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INTRODUCTION.

In the following series of letters much will be found which originally appeared in two pamphlets, entitled, "The Catholic Church Vindicated," addressed by the present writer to the late Archdeacon Hodson, and published respectively in the years 1838 and 1840. There may also be found a few extracts from another pamphlet, which was chiefly of local interest, entitled, "Rome, Purgatory, Indulgences, &c.," published in the year 1863. The occasion of the present publication was a series of letters which appeared in the Midland Counties Express, a weekly paper published at Wolverhampton, in the year 1867 and the commencement of 1868. In a letter addressed to the editor, June 8, 1867, an influential member of the Town Council asserted that in the Roman Catholic Church "indulgences and absolutions, which might be purchased at any price from two shillings upwards, would enable" the purchaser "to commit any sin—from reading the Bible to murder—with impunity." The truth of the assertion was immediately questioned by a Catholic solicitor (Mr. J. Hawksford); and in order to bring the question to an issue Mr. Hawksford offered to give fifty pounds to the Wolver-
hampton Infirmary, on the writer's "producing and proving the official authority of any indulgence to commit sin, issuing either from the Pope personally, or jointly with the constituted authorities of the Roman Catholic Church, or by the constituted authority of such Church only." Several letters from persons in the neighbourhood had appeared on both sides of the question, when the present writer, in a letter addressed to the editor, observed that Mr. Hawksford's pledge "was not one of a merely personal or local interest, but that as far as the circulation of the Express extended, Catholics generally were interested in it; that should one such document as Mr. Hawksford had specified be produced, the fifty pounds would be forfeited, and the stigma of its having been authoritatively issued would be felt as a reproach by the Catholic body." He observed, further, that the evidence which had so far been adduced in support of the assertion had been chiefly derived from certain documents entitled, "Taxæ Cancellarie, &c." (or Tax-tables of the Roman Chancery and Penitentiary), and from certain indulgences granted, or said to have been granted, by the Holy See; and, as a Catholic deeply interested in the question, he begged permission to controvert such evidence, and endeavour to demonstrate its fallacy. In reference to the question of indulgences, a challenge shortly appeared in the following terms:—"Mr. Green proposes, through your paper, to discuss the question of indulgences [?]. I hereby publicly offer to discuss with him the subject, and I undertake to prove that the present recognized teaching and practice of the Roman Church is a novel invention, unscriptural, delusive, dangerous, a pious fraud, and a
cheat" [!]. The author of the challenge was Mr. Charles Hastings Collette, a London solicitor, of No. 23, Lincoln's Inn Fields, the author of several controversial works, and more recently known to the public as the secretary and attorney to the "Society for the Suppression of Vice." In the following number of the Express (Aug. 31), assuming that his challenge would be accepted, he inserted a letter, headed "Romish Indulgences: The £50 Prize claimed;" in the course of which, he wrote as follows:

"I can produce a form of Indulgence which will satisfy the most fastidious unbeliever . . . and which will clearly entitle the Hospital to claim the £50. Ferraris gives several examples of a similar kind of Indulgence as the following . . . and, in order to satisfy myself that all the editions of this work are alike,* I have consulted another edition, Title, 'Ferraris, Bibl. Prompt., sub voce Indulgentia,' tom. iv. pp. 98-111, Bonon. 1758. The following form is found in p. 98, et passim, 'We mercifully grant in the Lord a plenary indulgence and remission of all their sins, by these presents, to be valid for all future times, with a power of applying the same plenary indulgence to the souls in purgatory.' The Latin is 'Plenariam omnium peccatorum suorum indulgentiam et remissionem misericorditer in Domino concedimus, præsens, perpetuis, futuris, temporibus valuturis, cum facultate etiam eandem plenariam indulgentiam applicandi animabus in Purgatorio.' † . . . .

* He had previously quoted from a Frankfort edition (Edit. Francof. 1781).
† N.B. The only part of the above quotation to be found in page 98, is the latter part, beginning with the words "cum facultate"
"The only question is, do the terms of this Indulgence come within the challenge to entitle the Hospital to call for the £50? I maintain, if I hold an ordinary plenary indulgence, that it operates for the past and present, with a clean sheet to commence again, but if I hold a present indulgence of the above form, 'to be valid for all future times,' I need not get the license renewed, for it operates as a forgiveness of all future punishments for future sins to be hereafter committed. 'Things that are equal to the same are equal to each other.' And, therefore, this is practically a license for future sins, and immunity from future punishments: Q. E. D."

The present writer replied to the letter sufficiently, he believes, in the judgment of the editor and his readers, to neutralize the claim to the £50. He at the same time respectfully declined the modest and courteous challenge, observing that the question, which he had undertaken to deal with, was the truth or falsehood of the charge which had been urged against the Catholic Church; that with regard to Indulgences, the question at issue was not whether the Catholic doctrine respecting them is true or false, but, 1. whether they are directly or equivalently a license to commit sin, and 2. whether they may be sold; that Mr. Collett was, of course, at liberty to write on Indulgences as extensively as he might please, and in any style that might suit his taste, but that he (the present writer) was not engaged in any discussion with him, nor would under-
take to correct any further misstatements, except so far as they might affect the charge in question.

Mr. Collette continued the course that he had commenced, and wrote a series of letters on the "forgiveness of sins," and the general question of "Indulgences." The present writer deviated somewhat from his original purpose of not noticing Mr. Collette's letters, partly for the more correct information of the readers of the Express, and partly to support his own statements. The editor having impartially admitted the letters from both parties, free of expense, for the space of two months, eventually signified that the next letter from each must be the conclusion of the series. Subsequently, some further letters were inserted by both parties, as advertisements; and Mr. Collette signified that he should shortly publish the whole of the so-called correspondence in a pamphlet. The publication gave occasion to the following three letters, which finally closed the newspaper controversy:

[ADVERTISEMENT.]

MR. C. H. COLLETTE.

To the Editor of the Midland Counties Express.

Sir,—I have read Mr. Collette's pamphlet, entitled, "Indulgences and Forgiveness of Sins," purporting to be a reprint of certain letters on those subjects, written by Mr. Collette and myself, and lately published in the columns of the Midland Counties Express. Your readers are aware that to test the correctness of certain quotations, translations, and assertions, on the part of Mr. Collette, I chal-
lenged the production of the relative documents, pledging myself to pay the costs of his inserting the same as advertisements in the *Express*, and to give, in each case, to the Wolverhampton Hospital the sum of five pounds. The called-for documents did not appear; but in a letter to the *Express* (December 27), he stated that he was "putting in print . . . . a complete reply" to the said challenges, which he characterised as "propositions profusely backed by wagers."

Your readers will remember that one of the said challenges* was as follows:—"Mr. Collette's translation [of the words 'Plenariam omnium peccatorum suorum indulgentiam et remissionem misericorditer in Domino concedimus. Præsentibus perpetuis temporibus valituris'] is: *We mercifully grant in the Lord a plenary indulgence and remission of all their sins, to be valid for the present, in perpetuity, and for all future times.*" (See Pamphlet, p. 178.) "Any Latin scholar would at once perceive that he is most egregiously mistaken. He has applied the term *valituris* (a participle in the ablative case) to the terms *indulgentiam et remissionem* (substantives in the accusative). An essential rule of Latin grammar is against him. The only term to which the Latin grammar and common sense can apply the term *valituris*, is the word *Præsentibus*; and the true literal translation will be: 'The present letter (or these presents) to be valid in perpetual future times.' If, however, as on a former occasion, Mr. Collette should contend for the correctness of his translation, let him consult the head-master of any incorporated grammar-school; and if, from the said head-master he can procure a duly authenticated certificate of the correctness of his said translation, he

* For other challenges see Appendix G.
may publish the said certificate in your next number at my expense, and I will give the hospital the sum of five pounds. —Let your readers bear in mind that unless the correctness of the said translation be established, the whole of Mr. Collette's boasted theory, and repeated assertions, as to indulgences being pardons of sins future, and practically therefore licenses of sinning, must at once fall to the ground.” (Letter, Nov. 23.)

Mr. Collette produced no certificate; he has “put in print” no reply whatever to the above “proposition;” he has suppressed, indeed, the proposition itself altogether; it does not appear in his pamphlet.

It will not be requisite for me to expose the fallacies of the (so-called) “complete reply,” with reference to the other “propositions,” nor to vindicate myself from the charges of “disingenuousness,” and “equivocation,” or from any other charge which Mr. Collette may have alleged against me. How far he is entitled to credit for honesty or truthfulness, in any of his quotations or assertions, he has himself supplied the evidence. I observed in a former letter (Jan. 4) that to misquote and misrepresent the statements of an opponent seemed to be his habitual practice; but I was not prepared to expect the following extraordinary exemplification. In my letter of Nov. 9, I had quoted correctly from the Summary of an Indulgence, in Mendham's "Memoirs of the Council of Trent" (p. 356), a passage containing the following words:—“And since you [N. N.] have contributed an alms of seven sueldos and three dineros de ordites, money of Catalonia . . . . we declare, &c.” * Mr. Collette,

* See the quotation in Letter XIII. p. 113.
in his pamphlet (p. 193), has quoted the same passage without the words "an alms of," and has subjoined the following note:—"Mr. Green has here interpolated 'An alms of,' and then argues on those interpolated words;" and in another note, in the following page, he has added, "An alms, is interpolated." The truth in plain English is, he has omitted the three words from his own false copy, and falsely accused me of having foisted them into mine. Now, Sir, I send you the volume of Mendham's "Memoirs," and a copy of Mr. Collette's pamphlet. I also enclose with this letter a Bank of England five-pound note; and my request is, that if you find that Mr. Collette's charge against me is true, and that the words "an alms of" are not in the original, you will hand over the five-pound note to the treasurer or secretary of the hospital, and insert a copy of his receipt of the same, at my expense, as an advertisement in your next number. The result of this appeal will be that either I must appear before your readers as a dishonest interpolator, or Mr. Collette will be known to them as a fraudulent copyist, and a detected "false witness."

I shall answer Mr. Collette's misstatements, and misrepresentations of Catholic doctrine, in a treatise on Indulgences, &c., that I am preparing for the press.

I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

T. L. GREEN.

ALDENHAM, March 5, 1868.

P.S.—You will oblige me by sending a copy of the Express in which this letter may appear to Mr. Collette,
and one copy each to the Secretary and Treasurer of the hospital.

The following is Mr. Collette's reply: it was published in the next number of the Express, March 21, 1868.

MR. COLLETTE AND THE REV. T. L. GREEN.

To the Editor of the Midland Counties Express.

Sir,—Mr. Green makes two charges against me in his letter last week. 1st, That I have mistranslated a Latin passage; 2nd, That I have improperly charged him with omitting [?] the words "an alms of" from a "Summary of an Indulgence" quoted by him. In the first charge he is wrong. In the second he is right; and while I have to express my regret for the error, I am not ashamed to avow it. Over such a vast range of quotations, extending to nearly 200, this is the only mistake Mr. Green has succeeded in detecting [?] after many months' study. In his letter of 9th of November, (p. 198 of my reprint,) he quotes in a most imperfect and garbled manner a "Summary of an Indulgence" purporting to be from Mr. Mendham's "Memoirs of the History of the Council of Trent," as will be seen by the indications [ ] in my reprint, thus exposing all Mr. Green's omissions, which are not only numerous but very significant; I charged Mr. Green with mutilating this document in a most improper manner, particularly in those parts which affected the controversy between us; namely, that "by virtue of the same Indulgence" it purported to grant the privilege of "extracting a soul from purgatory" by the act of visiting some altar "seven times,
praying to God for the union and victory of the Christian princes against the infidels,” on certain specified days; and this, from the very next paragraph in question, clearly establishing the fact Mr. Green had been contending for—as to the necessity of a previous contrition and confession, in order to gain an Indulgence was not necessary. The other omission of which I charged him was the clause “dispensing and compounding for irregularities.” These omissions from the document he was quoting, were of vital importance to the controversy and the arguments I had maintained,* whereas the two words I charged him with omitting, [?] but which I admit he did not omit, were really of little comparative consequence. My error arose by sending the book to my stationer to copy out the entire lengthy document, and the two words were accidentally omitted from that copy. I compared Mr. Green’s version with that copy, which, as your readers will see, was translated in full; hence the error, purely accidental, but which I admit to be a most unjustifiable negligence on my part. I deserve all Mr. Green says. I admit my error. But has Mr. Green reserved no censure for himself for the very strange and serious omissions by him, that the Indulgence permitted us to dispense and compound for irregularities?†

* To the question with which Mr. Green had to deal—viz., whether Indulgences were remissions of sin, or whether Indulgences or Absolutions could be sold, the omissions were all irrelevant. In the present work, however (Letter XIII.), the omissions complained of are supplied.

† The omission was irrelevant; it is nevertheless supplied. Respecting “Compositions,” in cases of dispensation, see Letter XIX., page 180, Note.
And that by visiting an altar a soul was (stated as a fact) extracted from purgatory, in virtue of the same plenary indulgence! Mr. Green is sharp upon me; he could not have omitted to see my other and serious charges against him, but he has taken up my manifest slip to cover his own shortcomings of a similar nature. Mr. Green promises us a pamphlet on Indulgences; he will be doing us a favour by explaining how he knows that "a soul is extracted from purgatory in virtue of the same plenary Indulgence," and whether in fact this is not a cheat.*

You, Sir, have the book in hand; the passages omitted by Mr. Green are found in p. 353, last paragraph [p. 192, last paragraph, of my reprint]; and page 357, [page 193 of my reprint].

