrow from Judas the cord and the precipice. Can one, moreover, believe an author to have been inspired by the Spirit of God, when he says (2 Macc. xv. 38) that *if he had done slenderly and meanly, it was all he could attain unto?*—ED.]

anything at all of the practice of the Jews about prayer and sacrifice for the dead, it proves that they prayed and sacrificed for those who died in mortal sin, that they might be loosed from their sins. Do "Roman Catholics of the present day" pray and offer sacrifice for those who die in mortal sin, that they may be loosed from their sins? Dr. Milner would tell us that *they do not*—that they consider this a wicked and heretical doctrine, and that it is condemned by their Church as such. How, then, can he tell us that this history proves that the practice of the Jews was the same as theirs?

Dr. Milner takes it for granted that the practice in question was a *constant* part of the public worship of the Jews—that is to say, that they practised it *always* and *continually* as a part of their public worship. But in fact it was (supposing

of all such historians, that a great difference is to be made between the *facts* which the historian relates and his own reflections upon those facts. The one may be most correct, and the other most erroneous. The difference is greater still between the actions which the historian records, and the historian's guess, for it can be little more than a guess, at the secret thoughts which led the actor to do what he did. Dr. Milner must surely have observed the importance of this distinction, in reading even historians of the highest character and credit.

"The highest praise an historian can obtain is, that he keeps the facts which he records distinct from his own reflections on those facts—that he does not allow his own reflections to influence the account of the facts. The writer of this book has done it admirably. He evidently connected in his own mind this sacrifice with the dead rather than with the living; yet where he relates the sacrifice—verses 43 and 46—he does not say it was for the dead; he describes it exactly as it was, in the true translation. Verse 44 is not the relation of the fact, but his own reflection on the fact, which may be right or wrong, without injury to his character for fidelity as an historian.

"We are, therefore, to consider this verse not as the relation of a fact, but as the inference which he drew from the fact he relates.

"Now, how could the writer of this book know the secret thoughts of Judas's mind? How could he know that Judas was *thinking* of the resurrection? If the writer was inspired, he *could* know it; but if he was only an uninspired man, it could only be a guess.

"Now, we are prepared to affirm that this writer was wrong in supposing that Judas offered this sacrifice with any regard to the resurrection of those who were slain. And still more we are prepared to expect that our Roman Catholic readers will, on reflection, agree with us that the writer was wrong in this (though, perhaps, not on exactly the same grounds that we think so). Now, let them mark this; the men who died on that occasion died in *mortal sin*. They carried in their clothes the proofs of their *idolatry*, perhaps in hopes to have the protection of the heathen gods in the battle; but whatever their motive, their sin was idolatry, which was a mortal sin. Romanists will not deny this. Even the note on the Douay Bible acknowledges the sin of which they were guilty to be a mortal sin, which cannot be denied, if we look to Deuteronomy vii. 25, 26. That note in the Douay Bible supposed these men might be excused through ignorance; but how could any Jew be ignorant that heathen idolatry was a mortal sin? what Jew could be ignorant that heathen idols were the accursed thing? Let Roman Catholics mark this; if that sacrifice was offered *for the dead*, it was offered for those that were KNOWN AND PROVED TO HAVE DIED IN MORTAL SIN, and, as we have shown, the Jewish law commanded idolatry to be punished with death (Num. xv. 30, 31)."

the Romish interpretation be correct) a thing done *only once*, 150 years before Christ, *and not repeated*, so far as we can derive any information from either inspired or profane history. And indeed the history, even as it is given in the Douay translation, does not profess to speak of what was usually done among the Jews, but only of what was done on that particular occasion. But we need not insist further on this, for if the history proves anything of the practice of the Jews 150 years before Christ, it proves that their public worship then comprised prayer and sacrifice for those who died in *mortal sin*, and that they might be loosed from their sins, whereas modern Romanists do not pray for those who die in mortal sin—these do not go to Purgatory; nor do Romanists pray that those in Purgatory may be loosed from their sins, for in Purgatory sins are supposed to have been already forgiven.

We now appeal to our Roman Catholic readers whether this be not conclusive proof that the reflections which the writer of this book of 2nd Maccabees makes on the facts which he records, are uninspired and subject to error? Will they now maintain that the opinion of this writer, contradictory as it is, not only to the doctrine of the Gospel, but even to the teaching of the Church of Rome, must needs be inspired? We add nothing to this, but that the writer of this book is allowed to have been a Greek, and, as such, may have had no opportunity of witnessing the public worship of the Jews.—See Acts xxi. 28, 29.

The text from Maccabees being the only passage in any writing anterior to the Christian era which is now commonly adduced in proof of the doctrine under examination, it may reasonably be inferred that the Old Testament writers knew nothing of Purgatory, notwithstanding the alleged “conclusive testimony of the belief of God’s people on this head 150 years before Christ.”

The alleged “inseparable connection between the practice of praying for the dead and the belief in an intermediate state of souls [in Purgatory],” we will presently consider. But before we dismiss the subject of the alleged Jewish custom, we may draw attention to the mode in which this subtle writer hurries to a conclusion, connecting one period with another.

Dr. Milner declares it quite clear, from 1 Cor. xv. 29, “Else what shall they do who are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptized for them?” and from this he deduces “that the Jews were in the habit of practising *some* religious rites for the relief of

the departed." But is it at all clear that the text refers in the remotest degree to the subject under discussion? Do Romanists now "baptize for the dead"? Dr. Milner should have shown how this text applies to the case of souls in Purgatory, or that "baptizing for the dead" meant "praying for deceased brethren."

Very far from being *clear*, this text seems to have given great occasion for disagreement. The great Popish controversialist and authority, Cardinal Bellarmine, in his treatise on Purgatory, falls foul of this text, but does not deal with it with such off-hand irreverence as this more modern aspirant. He shows<sup>a</sup> that the Fathers have given *five* different interpretations of the passage in question. Bellarmine, supported by one Father Ephrem, does not hesitate to reject the interpretation of Epiphanius, Theodoret, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Tertullian, and Ambrose. And then, again, he shows that we have the Romish Churchmen and Doctors, Petrus Cluniacensis, Dionysius, Hugo, Gagneius, and others, who differ in opinion from Blessed St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Anselm, Sedulius, and Cardinal Cajetan, and that the Blessed St. Thomas proves his respect for the Fathers by differing from *all* of them. And from what Bellarmine himself advances from the various interpretations adduced, we arrive at the conclusion that nothing can be gathered from this text in favour of Purgatory.<sup>b</sup> And yet this is the passage Dr. Milner has the hardihood to quote as most *clear* in favour of *Purgatory*!

But, again, we most emphatically deny Dr. Milner's conclusion, that "the Jews now pray for their deceased brethren" in the same sense, or to the same end or purport, modern Romanists do. We have carefully examined their books of public and private devotion, and we can trace no similarity whatever.

For the purpose of more precise information on this point, we placed before a Jewish Rabbi, well known in London both for his learning and his piety, two questions, and we have much pleasure in transcribing the replies.

Q. What is the nature or object of prayers for or concerning the departed in the Jewish Church?

A. "They have no further object than that the *sins of the departed may be forgiven*."<sup>c</sup> The prayers consist of supplica-

<sup>a</sup> Bell. de Purgatorio, lib. i. c. 5. p. 1800, tom. i. Ingolst. 1590.

<sup>b</sup> See Finch's "Sketches of the Romish Controversy," vol. ii. p. 461. London, 1850.

<sup>c</sup> The sins of the departed in Purgatory are supposed to be *already forgiven*. The prayers are for the relief of the sufferers of the pain or the punishment due for those sins already forgiven.



tions and appropriate psalms, expressing submission to the will of God, and our belief in eternal life. Psalm xlix. is one peculiarly applicable, and always read at the house of mourning."

Q. What do the Jews believe on the subject of an intermediate state after this life and before the resurrection?

A. "We know *nothing* of an *intermediate state*. We are taught throughout our Scriptures to believe that on the dissolution of the body, the spirit or soul will return to the Lord, who will then award reward or punishment according to its deserts; but in what manner, or when this will take place, *is not revealed* to us. We, therefore, presume not to form *any* conjectures, but rest satisfied that such will be the case, for which Isa. lxiv. is our warrant.—N.B. Charitable offerings are made in the synagogue the Sabbath after the decease of any member of the congregation. These are *not* to purchase prayers or blessings for the soul, but *wholly* and *solely* for the benefit of the poor, without any ulterior object whatever. The name of the deceased being associated with them is merely a customary compliment to his or her memory."

The words in italics are those which are scored under by the Jewish Rabbi.

II. (Luke xvi. 22.)—Dr. Milner pretends that the place to which Lazarus the beggar was carried by the angels, and which our Saviour called "Abraham's bosom," was neither heaven nor hell, but a *third place*, and, *therefore*, it is inferred, must be the Popish Purgatory! If we refer, however, to the note in the Rhemish Testament now in use, "Abraham's bosom" is represented as being "the *place of rest*, where the souls of the saints resided till Christ had opened heaven by his death."

The Jesuit Maldonate, referring to this text, says, "I do greatly suspect that by the bosom of Abraham the highest heavens is intended."<sup>a</sup> But we would ask any priest if he can conscientiously take money from any person, or would any person give money to a priest, for saying prayers or masses to redeem his or his friend's soul out of Abraham's bosom? Surely that is a state that needs none of his masses; neither would any other better than the "Serpent" pray for souls to be redeemed out of Abraham's bosom!<sup>b</sup>

It is admitted that the "*limbus patrum*," or the place where the saints who died before the coming of Christ,

<sup>a</sup> "Valde suspicor per sinum Abrahamæ summum cœlum designari."—Maldo. in Lucam, p. 298. Mogunt. 1596.

<sup>b</sup> See Gooch's "Plain Truth Vindicated," p. 215. Waterford, 1830.

went, is a different place from *Purgatory*. Yet this text is adduced by Dr. Butler, in his Catechism, approved by four Irish [Romish] Bishops,<sup>a</sup> in order to prove, or as referring to, a *limbo*; while Dr. Milner and Priest Keenan,<sup>b</sup> in his Catechism, also approved by a like authority, adduce the same text as referring to *Purgatory*.

III. (1 Peter iii. 18—20).—Dr. Milner follows the usual interpretation given to this text, and declares the *prison* here mentioned to be Purgatory, and it is intimated that the mere word is of itself sufficient to determine the question.

Now (writes Hall<sup>c</sup>) there are many considerations which lead to the conclusion, that the preaching of which the Apostle speaks did not take place between the death of Christ upon the cross and his resurrection from the tomb. In the first place, it is said that the souls to whom Christ, by his Spirit, preached, were such as had been “disobedient,” and that the time of their disobedience was before the flood, “while the ark was a-preparing,” so that the “long-suffering of God” must denote his patience and forbearance in calling them by his Spirit to repentance through the preaching of Noah (Gen. vi.). Moreover, since those to whom Christ preached were disobedient, it is clear that they were not confined in that receptacle for the souls of the patriarchs, which is known to Romanists, and to Romanists only, as the *limbus patrum*, for themselves acknowledge that Noah and the patriarchs were obedient preachers of righteousness. Neither could it be to souls in Purgatory that Christ went to preach, inasmuch as the souls there detained had already received full remission of all their sins, and were only suffering in order to satisfy<sup>d</sup> God’s demands previously to their entrance into heaven. To what purpose, then, would be his preaching, if no repentance or change could be effected by it? The text does not say he delivered them. If, indeed, these disobedient people died in mortal sin, they went to hell, whence there is no deliverance; and if in a state of grace, they went to *limbus*, where there was no torment requiring deliverance,<sup>e</sup> and where the preaching of Christ would have been no less superfluous than in Purgatory.

<sup>a</sup> See 32nd Edit. p. 13. Dublin.

<sup>b</sup> Catechism, 3rd Edit. p. 159.

<sup>c</sup> Doctrine of Purgatory and the Practice for the Praying for the Dead, Examined, pp. 56—62. London, 1843.

<sup>d</sup> Bellarm. de Christo, lib. iv. cap. 9; De Purg. lib. ii. cap. 6; Catechism. ad Parochos, p. 74, edit. Lugd. 1579.

<sup>e</sup> Bellarm. de Purg. lib. ii. cap. 6, 14. Catechism. ad Parochos, p. 73, ed. Lugd. 1579.

By attending to the scope of the Apostle's argument, as it is carried on uninterruptedly from the 18th verse of the third to the 7th of the following chapter,<sup>a</sup> it will be seen that he is drawing a parallel between the antediluvians in the days of Noah, and the Jews of his own time, and showing, from the cases of those respectively who obeyed or disobeyed the preaching of Christ by Noah, that a like distinction would be made between those Jews who received or rejected the offer of salvation which Jesus had died to purchase for them. In the former part of the third chapter, he had been exhorting his converts to the cultivation of a spirit of unity and brotherly love, and to the maintenance of a Christian life and conversation; entreating them not to be discouraged in the discharge of their duty by the fear of persecution, for that God was ever mindful of his servants; urging the example of Christ, who, being without sin, underwent the most cruel tortures and death; and calling upon them rather to glory that in any way they were deemed worthy to endure suffering for his sake. He proceeds to assure them that conformity to the will of Christ, in renouncing sin, in cultivating holy dispositions, in firmly adhering to the truth, was essentially necessary to their eternal peace; and this assurance he confirms by a reference to the punishment inflicted upon those who lived before the flood. To these rebellious spirits, who are reserved in prison unto the judgment of the great day, Christ had preached by his Spirit in Noah; but they being disobedient perished, while the eight souls who obeyed God's righteous laws were saved. And in like manner those who, under the Gospel dispensation, believe and obey the truth, will receive eternal salvation; but those who abuse the invitations and long-suffering of the Saviour, will be condemned for ever in the prison of hell.

God himself has declared that his Spirit did strive with man before the flood (Gen. vi. 3), which doubtless was the Spirit in Noah, by which he became a preacher of righteousness, and condemned the world of the ungodly (2 Peter xi. 5.; Heb. xi. 7). It is therefore reasonable to conclude, with two of the greatest divines<sup>b</sup> of our Church, that the Spirit by which Christ is said to have preached in Noah to the wicked spirits now in Hades, was that very Spirit by which he was

<sup>a</sup> It should be remembered that our Bibles were not originally divided into chapters and verses, but each book, gospel, or epistle was written as in one unbroken letter, so that the close connection in the argument, when the chain of argument was uninterrupted by the commencement of a new chapter, would then be more clearly seen than it is at present.

<sup>b</sup> Archbishop Tillotson and Bishop Pearson.

raised from the dead. None other could it be than the Spirit of his Divinity—his Divine Spirit, and not his human soul—inasmuch as he could not be raised from the grave by virtue of any other spirit; and consequently this preaching has no relation whatever to souls in a separate state. To say, as Bellarmine at first did, that Christ preached in his soul only,<sup>a</sup> is directly to contradict the statement of the Apostle, who manifestly teaches that his going forth to preach was in the Spirit of his Divinity, and before his appearance in the flesh. It cannot, therefore, be understood of his preaching the Gospel, between his death and resurrection, to departed spirits in Purgatory.

With respect to the patristic interpretation of the passage, Jerome observes that Christ preached to the spirits in prison, when the patience of God waited in the days of Noah, bringing the flood upon the wicked.<sup>b</sup>

It may be (suggests Augustine) that the whole of St. Peter's statement concerning the spirits in prison, who believed not in the days of Noah, has no reference whatever to hell, but rather to those times of which he has transferred the example to our own. For, before Christ came once in the flesh to die for us, he came after in the Spirit to those whom he would, giving them by visions such spiritual intimations as he wished; by which Spirit he was also quickened when, during his passion, he was mortified in the flesh.<sup>c</sup> With this interpretation of Augustine, Thomas Aquinas agrees.<sup>d</sup> The Venerable Bede also remarks: He who in our times, coming in the flesh, preached the way of life to the world, preached also before the flood, by his Spirit, to those who were then unbelieving and carnally-minded. For he was by his Holy Spirit in Noah and in other holy men who lived at that time, and by their good conversation preached to the wicked men of that age, that they might be converted to better things.<sup>e</sup>

Lastly Calmet observes, that Christ preached by his Spirit, with which he filled Noah, to the unbelievers of that time. He preached, therefore, to those unbelievers, not in person, or visibly, but by his Spirit communicated to Noah.<sup>f</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Bellarm. de Christi Anima, lib. iv. cap. 13—16. For his change of opinion see his *Recognitio Librorum*, tom. i. p. 1. ; Bp. Gibson's *Preservative*, vol. xi. p. 78, ed. Lond. 1848 ; Bp. Pearson on the Creed, p. 228, fol. edit. 1715 ; Fulke's *Annotations upon the Rhemish Testament*, 1 Pet. iii. 19.

<sup>b</sup> Hieron. lib. xv., *Comment. in Isai.* cap. 54, tom. iii. col. 395. Ed. Paris. 1704.

<sup>c</sup> Aug. *Epist.* 164, ad *Euodiu*m, cap. 6.

<sup>d</sup> *Summ. Theol.* pars iii. quæst. 52, art. xi. p. 145. Lugd. 1567.

<sup>e</sup> Bede in 1 Pet. iii. 19, tom. v. col. 980. Basil. 1563.

<sup>f</sup> Calmet, *Comment.* liv. xxiv. 159.

From the opinion of these writers, it appears that they interpret the passage precisely as we have done, referring the preaching to the Holy Spirit in Noah, and making not the slightest allusion to the preaching of Christ to suffering souls in the unknown Papal region, after his death upon the cross. His soul doubtless went where the souls of other men go when separated from the body, or the perfection of his human character would have been incomplete; but as to the notion that his soul was then employed in preaching to the dead, not only does there appear wanting a solid reason for his so doing, but also a deficiency of the same gift in those who seek for one.

One of the modern advocates of Popery observes, with reference to 1 Peter iii. 19: "It is necessary to state that the note upon this text in the Douay Bible does not pretend even to urge it as a proof of Purgatory; it merely says, it is a proof of a third place." But Messrs. Berington and Kirk, and likewise Mr. Husenbeth, certainly believe that the passage proves Purgatory; as did also Mr. Gother, Dr. Challoner, Dr. Milner, and the superiors by whose permission the "Abridgment of Christian Doctrine" is scattered among the Roman population. To the note then in the Douay version, and the comment of Dr. T. Butler, we will apply the words of Clemens Alexandrinus:<sup>a</sup> "Sometimes when they are convicted, they deny their principles; being ashamed openly to confess those doctrines of which in private they make their boast."

IV. (Luke xii. 58, 59; and see the parallel passage, Matt. v. 25, 26).—Dr. Milner makes a strange bungle of his texts; he actually makes the Abraham's bosom, where Lazarus was at rest, whither the souls of the just depart, to be the same place where the very last mite or farthing is exacted by the *adversary* who casts the delinquent into prison!

The text runs thus:—

Matt. v. 25, 26; Luke xii. 58, 59.—"Agree with thine adversary quickly, whilst thou art in the way with him, lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Verily I say unto thee, Thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing."

According to Dr. Milner, and in fact the general Papal interpretation, the *farthings* are "venial sins," the *payment*

<sup>a</sup> Ἐνίοτε δὲ καὶ τὰ ἑαυτῶν διελεγχόμενοι ἀρνοῦνται δόγματα ἀνίκως ὁμολογεῖν αἰδοῦμενοι ἢ κατ' ἰδίαν ἀυχοῦσι διδάσκοντες οὕτως. Serm. lib. viii. c. 16, tom. ii. p. 892. Oxon. 1715.

is "human satisfaction," and the *prison* "Purgatory."<sup>a</sup> To such lamentable straits are the supporters of this doctrine reduced, that almost every text of Scripture which contains the word "fire," or that speaks of, or even alludes to, any kind of "prison," is seized upon with the utmost avidity, for the sake of upholding their visionary views; like the servants of Benhadad, with ropes about their necks, who eagerly watched the lips of the king of Israel, to catch a word that might be favourable to their pitiable condition (1 Kings, xx. 31—33).


The plain meaning of the precept is readily determined by the context to apply solely to this life. It simply enjoins that if any difference exist between a man and his neighbour, it is the duty and interest of each to do all in his power to promote immediate reconciliation and peace, and not needlessly suffer an appeal to be made to the judge, where the loser may meet with painful, though just, severity. Now, what can this have to do with purgatory?

But take another view, and consider the spiritual application of the injunction. It may be paraphrased to the effect that man is a sinner; that God has a controversy with him; that the present life only is the accepted, the proper time for reconciliation; that he is invited to return to God through Christ; that if he neglect the invitation and die in his sins, he has only to expect the righteous sentence of his Judge, and that doom from which he will not escape "until he has paid the uttermost farthing." This is a method of expressing continuity or eternity, of which similar examples are not wanting in the Scriptures. Thus in Psalm cx. 1, "Sit thou on my right hand *until* I make thine enemies thy footstool" (see also Isa. xxii. 14); from which text it cannot be supposed that Christ will be removed from his high dignity as soon as all his enemies have been subdued unto him. Surely, then, nothing but a most perverted judgment can ever extract from the text under consideration anything like a proof of purgatorial durance.<sup>b</sup>

Suppose, for a moment, that a man could pay the uttermost farthing, in such case he would liquidate the debt, and his venial sins would stand in no need of that remission or

<sup>a</sup> Bellarmine, tom. ii., De Purg., lib. i. cap. vii. p. 397. Ed. Colonizæ, 1628. Milner, p. 413, letter xliii.

<sup>b</sup> If the word "until" (ἕως) is *always* to be understood as terminating at a certain period, how will the Romanist, who constantly insists upon the perpetual virginity of the mother of our Lord, get over the saying of St. Matthew (i. 25), "And he knew her not *till* she had brought forth her first-born Son"? According to the Papistical interpretation of the word in this place, the Virgin Mary had children after the birth of our Saviour, which is



forgiveness for which the Papist contends, when arguing upon Matt. xii. 32.<sup>a</sup> Where payment is made, pardon is not required. Besides, if no one who enters Purgatory is to come out "until he has paid the uttermost farthing," of what avail are prayers and masses for the sufferer while there? Yet we are told that by these means the dead are daily supposed to come forth discharged from all payments to be made by themselves. To be sure, it is not said by the Romish Church *where* the debt is to be paid: so that a mortuary fee, or the donation of some wealthy relative into the hands of a sordid priesthood, may probably solve the difficulty. But it is said in the text *by whom* it is to be paid;—"till *thou*," that is, the sinner himself, not his friends and relatives,—“till *thou* hast paid the uttermost farthing.” The debt, therefore, admits of no commutation; and, consequently, all the masses and prayers in Christendom are superfluous and nugatory.

In the interpretation which has been given above, it will be found that we are borne out by the authority of the Fathers, and even by the Romanists themselves.<sup>b</sup> Thus, St. Ambrose remarks, that the reconciliation must take place "while we are in this body."<sup>c</sup>

known to be universally denied by the Romish Church. The note, however, upon Matt. i. 25, in the Douay Bible, shall supply a comment upon the text under review, and also exhibit a specimen of Romish consistency of interpretation:—

"*Till she had brought forth her first-born Son.*—From these words Helvidius and other heretics most impiously inferred that the blessed Virgin Mary had other children besides Christ. But St. Jerome shows, by divers examples, that this expression of the Evangelist was a manner of speaking usual among the Hebrews, to denote by the word *until* only what is done, without any regard to the future. Thus it is said, *That Noah sent forth a raven, which went forth, and did not return TILL the waters were dried up on the earth*; (Gen. viii. 6, 7;) that is, did not return any more. Also God says, *I am TILL you grow old* (Isai. xlvii. 4). Who dares infer that God should then cease to be? Also in 1 Mac. v. 54, *They went up to Mount Sion with joy and gladness, and offered holocausts, because not one of them was slain TILL they had returned in peace*; that is, not one was slain, before or after they had returned. God saith to his divine Son, *Sit on my right hand TILL I make thy enemies thy footstool*. Shall he sit no longer, after his enemies are subdued? Yea, and for all eternity."—See Hieron. advers. Helvid. de Perpet. Virg. B.M., tom. iv. col. 133. Paris. 1706.

<sup>a</sup> "In Purgatory only is remission of sin, and not in hell, nor in heaven."—Abstract of the Douay Catechism, p. 95. London: Andrews, 1839.

"Assuredly we have a right to conclude that there is some remission of sin in Purgatory."—Dr. Wiseman, Lect. xi., p. 57. London, 1851.

<sup>b</sup> Dr. Milner, we have seen, refers us (but without any indication or reference to guide us in our examination) to Tertullian, Cyrian, Origen, Ambrose, Jerome, &c., as alleging that "the prison" and "Abraham's bosom," referred to by our Saviour, were one and the same place.

<sup>c</sup> "Redde promissum, dum in hoc corpore es, &c." Ambros. lib. ix., in Luc. cap. xix. 25, tom. i., col. 1503. Paris, 1686.

“He is never released from prison,” says Jerome, “who does not pay the last farthing before the end of life.”<sup>a</sup>

It is also observed, in a commentary wrongly attributed to this Father, that the sinner “will never come out” of the prison in question, “inasmuch as he is always paying the last farthing, while he is suffering the everlasting punishment of his earthly sins.”<sup>b</sup>

The comment of Chrysostom runs thus:—

“Agree with thine adversary whilst thou art in the way with him, that is, in this life; for, when the way is finished, there is no longer time for repentance. Beware lest the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge to the avenging powers, and thou be cast into prison; that is, into outer darkness, being condemned, not only for thy deeds, but even for thy thoughts. Let us implore the All-merciful God, that we be not delivered up to the devils.”<sup>c</sup>

Augustine has the following exhortation:—

“Induced, therefore, by these salutary reflections, beloved brethren, let us agree with our adversary while we are in the way with him; that is, let us conform to the Word of God while yet we are in this life; for afterwards, when we shall have departed hence, there will be neither room for contrition nor satisfaction. Nothing will then remain except the judge, the officer, and the prison.”<sup>d</sup>

Again, speaking of the parable of Dives and Lazarus, he observes:—

“With reference to his [Abraham’s] declaration, that the good cannot, even if they wished, pass over to those places in which the wicked are punished; what else does it mean, except that no merciful assistance can be rendered by the just, even if they wished to render it, to those who, by the immutability of

<sup>a</sup> “Nunquam solvitur a carcere, qui quadrantem verbi novissimum non solveret ante finem vitæ.”—Hieron. Comment. in Marc. iii., tom. v., p. 895. See also Pseudo-Jerom. Comment. in Matt. v. 25. Ibid. col. 856. Paris, 1706.

<sup>b</sup> “Semper non exiturum esse, quia semper solvat novissimum quadrantem, dum sempiternas pœnas terrenorum peccatorum luit.”—Pseudo-Jerom. Comment. in Lament. Jerem. lib. i., cap. i., tom. v., col. 807. Paris, 1706, Augustine has the very same words, de Sermone Dom. in Monte, ad locum. lib. i., cap. xi., sect. xxx., tom. iii., pt. ii., col. 177. E. Paris, 1689.

<sup>c</sup> Οὕτως εὐνοεῖ τῷ ἀντιδίκῳ σου, ἕως ὅτου εἶ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ μετ’ αὐτοῦ, τοῦτ’ ἐστὶν ἐν τῷδε τῷ βίῳ· εἶαν γὰρ ἡ ὁδὸς τελεσθῆ, οὐκ ἐστὶ σοὶ μετανοίας καιρὸς. Βλέπε μὴ σε παραδῶ ὁ ἀντιδικὸς τῷ κριτῇ, καὶ ὁ κριτὴς ταῖς τιμωρουσαῖς δυνάμεισι, καὶ βληθῆς εἰς τὴν φυλακὴν, εἰς τὸ σκοτὸς τὸ ἐξωτερὸν, ἕως οὐ ἀποδῶς τὸν ἐσχατὸν κοδραντήν, οὐ μόνον περὶ τῶν πρᾶξεων, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐνθυμησῶν κρινομένου. Ἡρακαλεσωμεν τὸν ἐλεημονα Θεοῦ, μὴ παραδοθῆναι τοῖς δαίμοσι.”—Chrysostom. Hom. lxxvii., de Pœnitentia, tom. i., p. 824, B. C. Ed. Paris, 1636. See also Hom. xvi. in Matt. v. 25, 26, tom. i., p. 204, seqq.

<sup>d</sup> “Hæc ergo, fratres charissimi, salubriter cogitantes, faciamus amicitias cum adversario nostro, dum sumus in viâ cum illo: hoc est, consentiamus verbo Dei, dum adhuc sumus in hac vita: quia postea, cum de hoc seculo transierimus, nulla compunctio vel satisfactio remanebit. Judex restat, minister et carcer.”—Augustin. Hom. v. in Tim. iv., tom. x., col. 420, D. Basil, 1569.



the divine sentence, are so fast in prison, that they cannot go out thence until they have paid the uttermost farthing?"<sup>a</sup>

That neither Hilary himself, nor those whose opinion he rejects, knew anything of the Romish interpretation, appears from the following exposition:—

“Since Christ permits us at no time to be influenced by an unforgiving spirit, he enjoins us to agree with the adversary quickly, during the whole course of our life. Of the opinion maintained by many on this head I have not thought it necessary to treat. They have referred the precept of being reconciled to an enemy by good-will, to the concord effected between body and spirit when at war with each other.”<sup>b</sup>

Theophylact writes thus:—

“Some suppose that the adversary is the devil, and the way, life; and that our Lord’s exhortation is to this effect:—While thou art in this life be reconciled to the devil, that he may not hereafter be able to convict thee of sin, and thereby of having what belongs to him. But rather understand, that Christ says this of adversaries in this world, exhorting us not to be litigious, and thereby be distracted from religious actions.”<sup>c</sup>

To the above may be added the interpretation of Fulgentius, a writer of the sixth century.

“A man makes the word of God his adversary, when he does those things which holy writ forbids. To such an one it is said in the psalm, *Thou hatest to be reformed and hast cast my words behind thee*. If any one in the way—that is, if any one in this life—agreeth not quickly with this divine word, he is thrown into the prison of eternal fire, and will have no rest beyond it. He is a friendly adversary who urges with a salutary opposition, in order that he may delivery us from the opposition of our deadly sins.”<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> “Quod autem dicit, ad ea loca in quibus torquentur impii, justos, etiam si velint, non posse transire, quid aliud significat, nisi post hanc vitam ita receptis in carcere, ut non inde exeant donec reddant novissimum quadrantem, per incommutabilitatem divinæ sententiæ, nullum auxilium misericordiæ posse præberi a justis, etiam si eam velint præbere?”—August. Quæstionum Evangeliorum, lib. ii., sect. iii., col. 265, tom. iii. Paris, 1689.

<sup>b</sup> “Quia nullum tempus vacuum affectu placibilitatis esse permittit, cito in omni vitæ nostræ via reconciliari nos adversario benignitate præcipit. Quid autem a pluribus in hoc capite sensum sit, non putavi esse tractandum. Hoc enim, quod adversario reconciliari benevolentia jubemur, ad corporis et spiritus adversantium sibi concordiam retulerunt.”—Hilar. Comment. in Matt. v. 25, 26, col. 626. Paris, 1693.

<sup>c</sup> Ἦντες νομιζουσιν αντιδικον λεγεσθαι τον διαβολον, οδον δε, τον βιον παρανειν δε τον Κυριον ούτως, έως οτου ει εν τη βιω τουτω, διαλυθητι προς τον διαβολον, ινα μη εχη υστερον ελεγχειν σε περι αμαρτιας, ως εχοντα τι των εκεινου. Συ δε νοει οτι και περι των ενταυθα αντιδικων λεγει τουτο, παραινων μη δικαζεσθαι, και απο των θειων εργων περι-σπασθαι.—Theophylact. Comment. in Matt. v., p. 30. E. Paris, 1635.

<sup>d</sup> “Adversarium sibi quippe facit homo Dei verbum, quamdiu illa facit quæ divinus sermo prohibet. Cui dicitur in Psalmo: ‘Tu vero odisti disciplinam, et projecisti sermones meos post te.’ Huic sermoni divino si quis in via, hoc est, si quis in hac vita, cito consentiens non fuerit, missus in carcerem ignis æterni, ultra requiem non habebit. Bonus enim adversarius iste, qui salubri adver-

Thus also Bede :—

“*Until thou payest* is put for infinity, just as in another place, ‘until I place thine enemies,’”<sup>a</sup> &c.

And Maldonatus :—

“The way is the time of this life, the prison is hell. He will never come out, because those who are in hell never pay.”<sup>b</sup>

Alexander also :—

“It does not mean that we shall come out afterwards, but that we shall never come out. Because, when the condemned suffer infinite punishments for any mortal sin, they never thoroughly discharge them. Those of whom this is said will never come out of the prison of hell.”<sup>c</sup>

It appears, then, that the interpretation given above fully accords with the primitive Fathers, and is entirely at variance with the sense which is forced upon the text by the Romanists of modern days.<sup>d</sup>

No foundation for the doctrine of Purgatory can therefore be discovered in this passage; for, (1.) To the person who is in danger of being thrust into prison, it is said, “*Thou shalt by no means come out till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.*” This is an expression which admits of no commutation of punishment. The sinner must pay the whole debt in his own person—the priests of Rome promise deliverance by means of masses and money; but, according to the text, the offender shall by no means come out except by paying the uttermost farthing. (2.) As the crime here spoken of is uncharitableness, and therefore a mortal sin, it cannot be said with any consistency, that Purgatory is the prison; because, according to their teaching, mortal sins send persons to hell. (3.) If the text refer to the other world, it may be expounded by that parable (Matt. xviii.) where the unkind servant is cast into prison till he shall pay all that is due from him; that is, he should lie there for ever; inasmuch as

sitate jugiter instat, ut a nobis adversitatem mortiferæ iniquitatis expellat.”—Fulgentii Rusensis Episcopi, de Remissione Peccatorum, lib. ii., cap. v., p. 387. Paris, 1684.

<sup>a</sup> “*Donec solves* pro infinito ponitur, sicut alibi, ‘*Donec ponam inimicos.*’”—Beda, lib. v., p. 12. Coloniae, 1612.

<sup>b</sup> “*Via est hujus vitæ tempus; carcer infernus. Nunquam exiturus, quia qui in inferno sunt nunquam persolvunt.*”—Maldonat. Comment. p. 121. Mentz, 1596.

<sup>c</sup> “*Non significat nos exituros postea, sed nunquam. Quia cum pœnas infinitas pro quolibet mortali peccato diluant damnati, nunquam eas persolvunt. Nunquam ex inferni carcere exituri sunt de quibus hoc dictum est.*”—Alexand. Histor., lib. ix., p. 385. Paris, 1683.

<sup>d</sup> The above extracts are taken from Hall’s “*Doctrine of Purgatory, and the Practice of Praying for the Dead, examined,*” pp. 36—42. London, 1843.

the debt was ten thousand talents, too much for a prince, much less for a servant who had nothing to pay, and therefore his master forgave him his debt. Our debt, as sinners, is not paid unto God by us, but forgiven; therefore, when it is not pardoned, it can never be paid. Uncharitable and malicious men, who will not forgive others, will be sent to hell; for he that hateth his brother is a murderer, and no murderer hath eternal life. Maldonatus, the Jesuit, and other Romanists as before shown, also acknowledge that "Purgatory cannot be proved from Matt. v. 25, as the prison there spoken of is hell, and not Purgatory."<sup>a</sup>

V. 1 Cor. iii. 13-15. We can scarcely permit a text to be advanced to prove a doctrine, when the very *meaning* of the text is a matter of considerable debate among these "Holy Fathers" of the Greek and Latin churches. With his accustomed boldness Dr. Milner adduces this text, as proof of the Popish Purgatory; "What other sense can that passage bear, than that which the Holy Fathers affix to it?" In a note are added the names of four "Holy Fathers," on whose testimony Dr. Milner relies—Origen, Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine.

Of all the texts in Scripture which seemed to puzzle the Fathers the most, Dr. Milner could not have selected one which more forcibly displays the absence of unity among them in their interpretation of the Scriptures. Cardinal Bellarmine in his book on Purgatory, in his famous controversial work, has brought together the various opinions on the subject.

The difficulties (he writes) of this passage are five in number:

"1. What is understood by the builders. 2. What is understood by gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble. 3. What is understood by the day of the Lord. 4. What is understood by fire, of which it is said that on the day of the Lord it shall prove every one's work. 5. What is understood by the fire, of which it is said, we shall be saved yet so as by fire. When these things are explained the passage will be clear. The first difficulty, therefore, is, who are the architects who build upon the foundation? *Augustine*, in his book on faith and works, chapter 16th and elsewhere, thinks that all Christians are here called by the apostle architects, and that all build upon the foundation of the faith either good or bad works. *Chrysostom*, *Theodoret*, *Theophylact*, and *Ecumenius*, appear to me to teach the same upon this passage. Many others teach that only the doctors and preachers of the Gospel are here called architects by the apostle. *Jerome* insinuates this in his second book against Jovinianus. The blessed *Anselm* and the blessed *Thomas* hold the same

---

<sup>a</sup> This last passage is extracted from Elliott's "Delineation of Roman Catholicism." Book ii., chap. xii., p. 251. London, 1851.

opinion on this passage, although they do not reject the former opinion. Many more modern think the same, as *Dionysius the Carthusian*, *Lyra*, *Cajetan*, and others.

“The other difficulty is rather more serious. For there are *six* opinions. Some by the name of foundation understand a true but an ill-digested faith; by the names of gold, silver, and precious stones, good works; by the names of wood, hay, and stubble, mortal sins. Thus *Chrysostom* upon this place, who is followed by *Theophylact*. The second opinion is, that Christ or the preaching of the faith is understood by the name of foundation; that by the names of gold, silver, and precious stones, are understood Catholic expositions; by the name of wood, hay, and stubble, are understood heretical doctrines, as the commentary of *Ambrose* and even *Jerome* seems to teach. The third opinion by the name of foundation understands living faith, and by the name of gold, silver, and precious stones, understands works of supererogation, &c. Thus the blessed *Augustine*, in his book on faith and works. The fourth opinion is that which is held by those, who explain by gold, silver, &c., to be meant good works, by hay and stubble, &c., venial sins. Thus the blessed *Gregory*, in the fourth book of his dialogues, chapter 39th, and others. The fifth is of those, who understand by gold, silver, &c., good hearers, and by stubble bad hearers, &c. Thus *Theodoret* and *Cœcumenius*. The sixth opinion, which we prefer to all, is, that by the name of foundation is to be understood Christ, as preached by the first preachers. By the name of gold, silver, &c., is to be understood the useful doctrine of the other preachers, who teach those who have now received the faith. But by the name of wood, hay, &c., is to be understood the doctrine, not heretical or bad, but the singular doctrine of those preachers who preach catholically to the Catholic people, but without that fruit and profit which God requires.

“The third difficulty regards the day of the Lord. Some understand by the name of day the present life, or the time of tribulation. Thus *Augustine*, in his book on faith and works, chap. 16, and *Gregory*, in his 4th book of dialogues, chap. 39. . . . But all the ancients seem to have understood by that day, the day of the last judgment, as *Theodoret*, *Theophylact*, *Anselm*, and others. The fourth difficulty is, what is the fire, which in the day of the Lord shall prove every one's work? Some understand the tribulations of this life, as *Augustine* and *Gregory* in the places noted, but these we have already rejected. Some understand eternal fire, but that cannot be, for that fire shall not try the building of gold and silver. . . . Some understand it to be the pains of purgatory, but that cannot be truly said. First, because the fire of purgatory does not prove the works of those who build gold and silver; but that fire of which we speak, shall prove every one's work what it is. Secondly, the apostle clearly makes a distinction between the works and the workmen, and says concerning that fire, that it shall burn the works but not the workers, for he says, if any one's work shall remain, and if any work shall burn; but the fire of purgatory, which is a true and real fire, cannot burn works, which are transitory actions, and have already passed. Lastly, it would follow, that all men, even the most holy, would pass through the fire of purgatory, and be saved by fire, for all are to pass through the fire of which we are speaking. But that all are to pass through the fire of purgatory and to be saved by fire is clearly false, for the apostle here openly says that only those who build wood and hay are to be saved as by fire; the church also has always been persuaded that holy martyrs and infants dying after baptism, are presently received into heaven without any passage through fire, as the Council of Florence teaches in its last session. *It remains, therefore, that we should say that the apostle here speaks of the fire of the severe and just judgment of God, which is not a purging or punishing fire but one that probes and examines.* Thus *Ambrose* explains it on Psalm 118, and also *Sedulius*.

“The fifth and last difficulty is, what is understood by the fire, when he says, but he shall be saved, yet so as by fire?

“Some understand the tribulations of this life, but this cannot properly be said, because then even he who built of gold and silver would be saved by fire. Wherefore *Augustine* and *Gregory*, who are the authors of this opinion, when

they were not satisfied with it, proposed another, of which we shall speak by and by. *Some understand it to be eternal fire, as Chrysostom and Theophylact.* But this we have already refuted. Others understand the fire to be the conflagration of the world. It is, therefore [?], the common opinion of theologians, that by the name of this fire is understood some purgatorial and temporal fire, to which after death they are adjudged, who are found in their trial to have built wood, hay, or stubble.<sup>a</sup>

In the above enumeration it will be observed, that three out of the four Fathers, *Jerome, Ambrose, and Augustine*, are adduced as holding opinions directly contrary to the modern Romish interpretation. The “*therefore*” of Bellarmine is consequently almost as conclusive as the assertion of Dr. Milner; but how they can come to a dogmatic decision, when the consent of the Fathers is anything but “*unanimous*” on the subject, is somewhat at variance with the requirements in that behalf contained in the Creed of Pope Pius IV., which imperatively demands the “*unanimous agreement of the Fathers*” on the particular text, before an interpretation can be affixed.

We will make a few remarks on the four Fathers cited :

I. *Origen* first paved the way for the introduction of a belief which led to the application of the text in question to a purgatorial fire. But he expressly admits that the passage “*was very difficult of interpretation.*”<sup>b</sup> This same writer in his last, best, and crowning work, that against Celsus, most distinctly considers the text as referring to God’s providential punishment of sin in *this* world : arguing, with some acuteness, that we cannot legitimately deem the fire mentioned by the Apostle to be a *literal* or *material* fire, unless, what is a plain absurdity, we also deem the objects consumed by it to be *literal* or *material* wood, and hay, and stubble.<sup>c</sup>

In one of his earlier works, usually cited,<sup>d</sup> Origen is wishing

<sup>a</sup> Bell. De Purg., tom. ii. cap. iv. lib. i. p. 332. Prag. 1721.

<sup>b</sup> ‘Ο τόπος ἦν δυσδήγητος σφόδρα.—Orig. in Jerem. Hom. xvi. Oper. vol. i. p. 155, ed. Huet. Rothomag. 1668; and edit. Paris, 1733, tom. iii. p. 232.

<sup>c</sup> Καταβαίνει γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου μεγέθους καὶ ὕψους, ὅτε τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ μάλιστα τῶν φαύλων οἰκονομεῖ. Ἐπὰν οὖν λέγηται πῦρ εἶναι καταναλίσκον, ζητοῦμεν ἴνα πρέπει ὑπὸ Θεοῦ καταναλίσκεσθαι; Καὶ φάμεν, ὅτι τὴν κακίαν, καὶ τὰ ὑπ’ αὐτῆς πραττόμενα, καὶ τροπικῶς λεγόμενα ξύλα εἶναι καὶ χόρτον καὶ καλάμην, καταναλίσκει ὁ Θεὸς ὡς πῦρ. Ἐποικοδομεῖν γοῦν ὁ φαῦλος λέγεται τῷ προῦποβλημένῳ λογικῷ θεμελίῳ ξύλα καὶ χόρτον καὶ καλάμην. Εἰ μὲν οὖν ἔχει δεῖξαι ἄλλως νενοῆσθαι ταῦτα τῷ ἀναγράψαντι, καὶ σωματικῶς δύνатаί τις παραστήσαι ἐποικοδομοῦντα τὸν φαῦλον ξύλα ἢ χόρτον ἢ καλάμην δῆλον, ὅτι καὶ τὸ πῦρ ὕλικον καὶ αἰσθητὸν νοηθήσεται.—Orig. cont. Cels. lib. iv. p. 168. Ed. Cantab. 1677.

<sup>d</sup> See Dr. Wiseman’s Lectures, lec. xi. vol. ii. p. 60. London, 1836. The passage relied on is quoted as from “Homil. xvi. al. xii. in Jerom., tom. pp. 231, 232. Benedictine Edit.”

to establish a new theory of his own, founded on this very text, namely, that the punishment of Hell was only *temporary*, and that *all*, the devil himself included, would be finally restored to eternal happiness. He also taught, that all, except Christ, would have to undergo this fiery ordeal. This, among other speculations, was condemned as *impious* and *heretical* by the fifth Ecumenical council of the church, namely, that of Constantinople, A.D. 553.<sup>a</sup>

But this is not all: Augustine himself repudiated the doctrine here enunciated by Origen: "What Catholic Christian (he said) learned or unlearned, does not vehemently abhor that Purgatory of sins which Origen speaks of—namely, the doctrine that those who have finished this life in scandalous crimes, and sacrileges, and impieties, the greatest possible—nay, that the devil himself and his angels shall, after a very long time indeed, be purged and liberated, and restored to the kingdom of God and to light. . . . Concerning which vain impiety I have disputed diligently in the books on the City of God, against the philosophers from whom Origen learned those notions."<sup>b</sup> And, before Augustine, Epiphanius did not hesitate to call Origen "the Father of Arius," and the root of other heresies, adding, "And this, too, which he maintains, I know not whether to grieve or laugh at; for this excellent teacher, Origen, dares to teach that the devil will again be what he was once, and will return to the same dignity, and will ascend the kingdom of heaven. O shocking! Who can be so senseless and so foolish as to believe that John the Baptist, and Peter, and John the Apostle, and Isaiah, and Jeremiah, and the rest of the prophets shall be co-heirs with the devil in the kingdom of God."<sup>c</sup>

When we consider that Dr. Milner quotes Origen and Augustine, as holding one and the same doctrine relating to Purgatory, and *that* "the same as the present Church of Rome now holds," we can scarcely sufficiently admire the boldness of the man in hazarding such an assertion. But to support so desperate a cause as the doctor has undertaken to advocate, we cannot expect that he would be very scrupulous as to the means employed for attaining his end.

*Ambrose*, Bishop of Milan about A.D. 370, is also referred

<sup>a</sup> Ἡ πέμπτη σύνοδος γέγονεν ἐπὶ Ἰουστινιανοῦ βασιλέως τοῦ πρώτου, ἑκατὸν ἐξήκοντα πέντε ἁγίων πατέρων συνελθόντων ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει· ἦτις ἐπεκύρωσε τὰ δογματισθέντα ὑπὸ τῆς ἁγίας τετάρτης συνόδου, καὶ τοὺς κατ' αὐτῆς βλασφημοῦντας ἀνεθεμάτισεν, ἤγουν Ὀριγένην καὶ τὰ αὐτοῦ ἀσεβῆ δόγματα καὶ συγγράμματα.—Bals. apud Beveridg. Synod. vol. i. p. 150. Oxon. 1672.

<sup>b</sup> Aug. Lib. de Hæres. c. xliii. tom. viii. p. 10. Edit. Benedict. Paris.

<sup>c</sup> Epiph. Oper. vol. ii. p. 314. Paris, 1622.

to, as giving the Popish interpretation to the same text; but Bellarmine, as we have seen, is constrained to admit, under the "third difficulty" arising on the interpretation of this text, that Ambrose held heretical opinions on this subject. "It remains, therefore," he says, "that we should say that the Apostle is here speaking of the fire of the severe and just judgment of God, *which is not a purging or punishing fire*, but one that probes and examines. Thus AMBROSE explains it in Psalm cxviii."<sup>a</sup>

*Jerome.* Dr. Milner refers us to the second book against Jovinian [cap. 13]; whereas Jerome, in the very same work, expressly refers to this *fire* as being the *temptations in this life* whereby a man is tried, and brought to the knowledge of his own weakness and sinfulness, as a preparation for the more perfect and excellent work of the Spirit by which the trials and suffering of life will be assisted and lightened.<sup>b</sup>

*Augustine.* It is quite impossible to conceive the boldness of Dr. Milner in adding *this illustrious Father* to his list of witnesses. We have seen that Bellarmine records his interpretation of the text, as referring to the "*tribulations in this life*;" and in this opinion he joins Pope Gregory I.<sup>c</sup>

But Augustine has written at considerable length on the text from 1 Cor. iii. The passage is so remarkable that we cannot do better than transcribe it into our pages. We quote from the work, "Enchiridion de Fide," &c., attributed to Augustine:—

"For the fire, of which the Apostle speaks, must be understood to be such a fire as both could pass through, that is to say, as well he who builds upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, as he who builds upon it wood, hay, stubble. For when he had said this, he added, 'And the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is; if any man's work abide, which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.' The fire, therefore, shall prove the work not of one of them only, but of both of them. The trial of tribulation is a sort of fire, respecting which it is clearly written in another passage, 'The furnace proves the potter's vessel, and the trial of tribulation just men.' That fire effects in this life what the Apostle affirms, if it occurs to two believers, to the one, namely, who thinks of the things of God, how he may please God, that is to say, who builds upon Christ the foundation, gold, silver, precious stones; and to the other, who thinks of worldly things, how he may please his wife, that is to say, who builds upon the same foundation, wood, hay, stubble. For the work of the former is not

<sup>a</sup> "Superest igitur, ut dicamus hic apostolum loqui de igne severi et justii judicii Dei, qui non est ignis purgans vel affligens, sed probans et examinans. Ita exponit Ambros. in Psalmo cxviii."—De Purg. lib. i. cap. v. p. 332, edit. Prag. 1721.

<sup>b</sup> See Willet's "Synopsis Papismi," vol. iv. p. 67, edit. London, 1852.

<sup>c</sup> "Aliqui intelligunt tribulationes hujus vitæ.—Quocirca B. Augustinus et Gregorius, qui sunt auctores."—Bell. de Purg. lib. i. cap. v. p. 332. Prag. 1721.

burned, because he did not love those things by whose loss he might be tormented; but the work of the latter is burnt, because these things which are loved in their possession, are not destroyed without grief. But forasmuch as when the alternative was presented to him, he preferred being without them to being without Christ, and did not, through the fear of losing them, desert Christ, although he grieved for their loss; *he is saved, indeed, yet so as by fire: because the grief for the things which he loved consumes him*; but it does not overthrow him, he being supported by the stability and incorruptibility of the foundation. *But that some such thing may take place after this life is not incredible, and whether it is so may be inquired into; and it may either be discovered or lie concealed, namely, that some believers are saved through a purgatorial fire, sooner or later, in proportion as they have more or less loved perishable goods, not those persons, however, of whom it is said, 'They shall not possess the kingdom of God,' unless, indeed, their crimes are remitted to them in consequence of their reasonable repentance."*<sup>a</sup>

Such, then, is St. Augustine's interpretation of the text. We ask any reasonable man whether from the above extract he can gather the acknowledgment, even in the fifth century, of the existence of the Romish doctrine of Purgatory; and, indeed, were Augustine's definition to agree point by point with the modern interpretation, Roman Catholics would be none the nearer in establishing their position, for Augustine expresses himself in a doubting manner. He there proposes a doctrine as not being *incredible*, or whether it be so might *be inquired into*. But this is undeniable evidence, that in Augustine's time Purgatory was not a matter of *faith*, and what is there stated is only a matter of opinion.

We have limited our quotations from "the Holy Fathers"

<sup>a</sup> "Ignis enim, de quo eo loco est locutus Apostolus, talis debet esse intelligi, ut ambo per eum transeant, id est, et qui ædificat super hoc fundamentum aurum, argentum, lapides pretiosos; et qui ædificat ligna, fœnum, et stipulam. Cùm enim hoc dixisset, adjunxit, *Uniuscujusque opus quale sit, ignis probabit. Si cujus opus permanserit, quod superædificavit, mercedem accipiet. Si cujus opus autem exuratum fuerit, damnum patietur: ipse autem salvus erit, sic tamen quasi per ignem.* Non ergo unius eorum, sed utriusque opus ignis probabit. Et quidam ignis tentatio tribulationis, de quo apertè alio loco scriptum est, Vasa figuli probat fornax, et homines justos tentatio tribulationis. Iste ignis in hac interim vita facit quod Apostolus dixit, si accidat duobus fidelibus, uni scilicet cogitanti, quæ Dei sunt, quomodo placeat Deo, hoc est, ædificanti super Christum fundamentum aurum, argentum, lapides pretiosos; alteri autem cogitanti ea quæ sunt mundi, quomodo placeat uxori, id est, ædificanti super idem fundamentum ligna, fœnum, stipulam. Illius enim opus non exurit, quia non ea dilexit quorum amissione crucietur; exurit autem hujus, quoniam sine dolore non pereunt, quæ cum amore possessa sunt. Sed quoniam alterutra conditione proposita, eis potiùs carere mallet quàm Christo, nec timore amittendi talia deserit Christum, quamvis doleat cùm amittit; *salvus est, quidem, sic tamen, quasi per ignem*; quia urit eum rerum dolor, quas dilexerat, amissarum; sed non subvertit neque consumit fundamenti stabilitate atque incorruptione munitum. Tale aliquid etiam post hanc vitam fieri *incredibile* non est, et utrùm ita sit quæri potest; et aut inveniri, aut latere, nonnullos fideles per ignem quendam purgatorium, quanti magis minusve bona dilectantia dilexerunt, tantò tardius citiusque salvari; non tamen tales de quibus dictum est, quòd *regnum Dei non possidebunt, nisi convenienter penitentibus eadem crimina remittantur.*"—Aug. Enchiridion de Fide, Spe, et Caritate, tom. vi. p. 222. Bened. edit. Paris, and Colon. Agripp. 1616, tom. iv. p. 250.



to the four cited by Dr. Milner; our readers will, we think, agree with us that they do not justify his confident appeal.

VI. Matt. xii. 32.—This is the last of the series of texts ordinarily cited “as a farther proof of Purgatory.” “The denunciations of Christ concerning *blasphemy against the Holy Ghost*, namely, that this sin *shall not be forgiven, either in this world or in the world to come* (we are informed), clearly imply that *some sins* are forgiven in the world to come.” A wonderful discovery indeed! Dr. Milner surely was aware that “forgiveness of sins” is a distinct article in the Christian’s creed, admitted by all Protestants. We sincerely believe that God, in His great mercy, does pardon the truly contrite and penitent believer; that if we seek that forgiveness, humbly bewailing our past sins, and bring forth fruits meet for repentance, God will “cast all our sins into the depths of the sea,” not imputing our trespasses unto us. We know that through Christ is preached unto us the forgiveness of sins;<sup>a</sup> that repentance and remission of sins are preached in His name;<sup>b</sup> “In whom we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins.”<sup>c</sup> We know also that Christ our Lord “is the propitiation for our sins;”<sup>d</sup> and that “His blood cleanseth from all sins.” There is no room for a *purgatory* other than this. The question between us and the Church of Rome is, whether that person whose sins are already forgiven, and who is thus reconciled to God, and whose name must therefore be “written in the Lamb’s Book of Life,” must nevertheless endure the pains and torments of Purgatory, a satisfaction to the divine justice for the temporal punishment of those sins which are forgiven. Impossible! God, we read, is faithful and just to *forgive* us our sins. Punishment is not a forgiveness; a purgation in the “blood of the Lamb” is not a bodily torture. For He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows, and He will give “us rest;” for there is a *rest*, and there is no condemnation to them that die in the Lord Jesus. We have a glorious hope before us: “We press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus;” a joy which no Roman Catholic can experience, for he must anticipate, not a joyful resurrection, but torments in Purgatory.

Does Dr. Milner pretend to assert that “the world to come” in this text means *Purgatory*? This, however, cannot be the meaning of the words in St. Matthew’s Gospel, “Who-

<sup>a</sup> Acts xiii. 38.

<sup>c</sup> Eph. i. 7.

<sup>b</sup> Luke xxiv. 47.

<sup>d</sup> 1 John ii. 2.

soever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him *neither in this world, nor the world to come.*"<sup>a</sup> The words are explained in the parallel text in Mark iii. 29, where we read, "He that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, hath *never* forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation." And St. Luke xii. 10, says, "Unto him that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost it *shall not* be forgiven him."

Dr. Milner here again refers us to the "ancient Fathers," Augustine and Pope Gregory. We will take first the Fathers antecedent to these two; their silence on the point will prove to demonstration that they were entirely ignorant of the Romish interpretation of the passage.<sup>b</sup>

Thus Hilary observes: "He [Christ] condemns the perverseness of the Pharisees with marked severity, promising the pardon of all sins, and withholding indulgence from blasphemy against the Spirit. For whereas other words and deeds are freely pardoned, the denial of God in Christ is shut out from mercy."<sup>c</sup>

Ambrose remarks to the same effect, that "whosoever shall not receive remission of sins in this world, will not be in heaven."<sup>d</sup>

Jerome merely adverts to the utter impossibility of forgiveness: "Whosoever shall ascribe the works of the Saviour to Beelzebub the Prince of the devils, and shall say that the Son of God hath an unclean spirit, his blasphemy shall at no time be forgiven."<sup>e</sup>

<sup>a</sup> "By the world to come, is understood the world succeeding this, and so it answereth to the world present, as Mark x. 30, 'They shall at this present receive a hundredfold, and in the world to come life everlasting.' Wherefore, Purgatory being imagined to be now present, it cannot be taken to belong to the world to come (Ephes. i. 12); so also must we understand that place, that Christ is exalted above every name, 'that is named in the world, or the world to come;' that is, in the world which shall be after this, I think that they will not by the world to come in this place infer Purgatory; nor yet, where the Apostle saith, 'The powers of the world to come' (Heb. vi. 5)."—Willet's "Synopsis Papismi." Revised edit. London, 1852, vol. iv. p. 62.

<sup>b</sup> It is a legal maxim, that "De non apparentibus, et non existentibus, eadem est ratio."

<sup>c</sup> "Pharisæorum perversitatem severissima definitione condemnat, peccatorum omnium veniam promittens, et blasphemiam Spiritus indulgentiam abnegans. Nam cum cætera dicta gestaque liberali venia relaxentur, caret misericordia, si Deus negetur in Christo."—Hilar. Pictav. Comment. in Matt. xii. 31, col. 671. Paris, 1693.

<sup>d</sup> "Qui hic non acceperit remissionem peccatorum, illic non erit."—Ambros. de Bono Mortis, cap. ii. sec. v. tom. i. col. 391, D. Paris, 1686.

<sup>e</sup> "Quicumque opera Salvatoris Beelzebub principi dæmoniorum deputarit, et dixerit Filium Dei habere spiritum immundum, huic nullo tempore blasphemiam remittetur."—Jerom. Comment. in Matt. xii. 32, lib. ii. tom. iv. p. i. col. 49, 50. Paris, 1706.

To conclude with the interpretation of Chrysostom: "Your blasphemy will be unpardonable, and ye will suffer punishment, both here and hereafter, Many, indeed are punished here only; as, for instance, the incestuous person, and those who received the sacrament unworthily among the Corinthians; but you will suffer both in this world and in the next."<sup>a</sup>

Augustine, one of Dr. Milner's authorities, himself says this sin "has no forgiveness for ever." "This sense," he adds, "is merely expressed in other words, and in another form of speech." Again, he observes that the sin in question "cannot be remitted at all," without the remotest allusion to any other exposition.<sup>b</sup> It is true that he seems, in one place,<sup>c</sup> to sanction the Romish view of this text; but with so little confidence in his interpretation, that elsewhere he remarks, "Concerning this point, since it is a most intricate question, no hasty opinion must be formed."<sup>d</sup> He also writes: "Indeed, no sins are remitted in the kingdom [of heaven]. But if none are to be remitted in that last judgment, I suppose that the Lord would not have said of a certain sin, that it shall not be forgiven, neither in this world, nor in the world to come."<sup>e</sup> It is clear, however, that he cannot here be thinking of Purgatory, since he is speaking expressly of the last judgment.

The fact is, that the great authority for this *non sequitur* interpretation is Pope Gregory himself, the founder of the doctrine, who says, "As every one departs out of this world, such is he presented at the judgment; nevertheless we must believe in a purgatorial fire for certain lighter failings before the judgment: for the Gospel says, *Whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, &c.* From this declaration it is given us to understand, that some sins may be pardoned in this life, others in the next. For, that which is denied

<sup>a</sup> Δια δη τουτο ασυγνωστος υμιν εσται η βλασφημια, και ενταυθα και εκει δωσετε δικην. Πολλοι (μεν) γαρ ενταυθα εκολασθησαν μονον, ως ο πεπορνευκως, ως οι αναξιως μετασχοντες μυστηριων παρα Κορινθιοις υμεις δε, και ενταυθα και εκει.—Chrysost. Hom. xli. in Matt. xii. 32, tom. i. p. 475. Paris, 1636.

<sup>b</sup> "Cum remitti nobis hoc peccatum omnino non possit."—Augustin. ad Bonifacium Epist. 185, cap. xi. sect. xlvi. tom. ii. col. 662, C. Paris, 1638.

<sup>c</sup> De Civit. lib. xxi. c. 24, referred to by Bellarm. de Purg. lib. i. cap. iv. tom. ii. p. 392, H. Colonizæ, 1628.

<sup>d</sup> "De quare, quoniam profundissima quæstio est, non est modo præcipitanda sententia."—August. contr. Julian. Pelag. lib. vi. cap. v. tom. vii. col. 1120, A. Basil, 1569.