But witness, again, Mr. Green's most unjustifiable mutilation of his quotation from the "Protestant Historian Soames" [p. 187]. Why did he expunge the only parts that told against him?† Again Mr. Green has left unexplained why he omitted from the mass of citations from the decrees of Trent, in explaining the Doctrine of Penance, the

* See Letter XIII., page 116.
† Mr. Collette had contended that Indulgences were remissions of sin, properly speaking; and the point was essential to his argument. Soames was quoted merely as negative evidence against him, inasmuch as he states that Indulgences "came at length to consist in the remission of canonical penances, the license to eat forbidden meats on fasting days, the power of choosing a Confessor, and a deliverance from the penal fires of purgatory," but that none of those points were equivalent to a remission of sins in the sense contended for by Mr. Collette. The question as to how far, as a Protestant writer, he might agree with Mr. Collette on other points was of course irrelevant.
only single decree which really bore on the point, namely, that explaining the difference of *contrition* and *attrition,* [p. 149.] I do not advance this as a justification for my gross negligence in that one instance, but there are such buildings as glass houses.

You hold the £5; I submit to your readers whether it is not fairly forfeited, on two occasions. My quotation from Morinus [p. 107] referred to by me as from Lib. xx., Mr. Green staked £5 if I produced the passage from "Lib. xx.,” he desired to convey, and did convey, to your readers that the *passage itself was a misquotation, and not to be found in Morinus, whereas the passage was correct, but the reference should have been "Lib. xxii."† Mr. Green was not chivalrous enough to admit his discomfiture. [See p. 210.] Again he staked another £5 on the alleged fact that in every instance a full stop preceded “Praesentibus.” [p. 206.] I proved it to be otherwise, even in the Bologna edition. [See p. 207-9, 205, &c.]‡

On the first charge I plead “not guilty.” Mr. Green is disingenuous and unfair. Had he quoted the entire passage, it would appear that the alleged mistranslation “We mercifully grant in the Lord a plenary Indulgence and remission of all their sins to be valid for the present, in perpetuity, and for all future times” was not my translation, [?] for I added [see p. 178, line 42] “I have translated *praesentibus*” in a former letter 'by these presents.' On consulting a

* See Letter X.
† Mr. Collette has here, in three instances, put “Lib.” instead of “Cap.” See Appendix G.—VI.
‡ See Appendix G.—III.
Roman priest, he says, I am decidedly wrong; he says it refers to present sins.” Now, right or wrong, it is evident from what I said in the very passage quoted against me, that the translation is not mine, [?] and Mr. Green by stopping short in his quotation shifts upon me an alleged false translation which he says should be “presentibus, by these presents.” * If Mr. Green will turn to the two previous places referred to, where I before quote the passage [pp. 104 and 118] he will find I give my own translation, which is the one he approves of, “by these presents.” †

This controversy with Mr. Green has been to him a terrible blow. If he can in any way, on whatever immaterial points or issues, catch me tripping he makes capital of it, thereby hoping to throw discredit on my entire labours. When I caught him tripping over Morinus, I wrote to him privately, and pointed out his error, and gave him an opportunity of correcting that error. I felt that I could afford to be generous.‡ Those of your readers who have read the entire controversy will see how Mr. Green

* Mr. Collette’s express words were “Which I” [not the Roman priest] “translate as follows: “We mercifully grant, &c.”

† Mr. Collette’s former translation “by these presents,” is but one shade less faulty than the other; and was never approved of by Mr. Green. He invariably applies the expression “to be valid” to the Indulgence, and not to the “presents.” The form in which “by these presents” is usually rendered, is “per has presentes.”

‡ He wrote to Mr. Green “privately,” and Mr. Green replied to him privately; and, without permission, he published the private letters. But even a private letter in Mr. Collette’s hands could not escape mutilation. Mr. Green wrote to him, “You make strange mistakes;” Mr. Collette took the liberty to reduce the plural to a singular, and published, in its stead, “You make a strange mistake.”
INTRODUCTION.

has appreciated my forbearance. Nos. 3 and 4 of the Protestant Library is a bitter pill for him.*

I trust Mr. Green, in his proposed pamphlet, will follow my example and print my arguments entire, as I have done his, and not omit those parts which are inconvenient to answer.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

C. H. COLLETTE.

23, LINCOLN'S-INN FIELDS.

In the next number, March 28, appeared the following:—

FAREWELL TO MR. C. H. COLLETTE.

To the Editor of the Midland Counties Express.

Sir,—Mr. Collette, in his letter of last Saturday, has only further exemplified his habitual practice of misrepresentation. I submit to your readers one specimen. He asserts in the outset that one charge which I made against him in my last letter was, that he had “improperly charged me with omitting the words, ‘an alms of’ from a Summary of Indulgence quoted by me” from Mendham’s “Memoirs of the Council of Trent.” The assertion is untrue, and the untrue assertion is followed by a tissue of misrepresentations. The assertion is untrue in more respects than one; it is untrue that he had charged me with omitting the

* Its bitterness was neutralized by a conscious sense of honesty, and a belief that a good cause needs neither falsehood nor fraud for its defence.

Digitized by Google
words "an alms of;" and it is equally untrue that I "made a charge against him" to that effect. The truth is that the omission occurs in his own quotation from Mendham—and not in mine; and the plea of its having been accidental is inadmissible. He has not only omitted the words from his own said quotation, but he has charged me with having interpolated, i.e. with having forged the words and fraudulently inserted them in mine. The charge is so gratuitous, and so grossly false, that I could not for a while persuade myself that Mr. Collette could culpably have made it. My impression was, that he must have been misled by some new and corrupt edition of Mendham's "Memoirs" (if perchance there were one), and that the fraudulent omission might be attributable to the editor of the same, and not to Mr. Collette. But the excuse could not be found; a London publisher assured me that no new or second edition of the work had ever appeared.

Fortunately, the truth or falsehood of the charge was capable of being tested; and, accordingly, I sent you, a fortnight ago, the volume of Mendham's "Memoirs," and a copy of Mr. Collette's pamphlet; I also enclosed with my letter a five-pound note, and requested that if you should find that his charge against me was true, you would hand over the five-pound note to the treasurer or secretary of the hospital, and publish his acknowledgment of the receipt thereof, at my expense, as an advertisement in your next number. I observed, moreover, that the result of that test would be, that either I must appear before your readers
as a dishonest interpolator, or Mr. Collette would be known to them as a fraudulent copyist, and a detected false witness. Now, Sir, the result of that test was determined last Saturday by the non-appearance in your columns of any acknowledgment of receipt. Your readers must at once have been convinced that I am not the dishonest interpolator; and if Mr. Collette is now known to them as a "fraudulent copyist and a detected false witness," I have only to say "Farewell to him." I need not reply to any charge which a detected false witness may urge against me. I shall not trouble your readers with any further notice of Mr. Collette.

I remain, Sir, your obedient Servant,

T. L. GREEN.

ALDENHAM, 25th March, 1868.

P.S.—You will oblige me by sending to Mr. Collette a copy of the Express in which this letter may appear.

Mr. Collette did not reply.
INDULGENCES, ABSOLUTIONS, AND TAX-TABLES.

LETTER I.

TEMPORAL PUNISHMENT.

To * * * * *

Sir,—The purport of the following series of Letters is chiefly to vindicate the Catholic Church from the charge of venality which Protestant writers have repeatedly urged against her. Amongst others, Elliott, in his Delineation of Roman Catholicism, says:—"The Tax-Book of the Roman Chancery fixes a price for the absolution of such crimes as the sovereign Pontiff only can forgive . . . . the truth is, that the absolution of those sins which are reserved for the Pope's pardon may be had for money."* Another writer has recently asserted that her "indulgences and absolutions," which, he says, may be "purchased at any time for two shillings, upwards," would enable the purchaser to "commit any sin—from murder to reading the Bible—with impunity."† And another, Mr. C. H. Collette, tells us that he is "persuaded that at any time a Roman Catholic may obtain a plenary indulgence, which is a leave to commit sin."‡ The evidence adduced in support of such charges

† Mr. Richard Lees (Midland Counties Express, June 8, 1867).
‡ "Indulgences and the Forgiveness of Sins," p. 103.
has chiefly been derived from the language of certain indulgences granted, or said to have been granted, by certain individual popes, and from certain documents, entitled "Taxœ Cancellariae et Sacrae Penitentiariœ Romanae;" or, "Tax-Tables of the Chancery and the Sacred Penitentiary of Rome." To meet such charges I propose to explain the real doctrine of the Catholic Church on the question of Indulgences and the Forgiveness of Sins, as far as those charges and other statements of opponents may affect it, and to show that, consistently with that doctrine, neither a leave to commit sin can upon any terms be granted, nor can any indulgence or pardon of sins be sold.

According to an official document, published some years ago by the English Catholic bishops, an indulgence "is not a leave to commit sin, nor a pardon of sins future, nor, properly speaking, any pardon of sin at all; but it is only a releasing of the temporal punishment that often remains to be suffered for sins, which as to their guilt and eternal punishment have been already remitted." A more ample definition of an indulgence will be given in a future letter. The Catholic Church teaches that a twofold punishment is due to sin, viz., the eternal punishment of hell in the next world, and a punishment which, being limited in its duration, is called the temporal punishment. We see the principle exemplified in the first sin that man committed. When Adam had sinned in paradise by eating the forbidden fruit, not only was he doomed to the everlasting torments of hell in the next world, but he was sentenced also to a life of sorrow and hard labour here and eventually to death: "Cursed is the ground for thy sake," said Almighty God to him; "in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life. Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee. . . . In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it
The Catholic Church teaches also that, although upon true repentance, through the merits of Christ's sufferings, the guilt and eternal punishment of sin may be remitted, the temporal punishment may yet remain to be endured. Of this position there are several illustrations in the sacred volume. We know, from experience as well as from Scripture, that though, according to the common opinion of divines, Adam repented, and, through faith and repentance, and the merits of a future Saviour, obtained the remission of the eternal punishment (otherwise due to his sin), he certainly did not obtain the remission of the temporal punishment. The earth to this day still bears its curse; it still brings forth its thorns and thistles; and "all the years that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years; and he died."† Again, we know from Scripture that the guilt of that sin, and the consequent liability to its punishment, have devolved upon all his posterity; that "by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned";‡ and further, that "by the offence of one judgment came unto all men to condemnation."§ And the same is set forth in the Articles and Liturgy of the Church of England. In the "Ministration of Public Baptism of Infants" (Book of Common Prayer) it is declared that "all men are conceived and born in sin . . . . and that none can enter into the kingdom of God, except he be regenerate and born anew of water and the Holy Ghost"; and the ninth of the Thirty-nine Articles declares that "in every person born into this world" this original or birth-sin "deserveth God's wrath and damnation." But the selfsame Liturgy, and the

* Gen. iii. 17, 18, 19. † Gen. v. 5.
‡ Romans v. 12. § Romans v. 18.
twenty-seventh also of the said Thirty-nine Articles, declare that this original or birth sin is remitted by baptism; and that infants, as well as adults, receive by baptism the remission of their sins, and are spiritually regenerated, justified, and sanctified.* Now it cannot possibly be denied that in infants regenerated, justified, and sanctified, both the guilt and eternal punishment of their original or birth-sin must be entirely cancelled; and that a baptized infant, if it dies, is received immediately into heaven. And yet, though the guilt and eternal punishment are certainly remitted, the temporal punishment is not remitted. That temporal punishment of our original or birth-sin is death and the various sufferings which precede and accompany it; and the baptized infant, though regenerated, justified, and sanctified, and never having been guilty of any actual transgression of its own, undergoes that temporal punishment, and dies, as commonly and indiscriminately as the infant that is not baptized. Both Scripture and experience then illustrate

* "Baptism is not only a sign of profession and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened; but it is also a sign of regeneration and new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the Church, the promises of the forgiveness of sin, and of adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost are visibly signed and sealed," &c. Art. xxvii.—"Almighty and everlasting God, look upon this child; wash him, and sanctify him with the Holy Ghost." . . . . "We call upon Thee for this infant, that he, coming to Thy holy baptism, may receive the remission of his sins by spiritual regeneration." . . . . "Dearly beloved, ye have brought this child here to be baptized; ye have prayed that our Lord Jesus Christ would vouchsafe to receive him, to release him of his sins," &c. . . . . "Ye have heard also that our Lord Jesus Christ hath promised in His gospel to grant all these things that ye have prayed for," &c. And (the baptism having been administered) "Seeing now, dearly beloved, this child is regenerate, let us give thanks," &c.—Baptism of Infants, Book of Common Prayer.
and confirm this Catholic doctrine, that a twofold punishment is due to sin, and that the one part is not necessarily remitted with the other. Indeed, the temporal punishment due to our original or birth-sin has in no case ever been remitted.

The same principle is also exemplified in Scripture with regard to actual sin, or sin committed by ourselves. A remarkable illustration may be seen in the 12th chapter of the second Book of Kings (al. 2 Samuel). It is there recorded that David, having been guilty of those two most dreadful crimes of adultery and murder, the prophet Nathan was commissioned to admonish him of his guilt, and to denounce the judgments of Heaven against him. The conscious monarch at once acknowledged his sinfulness, and became on the spot a sincere penitent; and the prophet declared to him that "the Lord also had taken away his sin, and that he should not die"; but that "nevertheless, because he had given occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, for this thing the child that was born to him should surely die." The only penalty here denounced against him on account of his having given occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme (which was rather an aggravating circumstance of the other sins than itself a distinct sin), was that the child should "surely die." The prophet, however, had previously announced to him that the "sword should never depart from his house," and that certain other severe afflictions which he specified should befall him; and we learn from the Scripture that although upon his repentance the Lord had taken away his sin, these temporal punishments were each of them inflicted. Now why, it may be asked, was the humble penitent to undergo these severe inflictions (which were all, be it observed, denounced as punishments of his sin), if it were not that the temporal punishment was not
remitted with the "guilt," and that the Catholic distinction between the remission of one and the remission of the other, with reference to actual sin as well as original, is both correct and Scriptural?

A still further exemplification of this Catholic distinction is recorded in the 14th chapter of the Book of Numbers. We read there that the Israelites had murmured against Moses and Aaron, and that the Lord declared to Moses that he would "smite them with the pestilence, and disinherit them, and make of him a greater nation and mightier than they." But Moses remonstrated with Almighty God, and represented to Him that if He should do so, and "kill all the people as one man," then the nations would say: "Because the Lord was not able to bring this people into the land which He sware unto them, therefore He hath slain them in the wilderness"; and he concluded with this prayer: "Pardon, I beseech Thee, the iniquity of this people, according to the greatness of Thy mercy, and as Thou hast forgiven this people from Egypt until now. And the Lord said, I have pardoned according to thy word: but as truly as I live . . . . because all these men . . . . have tempted Me now these ten times, and have not hearkened to my voice; surely they shall not see the land which I sware unto their fathers, neither shall any of them that provoked Me see it. . . . Say unto them, As truly as I live, saith the Lord . . . . your carcasses shall fall in this wilderness . . . . and your children shall wander in this wilderness forty years. . . . After the number of the days in which ye searched the land, even forty days, each day for a year shall ye bear your iniquities."

From these Scriptural statements it must be sufficiently manifest, 1. That the people had grievously sinned, and were liable, of course, to damnation. 2. That the temporal punishment decreed against them was that they should be
presently smitten with the pestilence, and utterly destroyed as a people. 3. That at the prayer of Moses God *pardoned* them; but, 4. That nevertheless He decreed against them another temporal punishment, which the subsequent history informs us He rigorously executed upon them. And the following inferences may be deduced, viz.:

1. Either this pardon of the *iniquity* of this people was a pardon of iniquity (or sin) *properly speaking,* or it was *not.* If it was, as far as the text informs us it would seem to have been granted unconditionally. There is no mention of faith, or repentance, or prayer (as proceeding from them), or alms, or fasting, or any other such Scriptural accompaniments and conditions; and, of course, the *essentials,* such as faith and repentance, and the like, must be supposed. And further, notwithstanding the fact of the iniquity being *pardoned,* the temporal punishment was as manifestly *not* *pardoned,* and the Catholic distinction between the remission of guilt and the remission of temporal punishment is again proved to be Scriptural.

2. And if, on the other hand, this pardon of iniquity (or sin) was *not* a pardon of iniquity (or sin) *properly speaking,* but only a remission of that severe temporal punishment with which they had been previously threatened, viz., that they should be smitten with the pestilence and utterly destroyed as a people, it must in that case be conceded that the word "*iniquity*" may be Scripturally used in a sense not properly speaking its own; and the reader may not unreasonably be prepared to expect that perhaps the "*pardon of sins," granted in certain Popes' Bulls of Indulgences, may not have been a pardon of sins *properly speaking,* but "only a remission of the whole or a part of the temporal punishment that often remains to be suffered for sins, which as to their guilt and *eternal* punishment have been remitted."

In accordance, then, with these Scriptural positions, the
Catholic Church has at all times believed that a twofold punishment is due to sin, and that the one part is not necessarily remitted with the other. She believes, yet further, and both Scripture and experience confirm the doctrine, that neither rewards nor punishments, according to the measure of God's justice, are dispensed in this life. It is undoubtedly true that the most abandoned reprobates are often known to be the most successful and prosperous; and David tells us that his "feet were almost moved," his "steps had well-nigh slipped . . . . seeing the prosperity of sinners."—Ps. lxxii. (al. lxxiii.). And wisely and mercifully has Providence decreed that such should be the case. Unfortunately the goods and evils of this life make a deeper impression on the minds of Christians in general, than the prospects of those of the future. Neither heaven nor hell, from a want of due reflection, produces much practical effect upon the conduct of the world at large. And how few indeed would have courage to repent of their wickedness, and to change their lives, if they knew from experience that their repentance would be followed by a change in their earthly circumstances; that the temporal punishment of their past crimes would necessarily be inflicted here; and that whether the remaining portion of their lives might be destined to be long or short, the whole must be inevitably endured, and that want of duration could only be compensated by increased proportion of severity. From reason then, and Scripture, and the attributes of the Deity, and the experience of every observer, we may confidently assume that rewards and punishments, in proportion to the measure of God's justice, are not administered in this world. And the Catholic Church teaches, that as with regard to those who die unrepentant, and to whom an eternity of punishment is due, there is a place prepared for that punishment to be inflicted; so with regard to those to whom
the guilt and eternal punishment may have been remitted, but to whom a proportion of temporal punishment still remains due, there is a place or state prepared for the infliction of that also; and that from that place or state they will not be suffered to depart till they have paid the last farthing.* It is of such temporal punishment with regard to another world, and not of any sufferings or afflictions which God may be pleased to send us in this life, that an Indulgence is said to be a remission. The correctness, however, or incorrectness of the above-stated doctrines of the Catholic Church is not the question at issue. I have stated and explained them to enable the reader to understand more correctly still further explanations of the real nature of an Indulgence. The question that I have to deal with is: Whether Indulgences or Absolutions are a licence, or "leave to commit sin," and whether, consistently with the doctrine of the Catholic Church, Indulgences or the Forgiveness of Sins may be sold. I propose in the next letter to explain the Catholic doctrine respecting the Forgiveness of Sins.

I remain, &c.

T. L. G.

* The Catholic doctrine of Purgatory, or a place or state of temporal punishment in another world, is further supported by the scriptural distinction between mortal and venial sin. Neander, alluding to a controversy, in the second century, "between a milder and a more rigid party on the subject of Church penance," says: "All were agreed in distinguishing those sins into which all Christians might fall through the sinfulness of their nature, and those which being wholly inconsistent with the character of the regenerate, clearly indicate that the transgressor had again fallen under the bondage of sin,—between peccata venalia and peccata mortalia, or ad mortem. These terms, they had derived from the first Epistle of St. John" (1 John v. 16, 17).—Neander's Church History, vol. i. p. 307. London, 1853.—See Appendix A.
LETTER II.

FORGIVENESS OF SINS.

To * * * * *

SIR,—It is an essential principle of the Catholic religion that no one can forgive sins in his own right, but God alone; and that no forgiveness of sins can be obtained from Him but through the merits of the “One Mediator,” our Lord and Redeemer, Jesus Christ. The Council of Trent expressly declares that the author of our justification is a “Merciful God, who gratuitously washeth and sanctifieth us, sealing and anointing us with the Holy Spirit of promise who is the pledge of our inheritance; and that He, who merited it for us, is His most beloved and only begotten son our Lord Jesus Christ, who, when we were enemies—for His exceeding great charity wherewith He loved us—by His own most sacred suffering on the cross merited for us justification, and made satisfaction for us to His Father.”*

It teaches, however, that although this divine Saviour “died for all, yet all do not receive the benefit of His death, but those only to whom the merit of His suffering is communicated;”† and that this communication of the merits of His suffering for the remission of sin, neither to infants nor adults, can take place in the first instance, without “the laver of regeneration, or a desire of the same, as it is written, Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.”‡

By this “laver of regeneration” the Catholic Church

* Sess. VI. De Justif. cap. vii.                     † Ib. cap. iii.
†† Ib. cap. iv.
understands the sacrament of Baptism, which she elsewhere characterizes as the "instrumental cause of justification," and declares to be essentially necessary for salvation.† A similar declaration had been previously made in the Synod held at Exeter in the year 1287.‡ And respecting baptism, her doctrine is that when administered to infants, by applying to their souls the merit of Christ Jesus it frees them from the guilt of their original sin, and the eternal punishment due to it; and when administered to adults who have never been previously baptized, and who by God's preventing and assisting grace are duly prepared for its reception, it remits not only the guilt and eternal punishment of their original sin, but also the guilt and punishment, eternal and temporal, of every actual sin of which they have been previously guilty; for that "in them that are regenerate there is nothing that God hateth, there is no condemnation to them that are buried together with Christ by baptism into death, who walk not according to the flesh, but who, stripping off the old man and putting on the new man, who is created according to God, are rendered innocent, immaculate, pure, blameless, and beloved of God, heirs indeed of God and joint-heirs with Christ, so that nothing remains which could hinder them from entering into heaven."§

But baptism is not the only means by which, in the communion of the Catholic Church, the forgiveness of sins is administered. Baptism can never, to the same individual, be administered more than once; and unfortunately such

are the frailty and corruption of our fallen nature, that the number of those is small in the extreme, who preserve unspotted throughout life their baptismal purity. The Holy Scripture assures us that, "in many things we all offend, and that if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." And the Council of Trent teaches that God, "who is rich in mercy, and who knoweth our frame, has been pleased to provide for us a remedy"; and that "in behalf of those who, after baptism, fall away by sin, Christ Jesus instituted the sacrament of Penance when He said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained."† And the Catholic doctrine is that by this holy sacrament the sins are remitted which are committed after baptism; and that as with regard to those who are not regenerate, there is no remission of sin, and consequently no salvation, because no application of the merits of Christ, except through the sacrament of Baptism; so, in ordinary circumstances, with regard to those who have been baptized, and have afterwards fallen away from the grace of their justification, there is no remission of sin, and consequently no salvation, because no application of the merits of Christ, except through the sacrament of Penance. The holy fathers in their writings, and in sundry councils, appropriately called it the second plank after the shipwreck of lost grace,‡ baptism being called the first.§ And the Council of Trent expressly declares that the "sacrament of Penance is neces-

* Sess XIV. De Pœn. cap. i.
† Sess. VI. De Just. cap. xiv.
§ Syn. Exon. ut supra.
sary for salvation for those who fall after baptism, as baptism itself is for those who are not regenerate."*

To obtain, however, the remission of sins through the sacrament of Penance, certain conditions on the part of the applicant are requisite. To explain or enumerate them all would be irrelevant to the present question. Suffice it to state that next to true faith, which, as the Council of Trent observes, is the "commencement of human salvation, the foundation and root of all justification, and without which it is impossible to please God, and attain to the fellowship of His children,"† the first and most important condition is true and heartfelt contrition (si vere fuerint corde contriti). The recipient must be truly and sincerely sorry for the sins which he has committed, and be firmly resolved, by the assistance of God’s grace, not to sin in future. Without this indispensable condition no earthly absolution can be to him of any avail. The Council of Trent expressly states that, "in order to obtain the remission of sins this movement of contrition (hic contritionis motus) was at all times necessary, and that in one who has fallen after baptism it is now preparatory for such remission, provided it be joined with a confidence in God’s mercy, and a desire of fulfilling the other requisites for a due reception of this sacrament,"‡ such requisites comprising, amongst other obligations, the due performance of the sacramental penance, and the making of satisfaction to our neighbour for every injustice which the party may have committed against him, either in his goods or good name.

† Sess. VI. De Just. cap. viii.
‡ Sess. XIV. De Pœn. cap. iv.
But besides this first and indispensable requisite of true contrition, it is further necessary that a person should humbly confess his sins to a priest duly authorized to absolve him (*si vere fuerint . . . . et ore confessi*). To those who willfully refuse to comply with this condition the sacramental absolution cannot validly be administered; nor to those who comply with it but partially, and either knowingly or culpably conceal any grievous transgression, can such absolution, if administered, be of any beneficial effect. The Council of Trent sets forth that "from the institution of the sacrament of Penance, the Universal Church has at all times understood that the entire confession of sins was instituted by the Lord, and that it is by divine right necessary for all who after baptism fall away by sin."*

Contrition and confession, then, are the essential requisites for a due reception of the sacrament of Penance; and united with them, the sacerdotal absolution is effectual for the full remission of the guilt of sin, and the eternal punishment due to it. To render, however, the sacrament complete, and to obtain through its instrumentality the remission of temporal punishment also, there is further requisite a third condition, or integral part, which is called satisfaction. And with reference to this the Council of Trent teaches that the "penance of a Christian [or baptized person] after falling is very different from baptismal penance; and that it comprises not only a cessation from sin, and a detestation of the same, or a contrite and humbled heart, but . . . . likewise satisfaction by fasts and alms and prayers, and other pious exercises of a spiritual life, not indeed for the eternal punishment which either by the sacrament or a desire of the sacrament, is remitted together with the guilt,

* Sess. XIV. De Pœn. cap. iv.
but for the temporal punishment which, as the sacred writings inform us, is not always, as in baptism, remitted to those who, ungrateful for the grace of God which they have received, have presumed to griev the Holy Spirit, and to violate the temple of God."* The following canons, with reference to the sacraments of Baptism and Penance, as far as the question at issue is concerned, will be found confirmatory of the foregoing statements:—

"If any one doth assert that the prevarication of Adam was injurious to himself only, and not to his offspring, and that he forfeited for himself only, and not for us, the sanctity and justice which he had received from God, or that being contaminated by the sin of disobedience, he transfused into the human race death only, and the afflictions of the body, and not sin also, which is the death of the soul, let him be anathema; † for he contradicteth the Apostle, who doth declare that by one man sin entered into the world, and by sin death; and so death passed upon all men, in whom all have sinned."‡

* Sens. VI. De Just. cap. xiv.