<sup>e</sup> "Et peccata quidem nulla remittuntur in regno. Sed si nulla remitterentur in judicio illo novissimo, puto quod Dominus non dixisset de quodam peccato, non remittetur, neque in hoc sæculo, neque in futuro."—August. adv. Julian. Pelag. lib. vi. cap. v. tom. vii. col. 1119, D. Basil, 1569.

respecting one sin, is, by a manifest consequence, granted respecting others."<sup>a</sup>

Such is the Pope's reasoning, which it is only necessary to carry out to its results in order to prove its fallacy. For example: the competency of Pope Gregory XVI. to carry a conclave of Cardinals upon his shoulders during an Italian carnival "is denied;" ergo, it is "by manifest consequence granted" that Pope Gregory XVII. will hereafter be able to accomplish the onerous task. Or, to be serious, the crime of murder can be approved neither in this world, nor in the world to come; therefore, upon the principles of Papal interpretation, some other crimes may be approved in heaven. Indeed so inconclusive is the reasoning upon this text to prove forgiveness of sin in the world to come, that although Bellarmine adduces it to establish the existence of a Purgatory, yet, in summing up, he candidly confesses that the inference does not follow from the premises, and therefore that any reasoning upon the passage for this purpose is altogether illogical.<sup>b</sup>

Having examined all the Scriptural texts advanced by Dr. Milner, we can sufficiently appreciate the boldness of his assertion that "the Apostles did teach their converts the doctrine of Purgatory." The second part of the subject—the "Patristic evidence," or the "evidence from Tradition,"—we will now consider more fully, as also the attempt to bolster up this modern Popish figment, by tacking to it the early, though not Apostolic or Scriptural, custom of praying for the dead.

---

SECT. III.—Origin and Progress of the Belief in Purgatory, founded on the custom of Praying for the Dead.

In order to enlist the early Christian writers in favour of the *modern* Popish doctrine of purgatory, Dr. Milner, like all other Romish controversialists, is obliged to tack this doctrine on to that of the early custom of "praying for the dead." He

<sup>a</sup> "Ex quibus nimirum sententiis constat, quia qualis hinc quisque egreditur talis in judicio præsentatur. Sed tamen de quibusdam levibus culpis esse ante iudicium purgatorius ignis credendus est, pro eo quod Veritas dicit, quia si quis in Sancto Spiritu blasphemiam dixerit, neque in hoc sæculo remittetur ei, neque in futuro. In qua sententia datur intelligi, quasdam culpas in hoc sæculo, quasdam vero in futuro posse laxari. Quod enim de uno negatur, consequens intellectus patet, quia de quibusdam conceditur."—Greg. Magn. Dial. lib. iv. cap. xxxix. tom. ii. col. 441. Paris, 1705.

<sup>b</sup> "Non sequi secundum regulas dialecticorum."—De Purg. lib. i. cap. iv. tom. ii. p. 393, B. Colonizæ, 1628.

Hall's "Doctrine of Purgatory, and Practice of praying for the Dead, examined," pp. 43—49.

treats of the two under one head. (Letter xliii.) We have seen (*supra* p. 25) that immediately after the text from 2 Maccabees, Dr. Milner adds:—

“I need not point out the inseparable connection there is between the practice of praying for the dead, and the belief of an intermediate state of souls, since it is evidently needless to pray for the Saints in heaven, and useless to pray for the reprobate in hell” (p. 412).

And from this assertion he jumps to the conclusion, that where prayers were offered for the departed, they were offered for those supposed to be “in a middle state,” and this middle state he at once declares to be *the* modern Popish Purgatory.

In order, however, fully to appreciate the value of Dr. Milner’s references, we must enter into a short history of the origin and gradual development of the practice of praying for the dead.<sup>a</sup>

There can be no doubt but that the Purgatory of the Romish Church is founded on Paganism. The early Christian custom of offering oblations for the dead, on the anniversary day of the death of saints and martyrs, gave occasion for its gradual reception and revival among some Christians; for from hence proceeded the custom of reciting prayers for the dead, which gave rise to the speculation of an intermediate place between heaven and hell where the departed spirits were supposed to rest, waiting for the day of judgment.

It is well known that when our Lord ascended to His throne above, the Apostles and their immediate successors suffered cruel persecutions. The histories of the early Christian Church record the severe persecutions suffered by the converts from Judaism and Paganism, which were carried on through all the Roman provinces. The martyrs died in support of their faith, and sealed it with their blood. Torments of the most exquisite nature were invented, and none were considered too horrible to be inflicted on those soldiers of Christ.<sup>b</sup> The vengeance of their persecutors was not satisfied with the death of the victims, but their malice extended to their dead bodies, and even to their very bones; for they used to burn the latter, and scatter the ashes to the winds. This was done in the vain hope of depriving Christians of a *future resurrection*; the mainspring of their constancy, and solace in their sufferings.<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> The following is adopted from the editor’s “Pious Frauds, exemplified in Dr. Wiseman’s Lectures,” London, 1853, p. 53 et seq. :—In every instance where a reference to the Fathers is made, the original text itself is added. We omit the original text for the sake of brevity.

<sup>b</sup> Iren. lib. iii. c. 4.

<sup>c</sup> Epist. Martyrum Gallie, apud Euseb. lib. v.

The early Greeks, we are told, celebrated the memory of their heroes, and those illustrious persons who died in defence of their country, on the anniversaries of their deaths; and these celebrations and solemnities were performed about their tombs. This was done both in regard and honour of the deceased, and also to animate and encourage each other to follow the example of the illustrious dead.

Thus the early Christians, lately converted, bringing with them their customs and prejudices, imitated, in this respect, their Pagan ancestors, and in like manner celebrated the anniversaries of the death of those who had suffered for the Gospel. They also hoped, thereby, to confirm others in the faith, and excite them to patience and fortitude, and strengthen them to meet their fate with resolution and resignation. The great object of the survivors was, in the first place, to give their martyrs burial; and where they could not recover the *entire* body, to collect such fragments as could be found, which, as relics of the departed, they honourably buried; without, however, pompous ceremony—without requiems or dirges, such as mark the present Church of Rome. There is in the Epistle from the Church of Smyrna to the neighbouring churches,<sup>a</sup> announcing the martyrdom of Polycarp, an interesting passage, which may be appropriately quoted here. The epistle describes the circumstances attending his martyrdom. He was burnt to death; after this some Christians collected his remains, and the epistle proceeds:—

“But the envious adversary of the just observed the honour put upon the greatness of his testimony and his blameless life from the first, and knowing that he was now crowned with immortality and the prize of undoubted victory, resisted, though many of us desired to take his body, and have fellowship with his holy flesh. Some then suggested to Nicetes, the father of Herod, and brother of Alce, to entreat the governor not to give up his body. ‘Lest,’ said he, ‘leaving the Crucified One, they should begin to worship this man.’ And this they said at the suggestion and importunity of the Jews, who also watched us when we would take the body from the fire. This they did, not knowing that we can never either leave Christ, who suffered for the salvation of all who will be saved in all the world, nor worship any other. For Him, being the Son of God, we worship; but the martyrs, as disciples and imitators of our Lord, we worthily love, because of their pre-eminent goodwill towards their own King and Teacher, with whom may we become partakers and fellow-disciples. The centurion, seeing the determination of the Jews, placed him in the midst, and burnt him, as their manner is. And thus we, collecting his bones, more valuable than precious stones, and more esteemed than gold, deposited them where it was meet. There, as we are able, collecting ourselves together in rejoicing and gladness, the Lord will grant to us, to observe the birthday of his martyrdom, for the remembrance of those who have before undergone the conflict, and to exercise and prepare those who are to follow.”

The celebration of an *anniversary commemoration* of the trials and constancy of martyrs, on the day on which they *suffered death*, was then introduced. The anniversary days

<sup>a</sup> Euseb. Hist. iv. cap. xv. p. 163. Paris, 1628.

of the martyrs' death were called the *days of their nativity*, as upon that day they were *born* to a new life, or, as it is sometimes called, "*their translation*." These anniversary commemorations were still continued to be held at the places of burial; and therefore the assemblies were ordinarily held at the cemeteries, and subsequently in churches; they became more frequent as the long list of martyrs daily increased; and we gather from the early writers how these meetings were conducted. Public or congregational prayer was celebrated, with an exposition of the Scriptures. The names of those who had that day suffered for the truth were rehearsed. They dwelt on the several trials and sufferings sustained by the departed; their courage was extolled, their tombs decorated with trophies or garlands of flowers, as emblems of victory; then *thanksgivings were offered to God for giving their martyrs victory over sin and death*; Chrysostom describes their enthusiasm as rising almost to madness.<sup>a</sup> The ceremony was concluded by the celebration of the Eucharist, and *alms-giving to the poor*.

These alms were afterwards called *oblations*. The gifts were mere *doles*, not in money, but in corn, grain, grapes, bread, wine, &c.; and not, as in modern days, offered for the souls of the deceased supposed to be in Purgatory.<sup>b</sup>

There can be no question, then, as to the intention of these assemblies and solemnities. It was, in the first place, to show to the people that such as were dead in Christ were still alive, both in God and in the memory of the Church; and, in the next place, to animate and encourage the survivors, who were still suffering persecutions, to the like trials, sufferings, and constancy. They worshipped Christ, and served no other; Him they adored as the Son of God, but cherished the martyrs as the disciples and followers of the Lord. *They solemnised the day of their nativity, which was that of their death*; in remembrance of such as had conflicted for the truth, and in order to incite others to follow the example thus set before them. They hoped to be made capable of the like graces, and at last copartners and fellow-sharers *in the same glory*.<sup>c</sup>

There is a very remarkable passage in one of the books attributed to Origen:—

"Let us observe, O friends, what a change has taken place in men. For the ancients (Greeks) celebrated the natal day, loving one life, and not hoping another after this. But now we do not celebrate the *natal day*, because it is

<sup>a</sup> Chrys. Oper. tom. ii. p. 339. Paris, 1718.

<sup>b</sup> See Scultet. Med. Theol. Patrum, Amb. 1603, p. 307, on the Canons of the Councils of Carthage and Vaison.

<sup>c</sup> See *ante* Epist. Smyrn. pp. 34, 35.

a beginning of griefs and temptations ; but we celebrate *the day of death*, inasmuch as it is a laying aside of all griefs, and an escape from all temptations. We celebrate the day of death, because those die not who seem to die. Wherefore, we both observe the memorials of the saints, and devoutly keep the remembrance of our parents and friends which die in the faith ; *as well rejoicing for their refreshing* [which cannot be in Purgatory] as requesting also for ourselves a goodly communion in the faith. Thus, therefore, we do not celebrate the day of birth ; because they which *die* shall live for ever, and we celebrate it, calling together the religious persons with the priests, the faithful with the clergy ; inviting, moreover, the needy and the poor, feeding the orphans and widows, that our festivity may be for a MEMORIAL OF REST to the souls departed ('ut fiat festivitas nostra in memoriam requiei defunctis animabus, quorum memoriam celebramus'), *whose memory we celebrate*, and to us may become a sweet savour in the sight of the eternal God.'<sup>a</sup>

That these commemorations and oblations were offered for, or in memory of martyrs, then actually enjoying *eternal happiness*, is evident from the writings of CYPRIAN, who professed himself to be a pupil of Tertullian, and a great admirer of his writings.<sup>b</sup>

The following passages from Cyprian are highly interesting, and pertinent to the subject. In his thirty-ninth epistle he writes :—

"His grandmother, Celerina, was long since crowned with martyrdom. His paternal uncle also, and his maternal uncle, Laurentius and Egnatius, themselves once militant in secular camps, but true and spiritual soldiers of God, whilst they overthrew the devil by the advance of Christ, merited palms of the Lord and crowns by illustrious suffering. We always offer sacrifices for them, as you remember, as often as we celebrate the passions and days of the martyrs by an anniversary commemoration."<sup>c</sup>

Again St. Cyprian, in his twelfth epistle, speaking of those who, though not having undergone martyrdom, had "witnessed a good confession" in chains and imprisonment, says :—

"Finally, also, take note of the days on which they depart from life, that we may be able to celebrate their commemorations among the anniversaries of the martyrs ; although Tertullus, our most faithful and most devoted brother, according to the usual anxiety and care, which he shows to the brethren in every kindness and labour of love (who neither in that respect is deficient in attention to their bodily wants), has written, and does write, and signify to me the days on which, in prison, *our happy brethren*, by the issue of a *glorious death, pass to immortality ; and oblations and sacrifices are here celebrated by us on account of their commemorations*, which we shall speedily hold in company with you, the Lord being our protector."<sup>d</sup>

It is allowed, also, that martyrs on death passed *into glory, not purgatory*. Cyprian, after having in preceding lines described the manner in which the year was passed by the confessors and saints shut up in prison, observes :—

"Sufficiently blessed are those of you, who, journeying by these footsteps of glory, have already departed from life ; and *the path of virtue and faith*

<sup>a</sup> Orig. Oper. studio Erasmi, Basil. 1536, tom. i. p. 500. ex off. Froben.

<sup>b</sup> See Jerome, vol. iv. part ii. p. 115, edit. 1684.

<sup>c</sup> Epist. xxxix. Oxon. 1682, p. 77, ed. Pamel. num. 34.

<sup>d</sup> Epist. xii. Oxon. p. 28, ed. Pam. num. 37.



*having been completed, have arrived at the presence of the Lord, the Lord himself rejoicing.*"<sup>a</sup>

"Torments which do not readily dismiss to a crown, but torture until they overthrow; unless that some one, rescued by the Divine Majesty, should expire amidst the very torments, *having obtained glory, not by the termination of punishment, but by the quickness of dying.*"<sup>b</sup>

Again, in his seventy-sixth epistle, addressed to Christians imprisoned in the mines for the cause of truth:—

"Joyful you daily expect the salutary day of your departure, and about forthwith to retire from life, you hasten to the gifts and the divine habitations of the martyrs; *expecting to see, after these darknesses of earth, the most resplendent light, and to receive a glory greater than all sufferings and conflicts,* agreeably to the declaration of the Apostle, 'The sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed to us.'<sup>c</sup>

And in Epistle 31:—

"For what more glorious or happy event could, from the divine Majesty, fall to the lot of any man than, amidst the very executioners, undauntedly to confess the Lord God?—than, whilst the diversified and exquisite torments were putting forth all their severity, the body having even been wrested to dislocation, and tortured and mangled, to confess Christ the Son of God, although with a departing, yet a free spirit?—than, *the world having been abandoned, to have sought Heaven?—than, men having been left, to stand among angels?—than, all secular hindrances having been burst asunder, now to be placed liberated in the presence of God?—than to hold fast, WITHOUT ANY DELAY, a heavenly kingdom?*"<sup>d</sup>

And again from Tertullian:—

"We make oblations for the dead *for their birthdays to Heaven on the anniversary days.*"<sup>e</sup>

To the like effect we might quote from other writers; it will, however, be sufficient to add here, that Cassander, a Roman Catholic himself, admitted that these prayers were to show the love and affection, and the hope of a resurrection, of those who offered them up. In a word, they gave thanks for the glorious victory of the martyrs.<sup>f</sup>

These sacrifices or prayers, therefore, which were offered for the departed, so far from being supplications for a mitigation of the punishment of souls in Purgatory, as suggested by Dr. Milner (*ante* p. 25), were in remembrance of those who as admitted by Romanists, go immediately to Heaven.

It will not be forgotten (see p. 25 *ante*) that Dr. Milner asserts that he need not point out the inseparable connection there is between the practice of praying for the dead, and the belief of an intermediate state of souls, since it is

<sup>a</sup> Epist. xxxvii. p. 73, ed. Pam. num. 16.

<sup>b</sup> Epist. xi. p. 23, ed. Pam. num. 8.

<sup>c</sup> Epist. lxxvi. Oxon. 1682, p. 233, ed. Pam. num. 77.

<sup>d</sup> Epist. xxxi. p. 62, ed. Pam. num. 26.

<sup>e</sup> De Cor. Milit. p. 289. Rothomagi, 1662. See Pope's "Roman Misquotations." London, 1840, p. 197, et seq.

<sup>f</sup> Cassander, Consultat. Artic. 24. De Artic. Religionis, p. 234. Lugd. 1608.

evidently needless to pray for the Saints in Heaven, and useless to pray for the reprobate in hell. Now the fact is—independent of the evidence even already adduced—so late as the fourth century, the opinion prevailed, and indeed was strongly advocated by Chrysostom and Augustine, that even the suffering of souls in hell might be alleviated, although they could not be entirely removed, by the prayers of the living, as the reader will find, by a reference to the passages indicated in the foot note.<sup>a</sup>

We quite agree with Dr. Milner that prayers offered for those in hell are “evidently needless,” but because they are needless, that can be no reason for declaring that these prayers necessarily presupposed a belief in those who uttered them, in the modern doctrine of Purgatory. Dr. Milner’s argument, or rather dogmatic assertion, falls to the ground; for prayers and sacrifices were offered for those admitted to be in a state of happiness, as well for those supposed to be in hell.

This primitive custom did not remain long in its original simplicity; *time* began to work changes, the large influx of Jews and Pagans who renounced their faith to embrace Christianity brought with them their prejudices, and retained many of the rites and ceremonies to which they had been accustomed. The following age, therefore (A.D. 200), was most fruitful in these innovations and ceremonies.

To confine ourselves, however, to the subject proposed, and fully to understand the development of the present dogma of Purgatory, it is necessary to trace out each custom bearing upon it to its particular source. As the anniversary meetings were derived from the ancient Greeks, so the *offering of oblations*, above alluded to, was derived from the Jews. It was customary with them, whenever they made their solemn appearances before God, always to take with them some presents, especially of the first-fruits of the earth, in token of homage and acknowledgment. The ancient Christians, of whom a great part were descended from the Jews, followed that example, insomuch that at the public assemblies every one brought with him a certain quantity of bread and wine, corn, grain, or grapes, which were sanctified or consecrated to God by prayer. A part of this bread and wine was apportioned for the communion of the Holy Supper, and

<sup>a</sup> *Augustine*, Enchirid. c. xx. sect. xxix. tom. vi. col. 238, D. et Paulin. Ep. 19. Paris, 1685.—*Chrysostom*. Hom. iii. in Philip, c. i. tom. vi. p. 33, B; Hom. xxxii. in Matt. c. xiii. tom. i. pp. 372, 373, and Hom. xxi. in Act. c. xi. tom. iii. p. 203, A. Paris, 1636.—*Athanas*. Quæst. ad Antioch. xxxiv. vol. iii. tom. ii. p. 275. Paris, 1698.—Prudent. Cathemerin. Carm. 5, De Cereio Paschali, p. 17. Amstelodami, 1667.—*Theophylact*. in Luc. xii. 5, p. 344, B. C. D. Paris, 1631.

the rest was eaten in common (for the *agapes*, or love-feasts, were continued after the days of the Apostles), and the surplus was distributed among the poor. These gifts, thus presented by the people, were, as before explained, called *offerings*, and it was from this that the *Eucharist* was sometimes called an *oblation*, and afterwards a *sacrifice*; not *expiatory* but *gratulatory* only. The Fathers of that age say that "they offered to God the first-fruits of his creatures," which words cannot be understood to mean the body of Jesus Christ, though it has served as a pretence afterwards for changing the *Supper* into a so-called *real sacrifice*. Thus it was that the offerings, presented at the assemblies held on the days solemnised for the martyrs, were called *oblations* or *sacrifices offered in memory of the saints*, the circumstance of the day occasioning that title; for nothing passed on that action relating to the saints other than *simple commemoration*; and those *offerings* were not the Body and Blood of Christ, but *bread and wine* only, or the first-fruits themselves, employed for the several purposes mentioned.

It is further remarkable, that to induce every one to contribute something, the names of those who offered, and the nature and extent of the offering itself, were with a loud voice proclaimed in the church.<sup>a</sup>

In course of time, we find, that, on the death of *any* distinguished personage, the year having fully expired, they commemorated in the assembly the *name* of the defunct upon that day, declaring how happy he was having *died in the faith*; and all those that were present, besought God that he would grant them the like exit; which done, the *parents or friends* of the deceased, that they might render *his memory honourable*, presented the church and the poor present with their offerings. Many stipulated that *their* names also through such *acts of charity* might continue in favour of the church; and, not unfrequently, for such purposes bequeathed to the church testamentary legacies, to be yearly paid upon the anniversary-day of their decease, and upon this the custom of *anniversaries* was grounded.

We have thus seen that these "offerings for the dead" were only *memorials* of the *devotions, trials, &c.*, of the deceased, and not *expiatory sacrifices*. In corroboration of this latter position, we find that women, who were never in those days permitted to sacrifice, still offered in memory of their deceased husbands;<sup>b</sup> besides many of the living pre-

<sup>a</sup> Hieron. in Iren. lib. ii. c. 11, and in Ezech. c. xviii.

<sup>b</sup> Tert. de Monag. c. 10, p. 955. Rothom. 1662.

sented such offerings upon their own *actual birth-days*, this being an *act of recognition* only, and a piece of homage paid to God, who gave them life on that day. We see now to what this ancient custom has been *perverted*, for from hence proceeded the custom of "praying for the dead," which, as we shall presently see, Tertullian confesses, even as practised in his days, to be founded on *custom and not Scripture*, ranking it among many other observances, which are at this day disallowed by the Church of Rome.<sup>a</sup>

But we should carefully remark in what sense the early Christians "prayed for the dead," for they never believed that they were shut up in a place of torment, for the expurgation or washing away the sins done in the body; and in fact the doctrine of Purgatory was as yet unknown in the Church. It was the belief of some that souls of martyrs and saints were *immediately after death* translated to Heaven. By others, that the souls of the just remained in a state of non-existence, as it were, awaiting the last day of judgment; which belief paved the way for the doctrine of Purgatory.

Irenæus believed that the souls of the just were not admitted into the presence of the "Beatific Vision" until after the Day of Judgment, and that the souls of those go into unseen places assigned to them by God, and there remain *till the resurrection*, afterwards receiving again their bodies and rising perfectly, that is bodily, even as the Lord also rose again, so will they come again into the presence of God.<sup>b</sup>

The questions that suggest themselves are:—Where is that place? Is it a place of torment? Is it a place of repentance? And did they believe that souls in that intermediate state could be assisted by the suffrages of the faithful? Irenæus explains the former passage as follows:—

"The preachers, who are the disciples of the Apostles, affirm that those who are translated from hence are transported into Paradise, that being prepared for just men and such as have the spirit, the place whither St. Paul's was caught up, where he heard things unutterable; and that they should continue there till the consummation and end of the world, seeing incorruption."<sup>c</sup>

And thus Erasmus, in his animadversions upon that Father, observes, and with good reason (*de purgatorio nulla mentio*), that there is no mention made by him of Purgatory; justly acknowledging, that that pious author spoke as one wholly unacquainted with any such fable; and for this reason it was ordered, by the *Expurgatory Index* both of Spain and

<sup>a</sup> Tertull. de Corona Militis, p. 289. Rothom. 1662.

<sup>b</sup> Iren. adv. Hæer. lib. v. c. 26, p. 356. Gallasii, edit. Genevæ, 1570; and cap. 31, § 2, ed. 1853.

<sup>c</sup> Iren. lib. v. c. 7.

of the Low Countries, that that note of Erasmus should be quite obliterated.<sup>a</sup>

Tertullian tells us his belief that:—

“That place (of departed souls) is the bosom of Abraham, not in Heaven, yet higher than hell, a refreshing to the souls of the just *until* the consummation of all things at the resurrection,” &c.<sup>b</sup>

But Romanists do not admit Tertullian’s speculation relative to the term “Abraham’s bosom,” for Maldonate, a Jesuit, on the text Luke xvi. 23, says, “I very much suspect, that by the bosom of Abraham the highest Heaven is intended.”<sup>c</sup>

That this place was believed to be a place of torment there is no evidence whatever, for similar passages to the following from Cyprian are frequently met with in the writings of the *ante-Nicene* fathers, who say that, “The righteous are called to their refreshing; the unrighteous are called to punishment.”<sup>d</sup>

That it was not considered a place of repentance, or that the souls after death could be assisted by the prayers of the faithful on earth, is evident; for Clement, Bishop of Rome (A.D. 66), who wrote copiously on Death and the Resurrection, gave it as his opinion, that “when once we shall have departed this life there is no room for us in another either to confess or repent; our condition hereafter being as fixed and immovable as that of an ill-formed vessel of clay, when once, with all its imperfections, it shall have been irrevocably hardened by the process of baking.”<sup>e</sup>

And again, Ignatius (A.D. 70), a reputed saint of the Church, said:—

“When our existence shall have been brought to an end, two states only are set before us, a state of death and a state of life. For as every allegorical coin bears impressed upon it the stamp of God or the stamp of the world, so after his decease shall every one depart to his own appropriate habitation.”<sup>f</sup>

All this looks very like Purgatory?

That one mortal can assist another in working out his salvation is so contrary to all Scripture and reason that were all

<sup>a</sup> Index Expurg. Belgic. p. 72, and Index Expurg. Hispan. p. 136.

<sup>b</sup> “Eam regionem sinum dico Abrahæ, etsi non cœlestem, sublimiorem tamen inferis; interim refrigerium, præbituram animabus justorum, donec consummatio rerum resurrectionem omnium,” &c.—Lib. iv. cont. Marcion. cap. 34.

<sup>c</sup> “Valde suspicor per sinum Abrahæ summum cœlum designari.”—Mald. in eum locum, p. 298. Edit. Mogunt. 1596.

<sup>d</sup> “Ad refrigerium justii vocantur, ad supplicium rapiuntur injusti.”—Serm. de Mortal. Edit. Oxon. 1682.

<sup>e</sup> Clem. Epist. ad Cor. ii. § 8. in Patres Apost. ed. Jacobs; Oxon. 1838.

<sup>f</sup> Ignat. Epist. ad Magnes. § 5. Edit. *ut supra*, Clem. Epist.

the Fathers to testify their belief in such a monstrous and unnatural doctrine it could have no possible weight in deciding the matter; but happily not one can be found, who, in the most distant manner, insinuates that such a belief ever existed in the primitive Church; on the contrary, such of them as have mentioned this subject are most positive in denouncing so gross an idea; one illustration alone, of the many that might be adduced, will suffice:—

*Hilary* said, “No one can be aided by the good works or merits of others, because each must buy oil for his own lamp.”<sup>a</sup>

It has been objected, however, that these early Fathers did nevertheless *pray for the dead*. To what end did they pray, if they did not believe that the departed could be assisted by these prayers? To establish this custom the ancient Liturgies are quoted. It is at once admitted that the early Christians did in a manner pray for the dead, and we have seen from whence that custom originated, and we admit that some of the early Liturgies do witness that some such custom did exist; but it has been established, beyond dispute, that the Liturgies attributed to the different writers, and which bear their respective names, are not genuine and unadulterated witnesses. Some of them have, by Romanists themselves, been proved to be of much later date than that which they are supposed to bear, and others have been greatly added to and interpolated. But such as they are they bear no evidence that the doctrine of Purgatory was ever admitted. In the Clementine Liturgy we read:—

“The souls of all live with Thee; and in Thy hand are the spirits of the just, *whom torment shall in no wise touch*; for all the sanctified are under Thy hands. Look, therefore, upon this Thy servant, whom Thou hast chosen and removed to another condition; and pardon him his sins, both voluntary and involuntary. Make the angels benevolent to him; and place him in the bosom of the patriarchs, and the prophets, and the apostles, and all those who have been pleasing to Thee from the beginning of the world, *where is neither grief nor pain nor lamentation*, but where is the quiet abode of the pious and the still land of the upright, even of those who in it beheld the glory of Thy Christ.”<sup>b</sup>

It must be admitted, that in the fourth century great innovations were made in the form and practice of public worship. Prayers and oblations for the dead became more frequent; and this custom, grounded on no warranty of Scripture, but

<sup>a</sup> “*Alienis scilicet operibus ac meritis neminem adjuvandum, quia unicuique lampadi suæ emere oleum sit necesse.*”—In *Matth. cap. 27, p. 591.* Paris, 1652. See *Birckbek's Protestant Evidence*, London, 1851, for a succession of witnesses on this subject.

<sup>b</sup> *Orat. pro Mort. in Liturg. Clement. apud Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 41.*

on tradition alone, was the first innovation on primitive Christianity. But to argue from hence that Purgatory was at this time an accepted doctrine of the Christian Church is a manifest perversion of the truth. The learned Jeremy Taylor on this subject observed:—

“How vainly the Church of Rome, from prayer for the dead, infers the belief of Purgatory, every man may satisfy himself by seeing the writings of the Fathers, *where they cannot meet with one collect or clause for praying for the delivery of souls out of that imaginary place.* Which thing is so certain, that in the very Roman Offices, we mean the vigils said for the dead, which are psalms and lessons taken from the Scripture, speaking of the miseries of the world, repentance, and reconciliation with God, the bliss after this life of them that die in Christ; and the resurrection of the dead; and in the anthems, versicles, and responses, there are prayers made recommending to God the soul of the newly defunct, praying, ‘*he may be freed from hell and eternal death,*’ that ‘*in the day of judgment he be not judged and condemned according to his sins, but that he may appear among the elect in the glory of the resurrection;*’ but not one word of Purgatory or its pains.”<sup>a</sup>

And Usher, in his celebrated “Answer to a Challenge made by a Jesuit,” in the chapter “Prayer for the Dead,” quotes largely from the liturgies of Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Cyril of Alexandria, Chrysostom, and others, which fully establish the fact that the oblations or sacrifices were offered for the Apostles, Virgin Mary, Martyrs, Saints, &c., wholly irrespective of either the modern additions or innovations of supplication for their intercession, or of the belief that such oblations would be beneficial to the departed, suffering in a supposed fiery or any other species of Purgatory. This alone is sufficient evidence that the custom and intent of the early Christians, in praying for the dead, were wholly different from the *modern* Popish doctrine, which we admit, with Dr. Milner, to be quite inseparable from the doctrine of Purgatory.

One example out of the many will suffice. In the liturgy attributed to the Apostles, under the title of the “Apostolic Constitutions,” is the following prayer:—“We offer unto Thee for all the saints which have pleased Thee from the beginning of the world, *patriarchs, prophets, just men, apostles, martyrs, confessors, bishops, priests, deacons,*” &c.<sup>b</sup>

It is asserted by Romish controversialists, to get over a difficulty, that martyrs went to heaven at once. This will not assist the argument; for, in reply, we assert that in the prayers found in the early liturgies, where prayers are offered

<sup>a</sup> Jeremy Taylor's Works, edited by Heber (Lond. 1822), vol. x. p. 149; “Dissuasive,” &c. chap. i. sect. 4.

<sup>b</sup> “Ἐτι προσφέρομέν σοι καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων τῶν ἀπ’ αἰῶνος εὐαρεστησάντων σοι ἀγίων, πατριάρχων, προφητῶν, δικαίων, ἀποστόλων, μαρτύρων, ὁμολογητῶν, ἐπισκόπων, πρεσβυτέρων, διακόνων, &c.—Constitut. Apostolic. lib. viii. cap. 12.

up for the departed, no distinction is made between one or another class of saints or departed. They are all classed under one form of prayer, and no single instance can be adduced, wherein prayers were offered up for souls supposed to be in a temporary state of purgation or punishment. We are aware that it is asserted that Augustine said, "that he does injury to a martyr who prays *for* a martyr." It is nevertheless not the less true that prayers were offered up *for* martyrs.

On the other hand, some of these early Christians held, with Paul, that to be absent from the body was to be present with the Lord. Justin Martyr (A.D. 150) said, "When God shall raise all from the dead, He will place the holy in eternal happiness, but will consign the unholy to the punishment of eternal fire."<sup>a</sup> He makes no mention of Purgatory.

In another place, in a work published with his writings, but supposed to be of a later date, and therefore a better witness against the Church of Rome, we read:—

"In this life, while the body and the soul are united, all things are common to the just and to the unjust. But, immediately after the departure of the soul from the body, the just are separated from the unjust, each being conducted by angels to their fitting places. The souls of the just pass forthwith into Paradise, where they become the associates of the angels and archangels, and where they are privileged to enjoy the beatific vision of Christ, the Saviour; but the souls of the unjust pass into certain regions of Hades, which have been appointed for them. Here, each, in the places respectively suitable to their characters, remain under sure guardianship, until the day of resurrection and final retribution."<sup>b</sup>

Cyprian, however, gives us still more precise information on this subject:—

"When once we have departed hence, there is *no longer any place for repentance, no longer any effectiveness of satisfaction*. Here, life is either lost or held: here, we may provide for our eternal salvation by the worship of God and the fruitfulness of faith. Let not any one, then, be retarded, either by sins or by length of years, from attaining to salvation. To a person, while he remains in this world, repentance is never too late. Those who seek after and understand the truth may always have an easy access to the indulgence of God. Even to the very end of your life, pray for your sins; and, by confession and faith, implore the one only true Deity. To him who confesses, pardon is freely granted: to him who believes, a salutary indulgence is granted from the Divine pity; and, *even in the very article of death, he passes to immortality*."<sup>c</sup>

This divided opinion, and uncertainty on the subject of the nature of the existence of the soul immediately after death,

<sup>a</sup> Just. Dial. cum Tryph. Oper. p. 270, edit. Heidelb. apud Commel. 1593; and cap. 117, tom. ii. p. 388, ed. Jenæ, 1843.

<sup>b</sup> Quæst. et Respons. ad Orthod. lxxv. in Oper. Justin. p. 339, edit. *ut supra*, and pp. 105, 106, tom. iii. pt. 2, ed. Jenæ, 1843.

<sup>c</sup> Cyprian. ad Demetrian. Oper. vol. i. p. 196. See also Cyprian. Epist. xii. Oper. vol. ii. pp. 27, 28; and also De Mortal. sect. ii. p. 157, edit. Oxon. 1682.



gave rise to many speculations; and Origen, as already observed, was the first of all the Fathers who suggested the probability of a purging, or purgation, of souls by fire.

This idea, first promulgated by Origen, was taken up by others who came after him; and Lactantius, Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, and others, put forward their speculations, but they still, to a certain extent, admitted the supposition started by Origen.

Augustine, however (A.D. 400), extended his speculative meditations on the subject. He at one time said that our souls must under some "circumstances remain in the fire of Purgatory, just so long a time as it may require to burn away our smaller sins, like wood, hay, and stubble."<sup>a</sup> This sounds very much like genuine Popery; but, not to mention that doubts have been raised whether this sermon was written by Augustine, the doctrine here enunciated is very different from the Popish Purgatory, for Augustine's fire was not then kindled—his, like Origen's fire, was deferred to the day of judgment. But even this was not an accepted doctrine of the Church in his day. He resolves the whole question, as we have seen, into a matter of probability; it was in his mind problematical only, and was not, therefore, dogmatically laid down by the Church.<sup>b</sup> And he admits that the doctrine was borrowed from the Platonists, and that Christians were not obliged to accept it.<sup>c</sup> But an acknowledgment made in another part of his works, the genuineness of which we have not heard disputed, leads us to believe that the former quotations are additions of a later date. In a later and more mature work he writes, in more decisive terms,—“There is no middle or third place, but he must needs be with the devil that is not with Christ;” and again, “The third place besides heaven and hell we are utterly ignorant of; nay, we find not in Scripture that there is any.”<sup>d</sup>

There are also mentioned purgatorial fires in other writings of the early Fathers, but used in quite another sense; namely, the *tribulations in this life*; thus in the fifty-fifth Epistle of Cyprian,<sup>e</sup> which we shall presently more fully notice, and in other writers.

<sup>a</sup> Aug. Serm. CIV. in Append. tom. v. col. 183, ed. Bened. assigned to Cæsarius of Arles.

<sup>b</sup> Aug. in Enchir. ad Laur. cap. 69, tom. vi. p. 222, Bened. edit. Paris, 1685. (See *suprà*, p. 50.)

<sup>c</sup> De Civ. Dei, lib. xxi. cap. 13, edit. Paris, 1685.

<sup>d</sup> “Non est ulli ullus medius locus, ut possit esse nisi cum diabolo, qui non est cum Christo.” “Tertium locum penitus ignoramus; imo esse in Scripturis sanctis non invenimus.”—De Peccat. Remiss. et Merit. Patr. Caill. tom. cxi. p. 316, sect. 55. Paris, 1842.

<sup>e</sup> Vol. ii. pp. 109, 110, edit. Oxon. 1682. “Aliud est ad veniam stare,” &c.

That the doctrine of Purgatory was not admitted by the early Church is thus frankly acknowledged by the Roman Catholic bishop Fisher.

“There is,” he says, “no mention at all, or very rarely, of Purgatory in the ancient Fathers. The Latins did not at once, but by degrees, admit this doctrine; and the Greeks believe it not at this day. And Purgatory being so long unknown, it is no wonder that in the first times of the Church there was no use of indulgences, for they had their beginning after men had been awhile scared with the torments of Purgatory.”<sup>a</sup>

This reference to the present belief of the Greek Church is a most conclusive argument that the custom of praying for the dead, as practised in the early Church, was totally different from the modern Popish practice, for it is now inseparable from the modern doctrine of Purgatory.

Before what is called the great Western schism took place, the Churches of the East and West professed one and the same creed and symbol of faith,—they were one in point of doctrine; corruptions of time affected each, the Greeks, equally with the Latins, in course of time prayed for the dead in the sense before explained. When the schism, or separation, took place, the Greeks did not *then* know of the doctrine of Purgatory; and though they still retain the ancient practice of praying for the dead, they do not *now* believe in Purgatory. The Latins, or Western Church, on the contrary, became by degrees more corrupt; and as, “by degrees,” the doctrine became developed, and men’s minds became “scared with the torments of Purgatory,” the priests began to find it profitable to themselves in many ways. It was therefore thought proper to stamp it with the infallible seal of the Church, which was first effected at the Council of Florence, A.D. 1439.<sup>b</sup>

The testimony of Bishop Fisher is thus corroborated by Alphonsus à Castro, who says, “There is almost no mention of it (Purgatory) in any of the ancient writers.”<sup>c</sup> The *almost* is, in fact, *never*. And on the subject of the Popish figment of INDULGENCES, the offshoot from Purgatory, the same Alphonsus says “that they were received very late in the Church.”<sup>d</sup> And Cardinal Cajetan said, “There is no authority of Scripture, nor of any Fathers, Greek or Latin, that bring them to our knowledge.”<sup>e</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Roffens. Lutheri Confut. art. xviii. p. 200. Colon. 1559.

<sup>b</sup> Synod. Florent. apud Labb. et Coss. Concil. tom. xiii. p. 515. Paris,

<sup>c</sup> “De Purgatorio fere nulla in antiquis scriptoribus mentio.”—Alphons. de Castro contra Hæres. lib. viii. p. 578. Paris, 1571.

<sup>d</sup> “Earum usus in Ecclesia videtur sero receptus.”—Ibid.

<sup>e</sup> “De ortu indulgentiarum, si certitudo haberi posset, veritati indagandæ

The proposition of a Purgatory, and an intermediate state of suffering, was *first* submitted for discussion at the second Session of the Council of Ferrara, 15th March, 1438.

Having thus briefly taken a review of the origin, progress, and subsequent establishment, of the doctrine of Purgatory, we can at once proceed to consider the quotations adduced by Dr. Milner from the writings of the early Christians in support of this modern Popish dogma.

---

SECT. IV.—Alleged Traditional Evidence, founded on the Testimony of the Fathers.

DR. MILNER thus introduces his Traditional evidence:—

“*St. Chrysostom* (he says), the light of the Eastern Church, flourished within 300 years of the age of the Apostles, and must be admitted as an unexceptionable witness of their doctrine and practice. Now he writes as follows: ‘It was not without good reason *ordained by the Apostles*, that mention should be made of the dead in the tremendous mysteries, because they knew well that they would receive great benefit from it.’<sup>a</sup> *Tertullian*, who lived in the next age to that of the Apostles, speaking of the pious widow,<sup>b</sup> says, ‘she prays for the soul of her husband, and begs refreshment for him.’ Similar testimonies of *St. Cyprian*,<sup>c</sup> in the following age, are numerous. I shall satisfy myself with quoting one of them; where, describing the difference between some souls which are immediately admitted into heaven, and others which are detained in purgatory, he says: ‘It is one thing to be waiting for pardon, another to attain to glory; one thing to be sent to prison, not to go thence till the last farthing is paid, another to receive immediately the reward of faith and virtue; one thing to suffer lengthened torments for sin, and to be chastised and purified for a long time in that fire, another to have cleansed away all sin by suffering,’ namely, by martyrdom. It would take up too much time to quote authorities on this subject from *St. Cyril of Jerusalem*, *Eusebius*, *St. Epiphanius*, *Ambrose*, *Jerome*, *St. Augustine*, and several other ancient Fathers and writers, who demonstrate that the doctrine of the Church was the same as it is now, not only within a thousand, but also within four hundred years from the time of Christ, with respect both to prayers for the dead, and an intermediate state, which we call Purgatory. How express is the authority of the last-named Father, in particular, where he says and repeats, ‘through the prayers and sacrifices of the Church and alms-deeds, God deals more mercifully with the departed than their sins deserve.’ (Serm. 172, *Enchirid.* capp. cix. cx.) How affecting is this saint’s account of the death of his mother, *St. Monica*, when she entreated him to remember her soul on the altar; and when, after her decease, he performed this duty, in order, as he declares, ‘to obtain the pardon of her sins.—*Confess. lib. ix. cap. 3.*”<sup>d</sup>

I. *Chrysostom*.—Now, to omit that Dr. Milner, in all these

opem ferret: verum quia nulla sacræ Scripturæ, nulla priscorum doctorum Græcorum aut Latinorum autoritas scripta hunc ad nostram deduxit notitiam.”—*Thom. de Vio Cajetan. Opusc. Tract. xv. De Indulg. cap. i. p. 129. August. Taurin. 1582, and Venet. 1531, tom. i. fol. 46.*

<sup>a</sup> “In cap. i. Philipp. Hom. 3.”

<sup>b</sup> “De Monogamia, cap. x.”

<sup>c</sup> “S. Cypr. lib. iv. ep. ii.”

<sup>d</sup> Letter xliii. pp. 414, 415.

passages, is constantly mistaking the mention of prayer for the dead, and the oblations made in the early Church, as if, of course, implying<sup>a</sup> a means of release from Purgatory through masses, and bequests of money for saying them, at so much per head; what argument of any decisive value can be derived from the sentence quoted from Chrysostom, when we find the paragraph (No. 4) from which it is selected, thus commencing?—

“Let us not lament for the dead merely, but for those gone in their sins; these are worthy of lamentations, of beatings of the breast, of tears. For what hope is there, I would know, of those who depart in their sins to a place where they cannot be cleared of them? Whilst they were on earth, there was a good hope of change,” &c.; and, then, the words almost immediately following: “But this [praying] is for those who have departed in faith; the catechumens are not counted worthy of so much consolation, but are deprived of all such assistance, this only excepted. The poor can offer something for them, and from this some little refreshment may be derived, for God desires that we should profit by one another,”<sup>b</sup> &c. &c. How little sound foundation there is in all such statements and arguments, or assertions—for Chrysostom does not prove where or when the Apostles *ordained* praying for the dead—upon which any one would choose to place any reliance, need not be shown. But let them carry what value they may, he must be clear-sighted who can see anything of Dr. Milner’s demonstration; there is no intimation that the effect was to be a release from torment in the pains of Purgatory-fire.<sup>c</sup> Both the language and the intent of the passages cited from most of the Fathers have been either distorted or misapprehended; the act of offering *for* an individual, signifying an act done *in his place* by some substitute, having, in later days and gradually, been perverted to mean a benefiting him through prayers on his behalf to get him out of Purgatory. The same course was also run as regarded *oblations*; both the act of making offerings, and the recital at the altar of the names of such as had made oblations of any considerable value, by degrees coming to be degraded into saying masses for the dead; and the priesthood, finding and making a most profitable revenue out of that

<sup>a</sup> “Our Romanists, indeed, do commonly take it for granted that Purgatory and prayer for the dead be so closely linked together that the one doth necessarily follow the other; but in so doing, they reckon without their host, and greatly mistake the matter.”—Usher’s “Reply to a Jesuit,” chap. vii. p. 168. Camb. 1835.

<sup>b</sup> Hom. iii. in Epist. ad Philipp., tom. xi. p. 251, ed. Paris, 1837.

<sup>c</sup> See Bingham’s “Antiquities of the Christian Church,” book xv. chap. iii. 16.

popular opinion, of course diligently inculcated it. But originally, as Bingham states, "the reasons which we meet with in the ancients for praying for souls departed, have no relation to their being tormented in the fire of Purgatory, but most of them tend directly to overthrow it. Whence we may safely conclude, that though the ancients prayed generally for the dead, at least from the time of Tertullian, who first speaks of it, yet they did it not upon those principles which are now so stiffly contended for in the Romish Church."<sup>a</sup> Chrysostom's doctrine, however, on the object and efficacy of prayers, was very different from the present teaching of Rome, for he strongly advocated the opinion, that even the sufferings of souls in hell might be alleviated, although they could not be entirely removed, by the prayers of the living.<sup>b</sup> And he expressly says that prayers were offered *for* martyrs.<sup>c</sup>

In another place, however, Chrysostom speaks more clearly on the subject we have on hand, affirming, without any ambiguity of language, that, "so long as we remain on earth, we have good hopes before us; but as soon as ever we depart, we have opportunities for repentance no longer with us, nor can we wash away our offences."<sup>d</sup> He then enlarges upon the case of Dives, and how at last he had to become a humbled petitioner to *him* who once lay at his door begging; but there is no record of his succeeding in his suit, nor that masses in consequence were offered for his release, nor a word about £10,000 left to priests to say them, or to build a chapel to our Lady for any of those mummeries and delusions now characterizing so fully the Church of Rome; not a word of all this machinery for raising him from the pit of woe, nor of the merits of St. Abraham as any way available.

II. *Tertullian*.—The passage quoted from this writer is in the original as follows: "Pro anima ejus oret; et refrigerium interim adpostulet ei, et in prima resurrectione consortium; et offerat annuis diebus dormitionis ejus,"—that is, "Let her pray for his soul; and let her meanwhile beg for him refreshment, and a participation in the first resurrection; and let her offer on the anniversaries of his dormition."

It is surprising that Dr. Milner should have selected this

<sup>a</sup> "Christian Antiquities," book ii. chap. xx. 5, and book xv. chap. iii. 16.

<sup>b</sup> Hom. xxi. in Act. Apost. tom. iii. N.T. pp. 202, 203, Paris, 1636; tom. ix. p. 186, ed. 1837; and see *suprà*, p. 60.

<sup>c</sup> Ὑπερ μαρτυρων. Ibid. p. 204. Paris, 1636; and tom. ix. p. 188; tom. ix., ed. Paris, 1837.

<sup>d</sup> De Lazaro, Concio 2, sect. 3, tom. ii. p. 894, edit. Paris, 1837.

work (*De Monogamia*) as establishing the custom of the early Church. Tertullian, when he wrote this treatise, was actually out of the pale of the Church; nay, more, he wrote it against the Church.<sup>a</sup>

This is the only passage quoted from Tertullian, though there are others much more to the point, and which are continually quoted by Romanists to prove that the doctrine of Purgatory was admitted by the Christians of that time. It will not be an uninteresting inquiry to trace the reason of this apparent omission on the part of Dr Milner; it is not accident. Bellarmine quotes one passage from Tertullian to the following effect: "Why should you not think that the soul is both punished and cherished in Hades in the meantime, while it is expecting either judgment, through a certain practising or whitening of it?"<sup>b</sup> Now one would have supposed that this was sufficiently explicit for Dr. Milner, but he knew that this was dangerous ground; for, though this work also was written when Tertullian was a heretic, Dr. Milner was likewise aware that Tertullian expressly says that he derived this doctrine from the wretched impostor Montanus, who pretended to be the "Holy Ghost," and deceived many, and among others Tertullian himself, who was on this account also declared to be a heretic:<sup>c</sup> "for the Paraclete [meaning Montanus] most frequently set forth this doctrine." This passage, therefore, would not serve his purpose. The other passage more frequently quoted is taken from the treatise "De Corona Militis," a work which Tertullian also wrote after he espoused Montanism. The passage is, "*Oblationes pro defunctis, pro natalitiis, annua die facimus,*"—"We make oblations for the dead, for their birthday to heaven, on the anniversary day."<sup>d</sup> This, in "The Faith of Catholics," is rendered "We make oblations for the dead on the anniversary day," as the correct translation; and to carry out the deception, the editors actually add what they pretend to be the passage from the original, as the words of Tertullian, "*Oblationes pro defunctis annua die facimus.*"<sup>e</sup> The significant words, "*pro natalitiis,*" are omitted. That "*pro natalitiis*" is properly rendered *birthdays to heaven*, is borne out by the corroborative testimony of two Roman commentators. De la Cerda, the Jesuit, on this passage, says,—"*By natalitia Tertullian means the days on which saints, dead to the world,*

<sup>a</sup> Præfatiuncula Pamelii, Rothom. 1662, p. 936.

<sup>b</sup> Bell. de Purg. lib. i. cap. 7 and 10, from Tert. de Anima, cap. 58.

<sup>c</sup> See Edit. Rigalt. p. 306, Paris, 1675. Tert. de Anima, cap. 58.

<sup>d</sup> Edit. Roth. 1662, p. 289. (See p. 60, *suprà*.)

<sup>e</sup> "Faith of Catholics," ed. 1813, p. 354, and edit. 1830, p. 356.

are born to heaven.”<sup>a</sup> And another Roman Catholic, le Prieur, says,—“By *natalitia* Tertullian means the solemnities accustomed to be held in honour of martyrs, on the day on which, being dead to the world, they were born to heaven. From whence we make oblations on the annual day—that is, yearly.”<sup>b</sup>

The omission of the word *natalitia* (if intentional) is most obvious; for its appearance in the proper place clears the passage of all difficulties.

We have seen what these *oblations* on the anniversary days mean, we may be, therefore, spared any further explanation here. We, nevertheless, have, in this passage, the tempting word “oblations,” though Dr. Milner lets this passage pass. There must be some reason for this, which must account for the *difficulty he had in selecting such passages as may appear the clearest*.

There is no difficulty, however, in accounting for his passing over this passage unnoticed. It will be remembered, that Dr. Milner asserted that the doctrine of Purgatory, which he tacked on to the doctrine of “praying for the dead,” was taught and sanctioned by Scripture. Now, had Dr. Milner quoted the passage in question, he would have at once destroyed his argument; for, in the same paragraph, Tertullian admitted that the custom was not enforced by Scripture, which he vindicated without any support from writing, but “by the authority of tradition *alone*, and from thence by the protection of custom.” He expressly classes the custom among many others which were merely traditional customs, or discipline, not matters of faith, but ceremonial usages, and for the most part entirely repudiated by the Roman Church at the present day. After naming all these several observances, Tertullian uses these words: “If for these and other like *regulations*, you demand the law of the Scriptures, none can be found; tradition will be held up before you as originating, usage as conforming, and faith as practising them.”<sup>c</sup> He nowhere states the custom to be an “Apostolic tradition;” this also is an invention of the compilers of “The Faith of Catholics.”

Now, it must be observed that Roman Catholics have always quoted this last passage in proof of the antiquity of

<sup>a</sup> “Tertullianus intelligit per natalitia dies quibus sancti, mundo mortui, nascuntur cælo.”—De la Cerda e Soc. Jesu, *in loc.* Tert. Op. Paris, 1624, p. 657.

<sup>b</sup> Prieur, *in loc.* Tert. Oper. Rig. et Prior. Annotat. adject. Lutet. 1664, p. 102. Pope’s “Roman Misquotations,” London, 1840, p. 65.

<sup>c</sup> “Harum et aliarum ejusmodi disciplinarum si legem expostules Scripturarum, nullam invenies; traditio tibi prætendetur auctrix, consuetudo confirmatrix, et fides observatrix.”—Edit. Roth. 1662, p. 289.

Roman "masses." Modern Roman oblations for the dead, and masses for the dead, are almost inseparable; we ask whether Romanists are ready to stand by the testimony of Tertullian, namely, that there is no warranty in Scripture for their doctrines of Purgatory, and Masses, and Prayers for the dead? We do not think they will dare to make so wide an admission; and, if not, they must entirely renounce the testimony of Tertullian.

It may not be amiss to notice that when Tertullian is talking of a matter of *faith*, as necessary to be believed, he uses a very different strain; here he makes a direct appeal to SCRIPTURE, and rejects all other authority. He "adores the fulness of Scripture." "Whether all things were made of any subject-matter, I have as yet read nowhere. Let those of Hermogenes' shop show that it has been written; if it be not written, let them fear that woe which is appointed for such as add or take away."<sup>a</sup>

We now can appreciate the value of the omission of this and of the former quotation by Dr. Milner from his list of witnesses.

III. *Cyprian*.—If our readers will take the trouble to examine the passage quoted from Cyprian, they will find that he was treating of the *trials and tribulations in this life, and to such he refers*; and this is admitted by Rigaltius, a Roman Catholic commentator on the works of Cyprian.<sup>b</sup>

The quotation from this author, "*It is one thing to be waiting for pardon,*" &c. deserves consideration, as well from the authority of the writer, as because it is the only evidence, at so early a period, which even seemingly leans to this opinion. "Testimonies from St. Cyprian" that there is a Purgatory are NOT "numerous;" but testimonies that there is not any Purgatory ARE so, both from the strain of his discourses, and from explicit declaration.<sup>c</sup>

Cyprian was not a man so grossly to contradict himself, as a belief in Purgatory would imply. The passage can be misunderstood by those only who are unacquainted with his writings. The main controversy of that age was about the treatment of the "lapsed," those who had fallen from the faith during the persecution, and afterwards became penitent. Antonian, a

<sup>a</sup> "Adoro Scripturæ plenitudinem."—Tert. adv. Hermog. cap. 22, edit. Roth. 1662, p. 417. "An autem de aliqua subjacenti materia facta sint omnia, nusquam adhuc legi. Scriptum esse doceat Hermogenis officina. Si non est scriptum, timeat væ illud adjicientibus aut detrahentibus destinatum."—Ibid.

<sup>b</sup> See the passage from Rigaltius fully set out in the Oxford edition of Cyprian, in a note, p. 109, vol. ii, edit. 1682.

<sup>c</sup> See the treatise Ad Demet. sect. 16, or cap. v.; and De Mortal. cap. v.



prelate of Numidia, having heard that Cornelius, bishop of Rome, had readmitted to his church, after penance, some who had sacrificed to idols, wrote to Cyprian, expressing his opinion that this indulgence would slacken the zeal of Christians to endure martyrdom, and his doubts of the propriety of communicating with Cornelius. It is in reply to this, that the passage in question occurs. Cyprian meets the objection of the Numidian bishop, and dissipates his alarm, by reminding him that the severe penances which the lapsed had to undergo before readmission, and the uncertainty of a ratification by God, rendered their case so obviously different from the glorious estate of martyrs, that there was no danger of zeal being thereby slackened. "You admit," he argues, "adulterers to penance for a certain time; and then restore them to the Church; yet the number of the continent is not thereby diminished, nor the resolutions of chastity weakened." "It is one thing, at last, to stand waiting for a pardon," &c.

It is then apparent that Dr. Milner garbled the passage, as his custom was, and that it has nothing to do with an intermediate state of expiation.<sup>a</sup>

This passage, quoted by Dr. Milner, on which, as Bishop Forbes remarks, almost all Romanists are wont to glory, is, in the first place, obscure—nothing certain can be inferred from it; and, in the second, whatever may be the correct interpretation, it helps nothing in support of the Purgatory of the Romanists. Those, the Bishop observes, who are being tormented in Purgatory, can neither be described as "waiting for pardon," nor to be uncertain what their final sentence may be; seeing that, according to Romish doctrine, souls in Purgatory are taught to regard their salvation as sure.<sup>b</sup>

The passage we have before quoted from Cyprian's works [p. 66] will sufficiently clear this illustrious Bishop of Carthage from the charge of holding the modern Popish doctrine of Purgatory.

IV. *Augustine*.—The names of *Cyril*, *Eusebius*, *Epiphanius*, *Ambrose*, *Jerome*, are all proclaimed as "demonstrating that the doctrine of the [early] Church was the same as it is now;" but Dr. Milner does no more than advance a bare and unsupported assertion. Knowing the value of his unsupported assertions, we may safely pass over to *Augustine*,

<sup>a</sup> Garbett's "Nullity of the Roman Faith," pp. 294-96, Lond. 1827.

<sup>b</sup> So Bishop Forbes, in his "Considerationes Modestæ," pp. 226-28, Lond. 1658. S. Cyp. lib. iv. ep. 2; ep. 51, p. 62, ed. Paris, 1836.

though it is unfortunate that in quoting from this one single discourse (172, col. 827, edit. 1683), the Doctor did not observe the doubt cast upon its being a genuine production of Augustine's. But, any way, nothing is proved as to a Purgatory. What is exhorted to be done is put down to tradition and the custom of the Church; and includes a qualification that the parties for whom prayers are offered, and oblations made, are those who have died, having partaken of the body and blood of Christ. And then, the style of the subsequent remarks is so equivocal, that the Doctor would have done better had he not selected just this particular *Sermo* in support of his Church's dogma. Who can doubt, it is asked, that assistance is obtained by works of mercy, for those "on whose account prayers are not idly (*non inaniter*) made to God?" Whereas many would unhesitatingly confirm their utter uselessness, even in the time of St. Augustine. And then he goes on, "Non omnino ambigendum est ista prodesse defunctis," &c.,—"it is not altogether to be questioned but that the dead are benefited by offerings and prayers;" but such, that is, who have so lived in this life that these things prove beneficial to them after death. But "there is not the slightest necessity for connecting the words with sulphureous torments or Vatican satisfaction. It was believed that prayer and almsgiving might possibly render some assistance to the departed; at least it was so hoped, and the ancients, in charity perhaps, though unscripturally, thus attempted to aid them, and wished to be assured that they were able to do so. As to the authority for the practice, we say, οὐδὲ γρῦ."<sup>a</sup>

The other passage is Augustine's account "of the death of his mother, Monica." But what can this have to do with the question of Purgatory? In the first place Purgatory is not a place of *pardon*, according to Romish teaching, but of punishment,—the sins are supposed to *have been pardoned*;<sup>b</sup> whereas Augustine was praying for the forgiveness of the sins of his mother. Secondly—What were the offences respecting which St. Augustine prayed? They were offences of the tongue, of which Christ had said that they who commit them should be in danger of hell fire, for he says:—

"Yet I dare not say that from the time that Thou didst regenerate her by baptism, no word came out of her mouth contrary to thy command. And it was said by thy Son, the Truth, 'whosoever shall say to his brother, thou fool,

<sup>a</sup> Elliott's "Delineation," p. 277, London, 1851.

<sup>b</sup> See Dr. Wiseman's "Moorfield Lectures," Lect. xi. vol. ii. pp. 47, 54. London, 1851.

shall be in danger of *hell fire*.' And woe be even to the commendable life of men, if, laying aside mercy, Thou didst examine it; but because Thou art not extreme in seeking out what is done amiss, &c. I, therefore, &c., do now beseech thee, for the sins of my mother, &c., forgive, O Lord, enter not into judgment with her, &c."<sup>a</sup>

Augustine, therefore, was not praying for his mother's delivery from the pains of Purgatory, but that she might not be condemned to hell. It must be remembered that Monica was not yet judged; Augustine prayed that when judged she should not be condemned. It is evident, therefore, that he had no thought at all of praying that she might be released from what she was suffering at that time; there is no hint of such a thing in his prayer. Yet this is what any one, who believed in Purgatory, would certainly have prayed for. And lastly, not only was St. Augustine silent respecting any temporal pains, but he added—"I believe Thou hast already done what I ask,"—"Et credo jam feceris quod te rogo." Therefore, if St. Augustine believed that God had *already* granted everything he thought it necessary to pray for, for his mother, he could not have been uneasy about the repose of her soul. We have already seen that Augustine was by no means decided in his opinion with regard to a Purgatory; as he states in one place, that there *might* be such a place, at another, that there is no such third place.<sup>b</sup>

Such, then, are Dr. Milner's proofs in support of the modern Popish doctrine of Purgatory from Tradition.

---

SECT. V.—Alleged Concessions of "Eminent Protestant Prelates."

Dr. Milner is very ready—as all other Romanists ever have been—to avail himself of any, however distant, acknowledgments made by Protestants, in favour of Romanism. These acknowledgments are paraded with an air of triumph, as if it had been undoubtedly "demonstrated," and from the very mouths of the opponents themselves, that they freely supported what they laboured to overturn, and inculcated upon others what they themselves openly denied. Especially is this the case with regard to Martin Luther, of whose sentiments, and Melancthon's, we shall have hereafter more to say. The necessity of the case is certainly urgent; the doctrine of Purgatory, and its accessory Indulgences, is most remunerative; and any one, dead or alive, whom it is fancied has a shadow of a vote to give, must be pressed to record it upon the side of

<sup>a</sup> Aug. Confess. lib. ix. cap. xiii. sect. 35, tom. i. col. 170. Paris, 1689.

<sup>b</sup> See *suprà*, p. 50, and p. 67.

the doctrine. "Sirs, you know that our gain is by this trade;"<sup>a</sup> and gross as is the delusion, yet such profits are made by the living proprietors of the lottery, that the clamours and advertisements to come and buy are incessant; and though the tickets are utterly useless, every one turning up *blank*, the managers cease not quoting any and every authority for the profitableness of the investment; even Luther *himself* being pressed into the service by Dr. Milner, as recommending the trade! (See Letters xliii. p. 416, and xlii. pp. 409, 410.)

But the Doctor thus continues his subject: "I should do an injury to my cause, were I to pass over the concessions of eminent Protestant prelates and other writers, on the matter in debate." The matter in debate, and the heading of each page, is "Purgatory;" and the chapter is entitled, "On Purgatory *and* Prayers for the Dead." We have seen that Dr. Milner has asserted the "inseparable connection" between the two; that Protestant prelates "believed that the dead ought to be prayed for;" that therefore they held the Popish doctrine of Purgatory. But a few extracts by way of *evidence* will at once set this question at rest.

Among the names cited we find those of Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, Bishops Cranmer, Ridley, Andrews, Usher, Montague, Taylor, Forbes, Sheldon, Barrow, and Blandford;—a goodly selection of illustrious names indeed!