† N.B. The Protestant Church of England, in her "Thirty-nine Articles," uses the term "accursed." "They also are to be held accursed that presume to say," &c.—Art. XVIII. And Bishop Tomline adds, by way of explanation, "that is, they are to be looked upon as subject to the wrath of God, and unworthy of communion with the Church;" and in a marginal note, he observes, "It was formerly the custom to condemn errors in this form: If any one holds such an error, anathema sit, which we translate, let him be accursed. Many instances of this kind may be found, not only in the acts of Councils, but also in the controversial writings of the ancient Fathers; and the practice seems to have been derived from some expressions of Scripture (Rom. viii. 3; 1 Cor. xvi. 22; Gal. i. 8). The persons against whom an anathema was pronounced were excluded from communion with the Church of Christ."—Elem. Christ, Theol. vol. ii. part 3, art. xviii.

‡ Rom. v. 12; Conc. T. id. Sess. V. De Pecc. Orig. can. ii.
"If any doth assert that this sin of Adam . . . . is taken away by any other remedy than by the merit of the one Mediator our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath reconciled us to God in His blood, made unto us justice, sanctification, and redemption; or doth deny that this merit of Christ Jesus is applied to adults, as well as to infants, through the sacrament of baptism rightly administered in the form of the Church, let him be anathema; For there is no other name under heaven given to men, whereby we must be saved."

"If any one shall say that the sacraments of the new law are not necessary for salvation, but superfluous; and that without them, or a desire thereof . . . . men may obtain from God the grace of justification (though all are not necessary for each individual) let him be anathema."†

"If any one shall say that baptism is free, or, in other words, that it is not necessary to salvation, let him be anathema."‡

"If any one shall say that in the Catholic Church Penance is not truly and properly a sacrament, instituted by Christ our Lord, for reconciling the faithful to God as often as after baptism they shall fall into sin, let him be anathema."§

"If any one shall say that he who has fallen after baptism cannot rise again by the grace of God; or that he can indeed, but by faith alone, recover the justice which he has lost, without the sacrament of Penance, according as the holy Roman and universal Church, taught by Christ the Lord and His Apostles, has always professed, maintained, and taught, let him be anathema."||

* Acts iv. 12; Sess. V. De Pec. Orig. can. iii.
† Sess. VII. De Sacram. in gen. can. iv.
‡ Sess. VII. De Bapt. can. v.,
§ Sess. XIV. De Poen. can. i.
|| Sess. VI. De Just. can. xxix.
"If any one shall deny that for the full and perfect remission of sins, there are required three acts on the part of the penitent . . . . viz., contrition, confession, and satisfaction, which are called the parts of Penance . . . . let him be anathema." *

From these authoritative declarations it must appear sufficiently evident that, according to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, the sacraments of Baptism and Penance are the only ministrations by which, in ordinary circumstances, the forgiveness of sins, properly speaking, can be administered. How far either of them can be considered, directly or indirectly, a licence to commit sin, the reader will form his own opinion. Whether either of them, consistently with Catholic doctrine, can be sold for money, will be considered in a future letter.

I remain, &c.

T. L. G.

* Sess. XIV. De Pœn. can. iv.
LETTER III.
SATISFACTION.

To * * * * *

Sir,—The reader has already been informed, that in order to obtain the remission of temporal punishment, the Council of Trent sets forth, that by fasts, and alms, and prayers, and other pious exercises of a spiritual life, satisfaction must be made to the injured justice of God; and in accordance with this doctrine, in the administration of the sacrament of Penance, satisfaction to a certain extent by some one or more of such means is enjoined in what is usually called the Sacramental Penance. To those who may deem the principle derogatory to the merits of the atonement of Jesus Christ be it briefly observed, that an essential doctrine of the Catholic Church is, that independently of the merits of the atonement of Jesus Christ no atonement on the part of man could possibly be of any avail; that if Adam's transgression in Paradise had been the only offence which had ever been committed, neither Adam himself nor all his posterity could ever have atoned for its guilt, or obtained by any merits of their prayers, or sufferings, or repentance, the remission of the slightest degree of its punishment either here or hereafter. Their penances and prayers would for ever have been as destitute of merit, and as unavailing in the sight of Heaven, as the ceaseless and fruitless lamentations and sufferings of the demons and the reprobate in hell. But with regard to the merits of our only Redeemer, the Catholic Church believes, that if in His all-wise counsels He had been pleased to exist but one
moment in our human nature, and to have shed for our salvation but one drop of His blood, that single drop would alone have sufficed to have purchased our ransom, and superabundantly to have satisfied for the sins of all mankind: that single drop would alone have sufficed to have quenched for all eternity the flames of hell,—to have restored the fallen angels to their forfeited seats in heaven,—to have reinstated lost man in his original justice,—and to have entitled each one of us to a throne of glory in heaven incomparably more resplendent than that of the brightest of the seraphim. And if the reader be tempted to inquire why, if one drop alone would have sufficed, the whole flood should superabundantly have been spent, and why, although the whole has been poured forth, less benefit should actually have been imparted than the single drop might alone have procured, my only reply to such queries must be in the words of the Apostle,—to the former, that "God so loved the world"; and to the latter, "Oh, the depth of the riches of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God; how incomprehensible are His judgments and how unsearchable His ways."

Our belief, then, Sir, is, that although the merits of Christ's sufferings are unlimited in themselves, and have superabundantly atoned to the infinite majesty of the Deity for every offence which ever has been committed, or ever can be committed, by the corrupted will of man, or the malice of the infernal spirits, the benefit of those merits is imparted to the offenders themselves but partially and according to measure. To the fallen angels, we are certain, that although they sinned but once, and in thought only, no benefit whatever has been extended: Christ did not offer to His Father any portion of His sufferings for their salvation; and in hell to all eternity must they bear their irrevocable doom. With sinful man, indeed, He has been pleased
to deal less rigorously. For his salvation He has shed without reserve the last drop of His blood; but to him, nevertheless, He has never yet remitted, nor will He ever remit, the temporal punishment due to his original sin; nor its eternal punishment, except through the sacrament of baptism: nor in like manner, after baptism, does He ever remit the eternal punishment due to actual sin, except to the truly penitent, nor ordinarily otherwise than through the sacrament of Penance; nor in ordinary circumstances, does He remit its temporal punishment, except to those who being truly penitent, and having obtained through the sacrament of Penance the remission of its guilt and eternal punishment, endeavour by fasts, and alms, and prayers, and other pious exercises of a spiritual life, through the merits of Christ, to make due satisfaction for the same.*

* St. Paul says, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians (ix. 27), “I chastise my body.” The words in the original are ἐσπαράζω μον τὸ σῶμα, the literal meaning of which is, “I discolour my body with my blows.” The verb ἐσπαράζω means literally and strictly “to discolour with a blow the part of the face below the eye” (in common parlance, “to give a black eye”); and less strictly, the meaning is applicable to other parts of the body. St. Paul, adding the words μον τὸ σῶμα, signifying his body, says, “I chastise my body.” He also tells the Colossians (i. 24) I “now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up those things that are wanting of the sufferings of Christ in my flesh, for His body, which is the church.” Most Protestants admit that we must fill up those things that are wanting of the sufferings of Christ (as to the application of their merits to us) at least by faith and repentance. And Calvin, commenting on those words of St. Paul, in which he tells the Corinthians what good effects a sorrow according to God had wrought in them (2 Cor. vii. 11), says: “The last is ‘revenge’; for the more severe we are against ourselves, and the more sharply we deal with ourselves on account of our sins, the more propitious and merciful we may hope that the Lord will be. And certainly it cannot be otherwise than that a soul, struck with dread of the divine judgment, should take the part of revenge in inflicting punishment on herself.”
On the efficacy of fasting and alms-deeds for the canceling of temporal punishment, the book of Homilies of the Church of England, which, according to the Thirty-fifth of the Thirty-nine Articles, "doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine," refers its readers to the case of the Ninivites, as recorded in the Book of the Prophet Jonas; and notices also that "Fasting was one of the means whereby Almighty God was occasioned to alter the thing which He had purposed concerning Ahab for murdering the innocent man Naboth."

And with regard to alms-deeds it declares that "Merciful alms-dealing is profitable to purge the soul from the infectious and filthy spots of sin"; that "mercifulness and almsgiving purgeth from all sins, and delivereth from death, and suffereth not the soul to come into darkness"; that "as water quencheth burning fire, even so mercy and alms resisteth and reconcileth sins"; that if by any infirmity or weakness we have been touched and annoyed with sins, "straightways shall mercifulness wipe and wash away, as salves and remedies to heal their sores and grievous diseases"; and that by relieving and helping the afflicted, we may "purge our sins and heal our wounded souls."

Now, whether by the word "sin" in these several passages the Church of England understands sin properly speaking, or whether it maintains, as a "godly and wholesome doctrine," that by any works of ours, independently of Christ's merits, "we may purge our sins, and heal our wounded souls," it will be the province of an opponent to explain, rather than mine.

* Hom. XVI. On Good Works: and First, Of Fasting, part ii.
† Hom. XXIII. On Alms-deeds, part ii.
The Catholic doctrine is, that when by fasting, and alms, and prayer, and such pious exercises, we make satisfaction for our sins, "this satisfaction is not in such manner ours, as not to be through Christ Jesus; for that we who of ourselves, as of ourselves, can do nothing, are able to do all things by the co-operation of Him that strengtheneth us; so that man hath nothing wherein he may glory; but all our glorying is in Christ Jesus, in whom we live, in whom we merit, in whom we satisfy, bringing forth fruits worthy of penance, which from Him derive their virtue, by Him are offered to the Father, and through Him are accepted by the Father."*

There is yet a further principle connected with the doctrine of indulgences, exemplified in Scripture, and taught in the Catholic Church, viz.,—that the fasts, and alms, and prayers, and other such pious exercises of a spiritual life, performed by one individual, may be made available to the benefit of others, and that the temporal punishments decreed against notorious sinners, are not unfrequently remitted in consideration of the merits of the just. Thus we read in the 18th chapter of Genesis, that for the sake of ten just men the Lord would have spared the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah; and in the 19th chapter of the fourth Book of Kings, and in the 37th chapter of the Prophet Isaias, that for the sake of David his servant (who had been dead, be it observed, more than three hundred years) he actually did "protect" and "save" the city of Jerusalem. And in the 11th chapter of the third Book of Kings we read, that certain temporal judgments denounced against King Solomon were remitted, as far as he was personally concerned, "for David his father's sake." And again in the 15th chapter, that notwithstanding the wickedness of Abijam, "for

David's sake did the Lord his God give him a lamp in Jerusalem to set up his son after him, and to establish Jerusalem, because David had done that which was right in the eyes of the Lord." And we find in the 9th chapter of the Book of Deuteronomy, that in conformity with this principle, Moses offered his fasts, as well as his prayers, for the sins of his people, and that he "fell down before the Lord forty days and forty nights," and that he "did neither eat bread nor drink water because of all their sins."

Now whether David had done more of "that which was right" than he needed for his own salvation, or whether Moses stood so little in need of fasting for his own sins that he could devote forty days to fast for the sins of others, or whether the clergy of the Church of England and their flocks are so superabundantly righteous, that over and above the prayers which are requisite for their own salvation they can afford to offer every Sunday a certain amount in behalf of the Queen and the Royal Family, the Bishops and their clergy, the Lords of the Council, and all the nobility, and a multitude of other persons who in divers tribulations may need their prayers (see the Litany, in the Book of Common Prayer), are so many further points which for the present I may leave to the consideration of an opponent.

I remain, &c.

T. L. G.
LETTER IV.

CANONICAL PENCES.

To * * * * *

Sir,—In accordance with the Catholic and Scriptural doctrine (as explained in a former Letter) of temporal punishment being often due to sin, after the remission of its guilt and eternal punishment, and of the said temporal punishment requiring ordinarily for its remission satisfaction on the part of the penitent, by fasts, and alms, and prayers, and other pious exercises of a spiritual life, the Book of Common Prayer informs its readers that "in the primitive Church there was a godly discipline, that such persons as stood convicted of notorious sin were put to open penance, and punished in this life, that their souls might be saved in the day of the Lord"; and it adds that it is "much to be wished that the said discipline might be restored."* In the case of the incestuous person mentioned by St. Paul, in the 5th chapter of his first epistle to the Corinthians, we read that the Apostle delivered the delinquent to Satan "for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit might be saved in the day of our Lord. And in the interesting narrative of St. John the Evangelist and the Robber, recorded by Eusebius, we are informed that even after the Evangelist had assured the robber that he had "found pardon for him in his prayers at the hands of Christ," he nevertheless continued "supplicating with frequent prayers, contending with constant fastings... and did not leave him, as it is said,

until he had restored him to the Church.”* In the administration of this godly discipline will be found the origin of Indulgences. It prevailed throughout the Christian Church, with more or less severity, from the age of the Apostles till later than the close of the twelfth century. By virtue of this discipline persons who were guilty of grievous offences, whether publicly committed or not, were subjected to a long course of rigorous corporal austerities, and trying humiliations and privations. The course of each penance was usually distributed into four distinct periods; and the penitents were classed accordingly into so many different orders, and were called respectively the mourners, the hearers, the kneelers or prostrators, and the consistents or co-standers.† All were required, during the whole term of their penance, to fast on bread and water two or three days in the week, to take their repose at night on the bare floor, to refrain from all worldly diversions and all entertainments and feasting, and to live retired, in painful laborious exercises and assiduous humble prayer. During the first period they were not allowed to enter the church to be present at any part of the holy mysteries; and on Sundays and festivals they stood near the church door, clothed in sackcloth, soliciting the prayers of the faithful as they entered. During the next two periods they were allowed to enter the church, and to remain, kneeling or prostrate, at the lower end, till the commencement of the more solemn part of the service; and in the fourth period they were allowed to remain the whole time, but not to make their offering, or to receive the Holy Communion. The term of each course as proportioned to the sin for which it was enjoined, was regulated by a code

* Crusé’s Translation, p. 96. London. 1851.
† Called in Greek προσκλαιοντες, ἀχρωμενοι, ὑποπιπτοντες, and συνεσταιμενοι; by the Latins, Flentes, Audientes, Prostrati, and Consistentes.
of ecclesiastical canons, which in point of severity are found to have varied in different countries and at different periods. For some sins the course was twenty years; for others, fifteen; for others, seven; and for others, less: for the sin of idolatry or apostasy it was usually enjoined for the whole life. The canons which imposed such penances were called the penitential canons; and the penances were called canonical penances. Let the reader, however, understand that these penances were not compulsory; they were not enforced by power of civil law. By the truly penitent they were voluntarily submitted to, and often solicited with tears; they were even frequently performed by persons to whom they were not enjoined, and who had never been guilty of any grievous transgression; and such was the discipline of the Church respecting them, that for the first seven centuries, with regard to persons who had once performed a publicly enjoined canonical penance, and relapsed into grievous sin, she would never under any circumstances admit such persons to penance a second time.*

From the earliest period, however, and on various grounds, these penances were occasionally either partially or totally remitted. St. Paul informs the Corinthians (2 Cor. ii.) that he forgave the individual whom he had "delivered to Satan for the destruction of the flesh,"† and that for their sakes he forgave him in the person of Christ; and he assigns as the reason, "lest perhaps such a one be swallowed up with over-much sorrow."

During the first three centuries, whilst the Church was repeatedly exposed to the violence of persecution under the

---

* See Morinus, De Pœn. lib. vi.; see also Butler's "Moveable Feasts and Fasts," Tr. v. ch. viii.

† The most ancient Fathers interpret this expression of St. Paul as referring to the corporal austerities of penance. See quotations from Tertullian, Origen, and others, in Morinus, lib. vi. cap. 11.
Roman emperors, similar remissions of penance were occasionally granted at the request of the martyrs. When Christians, who were imprisoned for the Faith, interceded in behalf of the penitents, and recommended them to the clemency of the Church, considerable regard was paid to such requests. The notes, or written recommendations, to that effect, which they sent or delivered to the penitents were submitted to the bishop's examination; and subject to his discretion, the remissions were granted in consideration of the martyrs' merits. St. Cyprian observes, in his thirteenth Epistle, that "those who have received recommendations from the martyrs, may also by their prerogative be assisted before God"; and in the following Epistle, "Those who have received a communication from the martyrs, may also by their aid be assisted before the Lord"; and in his Treatise on the Fallen, "We believe that the merits of the martyrs, and the works of the just, prevail greatly with the Judge."* The probability seems to be, that such recommendations were not taken into account until after the persecution had ceased, nor considered available unless the confessors who had signed them had also completed their course of martyrdom.†

Another and more frequent cause for the remission or relaxation of canonical penance was the fervour and compunction of the penitents themselves. The practice of granting such remissions on this ground prevailed in the


† For a clear and satisfactory account of these Libelli Martyrum, and the practice of the Church respecting them, see Morinus, lib. ix. cap. 23, 24, 25, 26, 27.
Church from the commencement of the discipline in the apostolic age till its eventual discontinuance. It is sanctioned and recommended in the twelfth canon of the Council of Nice, A.D. 325, and in the seventh canon of the Council of Ancyra, and is noticed by St. Basil and by other fathers.*

With regard, however, to these remissions of penance, whether plenary or partial, which were granted by the Church from the earliest ages, the reader will observe that on all occasions they were special remissions granted for the causes assigned, to individuals. The plenary indulgence which was granted by Pope Urban the Second, in the Council of Clermont, to those who should take up arms for the rescue of the Holy Land, is probably the first instance of a general remission being granted.† The following is the canon which the Council passed to that effect:—"Whoever for devotion's sake alone, and not for the acquiring of honour or of pelf, shall proceed to Jerusalem to free the Church of God, to him let the said expedition be accounted in lieu of all penance."‡ But the spiritual effects, or the spiritual benefits of the remission, were in every instance the same. The penances themselves, be it remembered, were not compulsory. They were voluntarily submitted to as humiliating and painful, but efficacious, remedies for the health of the soul. They were considered not only as a

* See the quotations in Morinus, lib. i. cap. 15, and lib. vi. cap. 19.
† An earlier date is assigned to such remissions by William of Auxerre, Baronius, and some others. For a reply to their conjectures, and to the authorities cited by them, see Morinus, lib. x. cap. 20; or Van Espen, "Jus Eccles. Univ." pars ii. tit. 7; De Indulg. cap. 1.
‡ "Quicunque pro sola devotione, non pro honoris vel pecuniae aedepitione, ad liberandum Ecclesiam Dei Jerusalem profectus fuerit, iter illud pro omni peenitentia reputetur."—Conc. Claromont. can. ii.; Labbe, tom. x. col. 507.
powerful means, in conjunction with alms and prayer, for obtaining through the merits of Christ's sufferings a spirit of compunction, or a "contrite and humbled heart," but also as satisfactions through the selfsame merits, and calculated as such to cancel a far more grievous punishment to which the parties would otherwise be exposed. And had the remissions been restricted to the penances only, and not further extended to the punishment which the penances were intended to cancel, such remissions, as St. Thomas and other controvertists have justly argued, so far from being an advantage to the individuals, would obviously have been detrimental. The general belief therefore of Catholics is, that such remissions of penance, so granted by the pastors of the Church, were by virtue of the power of the keys, still further remissions of the temporal punishment which the performance of the penance would otherwise have been efficacious to cancel. And such precisely is what Catholics generally understand by an Indulgence.

An Indulgence then was originally, in times when canonical penances were enjoined, a remission, either wholly or in part, of an enjoined canonical penance, and provided the individual to whom it was granted, being truly contrite, had obtained the remission of the eternal punishment due to his offences, the belief of Catholics is that it included also a remission of as much temporal punishment due in the sight of God as the performance of the whole or of the remitted portion of the penance would have cancelled. And an Indulgence is now, since the discontinuance of such canonical penances, what the English bishops in their official document stated it to be, viz., "not a licence to commit sin, nor a pardon for future sins, nor, indeed, properly speaking, any pardon of sins at all, but only a remission of the whole or a part of the temporal punishment that often remains to be suffered for sins, which as to their guilt and eternal
punishment have been remitted." A further explanation will be requisite of those Indulgences which were called "Eleemosynary Indulgences," and of those transactions which have generally been characterized as sales of Indulgences. These will form the subject of a future letter.

I remain, &c.

T. L. G.
LETTER V.

INDULGENCES.

To * * * * *

SIR,—The preceding explanations have reference chiefly to Indulgences in general. Considered as to their kinds, and in relation to the present question, Indulgences are either *plenary* or *partial*. According to the official document of the English bishops, "Some Indulgences are called plenary, which when fully obtained [by a due fulfilment of all the requisite conditions] remit the whole debt of temporal punishment that remained due on account of past sins"; *—"others [called partial] are of a certain number of years or days, which when fully obtained remit so much of the temporal punishment as would have been discharged by the performance of so many years or days of canonical penance."† Dens observes of the latter that they "are usually determined by certain days or years, according to the mode in which anciently the canonical penances were prescribed"; so that "by an indulgence of a hundred days is not meant, as is commonly imagined, that by such an indulgence a person would be freed from precisely a hundred days' duration of punishment in purgatory, but that he who obtains an indulgence of a hundred days

* Article on Indulgences, in the Laity's Directory, A.D. 1811.—
  "Indulgentia plenaria tollit totam poenam in purgatorio luendam,
  quando quis ejus fructum consequitur."—Sylvius, *Sap. Quest.* 25,
  *De Indulg.* art. 2. "Indulgentia plenaria totum poenæ reatum tollit,
  qui post culpam remissiam forte remansit."—Bellarmine, tom. ii.
  *De Indulg.* lib. i. cap. 8.

† Laity's Directory, as above.
obtains as ample a remission of temporal punishment, which would otherwise be to be endured in this life or in purgatory, as he would have obtained if actually he had performed a hundred days' canonical penance (the said penance, however, being merely considered inasmuch as it would be a satisfaction); but what proportion of temporal punishment, or how many days' duration in purgatory would correspond to a penance, or indulgence of a hundred days, is to us altogether unknown." It is, however, upon this principle that Indulgences of thousands of years may be explained. If in the early ages of the Church, for some sins once committed a canonical penance of twenty years was usually prescribed, a proportionate penance for the frequent repetition of such sins, continued perhaps for years (could such a penance be performed) might easily be found to consist of more years than the amount specified in any known Indulgences. It may further, moreover, be observed, that no such Indulgences can be more ample than one that is plenary; for if a plenary Indulgence remits the whole debt,

* Dens, Tract. de Indul. No. 31; see also Sylvius, and others, to the same effect.—There are other partial Indulgences, called Indulgences of one Quadragena, or more; or of one Carena, or more. A Quadragena was a fast of forty successive days; a Carena was a fast of the same duration, the diet being restricted to bread and water. An indulgence of a Quadragena, or Carena, was a remission of as much temporal punishment as would correspond to a penance of either one or the other.—Dens, ut supra; Bellarmine, &c. Other partial indulgences are said to remit the half, or the third, or fourth part of a person's sins (Indulgentia dimidiae, vel tertiae, vel quartae, partis peccatorum). The meaning of such indulgences, if any such exist, is, that they are remissions of the half, or the third, or fourth part of the penances due to such a person's sins, or of the temporal punishment corresponding to such part of the said penance. "Interdum dimittitur dimidia, aut tertia, aut quarta, pars peccatorum: id est, condonatur tanta pars peccatis debitæ."—Sylvius, ut supra.
an indulgence of a million of years could not possibly remit more. Hence Dens and others consider that "some writers have, without cause, censured such indulgences as forgeries of the quaestors."*

In explaining, however, the nature of indulgences considered in general, or with reference to their several kinds, Catholic theologians themselves are not unanimous. On points of doctrine which have not been authoritatively defined, and as far as consistency with established principles will allow, Catholic theologians vary as much in their opinions as, on questions of law which have not been determined by the judges, civilians vary in theirs. In reference to the jubilee indulgence published by Pope Boniface VIII. as "not only plenary and more ample, but most plenary" (\(\text{non solum plenam et largiorem, imo plenissimam}\)), Dens and other theologians state that those indulgences are called plenary which are granted for the remission of the whole temporal punishment to which a person is liable; that those are said to be "\(\text{pleniores}\)" (more ample) which grant, in addition, the faculty of absolving from cases and censures reserved to the Pontiff; and that those are said to be "\(\text{plenissimae}\)" (most ample) which include still further (according to Collet) the power of commuting vows, and dispensing in certain cases of irregularity.†

* Dens, \(\text{ut supra}\); Bellarmine, \(\text{ut supra}\). See also Benedict XIV. De Synodo Dioec. lib. xiii. cap. xviii. sect. 7.
† Dens, \(\text{ut supra}\).—Collet, Traité des Indulgences, tome i. p. 6; Bellarmine, tom. ii. De Indulg. lib. i. cap. 9.—"Dum dixit (Bonifacius VIII.) se non \(\text{plenam ant largiorem dumtaxat sed et plenissimam}\) indulgentiam dare, idem est, ac si dixisset, omnem \(\text{possibilem}\) . . . . Antiquus Glossographus quærens quomodo ista \(\text{se compatiantur pленam, лargiorem et plenissimam}\), respondet: 'Dico Papam interpretatum fuisset in consistorio, me presente, hanc indulgentiam
With regard to the "Indulgentia plenior," it was stated in a former letter, that in order to receive the remission of sins, through the sacrament of Penance, the applicant must confess his sins to a priest duly authorized to absolve him. For the valid administration of the sacrament of Penance two distinct powers are requisite, viz., the power of order, and the power of jurisdiction. According to the doctrine and discipline of the Catholic Church, the power of remitting and retaining sins in the sacrament of Penance (the power of order) imparted to a priest by virtue of his ordination, can only be validly exercised in favour of those who are spiritually subject to his jurisdiction, and not further in any respect than such jurisdiction extends. The source of such requisite jurisdiction is acknowledged to exist in the Apostolic See of Rome;* from thence it is communicated to the bishops with regard to their respective dioceses, and by them to the inferior clergy with regard to their respective parishes and parochial districts. In each of these gradations, it is subject to, such limitations as the See of adeo plenam prout clavium potestas se extendit."

The late Mr. Mendham, in his work entitled The Venal Indulgences and Pardons of the Church of Rome, in a note at page 108, makes the following strange misstatement:—"Of the indulgences Bellarmine asserts that the plenissima adjoins the remission not only of poena, but of culpa saltem venialis." Bellarmine in reality asserts directly the reverse. He repeatedly asserts that no culpa whatever is remitted by indulgences, "nee lethalis, nec venialis." In the chapter entitled "A quo vinculo per Indulgencias solvamur, vel absolvamur," the first proposition which he undertakes to substantiate is "Per indulgentias non absolvimur nec solvimur a reatu culpa saltem illius, id est, nec lethalis nec venialis."—Tom. ii. De Indulg. lib. i. cap. 7. Mr. Mendham gives no reference for his statement as to Bellarmine's assertion.