With regard to *Luther* (who, as Mr. Maguire, M.P., lately instructed the House of Commons<sup>b</sup> was a believer in Purgatory), *his* opinion respecting such wares has been delivered with tolerable distinctness in the Smalcaldic Articles (Part 11, art. 2, sec. 15), where, having referred to the case of *Monica*, the mother of St. Augustine—the instance so often adduced by Romanists—he thus proceeds: "Our Romanists cite these human testimonies in order that their shameful, blasphemous, and accursed marketings in masses to be said for souls in Purgatory, and for offerings, may acquire credit. But never will they find support for such things from Augustine; he never even dreamed of this purgatorian mass-mongering."<sup>c</sup> So much for Luther! And as respects *Melancthon*, who it is insinuated favoured Purgatory, the very section, of the Apology for the Augsburg Confession, cited by Dr. Milner, commences with these words (cap. xii., Abus. art. iii. sec. 90), "The position which our

<sup>a</sup> Acts xix. 25, Douay version.

<sup>b</sup> In a late *Maynooth* Debate! What connection on earth could there be between the two? But note the diligence of Rome, ever on *the watch* to turn a penny.

<sup>c</sup> Libri Symbolici Eccles. Lutheranæ, edidit F. Frantze, Lips. 1847, p. 12, sect. 16.

opponents take for maintaining the application of masses for rescuing souls from Purgatory, through which they make untold profits, is altogether unsupported<sup>a</sup> from the Scriptures." In truth, so far from the doctrine being the same now, as asserted by Dr. Milner, as in the days of the Fathers, an entirely different meaning was attached to the expressions among the earlier Patristic writers. To offer *for* the dead, whether for saints or for others, was to make oblations *in their stead*, and as a sign that the individual had departed in the faith, and in communion with the Church; and indeed this custom prevailed so generally, that where it was omitted the person was regarded as having separated from the Church, neglected his duties, and as having intimated that he was not unwilling to be ranked as a heathen; and, accordingly, the Church, by *refusing* oblations, used to signify the exclusion of the individual from the body of the faithful; and hence the dying, in order to mark their adherence to the Church, and that they did not class with either catechumens, or penitents, or excommunicated, used to express a desire that offerings should be made in their name, and in *their stead*.<sup>b</sup> Is this all "the same" with Romish trafficking in masses?

Of *Cranmer*, Dr. Milner writes:—

"In the first liturgy of the Church of England, which was drawn up by Cranmer and Ridley, and declared by Act of Parliament to have been framed by inspiration of the Holy Ghost, there is an express prayer for the departed, that God would grant them mercy and everlasting peace" (p. 416).

*Ergo*, Dr. Milner would have it understood that Cranmer and the first English liturgy taught the doctrine of the Papal Purgatory!

"Is not all our trust," exclaims Archbishop Cranmer, "in the blood of Christ, that we be cleansed, purged, and washed thereby? And will you have us now to forsake our faith in Christ, and bring us to the Pope's Purgatory to be washed therein, thinking that Christ's blood is an imperfect lee or soap that washeth not clean? If he shall die without mercy that treadeth Christ's blood under his feet, what is treading of his blood under our feet, if this be not? But if, according to the Catholic faith which the holy Scripture teacheth, and the prophets, apostles, and martyrs confirmed with their blood, all the faithful that die in the Lord be pardoned of all their offences by Christ, and their sins be clearly expunged and washed away by his blood, shall they be cast into another strong and grievous *prison of Purgatory*, there to be punished again for that which was pardoned before? God hath promised by his word, that the souls of the just be in God's hand, and no pain shall touch them; and again he saith, *Blessed be they that die in the Lord. For the Spirit of God saith that from henceforth they shall rest from their pains.*"<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Nulla habent testimonia, nullum mandatum ex Scripturis.

<sup>b</sup> See the treatise of Fechtius *De Origine et Superstitione Missarum in Honorem Sanctorum*, p. 113, Rostochii, 1707.

<sup>c</sup> Jenkyns's *Cranmer's Remains*, vol. ii. p. 234, quoted in Dr. Jervis's *Reply*, p. 222.

We then have the names of eight other prelates given, who are represented as having entertained a belief that “the dead *ought* to be prayed for;” all embraced under the very ample reference, as authority for the statement—“Collier’s History”!<sup>a</sup> We will take the eight in succession, availing ourselves, in some measure, of Dr. Grier’s “Defence” of his reply to Dr. Milner’s assertions, &c.

*Archbishop Usher* is first named, who nevertheless cautions us—

“Diligently to consider, that the memorials, oblations, and prayers made for the dead at the beginning had reference to such as rested from their labours, and not unto any souls which were thought to be tormented in that Utopian Purgatory, whereof there was no news stirring in those days,” though there might be “certain sticks then a-gathering, which ministered fuel afterwards unto that flame.” And again he remarks, referring specially to Bellarmine, “Thus these men, labouring to show how the prayers for the dead, used in their Church, may stand with their conceits of *Purgatory* do thereby inform us how the *prayers for the dead*, used in the ancient Church, may stand well enough *without the supposal of any Purgatory at all.*”<sup>b</sup>

This is rather an infelicitous commencement. This witness, at least, hardly supports what he is summoned to accredit.

*Montague*, Bishop of Chichester, on the contrary, derides the idea of praying for souls in the kingdom of Purgatory; and tells us that “it is the purging fire, which hath made the *Pope’s kitchen smoke* so much heretofore.”<sup>c</sup> And again, after summing up all his arguments against the dogma, he concludes with saying, “that there is *not any* resolution, public or private, for the first 600 years in the Church on the subject.” Lastly, he tells his opponent to “believe it if he will; that he must see *better* evidence before *he* believes it.” In addition to this we have the collateral evidence of Spinckes,<sup>d</sup> that “Bishop Montague *does not* speak in favour of Purgatory,” notwithstanding the singularity of his opinion on the subject.

Then *Dr. Taylor*, bishop of Down, says: “We complain that the doctrine of Purgatory, which is in all parts of it *uncertain*, and in the late additions to it *certainly false*, is yet with all its faults passed into an article by the Council of Trent.”<sup>e</sup> Again, “Purgatory is an *innovation*; wherever the ancient Fathers speak of *prayers for the dead*, they rarely, *if ever*, make mention of Purgatory.”<sup>f</sup> As the same prelate

<sup>a</sup> Letter xliii., p. 416.

<sup>b</sup> *Answer to a Jesuit*, pp. 169, 178, 187, edit. Camb. 1835.

<sup>c</sup> *New Gag for an Old Goose*, pp. 295–98. See also Mr. Goode’s “Tract XC. historically Refuted,” pp. 135–42.

<sup>d</sup> *Answer to Proposal for Catholic Communion*, p. 176.

<sup>e</sup> *Works*, vol. x. 154, Heber’s edition; or *Dissuasive*, p. 28, ed. Oxford, 1836.

<sup>f</sup> *Grier’s Defence*, pp. 269–70.

elsewhere observes, the doctors of Rome, like Dr. Milner throughout his 48th letter, ordinarily assume a necessary connection of praying for the dead with Purgatory, "vainly supposing that whenever the holy Fathers speak of prayers for the dead, that they conclude for Purgatory, which *vain* conjecture is as false as it is unreasonable: for it is true the Fathers did pray for the dead, but how? That God would show them mercy and hasten the resurrection, and give a blessed sentence in the great day."—Dissuasive, part i. section iv. § 4.<sup>a</sup>

With reference to *Bishop Forbes*, Dr. Milner would have served his cause better had he never summoned him to speak a word for his Purgatory. We do not wonder at his anxiety to bring up any one who seems willing to testify in favour of the doctrine, for it is, to Rome, most valuable. Bishop Forbes, however, asserts, in his "*Considerationes Modestæ*" (p. 210), that the dogma has no foundation in Scripture; that Bellarmine's arguments, especially those from Scripture, are miserably distorted and most frigid; and that as regards the imaginary support from 1 Cor. iii., writhe as the cardinal does miserably, he does after all but *squeeze* an argument out of the passage. Then again, on p. 239, the bishop observes that the Papal Purgatory may be refuted by most clear testimony from the Fathers; and lastly (p. 266), affirms that the Romanists, inasmuch as their doctrine finds assured support from neither Scripture, nor the early Fathers, nor the Councils, do not reckon it as an article of faith.

So much for Bishop Forbes as a believer in the Papal Purgatory,<sup>b</sup> though mistaken in his closing observation, as is plain from the creed of Pope Pius IV. § 9.

As to *Sheldon*, Archbishop of Canterbury, he published *two* sermons according to Wood ("*Athenæ Oxon.*"), and *only one* according to Collier ("*Historical Dictionary*"). However, neither of the two under his name expresses any opinion about prayers for the dead.

Then there is brought up *Barrow*, Bishop of St. Asaph, who has his epitaph engraved on a plate of brass, and fastened to his tombstone in the churchyard at Shrewsbury. It

<sup>a</sup> It may be noticed that Bishop Taylor's words have been perverted to serve the same cause, in our own days also; Mr. French, in the Hammersmith Discussion (p. 376, London, 1851), quoting him as if assenting to the interpretation put upon the passage in the History of the Maccabees, "that the Jews did pray and make offerings for the dead." And how is that effected? By just dropping the words, "says the Romanist," and thus leaving it to be regarded as the bishop's *own* assertion! See his "*Liberty of Prophecy*," chap. 20.

<sup>b</sup> The original of several of the passages here alluded to is given by Mr. Goode in his "*Tract XC. historically Refuted*," Lond. 1845, p. 132.

entreats those repairing to the house of God to pray that "their fellow-servant might find mercy." Spinckes speaks of his being the author, yet that he only desired prayer in the sense St. Paul prayed for Onesiphorus (2 Tim. i. 18).

It is doubted, however, whether the inscription did proceed from the bishop himself; and, any way, neither the Church of England nor its members, are bound by the sentiments of a "private doctor." And, "in fact, were each of these prelates individually possessed of the notion" in favour of a Romish Purgatory, "it would afford no colourable plea for the continuance of a practice which is unsupported by Scripture."<sup>a</sup>

The opinion attributed to *Dr. Blandford*, Bishop of Worcester, depends for its validity upon the statement of the duchess of York, who, in the days of Charles II., *wanted* to be proselyted to Rome, and accordingly accepted, nothing loth, the opinions upon the matter in hand of Dr. Heylin, Archbishop Sheldon, and Bishop Blandford, asserting—for Dr. Morley, Bishop of Winchester, doubts if any such conference ever took place—"that she spoke to two of the best bishops we have in England," and that "they told her that there were many things in the Roman Church which it were much to be wished we had kept." Among these are mentioned confession, prayer for the dead, &c. "But God be thanked," writes Bishop Stillingfleet, "the cause of our Church doth not depend upon the singular opinion of one or two bishops in it. The utmost that can be made of all this is, that there was a certain bishop of the Church who held both Churches to be so far parts of the Catholic Church, that there was no necessity of going from one Church to another. But if he asserted that, he must overthrow the necessity of the *Reformation*, and consequently not believe our Articles and Homilies; and so could not be a true member of the Church of England."<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Grier's *Defence*, pp. 271-73; and see Chalmer's Dictionary.

<sup>b</sup> An Answer to some Papers lately printed, concerning the authority of the Catholic Church in matters of Faith, &c. Lond. 1686, pp. 60-63.

It will not be considered an unsuitable addition, we trust, if we just show the modern use which is being made of this duchess's name for attracting and encouraging proselytes; and the ingenious readiness of Rome in catching at anything that may in any way promote her glory, and keep up the empty notions of her followers. We copy the following notice of Rome's adroit adaptation of former occurrences to modern times, from a letter addressed to the *Liverpool Herald*, March 8, 1856. As the editor remarks, there is no such person now existing as a Duchess of York; but what mattered that among the party whose valour was to be warmed up by the "glorious announcement;" and the hopes and fancies of both priest and attendants to be kept glowing? The introduction of Lord Clarendon's name just at this present period is also not without signification—"that persecuting minister:"—



And lastly, we have *Andrews*, Bishop of Winchester. This bishop's opinion respecting Purgatory and prayers for the dead appears in his "Sermons" (p. 302), and in his answer to Bellarmine (p. 192), to be in perfect accordance with the doctrine of the Church of England.<sup>a</sup>

So much then for the alleged "concessions of eminent Protestant Prelates" on the matter in debate; and with this further illustration of Dr. Milner's modesty, candour, and love of truth, we dismiss for the present the subject of Purgatory. We quite agree with the doctor that he is not *infallible*, and we accept his apology that he "is far from claiming inerrancy:" but we do doubt the sincerity of his further declaration, "that he should despise himself, if he *knowingly* published any falsehood, or hesitated to *retract* any one that he was proved to have fallen into;"<sup>b</sup> for during his lifetime every one of the erroneous statements which we have examined were pointed out to Dr. Milner, but neither he nor his followers have ever had the grace to *retract* any one of the PIOUS FRAUDS we have here again exposed.

---

## No. XIX.

### INDULGENCES.<sup>c</sup>

THAT Popery has been for some time, and still is, rapidly on the increase in England, no one, who has paid the least attention to passing events, can for a moment doubt. How far it may be permitted to spread its baneful influence, is

"SIR,—Passing St. Anne's Roman Chapel on Sunday evening last, I was rather surprised to see a great crowd assembled at the front gate; on crossing the street, something like the following caught my ear: 'The glorious conversion of one of the Royal Family to Catholicity! Here you have the glorious conversion of one of the Royal Family, the Duchess of York, to the Catholic faith; in a letter to that persecuting minister, Lord Clarendon; neatly printed in a book of 12 pp. for one penny!' This was addressed to the people coming out after service. In the midst of the harangue a priest came out, and on hearing the noise, he came down and listened to the *glorious announcement* [which he himself had probably set the crier to sell]; and after giving a very perceptible smile of approbation, went back again, &c. &c.,

Yours truly, TRUTH."

<sup>a</sup> Grier as above.

<sup>b</sup> Address, p. 30, note.

<sup>c</sup> The Editor is indebted to the Rev. John Evans, of Whixall, Prees, Shrewsbury, for this Article.

only known to Him who is the great Disposer of all things. Doubtless, for good and wise purposes, these things are permitted; and although it becomes not us, short-sighted mortals, to attempt to measure the designs of Infinite Wisdom by our finite understandings, yet we trust that there is nothing of presumption in the hope which we would express, as to the shades which seem fast deepening around us; we hope, then, and trust, that they may be intended as a merciful warning to us, that the gross darkness which once involved the nation may again visit us, if we are indifferent to the blessings so dearly purchased for us, under God, by the sufferings and blood of our holy and devoted martyrs—if we do not exert ourselves to strengthen the things which remain.

If the early days of the Church were distinguished by the zeal with which her spiritual guides “contended for the faith once delivered to the saints,” by the holy earnestness which they exhibited in their unceasing endeavours to arrest the progress of heresy and superstition, surely a coldness or indifference in this respect argues a fearful departure from the spirit of primitive Christianity!

Does it not, then, become an imperative duty, on the part of those who “profess and call themselves Christians,” to embrace every opportunity of exposing, in all their naked deformity, the soul-destroying doctrines of the most corrupt of all communities, the Church of Rome?—for exposure of error may reasonably be expected to advance the cause of truth, among those at least who are not dead to every religious feeling. The very nature of that charity which we are bound to extend to every individual, be his errors what they may, forbids us to extend it to the errors themselves. Dr. Johnson once wrote, “He that voluntarily continues in ignorance, is guilty of all the crimes which ignorance produces; as to him who extinguishes the tapers of a lighthouse might be justly imputed the calamities of shipwrecks:” how much more guilty are they who not only “extinguish the tapers of the lighthouse,” but hold out false lights, to lure unfortunate mariners to run their bark upon a rocky coast, for the sake of sharing in the plunder of the wreck; and little short would be the guilt of him, who, when it was in his power to do it, should fail to warn the intended victims of the destruction prepared for them. Of all the “cunningly devised fables” of Rome—and they are many, the doctrine of Indulgences may be looked upon as one of the most ensnaring, and as perilous to those who are so unhappy as to be beguiled by it, as it is gainful to the Church which employs it in

“making merchandise of souls.”<sup>a</sup> As we proceed we shall see abundant reason why the Church of Rome should both be anxious to retain the doctrine, and, at the same time, by all the means in her power, endeavour to prevent the exhibition of it, in its true light, to the eyes of the world. She has not forgotten the consequences which followed the exposure of these things in the days of Luther; and Protestants would do well to bear this important point in mind also. If the exposure of the nefarious traffic in indulgences led the way to the exposure of other abominations, at the commencement of the Reformation—if it *then* induced men to turn their attention to the dangerous and wicked doctrines connected with the doctrine of indulgences, why may it not, *a fortiori*, with the blessing of God, lead to similar results *now*? We fully believe that such would be the case, and we feel assured that our belief is shared by the modern champions of Rome; hence, indeed, their extreme sensitiveness on these matters; hence their attempts to explain away, or to soften down, the language of Papal documents still extant, and, if the claim of infallibility be allowed, still in force.

They, the advocates of Rome, would fain persuade us that she *never countenanced* such things as the sale of pardons and indulgences, and that, although such doings were *formerly* heard of, nothing of the kind can take place in these days and in enlightened and happy England! Dr. Milner writes:—

“I. An indulgence never was conceived by any Catholic to be a leave to commit a sin of any kind, as Dr. Coetlogon, Bishop Fowler, and others may charge them with believing. The first principles of natural religion must convince every rational being, that God Himself cannot give leave to commit sin. The idea of such a license takes away that of His sanctity, and of course that of His very being.”—Letter xlii.

By Dr. Milner’s own showing, then, if it shall appear that Rome has ever encouraged “the idea of such a license,” that of her “sanctity” can scarcely be entertained; whilst the very evidence that she *has* encouraged such an idea, by authoritative documents, will go far to endanger “of course that of her very being,” so far as she claims to be a *Christian community*.

“II. No Catholic,” says Milner, “ever believed it to be a pardon for future sins, as Mrs. Hannah More and a great part of Protestant writers represent the matter. . . . III. An indulgence, according to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, is not, and does not include, the pardon of any sin at all, little or great, past, present, or to come, or the eternal punishment due to it,

---

<sup>a</sup> See “Church of England Quarterly Review,” for Jan. 1840, for an article by the writer of the present paper, on “The Nature and Venality of Papal Indulgences.”

as all Protestants suppose. Hence, if the pardon of sin is mentioned in any indulgence, this means no more than the remission of the *temporary punishments* annexed to such sin."

"If the pardon of sin is mentioned in any Indulgence"—the use of the word "*if*" seems to imply something of a doubt, whereas the Doctor should have written "*when*," as he was perfectly aware that "*pardon of sin*" is mentioned in some very important documents. Dens makes no "*if*" about the matter, but boldly meets the objection, that "Pontiffs sometimes say in their Bulls that they grant indulgences of sins," by the following answer: "R.—The *cause* is put for the *effect*, and the indulgence of the *punishment* arising from the sin is signified."<sup>a</sup> Though "*your if* is a great peace-maker," Dens scarcely thought it prudent to trust to it in so important a matter. Mr. Green, the Roman priest at Tixall,<sup>b</sup> tells us, "The expressions '*venia peccatorum*' and '*remissio peccatorum*' are *technical* expressions, as familiarly understood by a Catholic theologian as any legal technicality is by a gentleman of the law." We shall have something to say, by-and-by, upon these theological "*technicalities*," but at present it will be sufficient to observe that, according to Dens and to Mr. Green, the difficulty can only be got over by interpreting the words "*pardon*" and "*remission*" in a "*non-natural sense*," as some modern writers propose to interpret the language of the Thirty-nine Articles, and indeed as was suggested some years ago by a proselyting son of Rome.<sup>c</sup> That "*pardon of sin*" is mentioned, we have abundant proof, and the very defence, by Dens and Green, is an admission of the fact. Pope Urban, towards the close of the eleventh century, promised to those who should join the banners of the cross against the infidels, "an indulgence of all their sins," and a good deal more—"Plenam suorum peccatorum, si veraciter fuerint corde contriti et ore confessi, veniam indulgemus; et in retributione justorum salutis æternæ pollicemur augmentum."<sup>d</sup> Mr. Green's own extract and reference are given, and so also shall his translation be adopted. "We mercifully grant them full pardon of their

<sup>a</sup> "OBJ.—Pontifices in Bullis aliquando dicunt, se concedere indulgentias peccatorum: ergo," &c.

"R.—Ponitur causa pro effectu, et significatur indulgentia pœnæ ex peccato."  
—Dens, Theol. vol. vi. p. 418, No. 30.

<sup>b</sup> "The Truth, the whole Truth, and nothing but the Truth," by the Rev. T. S. Green. London, T. Jones, &c. 1838, p. 28.

<sup>c</sup> See "Bampton Lectures," by William Hawkin, M.A. Annotations, p. 275. Oxford, 1787.

<sup>d</sup> Ex Oratione Urban. II. in Conc. Claremont; apud Matt. Paris, anno 1095.

sins, if they be truly contrite in heart and make confession with the mouth; and in the retribution of the just we promise them an increase of eternal happiness.”<sup>a</sup> Mr. Green favours us with an extract from the hortatory oration of Innocent III.,<sup>b</sup> to the fourth General Council of Lateran, in which the phraseology is the same with that of Urban, except the word “*peccaminum*” is substituted for “*peccatorum*,” and the words “*de quibus*” (“for which”) are inserted before “*veraciter fuerint corde contriti*.” Mr. Green’s object is to fix the attention upon the words “*corde contriti*” and “*ore confessi*,” and so also in an extract from an indulgence granted by Alexander III. to those who would take up arms against the Albigenses: “The words are,” says Mr. Green, “*Qui autem in vera pœnitentia ibi decesserint, et peccatorum indulgentiam et fructum mercedis æternæ se non dubitant percepturos*.”<sup>c</sup> “With regard to those who die there *in true repentance*, let them not doubt that they will receive indulgence of their sins and the fruit of an eternal reward.” Surely Dr. Milner had no occasion to employ the conjunction “*if*.” It is more than probable that, “*if*” the parties concerned in the liberal promises of Urban, Alexander, and Innocent, had known that when “pardon” and “remission” were spoken of, “the effect was put for the cause,” or that the words “pardon” and “remission” were mere “technical terms,” and that the word “sins” was in the same predicament; it is more than probable, we repeat, that if the parties concerned had been aware of such an interpretation, they could hardly have “screwed their courage to the sticking point,” as fearless soldiers of the Church against the infidels and heretics. In the case of Urban, “Gul. Tyrius says, ‘that Urban expressly mentions those sins which the Bible tells us exclude from the kingdom of God, *viz.* “murders,” “thefts,” and the like; and not only absolved them from all the penances due to their sins, but bid them not doubt of an eternal reward after death,’ as William of Malmesbury also tells us. The same testimony is given by Odericus Vitalis, in whose time the expedition began, ‘upon which,’ he says, ‘all the thieves, pirates, and rogues came in great numbers and enlisted themselves, having made confession;’ and St. Bernard<sup>d</sup> rejoices much that ‘there were few who were not bad characters; because, he says, there was a double cause

<sup>a</sup> “The Truth,” &c. p. 20.

<sup>b</sup> Ex Serm. Hortat. Innoc. III. in Conc. Lat. 4; apud Matt. Paris, anno 1215.

<sup>c</sup> Ex Decreto xxvii. Conc. Lat. 3.

<sup>d</sup> Ad Milites Templi Sermo, chap. 5.

of joy; *viz.*, that their own countries were well rid of such rogues, and that they had entered upon an enterprise which would assuredly take them to heaven.”<sup>a</sup> Good reason indeed had Bernard for rejoicing, and, whatever might be the meaning of “remission,” “pardon,” or “sin,” there can be little doubt that the countries relieved from the presence of such characters were truly indebted to the Pope for his *indulgence*. We may, however, be reminded, that although the terms “pardon of sins” are found in these and other Bulls, yet the condition “*contriti et confessi*” is also found. Most true; and the value of it we may learn from the testimony of a most unexceptionable witness to the behaviour of these *vere pœnitentes et contriti*, as well as *confessi*, when they had arrived as far as Constantinople:—“And the Christians themselves conducted themselves shamefully, since they overthrew and burned the palaces of the city, and carried away the lead, whence the churches were covered, and sold it to the Greeks.”<sup>b</sup> Lest the reader should be wearied, one other specimen only shall be given of a “pardon” granted by Pope Boniface (the inventor of Jubilees), in his Bull published in the year 1300, “not only a plenary and larger, but a most full pardon of all their sins, we will and do concede.”<sup>c</sup> This Bull also contains the clause about contrition and confession, “*vere pœnitentibus et confessis*,” with a remarkable addition, which appears in Mr. Green’s extract, *viz.* “*vel qui vere pœnitebunt et confitebuntur.*” Mr. Green was very angry with Archdeacon Hodson for inferring, from the phraseology of Boniface, that “the Pope here takes away *more than all the punishment due to sin*,” and accuses the archdeacon of misinterpreting, and therefore of misapplying, a passage from Bellarmine. The archdeacon thus writes: “Now Bellarmine tells us that ‘a plenary Indulgence takes away all the punishment due to sin.’ With this interpretation Mr. Green quarrels, and gives us his own interpretation, and, in a note, the words of Bellarmine.”<sup>d</sup> Mr. Green’s translation seems to have been

<sup>a</sup> See “British Mag.” Aug. 1842, p. 157, for a paper by the Rev. E. C. Harrington.

<sup>b</sup> “*Ipsique Christiani nequiter deducebant se, quoniam civitatis palatia sternebant, et auferebant plumbum, unde ecclesiæ erant coopertæ, et vendebant Græcis.*”

This is an extract from “*Belli Sacri Historia*,” the *original* of the first piece in the “*Gesta Dei per Francos*,” which is but an abridgment. The whole is given in Mabillon and Germain’s “*Museum Italicum*,” tom. i. pars alt. pp. 130—239. “The Church of Rome’s Traffic in Pardons substantiated.” London, Painter, 1838, p. 15.

<sup>c</sup> “*Non solum plenam et largiorem, imo plenissimam concedemus et concedimus peccatorum.*”—Bullar. Compend. Cherubin., tom. i. p. 36.

<sup>d</sup> “*Indulgentia . . . plenaria totum pœnæ reatum tollit qui post culpam remissam forte remansit.*”—Bellarm. tom. iii. De Ind. lib. 7, cap. ix. G.

made in a *hurry*, and, assuredly, does not mend the matter: "A plenary indulgence takes away *all the punishment* due to sin, *which remains after the remission of the guilt.*" The word "*forte*" seems to have been overlooked. How the inference drawn by the archdeacon is affected by the above it is difficult to perceive; for if *all*, whether punishment or guilt, be forgiven by a *plenary* indulgence, what is the effect, in such a case, of "*indulgentia plenior,*" and, *a fortiori*, of an "*indulgentia plenissima?*"

Bellarmino, indeed, tells us that "indulgences do not remit guilt [culpam], neither mortal nor venial, but only punishment, and that temporary."<sup>a</sup> And so also Dens: "What is an indulgence?—It is the remission of the temporal punishment due to sins remitted as to the guilt, made by the power of the keys *extra sacramentum*, by the application of satisfactions which are contained in the treasure of the Church."<sup>b</sup> The doctrine thus stated is not altogether reconcilable with other statements of Romish teachers, but *that* is *their* concern; let us, however, take these statements as they stand, and, surely, they afford us an example of the most solemn trifling. If *all* the punishment of sins, whether mortal or venial, or, if you choose, all the *remaining* punishment, *temporal* though it be (and the word *temporal* is not confined to mortal life!), is taken away, what does it matter to the receiver of such indulgence whether it be called "a pardon of sin" or "a remission of punishment?" Rome wishes to retain both the power of confession and absolution, and also the power of granting indulgences; there is no little danger lest, whilst advocating the efficacy of each, one should be exalted at the expense of the other. If there remain, after confession and priestly absolution, so heavy a debt of punishment that, it may be, thousands of years must elapse before that debt is satisfied, the penitent may feel uncomfortable with such a prospect before him, and think slightly of the absolution which leaves him in so undesirable a position. Something like this seems to have occurred to Bellarmine, when he wrote "*reatum tollit qui. . . FORTE remansit,*" not perceiving how much the value of the plenary indulgence was damaged by thus making the benefit depend upon "*if, perchance.*" To ordinary readers, nevertheless, "indulgence and remission of sins are everywhere united, so as to convey the idea that the pardon of guilt, as well as the remission of a temporal punishment, is included in the

<sup>a</sup> Ibid. tom. ii. De Ind. lib. ii. c. 3, F.

<sup>b</sup> Theol. vol. vi. No. 30, p. 417.

boon.”<sup>a</sup> Morinus, “in his ‘Sacrament of Penance,’ justly observes, that these indulgences cannot be understood of a mere relaxation of canonical penance, because that remission of sins is granted upon which eternal life is vouchsafed, and therefore, they must have reference to God, and not merely to the Church.”<sup>b</sup> The reader may think that there is some truth in the distinction between “Old Popery” and “New Popery,” which some writers have made, notwithstanding the claim of infallibility set up for the Church of Rome. Perhaps, however, some modern sons of Rome may think, as others have done before them, that an indulgence can neither secure the pardon of sins nor exemption from punishment. That there *were* some who thought thus, we learn from very good authority. Gregory of Valentia tells us of some who thought “that ecclesiastical indulgence of itself could remit no punishment either in the judgment of the Church, or in the judgment of God; but that it was a kind of *pious fraud*, whereby the Church, by promising such remission, may allure men to the devout performance of good works which were required in the form of the indulgence, that in proportion to that devotion, and the value of those works, satisfaction be made to God, and not by any virtue in the indulgence itself.”<sup>c</sup> To much the same purpose speaks another “school-doctor:” “The devising of Indulgences is a pious fraud and a harmless deceit, that by a devout kind of error the people may be drawn to godliness.”<sup>d</sup> The same opinion is, doubtless, referred to as in the above extract. Roman Catholics holding such opinions, certainly never believed an indulgence to convey “a pardon for sin.”

“IV. We do not,” proceeds Dr. Milner, “believe an indulgence to imply any exemption from repentance, as Bishop Porteus slanders us; for this is always

<sup>a</sup> Ferraris, Prompt. Bibliotheca, Indulg. art. v. sect. 16, 17. See Elliot’s “Delineation of Roman Catholicism,” p. 339, edit. Lond. 1851.

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.* p. 232.

<sup>c</sup> “Una est, quam refert Albertus in quarta distinctione vigesima, articulo decimo septimo, et D. Thom. hic in supplem., tertie partis, questione vigesima quinta, articulo secundo, quorundam qui dixerunt indulgentiam ecclesiasticam nullam pœnam remittere per se, nec in foro Ecclesiæ, neque in foro Dei; sed esse piam quandam *fraudem*, quâ Ecclesia per illam remissionis pollicitationem homines alliciat ad exequendum devote ea opera pia, quæ in indulgentiæ forma exiguntur, ut pro ratione ejus devotionis, et valore eorum operum, Deo satisfiat, non autem per vim ipsius indulgentiæ.”—Gregorii de Valentia, e Societate Jesu, Comment. Theol. tom. iv. disp. vii. quest. xx. de Indulgentiis, punct. i. col. 1784, A. Lutet. Paris. 1609.

<sup>d</sup> “Num tibi leves . . . causæ videntur, quibus ab hac nova indulgentiarum assertionem patres ante Albertum et Thomam discesserunt, asserentes nihil esse nisi piam fraudem ac dolum non malum, quo plebs officioso,” &c.—Wessel. Farrag. Rer. Theolog. Basil, 1522. Epist. contra Tac. Hock de Indulgent. cap. i. fol. 106.



enjoined or implied in the grant of it, and is indispensably necessary for the effect of every grace ; nor from the works of penance and other good works, because our Church teaches that the ‘life of a Christian ought to be a perpetual penance ; and that to *enter into life*, we must *keep God’s commandments*, and must *abound in every good work*.’ Whether an obligation of all this can be reconciled with the articles of being ‘justified by faith only,’ and that ‘works done before grace partake of the nature of sin,’ I do not here inquire.”

There is no little confusion and a good deal of caution in the above. What are the “temporary punishments” spoken of above ? Do they not *include* “canonical penance ?” Dens, in explaining the meaning of an indulgence for a certain time, as “of a hundred days,” affirms that the benefit is the same as if the penitent had “performed a penance of a hundred days, *accustomed to be imposed, according to the canons*.”<sup>a</sup> But we shall see more of this by-and-by. The good Doctor exhibits a prudent caution when he tells us that repentance is “always enjoined or *implied* in the grant,” for, if we may trust Dens, it is *not* always enjoined, neither is it *always required*, and is sometimes dispensed with :—

“The seraphical doctor tells us of some indulgences granted to help to build some church, or the like : those that gave a penny towards it should be pardoned the third part of their repentance, and for another penny another third part, and for another penny the last third part ; so that for three pence remission may be obtained.”<sup>b</sup>

The same principle is clearly acknowledged by Dens :—

“If the work concur, in substance, with the end intended by him who grants the Indulgence, it seems to be sufficient ; otherwise not. So Bellarmine, Layman, Billuart, and Daelman, against Neessen, Collet, &c. Whence if an indulgence be granted to those who shall give money to build a church, *although it be given out of vain glory*, they gain the indulgence ; but if prayers, fasts, alms, &c., be enjoined *to appease God*, to obtain the conversion of infidels, &c., he who gives out of vain glory does not appear to satisfy.”<sup>c</sup>

Can a man be “in a state of grace” who gives “out of vain glory ?” And yet, if the object be “to build a church,” a person giving “out of vain glory” obtains, or

<sup>a</sup> “Sed significatur, quod is, qui consequetur illam indulgentiam centum dierum, obtineat tantam remissionem pœnarum temporalium *in hoc seculo vel in Purgatorio* luendarum, quantum obtinisset, si pœnitentiam centum dierum secundum canones imponi vera peregisset, spectando scilicet eam mere quatenus satisfactoriam !”—Dens, Theol. tom. vi. No. 31, p. 419.

<sup>b</sup> Bonavent. in Sent. Venet. edit. p. 323.

<sup>c</sup> “An sufficit facere opus injunctum quoad substantiam, etiamsi ex fine vel circumstantiis fiat peccatum veniale ?

“R. Si opus quoad substantiam factum concurrat ad finem intentum a concedente indulgentiam, videtur sufficere ; secus non. Ita Bellarmine, Layman, Billuart, et Daelman, contra Neessen, Collet, &c. Unde si concedatur indulgentia eis qui dabunt nummum ad ædificandum ecclesiam, etsi ex vanâ gloriâ detur, lucrantur indulgentiam ; si vero injungantur preces, jejunia, eleemosynæque ad placandum Deum, ad obtinendum conversionem infidelium, &c., non videtur satisfacere qui illa opera facit ex vanâ gloriâ.”—Dens, Theol. tom. vi. No. 35, p. 430.

rather *gains*, the Indulgence. The very question, to which the preceding extract is the response, proves that a person may commit a *venial* sin, and yet obtain an Indulgence. "Is it sufficient to perform the enjoined work as to its substance, although from the intention [*ex fine*] or circumstances a venial sin be committed?" Rome, as we have said, likes to have both Confessions and Indulgences when she can; but she is very liberal, and, when it appears to serve her purpose, by no means exacting as to the conditions of an Indulgence; thus Dens tells us, that, as to sacramental confession,—

"1. When it is not required in the Bull, it is *not* necessary, but a state of grace is sufficient; nevertheless to those who are in mortal sin, and desirous to gain an indulgence, it will be necessary as an ordinary mean to a state of grace, *if a confessor can be had*.

"2. When, indeed, confession is required in the Bull, but only as a disposition and ordinary mean to a state of grace, it is necessary indeed to those who have fallen into mortal sin, *but not to those who have only venial sins.*"<sup>a</sup>

If a person does not *confess*, how is he to be judged of as to being in a proper state to receive, or gain, an Indulgence? Is he left in *this* important matter to the exercise of *private judgment*? But to return to Dr. Milner:—

"V. It is inconsistent with our doctrine of *inherent justification* to believe, as the same prelate charges us, that the effect of an indulgence is to transfer 'the overplus of goodness,' or justification of the saints, by the ministers of the Pope, to us Catholics on earth. Such an absurdity may be more easily reconciled with the system of Luther and other Protestants concerning *imputed* justification, which, being like a clean neat cloak thrown over a filthy leper, may be conceived transferable from one person to another."

There may be some "technicalities," which only a Romish theologian can explain, but, assuredly, Dens and others speak of a treasure of "Satisfactions:"—

"What is an Indulgence?"

"It is the remission of the temporal punishment due to sins remitted as to their guilt, made by the power of the keys 'extra sacramentum,' by the application of the *satisfactions* which are contained in the treasure of the Church.

"What is understood by the treasure of the Church?"

"It is an accumulation of *spiritual goods* remaining in the divine keeping, and of which the disposal is intrusted to the Church.

<sup>a</sup> "An ad lucrandum indulgentiam necessaria sit confessio sacramentalis?"

"R. 1<sup>o</sup>. Quando ea in Bulla non exigitur, non est necessaria, sed sufficit status gratiæ; existentibus tamen in peccato mortali et indulgentias lucrari cupientibus, erit necessaria tanquam medium ordinarium ad statum gratiæ, si habeatur copia confessarii.

"2<sup>o</sup>. Quando in Bulla exigitur quidem confessio, sed tantum tanquam dispositio et medium ordinarium ad statum gratiæ, ea quidem necessaria est lapsis in mortali, sed non iis qui habent sola venialia."—Dens, Theol. tom. vi. No. 35, p. 431.

“Whence is this treasure got together?”

“First it is got together from the superabundant satisfactions of Christ, then from the superfluous satisfactions of the Blessed Virgin Mary and of the other Saints.”<sup>a</sup>

The play is upon the word “satisfactions;” it matters little, however, by what name these “bona spiritualia” are called, so long as the pretended effect is the same; nor whether that effect is produced by their being “imputed” to Roman Catholics, or “offered to God for them.” What can it signify to a debtor, whose creditor is *satisfied* by another man paying the debt, whether that other man pays the sum, earned by his own industry, into the hands of the creditor, or a sum equal to the debt be placed to his name on the credit side of his account? It certainly cannot be placed to the account of the debtor’s own *inherent industry*, nor, if his defalcations have been the result of wasteful extravagance, to his *inherent honesty*. Now Dens employs an illustration very like this in explaining the difference between the effect of indulgences in the case of the living and the dead; in the latter case, it is “solum solutio,” but in the former case it is both “solutio,” and also “absolutio.”

“For example, whilst payment is made for a person imprisoned for debt out of a common fund left for that purpose, nevertheless, in the case of indulgences for the living, he [the prelate] further takes and applies in the name of Christ the same satisfactions, and thus, in consideration of them, the punishment due is remitted, which is nothing else than absolution, or *judicial* or authoritative remission, which cannot be exercised towards the dead,” &c.<sup>b</sup>

“A *judicial* remission” looks very like “a *justification*,” for the person thus absolved and cleared is made “rectus in curia.” His character is cleared, and that out of a fund accumulated by others! Dr. Milner and Dens speak of “satisfactions,” whilst in Dr. Butler’s Catechism, revised,

<sup>a</sup> “Quid est Indulgentia?”

“R. Est pœnæ temporalis peccatis quoad culpam remissis debitæ remissio, factu potestate clavium extra sacramentum per applicationem satisfactionum quæ in thesauro Ecclesiæ continentur.

“Quid intelligitur per thesaurum Ecclesiæ?”

“R. Est cumulus bonorum spiritualium permanentium in acceptatione divina, et quorum thesaurio Ecclesiæ est concredita.

“Ex quibus thesaurus ille coalescit?”

“R. Primario coalescit ex superabundantibus Christi satisfactionibus, deinde ex superfluentibus Beatæ Mariæ Virginis et reliquorum Sanctorum satisfactionibus.”—Dens, Theol. tom. vi. No. 30, p. 417.

<sup>b</sup> “V.g. dum pro incarcerato propter debita solvitur ex bonis communibus ob illum finem relictis, attamen etiam in indulgentiis pro vivis ulterius nomine Christi easdem satisfactiones acceptat et applicat, sicut consideratione earum remitti pœnas debitas, quod nihil aliud est quam absolutio, seu remissio judicialis vel autoritativa, quæ exerceri non potest in defunctos,” &c.—Dens, Theol. tom. vi. No. 39, p. 437.

enlarged, approved, and recommended, as a general catechism for the kingdom, we find different terms employed:—

“When the Church grants indulgences, what does it offer to God, *to supply our weakness and insufficiency*, and in satisfaction for our transgression?—The *merits* of Christ, which are infinite and superabundant: together with the *virtues* and *good works* of his Virgin Mother, and all his saints.”—Lesson xxviii. Cork, 1839.

In a French catechism, to which the Pope’s Bull is prefixed,<sup>a</sup> we read:—

“Q. What, then, in a word, is the intention of the Church in the dispensation of indulgences?”

“A. To assist well-meaning Christians to *clear* themselves in regard to God, and make up their infirmity.”

Something very like “justification,” in making Christians “clear in regard to God.” There are, indeed, few points in which the doctors of Rome are agreed as to the nature, effects, and extent of indulgences; and no wonder, therefore, that Dr. Milner should fall into inconsistency in attempting to settle the whole matter in a page or two; and his playing upon the words “justification,” “satisfactions,” “imputation,” was probably only intended to draw off the attention of the reader from the real merits of the case, and to make him believe that he, Dr. Milner, had cleared up a matter upon which so much has been written, and such various opinions held, by the ablest divines of Rome.<sup>b</sup> Bossuet and Gother represent indulgences merely as the relaxations of the canonical censures or canons, whilst by Dens and Delahogue the opinion of Bellarmine is followed, that an indulgence averts the wrath of God with respect to the temporal punishment of sin.<sup>c</sup>

“Lastly,” writes Dr. Milner, “whereas the Council of Trent calls indulgences *heavenly treasures*, we hold that it would be a sacrilegious crime in any person whatever to be concerned in buying or selling them.” A crime, indeed, for other reasons besides the one given by the Doctor, who is “far from denying” that such things *have* been! And yet we find Dens allowing that an indulgence may be “gained” by giving money to build a church, even though it be given “*out of vain glory!*” We remember to have read of an unsophisticated rustic being told by a surly porter, that Lord —

<sup>a</sup> Cited in Elliot’s “Delineation,” &c., pp. 310, 311. London, 1851.

<sup>b</sup> “Sed quænam sit illa pœna quæ vi indulgentiarum remittitur, *non convenit inter theologos*, ut videri est in *Regula Fidei*, Veronii (c. ii. sect. 4, de Indulg.)”—Delahogue Tract. de Sac. Pœnit. Append. de Indulg. chap. ii. art. 1.

<sup>c</sup> “Valent autem indulgentiæ non solum in foro Ecclesiæ sed etiam in foro Dei,” &c.—Dens, Theol. tom. vi. No. 30, p. 418.

was "not at home;" but, before the poor fellow had gone very far from the nobleman's residence, the porter called him back and hinted, that, "if he would give him half a crown," perhaps he, the porter, could name the hour when "my lord" would be "at home." The countryman complied, and when he had, a second time, got a little way from the door, he turned round, and, after a pause of a minute or two, exclaimed, "Well, now, if that wasn't a *Lord's* house, I should say such doings were very like bribery and corruption!" And, probably, such doings as granting an indulgence to a *vain-glorious* person, simply because he had "given money to build a church," would be termed, "if that wasn't the Pope's house," a very disreputable affair, even by Dr. Milner.

After having told us what an indulgence is *not*, Dr. Milner proceeds to tell us what it *is*, but by no means succeeds in clearing the matter from its difficulties.

I. He supposes a prince wholly to remit a capital punishment, or to leave the criminal subject to a lighter punishment, and tells us that God may act in either of these ways; but we know that God has told us in His Word that "the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin;" He tells us what He *has* done, and does not leave us to speculate on what He *might* do.

II. He seeks a proof in the punishment of Adam, that the guilt of sin was pardoned, and "the eternal punishment due to it" remitted! A most unfortunate reference for the doctrine of indulgences, for, will any one say that the infirmities of the body which "is dead because of sin,"—those infirmities, that mortality, which every son of the offending Adam inherits,—can be averted, or even alleviated, by an *indulgence*? We know of Rome's pretended miracles of healing the sick, but have any of her writers claimed this virtue for an *indulgence*? And some such test would assuredly have proclaimed their power, had such power been connected with them! Our Saviour attested His own power to forgive sins by showing His power to heal the infirmities of the body: "Whether is it easier, to say, Thy sins are forgiven thee; or to say, Rise up and walk? But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (He said unto the sick of the palsy) I say unto thee, Arise, and take up thy couch and go into thine house. And immediately he rose up, and took up that whereon he lay, and departed to his own house glorifying God."<sup>a</sup> Equally unfortunate is the appeal to the case of David (2 Sam. xii. 14), for Nathan was especially commissioned, and gives a special reason, "Howbeit, because by this deed thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of

<sup>a</sup> Luke v. 23—25.

the Lord to blaspheme, the child also that is born unto thee shall surely die." Now, to make the parallel hold, as the indulgence remits the *temporal* punishment of sin, to say nothing of other important differences in the case, we should have read of some mitigation of David's temporal punishment; but we read of none, the Prophet told him that the child should surely die, and it *did die!* The reference to the case of the incestuous Corinthian (2 Cor. ii. 10) is not more fortunate: "To whom ye forgive anything, I forgive also;" and, in the preceding verses, St. Paul assigns his reasons why the penitent should be forgiven, "Lest perhaps such an one should be swallowed up with over much sorrow."<sup>a</sup> If the whole context be examined, there will be seen to be no parallel whatever between the proceeding of the Apostle and indulgences of Rome. The object of those who adduce the passage is to show that the good deeds of others might "*satisfy*" for the misdoings or "infirmities" of the offender; and that the Apostle assumed the power of remitting the "temporal punishment;" and then to have it supposed that this power has descended to "the successors of St. Peter;" but this is not only a *petitio principii*, but in every way a misrepresentation of the case. St. Paul could scarcely contemplate the superabundance of good works on the part of those to whom he proposed the comforting of the offending brother, that he "might know the proof of them," whether they were "*obedient in all things.*"

We need not pause to examine the justness of Dr. Milner's inferences from such premises further, as to the above points; for, if all that he contends for were granted, still he must assume another very important point before he can establish the parallel he seeks; he must take it for granted that the doctrine of a *Purgatory* also is true; he must assume also the truth of the doctrine of works of supererogation, though our Lord Himself has said, "When ye have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants, we have done that which was our duty to do." A Pope would teach Dr. Milner that Rome's teaching on these points is not that of Scripture. Gelasius adduces the peti-

<sup>a</sup> "But if any have caused grief, he hath not grieved me, but in part; that I may not overcharge you all. Sufficient to such a man is this punishment, which was inflicted of many. So that contrariwise ye ought rather to forgive him, and comfort him, lest perhaps such a one should be swallowed up with over much sorrow. Wherefore I beseech you that ye would confirm your love towards him. For to this end also did I write, that I might know the proof of you, whether ye be obedient in all things. To whom ye forgive anything, I forgive also: for if I forgave anything, to whom I forgave it, for your sakes forgave I it in the person of Christ."

tions of the Lord's Prayer, "lead us not into temptation, &c." to prove that the best of men is not without sin, and argues that the text, "If we say that we have no sin, we shall make him a liar" (1 John i. 8), is applicable in this case.<sup>a</sup>

Again he argues that Acacius, being dead, could not obtain absolution, because he was altogether beyond all human interference.<sup>b</sup>

Thus we see that the doctrine of Indulgences is connected with many other equally unscriptural doctrines, and that Rome necessarily fears the exposure of her traffic in such matters, as it thus leads to investigate all the errors which it involves. Even Bellarmine agrees with Gelasius as to the power of Rome over the *dead*. "Therefore neither Peter, nor the Pope, can challenge any prerogative more than other over the dead;"<sup>c</sup> though he thinks that Indulgences are profitable to the dead "per modum suffragii." A remarkable instance of an acute mind endeavouring to support a doctrine, the hollowness of which it could not but clearly perceive! Durandus confesses that Indulgences have no foundation in Scripture or antiquity:—"Very little can be affirmed with any certainty, concerning Indulgences, because neither the Scripture speaks expressly of them; and the Fathers, Ambrose, Hilary, Augustine, Hierom, speak not at all of them."<sup>d</sup> Sylvester Prierias says, "Indulgences have not become known to us by the authority of Scriptures, but by the authority of the Church of Rome, and of the Popes, which is greater."<sup>e</sup> Alphonsus de Castro says, "Among all things, there is none which the Scriptures have less opened, or whereof the old writers have said less. What wonder, then, that among the ancients there is no mention of them?"<sup>f</sup> "The use of them,"

<sup>a</sup> Labbé et Cossart, tom. iii. col. 1243. Paris, 1671.

<sup>b</sup> "Siquidem ipsis Apostolis Christi voce delegatum est, *Quæ ligaveritis, et reliqua*. Cæterum de eo, qui in divino judicio est constitutus, nobis non fas est aliud decernere præter id, in quo eum supremus dies invenit."—Ibid. col. 1259.

<sup>c</sup> Bellarm. de Indulg., lib. i. cap. xiv. q. 2.

<sup>d</sup> "De Indulgentiis pauca dici possunt per certitudinem, quia nec Scriptura expresse de eis loquitur. Quod enim dictum est Petro, Matt. xvi. : 'Tibi dabo claves regni cælorum. Et quodcumque ligaveris,' &c., intelligitur de potestate ei data in foro pœnitentiæ. De collatione autem Indulgentiarum non est clarum quod debeat intelligi: Sancti etiam, ut Ambrosius, Hilarius, Augustinus, minime loquuntur de Indulgentiis."—Durand. à Portiano in Sent. Theol. P. Lombard., lib. iv. dist. xx. quæst. 3.

<sup>e</sup> "Indulgentiæ auctoritate Scripturæ non innotuere nobis; sed auctoritate Ecclesiæ Romanæ, Romanorumque pontificum, quæ major est."—Sylvest. Prier. in Luth. Concl. Dial. in Luth. Op. Witeb. 1554, tom. i. fol. 166.

<sup>f</sup> "Inter omnes res, de quibus in hoc opere disputamus, nulla est quam minus aperte sacræ literæ prodiderint, et de quâ minus vetusti Scriptores dixerint. Quid ergo mirum . . . ut apud priscos nulla sit de eis mentio."—Alphons. de Castro adv. Hær. col. 1539, lib. viii. Indulg. fol. 142; or

he tells us, "was, it seems, received late into the Church."<sup>a</sup> Cardinal Fisher candidly acknowledged, "As long as there was no care about Purgatory, no one sought for Indulgences; for upon that depends all the value of Indulgences; if you take away Purgatory, what need will there be of Indulgences?"<sup>b</sup> Other ancient testimonies might be adduced to the same purpose, but the above are sufficient to show a considerable difference between "Old Popery" and "New Popery," and to shake considerably the assumed confidence of appeal to *scriptural* authority in support of the doctrine of Indulgences.

What if, after all, the whole matter has a heathen origin? "What," writes Mr. Blunt, in his "Vestiges of Ancient Manners and Customs discoverable in Modern Italy and Sicily,"<sup>c</sup> "what then is the advantage of Masses? It is the price of the Indulgence, or a more speedy delivery from the pains of Purgatory. And what was the advantage of sepulture, and the funeral rites of old? A more speedy deliverance from the misery of wandering on the wrong side the Styx. The difference is inconsiderable." Mr. Blunt has just before remarked, "In some places the poor are deluded enough to pay a certain sum monthly to their priest, for the sake of insuring a ceremony after death which they hold it a serious misfortune to want." And a little after he says: "Having had cause to touch upon the sale of Indulgences, it is convenient to mention in this place a passage in Suetonius, which appears to me to afford some explanation of that abuse of the Church of Rome. In his life of Vespasian he records several indecent plans which that emperor pursued for raising a revenue; and amongst the rest that of selling pardons ('absolutiones' is the word used) to culprits, whether guilty or innocent, 'nec reis, tam innoxiiis quam nocentibus, absolutiones venditare cunctatus est.' (Vespas. 16.) Since then the Pope has confessedly adopted some practices of his imperial predecessors, those *pontifices maximi* whose title he inherits; such, for instance, as that of offering his foot for salutation, which was first done by Dioclesian, is it not possible that he may also have followed so tempting an example in his fiscal arrangements, and have thus granted to

Alphonsi a Castro Opera adversus omnes Hæreses, lib. viii. sect. Indulg. col. 578, fol. Paris, 1571.

<sup>a</sup> "Earum usus in Ecclesiâ videatur sero receptus."—Ibid.

<sup>b</sup> "Quamdiu nulla fuerat de Purgatorio cura, nemo quæsit Indulgentias; nam ex illo pendet omnis Indulgentiarum existimatio; si tollas Purgatorium, quorsum Indulgentiis opus erit."—Assert. Luther. Confut. Antwerp, 1523, p. 111.

<sup>c</sup> London: John Murray, 1823, p. 186.



spiritual offenders, as a spiritual prince, that release from punishment which it seems was before accorded to temporal offenders by a temporal prince?"<sup>a</sup> The truth of Mr. Blunt's suggestion will be pretty evident when we touch upon the rise of Indulgences, on which we shall have the less occasion to dwell, having already cited authorities alluding to that part of the subject.

"Still," says Dr. Milner, "this power, like that of absolution, is not arbitrary; there must be a just cause for the exercise of it; namely, the greater good of the penitent, or of the faithful, or of Christendom in general; and there must be a certain proportion between the punishment remitted and the good work performed. Hence [mark this, reader!] no one can be sure that he has gained the entire benefit of an Indulgence, though he has performed all the conditions appointed for this end; and hence, of course, the pastors of the Church will have to answer for it, if they take upon themselves to grant Indulgences for unworthy or insufficient purposes."

What an admission! All then may amount to just nothing! And therefore all the learning and sophistry of the doctor might have been spared. How careful ought the pastors to be in examining into the worthiness of the "cause" before granting Indulgences, and yet Dens tells us this must *not* be too nicely questioned, but taken for granted,<sup>b</sup> and no doubt should ever be *publicly* expressed respecting the validity of an Indulgence on the part of the grantor. Has not the good doctor been a little incautious in his admission? The benefit of the individual, the good of the Church or of Christendom, affords, after such an admission, but a treacherous foundation to rest upon. There are other dangers too, as we shall presently see.

"Lastly," writes Dr. Milner, "it is the received doctrine of the Church, that an Indulgence, when truly gained, is not barely a relaxation of the canonical penance enjoined by the Church, but also an actual remission by God himself, of the whole or part of the temporal punishment due to it in his sight. The contrary opinion, though held by some theologians, has been condemned by Leo X. and Pius VI.; and indeed, without the effect here mentioned, Indulgences would not be *heavenly treasures*, and the use of them would not be *beneficial*, but rather *pernicious* to Christians, contrary to two declarations of the last General Council, as Bellarmin well argues."

Assuredly in that case Indulgences would *not* be *heavenly treasures*, even "when truly gained," of which the doctor admits there may be a *doubt!* "The above explanation," proceeds Dr. Milner, "of an Indulgence, conformably to the

<sup>a</sup> Ibid. pp. 190-1.

<sup>b</sup> "Denique observandum est, quòd non sit particularium examinare causas Indulgentiarum, sed quòd pro reverentiâ debitâ Prælates Ecclesiæ debeant supponere, causam justam et sufficientem esse: igitur neque in concionibus, neque in aliis occasionebus coram populo unquam moveatur dubium circa validitatem Indulgentiæ ex parte concedentis."—Dens, Theol., tom. vi. No. 37, p. 434. Edit. Dublin, 1832.

doctrine of theologians, the decrees of Popes, and the definitions of Councils, ought to silence the objections, and suppress the sarcasms of Protestants on this head." How far the given explanation will accomplish all this, the reader will judge for himself; and to enable him to do so more effectually, we proceed to a brief outline of the history of Indulgences, and of Jubilees, so intimately connected with them. Rome, indeed, has little wish to have this point cleared up, and her modern champions, in their attempts to conceal the true state of the case, have done little more than endeavour to cover the original painting with a coat of water-colours, which any Pope may, at his pleasure, easily remove by a slight application of his infallible sponge, whenever it shall appear desirable to exhibit the original picture in its primitive beauty to the admiring gaze of his delighted subjects!

In the primitive Church a wholesome system of discipline obtained, by which offenders were frequently obliged to continue for a considerable time—in some cases for many years—in a state of penance and separation from the sacraments. It seemed, however, expedient to the Council of Nice to give power to all bishops to shorten the time, and to relax the severity of the Canons.<sup>a</sup> This favour was called an Indulgence, and appears to have been a just and necessary provision, without which no society could be well governed. But after the tenth century a great alteration took place, and the original design seems to have been altogether laid aside. In the hands of the Popes the machinery of Indulgences was employed, and with effect, to promote the power and affluence of the See of Rome. The first Indulgence, in the modern sense of the word, was granted by Anselm, Bishop of Lucca, and Legate of Gregory VII., to those who would take his part against Henry IV. Similar Indulgences were granted by Urban II. to such as would undertake the Crusade to the Holy Land; and, after him by succeeding Popes, for the same purpose. Morinus states that these Indulgences did not merely absolve from Canonical penance, but that "a remission of such sins was granted by them, upon which eternal life depends."<sup>b</sup> Be this as it may, we find that when they came to be regarded as effecting a deliverance from

<sup>a</sup> "Licet Episcopo humanius aliquid de eis statuere."—See Beveregii Pand. Can. Conc. Nic. Can. 12.

<sup>b</sup> See Baron. Annal., A.D. 1084, n. 15, and Bower's "Lives of the Popes," vol. v. p. 280, 4to. (edit. London, 1750); Morinus de Sac. Pœn. l. 10, c. 20. The reader will excuse some few repetitions of authorities, as they are necessary to the course of the statement.

Purgatory, they were considered as too important to be intrusted wholly to inferior hands; and, accordingly, in the Fourth Lateran Council, held by Innocent III.,<sup>a</sup> the power of the bishops was abridged. We may here draw the attention of the reader to a remark previously made, that without Purgatory the Indulgences would be things of no value, as admitted by Cardinal Fisher, whose opinion has already been cited.<sup>b</sup> The value, then, of Indulgences clearly depends upon Purgatory. But something more was necessary to make the machinery work satisfactorily; and accordingly, counsels of perfection, works of supererogation, and a communication of merits, or, more correctly speaking, of "satisfactions,"<sup>c</sup> were invented.

Here then we see at once why the Church of Rome is so solicitous to maintain these doctrines; without them Indulgences would be nothing worth. And here also we see the reason of her sensitiveness on the subject of Indulgences; if *they* are brought into disrepute, the doctrines of Purgatory, works of supererogation, &c., become little better than idle tales. We have already seen, as to the doctrine of Indulgences, that the theologians of Rome tell us of a certain treasure placed at the disposal of the Pope; and that this treasure consists of the superabundant satisfactions of Christ, with the superfluous satisfactions of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and of the rest of the saints.<sup>d</sup> Clement VI., however, speaks of the *merits* of "the Holy Mother of God and of all the elect" as contributing to the said treasure; so that if any important deduction depends upon the term "satisfactions," we must have recourse to the *technical* interpretation, and say that "merits" mean "satisfactions," or no little confusion will ensue. There appears, even with the aid of the *technicalities*, some difficulty on the subject of the *culpa*, when the application of the above-named treasure is to be made for the release of souls from Purgatorial sufferings, or from a part of them. We have seen that an Indulgence is stated to be "the remission of the temporal punishment due to sins already remitted *quoad culpam*, by the power of the

<sup>a</sup> A.D. 1215.

<sup>b</sup> "Quamdiu nulla fuerat de Purgatorio cura, nemo quæsit Indulgentias; nam ex illo pendet omnis Indulgentiarum existimatio: si tollas Purgatorium, quorsum Indulgentiis opus erit."—Assert. Luther. Confut., Antwerp, 1523, p. 111. (*Suprà* p. 98.)

<sup>c</sup> Eckius distinguishes between merits and satisfactions.—Enchiridion, p. 248, Coloniae, 1567.

<sup>d</sup> Dens, Theol., tom. vi. No. 30. "Ad cuius quidem thesauri cumulum, beatæ Dei Genetricis, omniumque electorum, a primo justo ad ultimum, *merita* adminiculum præstare noscuntur."—Corpus Juris Canonici Extravag. Commun. lib. v. tit. ix. c. i. ii.

keys, *extra sacramentum*, and by the application of the treasure which is contained in the Church." But this unfortunate *culpa*, Romish theologians have found it no easy matter to manage. Accordingly, we find Dens, somewhat inconsistently with his definition of an Indulgence, it must be confessed, stating, "but the guilt itself of the sin is not *directly* remitted by Indulgences." Was this an inadvertence? or was the cautious phraseology suggested by the recollection that some of the Popes, not aware of the mischief their infallibilities were doing, had made use of expressions sounding so very like pardon of sins, "properly speaking," that the assertion of Indulgences having nothing at all to do with such pardons, was too hazardous? Such a recollection clearly suggested the interpretation of "*causa pro effectu*," as appears from the previous statement of the objection,— "Pontiffs sometimes say in their Bulls that they grant Indulgences of sins."<sup>a</sup> The very use of the word *directe* implies that *indirecte* there is *some* connection implied. It is really of little consequence whether "confession" be required or not; if it be required, it is then only one of the *conditions*, and the Indulgence is to give full and certain effect to the absolution, and something besides. If it were not so, there would be no necessity for naming the *absolution*, for *that* would be a matter of course, and would be understood as such; *some* connection, then, there must be, though not *directe*. When Indulgences were first brought into the market, it would be necessary to speak of them as accomplishing all that the purchasers could wish to have done for their money. In a little time, however, this would be found to damage the Confessional, for who, with a full pardon in his pocket, would want absolution from a common priest? What must be done? A clause "*contritis et confessis*" must be inserted, and insisted upon; matters would then go on better, Indulgences would recommend Confession, and yet had a boon to bestow, which the Confessional had *not*, and

<sup>a</sup> "Ipsa autem peccati per Indulgentias directe non remittitur."—Theol., tom. vi. No. 30, p. 418. Again, "Generatim autem Indulgentia non remittit pœnam ullius peccati, nisi ante quoad culpam remissi."—Ibid. No. 34, p. 426. Dens is not always quite consistent with himself; in p. 426 he tells us that "in *all* indulgences mention is made 'de vere contritis et confessis,'" and yet, in p. 431, he speaks, as we have seen, of a case in which confession is not required: "Quando ea in Bulla *non exigitur*," &c. Are we to "take a distinction," as Counsellor Crossmyloof says, and understand Dens to mean that it is always mentioned in the Indulgence, though not always in the Bull? But, by his own showing, if not mentioned in the *Bull*, the mention in the Indulgence "goes for nothing." By the way, Mr. Green would soften Dens by translating, "But the guilt itself of sin directly is not remitted by an Indulgence."—"The Truth, &c.," p. 145.

would thus recommend themselves. We may observe that "*Indulgence AND remission*" are both mentioned in a document by Benedict XIII. "We mercifully, in the Lord, grant . . . to all and each of the faithful, *vere pœnitentibus et confessis*, . . . to gain a plenary *Indulgence AND remission* of all their sins."<sup>a</sup> Whatever may be the explanation of this redundancy, it certainly is very *emphatic*.