* The Church of England acknowledges no jurisdiction but such as it receives from the Crown. See Appendix B.
ABSOLUTIONS.

Rome, or as any of the bishops, may respectively deem expedient. In order to deter the faithful from the commission of grievous and enormous transgressions, and for other laudable and commendable ends, the See of Rome may reserve to itself, exclusively, the power of absolving the transgressors; and in addition to such cases reserved to the See of Rome, each bishop in his own respective diocese may, for similar reasons, reserve to himself the power of absolving others. In the event of an individual being guilty of such transgressions, no ordinary confessor can validly absolve him. He must either apply personally and make his confession to the Pope himself, or to the bishop, as the case may be, or to one of their respective penitentiaries; or a faculty must be obtained from the one or the other, to authorize an ordinary confessor to receive the confession, and, if the case may justify it, to absolve him. Independently of such faculty, the absolution of an ordinary confessor would be null and void; and the act of administering the same would subject the confessor himself to ecclesiastical censures, from which no one could absolve him but the superior authority to whom the previous case was reserved. The faculty, however, be it further observed and duly borne in mind by the reader, is neither itself an absolution, nor a mandate or injunction to the confessor for the administration of one. It is merely the conveyance of a power to absolve, or of the jurisdiction requisite to render the absolution of the confessor valid. The propriety of absolving or deferring absolution must still be dependent upon circumstances, the cognizance of which must rest entirely with the confessor himself. On the further faculty for commuting vows and dispensing in certain cases of irregularity, I shall have occasion to treat somewhat later. The difference, then, between a jubilee and an ordinary plenary indulgence consists chiefly, if not
solely, in this, that the document or Bull for the former, in addition to the grant of a plenary indulgence, conveys the several above-stated faculties to ordinary confessors in general. The faculties themselves, however, are distinct from the indulgence: a plenary indulgence may be granted without them; and they also may be extended to confessors in general without any indulgence being attached to them. "A plenary indulgence," says Sylvius, "is not subdivided; for a jubilee indulgence, though it differs with respect to the privileges appended to it, as to its own peculiar effect corresponds with one that is plenary." *

Amongst the conditions which are requisite for gaining the benefit of an indulgence there is one which is essential, and common to all indulgences: and there are others which are only requisite inasmuch as they are respectively and specially enjoined. The one which is essential and indispensably requisite is that the applicant be free from the guilt of mortal sin, and the consequent liability to eternal punishment. All theologians are agreed that he must be in the state of grace, or a state of justification, for that no punishment is remitted to him who is an enemy of God; and hence St. Thomas Aquinas observes that in all indulgences there is mention of those who are truly contrite and have made a confession of their sins. Other conditions, which are only requisite inasmuch as they are respectively and specially enjoined, are the due performance of certain good works, such as prayer, and fasting, and alms-deeds, frequenting the sacraments, visiting certain churches for the performance of certain devotions, and the like.

The source from which indulgences are said to be granted

* "Quae plenaria est non subdividitur; nam et indulgentiae jubilæi (quantum ad proprium effectum) conveniunt cum plenaria, licet different ratione privilegiorum adjunctorum."—Sylvius, Sap. Quaest. 25; De Indulg. Art. ii.
are the infinite and superabundant merits and satisfactions of our divine Redeemer Jesus Christ, and the superabundant satisfaction of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints. It was stated in a former letter that though the merits of our divine Redeemer's sufferings are an infinite and superabundant atonement and satisfaction to the Deity for all sins past, present, and future, the benefit of those merits is imparted to man but partially, and subject to conditions; that to obtain the forgiveness of sins most Protestants believe that faith and repentance are required; and that to obtain still further the remission of temporal punishment Catholics believe that satisfaction also is required. All, however, are doubtless agreed that, independently of the merits of our divine Redeemer, neither faith and repentance, nor any satisfaction on the part of man, would be of any value in the sight of God.

It was also stated in a former letter, as a principle connected with indulgences, and illustrated in Scripture, that in the "Communion of Saints" the fasts, and alms, and prayers, and other such pious exercises of a spiritual life, performed by one individual, may be made available to the benefit of others. In the exercise of prayer, as exemplified in a former letter by a reference to the Litany, the principle seems to be practically admitted by Protestants. A further principle believed amongst Catholics is, that such voluntary exercises, as far as they are of a penal or penitential character, and also afflictions borne with Christian patience and resignation, through the merits of Christ, have a twofold efficacy; that they are available not only for a future recompense in heaven,* but also as satisfactions for temporal punishment. Of future recompense in heaven of course there can be no superabundance, but as satisfactions

* 2 Corinthians iv. 17.
for temporal punishment it may reasonably be presumed that the sufferings and privations, and penitential exercises of numberless saints and martyrs would be more than sufficient to compensate for any amount of temporal punishment which might respectively be due to them. In the case of the Blessed Virgin, who, we believe, was never stained with sin, all such satisfactions must have been entirely superabundant. These then, in the "Communion of Saints," are believed to be available for others, and together with the infinite merits and satisfactions of our divine Redeemer, from which indeed all others must derive their efficacy, form what is called the treasure of the Church. It is believed still further that, when Jesus Christ delivered to St. Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and declared that whatsoever he should bind on earth should be bound also in heaven, and that whatsoever he should loose on earth should be loosed also in heaven, he invested him and his successors with the power of dispensing this treasure.

Indulgences are further said to be granted externally to the sacrament of Penance (extra sacramentum). An indulgence is not a sacrament, nor a sacramental act; and the remission which it conveys is totally distinct from any remissions of sin administered either in the sacrament of Baptism, or that of Penance.

In accordance with the above-stated principles, Dens and other theologians define an indulgence as follows:—An indulgence is a "remission of the temporal punishment, due to sins remitted as to their guilt; granted by the power of the keys, externally to the sacrament, by an application of the satisfactions which are contained in the treasury of the Church."*

Now whether the several doctrines which I have so far

* Dens, De Indulg. Art. ii.
ABSOLUTIONS.

explained are correct, or not, is not the question at issue. I have explained them for the information of the reader, and to enable him more clearly to understand the answers which will be given to the arguments of opponents. I am not writing a theological treatise on indulgences, or on the sacrament of Penance, except so far as may be requisite to meet such arguments. The question which I have undertaken to examine, as stated in a former letter, is whether indulgences, or absolutions, are a license or leave to commit sin, and whether, consistently with the doctrine of the Catholic Church, indulgences, or the forgiveness of sins, can be sold.

I remain, &c.

T. L. G.
LETTER VI.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.—I.

To * * * * *

SIR,—I may now proceed to consider the chief of Mr. Collette's statements and evidences in opposition to the Catholic doctrine. They are set forth in a pamphlet entitled "Indulgences and the Forgiveness of Sins." The pamphlet is the third of a series; and Mr. Collette's first letter commences at page 101.

At page 102 he contends that indulgences are pardons of sins *properly speaking*; and that certain indulgences granted indefinitely, and not for a limited period, are equivalent to a pardon of sins future, and consequently to a "license of sinning." In support of his position he appeals to the language of five indulgences granted respectively by Urban II., Boniface VIII., Clement VI., Sixtus IV., and Innocent XI., and a sixth, the grantor of which he does not name. In each of these indulgences the Popes respectively use the expressions "full pardon of all sins"; "a most plenary pardon of all sins"; "indulgences and remissions of sins"; and in one instance (the Jubilee of Boniface VIII.), "not only a full and more abundant, but a most plenary pardon of all sins." He appeals also to the language of certain indulgences, as applicable to the "dead as well as to the living"; and he appeals, further, to "Ferraris, a Roman Catholic writer of very considerable note, who has treated largely on this subject." He asserts that "from the examples given by this Roman Catholic author, in his Ecclesiastical Encyclopaedia (edit. Venice, 1782), there is no doubt of the fact that the remission of the guilt of sin, as well as of the
temporal punishment, is embraced in the indulgence; otherwise the instruments have no meaning”; and that, “according to Ferraris, indulgences and remission of sins appear to be everywhere united, so as to convey the fact to the recipient, that the pardon of guilt, as well as the remission of temporal pain, is included in the boon.” How Mr. Collette could make such assertions respecting Ferraris, appears to me passing strange. That writer, in his first “Article” on the subject, says that “An indulgence is rightly described as a remission of temporal punishment due for sins already remitted as to their guilt.” And in his third “Article” he says, that “the effect of an indulgence is not the remission of sin, either mortal or venial.” He states it as the common opinion of theologians, and refers to Maldonatus, who in the passage referred to, declares that “all theologians without exception unanimously reply that an indulgence is not the remission of the guilt, but of the punishment; and therefore” (the author continues) “when in the form or grant of an indulgence it is said that the remission of sin is granted, the word ‘sin’ is used for the punishment of sin, in accordance with that verse in 2 Machabees, c. xii., ‘that they may be loosed from sin’ . . . . The effect of an indulgence,” he further observes, “is a remission of the temporal punishment residuary and remaining from sins, which as to their guilt have been remitted.”

—*“Indulgentia recte describitur quod sit remissio poene temporali debita pro peccatis actualibus quoad culpam jam remissis.”*—
*De Indulg. Art. i.*

† “Effectus indulgentiae non est remittere peccatum, neque mortale neque veniale: *Commun. cum Maldonato, t. i. De Pœn. q. 6, tit. de Indulg. par. 1, qu. 1,* ubi sic expresse dicit: ‘Uno ore omnes theologi, nemine excepto, respondent indulgentiam non esse remissionem culpæ, sed poenæ.’ Unde quando in forma seu concessione indulgentiae dicitur per illam concedi remissionem peccatorum, accipitur peccatum pro poena peccati, secundum illud
The truth is, that the expressions "venia peccatorum" and "remissio peccatorum" (the pardon or remission of sins) are technical expressions, as familiarly understood by a Catholic theologian as any legal technicality would be understood by Mr. Collette. Mr. Collette must know that in law as well as in theology, there are words and expressions which would ill bear a literal interpretation; and much less would either profession bear to be held responsible for the incongruous deductions which might easily be drawn from them. There is a maxim, for instance, in the British Constitution, "The King (or Queen) can do no wrong." Literally taken it might be understood to mean that the Queen not only never sins, but that actually she is incapable of sinning. It is sufficiently understood, however, that it does not mean that she can do no wrong, properly speaking; that it has no reference to a capability of sinning, in a moral sense, nor even to a capability of error or delinquency in governing, but only that in cases of such error or delinquency, her ministers, and not she, shall be amenable to the laws. It may also, perhaps, have other constitutional meanings.

With reference to the technicalities in the Bulls of Indulgences—that the word "sin" may be used with propriety in a sense not properly speaking its own, can scarcely require to be proved. St. Paul repeatedly in his epistle to the Romans calls concupiscence "sin"; and in 2 Cor. v. 21, speaking of our divine Redeemer, he says that God "made Him to be sin." Now surely no Christian for a moment could suppose that in either of those cases St. Paul meant "sin" properly speaking. With respect, indeed, to the former passages, the ninth of the Thirty-nine Articles explains his meaning to a certain extent, by stating that "the Apostle

doth confess that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin." And the Council of Trent declares that the Apostle does not call concupiscence, sin, from its being in those who are born again, truly and properly sin, but only on account of its being the result of sin, and inclining to sin.* The particular sense, however, in which the said word is used by the Popes in their Bulls of Indulgences, and in which the said Bulls will be found to accord with the "official document" of the English bishops, appears to be precisely that Scriptural sense in which the word "iniquities" is used in Numbers xiv. 34 (quoted in a former letter), in which Almighty God, after having assured Moses that He had pardoned the iniquity of the people, declared that for forty years they should still "bear their iniquities," meaning, evidently, from the context, the consequences or the temporal punishment of their iniquities.

To proceed, however, to the several indulgences: the first to which Mr. Collette refers is the one for the first crusade. "Pope Urban II.,” he says, “promised to those who should join the banners of the Cross against the infidels, a plenary indulgence of all their sins, having truly with a contrite heart confessed them, and in addition, in the rewarding of the just, he promised an increase of eternal happiness” ("plenam suorum peccatorum, si veraciter fuerint corde contriti et ore confessi, veniam indulgemus, et in retributione justorum salutis æternæ pollicemur augmentum").† The conditions, therefore, would be,—1. That the recipients should


be truly repentant—"truly contrite of heart"; 2. That they should orally "confess their sins"; and 3. That they should enter the army of soldiers, and join in the expedition for rescuing the Holy Land from the infidels. Now, supposing that the grant was really intended to be a remission of sins properly speaking, would not, may I ask, the generality of Protestants believe, that on the first condition alone, if the parties were truly contrite of heart, "the blood of Jesus would cleanse them from all sin," and free them from all liability to punishment? The sixteenth of the Thirty-nine Articles declares that "they are to be condemned, which . . . . deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent." Mr. Collette's extraordinary gloss upon the passage is as follows . . . . "so that if any one should from that day join the banners of the Cross, he gains pardon of all his sins. In other words, if a man committed murder, in order to wipe away his sin, he had nothing to do but place himself under the protection of this Bull, which is tantamount to granting a license to sin; certainly he would get a remission of past and present sin—the sin itself—for what it was worth. He could sin with a conviction of getting the pardon" (!)—Might not the argument, however, be justly retorted? Does not Protestantism offer easier terms of forgiveness? Does not the Article above-quoted promise it to such as "truly repent," without requiring any further condition? And might it not be urged in reply, that if a man committed murder, in order to wipe away his sin, he would have nothing to do but "truly to repent"; which (by a parity of reasoning) would be "tantamount to granting a license to sin. . . . He could sin with a conviction of getting the pardon" (!)