Indulgences are divided by theologians into—1. "*Plenariæ*," 2. "*Non plenariæ*," 3. "*Pleniores*," 4. "*Plenissimæ*." When an Indulgence is limited to a certain place, as an altar or a church, it is called a "*local Indulgence*;" when it is attached to any material thing, as an image, a rosary, &c., it is termed "*real*;" when granted to any person, without any restriction as to a place or thing, it is called "*personal*;" whilst those which are granted only during a certain period are called "*temporal*."

"*Plenariæ*," we are told, remit the whole debt of *temporal*<sup>b</sup> punishment; "*pleniores*" go further, as regards the offences with which the debt is connected, and give a power of absolving in "*cases and censures reserved to the Pope*." Here, then, the Indulgence is needed to gain *absolution* in certain cases! If by *absolution*, priestly absolution, sins are remitted "*quoad culpam*," the plenary Indulgence, by permitting that absolution, *in reserved cases*, which the priest could not give without such permission, *does*, to all intents and purposes, convey a pardon, "*quoad culpam*" as well as "*quoad pœnam*." If such a conclusion had not been very evident, Milner and others might have saved themselves much trouble by simply stating that "*remission only relates to granting absolution in reserved cases, &c.*" "*Plenissimæ*" have a further power, according to Collet, "*of commuting vows or of dispensing in the case of certain irregularities.*" "*Non plenariæ*" are not granted for the remission of the whole debt of temporal punishment, but are wont to be limited to a certain number of days or years, "*according to the method by which formerly canonical penances were prescribed; which being abrogated, the use of Indulgences began to be more common, and, as it were, succeeded to their place,*" &c.<sup>c</sup> A very incautious admission this, because, when an Indulgence is granted, as

<sup>a</sup> "*Plenariam in uno die cujuslibet mensis duntaxat, per unumquemque fidelem, ad sui libitum, eligendo omnium peccatorum suorum Indulgentiam ac remissionem misericorditer in Domino concedimus.*" Datum Romæ, apud Sanct. Mariam Majorem, sub Annulo Piscatoris, die 14 Septembris, 1724, Pontificatus nostri anno primo.—Dens, Theol., tom. viii. No. 287, p. 430.

<sup>b</sup> The sufferings of Purgatory are spoken of as "*temporal*," as opposed to the eternal torments of Hell.

<sup>c</sup> Dens, Theol., tom. vi. No. 31, p. 419. Dublin, 1832.

they have been, for some hundreds or thousands of years, it seems absurd to suppose that any penance would have been imposed for a term so far exceeding the life of man. This matter has troubled the theologians of Rome exceedingly, and their explanations do not seem to clear the matter very satisfactorily. Bellarmine thinks that the popes who granted indulgences for "ten or twenty thousand years," in so doing had an eye to the heinousness of the crimes committed.<sup>a</sup> What is most worthy of remark is that Bellarmine supposes the punishment to be proportioned to the *penance* which would have been enjoined! Dens does not mend the matter; "for any one may owe so many years of penance if he had so sinned that so great a penance should be owing." This is the opinion of Steyaert: "Nor," he adds, "ought there to seem anything wonderful that so many years of punishment should be due, according to the Canons, although one cannot live so long: because that length of time, says Boudart, might be abridged by the intensesness and fervour of charity, by which the enjoined works or other works of virtue were imposed! Hence some undeservedly find fault with these Indulgences of many [years] as if they were forged by the questors, and never granted by the Church."<sup>b</sup> But how is the proportion to be reckoned? If the sufferings in Purgatory exceed all that could be suffered in this life, in intensity, surely the ratio should be *reversed*! No wonder that some Romanists feel rather sensitive on this point, seeing that such unsatisfactory reasons are given for centenary and millenary Indulgences. That any honest man should be scandalized by such absurdities no one can wonder; but that a serious doubt should be expressed as to a *fact*, supported by the most undeniable evidence, does seem a little extraordinary;<sup>c</sup> and, as Mr. Mendham very pertinently observes, "by the simple process of accumulation, Indulgences of moderate length may reach the extent of one of any dimensions, particularly in the case of long livers and frequent offenders."<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> "Sed quidquid de hoc sit, non videtur negandum, posse aliquos reos fieri pœnitentiæ agendæ secundum canones per spatium aliquot millium annorum."—Bellarm. Opera, tom. vii. ; De Indulg., lib. i. cap. ix. Colon. 1617.

<sup>b</sup> Dens, Theol., tom. vi. No. 31, p. 420. Dublin, 1832.

<sup>c</sup> See Mendham's "Memoirs of the Council of Trent," p. 318, note. Ed. 1834.

<sup>d</sup> Dr. Milner obtained an Indulgence, bearing date June 27, 1814. By the performances of certain conditions thereunto annexed, a plenary Indulgence might be obtained, and also an Indulgence of a *hundred days*, which might be obtained for the space of *fifteen years*, once a day by each individual; so that it appears, by a very simple arithmetical process, that a person whose life should extend through that space, and whose circumstances admitted of the performance of the conditions, might obtain an Indulgence for 1500 years! (See "Devotion of the Sacred Heart of our Lord Jesus Christ," pp. 485, 486. London, Keating and Brown, 1830.)

The Pope is the great dispenser of the treasure which supplies Indulgences, and, to a certain extent, the bishops also, but this extent is not exactly ascertained nor defined; so there is a danger, should they go beyond a certain limit, of the Indulgence granted by the bishops being altogether invalid; whether the *whole* of such Indulgences are to be considered as of no effect, or only the *excess*, is not agreed upon among divines.<sup>a</sup> Purchasers, under such circumstances, would do well to take the opinion of some *skilful* and *practised theological conveyancer*, lest perchance they may afterwards discover some flaw therein, which may have the effect of vitiating the whole. Especially careful should they be that the Indulgence has not been obtained at a time when such kind of Indulgences were suspended, nor of those which have been absolutely annulled! Pius V., in 1567, repealed all those that had been granted for lucrative purposes. Paul V., in 1606, repealed all those which were granted to the regulars of every order by his predecessors, and gave others in their places; Innocent XI., in 1678, also withdrew many Indulgences, as *false, forged, and apocryphal*.<sup>b</sup> How does any one know that a *future* pope may not thus deal with the Indulgences he has himself obtained at, it *may* be, a great sacrifice? For if "religious orders" were thus dealt with, what can private individuals expect?

The Pope or Bishop, although he cannot grant an Indulgence to himself, *may*, nevertheless, have a share in the Indulgence he grants to another, as he may also give power to a priest to give him absolution; one reason, however, which is assigned, appears somewhat fanciful,—"*as a person who dispenses public property may take his own share!*"<sup>c</sup> With regard to the requisites for obtaining Indulgences, the applicant must be a baptized person; must be in a state of grace, and perform certain conditions; but the conditions must not in themselves be such as would *satisfy* for the debt of punishment, otherwise the Indulgence would be nugatory.<sup>d</sup> The conditions usually enjoined are, prayers, penance, visiting of churches, alms, fasting, &c. The amount of alms, unless determined by the Bull, may vary according to the circumstances of the giver. Should the Bull be indefinite in the directions given, *e.g.* that an Indulgence will be granted of a hundred days to a person visiting a certain church, he may

<sup>a</sup> Dens, Theol., tom. vi. No. 33, p. 424. Dublin, 1832.

<sup>b</sup> Ferrari's Prompt. Bib. Indulgent., art. iv. sect. 14, et seq. Franc. 1781.

<sup>c</sup> Dens, Theol., tom. vi. No. 33, p. 425. Thom. Suppl. 27 quæst. art. 4.

<sup>d</sup> St. Thomas says that in such a case the Indulgences would be *pious frauds*.

obtain that Indulgence as often as he repeats his visit, *i.e.* it would be a *partial* Indulgence, and such partial Indulgences may be obtained “*sæpius eodem die.*” A plenary indulgence can only be obtained *once* in a day. If two Indulgences be granted under different heads for the same day, and each prescribe a condition which cannot be repeated in the same day, then by *one* act both may be gained. The Church requires a certain *intention* in those who wish to gain Indulgences, yet they may be granted to one insensible and about to die!<sup>a</sup> As to the conditions, it is sufficient, unless otherwise expressed, that the *last* be performed when the individual is in a state of grace; so much of the enjoined conditions is only *absolutely* necessary as may answer the proposed end of the party granting the Indulgence. The effects are, however, *more certain*, if all the conditions be performed in a state of grace. We have already seen how liberal the Church is respecting the condition of sacramental confession, and in the case of a contribution to build a church, though given “*ex vanâ gloriâ;*” nor does it signify whether the money be given “*propriâ manu,*” or sent by another hand. The very question “*whether, by the force of the ‘clausula,’ contritis et confessis, which is put in ordinary Indulgences, the faithful, though not conscious of any mortal sin, be not bound to confess?*” shows that the “*clausula*” did not occur in *every* case. On account of the very *great difficulty* occasioned by this requisition, Clemens XIII., who had approved the Decree of the Sacred Congregation by which it was made imperative, relaxed the severity of it so far as to dispense with actual confession in the case of those accustomed to attend the sacrament of penance once a week, and were conscious of no mortal sin since they last confessed. It is acknowledged that there was a wish to keep up the custom of confessing as frequently as possible.<sup>b</sup> We have seen that an adequate cause for granting Indulgences is required; but that it ought to be taken for granted and not too curiously inquired into. When granted to *many*, it suffices if the united works of many are proportionate to the proposed end; *the mere relief, however, of souls suffering in Purgatory is not an adequate end!* Now, although with regard to an individual it be deemed a sufficient end that the merciful disposition [“*mansuetudo*”] of the Church is made manifest, this will not do for a *community*. There

<sup>a</sup> “*Dictis non obest, quo minus possit Indulgentia concedi sensibus destituito et morituro; sicut enim potest quis applicare satisfactiones suas ignoranti, ita potest Pastor Ecclesiæ applicare satisfactiones Christi et Ecclesiæ sensibus alieno.*”—Dens, tom. vi. No. 34, p. 428. Dublin, 1832.

<sup>b</sup> Dens, Theol., tom. vi. No. 36, p. 432.



are other details, which, lest the reader be wearied, are omitted; but surely enough has been given to show that the affair is somewhat complicated.

Turn we now to a very, very, important matter—the *value* of Indulgences. It is acknowledged to be an *axiom* respecting them, that “*tantum valent, quantum sonant;*” but *how* is this axiom to be understood? Two solutions are given. First,—that in the performance of the prescribed conditions an individual, “*licet in minimo gradu devotionis,*” obtains the whole indulgence to the extent expressed, whether plenary or for a hundred days, &c.; and this opinion, we are told, holds good when the enjoined conditions are particularized.<sup>a</sup> Second.—The other opinion is, that the individual is benefited in proportion as he fulfils the intention of the donor, and that the quantity is mentioned to show *how much the donor could give*, and not that every one obtains the benefit to that extent; and this opinion holds good when the conditions are not expressly stated.<sup>b</sup> It is also proved by a quotation from the “*Extravag. Antiquor. de Pœnitentiis,*” in which Boniface VIII. grants the fullest Indulgence to those who visit the Basilica of St. Peter and St. Paul.<sup>c</sup> Hence it follows, that a person, through some defect on his part, may not benefit to the full extent expressed, and therefore it is recommended, although he may have obtained one to the fullest extent, to make all sure, *by getting another!* and also to perform the prescribed works “*amplius et liberalius.*”

Holden, in his *Divinæ Fidei Analysis*,—a work in use among modern Romish divines—affirms that,

“The effects of all Indulgences are doubtful, that are granted for the consolation of souls in Purgatory. Much more doubtful is it whether any Indulgences

<sup>a</sup> Thom. Supplem., quæst. 25, a. 2, ad. 4.

<sup>b</sup> Dens, Theol., tom. vi. No. 33, p. 436. Dens cites Steyart, who quotes Estius, Sylvius, and Wiggers.

<sup>c</sup> “Unusquisque tamen plus merebitur, et Indulgentiam efficacius consequetur qui Basilicas ipsas amplius et devotius frequentabit.”

The term *Basilica* among the ancient Romans signified a building where causes were heard, ambassadors received, public business transacted, &c. The term was afterwards applied to certain churches in Rome, *viz.*, St. Peter's, St. Maria Maggiore, St. John Lateran, St. Croce in Gerusalemme, St. Paul's, St. Lorenzo, and St. Sebastian's. The following reason has been assigned for the application of the term. Upon a certain occasion, the four Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Constantinople, came to Rome, and four principal churches were assigned to them during their residence, *viz.*, St. Paul's, St. Maria Maggiore, St. Lorenzo, and St. Peter's. The Pope reserved for himself St. John Lateran, which was then superior in rank to St. Peter's. St. Sebastian's and St. Croce were afterwards added, because in going from St. Paul's to the Lateran it was necessary to pass by St. Sebastian's, and in continuing the visitation from the Lateran to St. Lorenzo, St. Croce came also in the way.—See Burton's “*Antiquities of Rome,*” p. 386. London, John Murray, 1821.

at all avail to deliver souls from Purgatory; nay, more, whether they profit the dead in any way; so that there is no certainty that prayers and oblations, including even the sacrifice of the Mass celebrated at what are called *privileged altars*, carry with them any efficacy or value as regards the dead, on the score of the Indulgences granted for that purpose, except it be in the way of suffrage, that is, meaning the piety and holiness of the party making the offering, and the good pleasure of an omnipotent and merciful God, of which man knows absolutely nothing."<sup>a</sup>

Veron, who is recommended to us in his "Rule of Faith," is equally uncertain as to the value or efficacy of these wares of Rome.

Indulgences granted for the dead, as we have seen, differ from those granted for the living, as being only "solutio." The power of granting them belongs to the Pope, and to him alone. He has power so to do, according to some divines, because the words, Matth. xvi. 19, "*Whatever thou shalt loose,*" &c., may be referred to those to whom the power is delegated as long as they are on earth, or because the Church may do as much for the dead as the faithful do, who offer prayers and satisfactions to God, that souls may be delivered from Purgatory; whilst others, again, contend that the souls in Purgatory *may still be considered on earth*, for they have not reached their journey's end, and, *therefore*, are under the jurisdiction of the Pope! Indulgences "pro defunctis" are applied by way of suffrage, and the souls in Purgatory will benefit according as they departed in a state of grace or otherwise. Applicants for these must perform the prescribed works duly, and, according to Tournelly, should be in a state of grace. This is, however, denied by Bellarmine, Boudart, Billuart, Neesen, and others, unless it be enjoined expressly. As to the *certainty* of their being efficacious, authors are divided; but we are given to understand, that it is more meritorious to obtain Indulgences for the dead than for ourselves. Benedict XIII., Jan. 15, A.D. 1720, granted certain Indulgences called, "plenariæ liberæ," *i. e.* applicable at pleasure "pro defunctis aut pro vivis." So numerous are the Indulgences which, from time to time, have been granted, that it is usual to *suspend* them (certain privileged altars and confraternities excepted) during the year of a Jubilee, lest they should interfere with each other! In cases where the soul is lost or happy, the fruit of the Indulgence is to go into the common treasury, or is applied to other souls, or to the more indigent or worthy among the living.<sup>b</sup> With respect to

<sup>a</sup> Lib. ii. cap. 6, sec. 3.

<sup>b</sup> Dens, Theol., tom. vi. No. 40, pp. 440, 441. For an account of the differences of "doctors" on these difficult questions, see paper in Br. Mag. for April, 1843, by the Rev. E. C. Harrington; and for Bellarmine's perplexity especially, Br. Mag., June, 1843, by the same gentleman.

Jubilees, we may briefly remark that they are either ordinary, every twenty-five years, or extraordinary, granted for some weighty reason, such as the commencement of a pontificate, or a massacre.<sup>a</sup> Boniface VIII. instituted the first Jubilee, A.D. 1300, to recur every hundred years; Clement VI. reduced the term to fifty, *exemplo Jubilæi Judaici*; Urban VI. again reduced the term to thirty-three years, *pro numero ætatis annorum Christi*; at length Paul II., considering the shortness of human life, ordained that it should take place every twenty-five years. During the ordinary Jubilee, all Indulgences, except those for the dead, *extra urbem Romanam*, are suspended, with certain exceptions as above stated; but no rule, we are told, can be laid down, "cum tanta reperiatur varietas in diversis Bullis."<sup>b</sup> The only sure way is to consult the Bull appointing the Jubilee, called the "*Bulla Concessionis*." Privileges usually conceded at such times are, the liberty of *choosing confessors*; a faculty, conceded to confessors, of absolving from reserved cases, *in foro conscientiæ tantum*; of commuting vows; of commuting prescribed works, as in the case of boys not yet admitted to the communion.

Tedious as, probably, the reader may have thought the above account of Indulgences and Jubilees, the subject has, in reality, been treated with all the conciseness it would allow of; and it may be urged, as a further apology, that the subject is, at the present moment, one of paramount importance. The materials have been collected from accredited sources; and *briefly*, compared with what might have been done; as the subject has been touched upon, it is trusted that enough has been done to shake the confidence of the reader in Dr. Milner's statement. If the ablest theologians of Rome have not been able to unravel the intricacies of the subject, nor even the Sacred Congregation, especially appointed for that purpose, we can scarcely hope to succeed in making that plain which has perplexed the most celebrated divines. An appeal to the Council of Trent will do nothing for us, for the "Decree concerning Indulgences" does little more than admit the abuses of these things; it is as follows:—

"Whereas the power of conferring Indulgences was granted by Christ to the Church; and she has, even in the most ancient times, used the said power, delivered unto her of God; the sacred synod teaches and enjoins that the use of Indulgences, most salutary for the Christian people, and approved of by the

<sup>a</sup> Witness the St. Bartholomew. See Mendham's "Life and Pontificate of St. Pius V." p. 213 (London, 1832); and "The Massacre of St. Bartholomew," by Sir W. S. R. Cockburn, Bart., A.M. London, W. Parker, 1840.

<sup>b</sup> Denis, Theol., tom. vi. No. 43, p. 448. Dublin, 1832.

authority of sacred councils, is to be retained in the Church ; and it condemns with anathema those who either assert that they are useless, or who deny that there is in the Church the power of granting them. In granting them, however, it desires that, according to the ancient and approved custom in the Church, moderation be observed, lest, by excessive facility, ecclesiastical discipline be enervated. And desiring that the abuses which have crept into these matters, and by occasion of which this excellent name of Indulgences is blasphemed by heretics, be amended and corrected, it ordains generally by this decree, that all evil gains for the obtaining thereof, whence a most abundant cause of abuses amongst Christian people has been derived, be entirely abolished. But as regards the other [abuses,] which have proceeded from superstition, ignorance, irreverence, or from what other source soever, since by reason of the manifold corruptions in the places and provinces where the said abuses are committed, they cannot conveniently be specially prohibited ; it commands all bishops, that they, each in his own church, diligently collect all abuses of this nature, and report them in the first provincial synod ; that after the opinions of the other Bishops have been also ascertained, they may be forthwith referred to the Sovereign Roman Pontiff, by whose authority and prudence that which may be expedient for the Universal Church will be ordained ; that thus the gift of holy Indulgences may be dispensed to all the faithful, piously, holily, incorruptibly."—Session XXV.

In the above decree, that "evil gains" *had* been made is fully admitted ; and as gains may be good or evil according to the view of the parties making them, the question still remains open as far as this decree is concerned, nor is the matter at all cleared by a previous decree of the twenty-first session, which abolishes questors.

"But as regards Indulgences, or other spiritual graces, of which the faithful of Christ ought not on this account to be deprived, it decrees that they are henceforth, at the due times, to be published to the people by the ordinaries of the places, aided by two members of the chapter. To whom also power is given to gather faithfully the alms, and the succours of charity offered, without their receiving any remuneration soever ; that so at length all men may truly understand that these heavenly treasures of the Church are administered, not unto gain, but unto godliness."

The above does little more but change *names*, for under what name would a contribution in money, to build a church for example, or for a crusade, be received? And if received, what does it matter whether the receiver be called a *questor* or "the ordinary of the place," since *money* is given and an Indulgence received in *exchange*? The criminality of the sale is acknowledged, and the crime condemned but not abrogated. "The people *give* alms, and the Pope *gives* Indulgences," so there is no *sale*, and consequently no *evil gains*. "What priest or pope would ever confess that his gains were of *that* description?"<sup>a</sup> Under what name were the proceeds received, which Leo granted to his favourite sister Magdalena, married to Francisco Cibo, the natural son of Innocent VIII.?<sup>b</sup> To forbid *all* gains would have

<sup>a</sup> Cramp's "Text Book of Popery," p. 338. London, 1851.

<sup>b</sup> Elliott's "Delineation, &c." p. 325. London, 1851.

been highly inexpedient, as well as somewhat disrespectful, to some of the so-called successors of St. Peter. We shall see more of this, however, by-and-by; and it will be difficult for Rome to escape from the charge of venality, by any *technical* subterfuge. "The fairest and most rational method," says Blackstone,<sup>a</sup> "to interpret the will of the legislator, is by exploring his intentions at the time the law was made, by signs the most natural and probable; and these signs are either the words, the context, the subject matter, or the spirit and reason of the law." If the word "peccatum" be examined, in some of the instruments in which it is found, by such a process it will require no little ingenuity to show that it means "pœna." But as to the technicalities of the *law*, so far as mere words are concerned, they may be accounted for by the adoption of terms employed in preceding statutes, and which words bore a certain and intelligible meaning to those for whom such statutes were originally intended; any difficulty that may attend the interpretation of them in our time, arises, in a great measure, from the different acceptation of such terms in the present day; to ascertain their legal meaning, we must trace them to the time when they were first employed, and the meaning *then* attached to them by the legislator, who employed them, will be their meaning *now*. Thus in a statute of Edward III. all ecclesiastical persons were forbidden to purchase *provisions* at Rome; now, when we know that, at the time the statute was framed, *the nominations to benefits by the Pope* were called *provisions*, we are not at a loss to interpret the meaning of the word, when we find it in the above-named statute. There are, indeed, certain *technicalities*, which are known among lawyers by the name of "legal fictions." Are we to consider Papal technicalities as coming under *this* head? Assuredly they could hardly be looked upon in the light in which Blackstone views certain "legal fictions, as highly beneficial and useful,"<sup>b</sup> for they could scarcely be restrained within the same limits, with regard to which it is a maxim, "that no fiction shall extend to work an injury," this could not be the case with *theological* fictions.

Some of the "legal fictions" have of late years been done away, and no harm appears to have arisen from their abrogation. However beneficial they may be accounted in *law*, the less we hear of them in *divinity* the better. What *some*

<sup>a</sup> "Commentaries," Introduction, § 2.

<sup>b</sup> Blackstone's "Commentaries," Book III. Chap. 4, § vi. "It is no uncommon thing for a plaintiff to feign that a contract made at sea in *reality* was made at the Royal Exchange."—Ibid. Book III. chap. 7, § iii.

theologians understand by "technicalities" we are able to ascertain; Amort<sup>a</sup> quotes a constitution of Pius IV., in which the Pontiff says, "we grant that the soul may obtain, as far as shall please the Divine Majesty, a plenary indulgence from *punishment and guilt*." Clement X., so late as 1675, a Jubilee year, in a Breve of Indulgences in favour of the Archconfraternity *Cincturatorum et Cincturatarum*, recites from an Indult of Gregory XIII. a merciful relaxation, or release *a pœnâ et a culpâ*.<sup>b</sup> We come still later to the Extension of the Universal Jubilee in 1775, celebrated under Pius VI.; and at p. 5 (Roman edition) his holiness declares that the sum of the Jubilee is, that the penitent faithful, in the first place, "*ex Clavium potestate a culpâ penitus liberentur* [by the power of the keys are thoroughly freed from guilt], and are finally absolved from obligation to punishment—*pœnæ reatu absolvantur*."<sup>c</sup> Surely *technicalities* will not do here; nothing short of a "legal fiction" can make *culpa* stand for *pœna*. But were it otherwise, if the offender feels that he is free from all the *consequences* of *guilt*, what need he care for the doctrine which tells him that the *guilt* was not removed by the instrument which freed him from punishment? "The rose doth smell as sweet by any other name." In a high-flown address of Dr. Moylan, dated Nov. 2, 1813, we read, "Were your sins as red as scarlet, by the grace of absolution and *application of this plenary Indulgence*, your souls shall become white as snow."<sup>d</sup> Surely such language connects, *indirectè* at least as Dens says, Indulgences with *pardon* of sin, and makes them effectual in doing what simple absolution could not effect, or why speak of the "application of this plenary Indulgence" in addition to the absolution? We must not omit to mention certain curious documents called "Confessionalia,"<sup>e</sup> which are certain forms on a small sheet of vellum or paper, and containing, "perhaps without exception, among other favours, the choice of a confessor with full power to absolve both in common and reserved cases. It is impossible to deny the existence of these little important documents," says Mr. Mendham, "and I am happy to have a pretty large number of originals in my own possession; a blank is left for the name, and particular date of the month, the year being generally printed." As to their

<sup>a</sup> Hist. Indulgent., p. 416. (See Mendham's "Venal Pardons and Indulgences of Rome," p. 77. London, 1839.) "Ut anima indulgentiam plenariam a *pœna et culpa*, quantum Divinæ Majestati placuerit, consequatur, concedimus."

<sup>b</sup> Mag. Bullar. Luxemb. 1730, tom. x. p. 208.

<sup>c</sup> "Venal Pardons, &c." p. 78.

<sup>d</sup> Referring to an Indulgence of Pius VII. (See next note.)

<sup>e</sup> See Mendham's "Venal Pardons, &c." p. 58, et seq. London, 1839.

contents, "Pretty universally we have—a full pardon and remission of sin—all sin—the gravest and most enormous sins—an elected confessor to make all things as sure as possible—in cases of emergency when absolution may not be attainable, the application of the Indulgence in its full virtues at the point of death, *in articulo mortis*—and, lest that should not take place, an adjourned efficacy is even given to it, as often as required, *toties quoties*—likewise the possessor attains the portentous addition to his treasures, that it will secure him living, from future Purgatory (a claim afterwards sufficiently guarded, but still absolutely asserted at the time by the donor)—and in one instance remission from guilt as well as from punishment, *a pœnâ et culpâ.*"

But these are bygone things, we may be told; such things, however, (as when we come to the Taxæ there will be an opportunity of proving), are not altogether so obsolete as some would have us to believe. It has not been thought necessary to go into the history of Tetzels, which is so generally known, nor to disprove that Luther's only quarrel was with him as a monk of another order,<sup>a</sup> because, as we have seen, the decree of the Council of Trent fully admits the existence of the grossest venality in the case of Indulgences. We may now fairly ask, Must not such things be fraught with the greatest evil? Is there not something fearfully revolting in the language of Clement VI.,<sup>b</sup> who says, as " 'a single drop of Christ's blood would have sufficed for the redemption of the whole human race' the rest was a treasure which he acquired for the militant Church to be used for the benefit of her sons, &c. &c.?"<sup>c</sup> As if the Redemption of mankind were dependent not on the *death* of the Saviour, but on the *quantity* of his precious blood which was shed? As if the Almighty, in his infinite wisdom, either exceeded or fell short of what was necessary to effect the purposes of his mercy? Is such doctrine likely to improve the spiritual condition of professing Christians? The history of Christendom furnishes a melancholy response to such a question. When the most notorious sinners may, by the performance of such conditions as we have seen, do away with all fear of future punishment—when the rich man, "clothed in purple and fine linen, and faring sumptuously every day," may, by a pecuniary sacrifice, though the money be given "ex vanâ gloriâ," be as sure as the most

<sup>a</sup> The case is well cleared up in a note in Murdock's edition of "Mosheim's Eccl. Hist.," vol. iii. pp. 101-2. London, 1841.

<sup>b</sup> In his Bull Unigenitus, De Pœnitentiis, &c. Extrav. Clem. Unigenitus, tit. De Pœn.

<sup>c</sup> See Elliott's "Delineation, &c." p. 309. London, 1851.

devout and humble Christian, of escaping the sufferings due to his sins—what must be the practical effect of Indulgences? Well may Mr. Eustace, when speaking of the depraved state of morals in Italy,<sup>a</sup> ask, “May it not be ascribed to the corruptions of the national religion, to the facility of absolution, and to the easy purchase of Indulgences?” Here is a testimony, at once to the *purchase* of Indulgences, in *modern* times, and to the *practical* working of the system. This testimony is the more valuable, as it is that of a Roman Catholic of no mean attainments as a scholar.

From what the reader has seen of Indulgences, he may feel disposed to think that these “heavenly treasures” are “not *beneficial*, but rather *pernicious* to Christians.”<sup>b</sup> Dr. Milner’s attempt to establish a parallel between Protestant *Indulgences*, as he calls certain relaxations relating to matters purely of discipline; the devoting by the clergy of their money to the service of Charles I., and the conduct of the Anabaptists, is merely ridiculous, when we recollect his own statement of “the received doctrine of the Church, that an Indulgence, when truly gained, is *not barely a remission* of the Canonical penance enjoined by the Church, but also an *actual remission by God himself of the whole or part of the temporal punishment due to it in his sight.*”<sup>c</sup>

The reader by a reference to Burn’s “Ecclesiastical Law,” under the head “Penance,” will see at once how far the Indulgences of Rome, as defined by Dr. Milner, are parallel with any commutation of penance allowed by the Canons.

As to the instance of *Matrimonial Indulgences*, the parties who purchase marriage *licences*, which are, in fact, a *dispensation* from the necessity of having the banns of marriage published, are the best judges how far these matters are connected with *Purgatory*. By the statute of 25 Hen. VIII., power is given to the Archbishop of Canterbury to grant faculties, dispensations, and licences, *as the Pope had done before.*<sup>d</sup>

Could the doctor mean to perpetrate a miserable *pun* when he adduced the conduct of the Anabaptists of Munster as *dispensing* with all law and *indulging* themselves in lawless riot? Under any other supposition, nevertheless, there is no semblance of connection!

<sup>a</sup> “Classical Tour through Italy,” vol. iii. p. 133, 6th edit. London, 1821.

<sup>b</sup> Letter xlii.

<sup>c</sup> Letter xlii.

<sup>d</sup> See Burn’s “Ecl. Law,” Marriage-Licence, Phillimore’s edition, vol. ii. p. 465.



We now proceed to consider the important subject of the TAXÆ.

The books known under the title of TAXÆ CANCELLARIÆ APOSTOLICÆ and TAXÆ SACRÆ PŒNITENTIARIÆ APOSTOLICÆ, eminently deserve the character given to them by Mr. Mendham, as the most important and curious works in the whole circle of Papal literature. The champions of Rome are exceedingly troubled and perplexed on the subject of the said Taxæ, and would fain exonerate the Church of Rome from the charge of having put forth these extraordinary publications; but, unfortunately for their client, they have, in the eagerness and blindness of their zeal, adopted, individually, such opposite lines of defence, that they have, in reality, *substantiated* the charge they sought to meet; thus, one party would resolve the charges for absolution, commutation of penance, &c., into mere fees of office; another avers that the whole is a mere forgery by Protestants; whilst a third party declares that Rome is quite clear in the matter, inasmuch as the "vile book" was placed in the Index Prohibitorius! Dr. Milner is particularly grieved and highly indignant on the subject, as we find by a note appended to Letter xli.—

"This curious account,"<sup>a</sup> writes the doctor, "is borrowed from the *Taxæ Cancellariæ Romanæ*, a book which has been frequently published, though with great variations both as to the crimes and the prices, by the Protestants of Germany and France, and as frequently condemned by the See of Rome. It is proper that Mr. Clayton," the gentleman assailed by the veracious Bishop, "and his friends should know that the Pope's Court of Chancery has no more to do with the forgiveness of sins, than his Majesty's Court of Chancery has. In case there ever was the least groundwork for this vile book, which I cannot find there ever was, the money paid into the Papal Chancery could be nothing else but the fees of office, on restoring certain culprits to the civil privileges which they had forfeited by their crimes."

It is important that the reader should bear in mind, that the *Taxæ Cancellariæ Apostolicæ*, and the *Taxæ Sacræ Pœnitentiæ Apostolicæ* are *distinct* works, at least distinct portions under the general denomination of Taxæ; a circumstance which Dr. Milner did not find it convenient to remember, although we fully agree with him that "the Pope's Court of Chancery has no more to do with the *forgiveness* of sins, than his Majesty's Court of Chancery has." Was Dr. Milner really ignorant of the true history of these books? The reader will, perhaps, be able to give an opinion of the proper answer to this question, after reading the evidence about to be produced of the genuineness and authenticity of the "vile book."

When Dr. Doyle was examined before the Parliamentary

<sup>a</sup> Of licence to commit crimes for a pecuniary consideration.

Committee on the state of Ireland, he retorted the charge of pecuniary Penance on the Church of England, and referred to Burn's "Ecclesiastical Law," under the word PENANCE, in proof of the fact; this recriminating charge we have already seen disposed of when the subject of Indulgences was under consideration; and therefore pass on to the defence attempted by other equally ingenious advocates of Rome. The late Charles Butler, Esq., of Lincoln's Inn, says<sup>a</sup>—

"The real state of the case is as follows:—There are some sins so enormous, that to raise the greater horror of them, the absolution from them is reserved to the Holy See. In these cases the Priest, to whom the penitent reveals them in confession, states them without any mention of person, time, or place, to the Roman See; and the Roman See, when it thinks the circumstances of the case render it proper, grants a faculty to the Priest to absolve the penitent from them. All this is attended with expense. An office or tribunal is kept up for that purpose; a fee is required for the document in which the power of absolution is granted. Thus the sums of money are only fees of office; they are small; the lips of a Roman *datary* would water at the sight of a bill of an English proctor."

Here, then, we see what Dr. Milner could not discover, the "groundwork for this vile book," although even Mr. Butler forgot the *Taxæ Sacræ Pœnitentiariæ Apostolicæ*, and only remembered the *Chancery*. The Jesuit Lingard carries his admission further, and acknowledges the existence of the *Taxæ Cancellariæ Romanæ*;<sup>b</sup> but then "the *Taxæ Cancellariæ Romanæ* were ingeniously corrected, interpolated, and enlarged; the improved copy was circulated by the Reformers, as a proof that Rome was the great custom-house of sin; and the cheat was greedily devoured by the prejudices of their disciples." Lingard was, it would seem, not so ignorant as Dr. Milner, for he, Lingard, was aware of the "real groundwork of the vile book," and knew how "the vile book" was "corrected, interpolated, and enlarged;" for surely what had *no existence* could be neither *corrected*, nor *interpolated*, nor *enlarged*, by the opponents of Rome!

Dr. Thomas Butler, Chamberlain to His Holiness Pope Gregory XVI., and formerly President and Professor of Divinity in St. Clement's College, Rome, writes thus<sup>c</sup>—

"Now for the reasons which I myself have for considering it a spurious production—First, It is a palpable forgery, because even the printer has not dared to put his name to it.<sup>d</sup> Secondly, Because it has not the censor's appro-

<sup>a</sup> Butler's "Book of the Roman Catholic Church," pp. 111, 112. London, 1825.

<sup>b</sup> Lingard's "Remarks on the Charge of the Bishop of Durham," &c. p. 246, 12mo. Dublin, 1822.

<sup>c</sup> Butler's "Truths of the [Roman] Catholic Church proved from Scripture alone," vol. ii. p. 265, 12mo. fourth edition. London, 1843.

<sup>d</sup> We shall see hereafter that this is not the case.

bation; and no work, as it is well known, can be printed in a Catholic country without such approbation. Thirdly, Because it is asserted to be printed at Rome in the year 1744,—a work, to be sure, printed at Rome more than two hundred years after the Reformation,<sup>a</sup> to expose the infamies of Popes! Fourthly, Because it is said to be printed at Rome in Latin, and in French, forsooth, for the benefit of Italians. Fifthly, Because immediately after its first appearance it was condemned at Rome, at Paris, and at Madrid, as a manifest calumny against the Church of Christ.”

It is a pity that Dr. Thomas Butler had not before his eyes the admissions of his namesake and of Lingard, for the recollection of these might have made him a little more cautious, and taught him to speak of a *corrected*, *interpolated*, and *enlarged* work, rather as a *partial* than a *total* forgery! But the work was condemned, “immediately after its first appearance, at Rome, at Paris, and at Madrid;” that is, we presume, that it was placed in the *Indices Prohibitorii*, though, according to Lingard, the *Index Expurgatorius* would have been the fitter place for it; and even here it might have been noted, as many works are, not to be read *donec expurgetur*; this would have prevented the circulation of the debased coin, and have preserved to Rome the precious residuum after the dross had been purged away. But “this,” writes Mr. Mendham,<sup>b</sup> “is a matter worth inquiring into; it is both a literary and a Papal curiosity. By the year 1564, when the Trent Index was compiled and published (to say nothing of preceding Indexes), twenty-seven of the editions of the Taxæ, above enumerated,<sup>c</sup> had appeared, and there were probably more, now unknown, and yet no notice whatever was taken of them, not of a single instance! The first notice which *was* taken of them, or rather of something like one of them, was in the year 1570, just a century after the appearance of the first edition, and *that*, not in a Roman Index, but in an Appendix to the Roman one, published by the authority of the King of Spain. And in what terms does it there appear? ‘Praxis et Taxa Officinæ Pœnitentiariæ Papæ’ (pp. 76), a work, which, if even it existed under that title, was probably never, and certainly not *now*, known. It is, however, generally admitted to refer to the copy in the ‘Centum Gravamina;’ as if this were the only edition, or none had proceeded from Rome and elsewhere, or were not known! But let us follow the progress of this singular condemnation. With apparent misgiving, and possibly with some fear, that, in its simple form, it

<sup>a</sup> And yet the *prohibition*, on which so much stress is laid by some, appeared one hundred years (1570) after the first appearance.

<sup>b</sup> “Spiritual Venality of Rome,” p. 73. London, 1836.

<sup>c</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 21—58.

might involve what the Papacy knew to be its own offspring, the next Index published by Papal authority in Rome, that of 1596, by Clement VIII., adds, *ab hæreticis depravata*. In the edition by Pius VI., in 1786, it is still further slightly, probably with some intention, altered—*cum ab hæreticis depravata*. It is the same in Pius VII.'s, in 1806, and in 1819." When the reader recollects that the "Centum Gravamina" contained the Exposition of Grievances by the Popish Princes of Germany, and that the third grievance complains of the "intolerable burden of Indulgences, when under the show of piety for building churches, or an expedition against the Turks, the Pope sucks the marrow of their estates, &c. &c."<sup>a</sup> When the reader recollects *this*, he will not wonder that the perusal of such a home-charge against Papal exactions should be prohibited, and, at the same time, the prohibition be so entered as not to touch what it would be vastly inconvenient to abolish; and, indeed, the Index Prohibitorius, by not *forbidding*, sanctions the work when not "*depraved by heretics*;" the work must needs exist, or it could not be *depraved*, as we before remarked.

We are now prepared to enter upon the history and description of these most remarkable productions; and shall see abundant reason, in the course of our inquiry, why Rome should wish both to *retain*, and, at the same time, to *disown* them. In pursuing our investigation of the subject, our task will be comparatively easy, as we have little more to do than to follow the path marked out by the late Rev. Joseph Mendham, in his able and invaluable work, "*The Spiritual Venality of Rome*."

The subject of the Taxæ is intimately connected with that of Indulgences; for<sup>b</sup> "to this power of granting Indulgences is to be assigned the power of pecuniary absolution, or the commutation of penance for money, which is the foundation of the Taxæ, and constitutes their essence. Simply to enjoin penitence and penance, and to absolve the offender on the performance of them, may be considered as an exercise of ecclesiastic authority, emanating from the power of the keys; but to allow them to be commuted, to be compounded for, or redeemed for money, is certainly the exercise of a further prerogative; it is not an act of discipline, but of Indulgence. And that such a prerogative was claimed by the Church, with respect to all sins, of whatsoever enormity, is evident, from many, perhaps the greater part, of the ancient Penitentiary Canons."

<sup>a</sup> Dupin, *Ecl. Hist.*, vol. iii. p. 182 *et seq.* Dublin, 1723.

<sup>b</sup> "*Spiritual Venality*," p. 10. London, 1836.

This proceeding was introduced into England at a very early period, as we find by a reference to the "Pœnitentiale" of Theodorus, who was sent from Rome to be Archbishop of Canterbury in the seventh century; the work is still extant, and an excellent edition of it has been given by Petit, Paris, 1677. Theodorus was succeeded by the venerable Beda, who has also given a work of the same description under the title of "De Remediis Peccatorum." "And here," says Mr. Mendham, "which is all that answers our particular purpose to remark, the penance enjoined for all sorts, and the most infamous, of crimes, might, in case of inability (not easily distinguishable from disinclination) to perform the penance, be commuted by almsgiving, which doubtless went through the hands of the confessors, or others.<sup>a</sup> . . . . We here see how naturally, and almost innocently, crept in a system, which, in progress of time, attained the most flagitious character."

The next instance is supplied by the "Pœnitentiale" of Egbert, in the eighth century. We have carefully examined this document, and fully accord with Mr. Mendham in his opinion of its fearful contents:—"Here we are likewise disgusted with the demoralizing particularization of the vilest iniquity; an advance is made in the compounding system." So truly disgusting are some of the contents of this "Pœnitentiale," that we cannot pollute our pages with the transcription of them, even in the original language. "A consideration is had of the different capabilities of the rich and the poor; the penances are more accurately valued; and the alms are to be divided into three parts, one to the altar, the second for redeeming slaves, the third to be distributed to ecclesiastic necessities—*ut ecclesiasticis necessitatibus distribuatur*. After some matter of the same character, there follows an enumeration of what are called the Twelve Remissions of Sin."<sup>b</sup> "In the ecclesiastic laws of Alfred the Great, § vi.—ix., something of the same kind occurs, but it is in the nature of direct fine."<sup>c</sup>

We turn now from England to what Mr. Mendham appropriately calls "the legitimate and congenial soil of such productions;" and in the "Pœnitentiale Romanum," a collection from a more ancient book of the same name, and

<sup>a</sup> "Item qui non potest sic agere pœnitentiam, sicut superius diximus, in primo anno eroget in eleemosynam solidos viginti tres, pro uno anno in pane et aqua, donet in eleemosynam solidos viginti duos, et in unaquaque hebdomada, unum diem jejundet ad nonam, et alium ad vesperum, et tres quadregesimas; in secundo anno viginti solidos; qui sunt sexaginta quatuor solidi."—§ xiv.

<sup>b</sup> See Wilkins' Conc. Mag. Brit. tom. i. pp. 140-41. "Spiritual Venality," p. 12.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid. pp. 12, 13.

others, and strongly characterized by its offensiveness, and there we find, in an extract from the ancient work and Theodorus, tit. ix. cap. xxvi.—xxix., the same pecuniary composition for declined penance, adapted in one case, in the proportion of three to one, to the different means of the rich and the poor. The Canon derived from Theodorus is nearly, if not quite, the same as that given above from Beda." In the canons subjoined to the Decretals of Gratian, near the end, is the following note:—

"It is to be noted also, according to John, that if a penance be imposed by a Canon, any one may be liberated, by the proper authority, from fasting, by giving a penny, or reading the Psalter. But Innocent says, that necessary fasts, as of the four seasons, and of the like sort, cannot be redeemed unless there be a reasonable cause; but voluntary fasts may be redeemed even without the authority of the superior."<sup>a</sup>

Mr. Mendham states that he is indebted to Rusticus, in his "Three Capital Offences,"<sup>b</sup> &c., "for an important reference to Muratori's "Antiq. Ital. Med. Ævi," ed. Milan, 1738, &c., and therein to tom. v. coll. 711, &c., containing a dissertation *De Indulgentiarum Origine*, where the learned Romanist affirms that 'in process of time, men dedicated to God reduced the entire redemption of penance to pecuniary mulcts, which for the most part they did not allow to escape from their own hands.' In col. 741, is the following parallel passage—one of those, no doubt, which were not very acceptable to Benedict XIV. :—'Wherefore, from the time that the Penitential Canons were published in the West, and the form of this kind of redemption was brought in, a broad way was opened to many, not to say most of the clergy, to procure their own advantage, not less than that of others.'<sup>c</sup> But his most important communication is, the Penitential Canons of the Monastery at Bobbio, near Piacenza, entitled *Pœnitentiæ Ritus*, e codd. MSS. Monasterii Bobiensis, pp. 723, &c. There the rate of compensation, if a penitent could not fast, was twenty-six solidi for one year's fasting, if rich, or three, if poor, with a great deal more to the same purpose. The usual enormities being included."<sup>d</sup> We need not here go again into the matter of indulgences and their venal conditions, but proceed with the Tax-tables of Rome, which, as Mr. Mendham observes,—

<sup>a</sup> "Canones Pœnitentiales," edited by Antonius Augustinus, Archbishop of Tarragona. Venet. 1584.

<sup>b</sup> Published at Liverpool in 1824.

<sup>c</sup> "Quare ex quo Canones Pœnitentiales in Occidente prodierunt, et invecta fuit forma ejusmodi redemptionis; multis, ne dicam plerisque, e clero via lata aperta est ad suum sibi commodum procurandum, non minus quam alienum."

<sup>d</sup> "Spiritual Venality," p. 14. London, 1836.

"Are certainly a considerable advance and improvement upon the simple Indulgence under which they class; for their absolution for the grossest crimes—perhaps for *all* crimes—is expressly set to sale at specified prices, without any allusion or admonition respecting the two first parts of penance, although, if mentioned, they would probably occasion no impediment. But, in the penitentiary part, *that* which chiefly occupies us, the whole is nothing but bare absolution, or dispensation, or licence, &c., for grossi, or floreni, or ducats, pounds, shillings, and pence."<sup>a</sup>

"To what times or persons the origin of these small and *precious* volumes is to be assigned is, perhaps, impossible to be determined. The least objectionable part, indicating only unprincipled cupidity and rapacity, the Chancery Taxes, may with certainty be traced back to Pope John XXII., who reigned at the beginning of the fourteenth century, and is celebrated by papal,<sup>b</sup> as well as other historians, for his immoderate extortion by the dexterous management of benefices, and by other means, and for the immense wealth which he accumulated, and left behind him. The frequent and exclusive reference to the Liber Jo. XXII. in Leo the Tenth's Taxæ Canc. Apost., published 1514, place the fact beyond a doubt." . . . "Polydorus Vergilius expressly ascribes the origin of some such Taxes to him."<sup>c</sup>

Mr. Mendham enumerates the various editions of the Taxæ, pertaining to the Penitentiary, as well as to the Chancery of Rome, extending from the year 1471, in which Sixtus V. occupied the pontifical chair, to the year 1820, during which time not less than FORTY-FIVE impressions appeared before the public. A manuscript collection of these Taxæ is then adverted to, which appears in the British Museum. The original is found in the Harleian department of the Museum, and is described, in the last catalogue of the MSS. in it, in four volumes folio, 1808, in vol. ii. p. 262, &c. It consists of two volumes, small folio, Num. 1850, 1852, written on vellum, having every appearance of genuineness and coeval antiquity, that is, in the former part of the sixteenth century. These volumes were withdrawn from the archives of the Roman Chancery, at the death of Innocent XII., by John Aymon, Apostolic Prothonotary, and bought of him in Holland, at a great price, by the earl of Oxford. They contain copies of the Taxæ, both Cancellariæ and Pœnitentiariæ, in various forms.<sup>d</sup>

"And now," says Mr. Mendham, "it may fairly be asked, whether, in the face of the evidence which has been adduced, the pretence can, with the slightest probability, be supported, that these infamous productions are not the genuine and authentic productions of the Papacy? We have seen the way prepared by the Penitentiary Canons; and to them succeeded the Tax-Books, of the genuineness of which no reasonable doubt can be entertained; the first of these, to more than the number of twenty, issued from countries and places devoted to the Roman See; the very first, to the number of fifteen, from Rome itself, most of them attested by Audiffredi in a professed work<sup>e</sup> enume-

<sup>a</sup> "Spiritual Venality," p. 19.

<sup>b</sup> See Ciaconii "Vitæ et Acta Pontt." &c. tom. ii. p. 395, ed. 1677.

<sup>c</sup> "Spiritual Venality," p. 20.

<sup>d</sup> See Elliott's "Delineation of Romanism," p. 354, third edition. 1851.

<sup>e</sup> "Catalogus Romanarum editionum Sæculi XV." Romæ, 1783.

rating the first Roman editions, dedicated, *quite devoutly*, to Pius Sextus, Pont. Opt. Max. (quasi Deo Opt. Max.), the rest from Paris, Cologne, Venice; that from the last place under the auspices of Gregory XIII."

We have now seen what is the value of the assertions of those who attempt to deny the authenticity and genuineness of the *Taxæ*, how they contradict each other; and that the mention, unmeaning as it is, in an Index Prohibitorius, actually proves the existence of the work, the *depraved* copies of which it *affects* to condemn! If further confirmation were needed, such may be found from a well-known passage in the writings of the celebrated Claude D'Espence, who particularly refers to the edition of the *Taxæ* published in Paris, 1520.<sup>a</sup>

"He never once doubted of its being a genuine production of Rome. . . He throws not out the slightest insinuation that the work, which he distinguishes from the 'Centum Gravamina,' proceeded from any heretical quarter." . . . "The eminent Frenchman, to whom we are so much indebted, was a doctor of the Sorbonne, and rector of the University of Paris. Paul IV. would have made him a cardinal, had not the supposed interests of France prevailed. De Thou affirms that he was too good, as John de la Casa was too bad, for that honour.<sup>b</sup> Crashaw writes concerning him, 'of whom not only Thuanus, Bochelius, and other indifferent and moderate, but even Possevino, the Jesuit, and Genebrard, that rough and bitter Papist, give most honourable testimony."

"In his commentary on the Epistle to Titus, on c. i. v. 7, he has, what he calls, Digressio Secunda, on the word *ἀσχροκερδία*, and there, having expressly referred to the 'Centum Gravamina,' he proceeds to say that all those charges might be considered as a fiction of the enemies of the Pope, were it not for a book printed, and for some time publicly exposed to sale at Paris, entitled *Taxæ Camerae seu Cancellariæ Apostolicæ*,<sup>c</sup> in which more wickedness might be learned than in all the summaries of all vices, and in which are proposed licence of sinning to most, and absolution to all who will buy it. He wonders that this infamous and scandalous index of iniquity should be so far from being suppressed, by the friends and rulers of the Roman Church, that the licences and impunities for such abominations continue to be renewed in the faculties granted to the legates from Rome of absolving and rendering capable of ecclesiastical promotion all sorts, and even the most atrocious, of criminals. He then calls upon Rome to blush, and cease any longer to prostitute herself by the publication of so infamous a catalogue."

Dr. Milner seems to have been especially annoyed by a publication by Anthony Egane, B.D., who had been for some years the Pope's Apostolical Penitentiary, or Confessor-General in Ireland, and who "revealed this *mystery of iniquity*," after his conversion to the Protestant faith; it is entitled "The Book of Rates now used in the Sin Custom-House of the Church and Court of Rome, containing the

<sup>a</sup> "Spiritual Venality," pp. 76—78.

<sup>b</sup> Lib. xvi. ad ann. 1555.

<sup>c</sup> "Quæ scandala ex Gravaminibus Germanicis passim collecta, 1, 2, 5, 8, 67, 74, 75, 84, 91, 95. Hæc, inquam, lucra turpia, odio Pontificis Romani ficta sint, si non, quod ait et conqueritur ille, velut *Prostat, et in quæstu pro meretrice sedet*, liber palam ac publice hic impressus, hodieque, ut olim, venalis, *Taxæ Camerae seu Cancellariæ Apostolicæ*," &c. (Mr. Mendham gives the whole text.)



Bulls, Dispensations, and Pardons, for all manner of Villanies and Wickednesse, with the several sums of monies given and to be paid for them. Published by Anthony Egane, B.D., late Confessor-General of the Kingdom of Ireland, and now, through the mercy of God, Minister of the Gospel according to the Reformed Religion. Licensed according to Order. London, 1674.”<sup>a</sup>

“In reference to these tables of ‘decreed impositions,’” Egane observes, that “there are hundreds even of the ordinary priests who know not what it means; because that these *arcana imperii* are always kept close from them, and reserved on purpose for certain persons called Apostolic Penitentiaries, to whom the absolution of particular and heinous sins is committed (as it was to myself in Ireland within these four years), and of such persons there may be one or two in every city or diocess; which, before they have that power, must take an oath of secrecy never to reveal the mysteries of their Church, and to keep them from the knowledge, not only of the laity, but also of the ordinary Priests and Friars, and especially from any man that is suspected to be of no acute parts, or of so much learning or honesty, as might make him scruple their authority; and neither may it, perhaps, have come to the knowledge of some half-witted fellows, who either for lucre or liberty, neither stick to the one religion or the other, of which sort of people we have divers amongst us in this kingdom, whose names are not worth mentioning by either party; but as to those sins commonly called reserved cases, if any man shall acknowledge himself guilty of any such in confession to an ordinary confessor, he can only tell him where the Pope’s bankers reside, who are to absolve him, and will gladly receive him, so he bring with him the price of his sin; and this great Penitentiary is thereupon to procure a Bull of Indulgence and pardon for all wicked persons offending in the cases here set down, and divers others.”<sup>b</sup>

These assertions of Anthony Egane have been corroborated by Father O’Leary, in his “Caution to the Common People against Perjury, so frequent at Assizes and Elections.” This facetious and talented individual enables us to discover where those “detestable bankers,”<sup>c</sup> who traffic in these vile anti-Christian and anti-social crimes, are to be found. O’Leary,

<sup>a</sup> A second edition appeared in 1678, and a fifth in 1715; it was again published in 1809, by Francis Maseres, Esq., Cursitor Baron of the Exchequer. See Maseres’ “Occasional Essays,” p. 558, 8vo. London, 1809.

<sup>b</sup> Elliott’s “Delineation,” p. 368, third edit. London, 1851.

<sup>c</sup> Milner’s “Vindication of the End of Religious Controversy,” p. 246. London, 1822.

“the light and glory” of the Popish clergy of Ireland, as his biographer styles him,<sup>a</sup> says, “In the diocess of Cork, and in several others, the crime of perjury is considered a reserved case, from which no one but the Bishop can absolve, let them be never so penitent. The restraint shows the enormity of the guilt; whereas the inferior clergy can reconcile ordinary sinners, upon sincere repentance, and a firm resolution of amendment. But the perjurer, having exceeded the ordinary bounds, let his repentance be ever so sincere, must have recourse to an extraordinary power.” Egane tells us that there is a Papal missionary resident in each diocess in Ireland to absolve from heinous sins; whilst O’Leary inadvertently tells us that the Bishop is such, and it cannot be supposed that, if the ordinary Priest has his confessional dues, the Bishop, in extraordinary cases, goes without *his*.<sup>b</sup>

“Dr. Milner is evidently much chagrined on finding such overwhelming evidence against the practices of the Papacy, of which he endeavours to get rid by inveighing against Egane personally, with whom, he says, ‘this vile fabrication originated.’ (!) The reason which the Bishop assigns for his assumption is Egane’s poverty! But what has the account of this man’s vagrancy from Ireland to Oxford, and thence to Cambridge, so circumstantially reported from Wood’s ‘Athenæ,’ to do with the main question, which respects the genuineness of the book itself? Although, by the way, Egane does not deserve to have such disrespectful mention made of him, since, on leaving the former University in 1673, he bore with him the attested certificate of the Vice-Chancellor and Provost for excellent conduct during his stay there. Be this as it may, the *Taxæ* went through numberless editions, both in Popish and Protestant countries, before Egane was born. Dr. Milner certainly must have known that a Paris edition of this book made its appearance about the commencement of the Reformation, in a thin quarto, with the French king’s licence of sale for three years, from the press of T. Dennis;<sup>c</sup> and that the ‘*Taxæ Penitentiariæ*’ were published along with it at the same time; that D’Aubigné, in his ‘*Confession of Sanci*,’ says that the See of Rome will not suffer the book to be destroyed; and that Richerius, a

<sup>a</sup> “Life of Dr. O’Leary,” by Rev. Mr. England, 8vo. Cork, 1823.

<sup>b</sup> See Blair’s “Letters to William Wilberforce, Esq., M.P.” London, 1819, pp. 82—95. The late C. Butler, Esq., admitted “*the fee for the document!*”

<sup>c</sup> Grier’s “Defence of his Reply,” pp. 251, 252, cited in Elliott’s “Delineation,” pp. 368, 369, third edition. The original is worth giving:—“*Cujus rei (Romish peculation) testis est locupletissimus nullaque ratione refutandus aut improbandus Liber Taxæ Cancellariæ Romanæ.*”—Hist. Concil. General. lib. quarti, pars ii., auct. Ed. Richerio, p. 106. Colonix, 1681. And yet, as we have seen, one objector says that there was no printer’s name.

writer not of inferior note to Dr. Milner, tells us that it is 'a book not to be impeached or disproved.'

We may now introduce the reader to a few select *morceaux* from the Tables themselves, commuted into English money, omitting, necessarily, some of the most flagrant instances, because the crimes to which they relate are too horrid to be named before Protestants.<sup>a</sup>

"I. DISPENSATIONS OF VOWS.

	£.	s.	d.
"1. If a man has vowed, but not solemnly, to take the habit of some religious order, for changing his vow, made in conscience only, he is to pay .. .. .	15	4	0
"2. If a man has taken a vow of chastity, solemnly, he may have a dispensation, if necessary, for not keeping his vow, paying the prelate .. .. .	15	4	0
"3. For prolonging the term of vows to go to the holy sepulchre, or to St. Peter's, at Rome, upon a lawful cause assigned..	9	2	9
"4. If the dispensation be only for two years .. .. .	4	0	1
"5. For changing the pilgrimage to the sepulchre into another..	12	3	6
"6. For changing one vow into another for a perpetuity, in the case of a chapter, convent, or great college.. .. .	100	0	0

"II. DISPENSATIONS OF OATHS.

"7. For the breach of an oath or contract respecting civil employments or concerns. . . . .	7	2	3
"8. For a Bull containing both the inhibitory clauses, and absolution from infamy, in such cases .. .. .	56	9	6
"9. And if several persons are included in the same act or contract, each must pay .. .. .	3	0	0
"10. For the breach of an oath that cannot be kept without incurring everlasting damnation; as, for example, a dishonest vow, or a wicked promise .. .. .	6	2	0

"N.B. You are to take notice, that there is a difference to be made between the tax of a bishop, abbot, or general of an order, and of an ordinary person. The prelates are to be left to the discretion of their confessors (who best know their incomes).

"III. DISPENSATIONS OF CRIMES.

	£.	s.	d.
"11. For a marriage contracted in the first degree of affinity, and in conscience only, to be paid for according to the ability of the party .. .. .	1000	2	6
"12. For a marriage in the second degree, beside a gratification to the prelate, the pope, or his missionary, is to be paid..	100	15	6
"13. For erecting a public Jewish synagogue .. .. .	603	15	0
"14. For a private synagogue in a Jew's house .. .. .	300	1	6
"15. For (a crusader, or) soldier in the Catholic cause, who neither kills nor wounds any (heretic) in war, nor (as an officer) causes another to do so .. .. .	36	9	0
"16. For pardon and rehabilitation (or readmission into the bosom of the Church) of a heretic in ample form, with the inhibitory clause, before abjuration (of his heresy) ..	36	9	0
"17. For simony, or for fornication of priests, friars, or nuns, each .. .. .	36	9	6
"18. For incest in a layman .. .. .	4	6	0

<sup>a</sup> See "Letters on Roman Catholic Controversy," by W. C. Brownlee, D.D., p. 353, *et seq.* New York, 1834.