On the next three indulgences Mr. Collette makes no comment. In reference to the fourth (the one of Innocent XI.) he merely observes that "the following mode of
expression runs through almost all the indulgences: "We mercifully grant in the Lord a plenary indulgence and remission of all their sins" ("Plenariam omnium peccatorum suorum indulgentiam et remissionem misericorditer in Domino concedimus"). In all four, however, he omits to insert the conditions, viz., true contrition of heart and oral confession.

Mr. Collette next refers to indulgences of 29,000, 7,000, 10,000, and 3,000 years, and represents them as remissions of so many years in purgatory. 'He is mistaken; no Catholic theologian holds such an opinion. An explanation of such indulgences has been given in a former letter. Mr. Collette must have seen in Ferraris a similar explanation, and ought to have known that his own interpretation of such indulgences is incorrect. He might also have seen it there stated as improbable that purgatory will last so long. No Catholic believes that purgatory will continue beyond the day of judgment. On that day temporal punishment and time itself will end. All mankind will form but two companies; one to be received immediately into heaven, and the other to be consigned for all eternity to hell.

With regard to masses in behalf of the dead (p. 103) Mr. Collette observes: "If a man can bring himself to believe, and there have been many such [1], that by paying for these masses he will save himself from punishments for sins committed in the flesh, for 29,000, 10,000, and 3,000 years, all which is done by the application of indulgences, may he not very fairly say to himself, 'I will indulge from now to death in some favourite vice; I have wherewithal to leave to the Church to purchase immunity from the consequences of my sin by masses.' Is not that practically a license to commit sin?" If Mr. Collette asks the question seriously, he is again mistaken. According to the principles of the Catholic religion, such a man would be living habitually in
a state of mortal sin; he would have derived no benefit from masses, or sacraments, or indulgences, during life; and in the instant after death he would find himself, not in purgatory, but in hell: and in hell there is no redemption.

At page 108 Mr. Collette writes thus: “A recipient [of an indulgence] need not of necessity be in a state of grace; for Dens tells us that if an indulgence be granted to those who shall give money to build a church, although it be given in vainglory, they gain the indulgence. (Unde si concedatur indulgentia eis qui dabunt nummum ad aedificandum ecclesiam, etsi ex vana gloria debit, lucruntur indulgentiam.—Dens, Theol. tom. vi. No. 35, p. 430.) No man in a state of vainglory can be in a state of grace.” Mr. Collette is mistaken. In the first place, Dens, in common with all theologians, asserts that, “to receive the fruit of an indulgence a state of grace is requisite,” and assigns as a reason that “to an enemy of God no penalty is remitted.” 2. Dens supposes the case of vainglory in question to have been comparatively slight, and as such only venially sinful. Mr. Collette must therefore either have misunderstood the question, or he must suppose that venial sin is incompatible with a state of grace. In either case he is mistaken. In the latter supposition all theologians would be against him. A slight degree of anger, even with the addition of a slightly offensive word (“Raca”), does not subject the offender to the “danger of hell fire” (Matt. v. 22); and consequently is not incompatible with a state of grace. The same, I presume, may be said of a slight degree of vainglory. 3. The case, as supposed by Dens, is not a state of vainglory; it is simply an act of vainglory, which, consistently with the case supposed, might have been repented of immediately. The expression, indeed, “ex vana gloria” is mistranslated: it means neither “in vainglory,” nor “in a state of vainglory.” 4. Dens gives merely an opinion on the question,
and refers to other theologians whose opinion differs from his own.* In rejoinder (p. 166) Mr. Collette urges much that is irrelevant, contending that for gaining certain partial indulgences, confession and communion (not a state of grace) are not requisite. The two questions are totally distinct. He does not, moreover, quote one theologian in support of his mistaken theory; and in asserting that a state of grace "is required only to obtain a plenary" indulgence, he is still further most egregiously mistaken.

In the same page (108) Mr. Collette makes the following assertion:——"That confession and absolution is not necessary we again learn from the same Dens, who tells us that indulgences may be granted to one insensible and about to die. (Dictis non obest, quo minus possit indulgentia concedi sensibus destituto et morituro.—Dens, tom. vi. No. 34, p. 438)." He is again mistaken. Confession, of course, would be impossible; and neither God nor the Church of God requires impossibilities. With regard to absolution, however, the consequence does not follow: it would be administered before the imparting of an indulgence; and Mr. Collette might have

* The practical question would be, whether to gain the benefit of the indulgence, it would be requisite to make a second contribution. The opinion of Dens and other theologians is, that it would not, inasmuch as the object of the contribution (the building of the church), notwithstanding the sinfulness of the act, would be equally attained. On the other hand, Dens and all theologians are agreed that if the condition in question were prayers, or fasts, or alms, to appease the anger of God, or to obtain the conversion of infidels, or the like, and any of these were vitiated by a motive of vainglory, they would be unavailing before God for obtaining the end proposed; and to gain the benefit of the indulgence, a repetition would doubtless be required. If in either of the suppositions the act were mortally sinful, the individual would no longer be in a state of grace, and would be incapacitated for receiving the benefit of any indulgence.
surmised that a person insensible and about to die would be at least as capable of receiving the remission of temporal punishment by an indulgence, or the remission of eternal punishment by a sacramental absolution, as an infant in the Church of England "coming to holy baptism" is capable of receiving "the remission of his sins by spiritual regeneration." (See the Book of Common Prayer—Baptism of Infants.) The beneficial spiritual effect in the former case would depend on the point as to whether the recipient was free from mortal sin, or truly penitent, at the time of his becoming insensible. If he were not, neither the absolution nor the indulgence would be to him of any avail.

Mr. Collette proceeds thus: "Bellarmine tells us how a full plenary indulgence may be obtained without saying any prayers at all, nor confessing, nor being absolved, nor even being in a state of grace." These are Mr. Collette's words, not Bellarmine's. He then quotes Bellarmine as follows:—"We see that the very greatest indulgences are sometimes given for the most trifling reasons, as for instance, when a plenary indulgence is given to every individual of the crowd [omnibus] that stand before the door of St. Peter's on Easter Sunday, when the Pope blesses the people." And Mr. Collette gives the following gloss:—"Here is an indiscriminate crowd from all quarters of the world, and of all religions, huddled together, one jostling the other to get the best place to see the sight, and yet every individual gets a plenary indulgence for simply looking on"! Mr. Collette is strangely mistaken:—1. According to Bellarmine himself, in common with all theologians, not one of the said individuals would then and there obtain the benefit of the said indulgence, who was not in a state of grace (Bellarm. cap. xiii. A.); and 2. Not one of the said individuals who was "jostling another to get the best place to see the sight," would obtain it. To obtain the benefit of an indulgence it
is requisite that the several acts prescribed as special conditions, such as "alms, fasts, visitation of churches, prayers, and the like, be performed religiously and piously, and with a penitential and contrite heart." (Delahogue, de Indulg. cap. iv. art. 2.) And to obtain the benefit of the indulgence in question, it would be requisite that the Pope's blessing should be received in like manner, viz., "religiously and piously, and with a penitential and contrite heart." In rejoinder (p. 167) Mr. Collette only further misrepresents the case, contending that the word "omnibus" is not restrictive. He might as well contend that because Christ "died for all" (2 Cor. v. 15), "every individual" receives the benefit of His death, and is consequently admitted into Heaven. The words "πάντως" in the Greek version, and "omnibus" in the Latin, are not more "restrictive," in the Scriptural passage referred to, than the word "omnibus" in the form of the indulgence. The fallacy of such reasoning must be sufficiently manifest. Common sense, indeed, might have told Mr. Collette that his representation of the case could not be the true one. The terms, however, in which the indulgence is granted are decisive against him: it is granted "in the accustomed form of the Church" (in forma Ecclesiae consuetud); and Mr. Collette knows that that form prescribes true contrition of the heart and oral confession as the ordinary conditions of an indulgence. The indulgence is proclaimed by one of the Cardinals in Latin and in Italian, immediately after the blessing has been pronounced by the Pope. He announces that his Holiness the Pope "gives and grants to all there present a plenary indulgence in the accustomed form of the Church;" and he begs that they will "pray to God for the prosperous estate of his Holiness, and of our holy Mother the Church." A number of printed copies in Latin and Italian are then thrown amongst the people. One such
printed copy in each language is now lying before me. The forms are as follows:—"Sanctissimus in Christo Pater et Dominus noster, Dominus Pius Divina Providentia Papa Nonus dat et concedit omnibus hic præsentibus Indulgentiam Plenariam in forma Ecclesiae consueta. Rogate igitur Deum pro felici statu Sanctitatis Suae, et S. Matris Ecclesiae."

—"La Santità di nostro Signore, Signore Pio per la Divina Providenza Papa Nono dà, et concede a tutti i fedeli qui presenti l' Indulgenza Plenaria nella forma consueta della S. Madre Chiesa: Pregate dunque il Signore Iddio per il felice stato della Santità Sua e della S. Madre Chiesa."

I remain, &c.

T. L. G.
LETTER VII.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.—II.

To * * * * *

Sir,—In reference to Canonical Penances. Mr. Collette states that "it seemed expedient to the Council of Nice to give power to all bishops to shorten the time of penance, and to relax the severity of the canons (Liceat Episcopo humanius aliquid de iis statuere.—Conc. Nic. can. 12)," and that "this favour was sometimes called an Indulgence"; but he denies that such an indulgence (provided the individual to whom it was granted, being duly contrite, had obtained the remission of the eternal punishment due to his offences) "included also a remission of as much temporal punishment, due in the sight of God, as the performance of the whole, or of the remitted portion, of the penance would have cancelled" (p. 106). Mr. Collette has mistaken the purport of the canon from which he has quoted.* It was not from the Council of Nice that bishops

* The canon has special reference to one particular class of delinquents, viz., soldiers who had left the army in order to subject themselves to canonical penance, and afterwards re-entered the army (even purchasing their re-admission), as a plea for not completing the course; it prescribes in their regard an additional ten years of penance; but remits it in behalf of those who by the tenor of their conduct should give unquestionable evidence of a true conversion; and adds that the bishops might afterwards deal with them more leniently. The Council thus sanctioned what was stated in a former letter as "another and more frequent cause for the remission or relaxation of canonical penance," viz., "the fervour and
derived their power "to shorten the time of penance, or to relax the severity of the canons." They had unquestionably exercised such power, on the recommendation of the martyrs, more than a century before the Council of Nice; and, unless his subsequent mutilated quotation from Suarez is "second-hand," he might have known that they had always possessed it.

Mr. Collette, however, in support of his denial, appeals to Suarez, who, he says, "in considering the early custom, and the canon of the Council of Nice and of other Councils, admitted 'That we only find that it was lawful * for a bishop to remit some of the public penances enjoined by the canons for divers crimes'; but that such a remission should be extended to a pardon of penalties due in the tribunal of God cannot be inferred from those Councils. —Tom. iv. in 3 partem, dis. 49, sect. 1. Mogunt. 1604" (p. 107). In reply: 1st. I am not aware that any attempt compunction of the penitents themselves." The canon is as follows:—"Qui autem a gratia evocati, et primum suum ardorem ostenderunt, et cingula deposuerunt, postea autem ut canes ad suum vomitum reversi sunt, ut nonnulli etiam pecuniam profuderent, et beneficiis militiam assequerentur, hi decem annis prosternantur supplices, etiam post triennii auditio tempus. In his autem omnibus examinare convenit consilium et speciem poenitentiae. Quicumque enim et metu, et lacrymis, et tolerantia, et bonis operibus conversionem et opere et habitu ostendunt, hi impleto auditio tempore quod praefinitum est, merito orationum communionem habebunt, cum eo quod liceat etiam episcopo humanius aliquid de eis statuere. Quicumque autem non adeo graviter tulerunt, nec multum suum referre existinarunt, satisque esse putarunt in ecclesias ingredi ad conversionem, tempus omnino impleant."—Labbe, tom. ii. col. 242.

* Mr. Collette must have overlooked the word "semper." Suarez says that in those Councils we only find that it had always been lawful for bishops, &c. "In his solum legimus semper licuisse Episcopis," &c.—Suarez . . . . sect. 2.
has been made to draw such an inference from those Councils. They were referred to in a former letter merely as bearing evidence to one of the grounds on which canonical penances, in the earliest ages, were remitted, viz., the fervour and intense contrition of the penitents.—2. And in section 1, to which Mr. Collette by mistake refers for his own quotation, Suarez asserts that “there is in the Church the power of granting indulgences, by which the punishments, due before God for sins remitted, may be remitted to the faithful,” and that “this power the Church received from Christ the Lord.”* According to Suarez, therefore, the Church must unquestionably have had the said power from the beginning; and whether in the early ages she thought proper to exercise it, or not, the opinion of Suarez, as an authority, must be fatal to Mr. Collette’s theory.