	£	s.	d.
"19. For adultery in a layman .. .. .	4	0	0
"20. For adultery and incest together .. .. .	6	2	0
"21. For the adulterer and adultress jointly .. .. .	6	6	0
"22. For absolution to keep a concubine at bed and board, with a dispensation to hold a benefice .. .. .	4	5	6
"23. For striking a clerk or priest .. .. .	6	2	2
"24. For striking an abbot or prelate .. .. .	12	6	3
"25. For striking a bishop or archbishop .. .. .	24	6	0
"26. For wounding a priest in any of his members .. .. .	18	4	9
"27. For wounding a layman .. .. .	0	0	6
"28. For murder committed by a bishop, abbot, chief of an order, or knight, each .. .. .	50	12	6
"29. For murder by a friar, or guardian of a monastery .. .. .	40	9	0
"30. For murder, by an ordinary person, to be rated according to circumstances at the discretion of the prelates .. .. .	0	0	0
"31. For the murder of a priest by a layman .. .. .	6	2	0
"32. And for commutation of public penance to private for the same .. .. .	18	4	6
"33. For the murder of a layman by a layman .. .. .	3	2	4
"34. For the murder of a father, mother, brother, sister, or wife, each .. .. .	4	1	8
"35. For marrying another wife after murdering the former, &c. .. .. .	8	2	9

The reader is now in a position to exercise his own judgment as to the genuineness and authenticity of the *Taxæ*, and also as to their corrupting tendency, and the matter may be safely left to his unbiassed opinion.<sup>a</sup> Intimately connected as these *Taxæ* are with the subject of Indulgences, we would,

<sup>a</sup> In the year 1800, a Spanish ship from Europe was captured near the coast of South America by Admiral Harvey, then captain of the *Southampton* frigate. There were on board large bales of paper, valued in her books at £7,500. These were Indulgences or pardons for various sins mentioned in the Catholic Rubric, and the price, which varied from half a dollar to seven dollars, was marked on each. *They had been BOUGHT in Spain, and were intended for SALE in South America.* At Tortola some Dutch merchants bought the whole for £200, with the hope of being able to smuggle them among the Spaniards in America. (Hamilton's "Tracts on some leading Errors of the Church of Rome," p. 68.) We have been favoured by a friend with the following fact, of which he himself was an eye-witness:—When the small seaport of Diluzo (the ancient Antium) was taken by the squadron under the orders of the late Admiral, then Captain, Dundas, a party of sailors, who had strolled as far as the palace of a church dignitary, in the neighbourhood, found in the library a small deal box, tied with tape and sealed. On examining the box, it was ascertained to be entirely filled with blank Indulgences, printed at the "Stamperia of the Pope," and impressed with the Papal arms. *It is hardly possible for the most depraved imagination to fancy a crime which was not set down in these Indulgences, with its price annexed;* besides which, there was a plenary indulgence, the price of which varied, according as the crime or crimes had already been perpetrated, or were to be committed within a specified time, and a further indulgence for all crimes not contained in the catalogue.

In 1748 a Spanish ship, containing bales of Indulgences, was captured by an English cruiser, and sent into Boston. Fleet, the bookseller there, purchased a large quantity of them, and printed various editions of ballads on the back of them. He also advertised the originals, to be had at a much cheaper rate, either by single Bull, quire, or ream, than they could be purchased of priests, "and yet warranted to be of the same advantage to possessors."—See Dr. Sall's "True Catholic and Apostolic Faith," London, 1840, pp. 443, 444.

for a moment, revert to the assertion that *Indulgences* do not remit the *guilt* of sin, and that though *absolution* remits the guilt, it still leaves a degree of punishment, more or less, to be remitted by the Indulgence; we thus revert to this assertion, because, by thus taking Rome on her own grounds, we come to a very pregnant question: "What is the difference between the efficacy of our Saviour's blood as the *Scripture* teaches, respecting the extent of its application to the case of the truly humble and penitent sinner, and as *Rome* teaches, when its efficacy depends upon its application by Papal hands?" "The blood of Christ cleanses from all sin," according to the *Scripture*, and there is "no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus,"—every claim is satisfied, "the handwriting that was against us is taken out of the way," the bond is *cancelled* by him who "nailed it to his Cross." But with Rome it is not so! Though we are told that "a single drop of his blood would have sufficed for the redemption of the whole human race," and that the superabundance of that precious blood forms a part of the treasure to be applied by the Pope; yet he cannot *wholly* apply it—for *absolution* leaves a portion of the debt still to be remitted! and the *Indulgence*, by which that portion is remitted, cannot remit the *guilt*! Rome would have acted more in conformity with her usual boldness to have claimed the power of remitting both guilt and punishment, which, indeed, we have seen that, *on emergency*, her Papal rulers have not scrupled to do!

As a closing sentence on the subject of Indulgences, Dr. Milner quotes (p. 410) a passage, by no means a novel one among writers of his class, from Bucer ("de Regno Christi," lib. i. cap. 4.), to the effect that the Protestants "seem to have embraced the Gospel" merely "in order to shake off the yoke of discipline, and the obligation of fasting, penance, &c., which lay upon them in Popery, and to live at their pleasure;" and the citation would have been pertinent, had either Bucer himself or his Church countenanced, or his instructions any way encouraged, such notions, which it has been made sufficiently evident that the doctrine and practice of the Church of Rome, with regard to Indulgences, does do; and as for "the yoke of discipline," we beg our reader to consult Mr. Scudamore's "England and Rome," Lond. 1855, p. 398, and ponder the lamentation of Herschen, a modern R. C. divine, upon this very subject. Bucer characterizes such persons as he brought forward as the "impious," and shows plainly that their manner of life was utterly unconnected with the *instructions* of their *teachers*.<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> P. 24 of Buceri "Scripta Anglicana." Basil, 1577.

## No. XX.

## COMMUNION UNDER ONE KIND.

SECT. I.—Dr. Milner's False Definition.—The Decree of Constance.—Admitted Modern Innovation.—Cardinal Bona, Thomas Aquinas, Cassander.—Milner's Statement.—Asserted to be Traditionary.

OF all the arguments adduced to support popish doctrines, those in favour of the custom of administering the Lord's Supper to the laity under one kind, and thus depriving them of the cup, are the most flimsy and the most contradictory.

The laity was first authoritatively deprived of the cup by Conciliar decree in the year 1414, namely, by the Thirteenth Canon of the Council of Constance. It will be necessary to set out this decree in full, in order to avoid the possibility of misrepresentation; and this is the more important, since Dr. Milner accuses "Bishop Porteus, Dr. Comber Kennit, &c.," of misrepresenting this Council. It is a fact, nevertheless, that Dr. Milner, while thus complaining, is himself guilty of misrepresenting the same decree. His words are,

"Dr. Porteus, &c., accuse this Council of decreeing that '*notwithstanding* (for so they express it) our Saviour ministered in both kinds, one only shall in future be administered to the laity, as if the Council opposed its authority to that of Christ; whereas it barely defines that *some circumstances of the institution* (namely, that it took place *after supper*, that the apostles received, *without being fasting*, and that both *species were consecrated*) are not obligatory on all Christians."<sup>a</sup>

Now we maintain that the Council did oppose its authority to that of Christ, for it declares, decrees, and defines that, although Christ did institute this sacrament *after supper*, and administered it to His disciples under each species of bread and wine, nevertheless, *notwithstanding this* (hoc non obstante), that this sacrament should *not* be consecrated after supper, nor received by the faithful unless fasting, excepting in certain cases, such as infirmity and the like, and that it be received by the laity in one kind only, and this is declared to be law. The alleged "bare mention" is put forward in a most positive and unequivocal manner, and is made the principal object of the decree. The decree not obligatory! Why, are not all gainsayers "repelled as heretics that ought to be severely punished," and handed over to the tender mercies

<sup>a</sup> Letter xxxix. p. 379, note.

of "the Inquisitors." The decree itself is so unequivocal that we will let it speak for itself:—

"Whereas in some parts of the world there are persons who presume rashly to assert that Christian people ought to take the Sacrament of the Eucharist under both species of bread and wine, and that the laity should communicate not only under the species of bread, but also under the species of wine; also that they should receive it after supper, or at least not fasting, &c. : hence it is that this present sacred General Council, lawfully congregated, in the Holy Spirit, at Constance, taking care to provide for the safety of the faithful against this error, after mature deliberation of those learned in both divine and human law, *declares, decrees, and defines*, that, although Christ did institute this venerable sacrament after supper, and administered it to his disciples under each species of bread and wine, nevertheless, *notwithstanding this (hoc non obstante)*, the laudable authority of the sacred canons, and the approved custom of the Church, has held, and does hold, that this sacrament should not be consecrated after supper, nor received by the faithful except fasting, unless in case of infirmity, or other necessity, by the law of the Church conceded and admitted. And as this *custom* was reasonably introduced to avoid some *dangers and scandals*, although in the *primitive Church* this sacrament was received by the faithful under each species, *henceforth* let it be received by those consecrating it under each species, but by the laity only under the species of bread, &c. Whence, since a custom of this sort was reasonably introduced by the Church and Holy Fathers, and has been very long observed, let it be taken for *law*, which it is not lawful to disapprove or to change at pleasure, without the authority of the Church. Wherefore to say that to observe this custom or law is sacrilegious or unlawful, ought to be deemed erroneous, and those pertinaciously asserting the contrary of the foregoing ought to be *repelled as heretics and severely punished* by the diocesans of the place or their officials, or the *inquisitors* of heretical depravity, in the kingdoms or provinces in which anything shall happen to be attempted or presumed against this decree, according to the canonical and lawful sanctions wholesomely framed in favour of the Catholic faith, and against heretics and their adherents."<sup>a</sup>

---

<sup>a</sup> "Cum in nonnullis mundi partibus quidam temerariè asserere præsumant, populum Christianum debere Eucharistiæ sacramentum sub utraque panis et vini specie suscipere, et non solum sub specie panis, sed etiam sub specie vini, populum laicum passim communicent; etiam post cœnam vel alias non jejunum, &c., hinc est quod hoc præsens Concilium Sacrum Generale Constant. in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregatum, adversus hunc errorem saluti fidelium providere satagens, matura plurium doctorum, tam divini quam humani juris, deliberatione præhabita, declarat, decernit, et diffinit, quod, licet Christus post cœnam instituerit, et suis discipulis administraverit, sub utraque specie panis et vini, hoc venerabile sacramentum, tamen, hoc non obstante, sacrorum canonum auctoritas laudabilis, et approbata consuetudo Ecclesiæ servavit et servat, quod hujusmodi sacramentum non debet confici post cœnam, neque a fidelibus recipi non jejunis, nisi in casu infirmitatis, alterius necessitatis, a jure vel Ecclesia concessa vel admissa. Et sicut hæc consuetudo ad evitandum aliqua pericula et scandala est rationabiliter introducta, quod licet in primitiva Ecclesia hujusmodi sacramentum reciperetur a fidelibus sub utraque specie, *postea* a conficientibus sub utraque et a *laicis* tantummodo sub specie panis, suscipiatur, &c. Unde cum hujusmodi consuetudo ab Ecclesia et sanctis patribus rationabiliter introducta, et diutissime observata sit, *habenda est pro lege quam non licet reprobare*, aut sine Ecclesiæ auctoritate pro libito mutare. Quapropter dicere, quod hanc consuetudinem aut legem observare sit sacrilegum aut illicitum, censi debet erroneum; et pertinaciter asserentes oppositum præmissorum *tanquam hæretici arcendi sunt et graviter puniendi*, per diocesanos locorum, seu officiales eorum, aut inquisitores hæreticæ pravitatis, in regnis seu provinciis, in quibus contra hoc decre-

We shall pass on from this strange endeavour to misrepresent the plain meaning of this decree to other parts of the subject, as raised by Dr. Milner. It will be observed that the Council admitted that Christ, when He instituted this sacrament, administered it in both kinds; and that it was so received in the primitive Church; but that to avoid certain alleged scandals, a change was reasonably introduced by the Church and holy Fathers, and had been *very long observed*, and was to be taken for law. Now, in contradiction to this assertion, that the custom of half-communion had been *very long observed*, we have the acknowledgment of Cardinal Bona, who testifies, that, from the origin of the Church to the twelfth age, Christians at all *times and in every place* communicated under the species of bread and wine.<sup>a</sup> St. Thomas Aquinas said, "According to the ancient *custom of the Church*, all men as they communicated in the body, so they also communicated in the blood."<sup>b</sup> And Cassander, the famous Romish ritualist, to the same effect, says, "In the Latin Church, for upwards of a thousand years, uninterruptedly, the body of Christ and the blood of Christ were separately given, the body apart, and the blood apart, after the consecration of the mysteries."<sup>c</sup> And Cardinal Bellarmine virtually admits the same, when he says, in his chapter *De Euchar.*, lib. iv. c. 4, while alleging, in excuse for the change, "that the inconvenience became more and more apparent as the multitude of communicants increased, and so the *custom* under both species gradually ceased." We will not now insist on the passages usually quoted from the epistle of Pope Gelasius, where he declares that communion in one kind only could not be administered without great sacrilege; nor the words of Pope Leo, that those who communicated in one kind should be thrust out of the Church by sacerdotal authority; since the import or intent of these passages is

tum aliquid fuerit forsan attentatum aut præsumptum, juxta canonicas et legitimas sanctiones, in favorem Catholicæ fidei, contra hæreticos et eorum fautores, salubriter adinventas."—Labb. et Coss., tom. xii. p. 99, &c. Paris, 1672.

<sup>a</sup> "Semper enim et ubique ab Ecclesiæ primordiis usque ad sæculum duodecimum, sub specie *panis et vini* communicaverunt."—Bon. Liturg., lib. ii. cap. 18.

<sup>b</sup> "Secundum antiquæ Ecclesiæ consuetudinem, omnes, sicut communicabant corpori, ita communicabant et sanguini."—S. Thom. in Joannem, cap. vii. sec. vii. p. 363. Paris, 1640.

<sup>c</sup> "Occidentalis vero, sive Romana Ecclesia, mille amplius annis continuis, non aliter quam sub duplici hac specie in conventu Ecclesiæ sacramentum hoc Dominici corporis et sanguinis administrasse legitur, idque in pane et vino, atque aded separatim."—Cassander, de Sacr. Commun., p. 1025. Paris, 1616.



questioned; they will form the subjects for subsequent consideration.

The reader will not have failed to observe the conflicting testimony borne by the fathers of the "General Council of Constance," and that of various cardinals and doctors of the same Church, and how very different these latter report the testimony, as to the custom of the ancient Church, to what Dr. Milner does.

With these preliminary observations we shall proceed to examine and expose Dr. Milner's subtleties, as set out in Letter xxxix. He begins by intimating that the Romish practice is sanctioned by *tradition*; "The Catholic Church," he says, "was formed and instructed in its divine doctrines and rites, and especially in its *sacraments* and *sacrifices*, before any part of the New Testament was published, and whole centuries before the entire New Testament was published and collected and pronounced by her to be authentic and inspired" (p. 374).<sup>a</sup> Again intimating by this that half-communion was a divine rite established by the Church, before any part of the New Testament was published; and that the custom therefore was founded on the *tradition* of the Church from the time of the Apostles. This intimation becomes more evident from what follows:—"Indeed Protestants are forced to have recourse to the *traditions of the Church* [printed in italics] for determining a great number of points which are left doubtful by the sacred text, particularly with respect to the two sacraments, which they acknowledge." Mark the Jesuitical *insinuation*; he dared not assert boldly, that the question under consideration was left "doubtful by the sacred text." What! Does Dr. Milner dare even to *insinuate* that the institution and administration of the Eucharist in both species was left *doubtful* by the "sacred text"? Are we not told, in Matthew xxvi. 26, &c., Mark xiv. 22, Luke xxii. 19, and in Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians xi. 23, that our Lord took bread, that He blessed, brake, and gave to His disciples, saying, TAKE, EAT, &c.; and that He took wine, blessed, and delivered the cup, saying, DRINK YE ALL OF THIS; and that He said to them all, *Do this in remembrance of me?* And again, does not St. Paul plainly say, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" (1 Cor. x. 16.) And again, "For as often as ye

<sup>a</sup> We are to deduce from this that the authenticity and inspiration of Scripture depended on the declaration of the [Roman] Church: this is arrogance indeed!

eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till He come.—Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup." (1 Cor. xi. 26—28.) Is the question left here in any *doubt*? And as if still farther to bear out his bold theory, he compares half-communion with the custom of the Church in the use of water in baptism, by "infusion or aspersion" instead of immersion, and also of "infant baptism," which latter (by the way), Bellarmine asserts, is sufficiently and clearly proved from Scripture,<sup>a</sup> and then in contradiction to what had been before asserted, he goes on to compare it with customs apparently enjoined by the example of Christ, *and which can only be proved by Scripture*, which, nevertheless, Protestants, he asserts, do not follow; and he instances that Christ communicated with the Apostles at an *evening supper*, after they had feasted on a lamb. Christ never said, "Do this after supper, and after you have feasted on a lamb." Though the Council of Constance did declare that the sacrament *should not* be administered after supper, it might just as well be urged that the sacrament is not properly performed, unless administered in an "upper chamber," or that it was not to be administered to females, because none were present at the institution. The other case cited, as showing that Christ's ordinances were not to be followed, is that he enjoined the Apostles to wash one another's feet, as an example that "they should do as he had done to them." (John xiii. 9—15.) The Church has *never* considered this an ordinance to be observed; it bears no parallel with the duty of administering the cup to the people, which the Church did universally practise until withheld by a Popish Council. The priests of Rome do not in this respect follow the alleged command, admitting it to be a matter of indifference; but if Dr. Milner's argument is to be admitted, then equally the entire sacrament is a matter of indifference, as much so as he makes one point of it.

Having thus misstated and mystified the question, he emerges from his cloud of sophistry by complacently asking:—

"That if none of these rites are essential to that ordinance [the Eucharist], or necessary to be practised at present, with what pretension to consistency then can they [Protestants] reject her [the Popish] doctrine and practice in the remaining particulars [*i.e.*, taking the cup from the laity] of this mysterious institution?"

---

<sup>a</sup> "Licet enim non inveniãmus expresse mandatum, ut baptizemus infantes, tamen id et colligitur *satis aperte* ex scripturis, ut supra ostendimus."—Bell. de Sacra. Bap., lib. i. cap. ix.

In order to afford the best answer to the objections raised against this practice, Dr. Milner proposes to give a clear exposition of the institution itself, and of the doctrine and discipline of the Church concerning the controversy in question. This exposition is given in the following lucid manner:—

“It is true that our Blessed Saviour instituted the Holy Eucharist under two kinds; but it must be observed that he then made it a *sacrifice* as well as a *Sacrament*, and that he ordained *priests*, namely, his twelve Apostles (for none else were present on the occasion), to consecrate this Sacrament and offer this sacrifice. Now, for the latter purpose—namely, a *sacrifice*—it was requisite that the victim should be really present, and at least mystically immolated, which was then, and is still, performed in the Mass, by the symbolical disunion or separate consecration of the body and the blood. It was requisite, also, for the completion of the *sacrifice*, that the priests, who had immolated the victim by mystically separating its body and its blood, should consummate it in both these kinds. Hence it is seen that the command of Christ, on which our opponents lay so much stress—*drink ye all of this*—regards the Apostles *as priests*, and not the laity as communicants.”<sup>a</sup>

Did any one ever read such a tissue of sophistry—such a “learned way of talking nonsense”? Christ never made the sacrament a *sacrifice*, in the sense the Roman Church attaches to that word; He did not *then* ordain the Apostles priests; they were ordained to that office after the resurrection of Christ, when he breathed upon them and said, “Receive ye the Holy Ghost.” Dr. Milner must mean that the Apostles were ordained priests by our Saviour saying *Hoc facite*, which he would construe *sacrifice this*, but which we render, and properly, “Do this.” And then he would persuade us that the Apostles received the cup as *priests*; and consequently that though these priests are now obliged to receive the cup as the Apostles did; yet it is sufficient if other persons receive the bread only. Let us admit that the word *facere* does sometimes signify “to sacrifice,” but it would puzzle even the ingenuity of a Dr. Milner to prove that *ποιεῖν*, which is the word in the original, is ever used in that sense either in the New Testament or elsewhere, nor can it be proved that a priest was ever ordained by that form. Suppose it did confer this privilege, then when the Apostles took the *bread*, the words having been uttered, they were consecrated priests, whereas the tenor of Dr. Milner’s argument is, that it was necessary, at least, for the Apostles on that occasion to *have taken in both kinds*; they all were priests; but then how is it that in the Church of Rome, though several priests assist at the celebration of the mass, yet he only who consecrates the elements, does take the wine?

<sup>a</sup> Letter xxxix. p. 375.

It is plain, therefore, by confession, that since all the Apostles drank of the cup as priests, they do plainly offend against the order of the first institution, in allowing the cup to no more than one of all the priests that are present. Had such a distinction been really intended to have been established by our Saviour, and that the cup was to be received by the priest, and denied to the laity, could Paul have omitted to refer to it? On the contrary, when he wrote to the Corinthians about the Lord's Supper, he utters not a syllable on that matter; but refers them to the first institution, and tells the whole Church, that they are commanded to receive both kinds in remembrance of Christ (1 Cor. xi. 23, &c.)<sup>a</sup>

Then look at his compromise or paring down of the genuine Popish doctrine of the corporal presence, by talking of a "mystical immolation,"—"symbolical disunion,"—"mystical separation." Does not his Church plainly teach that the victim said to be offered up at the mass, is no mystical or symbolical thing, but the selfsame Christ that lived and walked in this world, and hung on the cross?<sup>b</sup> Does not the Catechism of the Council of Trent tell us that it is the "very body, blood, bones, and nerves" of our Lord, as well as his "soul and divinity"?—Does not his Church teach that the wine is truly and really *substantially* changed into the blood, and the bread into the body? Then why talk about "*mystical* immolation" and "*symbolical* disunion," &c., but to mystify and mislead, or because he could not help seeing, though he could not or would not admit, the falsehood of the interpretation of the Church of Rome, utterly incompatible, as he was beginning to discover it to be with reason and Scripture. And again, why talk about "*mystically* separating the body and its blood," when immediately after he tells us that the Romanist takes both body and blood when he receives the consecrated bread?

Yet consider again the quality of this man's reasoning:

"True it is. (he says) that when Christ promised this Sacrament to the faithful in general, he *promised, in express terms*, both his body and his blood (John vi.); but this does not imply that they must, therefore, receive them under the different *appearances of bread and wine*."—P. 375.

And what is his reason? forsooth because the modern Trent conventicle teaches otherwise! And to introduce the 6th chapter of John's gospel as expressly, and as of course,

<sup>a</sup> See Bennett's "Confutation of Popery," chap. xi. part ii. London, 1714.

<sup>b</sup> "Catechism of Christian Doctrine," p. 108. London, 1843.

<sup>c</sup> "Jam vero in hoc loco a pastoribus explicandum est, non solum Christi corpus, et quidquid ad veram corporis rationem pertinet, veluti *ossa et nervos*, sed etiam totum Christum in hoc Sacramento contineri."—Catech. Conc. Trid., pars ii. sec. xxxi. p. 235. Paris, 1848.

referring to the Eucharist, is a bold step in advance for Dr. Milner to take, when he knew that the Council dared not apply this text to the Eucharist, for it was very cogently pressed upon them by one of the bishops present, that if they did admit the 6th chapter of St. John's Gospel to refer to the Eucharist, they must admit the Communion to be administered in *both* kinds, seeing Christ had said, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." (John vi. 53, &c.)<sup>a</sup>

And then with marvellous consistency he goes on to show that the laity are not deprived of the blood of Christ, because "the precious body and blood being *equally* and *entirely* [Italicised by Dr. Milner] present under each species, is *equally* and *entirely* given to the faithful, whichever they receive." If this be true, why is not the ministering priest contented to take one only, and that the bread? And here, by the way, we may note that there is a glaring inconsistency in the Decrees of Trent in this respect, for it says that the *bread* is changed into the *body*, and the *wine* into the *blood*. It is true that a body, that is a *living* body, may contain *blood*; but no *blood* contains the *body*. That each *species* equally and entirely contains both, is subsequently asserted by the Council merely to get over a difficulty. They have no warrant whatever, from Scripture or Tradition, for any such an assertion. "And thus" (says Dr. Milner, hurrying to a conclusion) "Romanists possessing the *reality* of them both, their species or outward appearance is no more than a matter of changeable discipline."

If this be *really* so, why does Dr. Milner thrust in the word *faithful*? According to his system, both the *faithful* and *unfaithful* alike receive the real body and "blood, bones and nerves, soul and divinity," when they receive of the wafer. It was necessary for him to confine it to the *faithful*, otherwise his 6th chapter of St. John would not fit, for there it is said, "*Whoso* eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood *hath eternal life*" (verse 54); whereas St. Paul contemplates an unworthy reception, which entails on the recipient a condemnation rather than a blessing. It is, however, not true that it is a matter of "changeable discipline," as we have seen by the Decree of Constance.

<sup>a</sup> See Albertinus "De Eucharistia," p. 210 (Daventriæ, 1654), and Du Moulin's "Anatomy of the Mass," p. 282, edit. Edinb. 1833.

## SECT. II.—Alleged Scriptural Evidence.

BUT after all, Dr. Milner proposes to prove half-communion from Scripture, which we had been led to suppose was “doubtful on the subject;” but now we are told, that, according to the “great lights of the Church,” St. Chrysostom, St. Augustine, St. Jerome, &c. (no references given, be it understood), and from the text (which he cites, p. 377), it seems clear that our Lord did “administer the Holy Communion” to Cleophas and the other disciples, whose guest he was, at Emmaus, “under the form of bread alone.” (Luke xxiv. 30, 31.) It is true that it is related that Christ “took bread, and blessed, and brake and gave to them.” From this it is pretended that although Christ did deliver both *bread* and *wine* at the first institution of the Lord’s Supper, yet he himself afterwards varied his own institution, for after the interview named he delivered the *bread* and not the *cup*.

It is admitted that at the time referred to Christ did take bread, and gave a blessing and brake, yet it does not follow that he then celebrated the Eucharist; and the Rhemish version merely says he blessed, but not that he blessed the bread, though our translators have added “it,” which is not in the original. The blessing and breaking of bread was usual at their ordinary meals. Thus St. Paul when he was in the tempest (Acts xxvii. 35), and also our Lord when he fed the five thousand (Matt. xiv. 13, Mark v. 41), and likewise when he fed the four thousand (Mark viii. 6). It will not be asserted that on either of these occasions our Saviour or St. Paul administered the Lord’s Supper. The reason of our Lord’s blessing and breaking bread at Emmaus, was evidently to convince his disciples of the truth of his resurrection; by his demeanour at table and the manner of blessing the meat, which were well known to them; and that, by his familiar conversation with them, they might be satisfied that he was the very person whom they well knew to have been lately crucified; and thus it came to pass, that “their eyes were opened” (Luke xiv. 31), because “he was known to them in breaking of bread” (verse 35).

But admitting that Christ did at this time celebrate the Lord’s Supper, we may suppose that He used the words of consecration, “This is my body,” and yet it is not so said that He did use them. Nor is it said that He consecrated any wine, which Romanists allege to be necessary at the Lord’s Supper, although the laity do not drink of it. Why, therefore, may we not suppose that he delivered the cup to

those disciples at Emmaus, although the history does not relate it; as well also we may and must suppose, according to their *own* principles, that He used the proper words in the consecration of the bread, and that He did not omit the consecration of the cup; although the Gospels do not mention either of those particulars.<sup>a</sup>

Again, Dr. Milner asserts that "it is written of the baptized converts at Jerusalem," that they partook of *bread*, without any mention being made of the *cup* in—what he assumes to be—a celebration of the Eucharist, because they are said to *break bread* (Acts ii. 42, and xx. 7), and of those at Troas also, without any reference to "the other species" (p. 377).

In reply we have to state, that although if by "breaking of bread" we are to understand the Lord's Supper (which nevertheless we have questioned), yet since there is not a syllable spoken of the consecration of the cup, we must beg leave to argue, as we did before—we must either suppose that they did consecrate the cup, whenever they brake the bread; or we must not; if we suppose they did, then Dr. Milner's objection falls to the ground. Because we have as much reason to suppose that they drank the cup, as we have to suppose the consecration of it; and consequently the silence of Scripture will not prove that they abstained from the wine. But if we must not suppose that they consecrated the cup, then they did not celebrate the Lord's Supper; because, according to the principles of the Romish Church, both kinds must be consecrated by the priest that officiates; or else there is no Sacrament.

But we assert that though there is nothing mentioned but "breaking of bread;" yet it must be considered that "bread" is a comprehensive word, and often signifies all manner of nourishment, whether of meat or drink. Thus when Joseph's brethren went "to eat bread" with him (Gen. xliii. 25), and our Saviour "ate bread" at the Pharisee's house (Luke xiv. 1), we are not to imagine that their entertainment consisted of bread alone, but of other eatables also. And surely Dr. Milner believed that both the Patriarch and the Pharisee allowed their guests some drink at their meals. Now since "bread" is so often put for both meat and drink, why may we not justly conclude that in the passages adduced, it is put both for bread and wine? and especially as this interpretation is more consistent with the first institution, and the other is inconsistent. But supposing some of these "baptized converts" did omit both the consecration and the delivery of the cup, it does not follow from this that we may lawfully do the

<sup>a</sup> Bennett's "Confutation," &c. p. 163. London, 1714.

same. Surely it cannot be argued that we may break a plain and positive law of God, because some others have done so before us.

The last text cited is that from I Cor. xi. 27, "Whosoever shall eat this bread *or* drink this cup unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord."

The accusation that the authorized version has been perverted by substituting *and* for *or* has been already fully discussed,<sup>a</sup> and the former rendering vindicated. In addition we might point out numerous passages in the Old Testament where the Hebrew has *or*, but where the later Vulgate translated it *and*.<sup>b</sup> It is worthy of notice that Bellarmine himself, in order to avoid the difficulty presented in the 53rd verse of John vi. (asserted to refer to the Eucharist), which, if taken literally, cuts at the root of the practice of "half-communion," "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man *and* drink his blood," desires to read it as if it were *or* instead of *and*, instancing (Acts iii. 6), "Silver *and* gold," which he says means, *or* gold, as a parallel passage.<sup>c</sup> Why, then, make such an outcry against Protestants, when, as it is alleged, they use *and* for *or*? That *or* is used in the same sense as *and* in the text in question is plain from the fact that the Apostle uses *and* in the 26th, 28th, and 29th verses (Cor. xi.), that is the one immediately preceding, and the two immediately following that quoted by Dr. Milner. But we are inclined to believe that the modern Rhemish reading is stronger for us. The Apostle says that by drinking *or* eating unworthily we are guilty of the body *and* blood; a person is supposed to have received both, because he is said to be guilty of both. But granting that Paul, writing to the Corinthians, intimated that one species might be omitted, what right has the Church of Rome to say that *that* shall be the wine? *Or* refers to either element.

To allay the conscience of the Roman laity, they are taught to believe a palpable absurdity; *viz.*, that "whole and entire Christ, and a true Sacrament is received under one kind only," for which assertion, set out in the 18th Article of Pope Pius's Creed, there is not one particle of authority in Scripture; nor is it supported by tradition. And this leads us to the assertion, to which we have given a direct denial, that—

<sup>a</sup> First Series, No. iv. p. 16, *et seq.*

<sup>b</sup> See, among other places, Lev. iv. 22, 23; Prov. xxx. 29, 30, 31; and for numerous instances in the New Testament where *or* and *and* are used indiscriminately, see Bennett's "Confutation," p. 168, chap. xi. par. ii. edit. as above.

<sup>c</sup> Bell. de Euchar., lib. iv. sec. 25, tom. iii. pp. 682, 683. Paris, 1608.



“The whole series of Ecclesiastical History proves that the Catholic Church, from the time of the Apostles down to the present—ever firmly believing that the whole body, blood, soul, and divinity of Jesus Christ equally subsists under each of the species or appearances of bread and wine—regarded it as a mere matter of discipline which of them were to be received in the Holy Sacrament.”—P. 378.

---

SECT. III.—Alleged Traditional Evidence.

IN the paragraph last cited Dr. Milner advances two propositions:—

*First.* That the whole series of Ecclesiastical History proves that the Catholic Church from the time of the Apostles down to the present time ever firmly believed that the body, blood, soul, and Divinity of Jesus Christ subsists under each of the species or appearance of bread and wine.

*Secondly.* That from the same evidence it is proved, that it has ever been regarded as a matter of discipline which of them (bread or wine) was to be received in the Holy Sacrament.

The First is an assertion yet to be proved. Various passages from different writers are adduced, not one of which refers in the remotest degree to the statement advanced, and which, therefore, remains a bare assertion put forward by Dr. Milner.

The Second is an abandonment of the true Popish teaching as advanced by the Church of Rome in the Council of Constance, whereby it is “declared, decreed, and defined” that the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper should not be received except fasting—that thenceforth it should be received by the laity under the species of bread only. And that this practice is to be adopted as an *ordinance*, which it is not lawful to gainsay or change without the authority of the *Church*. Whereas Dr. Milner asserts it to be a mere matter of discipline *which of them*—bread *or* wine—is to be received, the Council declaring that the bread *alone* was to be received by the laity.

When a proposition is so loosely stated, and alleged proofs are as loosely quoted to support erroneous assertions, the task of the critic becomes doubly onerous, and to a certain extent unprofitable; for it is comparatively easy, under such vague premises, to turn on the opponent, and allege that his arguments are misunderstood or misrepresented. Since, however, the Church of Rome denies the cup to the laity, we must take Dr. Milner’s quotations, as adduced, to prove that it has ever been considered a matter of *discipline*, that the bread should alone be received in the Holy Sacrament by the laity.

The list of passages from Christian antiquity selected to prove the truth of these assertions, is one in common use; nearly the same vouchers being exhibited in various Roman Catholic controversial publications; such, for instance, as Dr. Lingard's "Tracts,"<sup>a</sup> and seem intended rather to defend or excuse, than to establish the practice in question, or rather the requirements of the Church of Rome in the administration of this Sacrament. It might have been expected, accordingly, that such evidence would have been unambiguous, the doctrine or practice being in such direct contradiction to the plain and simple words of the Ordainer. It is, however, just the reverse, as will be seen when the passages are examined. And here again we have to complain of the vague and unsatisfactory manner in which these alleged proofs are placed before us. That there should be no mistake, we will transcribe all that Dr. Milner has alleged as proofs of the practice in question down to the Council of Constance.

"It is plain [that is, the two propositions above set out] from Tertullian in the second century (ad Uxor. l. ii.), from St. Dennis of Alexandria (apud Euseb. lib. vi. c. 44), and St. Cyprian (de Lapsis) in the third, from St. Basil (Epist. ad Cæsar.), and St. Chrysostom, in the fourth, &c. (apud Soz. l. viii. c. 5), that the Blessed Sacrament, under the form of bread, was preserved in the oratories and houses of the primitive Christians, for private Communion, and for the viaticum in danger of death. There are instances also of its being carried on the breast at sea, in the orarium or neckcloth (St. Ambrose in Orbit. [? Obit.] Frat.). It appears also that St. Birinus, the Apostle of the West Saxons, brought the blessed Sacrament with him into this island in an orarium (Gul. Malm. Vit. Pontif., Florent. Wigorn. Higden, &c.). On the other hand, as it was the custom to give the blessed Sacrament to baptized children, it was administered to those who were quite infants, by a drop from the chalice (St. Cypr. de Laps.). On the same principle, it being discovered, in the fifth century, that certain Manichæan heretics, who had come to Rome from Africa, objected to the Sacramental cup, from the erroneous and wicked opinion of the Mainchees, Pope Leo ordered them to be excluded from the Communion entirely (Serm. iv. de Quadrag.), and Pope Gelasius, for the same reason, required all his flock to receive under both kinds (Decret. *Comperimus*, Dist. iii.). It appears that in the twelfth century only the officiating priest and infants received under the form of wine; which discipline was confirmed at the beginning of the fifteenth century by the Council of Constance (see cap. xiii.) on account of the profanations, and other evils, resulting from the general reception of it in that form."—[Letter xxxix. pp. 378, 379.]

It will be perceived that Dr. Milner commences with Tertullian, who wrote about the latter end of the second century—why omit prior testimonies?

*Ignatius*, who was martyred about seventy years after the death of our Lord, in his Epistle to the Church of the Philadelphians (chapter iv.), exhorts them "to use one Eucharist; for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ and one cup."<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> P. 218. Ed. Dublin, 1822.

<sup>b</sup> "That one bread is broken unto all, and one cup is distributed to all." Εἷς καὶ ἄρτος τοῖς πᾶσι ἐθρίφθη, καὶ ἐν ποτήριον τοῖς ὅλοις διενεμήθη.—*Ignat. Ep. ad Philad.* According to the fuller text, p. 33. Ed. Geneva, 1623.

And Dionysius the Areopagite relates the practice of the Church in his time as follows: "After the priest has prayed that he may holily distribute, and that all they that are to partake of the sacrament may receive it worthily; he breaks the bread into many pieces, and divides one cup among all."<sup>a</sup> And in the "Constitutions," called "Apostolic," we read in book ii. chap. 57, "And when the sacrifice is offered up, let each rank receive by himself the Lord's body *and His precious blood.*" And *Justin Martyr*, who flourished about the middle of the second century, in his first Apology, sec. 65, writes:<sup>b</sup> "When the president has given thanks, and all the people given a joyful assent, they who are called deacons give to each of those who are present to partake of the consecrated bread *and wine* and water; and they carry it also to those who are not present;"<sup>c</sup> and adds the significant words, "as Christ commanded them."

And *Clement* of Alexandria, in his "Stromata," written against the Gentiles, says, "When they distributed the holy Eucharist, as the custom is, they permit every one of the people to take a part or portion thereof."<sup>d</sup> That he includes the wine, is evident from the following: "The mingling of drink, and of the water and of the word, is that which we call the Eucharist;"<sup>e</sup> so that, according to him, it was the custom in his day that the people should partake of the cup as well as the bread.

*Irenæus*, Bishop of Lyons, lived about A.D. 180. He also enjoined the use of the cup *with* the bread, as we read in his fifth book, chap. ii. sec. 2: "They are altogether vain who despise the restoration of the flesh; for, according to this notion, neither the *cup* of the Eucharist is the communion of His blood, nor the bread which we break the communion of His body." From these passages we gather both directly and indirectly that the cup used to be administered indiscriminately with the bread; while not one passage from these

<sup>a</sup> Τὸν γὰρ ἐγκεκαλυμμένον, etc. Dionys. Areopag. Eccles. Hierch. c. 3. Edit. Basil. 1539. We believe this to be the production of a later period. A caution is therefore necessary in its citation.

<sup>b</sup> Διδάσκειν ἐκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλάβειν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος. Καθὼς παρέδωκεν ἐντετάλασαι αὐτοῖς Ἰησοῦς.—P. 162; ex Bibl. Regia, Lutet. Græc. 1551; or vol. i. p. 268, ed. Jenæ, 1842.

<sup>c</sup> It appears to have been an ancient custom to mix water with the wine; a custom no way affecting the present argument.

<sup>d</sup> Καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν τινὲς διανείμαντες (ὡς ἔθος) αὐτὸν δὴ ἕκαστον τοῦ λαοῦ λαβεῖν τὴν μοῖραν ἐπιτρέπουσιν.—Clem. Alex. Stromat. lib. i. cap. i. p. 94. Ex Bibl. Medicææ. Florent. 1550.

<sup>e</sup> Ἡ δὲ ἀμφοῖν ἀδύς κρᾶσις ποτοῦ τὲ καὶ λόγου εὐχαριστία κέκληται.—Idem, Pædagog. lib. ii. cap. ii. p. 35. Edit. *ut supra*.

writers can be adduced to support Dr. Milner's propositions, or even that the administering the cup was a matter of discipline.

We come then to *Tertullian*. Dr. Milner does not give the passage on which he relies. *Tertullian*, however, in the passage referred to in the *fifth* chapter of the second book, "Ad Uxorem," is speaking of the difficulty of a Christian woman, married to a heathen, concealing from her husband the Christian rites; that when he discovers her taking bread in the morning, before she tastes anything else, he will suspect it not to be mere bread. The utmost that this can be adduced to prove, is that the Christians of *Tertullian's* age were perhaps accustomed to carry home with them part of the bread only, and not of the wine from the Lord's Supper; but to argue from it that they received the Communion only in one kind is utterly ludicrous.<sup>a</sup> The fact is, they took home not *one* but both species; and this appears on the evidence of *Tertullian* himself. *Bossuet* grants this, but says that it was done immediately after consecration; as if it made any difference, whether it was soon or not, when the question at issue is whether the primitive Christians preserved the blessed Sacrament, as Dr. Milner insists, under the form of bread only for private communion. But to come to *Tertullian's* testimony. This father, speaking of the resurrection, says (cap. 8), "Our flesh is fed with the body *and* blood of Christ."<sup>b</sup> And in his Address to his Wife, to which Dr. Milner particularly alludes, he urges her, in two separate places, *to take the cup* with earnestness of soul; which proves that the Sacrament was received, in his time, under *both* kinds.<sup>c</sup> It is in the sixth chapter of this same book that *Tertullian* writes, "Of whose hand shall she desire [the sacramental bread], and from whose *cup* shall she partake of the sacramental wine?"<sup>d</sup> Dr. Milner must indeed be possessed with some degree of assurance to refer us to *Tertullian*.

The next authority is *St. Dennis* of Alexandria, quoted by *Eusebius*;<sup>e</sup> but the passage is not given. He barely relates that one *Serapion*, who had sacrificed to idols, prayed for the comfort of the Eucharist as a token of reconciliation to the Church; and that the priest sent him, by the young man

<sup>a</sup> "Vigilance recommended [and just as needful now] in two Charges, and two Letters in Answer to Remarks on the Bishop of Durham's Charge."—*London*. 1813, p. 267.

<sup>b</sup> "Caro corpore et sanguine Christi vescitur, ut et anima de Deo sanguinatur."—*Tertul. de Resurrect.* cap. 8, edit. Pamel. Paris, 1631.

<sup>c</sup> *Ad Uxor.* lib. ii. capp. 4 et 6.

<sup>d</sup> "De cujus manu desiderabit? de cujus poculo participabit?"

<sup>e</sup> *Euseb. H. E.* vi. (not iv. as given by Milner), c. 44.

who delivered the message, a small portion of the Eucharist, enjoining him to moisten it, and so to pour it into the old man's mouth; and it is hardly worth further notice than to exhibit Dr. Milner's usual intrepidity of assertion, unsustained by a semblance of proof, when he says, in his "Vindication," that "there is not a word of the narration which intimates that the *liquid* species was sent with the Eucharistic bread, but the contrary." What, no intimation in the word *εὐχαριστία*, which implies *both* species—none in *ἀποβρέξαι*—nor any in *ἐπιστάξαι*, or *ἐνέχεεν*, that the liquid, not less than the solid, species was sent to the dying? None whatever, our Greek *savans* tell us!<sup>a</sup>

The sick person did receive in both kinds. For the lad who brought the portion of the Eucharist was commanded by the priest, who sent him to sop the bread into wine, and being moistened, to put it into the old man's mouth, and this was accordingly performed; the words used in the story, to which Dr. Milner sends us, are *ἀποβρέξαι*, *ἐπιστάξαι*, *ἐχέουσαι*, to wet, to moisten, to infuse, which are not properly spoken, but of some liquid matter.<sup>b</sup>

Really Romanists ought to be afraid, if they are not ashamed, of their champion, for he furnishes us with arguments, and refers us to works which stultify himself.

The passage from *Cyprian*, next referred to, if it be conclusive either way, proves the contrary to that for which it is cited. The use of wine is plainly expressed, the deacon is mentioned as administering it; and that of the bread is sufficiently implied in the words *edere et contrectare*.<sup>c</sup> But this is still more manifest from another passage in the very same tract, where the author expressly says, in the person of those who are supposed to have received only in one kind, "*nos nihil fecimus, nec derelicto cibo et poculo Domini,*" &c. (cap. 2).<sup>d</sup>

But we have not yet done with *Cyprian*. While speaking of such as in time of persecution had lapsed and not adhered to the truth, and thereupon were debarred from the Communion, he desired that upon their repentance they might be admitted, and he gives this reason: "How shall we fit them for the cup of martyrdom, if before we admit them not by right of communion to drink the Lord's cup in the Church?"<sup>e</sup> And again, while arguing for the necessity of

<sup>a</sup> Milner's "Vindication," p. 214. Grier's "Reply to the End of Controversy," p. 225; and "Defence," p. 223.

<sup>b</sup> Birekbek's "Protestant Evidence," vol. i. p. 176. Edit. 1849.

<sup>c</sup> De Lapsis, cap. 4.

<sup>d</sup> "Vigilance recommended," *ut suprâ*, p. 265.

<sup>e</sup> "Quomodo ad martyrii poculum idoneos facimus, si non eos prius ad

administering the Sacrament in *wine* and not in mere *water*, as the *aquarii* did (clearly proving the custom of administering the cup to the laity), he says, "Because some men out of ignorance or simplicity in sanctifying the cup of the Lord, and ministering it to the people do not that which Jesus Christ our Lord, the author and institutor of this sacrifice, did and taught."<sup>a</sup> These are all the authorities cited of the third century; we in vain look for proofs of either of the propositions suggested.

Descending the stream of time, we accompany Dr. Milner to the fourth century, when *Sts. Basil* and *Chrysostom* flourished, and to them he refers us. The former says, in the very epistle referred to (but not quoted) by Dr. Milner (Epist. ad Cæsar.), that "it is good and profitable to partake every day of the blessed body and blood of Christ." And where he treats of the peculiar custom of Christians, he asks, "What is proper to him who eats the bread and drinks the cup of Christ?"<sup>b</sup> And, as far as the latter is concerned, he draws no distinction between the priest and the laity, when we come to partake of the divine mysteries, "for we are," says he, "all admitted to them alike." And again, it was not lawful under the old dispensation, for the people to partake of the same things with the priest, but not so now; "for to *all* one body is offered, to *all* one cup."<sup>c</sup> Now, is it possible to find language more adverse to Dr. Milner's cause? particularly when he added that "the communion of the body and *blood of Christ* is *necessary* to salvation."<sup>d</sup> His allusions to the stories of Satyrus,<sup>e</sup> an unbaptized person, and of Birinus,<sup>f</sup> the apostle of the West Saxons, would be undeserving of attention, were it not that Dr. Milner has given them a dash of the miraculous. The circumstance of their having carried the consecrated bread in their neckcloths, during their voyage, however it might have *enabled them to walk on water*, after they encountered shipwreck, could only

bibendum in Ecclesiâ poculum Domini jure communicationis admittimus?"—Cyp. Epist. 54, tom. i. lib. i. edit. Pamel. Paris, 1602. Epist. 53, ed. Paris, 1836.

<sup>a</sup> "In calice Domini sanctificando et plebi ministrando non hoc faciunt, quod Jesus Christus sacrificii hujus auctor et doctor fecit et docuit."—Id. Epist. 63, lib. iii. ep. 3.

<sup>b</sup> Basil. Op. tom. iii. p. 267, and tom. ii. p. 445. Paris, 1839.

<sup>c</sup> Chrysost. in Ep. ad Corinth., Hom. 18, sec. iii. tom. x. p. 670, edit. Paris, 1837; in Matt. Hom. 32, sec. vii. tom. vii. See Dr. Grier's "Reply," p. 227.

<sup>d</sup> Reg. Moral. 21, ἀναγκαία πρὸς ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

<sup>e</sup> Apud Ambros. de Obitu Fratris, fol. 128 verso. tom. i. Edit. Paris, 1529.

<sup>f</sup> Guil. Malm. Vitæ Episc., p. 241. Edit. Francôf. 1601. See Fox's "Acts and Monuments," vol. i. 347-8. Edit. 1853.

go to prove their veneration for the Sacrament, but by no means the general usage of the Church. But the very climax of absurdity is, where he rests his proof of the ancient Church only communicating in one kind, on the hypothesis that these persons did not take the liquid species, because no mention is made of it; and the "puzzle he has given ingenuity to show how they could carry it in such a vehicle as their neckcloth."

Oh, but he presents proof positive that Chrysostom himself allowed Communion in one kind, referring us to Sozomen's "Ecclesiastical History;" for that a heretic lady, we are there told, contrived to put a piece of common bread into her mouth, in place of that which had been consecrated, and that, on applying her teeth to it, it became petrified. Dr. Milner gives the reference, but wisely suppresses the story. In order to throw an air of credibility round his story, the historian<sup>a</sup> adds that the stone was preserved in his time in the clinodia of the Church of Constantinople. But may not the lady have substituted a stone for the bread in her mouth? Whatever may have been the trick practised, the historian's silence about the wine is no proof that it was not administered. On the contrary, *Cardinal Bona*, in commenting on the passage, expressly says, "I can *nowhere* discover in Chrysostom's writings, that this affair led to a change in the established custom, according to which the deacon distributed the *wine*."<sup>b</sup> The contrast between the flippant assumption, that Chrysostom *allowed* any deviation from Communion in both kinds, and such high authority, supersedes the necessity of a single observation on this bit of romance.<sup>c</sup>

But only conceive the hardihood of a man pretending to candour and honesty [Letter i. pp. 50, 54, and p. 30, &c.] referring us to Chrysostom as proving the custom of depriving the laity of the cup. Why Chrysostom *insists* on the fact that there is no difference between the priest and the people, with respect to receiving the Eucharist (the very difference which the Council of Trent has established as a law of the Church). Thus he says:—

"There are things wherein the priest differs nothing from the people; as when, for instance, we must use the awful mysteries [the Eucharistic elements]; for *we are all equally worthy* of them. It is not now as it was under the old dispensation, when the priest ate some parts and the ruler others, and when

<sup>a</sup> Sozomen. Hist. Eccl., lib. viii. cap. v. Cantab., 1720.

<sup>b</sup> Rerum Liturg., lib. ii. cap. xviii. sec. 3.

<sup>c</sup> Dr. Grier's "Defence," pp. 226-8; see also Mr. Scudamore's "Communion of the Laity," pp. 66-69. London, 1855.

it was not lawful for the people to partake of what the priest partook ; but now one body *and one cup* are placed before *all*.”<sup>a</sup>

But were there no other illustrious Fathers to whom Dr. Milner could refer us in this fourth age? Let us fill up the gap for him.

*Ambrose* (de Sacram. lib. ix. cap. 6, sec. 28), speaking to the people concerning the Eucharist, says, “If as often as the *blood* is poured out it is poured out for the remission of sins, *it behoveth me always to receive it*, that my sins may always be forgiven me—I who am always sinning ought always to have medicine.” And, again, commenting on the xi. chap. of 1 Corinth., he says, “The testament is established with blood, because blood is the evidence of the divine goodness, in token of which *we receive the mystical cup* of the blood to the refreshment of our body and of our soul.” And in another passage of the same comment he says: “Because we have been delivered by the death of the Lord, mindful of this, in eating the flesh *and drinking the blood*, which have been offered for us, we signify that we have obtained in those the New Testament.”

These decisive testimonies from *Ambrose* himself sufficiently meet the argument in favour of half-Communion, which Romish divines seek to derive from the fact that, at the point of death, he communicated in the species of bread only. This did not arise from a recognition on his part, or on the part of those about him, of the practice of half-Communion; but simply from this, that he died before the cup could be administered.<sup>b</sup>

Again we have *Gregory Nazianzen*, of the same century. “Reverence (he said) the mystical table to which thou hast approached, the bread of which thou hast partaken, the *cup of which thou hast communicated*.”<sup>c</sup> And again, he said of his sister *Gorgonia*, “If the hand treasured up any portion of the types or tokens of the precious body and of the blood,”<sup>d</sup> that his sister, after she had communicated, laid up some part of the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; now, as she kept the consecrated bread in a cloth, so she might carry the wine in a phial; she however received in both kinds, might not also the other person who is said to have brought the bread in a neckcloth, have also brought the wine in a phial similarly concealed?<sup>e</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Ἄλλὰ πᾶσιν ἐν σῶμα πρόκειται καὶ ποτήριον ἐν.—Sup. 2 Cor. Hom. xviii. tom. iii. p. 645, edit. Savilii, et p. 670, tom. x. Paris, 1837.

<sup>b</sup> “Catholic Layman” (Dublin, June, 1856), p. 63.

<sup>c</sup> Orat. XI. in Sanct. Baptism., tom. i. p. 716. Paris, 1778.

<sup>d</sup> Καὶ εἴ που τι τῶν ἀντιτύπων τοῦ τιμίου σώματος ἢ τοῦ αἵματος ἢ χεῖρ ἰησαύρισην, τοῦτο καταμίγουσα τοῖς δάκρυσιν.—Greg. Nazianz. Orat. II. in Laud. Gorgon.

<sup>e</sup> Birckbek, vol. i. p. 210. London, 1849.



*Athanasius* speaks even yet more plainly in his Second Apology: "This, and no other, is the manner of this *cup*—this do *you lawfully give to the people to drink of.*" Whereas Dr. Milner's Church says it is *not* lawful to give the cup to the laity.

In passing on to the fifth century, we have the well-known passages from the ordinances of Popes Leo and Gelasius, in support of half-Communion, reproduced by Dr. Milner, as though they had never before been so much as challenged: "On the same principle (says he), it being discovered in the fifth century that certain Manichæan heretics objected to the sacramental cup, from the erroneous and wicked opinion of the Manichees, Pope Leo ordered them to be excluded from the Communion entirely." It was for the same reason, adds Dr. Milner, that Pope Gelasius "required all his flock to receive in both kinds." He, however, avoids quoting the passages in question; and for very obvious reasons, as the reader will see. We, however, will supply the deficiency, and here add the words of each pope.

Pope Leo the Great, in treating of the Manichæans, writes thus:—

"They withdrew themselves from the Sacrament of our salvation. With unworthy mouth they receive Christ's body; but they altogether refuse to *drink the blood of our redemption*, which things we would advertise you of, that both such men may be manifested by these tokens unto you, and also that they, being brought to light, may be *thrust out of the Church* by sacerdotal authority."<sup>a</sup>

Pope Gelasius I., who lived as late as A.D. 496, expressly says that to administer the Communion in one kind is open sacrilege:—

"We have found that some, having received only the portion wherein is the holy body, abstain from the cup of the sacred blood; who, without doubt (forasmuch as led by some strange superstition they are so taught), should receive the *whole Sacrament*, or be *kept from the whole*; because the *dividing* of one and the same mystery cannot take place without *great sacrilege.*"<sup>b</sup>

There is no doubt, therefore, but that such an order was made, as stated by Dr. Milner; but no evidence is offered to prove that it was the practice in Leo's time to distribute the

<sup>a</sup> "Abdicant enim se Sacramento salutis humanæ. Ore indigno Christi corpus accipiunt; sanguine autem redemptionis nostræ haurire omnino declinant. Quod ideo vestram volumus scire sanctitatem, ut vobis hujuscemodi homines his manifestetur indicis et notati et prodiți a sanctorum societate sacerdotali auctoritate pellantur."—Leon. Mag. Op. Lut. 1623, col. 108, serm. iv. de Quadrag.

<sup>b</sup> "Comperimus autem quod quidam, sumpta tantummodo corporis sacri portione, a calice sacrati cruoris abstineant; qui proculdubio (quoniam nescio qua superstitione docentur obstringi), aut integra Sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur: quia divisio unius ejusdemque mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest provenire."—Gelas. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Decret. Grat. tert. pars de Consecr., dist. ii. cap. xii. col. 1168. Ludg. 1661.

bread *only*, or that the practice was to be varied on that occasion by the addition of the cup. The contrary appears to have been the case, and that it was a settled custom to receive the cup as well as the bread, otherwise Leo would not have pointed out the refusal of those persons to partake of the wine as the surest mark of distinction between them and the orthodox.<sup>a</sup> He presses on the notice of his congregation the objections of those persons, "that so they might by this evidence be discovered, and their sacrilegious dissimulation be detected." In a word, if the distribution of the cup were not an established ordinance of the Church, why should he call the violation of it *sacrilegious*? Yet this passage is unblushingly adduced to prove that Communion under one kind was always partially admitted. Besides, if, as Dr. Lingard argues (by a curious inversion of reasoning, making the heretics give the law to the Church) that as the Manichees "communicated like others," it was customary with many Christians so to communicate, how would the refusal to drink *mark* that body? how could they be *detected*? Can anything more plainly show that the rest of the communicants, the orthodox Christians, *did* take the wine?

In Dr. Wordsworth's "Sequel to Letters to Mr. Gordon"<sup>b</sup> we find so admirable an exposure of Romish dealing with these decrees of the early Bishops of Rome, that we must transcribe rather largely. Dr. Wordsworth quoted the passages from Gelasius, in his letters to Gordon.<sup>c</sup> The *Dublin Review*, in an article supposed to be written by Dr. Wiseman, undertakes to call in question the citation and explain its meaning; and a remarkable feature in the explanations of the reviewer is, that he takes still a different view of the subject from Dr. Milner, and both again differing from Cardinal Baronius, as will be seen: "The title (says the reviewer) of the Canon he (Dr. Wordsworth) quotes, and the gloss upon it, forbid us to read it as he has done. The Canon forbids the priest to abstain from receiving the cup, and that abstinence it calls a 'great sacrilege.' It is the *celebrant* the Canon condemns, not the lay communicant; and the rule of the Church is no more condemned by it, than it is by the Statute of Mortmain or the Reform Bill."<sup>d</sup>

The *Dublin Reviewer* ventures to affirm that the prohibition of Gelasius refers to the consecrating priest alone, and not to anyone else; and thus, while he pretends to revere a Pope as

<sup>a</sup> See "Letters to the Author of Remarks [Dr. Lingard] on the Bishop of Durham's Charge," p. 262, *ut supra*.

<sup>b</sup> Letter vi. London, 1848, second edit.

<sup>c</sup> Third edit., London, 1848, Letter vi. p. 156.

<sup>d</sup> *Dublin Review*, July, 1847. Dublin.

infallible, he flatly contradicts him! For look at the words of Gelasius: "I hear that *some persons abstain* from the cup;" but these, says the reviewer, were priests, and priests alone. What? Priests of Rome bound by the ties of a certain superstition! This is very strange! Besides, these priests put themselves forward, and are allowed by other priests of Rome to consecrate the holy elements! and this they do, when, if they did not take upon themselves to be *celebrants*, they might escape unnoticed; for it is the *celebrant* alone, according to the Dublin Reviewer, that the Pope forbids to abstain from the cup; and this they also do, when—if they, being celebrants, abstain from the wine—the wine consecrated by them, which according to the reviewer was only to be tasted by the celebrant, will never be tasted at all! Why then did they consecrate it?<sup>a</sup> But this is not all the absurdity which the critic palms upon the Pope. These superstitious celebrants are either to receive the whole Sacrament or to be *repelled* from the whole, because, says the Pope, the division of the Sacrament cannot take place without great sacrilege; so that priests (not laymen), superstitious priests, are either to be admitted, not only to communicate, but to consecrate the elements, *or* else they are to be repelled from the Communion; and repelled by whom? by the celebrant—that is, by themselves!

But the reviewer says:—

"We find it impossible to explain upon what principle Dr. Wordsworth reads books. The *title* of the Canon he quotes, and the *gloss* upon it, forbid us to read it as he has done. The Canon forbids the *priest* to abstain from receiving the cup, and that *abstinence* it calls a great sacrilege. It is the *celebrant* the Canon condemns, and not the lay communicant."

"The *Title* and the *Gloss*," affirms the reviewer, make the prohibition apply to the PRIEST alone. The Title and the Gloss! Yes, and here is *another* striking instance of the destructive character of the Church of Rome. She spares no one, not even her own Popes. We have now a few words to say about the "Title and the Gloss."<sup>b</sup>

The precept of Gelasius, as we have observed, is found in one of his letters, with *no* "Title or Gloss." It is simply a paragraph in an epistle. This paragraph was extracted from the letter, and transcribed into the Canon law of the Roman Church, and it stands in the collection of Canons called the Decretum of Gratian, who was a Benedictine monk of

<sup>a</sup> See Jacobellum c. Brodam, ap. Von der Hardt. Conc. Const. iii. 476, 637.

<sup>b</sup> The title is "Corpus Christi, sine ejus sanguine sacerdos non debet accipere." The gloss is in the edition of Gratian, A.D. 1518, p. 545. "Hoc intelligo de *conficiente*; nam infirmus, vel sanus in necessitate, sine vino corpus sumere potest." In later editions this is "hoc *debet* intelligi," &c.

Bologna in the twelfth century, and completed his work about the year 1149, and dedicated it to Pope Eugenius III. The same paragraph of Gelasius will be found in the earlier collection of Canons, made by Ivo,<sup>a</sup> Bishop of Chartres, who is called a most careful interpreter<sup>b</sup> of the constitutions of the Church. But *there* it stands with *this* title: "The body of the Lord is not to be received without the cup;"<sup>c</sup> and another collector of Canons in the same age, Micrologus,<sup>d</sup> declares that Gelasius had commanded "all to be excommunicated, whosoever (*quicumque*) having received the body abstained from the blood;" and Radulphus de Rivo, who transcribes the words of Micrologus, gives the same reason as he does, *viz.*, the very words of Gelasius, that "the Sacraments cannot be divided without great sacrilege;" and Cassander<sup>e</sup> informs us, that in his old MS. of Canons, this was the title of the decree: "*No one* is permitted to receive the Communion of the body alone without partaking of the blood."

What, then, has the reviewer's remark led to? To the revelation of the fact, that the Church of Rome, finding that one of her own *ancient* Popes condemns her *present* practice of half-Communion as a *great sacrilege*, has treated him with the same arrogance as she has done Scripture; she has taken the words of Gelasius, and has dealt with them as she has dealt with many other authorities of a similar kind; she has clapped a viperine *gloss* by their side to eat out the bowels of the text, and has posted a title at their head to belie the whole body. If we may so say, she has put her own infallible judge into the pillory for speaking the truth; and has ordered him to recant his own orthodoxy, and to adopt her corruptions; and has made that to apply to the *priest* alone, which Gelasius intended for *all*. This is so evident, that it is allowed (as the reviewer ought to have known) even by the Roman Church Historian, Cardinal Baronius, a Pope's confessor and Prothonotary of the Church. He says<sup>g</sup> that *some* persons interpret the "words of Gelasius of the priest alone." "But," he adds, "in truth, there is in these words no mention

<sup>a</sup> Ayliffe, Parergon, p. xvii.

<sup>b</sup> Trithemius de Script. Eccles. sec. 349.

<sup>c</sup> Ivo, Decret. part ii. cap. 89, p. 66, edit. Lovan. 1561. "Non esse sumendum corpus Domini sine calice." *Gelasius* Majorice et Joanni Episcopis.

<sup>d</sup> De Eccles. Observ. cap. 19, in Biblioth. Max. Patrum.

<sup>e</sup> "De Commun. in utraque specie," p. 1106.

<sup>f</sup> For numerous instances of corruptions in the *Canon Law*, by means of titles and glosses, and even mutilations of the text, see Dr. James's "Corruption of the true Fathers," pp. 190, 245, 246, 252, 258, 262, 264, 265, ed. Lond, 1688, [reprinted Camb. 1843].

<sup>g</sup> Baron. Ann. Eccles. ad an. 496, sec. 21, tom. v. p. 571, ed. Colon. 1609.

made of the *celebrant*; and that which is evidently spoken generally, ought *by no means to be restricted* to the *priest*.<sup>a</sup> Reject, therefore," he says, "this childish interpretation." Such is the great historian's opinion of the solution of the reviewer, who will, we suppose, say that "he finds it impossible to understand upon what principle" Cardinal Baronius "read books." We for our own part are puzzled to understand on what principle the reviewer does *not* read them. But we turn from him to the Cardinal. Many of our readers will be aware, that Baronius, finding the fraud of the "title and gloss" to be too glaring, and yet not willing to admit the fatal alternative that half-Communion had been condemned by a Pope as a "great sacrilege," devised an ingenious method for getting rid of this difficulty; he alleged that Pope Gelasius *enjoined* Communion in both kinds, in order to detect *Manichæans*.

We know from Leo I., who was Bishop of Rome<sup>b</sup> more than a quarter of a century before Gelasius, that the Manichæans (who were the predecessors of the present Parsees, or sun-worshippers) believed in two principles, one good, and the other evil, and held other monstrous opinions; that they abominated wine, which they called the gall of the devil, and yet sometimes surreptitiously stole into Christian congregations, and intruded even into the ranks of communicants, and that they received the bread, and also the wine, but would never swallow the latter, but *pretended* to swallow it, and afterwards ejected it from their mouths.<sup>c</sup>

Leo mentions in one of his sermons<sup>d</sup> this fact of their "declining to swallow the wine;" and he tells his hearers, that he informs them of it in order that those Manichæan intruders may be made manifest to them by this test, and that they who are convicted of thus sacrilegiously counterfeiting the character of communicants, may be excommunicated by the priests.

It is alleged by Cardinal Baronius,<sup>e</sup> that Leo I., and Gela-

<sup>a</sup> The Cardinal's words are: "Revera nulla ibi de sacerdote sacrificante mentio habetur; ut plane quod generaliter esse dictum apparet, ad sacerdotes minime restringi debere satis intelligi possit. Rejicimus igitur frigidam ejusmodi . . . solutionem."

<sup>b</sup> Leo, A.D. 440—461; Gelasius, A.D. 492—496.

<sup>c</sup> See the passages quoted by Bishop Andrews, ad Card. Bellarmin., cap. 8, p. 190.

<sup>d</sup> The original words are given in Dr. Wordsworth's Appendix, i. p. 292. [S. Leonis Magni Opera, ed. Lugduni, 1700, tom. i. p. 106, sermo xli.]

<sup>e</sup> Baron. Annal. ad an. 496, sec. 22. "Quod igitur abstinentiâ calicis proderentur penitus Manichæi, idem plane remedium, quo usus est Sanctus Leo adhibendum putavit esse Gelasius, ut latitantes sub Catholico nomine impios detegeret Manichæos;—prudenter quidem S. Leonis vestigiis insistens Gelasius, istud quod vidimus sancivit decretum." And this opinion is

sus after him, *enacted* that the cup should be administered to the laity, to detect these Manichæans. Hence, says he, the decree of Gelasius.

To what wretched shifts are the greatest men of the Roman Church driven by their desire and determination to maintain the corruptions of Rome at all hazards. Desperate, indeed, must the cause be which can be defended by persons of their ability with no better arguments than these. Observe what absurdities are fathered on Leo and Gelasius by the Cardinal's hypothesis.

*First*—Leo detects the Manichæans by their abstinence from the cup, and yet he is said to have enjoined its administration, *in order* to detect them !

*Secondly*—Leo does not order the Priest to administer the cup, but he speaks to the people concerning the refusal of the Manichæans to partake of it; he *supposes* the cup to be administered, as a *matter of course*, and that every one will partake of it; and yet he is said to *enjoin* the priests to administer what he clearly implies it has been always the practice of the people to receive !

*Third*—Gelasius, who was a quarter of a century after Leo, is made to say that he *does not know* what is the tie of superstition by which these supposed Manichæans are bound, as if the reason for which the Manichees refused wine had not been given by Leo,<sup>a</sup> and was not notorious to all, *viz.*, that wine was created by the devil.

*Fourthly*—He is made to call Manichæism a *superstition*, that is an excess of reverence; whereas it was rank *infidelity*, and so Leo calls it.<sup>b</sup>

*Fifthly*—He is made to say that these intruders are either to be repelled from the entire Sacrament, *or* to be *admitted* to it.<sup>c</sup> What! Manichæan infidels admitted, by a Pope's order, to the Holy Communion !

And *Sixthly*, both these *Popes* are made to *enact* what had been *enjoined* by *Christ* himself, and continued in the uninterrupted practice of the Church, from the times of the Apostles to their own !

Thus far, and right well, Dr. Wordsworth in his *sequel*, on which the Dublin reviewer has not hazarded a rejoinder.

adopted by celebrated Romish divines of this day, *e. g.* Perrone (Prælec. Theolog.), pars i. cap. iii. p. 233, "Ad Manichæos detegendos."

<sup>a</sup> Leo, serm. xli. "Damnant creaturarum naturam in Creatoris injuriam, et contaminari edentes asserunt iis quorum non Deum sed *Diabolum* conditorem esse definiunt."

<sup>b</sup> Leo, l. c. "Ad tegendam *infidelitatem* suam nostris audent interesse mysteriis."

<sup>c</sup> "Aut integra sacramenta recipiant, aut ab integris arceantur."

But here we cannot but advert to a brilliant specimen of boldness in reference, upon which Dr. Lingard<sup>a</sup> has ventured in leading us, of all imaginable places, to the Eleventh Council of *Toledo*, to support even his cautious statements. He could hardly have selected one more subversive of the assumed practice of single Communion. The eleventh Canon of that Council actually refers to persons who *do* receive the cup, but could not swallow more; and releases those from a necessity of receiving, who, *compelled* by inevitable weakness, cannot retain what they have received.<sup>b</sup> And this we are to take as a proof of Communion in one kind, "being partially admitted" in the ancient Church! So much for "Toledo trusty!"

But Dr. Milner would reduce everything in his Church, except Supremacy, to a "matter of discipline" and occasional arrangement, proving her to be, as indeed her whole history shows her, a most dexterous accommodator; and, provided some temporary advantage is secured, advocating at different times opposite views of the same question. Otherwise he surely would not have introduced the Decree of Gelasius, quoted in the Canon Law (Gratian. part iii., de Consecrat. dist. ii. § 12), but, with Dr. Lingard,<sup>c</sup> set about questioning its genuineness, the Bishop affirming that a "division of one and the same mystery cannot be made without great sacrilege." Such was the decision of a Roman Pontiff, at the end of the fifth century; and here we see that the *sacrilegious* suppression of part of the Sacrament was the cause, and the *only* cause, for passing the Decree. But it does not hence follow, as Dr. Milner insinuates, that it was previously the practice to communicate in *one* kind alone. No! The Decree was not made to regulate the practice of the faithful, but was levelled, for the particular reason assigned, against the superstitious persons then in Rome. Cassander thought that the testimonies of Leo and Gelasius, instead of favouring, *condemn* this practice. In reply to a half-Communionist, he says, "that it is very evident, that during their Pontificates, Communion in *both* kinds was usual in the Church; otherwise how could the Manichæans be detected, unless the cup of Christ's blood had been offered to all in the

<sup>a</sup> Tracts, p. 214, ed. Dublin, 1822.

<sup>b</sup> Some of the original is worth quoting:—"Sed quod *præter* *Dominici calicis* haustum traditam sibi non possint Eucharistiam deglutire. . . . quicumque ergo fidelis *inevitabili* qualibet infirmitate coactus Eucharistiam perceptam rejecerit," &c.—Canones Apost. et Concil. Selecti, collegit H. T. Bruns, tom. i. p. 314, Berol. 1839.

<sup>c</sup> Tracts, p. 89. Dublin, 1822.

Church?" And not only for 500, as Cassander admits,<sup>a</sup> but even 700 years more, as Cardinal Bona acknowledges, the Communion was, as we have seen, most certainly administered to clergy and laity, to men and women, in both kinds. As for the impediments and obstacles, which are unavoidable, "What can be more unreasonable than to justify neglect of duty, where obvious and practicable, from omission of duty where impracticable? To necessity there is no law."<sup>b</sup>

But were there no other witnesses who lived in the fifth century, who can bear testimony to the practice of the Church in that age, whose writings have been preserved? Are the names of Jerome and Augustine of no authority with Dr. Milner? It is quite true that neither of them said one word of half-Communion, and therefore he prudently leaves them alone. But *we* can afford to consult them, for they most surely testify that the modern Papal innovation was then unknown.

*Jerome* said "that the Pastors administered the Eucharist, and distributed the blood of our Lord to the people."<sup>c</sup> He also reports how Exuperius, Bishop of Toulouse, in France, was wont to carry the Communion to persons absent. "There was no man (he said) richer than Exuperius, who carried the Lord's body in a wicker basket, and His blood in a glass."<sup>d</sup> It is true, indeed, that the Bishop sold the Church plate for the relief of the poor, so that he was driven to use osier baskets and glass cups; but, nevertheless, the story testifies that he carried the consecrated bread and wine separately and apart, and not by way of "concomitancy," that absurd modern Roman invention to get over the difficulty of taking the cup of life from the people, so insisted on in Dr. Milner's *first* proposition.

*Augustine*, speaking of the Eucharist as distinguished from the Jewish sacrifices, says, "Not only is no one hindered from taking the blood of the sacrifice, but, rather, *all who ask to have life are expected to drink of it.*"<sup>e</sup>

And again, "the whole Church having received the cup, answereth Amen."<sup>f</sup> We presume that Dr. Milner could not

<sup>a</sup> Cassandri Opera, p. 1025. Paris, 1616.

<sup>b</sup> Garbett's "Nullity of the Roman Faith," p. 155; and see Grier's "Reply to Milner," pp. 230, 231; and Jarvis's "Reply," p. 199.

<sup>c</sup> "Sacerdotes qui Eucharistiæ serviunt, et sanguinem Domini populis ejus dividunt."—Hieron. sup. Sophon., cap. iii. tom. vi. edit. Basil. 1537.

<sup>d</sup> "Nihil illo ditius, qui corpus Domini canistro vimineo, sanguinem portat in vitro."—Hieron. Epist. ad Rusticum.

<sup>e</sup> "Non solum nemo prohibetur, sed ad bibendum potius omnes exhortantur, qui volent habere vitam."—Aug. 4 qu. 57, sup. Levit.

<sup>f</sup> "Sanguis Abel significat sanguinem Christi, quo universa Ecclesia accepto dicit, Amen."—Id. ibid. qu. 49.



assert that the officiating priest, who alone receives the cup, is the "whole Church!" But once again:—

*Augustine*<sup>a</sup> thus writes: "While the host is being broken, and the *blood* from the cup is *being poured into the mouths of the faithful*, what else is signified but the immolation of the Lord's body on the cross, and the pouring out of the blood from his side?"

From the fifth Dr. Milner gives a leap to the twelfth century, when he says that "*It appears* only the officiating priest and infants received under the form of wine;" but gives no reference; and we cannot assist him, for it is not true. Hugo, of Saint Victor's, near Paris, lived in this century; he not only testifies that the cup *was* received by the laity, but also gives a reason why they should receive the entire Communion in both kinds. "Therefore (he says) the Sacrament is taken in both kinds, that thereby the twofold effect might be signified; for it hath force, as St. Ambrose saith, to preserve both body and soul."<sup>b</sup>

We might cite a succession of witnesses of each century from the fifth, where Dr. Milner leaves us, to the twelfth, who testified in the clearest terms of the continued practice of the Church unchanged, of administering the cup to the laity, but it would swell our pages beyond bounds: we shall therefore content ourselves by referring our readers to Birckbek's "Protestant Evidence," reprinted by the Protestant Reformation Society, in 1849, where he will find ample evidence of that fact.

From the twelfth century he takes another bound to the fifteenth, when he asserts that this "discipline was confirmed at the beginning of the fifteenth century by the Council of Constance."

Now, we would beg the reader to turn back and examine Dr. Milner's two propositions and assertions, and the evidence he has adduced in support of them, with the remarks which we have added; and we ask him if he ever met in any work, be its pretensions to merit what they may, so lamentable a failure; nay, not merely a failure, worse than that, downright misrepresentation and suppression of truth. We cannot comprehend how priests in this country can be so blind to their own cause as to put forward and recommend so shallow, so treacherous a hand-book, to instruct their lay dupes, in order to enable them to confound their Protestant antagonists.

<sup>a</sup> Gratian's Decret. pars iii. de Consecr. d. 2, c. 37, *Cum frangitur*, &c.

<sup>b</sup> "Ideo duabus speciebus sumitur, ut significetur hujus Sacramenti duplex effectus; valet enim ad tuitionem corporis et animæ."—Hugo de S. Victor, in Summâ Sentent. Tract. 6, cap. vi. tom. iii. Venet. 1588.

It appears, therefore, certain that it is on the decree of the Council of Constance that the present Church of Rome rests the foundation of her teaching, as regards half-Communion; and that she has directly opposed her authority to that of the Divine Founder of the institution, and the subsequent practice of the early Church. This decision was confirmed by the Tridentine Council. Both of these Councils employ the word *licet*,<sup>a</sup> which intimates to common understanding something more in prospect than a bare definition and decision upon matters of mere discipline. It was not enough for the Church of Rome "to make the commandments of none effect by tradition;" she has mutilated an express ordinance. The Council of Trent, imitating the example of that of Constance, confesses that Christ instituted the Sacrament in *both* kinds, and so delivered it to the Apostles, and that they and the primitive Church practised accordingly; then it is asserted that the Church had weighty and just causes for altering the divine institution;<sup>b</sup> and some *pericula* and *scandala*, "dangers and scandals," are mentioned as grounds of its decision; yet the weakness and folly of such excuses betray themselves when the magnitude and importance of the command, which is thereby violated, are considered. Dr. Milner thinks it necessary to use stronger language to bolster up and excuse such a deviation from the original ordinance; he says it was "on account of the *profanations* and other evils resulting from the general reception of it in that form" (p. 379).

This is giving a very bad character to the lay communicants of that day. Our uninstructed readers, however, will scarcely believe that the "profanations and other evils," alleged as justifying the setting aside of Christ's ordinance, and what Pope Leo the Great and Pope Gelasius considered *sacrilege* and as deserving of *excommunication*, were the risk of spilling the wine, and the indecency which arose from communicants dipping their beards into it; lest the wine kept for the sick should turn sour, or some person should not be able to bear its smell and taste, and the like! And it is worthy of remark that the examples adduced by Dr. Milner nearly all come under the latter class, contemplated by the Council.

It will have been observed that the *alleged custom* was made *law*, and was not to be changed, "except by the authority of the Church." The *authority* of the Church of Rome can be made known only by a decree of a General

<sup>a</sup> Conc. Const., sess. xiii. apud Labbe, tom. xii. col. 100. Conc. Trid., sess. xxi. cap. ii. Paris, 1671. See Cramp's "Text-book of Popery," p. 288, ed. 1851.

<sup>b</sup> See Elliott's "Delineation of Roman Catholicism," p. 183, edit. 1851.

Council, confirmed by a reigning Pope; short of such *authority*, any change would, according to the decree of the General Council of Constance, confirmed by the Trent Council, render the innovator a heretic, and place him under the ban of anathema.

---

SECT. IV.—Alleged Modern Concessions.

THE instances of concessions occasionally made in favour of certain religious bodies, which are cited by Dr. Milner, need no very particular notice; they were illegal, and unsanctioned by his Church. They are all, however, referable to her ordinary practice as a time-serving manager, of yielding to external pressure, or the gratifying by an exclusive privilege some royal "son of the Church." For instance, "Pius IV. (he tells us), at the request of the Emperor Ferdinand, authorized several bishops of Germany to allow the use of the cup to those persons of their respective dioceses, who desired it" (p. 379). But of the reason of this petition being granted nothing is said, which was the hope of checking the wide spread of a so-called heresy, with which the provinces of Hungary, &c., were fairly overrun, by the allowance to receive under both forms. But the plan did not succeed, and within two years the permission was withdrawn.<sup>a</sup> This fact, however, Dr. Milner withholds. Well is it, in one sense, that he should teach his readers "that the manner of receiving the Sacrament under one or the other kind, or under both kinds, is a mere matter of variable discipline" (p. 379), for after all his far-fetched and laboured arguments in support of half-Communion, he affirms in his "Vindication"<sup>b</sup> at last, "that he always knew and confessed that *both* species were *generally* ministered in the ancient Church," an admission deserving particular remark as illustrating the ambidextrous character of his writings, for previously he had held language of the very opposite description. The observation upon the "anathemas" (as he terms them) of the Bishop of Durham (Dr. Barrington), need not detain us. Both he and Dr. Lingard were observant of the opinions of that prelate, mainly lest they should interfere with Catholic Emancipation.

In the next place, we have an attempt to obtain the votes

<sup>a</sup> Card. Bona, *Rerum Liturg.*, lib. ii. cap. xviii. Cramp's "Text-book of Popery," p. 285, edit. 1851.

<sup>b</sup> "Vindication," p. 214; Grier's "Defence," p. 224.

of eminent Catholics in favour of the doctrine under consideration, a letter of *Luther* being quoted to show that he reproached Carlstadt "with having placed Christianity in things of no account, such as *communicating under both kinds*." The passage, as given in a note,<sup>a</sup> will show that the objection of Luther was directed rather against the perversion of it, and that because the proceedings of Carlstadt were leading people to suppose they had done a brave deed—a spirit and temper largely cherished in the Church of Rome, by partaking of both kinds, and resting upon the mere outward act. Luther's language on the occasion resembles, and may be justified by, that of Bossuet,<sup>b</sup> who complains, though the parties might in the latter case have readily defended themselves (the *Church* having authorized, for instance, Indulgences in the most open manner), that "many preached nothing but Indulgences, pilgrimages, almsgiving to the religious, and made those practices, which were only the accessories of piety, the foundation of religion."

"On another occasion" (Dr. Milner continues, p. 380) "he [Luther] writes, 'If a Council did ordain or permit *both kinds*, in spite of the Council we would take but *one*, or take neither, and curse those who should take both.'" A very ingenious perversion indeed, the good Dr. having just dropped the words qualifying the sentiment, and on which the argument of the whole sentence depends! The real statement of Luther is:—"Nor let it weigh with any one, that they boast about a Council, by authority of which [the partaking of both kinds] is now again allowed. We have authority from *Christ*, and have no desire to attend to *Councils* on points plainly sanctioned by the Gospel. Nay, we say further, if a Council by *its own authority* should take upon it to ordain or allow full Communion, in that case we should be less disposed than ever to partake of both kinds; on the contrary, neglecting both the Council and its edict, we should prefer that the people should partake in either form or none, and by no means under both kinds; and openly to hold *them* accursed, whosoever should partake of both *upon the authority of such Council*, and its edict."<sup>c</sup> This statement

<sup>a</sup> In a letter addressed to Gaspar Güttel: "Ego Carolostadium offendi, quod ordinationes suas cassavi, licet doctrinam non damnârim nisi quod displicet in solis ceremoniis et externis faciebus laborasse eum, neglecta interim vera doctrina Christiana, hoc est, fide et charitate. Nam sua inepta docendi ratione eo populum perduxerat, ut sese Christianum arbitraretur per has res nihili, si utraque specie communicaret, si tangeret, si non confiteretur, si imagines frangeret."—Luther's Briefe, vol. ii. p. 177. Berlin, 1826.

<sup>b</sup> "Variations," book v. sec. i.

<sup>c</sup> For satisfaction we subjoin the Latin: "Nec quenquam id morari debet, quod Concilium jactant, in quo id rursum licere sanciat. Nos Christi jus

will change the aspect of affairs, we apprehend, not a little. The management of the passage illustrates yet once more the dexterity of Dr. Milner, or his prompter, in cooking testimony.

The remaining evidence, which he supposes favourable to the Romish ordinance upon the subject, may be classed among those instances of impediments, which are distinctly mentioned, as at the synod of Poitiers in 1560, as being the ground for allowing or partaking in one kind; not authorizing the practice generally, still less making themselves or their synod sole referees on the subject. And here we meet again, most characteristically, some further "disingenuous" behaviour—instances multiply upon us in Dr. Milner's conducting of the case—in his "construction of the Proclamation of Edward VI., for which he rightly refers to Bishop Sparrow's Collection, p. 17. The king enacts with the consent of the Lords spiritual and temporal and Commons in Parliament assembled, 'That the most blessed Sacrament of the body and blood of our Saviour Christ should from henceforth be commonly delivered and administered unto all persons within our realm of England and Ireland and other our dominions, under both kinds, that is to say, of bread and wine (except necessity otherwise require), lest any man fancying and devising a sundry way by himself, in the use of this most blessed Sacrament of unity, there might thereby arise any unseemly and ungodly diversity.' The object was to turn the mass into a general Communion, according to the primitive practice of the Catholic Church; to make every Christian feel the necessity of his receiving the blessed Sacrament of unity in one uniform manner; and thus, except in cases of absolute necessity, to provide for the general administration and reception of the elements by all its subjects at the parish churches every Lord's day. The *exception* did not refer, as Dr. Milner dreamed, *to the two elements of bread and wine*, but to reasonable causes of absence from what was deemed a common and general duty. The old maxim that necessity has no law, is applicable here; and God will not mark as done àmiss what He in His providence deprives men of the power of performing. This construction is in perfect accordance with that of the historian whom

habemus, et Concilii nec morari nec audire volumus, in his quæ manifeste sunt Evangelii. Quin amplius dicimus; si quo casu Concilium propria auctoritate id statueret aut permetteret, tunc minime omnium nos velle utraque specie potiri, imo tunc primum, in despectum tam Concilii quam statuti sui, vellemus aut alterutra tantum aut neutra, et nequaquam utraque potiri; ac plane eos anathema habere, quicumque auctoritate talis Concilii vel statuti utraque potiantur."—Oper. tom. ii. fol. 416. Wittemb. 1546.

Dr. Milner quotes, contained in the paragraph preceding the proclamation. *And in the very page which he quotes, viz. Heylin's 'Hist. of the Reformation,' p. 58.<sup>a</sup>* With what face, then, could he *insinuate* that Communion *without* the cup was thereby allowed in cases of necessity, and thus triumph over the inconsistency of the Church of England? The 'dilemma' is entirely of his own devising."<sup>b</sup>

Having thus followed Dr. Milner, step by step, throughout the entire letter, we arrive at the following results:—

*First*—He misstates the decree and express law of his Church on the point in question.

*Secondly*—By his endeavour to class the practice as a "variable discipline," without the Church's authority, he shows how plastic is Rome when it suits her purpose.

*Thirdly*—That Dr. Milner's assertions that the doctrine of "concomitance," that is the body and blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ are equally and entirely present under each species, was "held by the Catholic Church from the time of the Apostles," and is proved by the "whole series of Ecclesiastical History," rest solely on his own unsupported *ipse dixit*.

*Fourthly*—And equally that it was regarded as a mere matter of discipline which of the species was to be received in the Holy Sacrament.

*Fifthly*—That not one of the authorities cited will bear the test of fair criticism or examination. They exemplify the hardihood with which Popish champions will hazard statements at the risk of damaging their own reputation, provided the advance of the Church can be in any way forwarded.

*And lastly*—That Dr. Milner has proved himself an advocate without discretion, without truth, and wholly unworthy of credit.

<sup>a</sup> Vol. i. pp. 119, 120, edit. Camb. 1849.

<sup>b</sup> Dr. Jarvis's "Reply to the End of Controversy," pp. 208-9.

## No. XXI.

## ON THE INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

1 Tim. ii. 5; Matt. vi. 6; Heb. ix. 15, xii. 24, viii. 6, vii. 25; Eph. ii. 18; John xiv. 6 and 13; Acts iv. 12; Heb. iv. 14-16.

SECT. I.—Dr. Milner's Definition of his Church's teaching—Complaints of Misrepresentation by Protestants.

IN letter xxxiii. Dr. Milner complains in bitter terms of the "foul misrepresentations" of the doctrine of his Church, on the subject of "Invocation of Saints"—"the worship of images and pictures."

This question is to be viewed in a twofold aspect,—*first*, what the Church of Rome authoritatively teaches in her Decrees of the Council of Trent; and *secondly*, what the people really practise, and what we find unrebuked and indeed sanctioned in rituals, books of devotion, and works of admitted orthodox divines and doctors of the Roman Church. The doctrine of Invocation of Saints as defined in the Decrees of Trent, is, perhaps, on first appearance, the least objectionable of Rome's peculiarities; but when we turn from these and see and read what is really practised, sanctioned, nay encouraged by the priests of Rome, then indeed, we assert that no language, no denunciation, no protestations can be too strong in reprobation of Romish teaching and practices on these subjects.

Our observations must for the present be confined to the subject forming the title of the present paper; and before we proceed to discuss Dr. Milner's position and references, we will bring under review some few of the fruits and results of the *licensed* teaching of the Church of Rome, and show whether Protestant objections are "foul misrepresentations," or whether such objections "have not a leg to stand on, if we take away misrepresentation" (p. 333).

The "genuine doctrine" on this "Article of Faith" Dr. Milner defines as follows:—

"It is simply this, that 'the Saints reigning with Christ offer up their prayers to God for man; that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them, and to have recourse to their prayers, help, and assistance, to obtain favours from God, through his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, who is alone our Redeemer and Saviour.'—Concil. Trid. Sess. 25, *de Invoc.* Hence the Catechism of the Council

of Trent, published in virtue of its decree (Sess. 24, de Ref. c. 7), by order of Pope Pius V., teaches that 'God and the Saints are not to be prayed to in the same manner; for we pray to God that *he himself would give us good things, and deliver us from evil things*; but we beg of the Saints, because they are pleasing to God, that they *would be our advocates, and obtain from God what we stand in need of* (Pars iv. *Quis orandus*)."<sup>a</sup>

The italics are as given by Dr. Milner.

We are not about to quarrel with this modified representation of the *authorized* teaching of the Romish Church as expounded by the Decrees and Catechism of the Council of Trent, except that Dr. Milner has omitted to notice that the Council of Trent intimates that the saints hear the *mental* and *verbal* prayers of the suppliant. The doctrine as *thus* enunciated is perhaps the least objectionable of the numerous heresies and corruptions complained of and protested against among those patronized by the Church of Rome. It cannot claim, however, the sanction of Scripture (indeed the Decree of Trent does not itself do so), and *therefore* is it rejected by us. But Dr. Milner knows well how to evade a difficulty. The charge of "gross Idolatry" is not in this respect brought against the Church of Rome, when speaking through her Decrees,<sup>b</sup> and the accepted or permitted teaching and practice of the members of that community. We charge her reputed saints and authorized doctors with teaching, and many of her members with practising, gross, blasphemous idolatry. As evidence of what we assert, we beg the reader to refer to the Rev. T. Hartwell Horne's "Mariolatry; or, Facts and Evidences demonstrating the Worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary by the Church of Rome, derived from the Testimonies of her reputed Saints and Doctors, from her Breviary and other authorized Romish Formularies of Devotion, confirmed by the Attestations of Travellers."<sup>c</sup>

In order, however, to make the contrast more striking, between the definition of his Church thus laid down, and the alleged slanderous misrepresentations, "the idolatrous phantom of Catholicity, which Protestant controversialists have held up for the identical Catholic Church" (p. 334,) Dr. Milner lays before us a series of propositions borrowed from

<sup>a</sup> Letter xxxiii. p. 334.

<sup>b</sup> It should be borne in mind that the Decrees of the Council of Trent furnish but a *polished* exhibition of the doctrines and usages of the Church of Rome. The state of the Church long previously to the assembling of that Council was such that its own members had for some time been loudly calling for reform, and a determination to have one of some kind was growing. Hence the abundant *mention* of reform, and the *delicacy* of it; and although, in the Decrees, it would not disturb current practices over much, our remarks will have reference more especially to doctrines and practices tolerated and licensed in that Church, rather than to formally-authorized proceedings.

<sup>c</sup> Second edition; London, Painter, Strand, 1841.



the Papist Gother, and "republished by the venerable [Popish] Bishop Challoner," containing accusations against Romanists invented for the occasion. He attempts to shelter the Church of Rome under a variety of *curses* framed by Gother, from the charge of practising or encouraging idolatry; though, should we propose "these cases" to any member of that communion, who did not agree with them, we should probably be asked, and very rationally, what right has he or they to pronounce curses? Who gave him power to anathematize? An examination, however, of these anathemas of Gother<sup>a</sup> will show that they amount to nothing, and prove no condemnation of the doctrine we reprehend. The first is, "Cursed is he that commits idolatry." This is to be sure very satisfactory, when the point in dispute is, What is idolatry? Is it idolatry to give to created things the honour due to the Creator? Yea, says the Church of England. No, says the Church of Rome. This, therefore, is a very cheap and harmless curse; but if it be contended that *no* idolatry is sanctioned by the Church of Rome, then we tell our Romish readers that we shall make good the charge of unrebuked idolatry against authorized teachers of their communion.

"Cursed is he (says Dr. Milner, quoting from Gother) that believes the Saints in heaven to be his redeemers; that pays to them as such, or gives God's honour to them, or to any creature whatsoever. Amen." All this reads marvellously well, and may have its effect upon those who have not been behind the scenes. But though "a Papist" may not pray to the Saints "as his redeemers," or give to them what is strictly the honour of God—this is not our charge against them, and is therefore no real honest disclaimer, though it might be wished that a Protestant should deem it such, that prayers of *any* description are offered up to the saints, and that *any* protection, or aid, or benefit, is expected from them. Our charge against them is for making the saints their mediators, advocates, and intercessors, and with depending upon their merits, expiations, &c. This charge is not denied; therefore, the anathematizer permits these to go free. And as to the next clause, we need not disagree about terms, though "Papists" do implore them and the Virgin to bestow gifts and graces which (if there be any truth in the Bible) God ONLY can bestow. We insist that to pray to any others than God, to worship them, to serve them, to implore spiritual

<sup>a</sup> "A Papist misrepresented and represented," p. 101, ed. London, 1832. A work represented by Dr. Milner "as one of great authority among Catholics."—Letter xxxiii. p. 334. But see Bp. Gibson's "Preservative," vol. xiii. p. 321, London, 8vo. edit.

blessings from them, to rely on their intercession, mediation, &c., is to give God's honour to creatures. But they deny this.

Again, "Cursed is every goddess-worshipper, that believes the Virgin Mary to be more than a creature." This is loosely worded; why did he not say, "Cursed is every one that worships the Virgin Mary with more than creature-worship?" The reason is obvious. He could not have so said, without cursing the saint and cardinal, Bonaventura, and those by whom the Roman liturgies and services were compiled, to say nothing of the extravagances of *Saint Liguori*. What have goddess-worshippers to do with the business? We call them not goddess-worshippers. We do not charge them with believing the Virgin to be a goddess in the strict use of the term, *viz.* uncreate, existing independently, &c.; though, as we shall presently see, one canonized saint invokes the blessed Virgin "to command her beloved Son by the right of a mother," and a pope only very lately declares her, as *alone* destroying heresies, his *greatest*, his entire ground of hope. This approaches very near to goddess-worship. "Cursed be he that *honours* her [Dr. Milner has omitted this expression!] that worships her, or puts his trust in her more than in God; that believes her to be above her Son, or that she can in anything command Him." When a man sits down coolly to curse and anathematize his fellows, we must suppose in charity that he is very wary and cautious in promulgating his execrations; and that those who adopt them are solemnly satisfied of their propriety. It appears, then, that this is their divinity: he who honours or puts his trust in the Virgin *as much* as in God, and believes her to be *equal* to her Son, is a good Catholic, and not to be condemned, for the curse only extends to *more* honour, or worship, or trust, being placed in her than in God! It is well that Dr. Milner admitted some modification; he considered himself on the safe side. However, what the blessed Virgin can do, or is said to do by her devotees and lovers, will appear in the sequel. These curses, which are bruited about and refulminated every now and then, are a sort of Anglican-Romish cannonade, noisy enough, but very harmless; the Papal or Pagan idolater may safely walk in the way of the discharge; if he be astounded with smoke and noise, it is the utmost he will sustain.<sup>a</sup>

But as Mr. Southey remarks,<sup>b</sup> greater authorities than Mr. Gother and Dr. Challoner, endorsed even by Milner, have

<sup>a</sup> Adapted from Garbett's "Nullity of the Roman Faith," pp. 341-44.

<sup>b</sup> "Letters to C. Butler, Esq.," p. 432.

taught adherents of Rome to do all these things; and the proofs of that statement are growing every day, and will be presently illustrated. Further to exemplify the alleged misrepresentation of the teaching of his Church, Dr. Milner tells us (p. 336) that "the charge of idolatry against [Roman] Catholics for merely honouring those *whom God honours*, and for desiring them to pray to God for us, is too extravagant to be any longer published by Protestants of learning and character." Had it been Dr. Milner's avowed object to show that the practice of the Church of Rome, in this respect, is actually idolatrous, he could hardly have expressed himself in terms better suited to that purpose. He is very indignant at the "blasphemous terms in which Mede and a hundred other Protestant controversialists" (p. 333), speak of the Romish invocation of saints, when they say that Romanists have substituted for the worship of Christ the doctrine of *demons*. Did Dr. Milner hope that his readers would be misled by the vulgar notion of that word, to suppose that we accuse his Church of worshipping *devils*? If so, a reference to Plato<sup>a</sup> may, perhaps, undeceive them. "A *demon*," according to that philosopher, "denotes a mediator between God and man. *Demons* are interpreters and carriers to the gods from men, and to men from the gods, of the prayers and sacrifices of the one; and from the other, of their commands and rewards." And again, "God is not approached immediately by man, but all the commerce and intercourse between gods and men, whether waking or sleeping, is carried on by means of *demons*."<sup>b</sup> Such, says Plato, were the demons of the ancient heathen; such, says Dr. Milner, are the *saints* and angels of the modern Romanist. Did the heathens worship their *demons*, not as the Supreme Creator, but as his creatures and ministers, as mediators, and intercessors between God and men? So do Romanists worship angels and saints. Did not this subordinate worship of "*those whom God honours*" ultimately lead the heathens "to worship the creature more than the Creator?" In the Romanist it has unquestionably led to the same abuse. The blessed Virgin, especially, is worshipped more than her Maker. For the truth of this we might appeal to every one who has resided in those countries where the Roman is the dominant religion; but even for the evidence of this notorious fact, we had rather appeal to those whose testimony cannot be suspected of partiality between us. We beg, then, for the present

<sup>a</sup> In *Sympos.*, Op., vol. iii. p. 202, ed. Serrani.

<sup>b</sup> Plato in *Sympos.*, vol. iii. p. 203.

purpose, to refer the Romish reader to the accounts which some of the most acute of the Mahomedan theologians have given, of the change which appeared to them to have taken place in the belief of Christians, concerning the fundamental doctrines of the Trinity. The passages to which we allude will be found in the second book *de Synedris* of the learned Selden, who gives them in the original language from manuscripts then in his possession, and now extant, we believe, in the Bodleian Library. It will be found, on perusing them, that these Mahomedans derived their most plausible argument against the Christian religion from the assumed fact, "that the belief of the ancient Church was essentially different from that of modern Christians, who, instead of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, adore the Father, Son, and the VIRGIN MARY." We do not of course mention this remarkable fact by way of proving that the blessed Virgin was ever worshipped as a person of the Trinity;<sup>a</sup> but this we say it does incontestably prove, that these learned Moslems could perceive no difference in the worship that was then paid to her and that which was given to the eternal Father and his incarnate Son.<sup>b</sup> And was it not with some show of reason observed that it appeared that the God of the Christians of the ninth century had changed his sex?

---

SECT. II.—The Practical and Licensed Teaching of the Roman Church.

Dr. Milner, we have seen, tells us that his Church teaches nothing more than that God and the saints are not to be prayed to in the same manner, and that the latter are not applied to for any good thing, or for deliverance from evil things. This is so common an assertion among Romanists, that it is essential that we should present our readers with a few extracts from the Roman Breviary (a more authentic source could not be appealed to); and it will be seen that prayers *are* immediately and directly addressed to the Virgin, and not simply to the Almighty in the name and through the mediation of Jesus Christ "the one Mediator between God and man;" Romanists do implore of *her* blessings which God alone can bestow. We quote from Husenbeth's edition, Norwich, 1830.

<sup>a</sup> Rome's Marie, not the Blessed Virgin of Holy Scripture, has been called a "complement" of the Trinity; and statues of her are rising, huge affairs! in various parts of Papal Europe.

<sup>b</sup> "Two Letters to Rev. J. Milner, D.D., on certain passages in his 'End of Religious Controversy,'" by the Rev. T. H. Lowe; London, 1826, pp. 43—45.

*Pars. Vern. cliiii.*—"Hail, Star of the Sea, and kind Mother of God, and ever Virgin, Happy Gate of Heaven! Do thou, taking that 'Hail' from the mouth of Gabriel, changing the name of Eve, establish us in peace. Do thou loose their bands for the accused; for the blind bring forth a light; drive away our evils; demand for us all good things. *Show that thou art a Mother!* Let Him who endured for us to be thy Son, through thee, receive our prayers. O excellent Virgin! meek among all, *do thou make us meek and chaste, free from fault; make our life pure:* prepare for us a safe journey, that beholding Jesus, we may always rejoice together. Praise be to God the Father, Glory to Christ most high, and to the Holy Ghost: one honour to the Three. Amen."

*Æst. cxlvi.*—"Under thy protection we take refuge, Holy Mother of God; despise not our supplications in our necessities, but from all dangers *do thou deliver us, O glorious and Blessed Virgin.*"

*Æst. cxlv.*—"O Mary, Mother of Grace, Mother of Mercy, do thou protect us from the enemy, and receive us at the hour of death."

*Æst. cxcviii.*—"The Holy Mother of God is exalted above the choir of angels to the heavenly realms. The gates of Paradise are opened to us *by thee, who, glorious this day, triumphest with the angels.*"—"Rejoice, O Virgin Mary, thou alone hast destroyed all heresies in the whole world. Deem me worthy to praise thee, hallowed Virgin. Give me strength against thy enemies."

Here are direct prayers to the Blessed Virgin, not through the merits or mediation of Christ. Nor is she applied to as an advocate, to obtain from God what we stand in need of; but she is asked to grant what God alone can bestow.

A person, who so positively repudiates all the grosser forms of superstition, and complains that the accusation brought against his Church is a scandalous misrepresentation, would himself, one would suppose, avoid occasion of complaint on the same score. This, however, is not the case; and to establish our assertion, we propose to give a few extracts from a little work, which was published under the patronage of "The R[ight] R[ev.] J[ohn] M[ilner], Bishop of Castab[ala], V[icar of the] M[idland] D[istrict]." The title of the work is—

"Devotion of the Sacred Heart of our Lord Jesus Christ, with its Nature, Origin, Progress, &c.; including *the Devotion to the Sacred Heart of the Blessed Virgin Mary, &c., and the Recommendatory Pastoral Letter of the Bishop of Boulogne to the Faithful* in his Diocese. Twelfth edition; with an Appendix, on Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus. . . . Prayers for the Exercise of that Devotion, and an Indult of his Holiness Pope Pius VII. in favour of it: for the use of the Midland District. By the R.R.J.M. Bishop of Castab., V.M.D. London: printed and sold by Keating and Brown, 38, Duke-street, Grosvenor-square, and 24, Bartlett's-buildings, Holborn. 1821." 12mo.

From the extracts which we are about to submit, it will be found that the teaching is not "simply" of that subdued character adapted to a Protestant country, as represented by the Doctor:—

"THE DEVOTION TO THE SACRED HEART OF MARY.—SECTION I.

"As the adorable heart of Jesus was formed in the chaste womb of the Blessed Virgin, and of her blood and substance, so we cannot, in a more

proper and agreeable manner, show our devotion to the sacred heart of the Son, *than by dedicating some part of the said devotion* to the ever-pure heart of the mother. For you have two hearts here united in the most strict alliance and tender conformity of sentiments, so that it is not in nature to please the one, without making yourself agreeable to the other, and acceptable to both. Go, then, devout client, go to the heart of Jesus ; but let your way be through the heart of Mary. The sword of grief which pierced her soul opens you a passage : enter by the wound love has made ; advance to the heart of Jesus, and rest there even to death itself. Presume not to separate and divide two objects so intimately one, or united together ; but ask redress in all your exigencies from the heart of Jesus, and ask this redress through the heart of Mary.

“This form and method of worship is the doctrine and the very spirit of God’s Church ; it is what she teaches us in the unanimous voice and practice of the faithful, who will by no means that Jesus and Mary should be separated from each other in our prayers, praises, and affections.

“Come, then, hardened and inveterate sinner, how great soever your crimes may be ! Come and behold ! Mary stretches out her hand, opens her breast to receive you. Though insensible to the great concerns of your salvation, though, unfortunately, proof against the most engaging invitations and inspirations of the Holy Spirit, fling yourself at the feet of this powerful advocate. Her throne, though so exalted, has nothing forbidding, nothing dreadful ; her heart is all love, all tenderness. If you have the least remains of confidence and reliance on her protection, doubt not she will carry you through her own most blessed heart in the most speedy and most favourable manner, to the truly merciful and most sacred heart of her Son Jesus.”—Pp. 198—201.

Here we are invited to “dedicate some part of the same devotion to the ever pure heart of the mother,” giving the *same* devotion to the mother as to the Son. Their two hearts are represented as united, so that it is not in nature to please the one, without making ourselves agreeable to the other, and accepted by both ; we are not to presume to separate the two, and we are also invited “*to ask redress through the heart of Mary.*” The Blessed Virgin is called “a powerful advocate.”

In “Section II.” the Virgin Mary is addressed as “O Holy Mother of God, glorious Queen of Heaven and Earth !” and the following words are not exactly in accordance with the idea that favours are to be obtained through Christ alone : “Obtain for me at present the gift of a true repentance, and those graces I may stand in need of for the gaining of life everlasting.”<sup>a</sup>

The following four prayers, from the same work, however, place the question in a very clear light. Graces are asked of the Blessed Virgin, which God alone can bestow, and these are not asked “through Jesus Christ :”—

“O Holy Mary, our Sovereign Queen ! as God the Father, by his own omnipotence, has made thee most powerful, so assist us at the hour of our death, by defending us against all power that is contrary to thine. *Hail, Mary.*

“O Holy Mary, our Sovereign Queen ! as God the Son has endowed thee with so much knowledge and charity that it enlightens all heaven, so in the hour of our death illustrate and strengthen our souls with the knowledge of

<sup>a</sup> Ibid., pp. 201, 202.

the true faith, that they be not perverted by error or pernicious ignorance.

*Hail, Mary.*

“O Holy Virgin, our Sovereign Queen! as the Holy Ghost has plentifully poured forth into thee the love of God, so instil into us at the hour of death the sweetness of divine love, that all bitterness at that time may become acceptable and pleasant to us. *Hail, Mary.*”

“Our Blessed Lady herself taught St. Mechtildis the above-mentioned triple salutation, promising her certain assistance for it at the hour of her death.”—Pp. 212, 213.

Again, there is another book, “The Catholic School-Book,”<sup>a</sup> from which the following passages are given, introduced, under the approbation of Dr. Milner, in 1818, as being, in his opinion, “eminently entitled to the patronage of the Catholic public.” . . . “As such,” he added, he should “not fail to recommend it in those places of education in which he had any authority or influence.” The subjoined extracts will show what profound reverence and affection the young mind is taught to entertain and cherish for the Virgin:—

“Next to God, and the most adorable humanity of his Son Jesus Christ, it is she whom we must chiefly honour and love, by reason of that most sublime and excellent dignity of Mother of God, which raises her above all creatures which God has ever created.

“By her we may receive all the assistance which is necessary for us. *She is most powerful with God, to obtain from him all that she shall ask of him. She is all goodness in regard of us, by applying to God for us. Being Mother of God, he cannot refuse her request: being our Mother, she cannot deny us her intercession when we have recourse to her. Our miseries move her, our necessities urge her; the prayers we offer her for our salvation bring to us all that we desire: and St. Bernard is not afraid to say, ‘That never any person invoked that Mother of Mercy in his necessities, who has not been sensible of the effects of her assistance.’*”—“Catholic School-Book,” p. 158.

“If you will be a true child, and a sincere servant of the Blessed Virgin, you must be careful to perform four things:—

“1. Have a great apprehension of displeasing her by mortal sin, and of afflicting her motherly heart by dishonouring her Son, and destroying your soul; and if you chance to fall into that misfortune, have recourse readily to her, that she may be your intercessor in reconciling you to her Son, whom you have extremely provoked. ‘She is the refuge of sinners as well as of the just, on condition they have recourse to her with a true desire of converting themselves,’ as St. Bernard says. 2. Love and imitate her virtues, principally her humility and chastity. These two virtues among others rendered her most pleasing to God; she loves them particularly in children, and is pleased to assist with her prayers those whom she finds particularly inclined to those virtues, according to the same saint. 3. Have recourse to her in all your spiritual necessities: and for that end offer to her daily some particular prayers: say your beads, or the Little Office, sometimes in the week; perform something in her honour on every Saturday, whether prayer, abstinence, or alms; honour particularly her feasts by confession and communion. 4. Be mindful to invoke her in temptations, and in the dangers you find yourself in of offending God. You cannot show your respect better than by applying yourself to her in these urgent necessities, and you can find no succour more ready and favourable than hers.

<sup>a</sup> “The Catholic School-Book; containing easy and familiar Lessons for the Instruction of Youth of both Sexes in the English Language, and in the Paths of true Religion and Virtue.” Twentieth edition, with additions. London, 1839. 12mo.

“If you perform this, you will have a true devotion to the Blessed Virgin, you will be of the number of her real children, and she will be your mother, under whose protection you shall never perish.”—*Ibid.*, pp. 159—161.

We would ask any admirer of Dr. Milner whether this teaching is in accordance with the simple definition he has before laid down. The fact is, he has written his book to mislead or waylay, as it were, Protestants, by making the system of his Church as palatable as possible in a Protestant country, having the success of the so-called Emancipation Bill in view;<sup>a</sup> but his practical teaching is exhibited in what he does “not fail to recommend in those places of education in which he had any authority or influence.”

But to clear ourselves from the alleged “foul misrepresentation” of Rome’s teaching, and to prove that we *have* “a leg to stand upon” without “indulging in misrepresentation,” let us go to a higher authority than Dr. Milner, and see to what frightful results this doctrine of “invocation of Saints,” and more particularly of Rome’s Virgin, has led and is leading millions. We refer to a very popular work, “The Glories of Mary,” by the late canonized Saint Alphonsus Liguori.<sup>b</sup> We start with the assertion that Liguori only develops the practical working of the system of Romanism, which, in fact, places the Virgin Mary on a level with, if not above, our blessed Redeemer.

In page twenty-eight we read—

“From the moment that Mary *consented* to become the Mother of God, says Bernardine of Sienna, she *merited* to receive sovereignty over all creatures. Mary and Jesus having but one and the same flesh, says St. Arnaud, Abbot, why should not the Mother enjoy *conjointly with the Son* the honours of ‘royalty?’ As many creatures as obey God, so many obey the glorious Virgin; everything in heaven and on earth which is subject to God, is also under the empire of His most holy Mother.”

Here is most unequivocal language. The Virgin reigns sovereign over all creatures, enjoys conjointly with the Son all honours of royalty, and everything in heaven and earth is under her empire. Thus we have the Virgin Mary practically incorporated in, or made equal to, one of the Trinity.

This co-operation of Rome’s Virgin is much insisted upon. We are told that—

<sup>a</sup> Letter xxxii. p. 332.

<sup>b</sup> Dublin, John Coyne, 1841; fourth edition, entered at Stationers’ Hall. John Coyne is the authorized publisher of Romish works in Dublin. The title-page of the work in question is as follows: “The Glories of Mary, Mother of God; containing a beautiful paraphrase on the ‘Salve Regina.’ Translated from the Italian of St. Alphonsus Liguori, and carefully revised by a Catholic Priest. Fourth edition. Hail Mary! full of grace! the Lord is with thee! *Angel Gabriel in St. Luke.* Dublin, printed by John Coyne, 24, Cook-street, 1841.”



“It was *by her consent* that Jesus might sacrifice Himself for our redemption” (p. 128).

“Why was not the mystery of the Incarnation accomplished *without the consent of the Virgin*? It is because God wishes she may be *the principal of all Good in the law of Grace*” (p. 88).

“St. Peter Damian (we are told) goes still further, asking himself this question: Why has God, before He became incarnate in Mary’s womb, *applied for her consent*? For two reasons (he replies); first, to oblige us to be very grateful to her; and, secondly, *to teach us that our salvation depends on the will of this Blessed Virgin*” (p. 123).

As a natural consequence, Abbot Rupert is quoted as exclaiming—

“O, great Queen! it is by *you the miserable are saved*; and because *their salvation is your work*, they shall form your crown in Heaven” (p. 34).

And it is, therefore, broadly stated that—

“It is now the general sentiment of the Church, that the intercession of the Mother of God is not only useful, *but even necessary to salvation*” (p. 122).  
“God will never save us without Mary’s intercession” (p. 131).

This is St. Bonaventure’s saying; but St. Augustine is represented as going a step further—

“Men,” he says, “have but one sole advocate in Heaven, and it is you, Holy Virgin” (p. 145).

If St. Augustine said this, we cannot be surprised that St. Anselm should add, that—

“Our salvation is often more speedily effected by invoking Mary, ‘Beautiful as the Moon,’ than in calling on Jesus, the ‘divine Sun of Justice’” (p. 186).

How natural, therefore, is the exclamation —

“Why should Christians feel any scruple in saying to her, with the [Roman] Church and the Saints, ‘SAVE US!’” (p. 130).

Yes, indeed, why should they, if the priests keep the Bible from them?

“St. German then had reason to call Mary the respiration of Christians; for as the body cannot exist without breathing, so the soul cannot live without recurring to the Mother of God” (p. 71). And “she herself warns us [when, and where, and whom, we are not informed], that she has at her disposal all the treasures of the divinity” (p. 89).

One would suppose that this was plain speaking enough. But hear St. Anselm, he asks—

“How is it, that we ask many things of God without obtaining them, but when we ask them through Mary they are granted to us?” (p. 104). He had only just before assured us in order “to increase our confidence in Mary, that our prayers will often be more speedily heard in invoking her name than in calling on that of Jesus Christ!”

Having thus completely superseded the office of Christ as our mediator and advocate, we are shown how necessary is the interposition of the Blessed Virgin: and for what reason think you?

“God [we are told by Richard St. Lawrence] in the Old Law often complained that there was none to interpose between him and sinners; but since

Mary the Mediatrix of peace has appeared on earth, *she restrains his arm and averts his wrath*" (p. 95).

"That as the Kingdom of God," observes Gerson, "consists in mercy and justice, the Lord has, as it were, divided it, reserving to Himself the dominion of Justice, and yielding to His Mother that of Mercy" (p. 29).

This view of the subject is much insisted upon:—

"An Angel told St. Bridget that the prophets of the ancient law leaped for joy when they foresaw that *in consideration of Mary's purity and humility* God would be appeased, and turn away his wrath from those who had most irritated him" (p. 65).

And Albertus Magnus says—

"If Ahasuerus heard the petition of Esther through love, will not God, who has an infinite love for Mary, fling away, at her request, the thunderbolts which he was going to hurl at wretched sinners?" (p. 30).

"Mary not only gives but offers to all men, without exception, milk and wool; the milk of mercy, and the wool of her intercession, the former to reanimate our confidence, and *the latter as a rampart against the thunders of Almighty vengeance*" (p. 31).

Not only is the Almighty represented to us in this revolting character, but Christ even is rendered an object of dread.

"Go," says St. Bernard to the sinner, "Go to find the Mother of Mercy; discover to her the wounds of thy soul; and Mary, showing to her Son the breast whence he drew nourishment, *will mollify his anger and appease his wrath*" (p. 64).

Then we have Rome's Virgin presented to us as an independent and self-acting power. To illustrate this we will take two of many similar passages:—

"St. Bernard, asking the question, why the Church calls Mary Queen of Mercy, answers it himself by saying:—'It is because she *opens at pleasure* the abyss of divine mercy, so that no sinner, *however enormous his crimes may be*, can perish if he is protected by Mary'" (p. 31).

And Mary is supposed to have appeared to St. Bridget and to have made to her the following revelation (p. 33):—

"I am the Queen of Heaven and Mother of Mercy; I am the joy of the just, *and the gate through which sinners go to God*; to no one on earth have I refused my clemency; there is no one who has not attained some grace through my intercession, though it were no greater than that of being less violently tempted by the devil; in fine, unless a person be absolutely cursed (this should be understood of the irrecoverable malediction of the damned), *how wicked and reprobate soever he is*, he may obtain grace and mercy through me; and hence *woe, eternal woe* to him who, having it in his power to profit of my commiseration, does it not, but is lost through his own fault."

Thus we see the Blessed Virgin is made, step by step, to supplant CHRIST (the sole mediator and advocate of the sinner), and even to share with the GODHEAD the glory of His empire and to dispense His mercies. If it had only stopped here, we should have had sufficient to deplore. But alas! Liguori goes still further than this. Mary is represented as having Christ and God Himself at her command, and they obey!

“Yes (says St. Bonaventure), Mary has so loved us, that she has given us her only Son.” “She gave him to us (says Nieremberg) *when, in virtue of her jurisdiction over him as Mother, she permitted him to deliver himself up to the Jews.* God could and did recompense Abraham’s generosity; but what can men render Mary for immolating Jesus? . . . *As she sacrificed for us a Son who was infinitely dearer to her than herself*” (pp. 46, 47). “While we say of Virgins that they follow the lamb, we can say of Mary, on earth, that the lamb followed her.”—“When Mary presents herself before Jesus, the altar of reconciliation, to mediate for us, she rather *seems to dictate than to supplicate*, and has more the air of a Queen than of a subject” (p. 137).

“We can say of the Saints that God is with them; but to Mary it has been given, not only to conform herself to the will of God, BUT THAT GOD HIMSELF HAS BEEN CONFORMED TO HER” (p. 137). “You, O holy Virgin, *have over God authority of a mother*, and hence you obtain pardon for the most obdurate sinners” (p. 140).<sup>a</sup>

And lastly, to crown all, we are told that “all is subject to Mary’s empire, even GOD HIMSELF” (p. 137).

As to visions of the Virgin Mary, and miracles wrought, we need scarcely add they are innumerable. To illustrate more practically the assertion with which we prefaced these quotations from Liguori’s work, we will further quote two narrations, which are taught and received as facts by the Romish Church:—

“During the pontificate of St. Gregory the Great, the people of Rome experienced in a most striking manner the protection of the Blessed Virgin. A frightful pestilence raged in the city, to such an extent that thousands were carried off, and so suddenly, that they had not time to make the least preparation. *It could not be arrested by vows and prayers which the Holy Pope caused to be offered in all quarters, until he resolved on having recourse to the Mother of God.*

“Having commanded the clergy and people to go in general procession to the church of our Lady, called St. Mary Major, *carrying the picture of the Virgin, painted by St. Luke, the miraculous effects of her intercession were soon experienced*; in every street as they passed, the plague ceased (?). And before the end of the procession, an angel, in *human form*, was seen on the tower of Adrian, named ever since the castle of St. Angelo, sheathing a bloody sabre. At the same moment, the angels were singing the anthem, *Regina Cæli, &c., ‘Triumph, O Queen, and Alleluia.’* The holy Pope added the words, ‘*Ora pro nobis Deum!*’ ‘*Petition God of our souls to save!*’ The Church has

---

<sup>a</sup> The extracts given are only a few of many of a similar nature. The work under consideration is by no means scarce, it having gone through several editions, and we have before us the edition of 1848, which is sold at the low price of one shilling; but Dr. Wiseman has lately edited another. Each later edition varies in some particulars from the preceding. Affrighted at the gross and glaring blasphemies of Liguori, not only are apologies and forced explanations tendered, but, in defiance of the unequivocal approbation of every single word which Liguori wrote, it has been deemed proper to drop parts, “from motives of expediency”—“*des motifs de convenance*” (p. iv. Paris edit. 1854).

We would not insult our readers by making any comment on such language and teaching as the above. A priest would tell us that all must be taken in a “Catholic” sense, and you must understand it as the “Church” does, and that she means nothing more than to honour the Blessed Virgin. But if there is any out-spoken honesty in our Roman Catholic readers, they will raise their voices in unanimous reprobation of such blasphemous teaching. The words are too plain for any but their literal interpretation, and the “Church” when approving them vouchsafed none other.

since used this anthem to salute the Blessed Virgin in Easter time."—  
 "True Devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary," p. 34.

And again—

"We read in the Chronicles of St. Francis, that brother Leo once saw in a vision, two ladders, one red, at the summit of which was JESUS CHRIST; and the other white, at the end of which presided his blessed Mother. He observed that many who endeavoured to ascend the first ladder, after mounting a few steps, fell down; and on trying again, were equally unsuccessful, so that they never attained the summit; but a voice having told them to make a trial of the *white* ladder, they soon gained the top, the Blessed Virgin having held forth her hand to help them" (p. 177).

The two following are taken from Dr. Wiseman's edition of Liguori, London, 1852, observing first that in the preface to this edition, p. xviii., we read as follows:—

"Remember that it [the work in question] has been strictly examined by the authority which is charged by God himself to instruct you, and that that authority has declared that it contains NOTHING [so printed in original] worthy of censure."

In page 64 we are informed:—

"Bernadine de Busto relates that a bird was taught to say, 'Hail, Mary!' A hawk was on the point of seizing it, when the bird cried out, 'Hail, Mary!' in an instant the hawk fell dead. God intended to show thereby, that if even an irrational creature was preserved by calling on Mary, how much more would those who are prompt in calling on her, when assaulted by devils, be delivered from them."

And again, in page 196—

"Father Eusebius Nieremberg says, 'that in a city of Aragon, there was a beautiful young lady, of noble birth, named Alexandra, who was courted by two young men. Out of jealousy, they one day fought, and both were killed. Their enraged relatives, considering the young lady as the cause of this sad event, murdered her, cut off her head, and threw it into a well. Some days afterwards, *Saint Dominic* passed by the spot, and, inspired by God, went to the well, and cried out, 'Alexandra, come forth!' In an instant the head of the murdered woman came up, and remained on the edge of the well, and entreated the Saint to hear her confession. The Saint did so, and in the presence of an immense concourse of people, drawn there by the wonderful event, gave her communion. He then commanded her to say for what reason she had received so great a grace. Alexandra replied, that when her head was cut off, she was in mortal sin; but that, on account of the Rosary she was in the habit of saying in her honour, the most Blessed Virgin had kept her alive. The animated head remained for two days on the edge of the well, so as to be seen by all; and, after that the soul went to Purgatory. A fortnight afterwards Alexandra appeared, beautiful and shining, like a star, to St. Dominic, and said, that the Rosary recited for the souls in Purgatory is one of the greatest reliefs that they meet with in their torments; and that, as soon as ever they get to heaven, they pray earnestly for those who have performed this devotion for them. As soon as she had said this, Saint Dominic saw her happy soul ascend, with the greatest joy, to the kingdom of the blessed."

We will now draw to a close our quotations, with two examples from Liguori's numerous prayers:—

"*Queen of heaven and earth! Mother of God! my sovereign mistress! I present myself before you as a poor mendicant before a mighty Queen. From the height of your throne, deign to cast your eyes on a miserable sinner, and lose not sight of him till you render him truly holy.*

"O illustrious Virgin! you are *Queen of the universe*, and consequently

mine ; I desire then to consecrate myself more particularly to your service ; *dispose of me according to your good pleasure ; direct me, I abandon myself wholly to your conduct*, never more let me be guided by myself ; chastise me if I disobey you ; your correction will be sweet and agreeable ; I am then no longer mine, *I am all yours* ; SAVE ME, O powerful Queen, save me by your intercession with your Son” (p. 35, edit. 1841).

“Draw me after you, O holy Virgin, that I may run in the odour of your perfumes. Draw me, for I am withheld by the weight of my sins, and the malice of my enemies. As no one can go to your Son, unless the heavenly Father draw him, so I presume to say in the same manner, *that no one can go to the Father* unless you attract him by *your prayers*. *It is you who obtain pardon and grace for sinners ; you are the teacher of true wisdom, and the repository of the treasures of the Most High*. You have found favour with God, being preserved from original sin, filled with the Holy Ghost, and selected as the Mother of His Son. All these graces you have received, O most humble Mary, not alone for yourself, *but also for us, in order that you might be able to assist us in all our wants*. You succour the just by preserving them in grace, and you help the wicked by disposing them to receive the divine mercy ; you aid the dying, preserving them from the snares of Satan, and conducting them, after death, to the mansions of the blessed” (p. 182).

Romanists do not cease to complain that they are misrepresented by Protestants of this country. Some few protest that it is unfair to visit the extravagances of a few enthusiasts on their church as a body. But we contend that we are justified in asserting that the sentiments of Liguori, as expressed in his acknowledged works, must be those of the modern Roman Catholic Church. How does the case stand as to the writings of Liguori ? We find, that with a view to his canonization (the most solemn act of this modern Church, and in which Cardinal Bellarmine asserts she is infallible),<sup>a</sup> Pope Pius VII. confirmed the decree of the Congregation of Rites, which declared—

“That all the writings of St. Alphonsus, whether printed or inedited, had been most rigorously examined according to the discipline of the Apostolic See, and, *that not one word had been found ‘censuræ dignum ;’* and that in all these examinations, *undertaken with a view to canonization* of St. Alphonsus, and in the definite judgment of the sacred congregation, all agreed, *‘voce concordi, unanimi consensu, una voce, unanimiter.’*”<sup>b</sup>

And in consequence he was canonized by the late Pope Gregory XVI., A.D. 1839. Again, in the “Lives of Modern Saints,” a work approved and specially recommended by two Roman authorities (Bishops of Roman Catholics, one of whom is Dr. Wiseman), and dedicated to the regular clergy of the [Roman] Catholic Church in England,<sup>c</sup> we find “the precious work, entitled ‘the Glories of Mary,’” most particularly mentioned and recommended as a work the fruit of several years’ labour, “in which he [Liguori] had employed himself to choose from among the works of holy fathers and theologians the *most conclusive proofs in favour of the pre-*

<sup>a</sup> Bell. “Church Triumphant,” tom. ii. p. 871. Colognæ, 1671.

<sup>b</sup> See “[Roman] Catholic Calendar for 1845,” p. 167.

<sup>c</sup> “Life of St. A. Liguori, &c.” vol. ii. pp. 19—21. Richardson, London, 1848.

*rogatives of Mary*, and the fittest to engage the faithful to devote themselves to her service" (p. 20). "The applause with which the book was received, or the number of editions through which it has gone, is scarcely to be credited" (p. 21).

But to place the matter beyond a doubt, that the doctrines taught by Liguori are or ought to be universally received by all classes of modern Romanists, we find in their own Missal, or Prayer-book, which is in daily use in England, that they must pray, on the 2nd of August in every year, in the following words: "O God, who by the blessed Alphonsus Maria, thy confessor and pontiff, who was inflamed with a zeal for souls, hast enriched thy Church with a new offspring, *we implore that, taught by his saving admonitions, and strengthened by his example, we may be able happily to come to thee through the Lord.*"<sup>a</sup>

And in Lesson V. of their Church Service for the same day, the identical book in question is thus expressly named, and specially commended: "Being an admirable worshipper of the Mother of God, he [Liguori] wrote and published a book upon her praises;" and in the same lesson his writings are stated to be "fraught with sacred erudition and piety."<sup>b</sup>

But the Blessed Virgin has not the monopoly. The "Queen of Heaven" has her glories recorded, and so has "ST. JOSEPH." We have now before us the work entitled the "Glories of Saint Joseph."


The "Glories of Saint Joseph" are entered at large in a volume under that title, stated to be "chiefly from the French of Rev. Father Paul Barrie," in a "second edition, revised, corrected, and improved," and published by "Richard Grace, [Roman] Catholic Bookseller, 45, Capel-street, Dublin, 1843."

We have stated the peculiar prerogatives of Rome's "*Marie*." What she enjoyed, Joseph, her spouse, enjoyed too; for we read in pages 14 and 15:—

"Mary, spouse to Joseph, doth in plenitude of grace, surpass both men and angels; and has not her husband, think you, the like endowments, since God judged him a fit match for her, and for this end gave him so great an abundance of grace, virtue, and sanctity, that neither men nor angels ever had the like, whereby to fit him to be the spouse and guide to the Virgin Mother; God judging it fit, that in her right, he should partake of *all her honours, favours, and dignities*? If, therefore, she be a princess, he is a prince, and he also is king, wherever she is queen; for God, who designed to raise Mary to the quality and honours of the Mother of God, at the same time designed her

<sup>a</sup> "Missale Romanum," Mechlin, 1840, p. 402, and "Roman Anglican Ritual." Keating and Brown, London, 1831.

<sup>b</sup> This article is quoted from the Editor's "Romanism in England exposed," Letter X. Lond. 1851.



a husband like to herself, whom He loved above all men upon earth, and therefore endowed him with all graces suitable to such a dignity.”

A logical deduction, indeed! *If* Mary was Queen of Heaven, then Joseph, of necessity, as her husband, was King of Heaven! “Much virtue is there in an *if*.” But *if* the Blessed Virgin is not Queen of Heaven, we suppose Joseph would not presume to claim the title of King. We are willing to leave this matter to such alternative; but not so “Father Paul Barrie,” and we must presume also Dr. Wiseman and the train of priests who attended at Poplar, on the dedication of a temple to their honour. For we are told, in page 16:—

“That the angels who beheld the Son of God, in the bosom of his Eternal Father in Heaven, seeing him also in the arms of St. Joseph upon earth, might very well cry out with wonder and astonishment: ‘Behold the Governor of the Universe, governed by a man,’ and address to St. Joseph the same admonition that Methodius did to the Mother of God in these following words: ‘O nursing-father to him who feeds all creatures? O rich Joseph, to whom God Himself became a beggar! Thrice happy art thou, who hast Him for thy debtor, who lends to every one whatsoever he possesses, for all creatures are indebted to God for their being, and for everything they enjoy; but to oblige thee, God will become obliged to thee, and make Himself thy debtor.’”

Then, again, what can be plainer than the following acknowledgment in favour of Joseph, by St. Theresa?—

“God by his other saints helped us in some particular cases of necessity; but helps us in all necessities by St. Joseph, as by his plenipotentiary, to let us understand, that as He was subject to him in all things upon earth as to a father, so He was the same in heaven, granting him whatsoever he asked” (p. 47).

He is accordingly called—

“The DIVINE Spouse of our Blessed Lady” (p. 51).

And “if we desire to know what is best to SECURE OUR SALVATION,” we are told that there cannot be any doubt but that the Blessed Virgin will advise us to be “devout to St. Joseph” (p. 129). It is not surprising, therefore, that in the “Litanies of St. Joseph” we find thickly and profusely scattered about such expressions as the following, as applied and addressed to him:—

“Advocate of the humble. Defender of the meek. Quintessence of all virtue. Theatre of all glorious privileges (p. 65). Appointed master of God’s household. Our Intercessor in the hour of danger. Our patron and protection (p. 155). Whom the Eternal Father made his Vicar on earth,” [and we presume, therefore, first Pope, even before St. Peter]. “Prince of all his possessions (p. 156), who [Joseph] dost triumph for ever, shining with ineffable glory: who didst sovereignly despise the world” (p. 157).

Then comes another series of rhapsodic expressions, peculiar to Romish theology. Joseph is declared to be:—

“The vermilion rose of charity. Lily of charity. Doctor of humility. Splendour of modesty. Mirror of married persons [and why don’t priests follow his

example?]. Advocate of sinners. Comforter of the afflicted. Protector of the poor. Solace of all who labour. Guide of the wandering. The safety of the shipwrecked. *Father* of the faithful. Who as an angel didst deliver divine oracles. Who, as an arch-angel was the companion and guardian of the angel of the Great Council. *To whom the Almighty was subject.* To whose dominion the Queen of Dominations was subject. In whose arms, and bosom, as on a throne, the King of Glory vouchsafed to sit (p. 158). The original guardian of Virgins. Our most holy patron. Our strongest defender. Our most loving father (p. 159). Ensign of our salvation. Heaven of Wisdom (p. 161). Mirror of Divine paternity. *Image of God the Son.* *Impression of the Holy Ghost* (p. 160)."

But this mighty Joseph condescended to step down for a moment from this lofty pinnacle of greatness, to assist us in all our little troubles, even to effecting "miraculous cures" (p. 112), and that too by the humble means of "a miraculous ointment" (p. 113), far more potent than that of the modern "Holloway." This "miraculous ointment" actually had (if we could only persuade our readers to believe it) so much virtue that it—

"Had the power of working miracles, which it likewise communicated to beads, medals, images, and papers that touched it, or the cloth that wiped it off" (p. 115).

A very awkward opponent Father Paul Barrie might prove to Mr. Holloway, *if* he (Father B.) could only procure a pot of this miraculous ointment!

Then St. Joseph cured all sorts of "sore eyes" (p. 120), "distempers and plagues," "violent headaches" (p. 119). He assisted a nun to pay the "debts which she had contracted" (p. 125). He "also favours marriage, and unites the hearts of married persons, procuring them a true and constant conjugal affection." Also "helps persons pregnant" (p. 127). "He favours also married persons, by giving them children" (p. 128). And we are told that he lifted "a cart out of a rut, which could neither go backwards nor forwards" (p. 131); and he is so obliging as to "help persons even without being asked" (p. 132); and this was exemplified in an extraordinary manner, in the case of a young man who had put himself under his protection:—

"As he walked in the fields for his amusement, he met two men unknown to him, one of whom shot at him with a blunderbuss charged with hail-shot. All entered his body, without giving him any mortal wound; two or three staid in his belly, and one of them beat flat upon his forehead."

Of course no injury was done, "and he offered a picture (at St. Joseph's church) of this miraculous escape, as a memory of his gratitude" (p. 133). But, to sum up, he supersedes any mesmeric medium, for we are told, "when you have lost anything you highly value," you are to have recourse to St. Joseph to beg "his help," and—heigh, presto!—"the lost thing is recovered" (p. 84, *et seq.*)



And to our fair readers St. Joseph shows himself peculiarly amiable; and this is testified on the unimpeachable evidence of Father Barrie himself!—

“I knew [he says] a young woman violently attacked with a passion of love, which she freed herself from by resolving, in honour of St. Joseph, to abstain for nine days from the conversation of the person she loved,”—and upon recommending herself every day to St. Joseph, “she was perfectly freed from this tormenting and dangerous spirit” (p. 108).

Another, more desperate, case is cited on the same evidence. We are surprised St. Joseph did not prescribe a nunnery. But this reminds me that St. Joseph makes himself generally useful even in this line. A religious “house of nuns” was running dry for want of “novices,” and funds as well. The Superior—

“Had recourse to St. Joseph, to beg his assistance. The devotion was no sooner begun, than a young lady *with a good fortune* offered herself to live and die with them in God’s service, which favour will never be forgotten” [of course not] (p. 68).

Our readers may think we are joking; but we assure them that we transcribe faithfully—and, what is more, Father Barrie declares that he “heard this from the mouth of the Superior herself” (p. 67); and you cannot, therefore, resist this evidence!

We must not quit this extraordinary production without calling attention to the fact that JESUS, MARY, and JOSEPH are created into another *Trinity*. The whole of chapter iii. treats of this. Gerson, we are told (p. 25), says,—

“That if the first rank and hierarchy in heaven is that of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, so the second is this of *Jesus, Mary, and Joseph*, and that all other saints are of a lower rank, and of a different hierarchy.”

The former is stated to be the *uncreated*, the latter the *created* Trinity, but in the image or likeness of the former.

“Mary bears the image of God the Father, Jesus the Son, according to his humanity, in a just likeness to what He is in Heaven, as he is the Word or Son of God; and St. Joseph represented the Holy Ghost, in the quality of Spouse to the Blessed Virgin Mary,” &c. (p. 26). And a little further on we are told that “as none can divide their love to the three persons in the uncreated Trinity, *they ought to follow a similar rule in their respect to the created Trinity*,” &c. (p. 27).

To sanctify this creation of Popish theology, we are told, that—

“Pius VII. [the same Pope who confirmed the approval of Liguori’s ‘Glories of Mary’], by a decree of the 28th April, 1807, granted for ever an indulgence of 300 days, to the faithful, each time they devoutly repeat the following three aspirations, and if only one of them is said, an indulgence of 100 days, and all applicable to the souls in purgatory:—

“Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, I offer you my heart and soul.

“Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, assist me in my last agony.

“Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, may I expire in peace with you” (p. 231).

Here let us pause for one moment, fully to appreciate the doctrine thus endorsed by a Pope. The three undivided persons of the uncreated Trinity, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are co-eternal and co-equal; "none, therefore, can (without sin) divide their love," each commanding an *equal* affection. We are offered another Trinity, of whom the same "Son," of the uncreated undivided Trinity, is *one*. This second Trinity is composed of this same Son, and Mary, and Joseph, who, we are told, demand also our "undivided love," to whom we are to "offer our hearts and souls," and to whom we are to pray "to assist us in our last agonies," and that we may expire in *peace* with them! In theology, as in mathematics, "things that are equal to the same are equal to one another." Mary and Joseph are placed in our affection on a level with Jesus, the second person of the Holy Trinity; so, therefore, must Mary and Joseph require from us the same equal and undivided affection which is given to the Father and the Holy Spirit. The consequence is inevitable. A new God and Goddess are thus incorporated into the Divine Trinity, converting Christianity into a Pagan Pantheism, and Pagan temples are erected to their honour.

It is true that this book does not come before us with the same authoritative endorsement as the "Glories of Mary," but we should not overlook the several rules and decrees of Popes that are ostentatiously set out in it, not merely recommending the devotion and Litanies to Joseph, but encouraging them by the offer of extravagant "indulgences" (those imaginary "celestial treasures" composed of equally imaginary superabundant merits of departed saints, and said to be at the free disposal of an ecclesiastical impostor), applicable as well to the devotee as to "souls in purgatory." And, further, this "second edition" is sold by the recognized "Catholic" bookseller in Dublin, and is sanctioned by the Romish priesthood; and in order to ascertain whether the sale be still permitted, the volume from which we quote was purposely purchased so late as the 18th of October, 1856. And, besides, what right has any one to repudiate the work? Do Romanists not boast of a uniformity of teaching throughout all her ministry? It is not in the index of prohibited books; and so confident does the writer feel that he is doing nothing contrary to the teaching of his Church, that he does not think it necessary to offer any apology, as did Liguori, in desiring his book to be accepted only so far as it was in conformity with the teaching of his Church.

Our extracts on this subject would not be complete were we to pass over the very famous or rather *infamous* Psalter of

*Saint Bonaventura.* Rome has, in the most emphatic manner, declared orthodox the works of this so called saint, having given them her approval in most unequivocal terms. Bonaventura was elected Cardinal-Bishop by Gregory X., and attained every honour in the Church, short of the Papal chair. Two centuries after his death he was canonized by Pope Sixtus IV., who declared that the "BLESSED TRINITY TESTIFIED TO THE FACT THAT HE WAS A SAINT IN HEAVEN;" and further, that "he [Bonaventura] so WROTE ON DIVINE SUBJECTS THAT THE HOLY SPIRIT SEEMS TO HAVE SPOKEN IN HIM."<sup>a</sup> It must be borne in mind that it is an accepted doctrine of this modern Church, that in the act of canonisation THE CHURCH is infallible.<sup>b</sup> A century after this, Pope Sixtus V. ordered the writings of this sainted individual to be "most carefully emendated," and in his decretal letter declares him to be an acknowledged doctor of the Church, and directs his authority to be cited in all places of education, and in all ecclesiastical discussions and studies; and, to crown the whole, a PLENARY INDULGENCE is promised to all those who assist at his mass on his feast, the 14th of July. All classes of Romanists, on this same 14th of July in every year, are bound to pray in the following words:—"O most excellent doctor, *Light of the Holy Church*, blessed Bonaventura, lover of the divine law, pray for us."—"O Lord, who didst give blessed Bonaventura to thy people for a minister of eternal salvation, grant, we beseech thee, that whom we enjoyed as the instructor of our life on earth, we may deserve to have as our intercessor in heaven." This prayer is in the Roman Breviary, Paris, 1846, p. 806; and the latter prayer is inserted in the Roman Missal as a collect, London, 1844, p. 318. Thus do we find, in a most solemn manner, that the modern Roman Church requires of all its members, both lay and clerical, that they should pray for the intercession of him who, in this life, instructed them in that system of religion which we can designate by no other title than "Baptized Heathenism," and must acknowledge his teaching, on the subject now under consideration, the "Invocation of Saints." These preliminary remarks are necessary, and must be most especially borne in mind, for Romanists do not hesitate, when it suits their convenience, and especially when hard pressed in controversial discussions, to deny all knowledge of such a saint, as also the authority of his works, and more particularly the work we are about to cite, though its authenticity is most indubitable.

<sup>a</sup> Acta Sanct. Antwerp, 1723, p. 831.

<sup>b</sup> See Bellarmine's "Church Triumphant," vol. ii. p. 871. Cologne, 1617.

Among the works thus "carefully emendated" is found the infamous "Psalter of the Virgin Mary," than which, perhaps, a more blasphemous production does not exist. This *saint* has parodied the Psalms of David, by substituting the name of the Virgin Mary in the place of the LORD JEHOVAH. One or two examples are sufficient to give an idea of this most extraordinary production. Our quotations are taken from the Metz edition, vol. vi. 1609,<sup>a</sup> The following is a literal translation from the Latin:—

Psalm xxx.—"In thee, O Lady, have I trusted; let me not be confounded for ever: in thy grace take me.

"Thou art my strength and my refuge: my consolation and my protection.

"To thee, O Lady, have I cried, while my heart was in tribulation: and thou didst hear me from the top of the eternal hills.

"Deliver me out of the snare which they have laid privily for me, for thou art my helper.

"Into thy hands, O Lady, I commend my spirit, my whole life, and my last day," &c. (p. 480.)

Psalm xxxi.—"Blessed are they whose hearts love thee, O Virgin Mary; their sins shall be mercifully blotted out BY THEE," &c. (p. 481.)

Psalm xxxv. 2.—"Incline thou the countenance of God upon us; COMPEL HIM (*coge illum*) to have mercy on sinners." (p. 481.)

Psalm xciii.—"The Lord is a God of vengeance; but thou, O Mother of Mercy, bendest to be merciful." (p. 485.)

And thus is the "Te Deum" also blasphemously addressed to the Virgin Mary:—

"We praise thee, Mother of God: we acknowledge thee, Mary the Virgin.

"All the earth doth worship thee, Spouse of the eternal Father.

"To thee all angels and archangels, &c., so faithfully do serve. Holy! Holy! Holy! Mary, parent Mother of God and Virgin!

"O Lady, SAVE THY PEOPLE (*salvum fac populum tuum*), that we may partake of the inheritance of thy Son," &c. &c. &c.

In vol. vi. p. 466, we read:—

"Therefore, O Empress, and our most benign Lady, BY THY RIGHT OF MOTHER, COMMAND (*jure matris impera*) thy most beloved Son that he vouchsafe to raise our minds from the love of earthly things to heavenly desires," &c.

The Litany and the Athanasian Creed have been similarly perverted.

Having brought to the notice of our readers Bonaventura's Psalter, let us at once meet an objection that is made by Romanists when this work is cited by Protestants as evidencing the practical teaching of their Church on the subject of the worship of the Virgin Mary. It may be relied on as a general rule, that the most repugnant and idolatrous portions of the Romish system are kept in the background in this country until the convert is fairly entrapped. The poison is

<sup>a</sup> The first edition of Bonaventura's collected works was commenced under the patronage of Pope Sixtus V., and finished under Clement VIII., to whom the work was dedicated (at least the sixth volume, which contained this very psalter) in seven volumes, printed at the Vatican press.

mixed with honey, so that the baneful quality of the mixture, unscen by the outward eye, does not become developed until it has fairly taken root and contaminated the whole constitution. Thus, these and such-like works are kept out of view in England; and, for purposes of their own, Romanists have not hesitated openly to declare that, but for Protestant malignity, such works, the exponents only of the sentiments of darker ages, would have remained in obscurity. Repeatedly has this objection been raised at public and other meetings, and as often refuted. Some Romanists, like snails, when they are touched, draw in their horns. In a mixed assembly of Protestants and Romanists, the latter dread an exposure, and for present purposes do not hesitate to invent any subterfuge, so as to appear better in the eyes of the Protestant public than they are represented to be. They successively reject fathers and doctors of their church, when they are brought in testimony against their modern innovations. In the present case, however, such objections and subterfuges cannot for one moment be admitted.

“*Roma locuta, causa finita est.*” Her motto is “*Semper eadem.*” She claims to be infallible, and an appeal is made by a self-styled infallible Pope on behalf of the writings of this very individual Bonaventura. According to her own doctrine, what was right then, must be so now; and, to carry out this same principle, the Psalter of the Blessed Virgin Mary was reprinted at Rome so lately as 1834,<sup>a</sup> and is a literal translation from the Latin into Italian, with the sanction and imprimatur of the masters of the so-called Apostolical Palace, “Fr. Angelus V. Modena,” and of his deputy, “A Piatti Archieps Trapesunt. ;” and further this same Psalter of the Virgin Mary was reprinted in 1844 at Rome, with all the sanction of the proper authorities, at the press of A. Monaldi, Via Sistina, No. 47, and has passed through no less than eleven editions within the last few years, and was publicly sold for twopence in the streets of Rome, and at the very steps of St. Peter’s Church, as well as in all the shops: and this, too, in a country where the press was under the most rigid ecclesiastical censure.<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> “Salterio di S. Bonaventura alla beata Vergine Maria, col Testo di rincontro. Roma, presso Gio. Battista Marini, Piazza del collegio Romano, Num. 4.” On the second title-page is the following:—“Preci Quotidiane alla Madre di Dio per impetrare una buona morte, tratte dal Salterio di S. Bonaventura. Nuova Traduzione col testo di rincontro. Roma, 1834. Presso Gio. Battista Marini, Piazza del collegio Romano, N. 4.”

<sup>b</sup> “To show you the popularity of this formulary of devotion, sanctioned as it is by the present Pope, and approved by the censors, I may mention that in the course of the five years which have elapsed from 1834 to the end of

Had this been a solitary instance in this modern church where such blasphemies had been indulged in, we might, in charity, be led to consider Bonaventura's extraordinary productions as the ravings of a deranged intellect; but alas! whichever way we turn, we find disciples of Bonaventura equalling, if not surpassing him, in his mariolatrous ravings. Witness the writings of Bernardinus de Bustis, in his "Office of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin," [*Cologne*, 1607]; Bernardinus Senensis [*Paris*, 1636]; Theophilus Raynaud, of Lyons [*Diptycha Mariana, Lugduni*, 1665]. These and many others we could name bear evident testimony of the practical working of Romanism. But for the present we will content ourselves by referring the reader to the several passages collected from these and other Romish writers in Tyler's works, the "Primitive Christian Worship," and the "Worship of the Virgin Mary," published by "The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge."

With such works at hand to exemplify the practical teaching of the Church of Rome, we need not resort to *misrepresentation*, to paint her worse than she is. But we protest against Dr. Milner's assertion, "That it appears that the heinous charge of *idolatry* brought against Catholics [Romanists] for their respect towards the saints, is *grounded on nothing* but the mistaken meaning of the word *WORSHIP*." (Letter xxxiii. p. 336.)

1839, it went through ten editions; and I hold in my hand at this moment the tenth edition, dated Rome, 1839, which is an exact reprint of that of 1834. I have also recently seen a gentleman, to whom a friend at Rome has sent a copy of the eleventh edition, dated 1840. So that on an average, this Psalter of Bonaventura is so popular as to require at least two editions every year; and in order that every Roman Catholic may possess it, it is sold at the very smallest possible price at which it can be printed. Now if streams be the purest near to the fountain, and if light is the more unsullied and clear the nearer we approach to the sun from which it emanates, may we not presume that the theology of the Romish church is most unalloyed under the very wing and superintendence of his holiness the Pope; and that if we are to find the pure and unquestionable exponent of Roman theology in any part of the universe, it will be where censors of books are appointed, as at Rome, to see that nothing erroneous passes through the press, and where the Pope, armed with the tremendous attribute of infallibility, inspects the publication, adds to it his signature, and pronounces it calculated to edify and instruct the faithful."—Dr. Cumming, "Lectures for the Times." London, 1845. Hall and Co., Paternoster-row. And we have seen a Paris edition of 1849. It is not true, as stated by some Romanists, that this Psalter was placed in the index of prohibited books. The "Catholic Layman," of May, 1855, gives a most learned and elaborate article, proving the authenticity of the work in question.

## SECT. III.—Dr. Milner's alleged Protestant Apologists for the Roman Teaching.

So anxious is Dr. Milner to vindicate his church from the charge of idolatry, and further to satisfy us that her doctrine has been misrepresented, that he presses into his service divines of the Church of England as repudiating such an idea. The argument would be good, if tenable; but, like most of Milner's quotations, the passages cited are blundering perversions.

“Several of the brightest lights (he says) of the Established Church, such as Archbishop Sheldon, and the Bishops Blandford (see ‘Duchess of York’s Testimony, in Brunswick’s Fifty Reasons’), Gunning (Burnet’s ‘Hist.’ &c., vol. i. p. 437), Montague, &c., have altogether abandoned the charge of idolatry against [Roman] Catholics on this head; the last-mentioned says, ‘I own that Christ is not wronged in his mediation. It is no impiety to say, as they (the Catholics [Romanists]) do, *Holy Mary, pray for me; Holy Peter, pray for me* (‘Treat. of Invoc. of Saints,’ p. 118), whilst the candid prebendary of Westminster warns his brethren ‘not to lead people by the nose, to believe they can prove Papists to be idolators, when they cannot.’—Thorndike’s ‘Just Weights,’ p. 10.” [Letter xxxiii. 339.]

We have already stated that we do not undertake to justify all that may have been written or said by divines of the Established Church.<sup>a</sup> We know, even at this day, that it would be a libel on our clergy to charge the whole body with the aberrations of a few Tractarians and Puseyites. The Church has never been entirely free from semi-popish divines, whose hearts are with Rome, but, with equivocal Jesuitical morality, do not hesitate to pass for Protestants. We, however, can claim, in some of the instances cited by Dr. Milner, “honourable exceptions.” Omitting the “et cetera” as rather too vague a reference even for Dr. Milner, we have five names cited; of these two only, Montague and Thorndike, are quoted with any possibility of finding the passage referred to. As to Montague’s “Treatise of Invocation of Saints,” at p. 118, the words quoted are found as given by Dr. Milner, but he stops short. Had he continued, he would have found that the bishop’s sentiments are directly the reverse of what Dr. Milner would represent them to be. Montague’s words are:—

“Indeed, I grant Christ is not wronged in his mediation; it is no impiety to say as they do, *Sancta Maria, ora pro me; Sancte Petre, ora pro me*; and so no wrong unto Christ Jesus to use mediation of intercession unto him.<sup>b</sup> As it is taught, I add, in their schools, by their Doctors, resolved by that oracle of

<sup>a</sup> First Series, No. xvi. p. 228.

<sup>b</sup> “This is the veil spread over the minds of many. It is a slender one; and yet the best that may be found. You make again a distinction where Scripture distinguishes not; when St. Paul says, ‘there is one mediator,’ it is a mediator of intercession that he is speaking of; for, having exhorted us to pray and supplicate for each other, he adds, ‘for there is one God, and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a

Trent. BUT NOT as practised in their use and custom, where simple men invoke Saints as they do God ; go to their devotions unto the Blessed Virgin, not only far more frequently than they do to Christ [as has been abundantly proved in preceding pages], but without any difference at all, go to it downright, as to the authors and originals of the things they desire, having them in their power to bestow or not. They have power much more than they had on earth ; not to give, but to entreat, to prevail with God, now sooner in the state of bliss and immutability, than in the state of subjection unto sin and misery. But admit it not impiety, as I think it is not ; it is *flat and egregious foolery* at best."—"Treatise of Invocation of Saints," pp. 118, 119.

The whole treatise of Bishop Montague shows the futility of all argument for the Invocation of Saints, from reason, Scripture, and from the Fathers ; in short he concludes it, to use his own words, "a point of plain *folly*, and ridiculous *absurdity*, as it is laid down, even by the most learned, judicious, and advised amongst them" (Romanists) ; and "in point of practice and performance, by the simple vulgar people not acquainted with nor capable of scholastic niceties, of difference in terms of invocation and advocacy, help, original and derived ; it is *flat impiety* against God, and *idolatry* in their ordinary *devotion unto the creature*."<sup>a</sup> Now it is known that Montague attacked Calvinistic doctrines—the Calvinists in turn attacked Montague ; they charged him with favouring Popish doctrines. In their charge against him, set out by Collier *verbatim*, in his "Ecclesiastical History," they say :—

"SEC. V.—The said Richard Montague hath, notwithstanding, in his said book entitled 'A Treatise concerning the Invocation of Saints' [the book referred to by Dr. Milner], affirmed and maintained that Saints have not only a memory, but a more peculiar charge of their friends ; and that it may be admitted that some Saints have a peculiar patronage, custody, protection, and power, as angels also have over certain persons and countries, by special deputation ; and that it is no impiety so to believe."<sup>b</sup>

It will be observed that there is no charge here that Bishop Montague held the Popish doctrine of Invocation of Saints, or that he favoured it. Had he done so in this book, his enemies, the Calvinists, would not have omitted to charge him with it. They did not do so.

We proceed to notice Dr. Milner's appeal to Herbert Thorndike, "the candid prebendary of Westminster." The ransom for all,' teaching us, that he alone who ransomed is the alone mediator of intercession, through whom our supplications are received. The office of mediator of redemption expired when he ascended on high, and his all-sufficient atonement was accepted of the Father."—Garbett's "Nullity of the Roman Faith," p. 328.

<sup>a</sup> "It seems almost customary with Romish writers—much to their advantage, to be sure—to omit the latter portion of the passage from Bp. Montague. 'You quote (observes the Durham clergyman, in reply to Mr. Lingard) Bp. Montague as conceding this point. Let me improve your quotation by giving the whole of it, we shall then better judge of the extent of this concession.'"—"Two Charges and a Letter to the Clergy of Durham," London, 1813, p. 145.

<sup>b</sup> Collier, "Eccel. Hist.," vol. ii. part ii. b. ix. p. 737. London, 1712.



quotation given, as from this writer, has no place whatever in the treatise to which Dr. Milner refers: it is an entire *fabrication* from first to last, concocted from three several sentences brought into hotchpot. The first sentence is taken from the *table of contents*, and the second and third have no connection with each other in the writings of Herbert Thorndike, and are, in fact, directly opposed to the sentiments of that writer, who declares that to pray to saints departed, for those things which God alone can give, as all Papists do, is, in the proper sense of the word, downright *idolatry*. If they say their meaning is by a figure only to desire them to procure their requests from God, how dare any Christian trust his soul with that Church which teaches that which must needs be *idolatry* in all that understand not the figure. [Judgment of the Church of Rome, xii. head.]<sup>a</sup>

So much for the "candid prebendary of Westminster."

The only reference to "Archbishop Sheldon and Bishop Blandford" is "See Duchess of York's Testimony in Brunswick's Fifty Reasons." The idea of a Milner referring to the unique production of the "Fifty Reasons" for "testimony!" The Duke of Brunswick's book, entitled "Fifty Reasons," is only one degree worse, if that be possible, than Dr. Milner's. They are both characterized by the boldest perversions of truth that it has ever been our misfortune to meet, without any exception. This supposed letter is added to some of the editions of Brunswick's "Fifty Reasons." Of the letter itself we beg to refer our readers to the remarks already offered in our article on Purgatory.

Burnet in his "History of his own Times," to which Dr. Milner has drawn our attention, does not in any way couple Sheldon's name with the Duchess of York, but he informs us that he and others preached so vehemently against Popery that the king interfered and endeavoured to put a stop to it, but Sheldon resisted.<sup>b</sup> And with reference to Bishop Blandford, all that Burnet relates is, that Blandford was called in when the Duchess of York was on her death-bed.

"She protested to him she had no scruples with relation to her religion, and was still of the Church of England; and assured him that no Popish priest had ever taken the confidence to speak to her on this matter [*i.e.*, taking the Sacrament]. Up to her death she never owned to him that she had any scruples, though she was for some days entertained by him at Farnham, after the date of the paper which was afterwards published in her name. All this passed between the bishop and me, upon the duke's showing me that paper all

<sup>a</sup> "Remarks on a Pamphlet by Rev. J. Waterworth, Newark," by the Rev. R. Simpson, 1834, quoted in the *Protestant Journal*, 1835, p. 302.

<sup>b</sup> Burnet's "History of his own Times," vol. i. pp. 308-9, edit. London, fol. 1742. The same edition as that quoted by Dr. Milner.

writ in her own hand, which was afterwards published by Maunbury. I went immediately to Mosley and gave him an account of it, from whom I had all the particulars above mentioned, and upon that he concluded that the unhappy princess had been prevailed on to give falsehoods under her hand, and to pretend that these were the grounds of her conversion.”—(P. 309.)

So, according to Burnet, it appears that, at the time the statement was made, it was supposed to be false.

That Burnet should be referred to in Gunning's case, proves either that Dr. Milner never turned to the pages of the writer he pretends to quote, or he must have supposed that he might safely hazard a perversion of truth, and stand the chance of detection. The reference to the pages of Burnet is correct, and there we read that—

“A bill was brought into the House of Commons, requiring all members of either house, and all such as might come into the King's court or presence, to take a test against Popery; in which not only transubstantiation was renounced, but the worship of the Virgin Mary and the Saints, as it was practised in the Church of Rome, *was declared to be idolatrous*. This passed in the House of Commons (A.D. 1678, reign of Charles II.) without any difficulty; but in the House of Lords, *Gunning*, Bishop of Ely, maintained that the Church of Rome was not idolatrous. He was answered by Barlow, Bishop of Lincoln. The Lords did not much mind Gunning's arguments, but passed the bill.”

This is the passage indicated by Dr. Milner from Burnet's “History of his own Times,” vol. i. p. 435.<sup>a</sup> Now here Dr. Milner would have us stop, for he gives us not the slightest idea of what followed. Burnet goes on immediately to say, “And though Gunning had said, that he could not take that test with a good conscience, yet as soon as the bill was passed he *took it in the crowd with the rest*.” Burnet goes on to show that a noble duke and duchess and twelve ladies were specially exempted by the bill which passed the Commons, still it does not appear that Gunning attempted to have himself included in this exemption. If Gunning really believed that the Romish practice was not idolatrous, surely Dr. Milner showed very little judgment in selecting such a man, who, against his conscience, immediately takes the oath against which he had protested. But we must be excused if we refuse to rank such a man among the “brightest lights of the Established Church,” though we can scarcely be surprised at his finding an admirer in Dr. Milner. That Dr. Milner has made Gunning's scruples a *point* for argument is evident, since he introduces the same subject in his letter on Transubstantiation [Letter xxxvi. pp. 355-6], wherein he says that the most eminent prelates, in the reigns of Charles I. and Charles II., generally acquitted Romanists of idolatry in “worshipping Christ in the Sacrament;” “and, more

<sup>a</sup> But not p. 437. Edit. fol., London, 1742.

especially, the learned Gunning, Bishop of Ely, who reprobated the *declaration*, when it was brought into the House of Lords, protesting that his conscience would not permit him to take it. (Burnet's 'Hist. of his own Times.')

Here again, wholly concealing the fact that he *took the declaration* nevertheless.

It really appears as if Dr. Milner could not speak the truth if he tried.

Again, in order to relieve his church from the "heavy" charges brought against her in invoking saints and angels, Dr. Milner calls up the Duke of Somerset, "who only took up the pretext of idolatry [he tells us] as the most popular for revolutionizing the [so-called] ancient religion" (p. 332); and that he and others were actuated merely by "motives of avarice and ambition," in carrying on the measure of abolition. His evidence for these statements is altogether omitted; and, even if true, what blame, particularly in a Protestant country, can a son of Rome, with any decency, lay upon them? Then Luther, with equal omission, is said "warmly to have defended the Romish doctrine in these particulars." The authorized Symbolic books of the Lutheran faith speak very unambiguously to the contrary; the Smalcald articles, as they are called, and which were drawn up by Luther himself, asserting that such invocation is to be ranked among abuses and errors of Antichrist, and at variance with an acknowledgment of Christ. "For it is (say they, Part II., art. ii. sec. 26) uncommanded and unsupported by any counsel, or example, or passage, in Scripture; it is a matter altogether injurious (sec. 27). Angels and saints are not to be invoked by us, nor honoured as patrons and intercessors; nor are certain helps to be attributed to them, as Papists teach and practise; for this is idolatrous, and such honour is owing to God alone."

So anxious indeed is Dr. Milner to enlist Luther in his own ranks, that he summons him again in another part of this same letter, as a witness in his favour, and notwithstanding the black catalogue of crime affixed upon him, Dr. Milner is glad enough to enlist "the Patriarch of Protestantism" (as he calls him, p. 338) in favour of praying to saints and angels, affirming that "Luther did not find anything idolatrous in the doctrine and practice of the Church with respect to the saints," and then quotes him as believing that great miracles are wrought at the tombs of the saints, and therefore "I (he is made to say), with the whole Catholic Church, hold that the saints are to be honoured and invoked by us." A *German* source is produced as authority

for this statement, and really it has something of a *mythical* aspect: here is Luther—the “sacrilegious” Luther—all at once become an uncommonly good fellow, and allowed to pronounce, as good as any of them, in favour of the invocation of saints! “I and the whole Catholic Church.” There is something mysterious in all this. The second portion of the reference<sup>a</sup> we can test the value of rather more easily; and there Dr. Milner does obtain some little help, but it is from a letter written in 1518, when Luther’s views on some points had not run clear of all Papal dregs; and yet, after all, his estimate of such prayers is but comparative, thinking applications to saints better than to wizards and gipsies. But Luther is quoted, as we so often find to be the case, imperfectly. He goes on to explain himself, observing that it is impious and perverse to be anxious solely about the body, neglecting the command, “Seek first the kingdom of God, and all these things shall be added unto you.” If then it is allowable to pray for such things, it should be permitted to those only who are imperfect, and who live rather in subjection to Moses than to Christ. Such worship of saints is therefore a thing merely to be borne with, not to be extolled as a practice altogether becoming a Christian life. Just consider if any of the saints addressed is noted among the people on the score of chastity, patience, faith, hope, charity, and other spiritual gifts: such blessings are not sought for; we have no such saints, to whom recourse is had for such things. But there is St. Laurence to quench fire, Sebastian for the plague, &c.; and in short all the celebrated saints are in repute for temporal benefits solely; so much so, that they are worshipped more than apostles, and would be altogether neglected were bodily ailments and grievances to cease,<sup>b</sup> or bodily things to be neglected. Such persons are to be borne with in such practices, till they can be instructed in a taste for better things, or, if better informed, reprovèd for not taking a higher aim. And this is an authority to be seized on for upholding the invocation of saints and angels! “the great Patriarch of Protestantism” become a serving-man to the Church of Rome!

The other reference to Luther’s works<sup>c</sup> furnishes still less for Rome’s support—if we have lighted upon the treatise intended—so indistinct are Dr. Milner’s guide-posts. There

<sup>a</sup> “Epist. ad G. Spalatin,” tom. i. fol. 131, ed. Aurifabri, 1579; or in De Wette’s “Luthers Briefe,” vol. i. pp. 201-3.

<sup>b</sup> Sometimes they curse their Saints in the present day, if their demands are not granted; calling St. Januarius, for instance, a *yellow-faced rascal*.

<sup>c</sup> Luther’s “Præp. ad Mortem,” [tom. i. fol. 89, edit. Witteb. 1589].

is nothing about invoking Marie, nor saints, nor angels; merely a half-sentence about saints praying *for us*, "orent pro me;" and thus fades away the vision of Luther's support to this "interesting" doctrine. Thus does Dr. Milner struggle to scrape together apologies even from so-called heretical Protestants, in defence of the Popish doctrine of "Invocation of Saints," even at the expense of truth and very much to the disparagement of his own character as an honest controversialist.

It is a matter of curious speculation how Dr. Milner read books when he took them in hand. Did he read backwards or hold the books upside down? For scarcely in a single instance, where an advantage is attempted to be gained, does he read straightforward in the honest orthodox way. It is well that he should cry out very loud that his church's teaching is misrepresented; he expected to distract the attention of an inquiring reader. It is an old trick. The fugitive thief, if he can do it dexterously, often joins the yelping pack, and with them cries lustily, "stop thief!"

---

#### SECT. IV.—Alleged Scriptural Sanction.

Is it a fact that, on an examination of the Decree of the Council of Trent, we find that the Council does not assert that the practice of invoking saints has any foundation in Holy Scripture? The absence of any such declaration is the more important, because in the very Decree immediately preceding, which establishes Purgatory as a doctrine of the Church of Rome, the Council declares *that* doctrine to be drawn from the Holy Scripture. In the present instance the Council proceeds no further than to charge with impiety those who maintain the invocation of saints *to be contrary to the word of God*. The Council abstains from affirming anything whatever as to the Scriptural origin of the doctrine and practice, which it commands all Bishops to teach "with diligent assiduity." Hence perhaps arises Dr. Milner's excessive caution in treating this part of his subject. He treads very gently, as on flints with bare feet. We propose now to examine his appeal to the written Word.

On entering upon this part of the subject, we must beg our readers not to confound two distinct questions, which are artfully brought together as included in the same system: namely, intercessory prayers one for another while in this world; and invoking the prayers of the *departed*. The one

is specially encouraged; the other, to say the least of it, has no sanction whatever in the Word of God.

I. Rom. xv. 30, Job xlii. 8.—On these texts Dr. Milner writes:—

“Our Protestant brethren will not deny that St. Paul was in the practice of soliciting the prayers of the church to which he addressed his Epistles (Rom. xv. 30, &c.), and that the Almighty himself commanded the friends of Job to obtain his prayers for the pardon of their sins.—Job xlii. 8.”—(P. 336.)

Here in the outset is an abandonment of the question, which is not, “whether it be lawful or profitable to pray for each other, while in this life,” but “whether (to follow the words of the Council of Trent) the Saints reigning with Christ offer their own prayers for men to God: and that it is good and profitable suppliantly to invoke them, and to fly to their prayers, help, and assistance, for obtaining benefits from God.” Now Paul, in the first text cited, besought his brethren, *then living*, “to strive together with him in their prayers to God for him (Paul);” and in Job we read that the Lord said, “Take unto you now seven bullocks and seven rams, and go to my servant Job, and offer up for yourselves a burnt-offering, and my servant Job shall pray for you: for him will I accept.” In both these instances prayers were to be made *directly* to God, and there is not the most distant allusion to any intermediate departed saint, whose help, prayers, and assistance were directed to be invoked. Mutual prayers for the living are in these texts expressly sanctioned and encouraged, and accordingly, do all classes of Protestants use such intercessory prayers. A prayer to God to assist a living suffering brother on *earth* is very different to offering up a prayer to a being who, the supplicant takes for granted, is reigning with Christ, and can hear his prayers, and who will offer up those prayers to God, that the saints will “fly to his help and assistance for obtaining benefits from God, by his Son Jesus Christ.” Dr. Milner may succeed in throwing dust into the eyes of his correspondent Mr. Brown, of New Cottage; but he and his admirers must despair of succeeding with any moderately well-informed reader.

II. Gen. xxxii. 26, xlviii. 16, xviii. 2, Jos. v. 14.—The Second class of texts are taken from the Old Testament.

“That it is lawful and profitable to invoke the prayers of the angels, is plain [Dr. Milner argues], from Jacob’s asking and obtaining the angel’s blessing, with whom he had mystically wrestled (Gen. xxxii. 26), and from his invoking his own angel to bless Joseph’s sons (Gen. xlviii. 16).”—(P. 338.)

How can this sanction the invocation of a departed invisible spirit? Jacob invoked a blessing from one he could touch and see, one with whom he wrestled. It is argued, however,

that this was a *created* angel. But if we turn to the passage, we find as follows: after he wrestled with the angel "Jacob called the place Peniel, for *I have seen God face to face*, and my life is preserved" (Gen. xxxii. 24—30).

It is clear from this, that Jacob did not wrestle with a created angel. That we are correct in this interpretation, we find it clearly stated so in 12th chap. of Hosea, 3—5. According to Hosea this angel was none other than the LORD himself; and this interpretation might be supported from early Christian writers, if any such testimony were needed.<sup>a</sup>

And then Dr. Milner appeals to the alleged fact, that Jacob "invoked his own angel to bless Joseph's sons" (Gen. xlviii. 16).

The text is as follows: "And he blessed Joseph, and said, God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me all my life long unto this day, the angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads." Here it is asserted that Jacob invoked his own angel. He did not invoke any angel. It was a prayer that the angel who *redeemed* him should bless his sons. Romanists do not pretend that angels are redeemers; such an assertion would be preposterous, and contrary to their authorized teaching. The redeeming Angel was no other than the "Angel of the Covenant," the second Person of the Trinity, in which the LORD has pleased to reveal himself to us. And this interpretation, also, is borne out by the primitive writers; among others, we might specially name Eusebius,<sup>b</sup> who declared that the angel spoken of by Jacob was God the Son.

Jacob clearly speaks of God as the Angel, and the Angel as God; being the Angel or Messenger of the Covenant, God manifested to man. And observe, he does not speak of this angel as Michael, Gabriel, or other created being; but of the LORD himself, who appeared to him agreeably to the revelation of God himself recorded in a previous chapter (Gen. xxxi. 11), and thus communicated by the Patriarch to Rachel and Leah. "And the *Angel* of God spake unto me in a dream, saying, Jacob; and I said, Here am-I. And he said . . . *I am the God of Bethel where thou anointedst the pillar, and vowedst a vow unto me.*" The angel whose blessing he desired for the lads was the God to whom he had vowed a vow in Bethel, the LORD himself.<sup>c</sup>

Then again, Dr. Milner instances the fact "of the three angels who permitted Abraham *to bow himself to the ground*

<sup>a</sup> Clem. Alexandrini Pædagogus, lib. i. p. 110. Paris, 1641. Chrysostom. in cap. xlviii., Gen. Hom. lxvi., tom. iv. p. 731. Paris, 1835.

<sup>b</sup> Demonst. Evan. lib. v. cap. 10.

<sup>c</sup> See Tyler's "Prim. Christian Worship," p. 40. London, 1847.

before them" (Gen. xviii. 2), which, he says, if a sin, they were guilty of a crime, as was the other angel before whom Joshua fell on his face and worshipped (Jos. v. 14).

These two texts are introduced to nullify the force of the fact stated in Rev. xix. 10, where the angel refused to permit John to prostrate himself and adore him. "For," continues Dr. Milner, "if the mere act itself, independently of the Evangelist's mistaking him for the Deity, was forbidden, then the angels [in the two texts cited from the Old Testament] were guilty of a crime." The cases are very different. In the former, John thought the angel to be the Lord, but was told by the angel himself that he was a mere creature: "See thou do it not. I am thy fellow servant, and of thy brethren that have the testimony of Jesus: worship God." But no such acknowledgment was made in either of the latter cases. On the contrary, the angel who appeared to Joshua declared himself to be present "as captain of the host of the Lord," and commanded Joshua to loose his shoe from off his foot, for the place whereon he stood was holy; made holy by the presence of the Lord himself, for immediately after we read, "And the *Lord* said unto Joshua" (cap. vi. 2).

In the case of Abraham, there is nothing to show that he considered that the three were other than men, or that he, in the first instance, gave them other than civil respect common in the East, by bowing down. The original Hebrew word, as also the Septuagint translation *προσεκύνησεν*, or De Sacy's rendering into Latin, *se prosternavit*, does not convey an act of solemn religious worship. Chrysostom,<sup>a</sup> who treats of this passage, takes it as a matter of course that Abraham, not knowing who they were, addressed them as *men* who were passing. It is evident that his acts were simply those of common hospitality usual in the East; and that he did not worship or invoke, or otherwise treat them as angels; and therefore this text can make nothing in support of the doctrine it is quoted to uphold. But here, again, the context clearly shows that it was the Lord, the Angel of the Covenant; and this view is also clearly maintained by the early Christian writers, and particularly Justin Martyr and Athanasius.<sup>b</sup>

These are all the references that are usually made to the Old Testament, and all that Dr. Milner adduces. We now come to the New Testament. He asserts:—

III. Rev. v. 8.—"That it is lawful and profitable to invoke the prayers of the angels, is also sufficiently plain, with respect to the saints, from the

<sup>a</sup> Chrys. in cap. xviii., Gen. Hom. xli., tom. iv. p. 481. Ben. Ed. Paris, 1836.

<sup>b</sup> Athan. Ep. contra Arian. tom. i. p. 561, &c. Paris, 1698. And Justin Martyr, Dial. cum Trypho, ch. 56, p. 150, &c. Paris, 1742.



Book of Revelations [Revelation] where the four and twenty elders in heaven are said to have *golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of the saints.* Rev. v. 8." (p. 338).

The text itself is as follows:—

"And when he (one of the elders referred to in verse 5) had taken the book [which had been sealed with seven seals, which no person could open, v. 3], the four beasts [which were round about the throne of God in heaven, full of eyes, c. iv. 6], and four and twenty elders [which were also round about the throne upon seats clothed in white raiment, with crowns of gold on their heads, c. iv. 4], fell down before the Lamb [which stood in the midst of the elders, as it had been slain, having seven horns, &c., c. v. 6] having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odours, *which are the prayers of saints, and they sang a new song, saying,*" &c.

From this text he asserts it to be *sufficiently plain* that it is lawful and profitable to invoke the prayers of the saints. Granting for one moment that the "odours" in these golden vials are the "prayers of *saints*," it does not say that they are the prayers of the "saints" on earth offered up to the saints in heaven, or the prayers of the "saints" in heaven for the "saints" on earth, or prayers on behalf of themselves. The prayers of the *sinner* to the "saints," if Dr. Milner's interpretation be accepted, are in no way contemplated.

We are not prepared to deny, nor afraid to admit that a *created angel* is in question, and that the prayers of the righteous are presented, or represented before God by the Angelic Host;<sup>a</sup> but the text requires many more additional words, to gather from it what Dr. Milner would desire to make out of it as so clear.<sup>b</sup>

It is not our province to offer a precise meaning to a text which has been variously interpreted, and of which the Church of Rome has not dared to offer an authoritative explanation. According to Bellarmine's opinion a litigated text can form no ground for establishing a doctrine; and Dr. Milner is no authorized expounder of Holy Writ where his Church has affixed no dogmatic interpretation, founded on the "unanimous agreement of the Fathers."

<sup>a</sup> It is evident, from a comparison of the parallel passages, that the Saviour was *not* the angel spoken of, inasmuch as the words, "before the Lamb" are quite express. Origen says, "Angelus ejus, perpetuo faciem celestis Patris aspiciens, semper preces ejus in cælum affert, PER UNICUM PONTIFICEM, summo Deo."—Cont. Celsum, lib. viii. p. 401. Cantab. 1658.

<sup>b</sup> "That this description gives no support to the Romish theory, will appear from one or two considerations. 1. These living creatures and elders are not the redeemed in glory. They are symbolical or hieroglyphical personages. 2. They are symbolical, not of the church in heaven, but of the universal spiritual church of God on earth. 3. The only doctrine which can be legitimately founded on the passage—and it is one which accords with the entire Word of God—is, that the church on earth is constantly employed in presenting its petitions to the throne of Jehovah, and that these petitions rise before him as 'the odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God.' How remote this is from the doctrine of saint-worship, we need not waste words in showing."—Edinburgh "Lectures on Popery," p. 293-4. Ed. 1851.

IV. Luke xv. 10.—The only other text that is referred to is brought in sideways as it were, “We know that there is joy before the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth. Luke xv. 10.” (p. 337.) This is introduced to prove that angels have some cognizance of what is passing on earth; and hence it is argued that, since the angels both know and take an interest in the actions of persons on earth, they can hear our prayers and act as our intercessors.

Romanists with exultation point to this text as proof that the angels and saints have cognizance of what transpires on earth; and, by a system of development peculiar to their theology, they add, if there is joy in the presence of the angels over one sinner that repenteth, they must be directly cognizant of our actions and thoughts; and if so, why may we not reasonably implore their intercession in our behalf? To this we answer, that there is no proof whatever in Scripture that either saints or angels, of their own power, are directly cognizant of what is going on on earth; but that what they do know of us is by a direct revelation from God to them; and this very text supports this view, as the context will testify. “Then drew near unto him all the publicans and sinners for to hear him. And he spake this parable unto them, saying, What man of you, having an hundred sheep, if he lose one of them, doth not leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness, and go after that which is lost until he find it? And when he hath found it, he layeth it on his shoulders rejoicing. *And when he cometh home, he calleth together his friends and neighbours, saying unto them, Rejoice with me, for I have found my sheep which was lost. I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth more than over ninety and nine just persons which need no repentance,*” &c.; that is to say, as the man who has found the sheep which was lost calls his friends together, *and tells them of the fact* that they may rejoice with him, so God proclaims, amid the choirs of the angels and of the saints in heaven, what they were previously ignorant of, namely, that some poor sinner has repented; and then they rejoice, not because they see what is done upon earth, but because they are told by Him who has no pleasure in the death but in the repentance of his people.<sup>a</sup>

This view of the subject is not restricted to Protestants alone; we have the opinion of the great schoolman and divine of the Roman Catholic Church, Gabriel Biel, who lays it down,—First, that “saints in heaven, by their natural know-

<sup>a</sup> This interpretation is given by Scott, Doddridge, Fulke, &c.

ledge, which is the knowledge of things in their proper kind, know no prayers of ours that are here upon earth, neither mental nor vocal, by reason of the immoderate distance that is betwixt us and them." Secondly,—that "it is no part of their essential beatitude that they should see our prayers or our actions in the eternal world;" and Thirdly,—that "it is not altogether certain whether it do appertain to their accidental felicity to see our prayers:" and concludes, "from whence it may seem probable, that although it do not follow necessarily upon the saints' beatitude that they should hear our prayers of congruity, yet it may seem probable *that God revealeth unto them* all those suits which men present unto them."<sup>a</sup>

Augustine, moreover, considered that this question was by no means easy of determination, "Whether at all, or how far, or after what manner, the spirits of the dead were acquainted with the things that concerned us here."<sup>b</sup> He, no doubt, had in view the warning of St. Paul on this very subject, namely, not to intrude into those things which he had not seen.<sup>c</sup>

But what need have we to drink from "broken cisterns" which hold no water, when we have the express testimony from the fountain-head that "*the dead know nothing more; neither have any part in this world, and in the work that is done under the sun.*"<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> "Dicendum quòd sancti in Patriâ qui de facto in cœlis sunt, naturali cognitione purâ vespertina, quæ est cognitio rerum in proprio genere, nullas orationes nostrum in terrâ consistentium, neque mentales, neque vocales cognoscunt, propter immoderatam distantiam inter nos et ipsos.

"Non est de ratione beatitudinis essentialis ut nostras orationes, aut alia facta nostra, matutina cognitione videant in verbo.

"Utrùm autem videre nostras orationes pertineat ad eorum beatitudinem accidentalem, non per omnia certum est.

"Unde probabiliter dicitur, quod licet non necessario sequitur ad sanctorum beatitudinem, ut orationes nostras audiant de congruo; tamen Deus eis revelat omnia, quæ ipsis ab hominibus offeruntur."—Gab. Biel in Canone Missæ. Lect. 31, Lugdun. 1527; and see Birckbeck's "Protestant's Evidence," vol. ii. p. 249. London, 1849.

<sup>b</sup> "Respondeo magnam quidem esse quæstionem—verum vel quatenus, vel quomodo, ea quæ circa nos aguntur noverint spiritus mortuorum."—P. 1221, tom. iv. part 2. Paris, 1681.

<sup>c</sup> Col. ii. 18.

<sup>d</sup> "Douay Version of Eccl. ix. 5, 6; and see 2 Kings (Douay Version, iv. book) xxii. 20, and Job xiv. 21, to the like effect. To the text from Ecclesiastes, the Douay Bible has this important note: '*Know nothing more, viz., as to the transactions of this world, in which they have now no part unless it be revealed to them.*' The question, then, that naturally suggests itself is, if the departed know nothing of what is done under the sun, unless it be revealed to them, is it not a manifest absurdity to pray to them for their intercession to God on our behalf when these very prayers must *first* be revealed to them by God himself?"—"Romanism in England Exposed," 2nd edit. pp. 42—44. London, 1851.

SECT. V.—Dr. Milner's Proofs founded on Tradition, and his Alleged Patristic Evidence Examined.

WITH these texts Dr. Milner closes his evidence derived from Scripture; and we now proceed to his alleged proofs derived from the early Christian writers. Dr. Milner's words are many, but his proofs are few. He says:—

“The Church derived her doctrine on this and other points immediately from the Apostles before any part of the New Testament was written. The tradition was so ancient and universal, that all those Eastern churches which broke off from the central Church of Rome, a great many ages before Protestantism was heard of [or Martin Luther either, we presume], perfectly agree with her in honouring and invoking the angels and saints.”—P. 338.

These are bold words, but alas! unsupported by any proofs, though an attempt is made; and they are summed up in a few hurried references as follows:—

“With respect to our opinion, as to the earliest date of prayers to saints, I may refer you to the writings of St. Irenæus, the disciple of St. Polycarp, who introduces the Blessed Virgin praying for Eve (*Contra Hæres.* iv. c. 19); to the apology of his contemporary St. Justin the Martyr, who says, ‘We venerate and worship the angelic host and the spirits of the prophets, teaching others as we ourselves have been taught’ (*Apol.* 2 *prope init.*); and to the light of the fourth century, St. Basil, who expressly refers these practices to the Apostles, where he says, ‘I invoke the Apostles, Prophets, and Martyrs to pray for me, that God may be merciful to me and forgive me my sins. I honour and reverence their images, since these things have been ordained by tradition from the Apostles, and are practised in all our Churches’ (*Epist.* 205, tom. iii. edit. Paris). You will agree with me that I need not bring down lower than the fourth age of the Church her devotion to the Saints.”<sup>a</sup>

We will examine these references in the order given.

I. *St. Irenæus*, the disciple of *Polycarp*, we are told, “introduces the Blessed Virgin praying for Eve.” There is no passage in Irenæus to justify any such assertion. The passage alluded to has been most ably examined and vindicated by the late Rev. J. E. Tyler, in his invaluable work, “The Worship of the Virgin.”<sup>b</sup> Irenæus was Bishop of Lyons, A.D. 180. The passage referred to is as follows:—

“As Eve was seduced to fly from God, so was the Virgin Mary induced to obey him, that she might become the *advocate* of her that had fallen.”<sup>c</sup>

Irenæus wrote in Greek; the original is lost, and we have only a Latin translation. It is useless, therefore, to speculate on what the writer intended to convey by this passage. The word used in Latin is *advocata*.

It is difficult to see how the circumstance of Mary becoming the advocate of Eve, who lived so many generations before her, to whom Eve neither prayed nor invoked, can bear upon the question, whether it is lawful and right for us, now

<sup>a</sup> Letter xxxv. p. 353.

<sup>b</sup> London, 1851, pt. iii. sec. iii. p. 157, *et seq.*

<sup>c</sup> Lib. v. c. xix. p. 316. Bened. edit. Paris.

dwelling on the earth, to invoke those saints whom we believe to be in heaven.<sup>a</sup> The most that Dr. Milner can make of this passage is, that the Virgin Mary is occupied in heaven offering up prayers for Eve. This is not the question at issue. But suppose departed saints do pray for us in heaven, that can be no warranty for us to pray to them that they may pray to God for us, or that they can hear our prayers. That Irenæus had no such idea as is pretended to be conveyed is evident; for, *first*, he believed that the souls of the just were not admitted into the presence of the "Beatific Vision" until after the day of Judgment, and that the souls of those who go into unseen places assigned to them by God, and there remain *till the resurrection*, afterwards receiving again their bodies, and rising perfectly, that is, bodily; even as the Lord also rose again, so will they come again into the presence of God.<sup>b</sup> He made no exception in favour of the Virgin Mary, while the Council of Trent requires that the Saint should be actually reigning with Christ. *Secondly*, even long after her death the Blessed Virgin was prayed *for*, and not prayed *to*, under the supposition that this consummation of happiness was not yet attained by the saints: Irenæus could not have considered the Virgin his *advocate* in the modern Roman sense. And *thirdly*, Irenæus himself leaves us no room to doubt as to his belief in the efficacy of invocation of saints and angels. For example, he writes:—

"Nor does it [the Church] do anything by invocation of angels, nor by incantations, nor other depraved and curious means; but, with cleanliness, purity, and openness, directing prayers to the Lord who made all things, and calling upon the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord, it exercises its powers for the benefit and not for the seducing of mankind."<sup>c</sup>

II. Dr. Milner takes care not to lose a chance of parading names in the ranks of witnesses, hoping thereby to induce his credulous readers to imagine that all equally bear the same evidence in his favour. *Irenæus*, he tells, was the disciple of *Polycarp*, and from this he would infer that he derived this doctrine of Invocation of Saints, and of the Virgin from *Polycarp*, and thus enjoyed Apostolic sanction. We will here again follow Mr. Tyler:—*Polycarp* suffered martyrdom by fire, at a very advanced age, in Smyrna, about one hundred and thirty years after our Saviour's death. Only one epistle from this holy man's pen has survived. It is addressed to the Philippians, and in it he speaks to his brother Christians

<sup>a</sup> See Tyler's "Christian Primitive Worship," pt. 1, c. iv. p. 120. London, 1847.

<sup>b</sup> Iren. Adv. Hær. lib. v. c. 36.

<sup>c</sup> Bened. edit. Paris, 1710. Lib. ii. c. 42, sec. v. p. 166, quoted by Mr. Tyler.

of prayer—constant, incessant prayer : but the prayer of which he speaks is supplication only to God ; to any other religious invocation he never alludes. In this epistle he admonishes virgins how they ought to walk with a spotless and chaste conscience, but he makes no mention of the Virgin Mary.

It would not be out of place here to advert briefly to the epistle generally received as the genuine letter from the Church of Smyrna to the neighbouring churches, narrating the martyrdom of Polycarp. With some variations from the copy generally circulated, the letter is preserved in the works of Eusebius. On the subject of our present research its evidence is not merely negative : it purports to contain not only the sentiments of the contemporaries of Polycarp who witnessed his death, and dictated the letter, but also the very words of the martyr himself in the last prayer which he ever offered on earth. So far from countenancing the invocation of any being save God alone, or relying upon any one's advocacy and intercession except only Christ's, the letter contains a very remarkable and very interesting passage which bears directly against all exaltation of a mortal into an object of religious worship. A few extracts must suffice :—

“The Church of God which is in Smyrna, to the Church in Philomela, and to all branches of the holy Catholic Church dwelling in any place, mercy, peace, and love of God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ be multiplied.”<sup>a</sup>

Before his death Polycarp offered this prayer, or rather this thanksgiving, to God, for his mercy in deeming him worthy to suffer death for the truth :—

“Father of thy beloved and blessed Son, Jesus Christ, by whom we have received our knowledge concerning thee, the God of Angels and power, and of the whole creation, and of the whole family of the just who live before thee ; I bless thee because thou hast deemed me worthy of this day and this hour, to receive my portion among the number of the Martyrs in the cup of Christ, to the resurrection both of soul and body in the incorruption of the Holy Ghost ; among whom may I be received before thee this day in a rich and acceptable sacrifice, even as thou the true God who canst not lie, foreshowing and fulfilling, hast beforehand prepared. For this, and for all, I praise thee, I bless thee, I glorify thee, through the eternal High-priest, Jesus Christ, thy beloved Son, through whom, to thee, with Him in the Holy Ghost, be glory both now and for future ages. Amen.”

Having described his death, and the anxiety of his friends to get possession of the remains of his body, the narrative proceeds :—

“Some one then suggested to Nicetes to entreat the governor not to give up his body, lest, said he, leaving the crucified One, they should begin to worship him ; and this they said at the suggestion and importunity of the Jews, who also watched us when we would take the body from the fire. This they did, not knowing that we can never either leave Christ, who suffered for the

<sup>a</sup> Euseb. Paris, 1628, book i. hist. iv. c. xv. p. 163.

salvation of all who will be saved in all the world, or worship any other. For him, being the Son of God, we worship; but the Martyrs, as disciples and imitators of our Lord, we worthily love because of their pre-eminent good will towards their own King and Teacher, with whom may we become partakers and fellow-disciples."

In this relic of primitive antiquity we have the prayer of a holy Martyr at his last hour, offered to God alone, through Christ alone. Here we find no allusion to any other intercessor; no commending of the dying Christian's soul to the Virgin. Here also we find that Christians offered religious worship to no one but the Lord; while they loved the Martyrs, and kept their names in grateful remembrance, honouring even their ashes when the spirit had fled. Polycarp pleads no other merits, he seeks no intercession; he prays for no aid, save only his Redeemer's.

III. The second reference is to *Justin Martyr*, who is represented as saying, "We venerate and worship the angelic host, and the spirits of the Prophets, teaching others as we ourselves have been taught;" and our search for the original passage is not aided by being referred to the Second instead of the *First* Apology, as arranged in old editions of Justin. Surely, will the reader uninitiated in Romish management exclaim, this is something to the point, and worthy of attention; for it shows that Justin Martyr attests that the Christians of his time, only forty years after the death of St. John the Apostle, venerated and worshipped both the angelic host and the spirits of the departed prophets; nay, more, attests that they had been taught so to do by their predecessors, which brings the testimony up to the very lifetime of St. John!

What, however, will our good readers think of the honesty and accuracy of Dr. Milner, who thus tries to *end controversy* on the subject, when we show them, by reference to the original, which Dr. Milner avoids, of course, that the passage is not only a grossly garbled one, but clearly mistranslated, and that Justin Martyr, in fact, never said any such thing as Dr. Milner imputes to him.

The passage referred to, and intended to be cited by Dr. Milner, occurs in Justin's *First Apology*; where, having stated that the Christians could never be induced to worship the demons whom the heathens worshipped and invoked, he proceeds thus:—

"Whence also we are called Atheists (men without God); and we confess that, with regard to such supposed gods, we are Atheists; but not so with regard to the most true God, the Father of justice and temperance and of the other virtues without any mixture of evil. But both HIM and the SON, who came from Him and taught these things to us, and the host of the other good angels accompanying and made like to Him and the Prophetic Spirit, we reverence and worship, honouring them in reason and truth; and, without

grudging, delivering the doctrine to every one who is willing to learn as we were taught.”<sup>a</sup>

Now, whatever doubt a Greek scholar might possibly entertain as to the true translation of this passage in other respects (as to which we shall say a word presently), how any man of Milner’s pretensions could have dared to transmute ΠΝΕΥΜΑ τὸ προφητικόν (the prophetic spirit of God, worshipped by the primitive Christians, as He is still, as the third person of the Blessed Trinity), into the disembodied *spirits of the prophets*, is somewhat amazing! But what will not those who value short-lived victory more than permanent truth venture upon, in the vain hope that the ignorance of their readers may save them from the exposure they merit?

We admit that there is some ambiguity in the other part of the passage, and are aware, as Dr. Milner must also have been, that the ablest critics in the Roman Church are much divided as to the proper translation of the clause relating to the angels; some translating it as we do, “Him [God] and His Son who came from Him, and taught us and the army of good angels those things, and the Holy Spirit we venerate and adore;” and others, “Him and His Son who came from Him, and taught us those things, and the army of good angels and the Holy Spirit, we venerate and adore.” The former making the word “taught” govern the words, “the army of the other good angels,” while the latter makes the words, “revere and worship” govern the word, “angels.” Supposing, however, each of these constructions to be possible grammatically; that the latter cannot be the true interpretation, will, we think, be clear to any one who plainly and closely considers the matter. To suppose it, would be to impute to Christians the practice of paying to the host of angels, the selfsame reverence, worship, and honour, which we pay to the Holy Trinity, the Supreme Father, His ever blessed Son, and the Holy Spirit, and even placing the angels before the third Person of the Trinity. All will revolt from such an interpretation, as not only impious, but contrary to

<sup>a</sup> Τοῦ ἀληθεστάτου καὶ Πατρὸς δικαιοσύνης καὶ σωφροσύνης . . . ἄλλ’ ἐκείνόν τε καὶ τὸν παρ’ αὐτοῦ Υἱὸν ἐλθόντα, καὶ διδάξαντα ἡμᾶς ταῦτα, καὶ τὸν τῶν ἄλλων ἐπομένων καὶ ἰσομοιουμένων ἀγαθῶν ἀγγέλων στρατὸν, Πνεῦμά τε τὸ προφητικὸν σεβόμεθα καὶ προσκυνῶμεν.—Apol. i. sec. vi. p. 47, Bened. edit. by P. Maran. Paris, 1742.

“Et confitemur quidem nos talium qui habentur Deorum esse expertes et atheos, sed non verissimi illius Dei; *Patris* videlicet justitiæ et temperantiæ et virtutum aliarum; verum hunc ipsum et qui ab eo venit, atque hæc nos et aliorum sequentium et assimilatorum bonorum angelorum exercitum docuit Filium et Spiritum Propheticum colimus et adoramus, cum ratione et veritate venerantes, atque unicuique discere volenti et edocti sumus candide tradentes.”—Justin. Martyr, *Apologia Prima*, p. 11, cum notis Thirlbii, 1722.



the principles professed by the most celebrated Roman Catholic writers; and every candid man must, we think, admit, that if Justin Martyr had intended to represent the holy angels as objects of religious worship (which in no other passage of his writings is there the slightest trace of), he would have selected some more appropriate place for so stating, and would not so violently have thrust the mention of them among the Persons of the ever blessed Trinity, assigning to them a place between the second and third Persons of the eternal hypostatic union.

Feeling this strongly, and anxious to avoid the charge of impiety, some writers (and, among others, the Benedictine editor of Justin)<sup>a</sup> have attempted to draw a distinction between the two verbs in this passage, "reverence and worship;" alleging that the lower degree of "reverence" expressed by the latter, applies to the angels; whilst the former verb, implying the higher degree of worship, alone relates to the Godhead. But this distinction rests on a false assumption; for the two words (*σεβόμεθα*) *we reverence*, and (*προσκυνούμεν*) *we worship*, are used equally to convey the idea of the highest religious worship, as is familiar to every scholar who has studied the Septuagint and the Greek Testament.<sup>b</sup>

In determining the true meaning of an obscure passage grammatically susceptible of two different acceptations, the author himself is often his own best interpreter; and if he has expressed, in another place, the same leading sentiment without the same obscurity, and free from all doubt, surely the light borrowed from that passage ought to be used to fix the sense of the ambiguous one and establish the author's consistency?

Now, Justin, in the very same treatise, a few passages further on, again defends the Christians against the same charge of being Atheists, and on the selfsame ground—first, "that they worship the Father, who is Maker of all; secondly, the Son, proceeding from Him; and, thirdly, the Holy Ghost." In both cases he refers to the same attributes of the Son as the teacher of Christian truth, and of the Holy Ghost, as the Prophetic Spirit. The following extracts are the only parts necessary for our present purpose—"Who of sound mind will not confess that we are not Atheists, reverencing, as we do, the Maker of the universe; and Him who taught us true things and who was born for this purpose—Jesus Christ crucified under Pontius Pilate.....

<sup>a</sup> Opera Justin. Paris, 1742; Præfat. pars ii. cap. iv. p. 22.

<sup>b</sup> Exod. xxxiv. 14; Ps. xciv. (xcv.) 6; 1 Sam. (1 Kings) xv. 25; 2 Kings (4 Kings) xvii. 36; Heb. i. 6; Acts xviii. 7, 13, xix. 27.

instructed, as we are, that He is the son of the true God, and holding Him in the second place; and the Prophetic Spirit in the third order—we, with reason, honour.”<sup>a</sup> In which passage he makes no mention or allusion whatever to the angels, either before or after the Holy Spirit.

We would also, in confirmation of this view, refer our readers to another passage in the same treatise, No. 17, in which Justin distinctly says, “We adore God alone” (Θεὸν μὲν μόνον προσκυνούμεν).<sup>b</sup>

We have no doubt, therefore, that the true meaning of the passage cited in so unfair and garbled a manner (to say the least of it) by Dr. Milner, in his “End of Controversy,” is as follows—“Honouring in reason and truth, we reverence and worship Him, the Father of Righteousness, and the Son (who proceeds from Him; and instructed in those things both ourselves, and the host of the true good angels following Him, and made like unto Him), and the Prophetic Spirit”—in which interpretation we follow the learned Grabe and Langus, entitled the interpreter of Justin,<sup>c</sup> and other eminent writers.

We have now, we think, at least, said enough to satisfy our readers that Dr. Milner’s version of the passage is not to be depended on, and that Justin Martyr cannot be considered an authority for the invocation of angels. As to the invocation of saints, there is not a suggestion, we venture to assert, from one end of his work to the other.<sup>d</sup>

IV. The third and last reference is to *St. Basil*, in the passage as given above. In the foot note we are referred to “Epist. 205, t. [tom.] iii. Edit. Paris;” no doubt meaning the Benedictine Edition, but Dr. Milner avoids giving any page.

St. Basil, Bishop of Neocæsarea, died about A.D. 378. All Christians, whether in the earliest ages from his own times, or in more modern days, have agreed to do his memory honour; he is often appealed to under the title of the great teacher of truth, and acquired the name of the Great Basil, in contradistinction to the multitude of bishops and pastors of the same name who succeeded him in other times, and were fully forty in number. We need scarcely be surprised, there-

<sup>a</sup> Bened. ed. Paris, p. 51.

<sup>b</sup> Bened. ed. p. 54.

<sup>c</sup> See S. Justinii Apologia Prima cum Latina Joannis Langi versione. Edit. a J. E. Grabe, Oxoniæ, 1700, p. 11. Any one who desires to investigate the matter further will do well to consult Bishop Kaye’s excellent work on Justin Martyr, p. 53 (Second edition, London, 1836); and Mr. Tyler’s “Primitive Christian Worship,” p. 107 to 114. London, 1847.

<sup>d</sup> For these observations on the passage in question we are indebted to “The Catholic Layman.” Dublin, 1852, July, p. 85.

fore, to find many confessedly spurious works ascribed to him; and the world is deeply indebted to the labours of the learned Benedictine editor, M. Julian Garnier, who has done so much towards the separation of the supposititious from the genuine works of this eminent writer.

In vol. iii., p. 69, Bened. Ed., Paris, 1730, the epistles attributed to St. Basil are arranged in three classes. First, those written by St. Basil before he was made bishop, A.D. 370; second, those which he wrote after he was bishop of Cæsarea, between 370 and 378; third, those without date, including many doubtful, and some spurious.

In page 462, vol. iii., appears one addressed to Julian the Apostate, numbered by the Benedictine editor 360, but originally printed as No. 205—the very epistle referred to by Dr. Milner.

It is unhesitatingly ranked by the learned Benedictines, not merely as doubtful, but spurious; and no one, we apprehend, could open the book without at once noticing that it is so—for at the top of the page in which it occurs, are the words, printed in large capitals—S. BAS. CÆSAREÆ CAPPADOC. ARCHIEP. EPISTOLÆ SPURIAE.—See page 462, tom. iii. Benedict., Paris, 1730.

The epistle in question is also specially condemned, and the reasons given in the life of St. Basil prefixed to the same work (c. viii. p. 63).

Now, what is this 205th epistle but the very one to Julian the Apostate? And, we ask,—did the Rev. Dr. Milner, who wrote in 1802, ever take the trouble of reading the epistle he thus quotes, or of looking at what the Benedictine editors, who wrote seventy years before, said of its undoubted spuriousness?

If Dr. Milner had the Benedictine edition before him when he wrote, we must pronounce him guilty of actual dishonesty, in concealing the fact that deprived the quotation of any authority; if he had not, what rashness was it for a man to suppose that he was *ending controversy*, when he did not even take the pains of knowing what the best writers of his own faith had written before him on the principal authority he relied on!

Truly, we cannot but be astonished at the risks which controversialists of the Church of Rome will run, when attempting to trace back the present practices of their Church to the times of our Lord and his Apostles; and whatever judgment our candid Roman Catholic readers may form of the fairness or the learning of Dr. Milner, we think they must admit that the authorities relied on by such writers require

to be examined into with the utmost caution, before they allow themselves to adopt them as proofs that the modern doctrines of their Church agree with those of the Catholic antiquity of the primitive ages.<sup>a</sup>

SECT. VI.—The Genuine Testimony of the Fathers Adduced.

HAVING examined, *seriatim*, all Dr. Milner's authorities from the early Christian writers in support of his case, we have now only to supply evidence *omitted* by Dr. Milner.

"To invoke the saints supplicantly,"<sup>b</sup> as recommended or enjoined by the Council of Trent, is, in plain English, to call on the saints in our prayers, or to *pray to them*; and that *prayer* to any unseen being involves religious worship, we think will scarcely be controverted by the most zealous advocate of the Church of Rome. Whether the prayers be to them as *intercessors* merely, or as the *direct dispensers* of grace, assistance, and safety; or whether they amount to what the Church of Rome attempts to distinguish as *Latria*, or not—without doubt such prayers are an act of religious worship, very different in kind from any mere honour or petition offered to any fellow-creature on earth, however elevated in power or rank.

That the Fathers thought prayer a mode of addressing God alone, is proved by numberless passages in which they uniformly define it with express reference to God and no other.

*Tertullian*, A.D. 190, says in his *Apology* for the Christians of his time:—

"Those things I may not pray for *from any other, but from Him* of whom I know I shall obtain them; because, both it is *He* who is alone able to give, and I am he unto whom it appertaineth to obtain that which is requested, being his servant, who observe Him alone."<sup>c</sup>

*Clemens Alexandrinus*, A.D. 200, defines prayer by its relation to God:—

"Since there is but one good God, both we and angels *pray to Him alone* that those good things may be given us which we want, and those continued which we have."<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> We are also indebted for these observations to "The Catholic Layman," July, 1854, p. 84; and see Bp. Hopkins's "Refutation," vol. ii. p. 100.

<sup>b</sup> "Bonum atque utile suppliciter eos invocare et ob beneficia impetranda a Deo, ad eorum orationes, opem, auxiliumque confugere."

<sup>c</sup> *Apologeticus adversus Gentes*, cap. xxx. p. 67, ed. Rigalt. Paris, 1635.

<sup>d</sup> "Ὅθεν εἰκότως ἐνὸς ὄντος τῆ ἀγαθῆ Θεοῦ παρὰ αὐτῆ μόνη τῶν ἀγαθῶν τὰ μὲν δοθῆναι τὰ δὲ παραμῆναι εὐχόμεθα ἡμεῖς τε καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι.—*Strom.* l. 7, p. 853, *Opera*, ed. Potteri. Oxon. 1715.

So *Origen*, A.D. 230, in his writings against Celsus (who had said of the demons that they belong to God, and in that respect were to be prayed to, that they may be favourable to us), thus replies:—

“Away with Celsus’s counsel, saying, that we must pray to demons; for we must pray to him who is God over all; and we must pray to the Word of God, his only begotten Son, and the first-born of all creatures; and we must entreat him, that he, as High Priest, would present our prayer to his God and our God.”<sup>a</sup>

“Prayer,” says *St. Basil*, A.D. 370, “is a request of some good thing, which is made by pious men unto God.”<sup>b</sup>

“Prayer,” says *Gregory Nyssen*, A.D. 380, “is a conversing, or a conference with God.”<sup>c</sup>

“Prayer,” says *St. Chrysostom*, A.D. 400, “is a colloquy, or discourse with God.”<sup>d</sup>

“Prayer,” says *John Damascen*, A.D. 780, “is an ascension of the mind unto God, or a request of things that are fit from God.”<sup>e</sup>

Now, as the holy Scriptures assuredly do not teach us, any more than the early Fathers, to *pray* to saints, either as benefactors or intercessors, the next question is, what did the early Fathers think of *invocation*? Did they distinguish it from prayer—and did they, or not, consider it a form of worship properly due to God only?

We need not here go back even so far as the third century, for the great *St. Athanasius*, in the fourth century, is conclusive on the matter:—

“We are,” says he, “truly worshippers of God; because we *invoke no one of the creatures*, nor any mere man, but the Son, who is, by nature, from God, and true God; made man, indeed, yet not the less therefore the Lord himself, and God, and Saviour.”<sup>f</sup>

So *Novatian*, a presbyter of the Roman Church, in the third century, argues that Christ is God, *because* he is everywhere invoked:—

“If Christ was only a man, how, *when invoked, is he everywhere present*; for omnipresence is the nature not of man, but of God?”<sup>g</sup>

So *St. Ambrose*, A.D. 390, in his funeral oration on the Emperor Theodosius, says:—

<sup>a</sup> Origen, Cont. Cels., lib. viii., Oper. tom. i. Bened. ed., p. 761. Paris, 1733.

<sup>b</sup> Basil. Orat. in Julittam Martyr., Op. tom. ii. p. 35.

<sup>c</sup> Greg. Nyssen., Orat. i., de Oratione.

<sup>d</sup> Chrysost. in Genes., Homil. 30, Op. tom. i. p. 301; *vide* same, lib. i., De Orando Dom. Op. tom. ii. p. 778.

<sup>e</sup> Damascen. de Fide Orthodox., lib. iii. c. xxiv.

<sup>f</sup> Ἀλλὰ ἀληθῶς θεοσεβεις, ὅτι μηδενα των γεννητων, μη δε κοινον τινα ανθρωπον, αλλα τον εκ θεου φνσει και αληθινον θεου Υιον επικαλουμεθα.—  
Athanas. Contr. Ar. Orat. iii. Op. tom. i. p. 582, Ben. ed. Paris, 1698.

<sup>g</sup> “Si homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo adest ubique invocatus, cum hæc hominis natura non sit sed Dei, ut adesse omni loco possit. Si homo

“Thou alone art to be *invocated*, O Lord ; thou art to be requested to supply the want of him in his son.”<sup>a</sup>

*Irenæus*,<sup>b</sup> A.D. 180, in his second book against heretics, says :—

“As the Church has freely received from the Lord, so does she freely minister ; nor does she do anything by *invocation of angels*, nor by incantations, but purely and manifestly directs her *prayers to God* who made all, and calls upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

So *Origen* (cont. Cels. lib. v., p. 580, opera, Benedict. Ed. Paris, 1733) says :—

“All supplications, and prayer, and intercession, and thanksgiving, we must offer up to God who is above all, through the living Word of God who is a High Priest superior to all angels. To *invoke* angels, indeed, when men know so little about them, were itself irrational ; but, even on the supposition that we were ever so well acquainted with such mysterious wonders, still this very supposed knowledge, while it was setting forth their nature and their respective offices, would forbid us presumptuously to pray to any other than the all-sufficient Deity, through the Son of God our Saviour.”

We shall merely add here the Canon of the Council of Laodicea, A.D. 364, the decrees of which were received and approved of by the whole Church (cap. 35) :—

“That Christians ought not to forsake the Church of God, and depart aside and *invoke* angels ; therefore, if any man be found using this secret *idolatry*, let him be accursed, because he hath forsaken our Lord Jesus Christ.”<sup>c</sup>

In the epitome of the canons which Pope Adrian delivered to Charles the Great this decree is thus abridged :—

“Ut anathema sit, quicumque relicta ecclesia angelos colere, vel congregationes facere præsumperit.” “That whosoever, leaving the Church, did presume to worship angels, or to make meetings, should be accursed.”

This condemnation of prayers to angels as idolatrous was occasioned by a sect of heretics in the fourth century, who, for the purpose of exercising this unlawful worship of praying to angels, held private meetings, separate from those of the

*tantummodo* Christus, cur homo in orationibus mediator invocatur, cum invocatio hominis ad præstandam salutem inefficax judicetur.”—Novat. de Trin., c. xiv. p. 747, Oper. Tertull. Rigalt. Paris, 1635. This treatise was frequently attributed to Tertullian or Cyprian, even in the time of St. Jerome, as he remarks, Catalog. Script. Eccl., c. 81, and Apolog. Cont. Ruffin. lib. ii. Natalis Alexander has shown that the doctrine of this treatise is sound.—Hist. Eccl., sæc. ii., dissert. ix. art. iv. tom. iii. p. 411. Paris, 1714.

<sup>a</sup> “Sed tamen tu solus, Domine, *invocandus* es ; tu rogandus, ut eum in filiis repræsentes.”—Ambrose, Op. tom. ii. p. 1207, Bened. ed. Paris, 1690.

<sup>b</sup> “Nec *invocationibus* angelicis facit aliquid, nec incantationibus, nec reliqua prava curiositate, sed munde et pure et manifeste *orationes* dirigens ad Dominum, qui omnia fecit, et nomen Domini nostri Jesu Christi *invocans*.”—Advers. Hæres., lib. ii. (c. lvii.) c. xxxiii., ed. Bened., p. 166. Paris, 1710.

<sup>c</sup> “Οτι οὐ δεῖ Χριστιανοὺς ἐγκαταλείπειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἀπιέναι καὶ ἀγγέλους ὀνομάζειν ἢ συνάζεις ποιεῖν, ἕπερ ἀπηγόρευται. Ἐἴτις οὖν εὐρεθῆ ταύτη τῇ κεκρυμμένῃ εἰδωλολατρεία σχολάζων ἔστω ἀνάθεμα ὅτι ἐγκατέλιπε τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ εἰδωλολατρεία προσήλθεν.—Concil. Laod. Can. 35. Pandecta Canonum Apostol. Oxon., 1672, p. 468.

Church, in which it was not permitted; and no one ever doubted that the Council would have equally condemned, on the same principle, prayers to saints, if such had been practised in their time.

In all these passages the essential identity of religious *invocation* and *prayer* is clearly implied; and it clearly never entered into the conception of any of these ancient Fathers that we could *pray* to any beings without *worshipping* them.

The very word *adoration* is obviously taken from *adorare*, which literally is *to pray to*.

Now, would it be possible to show more strongly that it was deemed by the Church of the first, second, third, and fourth centuries, that *invocation* was a thing *proper* to God only; and that it necessarily implied the *omnipresence* of the being invoked? which would be obviously to ascribe one of the attributes of Deity to a creature, a thing which could not be done without impiety, or, indeed, idolatry.

Let us next hear the great *St. Augustine*, A.D. 400—

“Let not our point of religion be the *worship of dead men*; for, though they lived piously, still they are not to be so accounted of, as seeking from us any such honours; but they rather wish us to worship Him, through whose illumination they rejoice that we should be associates of their merit. They are to be honoured, therefore, on account of *imitation*, not to be *prayed to* on account of religion.”<sup>a</sup>

A further reason for not praying to them might be mentioned, which no less a writer than Cardinal Cajetan candidly acknowledges, *viz.*:—“*That we have no means of certainly knowing whether the saints hear our prayers*” (which would destroy, at one blow, the whole system of invoking them), “though,” adds the cardinal, “we piously believe this to be the case.”<sup>b</sup> Why there should be any piety in believing a thing without any proof either from the holy Scriptures or the ancient Fathers of the Church, we are at a loss to imagine, unless *piety* and *credulity* are to be deemed identical!

We would add one more out of many early authorities, that of *St. Epiphanius*, Bishop of Salamis, in the island of Cyprus, in the fourth century (A.D. 370), who, after censuring, at great length, the Collyridian heretics for invoking the Blessed Virgin as a sort of goddess, and declaring that Christians ought not indecorously to venerate the saints, but rather

<sup>a</sup> “Non sit nobis religio cultus hominum mortuorum. Quia, si pie vixerunt, non sic habentur, ut tales quærant honores: sed illum a nobis coli volunt, quo illuminante lætantur meriti sui nos esse consortes. Honorandi sunt ergo propter imitationem, non adorandi propter religionem.”—August. de Ver. Relig. c. lv., Oper. vol. i. p. 786. Bened. ed. Paris, 1679.

<sup>b</sup> “Certa ratione nescimus, an sancti nostra vota cognoscant, quamvis pie hoc credamus.”—Cajetan in Secundam Secundæ Quæst., lxxxviii. art. 5. Aug. Taur. 1581, p. 411.

Him who is their Sovereign Lord and Master, sums up the whole with the following admonition, which is perhaps scarcely less needed in the present day than it was in the days of the nascent Collyridian heresy:—"Let Mary be held in honour; but let the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost be worshipped. *As for Mary, let no one worship her.*"<sup>a</sup>

We think we are now in a position to assert, that the *invocation* of saints was not the practice of the ancient Church in primitive times, and we cannot but admire the boldness with which Dr. Milner appeals to primitive Christianity, by declaring his willingness to be judged by evidence of writers of those days. It is difficult, indeed, to imagine how any man, who has sworn to abide by the unanimous consent of the Fathers, can dare to appeal to Catholic antiquity in justification of praying to any created being, in the face of such authorities as we have above cited.<sup>b</sup>

---

SECT. VII.—Dr. Milner's Inconsistencies and Speculative Theories, in his vain endeavour to make us believe that the Popish Doctrine of Invocation of Saints is a "sublime and consoling" doctrine.

THE Bishop of Durham is quoted by Dr. Milner as taking an objection<sup>c</sup> to the Popish practice of invoking saints. "It is blasphemous to ascribe to angels and saints, by praying to them, *the divine attribute of universal presence*" [p. 337]. To this Dr. Milner replies, by asking a question in return, how it follows, from his praying to an angel or a saint in any place where he might be, that he necessarily believes the angel or saint to be in that place? The question is a difficult one, but he himself pretends to solve it by supposing "*that God is able to reveal to them (saints and angels) the prayers of Christians who address them here on earth.*" A few lines above this last passage Dr. Milner exclaims against the "extravagance" published by Protestants, of the "Charge of Idolatry against [Roman] Catholics, *for desiring them to pray to God for us*" [p. 336].

Taking these two passages together, it is very evident, that

<sup>a</sup> 'Ἐν τιμῇ ἔστω Μάρια· ὁ δὲ Πατήρ, καὶ Υἱὸς, καὶ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, προσκυνέισθω τὴν Μάριαν μηδεὶς προσκυνεῖτω.—Epiph. Cont. Hær. lib. iii. tom. ii. hær. 79, p. 1064. Paris ed. 1622; Colon. 1682.—"Honoretur sanè Maria: Pater vero, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus adoretur. Mariam adorare nemo velit."

<sup>b</sup> We take this also from "The Catholic Layman," June, 1854; see also Scudamore's "England and Rome," pp. 304—408. London, 1855.

<sup>c</sup> "Charge in 1810" [p. 13; p. 99 in "Two Charges and a Letter to the Clergy of the Diocese of Durham," &c., ed. 1813, p. 98].



this controversial champion was not clear in his own mind, whether saints hear the prayers of Christians on earth *directly* when "they are desired to pray to God for us," or whether these prayers come to their knowledge indirectly, by being communicated to the saints by God himself. But then Dr. Milner would have to account (which of course he does not) for the apparent absurdity of a Christian praying to a departed saint, that the saint may intercede through Christ to God for certain blessings needed, which prayers are not *directly* heard by the saint, but are first revealed by God to the particular saint invoked, who, when informed of the fact, in turn prays to God to grant the prayer of the Christian offered through him. This "extravagant" idea is suggested by Dr. Milner himself in his endeavour to escape a difficulty, and by intruding into those things which are not, nor ever were, intended to be revealed to us. Cardinal Cajetan admits "that we have no means of certainly knowing whether the saints hear our prayers."<sup>a</sup>

This difficulty has puzzled other Romish theologians beside Dr. Milner. Cardinal Bellarmine, in his treatise on the "Beatitude of the Saints" (lib. i. c. 20), writes: "Concerning the manner in which they know what is said to them, there are four opinions among the doctors:—

"1. Some say that they know them from the relation of the angels who at one time ascend to heaven, and at another time descend thence to us.

"2. Others say that the souls of the saints, as also the angels, by a certain wonderful swiftness that is natural to them, are in some measure everywhere, and themselves hear the prayers of the supplicants.

"3. Others say that the saints see in God all things from the beginning of their beatitude which in any way may appertain to themselves, and hence even our prayers that are directed to them.

"4. Others say, lastly, that the saints do not see in the Word our prayers from the beginning of their blessedness, but that our prayers are only then revealed to them by God when we pour them forth."

Thus, then, we find, according to their own admission, the subject is surrounded by uncertainties and difficulties.

We may be permitted to add here, that Dr. Wiseman, in his Moorfield Lectures,<sup>b</sup> declares it *clear* that the saints and angels *do* know what passes on earth, and that they are aware of what we do and suffer. So much for unity.

Then again, to complicate matters, particular saints are said to have particular virtues:—

"We firmly hold it to be an article of faith [says the doctor] that angels and saints have no virtue or excellence but what has been gratuitously bestowed upon them by God, for the sake of his incarnate Son, Jesus Christ; and that

<sup>a</sup> In *Secundam Secundæ Quæst.*, 88, art. v. Aug. Taur. 1581, p. 411.

<sup>b</sup> Lecture xiii. p. 103, edit. 1851.

they can procure no benefit for us by means of their prayers to the Giver of all good gifts, through their and our common Saviour, Jesus Christ. In short, they do nothing for us mortals, in heaven, but what they did while they were on earth, and what all good Christians are bound to do for each other—namely, they help us by their prayers.”—P. 335.

The plea is disingenuous: for Romanists know well that the question is concerning unseen and heavenly mediators, not about men like ourselves. We allow it to be a duty of Christians to pray for each other; but there is a great difference between desiring good men to pray for us, in the Gospel sense of that duty, and requesting saints and angels to pray for us, in the meaning of Papal rituals, specimens of which we have already submitted, which are shown to be widely different from the representations of Dr. Milner. Romanists do, in fact, supplicate saints *directly*, as if they were heard by them, to befriend the supplicant by the *saints' own inherent power*; to intercede for them at the throne of God by virtue of their personal merits, in blasphemous derogation to the all-atoning and incommunicable intercession of the Redeemer—the one Advocate between God and man.<sup>a</sup>

But supposing Dr. Milner's theory to be true, what a complicated system we should have! We all know that, under different circumstances, different saints are invoked. Peculiar saints have, according to Romanists, to use Dr. Milner's own words, peculiar “virtues and excellences which have been bestowed upon them by God.” Thus, for instance, *St. Anthony*, the abbot, secures his votaries from fire; and *St. Anthony*, of Padua, is the refuge of the timid in times of thunder and war; *St. Blase* cures disorders of the throat; *St. Genou*, the gout; *St. Lucia* heals all diseases of the eyes; *St. Nicholas* is the patron of young women who desire to be married; *St. Ramon* is their powerful protector during pregnancy; and *St. Lazarus* assists them when in labour; *St. Polonia* preserves the teeth; *St. Domingo* cures the fever; and *St. Roque* is the saint invoked under apprehensions of the plague. And thus in all diseases, under every pressure of affliction, some saint is accessible by prayer whose peculiar province it is to relieve the object of distress.<sup>b</sup>

Romanism has been termed not inaptly “baptized Paganism;” there is an exact similarity between modern Romanism and Paganism. The parallel is to be traced here

<sup>a</sup> Elliott's “Delin. of Roman Catholicism,” p. 768, ed. 1851.

<sup>b</sup> See, for further information, Brand's “Popular Antiquities,” sess. 29, vol. i. pp. 196-7, ed. 1841. Cramp's “Text Book of Popery,” p. 398. London, 1851. “Historia Imaginum,” autore Jo. Molano, pp. 532 and 504-5, edit. Lovanii, 1771. Supplement to Gibson's “Preservative,” p. 181, vol. viii. London, 1850.

also. Pagans assigned to each of their gods the power of curing peculiar diseases; they prayed to *Apollo* against the plague; to *Hercules* against epilepsy or fits; to *Juno* and *Lucina* in times of pregnancy.

The Christian Father Arnobius (Cont. Gent. 1—3) formerly taxed the Pagans for forging themselves gods, the one a carpenter, others drapers, others mariners, fiddlers, cowkeepers; and to each was assigned a particular occupation. The orators and poets worshipped *Apollo*, *Minerva*, and the Muses; the physicians *Æsculapius*, the soldiers *Mars*, the blacksmiths *Vulcan*, the hunters *Diana*.<sup>a</sup>

St. Augustine (De Civit. Dei, i. lib. c. 5) writes a whole chapter of the employments men had been pleased to assign their gods, which he thinks the most ridiculous thing imaginable. "They cut out," he says, "to every god his task, and according to that distribution, they tell you, you must direct your prayers to each of them according to his office; does not that look more like the buffoonery of a stage than the majesty of God?" Whatever the absurdity be, the Church of Rome has not scrupled to do the like, assigning to every saint his office; every one choosing for his patron him whom he believes to preside over his trade or profession, and to whom he flies in times of trouble. The cobbler and journeyman shoemaker have *St. Crispin*, the tanner has *St. Clement*, the sailor *St. Nicholas*, and the printer *St. John* or *Daniel*, or *St. Luke*, or *St. Jerom*, or *Augustinè*, according to the quarter of Europe in which he dwells, though *Moses* is considered most appropriate. *St. Andrew* and *St. Joseph* are the patron saints of carpenters; *St. Anthony* of swineherds and grocers; *St. Blaise* of wool-combers; *St. Catherine* of spinners; *St. Cloud* of nailsmiths; *St. Eloy* of blacksmiths, farriers, and goldsmiths; *St. Euloge* [who is probably the same with *St. Eloy*] of smiths, though some say of jockeys; *St. Florian* of mercers; *St. Francis* of butchers; *St. George* of clothiers; *St. Anne* and *St. Goodman*, sometimes called *St. Gutman*, of tailors; *St. Gore*, also called *St. Goarin*, with the devil on his shoulders and a pot in his hand, of potters; *St. Hilary* of coopers; *St. John Port-Latin* of booksellers; *St. Josse* and *St. Urban* of ploughmen; *St. Leodagar* of drapers; *St. Leonard* of locksmiths as well as of captives; *St. Lewis* of periwig-makers; *St. Martin* of master shoemakers; *St. Nicholas* of parish clerks, and also of butchers as well as sailors; *St. Peter* of fishmongers; *St. Sebastian* of pinmakers, on account of being stuck with arrows; *St. Severies* of fullers;

<sup>a</sup> See "Roma Antiqua et Recens," by James du Pré. London, 1850. Cap. vii. p. 181.

*St. Stephen* of weavers; *St. Tibba* of falconers; *St. Wilfred*, *St. Hubert*, also *St. Honor* or *Honoré*, of bakers; *St. William* of hatmakers; *St. Windeline* of shepherds; and *St. Gertrude* is pleased to condescend so far as to be the friend of rat-catchers.<sup>a</sup>

But of all the saints REGINA MARIA reigns paramount as "Queen of Heaven." Pope Gregory XVI. claimed her as a patroness of peculiar worth. He showed his signal attachment to her in his encyclical letter addressed to the Prelates of the Romish Church in 1832, shortly after his assumption of the pontifical dignity. In the beginning of his letter his Holiness observes:—

"We select for the date of our letter the most joyful day (Feb. 15) on which we celebrate the solemn festival of the most Blessed Virgin's triumphant assumption into heaven, that she, who has been through every great calamity our patroness and protectress, may watch over us writing to you, and lead our mind by her heavenly influence to those counsels which may prove most salutary to Christ's flock."

The closing paragraph contains the following sentence:—

"But that all may have a successful and happy issue, let us raise our eyes to the most Blessed Virgin Mary, who alone destroys heresies, *who is our greatest hope—yea, the entire ground of our hope.* May she exert her patronage to draw down an efficacious blessing on our desires, our plans, and our proceedings, in the present straitened condition of the Lord's flock."<sup>b</sup>

This looks very much as if the Pope considered that the Blessed Virgin was not a secondary actor in the matter of our salvation, and we must presume that Roman Catholics take her out of the general list of saints, and place her on a higher and different footing. Now with regard to the patron saints enumerated, does a Roman Catholic pretend to assert with Dr. Milner, that when he addresses his prayers to one of these, he really believes that God has bestowed on that particular saint the peculiar "virtue or excellence" stated to be attributed to him or her, and that on the prayer being offered up by the Christian, the ALMIGHTY seeks out that particular saint endowed with *the* peculiar "virtue and excellence," and informs him or her of the prayers of the sufferer and his wants, and that this saint in turn, as the special advocate of that peculiar class of sufferers, prays to God as he before did while he was on earth, and then, after

<sup>a</sup> Let it not be considered that we are loading our pages with the notice of bygone absurdities. From the aspect of the times, and the tendency manifested to *club* in defence [See "Brit. Protestant," Oct. 1856, p. 171] of mother Church, there is no delusion or folly of former days but may be resuscitated in our own, if it will only subserve the formation of companies and *guilds*, and make individuals of *importance*, who before floated about, belonging to nothing out of the *common* way, besides being in another direction so interesting and so poetical.

<sup>b</sup> The Laity's Directory for 1833.

this roundabout process, the supplicant's prayer is rendered efficacious? To such "extravagance" does this Popish system lead!

It is quite a common thing to be told by Roman Catholics that because we Protestants do not practise saint-worship, or appeal to them as our intercessors and advocates, we can neither appreciate nor practically believe, a point in our common creed, the "*Communion of Saints*."

We all know that there is a "communion of saints" on earth, when there is mutual and congregational prayer and holy intercourse; and that there is a "communion of saints" in heaven, when they join with the angelic host in singing prayers and praises before the throne of grace; and that there will be a universal and perfect "communion of saints" when that happy period shall arrive, when "it shall come to pass, that the wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall eat straw like the bullock, and dust shall be the serpent's meat."—Isa. lxx. 25.

Our Roman Catholic brethren, however, consider that "communion of saints" must necessarily mean the act of praying to them as our intercessors. Forgetting, however, his *indirect* theory of intercession, and carried away by the grandness of his theme, Dr. Milner bursts out into extravagant laudation of the advantages enjoyed by the Romanist by reason of a supposed *direct* intercourse with angels by a "communion of saints," and of the "profitableness of invoking their prayers." "How sublime and consoling!" he exclaims, "how animating is the doctrine and practice of true Catholics, compared with the opinions of Protestants!<sup>a</sup> We hold *daily* and hourly converse, to our unspeakable comfort and advantage, with the angelic choirs, with the venerable patriarchs and prophets of ancient times, with the heroes of Christianity," &c. (p. 339). Sublime, indeed, for every shoemaker to have his *St. Crispin*, for every baker to have *St. Wilfred*, the carpenter his *St. Joseph*, and, last of all, a *Santa Rita* (as in Spain)<sup>b</sup> to accomplish impossibilities; though we must not omit the patron of thieves and highwaymen, who were commonly called *clerks of St. Nicholas*, and used to invoke him as devoutly for a rich booty as the rogues of ancient Rome

<sup>a</sup> These pleasant notions of the great advantages attendant on this companionship have been adopted by Mr. Keenan, in Scotland. He enlarges upon them in his "Romish Catechism," and argues how, urged by the kindlier feelings of our nature, if "we throw aside for a moment dreary, dry, unloving Presbyterianism," we think about "bright angels" and the lovely Maria, and obtain such treats as never were.—See Montgomery's "Popery as it exists in Great Britain and Ireland," Edinb. 1854, pp. 395, 452.

<sup>b</sup> "Roman Catholicism in Spain," by a resident. Edinb. 1850, p. 110.

did the goddess Laverna, or the modern Italian banditti make vows to the Virgin Mary.<sup>a</sup> "Consoling," indeed, is it for those who have a *St. Polonia* for a dentist, a *St. Ramon* for a man-midwife, a *St. Nicholas* to cheer up old maids. Only contemplate these "unspeakable comforts and advantages" our Roman Catholic brethren enjoy, of which we, poor benighted Protestants, are deprived! What Protestant does not envy the daily and hourly converse which is supposed to take place between the supplicant and the departed saint. But Dr. Milner forgets in his rhapsody that, according to his own theory, there is no communion, since neither of the parties can hear each other. God is represented as communicating the prayer offered up to the patron saint. The saint does not comprehend what is asked until it is revealed to him. If our Roman Catholic brethren call this holding converse or "communion with saints," we can only say that such an idea of conversing strikes us as very peculiar and original, only paralleled by the process employed by modern spirit-rappers, who invoke the spirit through a medium.

But again, there is another difficulty in the way of this Milnerian theory, and one not easily got over: the votary may be supplicating an imaginary spirit, a saint who does not exist, nor ever has existed. Who can vouch for the fact of the existence of any departed spirit in heaven among the beatified "reigning with Christ" (p. 339), "contemplating the wonderful ways of God's providence with all his creatures here on earth?" (p. 337.) This is no random supposition suggested by the sceptical whim of a Protestant. We are tempted to hazard an heretical unbelief from having read a strange occurrence related by Cardinal Bellarmine, the truth of which we are happily not called upon to vouch. It is gravely related by this cardinal "that the people [of the Church of Rome] did, for a long time, celebrate some one for a martyr, who, as related by Sulpitius in his 'Life of St. Martin,' afterwards did appear, and told them that he had been a thief and was damned!"<sup>b</sup> "How sublime and consoling! how animating" must these feelings have been! The party was doubtless invoked, prayed to, "for a long time." What "unspeakable comfort and advantage, to hold daily and hourly converse" with one who had been a thief and was damned!<sup>c</sup>

That some of these so-called saints never existed at all can

<sup>a</sup> "Protestant Guardian," vol. i. p. 301, note.

<sup>b</sup> Bell. de Sanct. Beat., lib. i. cap. vii. tom. ii. p. 397. Pragæ, 1721.

<sup>c</sup> See Horne's "Romanism Contradictory to the Bible," sec. iv. London, 1827; or "Protestant Journal," 1832, p. 411.

be proved from the testimony of Roman Catholic writers. We take the following extract from the eminent Romish ritualist, Cassander.<sup>a</sup> "There is," he says, "another error, not uncommon; that neglecting, in a manner, the ancient and known saints, the common people worship more ardently and diligently the new and unknown, of whose holiness we have but little assurance, and some of whom are known to us only by revelation, insomuch that of several of them it is justly doubted whether ever there were such persons in the world;" and he says that "St. Martin found a place, honoured in the name of a holy martyr, to be the sepulchre of a wicked robber."<sup>b</sup> Boniface VIII. caused Hermannus Ferrariens (who had been canonized for a saint), after thirty years, to be taken out of his grave, and burned in A.D. 1300. Then witness the exposure made by our Bishop Usher. According to our monkish historians, St. Amphibolus was bishop of the Isle of Man, and fellow-martyr and disciple of St. Alban, and was worshipped as a saint and martyr; but the matter turns out to be a mistake arising from a misunderstanding of a passage in the old acts or legends of St. Alban. In this the Amphibolus mentioned was nothing more than a cloak, which Alban happened to have at the time of his execution. It is a word derived from the Greek, and signifies a rough shaggy cloak, which was usually worn by ecclesiastical persons of that age. So that these people worshipped an old shaggy cloak for a saint!<sup>c</sup> almost as great an imposition as the so-called holy coat of Tréves. And another curious fact has come to light. There are two Popes, Zephyrinus and Callistus, in the calendar of canonized saints, who are even at this day invoked, and whose memory is recorded in the book of "lying wonders," the Roman Breviary.<sup>d</sup> We find, by the lately-discovered work of Hippolytus,<sup>e</sup> that both these individuals were a scandal to the Church, and held heretical doctrines on the personality and the divinity of THE SON.

Moreover Rome finds it, at times, a very good plan to forego those "sublime" fancies herself, if a temporary withdrawing of them will secure her some proselytes. *Mr. Veron*

<sup>a</sup> Cassander, Consult. p. 971. Paris, 1616.

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.* Art. 21, de Art. Relig., p. 973. Edit. 1616.

<sup>c</sup> Usher, De Brit. Eccles. Primord., c. xiv. p. 539, 4to. Quoted by D. Middleton, in his "Letter from Rome."

<sup>d</sup> See Collect in the Festival of Zephyrinus, 26th August. Brev. Rom., p. 1055, edit. Ratisbon, 1840; and Collect on the Festival of Callistus, October 14th. *Ibid.* p. 1151.

<sup>e</sup> St. Hippolytus, "Philosophumena; sive Refutatio Hæresium," lib. ix. sive x. p. 278, *et seq.* edit. M. Miller; and see Wordsworth's "Hippolytus," cap. xii. *et seq.* London, 1853.

—an authority—teaches us, in his “Rule of the Catholic Faith,” “that it is not of faith, that the saints in heaven hear the prayers of the living;” that “it is not of faith, that the saints are our mediators, and that rather that this character belongs to Christ only;” that “the canonization of the saints is no article of faith; in other words, it is no article of faith that the saints whom we invoke—for instance, St. Laurence, St. Vincent, St. Gervase, and St. Blase, St. Chrysostom, Ambrose, Dominic, &c.—are really saints, and in the number of the blessed.”<sup>a</sup> While, on the other hand, it is dogmatically laid down by a great authority, Ferraris,<sup>b</sup> with respect to the saints that are to be worshipped:—

“No one should be venerated as a saint, without the licence of the Pope; though during his lifetime he may have wrought miracles. (Tom. vii. sect. i.) Hence he only is properly and strictly taken as a saint, and worthy of veneration, who is duly canonized by the Pope enrolling his name in the register, or publicly, solemnly, and canonically entering it in the number and catalogue of Saints, and declaring and defining him to be such by a published decree, that he may be esteemed and worshipped by all. (Sect. ii.) The Pope being assured, by the instinct of the Holy Spirit, of the person’s sanctity, and of his being in glory, issues his diploma, or breve of his beatification. (Sect. xii.) Hence many noted doctors hold that it is an article of faith that the Pope cannot err in the canonization or beatification of Saints. (Sect. xv.) It is not certain who was the first Pope who canonized Saints. Many hold that the first canonization solemnly celebrated was by Leo III., A.D. 804.” (Sect. xix.)

But it was not until A.D. 1160, under Alexander III., that the first decree of canonization of Saints was issued, which ordained that none should be from thenceforward acknowledged Saint but whom the Pope declared to be such.

And this is the Church where only *sure* teaching is to be obtained! It would be well surely that the relations of individuals about to be canonized were aware of these drawbacks; they would save themselves in pocket at least, besides escaping the building on a mere sand-bank.<sup>c</sup> But these are trifles in the list of inconsistencies. Let us rather ponder over the “sublime and consoling” privilege which we—poor Protestants, though claiming to be true Catholics—have cast away. Let us suppose that Dr. Milner does not hold the *indirect* theory, but with Dr. Wiseman, and the great bulk of Romanists, claims for the suppliant “a daily and hourly

<sup>a</sup> Veron’s “Rule of Catholic Faith,” pp. 81, 83, 84. Birmingham, 1833.

<sup>b</sup> Ferraris F. L. “Encyclopædia Ecclesiastica, sive Prompta Bibliotheca,” tom. viii. 4to. Francof., 1781. See tom. vii. “Veneratio Sanctorum.”

<sup>c</sup> “The fees of all sorts have been considerably raised since the days of John XXII., and were so exorbitant in the seventeenth century, that a relation of Cardinal Borromeo, a Saint of Paul the Fifth’s manufacture, pathetically entreated his children that they would content themselves with being *honest* men, and never think of becoming *Saints*, as the canonization of their cousin had proved a most ruinous concern; and his rage for working miracles, instead of being any benefit to his kindred, had well-nigh reduced them all to beggary.”—See “Protestant Guardian,” I. 139, note.



converse" with departed and beatified spirits; then consider the position in which this notion places us, for example, with the supposed Queen of Heaven, Rome's *Marie*.<sup>a</sup> Every Romanist is bound to offer to her at least two prayers every day, morning and evening. All who use the rosary (and the more devout are accustomed to that exercise) extend this number to 150. Let us take into calculation the seven canonical hours of the monks and nuns, and the daily masses of the priests throughout the world, and we presume that the average for the whole Church of Rome would be very moderately stated at ten Hail Marys each day for every man, woman, and child belonging to their communion. Now, there are 128 millions of persons attached to that Church, to say nothing of all the rest who, as they claim, ought to be attached to it, and who, because they are not so attached, are charitably shut out from the hope of salvation. This, of course, gives the Virgin Mary the privilege of hearing (or having revealed to her, as the case may be) 1,280,000,000 petitions every day. Supposing the worship to be constant and unceasing, each hour of the twenty-four would contain, on the average, 53,333,333, or nearly fifty-four millions of these petitions; each minute would include about 889,000,000; and each second 14,814, or nearly fifteen thousand. And as we have allowed ten Hail Marys for each worshipper, the result would be that fifteen hundred souls must pass in review before the Virgin Mary *every second*, day and night, even if she had no other occupation than to attend to them; and of these she is expected to know all their wants, all their feelings, all their temptations, all their sins, and to give them the benefit of her influence, her protection and her prayers, so as to secure their salvation!

What wild absurdity to expect such a work as this at the hands of a creature, unless we first contrive to believe that creature to be invested with the attributes of God! Against Scripture, against reason, and against the true *Catholic* Church, how wonderfully the infatuation which Romanism has succeeded in establishing during the dark ages of European ignorance, and which the assumed infallibility of the Papal Church will not suffer her to reform away, even in the light of the nineteenth century! What is there, we ask, *sublime or consoling* in such a phantom of extravagance? What advantage could be gained to the Church, even if it were possible that the Almighty should have laid such a burden

<sup>a</sup> The rest of this article we take from Hopkins's "End of Controversy Refuted," vol. ii. p. 66, *et seq.* New York, 1854.

on the shoulders of the ever-blessed Virgin? How infinitely more sublime and consoling is it to know that the mighty providence of God is exercised by Him who alone can exercise it—by Him who is indeed Omnipresent, Omniscient, Omnipotent—by Him who beholds, without effort, the past, the present, and the future—by Him who is the King Almighty, immortal and invisible, by whom and for whom all things were created, and in whom all things consist—by Him who has promised that He will never leave us nor forsake us—by Him who is the true Head of his Church—**THE LORD JESUS CHRIST, God over all, blessed for ever! AMEN!**

---

## CONCLUSION.

WE have now brought to a conclusion the task which we proposed to ourselves, of exposing "the pious frauds" and misrepresentations contained in Dr. Milner's "End of Controversy." How far that task has been accomplished the reader must judge for himself; we can only say that we are not conscious of having, in the necessarily few subjects treated of in Part I. and II., omitted, or passed over any point of importance without investigating it to the utmost of our power; and that, whatever defects may be discovered in what we have written, will not, we trust, be imputed either to negligence, or to a wish to misrepresent, in a single instance, the practice or teaching of the Church of Rome. Our sole aim has been to discover and establish the TRUTH, whilst exposing the misrepresentations with which the work we undertook to examine so fearfully abounds; we have endeavoured to give a faithful account of what we found, carefully observing the rule, "nothing extenuate nor set down aught in malice."

To error in reasoning all men are liable, and, therefore, no degree of criminality may attach to the "lame and impotent conclusions" so often arrived at by Dr. Milner; but it is otherwise with regard to direct misrepresentation of facts, especially in those cases wherein ignorance can only be the result of culpable negligence or of criminal indifference. Some of the misrepresentations which it has been our painful duty to expose, are so glaring, that it is difficult to conceive how a dignitary of the Church of Rome, whose very position required that he should be a scholar, "a ripe and good one," and also an expert theologian, could perpetuate them in pure ignorance. Yet such misrepresentations abound in "The End of Controversy," and have been allowed to disgrace the pages of that work, in successive editions, to the present time. We cannot help asking ourselves the question, "Is it possible that such things can be the result of mere carelessness or inattention, or are they the fruits of a most reckless disregard of the truth?" Let the question be answered how it may, the answer must be fatal to the cause which is sought to be supported by such unworthy means. But a further consideration is forced upon us, when we remember that it is not in *one* or *two* solitary instances that such *manifest* misstatements occur; and that no attempt has ever been made, on the part of Romanists, to explain or disown them; but, on the contrary, "The End of Controversy" is extensively circulated, and spoken of as unanswerable. When we think of this, we are tempted to ask, "Is not only the doctrine of *equivocation* sanctioned by the practice of Rome, but even *direct untruths* approved, when they appear to serve her cause or to blacken the character of her opponents?" Alas, that we should be compelled to say so of any *professedly* Christian community! the answer must be in the *affirmative*. To make good this assertion we are not driven to the works of Sanchez nor of his hopeful follower Liguori (with regard to whose works, the Church of Rome has recorded her deliberate judgment, that they contain *not one word worthy of censure*); we find the doctrine of equivocation thus sanctioned in a note on Genesis xii. 13, "*My Sister*. This was no lie; because she was his niece, being daughter to his brother Aaron, and therefore, in the style of the Hebrews, she might truly be called his *sister*, as Lot is called Abraham's brother."<sup>a</sup> No *lie!* though the *object* was to deceive; and we know that the Egyptian king *was* deceived by the assertion of Abraham, and, when undeceived by the interposition of God himself, severely rebuked the patriarch for the deceit he had practised. Compare the truthful

---

<sup>a</sup> The Holy Bible translated from the Latin Vulgate, &c. Dublin, printed by Richard Coyne, bookseller to the college of St. Patrick, Maynooth, 1833.

statement in the Scripture of Abraham's backsliding with the *equivocal* note of the Divines of Douay, and sanctioned by the approbation of Dr. Murray. But we have said that Rome can sanction even that which she acknowledges to be a *lie*, whenever an emergency may seem to render such sanction necessary; and we are able to make good our assertion by adducing the note of the Douay Divines appended to Genesis xxvii. 19, "*I am Esau thy first-born.*" St. Augustine (L. contra Mendacium, c. 10), treating at large upon this place, excuseth Jacob from a lie, because this whole passage was mysterious, as relating to the preference which was afterwards to be given to the Gentiles before the carnal Jews, which Jacob by prophetic light might understand. So far is certain, that the first birthright, both by divine election and by Esau's free cession, belonged to Jacob: so that if there was any lie in the case, it would be no more than an officious and venial one." <sup>a</sup> "If there was any lie in the case!" The simple and truthful narrative of the Scripture shows us that there *was* a lie, and that both Jacob himself and Rebecca, at whose instigation Jacob was induced to utter the falsehood, were fully conscious of it, and of the probable consequences; nor, indeed, as the Scripture informs us, did either Jacob or Rebecca escape the punishment of their deceitful dealing. The Bible records this lamentable defection in Jacob for our *admonition*, whereas the Romish divines would have us believe that it is recorded for our *imitation*: "So that if there be any lie in the case, it could be no more than an officious and venial one."

But to return to our "Refutation of Milner:" if the reader should think that much more might have been said upon some important points, we must beg him to remember that we were necessarily restricted by the limits of a work intended to answer such a book as that of Milner, and, confined to the briefest form compatible with perspicuity; we have, moreover, given such abundant references, that whoever wishes for further information on such points can be at no loss where to search for it. If, on the other hand, some of our readers may think that we have been, occasionally, somewhat tedious, we must request them to bear in mind, that an illogical argument or a false representation may be stated in a *very few* words, whilst it may require *many* words to expose the misrepresentation, and to refute the illogical argument whose conclusion has been drawn from *false premises*, involving, perhaps, *more than one misrepresentation*. We have endeavoured to show, and we trust successfully, that Dr. Milner has signally failed in the proofs he has adduced in support of the doctrines of Rome which we have reviewed, both from Scripture and from the Fathers, and that he has equally failed in his attempts to adduce evidence in favour of Romish superstitions from the works of learned and eminent divines of the Protestant communion.

The observations which apply to the work of Dr. Milner are equally applicable to the writings of Dr. Wiseman, and of others who have pursued a similar course. Unwise, truly, is the builder who constructs his edifice upon a foundation of sand, and expects it to abide unshaken the pressure of the flood and the fury of the storm! But, surely, still greater is the folly of the man, who, when he may build upon a foundation of solid rock, seeks to cover the firm surface of that rock, ere he proceeds to build, with a depth of unstable and shifting sand! Yet, of such folly has Rome been guilty; she "has overlaid the foundation"—the solid rock of scriptural truth—with respect to that system of superstitious and corrupt doctrine and practice which distinguishes her from every truly Catholic community. Of this she is fully conscious, and would fain prevent her deluded children instituting a comparison between the immovable rock of Scripture, and the mere shifting sands of human inventions and fictitious traditions; or, she would persuade them that these crumbling materials partake of the solidity of the rock itself,<sup>b</sup> and are equally trustworthy. To bolster up

<sup>a</sup> The Holy Bible translated from the Latin Vulgate, &c. Dublin, printed by Richard Coyne, bookseller to the college of St. Patrick, Maynooth, 1833.

<sup>b</sup> The Council of Trent speaks of receiving and venerating the Scripture and tradition, "*pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia.*"—Sessio iv. Sec. 1, of the Canonical Scriptures.

this pretence has she invented the doctrine of infallibility—a most suicidal proceeding, for, if her claim to infallibility is just, then the stern facts of history, the contradictory Decrees of Councils and Bulls of Popes, show us that *such* infallibility cannot be relied upon, and, if we may so speak, that the Church has derived no benefit from an infallibility which is itself fallible. Whilst we repudiate the traditions of Rome, which she declares to be of equal authority with the sacred Scriptures, we do not undervalue the assistance we may derive from the writings of those venerable men “the Fathers;” nor should we—for, when carefully and candidly examined, their writings afford no support to the superstitions and corruptions of Rome; and, whatever may be their failings, for they were, like ourselves, fallible men, yet, if on any one point there be a “unanimous consent of the Fathers,” it is in referring us to the Bible as the *sole foundation of Faith*. We might adduce numberless passages in support of this assertion, but we will content ourselves with presenting to our readers the advice of St. Basil the Great:—

“If you know how to search the Scriptures for the help they offer you, you will have no need of my aid, or of that of any other person, to guide you in your conduct. You will have the illumination of the Holy Spirit to enlighten you; that is to say, you will draw your light from the source of light itself.” “*Work out your salvation with fear and trembling*; but I conjure you not to suffer anything like distrust to take possession of your soul; nothing can be more hurtful to its interests. Are you not in the service of the best of masters? is He not always willing to come to your assistance? Look up to Him with faith, and you will find that not only He will never abandon you, but every time you pray to Him with sincerity and confidence, you will feel His presence in the interior of your soul; He will deign Himself to say to you, ‘Here am I.’”<sup>a</sup> Perhaps the very best antidote to Romish error, is a careful and candid examination of Rome’s authorized teaching and the works of her most eminent divines, and a comparison of her peculiar tenets with the teaching of Holy Scripture; to the reader who has time and opportunity to make such comparison we may safely leave the answer to the all-important question, “Rome or the Bible,—Which?”<sup>b</sup>

---

<sup>a</sup> “Letter to a Lady,” cited in “The Book of the Fathers,” pp. 164, 165. London, T. W. Parker, West Strand, 1837.

<sup>b</sup> See an admirable Lecture by the Rev. H. B. Kennedy, D.D., Head Master of Shrewsbury School, and Prebendary of Lichfield, delivered at St. Chad’s Church, Shrewsbury, April 10, 1851.

ANTI-ROMISH WORKS  
BY  
CHARLES HASTINGS COLLETTE.

---

In Two Parts, Post Free, 5s. each, or 9s. together,  
**MILNER REFUTED,**  
Or Pious Frauds Exemplified in Dr. Milner's "End of Religious  
Controversy."

---

Second Edition, Post Free, price 2s. 8d.  
**ROMANISM IN ENGLAND EXPOSED.**

---

Post free, price 1s. 1d.  
**POPISH INFALLIBILITY.**

---

Post free, price 2s. 8d.  
**THE POPE'S SUPREMACY**  
A Thing of Priestcraft alike unwarranted by Holy Scripture  
or Tradition.

---

Also, price 1s. 1d. per post,  
**TWO LECTURES ON THE INVOCATION OF SAINTS.**  
No. I.—THE DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.  
No. II.—HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

*N.B.—Any of the above Works will be transmitted by post, on receipt of a  
post-office order or postage-stamps, by MR. WILLIAM PENNY, Printer and  
Publisher, 57, Lincoln's-Inn Fields, London.*

---

Price 7d. post free, pp. 105.  
**PIOUS FRAUDS EXEMPLIFIED**  
IN  
**DR. WISEMAN'S LECTURES.**  
No. I.—PURGATORY.  
Young Men's Tract Association, No. 2, Hornsey-road, Islington.

---

Price 1d.  
**A TRACT FOR CARDINAL WISEMAN**  
On CHAP. VI. of St. JOHN'S GOSPEL.


*N.B.—Grants of this Tract may be obtained at half-price, on application  
addressed to the Secretary of the YOUNG MEN'S TRACT ASSOCIATION, No. 2,  
Hornsey-row, Islington, London.*

2









THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE  
STAMPED BELOW

AN INITIAL FINE OF 25 CENTS  
WILL BE ASSESSED FOR FAILURE TO RETURN  
THIS BOOK ON THE DATE DUE. THE PENALTY  
WILL INCREASE TO 50 CENTS ON THE FOURTH  
DAY AND TO \$1.00 ON THE SEVENTH DAY  
OVERDUE.

DEC 2 1942

JAN 20 1943

DEC 7 1943

74 Jan '62 JF

Kiefer

FEB 14 1963

JAN 19 1963

7 Feb '63 SS

REC'D LD

FEB 7 1963

REC'D GIN MAR 2 '77

YC 440TT

27544

BX 1765

C3

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