Mr. Collette, in the same page (107), to support his theory that the indulgences to which he had referred were remissions of sins properly speaking, refers to Morinus, and tells his readers that Morinus says that “those indulgences (of the Middle Ages) did not merely absolve from canonical penance, but that a remission of such sins was granted by them, upon which eternal life depends.” The words in italics were originally placed within inverted commas, as a quotation from Morinus, and the reference was to “the 10th book, cap. xxii,” which he has since corrected for “cap. xxii.” The truth is, that there is no passage in either chapter for which those words would be a correct quotation. The passages to which he afterwards referred me in a private letter, occur in the first and sixth sections of the 22nd chapter. In the summary of contents at the head

* “Dicendum ergo est, esse in Ecclesia potestatem concedendi indulgentias per quas remittantur fidelibus peena pro peccatis remissis debitae apud Deum; quam potestatem a Christo Domino Ecclesia accepit.”—Tom. iv. in 3 partem, dist. 49, sect. 1.
INDULGENCES AND

of the said chapter Morinus undertakes to show that the work enjoined by an indulgence takes the place of a canonical penance and discharges its obligation (vice fungitur pæne canonicae et illius obligationem solvit), and also to show in what sense (qua ratione) the Pontiffs granting indulgences, though absent, and not having heard the confession, say that they absolve and remit sins. In the commencement of the chapter he proposes to submit to the reader a series of "conjectures" as to the modes in which the terms of an indulgence may be understood in reference to the guilt of sin, as well as to the penalties due to it, in accordance with a theory peculiarly his own; viz., that a canonical penance cancelled not only the temporal punishment, but also the guilt of sin, and consequently the eternal punishment, and that sacramental absolution was not administered till the close of a canonical penance. The conjectures occupy the first six sections, and each presupposes that the work enjoined by the indulgence is a substitute for a canonical penance.

The passage in the first section, referred to by Mr. Collette, is the following:—"Almost all the ancient testimonies which occur concerning these remissions of penances (pennitentiarum remissionibus) seem (videntur) most evidently to promise a remission not only of penalties due to sins, but also of the guilt and the crime, and the more ancient those testimonies are, the more evidently. Thus Urban II.: 'We therefore admonish and exhort in the Lord, and enjoin for the remission of sins'; and a little afterwards, concerning those who should undertake the expedition, 'If they shall die in true penitence, let them not doubt that they shall receive both pardon of their sins and the fruit of eternal reward.' These things seem (videntur) incapable of being understood of canonical penances only, but of sin itself, which the Pontiff by Apostolical authority promises shall
be remitted and absolved before God, not only before the Church, without any canonical penance, except the enjoined work. Therefore he says that the journey [the crusade] is enjoined not only that remission and indulgence of sins may be obtained, but also, if he presently depart, eternal life."* The reader is requested to observe that Morinus styles the indulgences in question "remissions of penances"; and he does not say that those remissions of penances actually did promise a remission of the guilt and the crime, or that those things actually are incapable, &c., but only that respectively they seem ("videntur") to "promise" and "to be incapable, &c." The reader is also requested to bear in mind that, according to Mr. Collette's own quotation from Matthew Paris, 'the plenary indulgence of all their sins' was promised by Pope Urban to those crusaders only who should be truly contrite of heart and orally confess their sins (si veraciter fuerint corde contriti et ore confessi): and most Protestants would doubtless agree with Pope Urban that such truly contrite sinners, if they should die in true penitence, might reasonably "not doubt that they would receive both pardon of their sins, and the fruit of eternal reward."

In the second section, by way of conjecture, Morinus observes that the "second canon of the Council of Clermont speaks still more clearly: 'Let that expedition be accounted to him [the Crusader] in lieu of a whole penance" (pro omni poenitentia); and his explanation is, that "whereas, according to the former discipline, a homicide, or other such grievous sinner, would have been subjected to a canonical penance of many years, and [sacramental] absolution would not have been granted until the end, or some intermediate period, the absolution might now be administered immediately after the confession, provided the applicant would

* Morinus, De Sacram. Pænit. lib. x. cap. xxii. sect. i.
undertake to join the crusade; and his "conjecture" is that the indulgence might therefore be said to have reference to the guilt of sin, inasmuch as it affected the absolution. He concludes the section thus: "That relaxation, therefore, or rather commutation of penance, has reference not only to the penalty of sin, but also to the guilt, inasmuch as it affects the absolution, earns it, and obtains it as present from God, as from the Church."

In the conclusion of the next section he observes that the indulgence, or the work enjoined, according to the dispensation of the Church, has the same efficacy as the imposing of an ancient penance; and therefore the performance of that work purifies the sinner, obtains for him mercy from God, and prepares him for receiving absolution; and that "therefore plainly, in the understanding of the Pontiffs and the Councils, the indulgence then granted affected the guilt, and the absolution from it, in the same manner as a canonical penance." And in the fourth section he says: "The intention, therefore, of the Pontiffs promising the indulgence, and of the believer receiving it, was to redeem a canonical penance by the performance of the proposed work, and to produce in the soul the same effect as the canonical penance would have produced." In the sixth section, referred to by Mr. Collette,

* "Respicit igitur illa relaxatio, sive potius paenitentiae commutatio, non modo peccati poenam, sed etiam culpam, cum absolutionem afficiat, promereatur, et a Deo sicut ab ecclesia praesentem impetret."—Morinus, De Sacram. Paenit. lib. x. cap. xxii. sect. ii.

† "Eo igitur plane modo, ex mente Pontificum et Conciliorum indulgentia tum concessa culpam et ab ea absolutionem afficiebat quo paenitentia canonica."—Ib. sect. iii.

‡ "Mens igitur Pontificis indulgentiam pollicentis, et fidelis eam accipientis, erat operis propositi executione paenitentiam canonicae redimere, eundemque in anima effectum producere quem paenitentia canonica produixerat."—Ib. sect. iv.
his "conjecture" is that "in this manner the Pontiffs, in the most ancient diplomas of indulgences, said that they remitted, absolved, pardoned all sins, or part of them, because in truth by their sole authority that relaxation or commutation is granted which remits the penalty, acts upon the guilt, and wipes it away. With reason, therefore, on that account, although they are absent, although they have not heard the confession, they are said to absolve and remit the sins, since they grant the indulgence, by virtue of which the canonical penance is cancelled, and that being removed absolution is granted, and displays its full force."*

In all these extracts the reader will observe that Morinus evidently considers that the Crusade, or the work enjoined by an indulgence of the Middle Ages, was a substitute for canonical penance; and that the intention of the Pontiffs granting the indulgence and of the believer receiving it was to produce in the soul the same effect as a canonical penance would have produced. It was stated in a former letter that canonical penance was considered a "powerful means, in conjunction with alms and prayer, for obtaining, through the merits of Christ’s sufferings, a contrite and humbled heart." The opinion of Morinus was that it usually procured the gift of perfect contrition, by virtue of which the guilt of sin was cancelled before absolution; and that in that sense the canonical penance, or the work which was

* "Hoc sane modo, ut ego quidem conjicio, Pontifices in antiquissimis Indulgentiarum diplomatis dixerunt se peccata omnia, aut eorum partem, remittere, absolvere, indulgere; quia revera eorum sola auctoritate, ea relaxatio, vel commutatio, quae penam remittit et in culpam agit, eamque abstergit, conceditur. Merito igitur ea de causa, licet absentes sint, licet peccatorum confessionem non audierint, peccata dicuntur absolvere et remittere, cum indulgentiam concesserint, cujus virtute paenitentia canonica expungitur, et, ea praetermissa, absolution conceditur, vimque suam omnem exerit."—Ib. sect. vi.
substituted for it, might be said to have wiped away the guilt. His opinion, however, differs from the general belief of theologians, inasmuch as he does not distinguish between the sacramental absolution which would generally be administered at the time of confession, and the public absolution pronounced by the Bishop at the close of a canonical penance. His conjecture also appears to be somewhat inconsistent with his own theory, inasmuch as the act of “taking the cross,” or offering oneself for the expedition to Jerusalem, could not be more effectual for procuring immediately the gift of perfect contrition than the act of presenting oneself for canonical penance; and if sacramental absolution could efficaciously be administered in the one case, it certainly might have been in the other. Mr. Collette, however, may once more be reminded that, according to his own quotation from Matthew Paris, the plenary indulgence of all their sins was promised by Pope Urban II. to those crusaders only who should be truly contrite of heart, and orally confess their sins (si veraciter fuerint corde contritae et ore confessi). It may further be observed that the English bishops, in their definition of an indulgence, stated that it is not, properly speaking, any pardon of sin at all, leaving it to be inferred that, improperly speaking, or figuratively, or in a certain sense, it may be considered such a pardon. And hence, setting aside “conjectures,” the true explanation of the expressions, in accordance with the general belief of theologians, and equally applicable to other indulgences, will be that to those crusaders who, being truly contrite and orally confessing their sins, should within the sacrament of Penance (intra sacramentum) receive the remission of their sins as to their guilt and the eternal punishment due to them, Pope Urban II., although he was absent and had not heard their confessions, granted, externally to the said sacrament (extra
sacramentum) the further plenary or full remission of their sins as to canonical penance and all temporal punishment which might otherwise remain due; thus producing in the soul the same effect which, according to Morinus, the due performance of the canonical penance would have produced.

Sins indeed in a certain sense may be either punished or pardoned, in as many different ways, and by as many distinct authorities, as there are different kinds of punishment due to them. Disobedience, lying, quarrelling, theft, or the like, on the part of a child, may be punished or pardoned by a parent. The same kinds of sins, or greater violations of God's commandments, on the part of an adult, may be punished or pardoned by the constituted authorities of the State. The Queen, for instance, on a late occasion, granted to the Sheffield trade unionists a remission or pardon of all their murders and other such atrocities and crimes. And in the early ages of the Church, when canonical penances were prescribed, the same kinds of sins or similar violations of God's commandments might, in a similar way, be punished or pardoned by the injunction or remission of canonical penance, by the constituted authorities in God's Church. But in every instance the nature and extent of the pardon are at once discovered, from the quality or character of the party who grants it. The pardon of a parent is different from that of a civil governor; that of a civil governor from that of an ecclesiastical official; and all three are essentially different from that which is imparted by a confessor to his penitent in the administration of the sacrament of Penance. I stated in a former letter that, according to the doctrine and discipline of the Catholic Church, it is only in the administration of sacraments that her ministers, whether priests, or bishops, or popes, have the power of forgiving sins properly speaking, or with reference to their guilt and eternal punishment. And
hence the plenary indulgence of all their sins which was granted to the Crusaders by Pope Urban II., and the various other indulgences, remissions, and pardons which appear in the Bulls of other popes, would be as perfectly intelligible to the Catholics to whom they were granted, as the Queen's late pardon to the Sheffield trade unionists is to every British subject at the present day. By no parties concerned would the former be understood as a pardon of sins properly speaking, and by no British subject who has common sense is the Queen's pardon understood to extend further than a remission of civil pains and penalties.

I remain, &c.

T. L. G.
SIR,—At page 116, Mr. Collette professes to be "quite aware of the definitions given by Ferraris, Bellarmine, Dens, and all modern writers, of the present acceptation of an indulgence, which dates (he says) only from Leo X. in the sixteenth century"; but he challenges "the production of any evidence whatever to prove that 'pardon and remission of sin,' granted by these prior Bulls of Indulgence [the Bulls to which he had previously referred] technically meant no more than a remission of temporal punishment. . . . ." "If (he says) when Boniface VIII., the inventor of Jubilees, by his Bull granted not only a plenary and larger, but a most full pardon of all their sins, or when Urban II. advertised a plenary indulgence of all sins to those who should join 'the armies of the Cross,' they did not mean to grant anything more than a remission of temporal punishment of sins already forgiven in the sacrament of Penance . . . . then I require . . . . some evidence of this fact, anterior to the date when the practice was changed to the modern form." Mr. Collette, in the first place, is mistaken in imagining than any such change of form has actually been made. The truth is, that the same form in substance has been continued without intermission, from the time of Urban II. to the present day; and if this can be shown, the presumption ought to be that the present interpretation, or acceptation of the terms, is the same in substance that they originally
bore, unless evidence be produced to the contrary. The respective dates of the "prior Bulls" are 1095, Urban II.; 1300, Boniface VIII.; 1350, Clement VI.; 1474, Sixtus IV.; and 1680, Innocent X.; the last being late in the seventeenth century. To show, therefore, that no such change has since taken place, I need only produce evidence from the two succeeding centuries. I will accordingly submit to the reader the original Latin of a corresponding passage from a Jubilee indulgence granted in the eighteenth (or last) century, for the year 1750, by Benedict XIV.; and Elliott's translation of a similar passage from one granted in the present century, for the year 1825, by Leo XII. The Latin for the former is as follows:—"Quo quidem Jubilaei anno durante, omnibus utriusque sexus Christi fidelibus verè penitentibus et confessis, sacraque Communione refectis, qui beatorum Petri et Pauli, necnon Sancti Joannis Lateranensis, et Sanctae Mariae Majoris de Urbe Basilicas semel saltem in die per triginta continuos, aut interpolatos dies . . . . devotè visitaverint, et pro Sanctæ Ecclesiae exaltatione, hæresum extirpatione, Catholicorum principum concordia, et Christiani populi salute et tranquillitate, pias ad Deum preces effuderint, plenissimam omnium peccatorum suorum indulgentiam remissionem, et veniam misericorditer in Domino concedimus et impetrāmus. Datum Romae apud S. Mariam Majorem anno Incarnationis Domini millesimo septingentesimo quadragésimo nono, tertio Nonas Maii, Pontificatus nostri anno nono."*

The following is Elliott's translation of a corresponding passage in a similar Bull published in the present century: "During this year of Jubilee we mercifully in the Lord grant and impart the most plenary and complete indulgence, remission, and pardon of all their sins, to all the faithful of

Christ, of both sexes, who are truly penitent and have confessed, and who have likewise refreshed themselves with the Holy Communion—provided . . . . they shall have devoutly visited these churches of the city, that of the Blessed Peter and Paul, of St. John Lateran, and that of St. Mary Major, at least once a day for thirty days, whether successive or (interpolatos) at intervals . . . . provided also that they shall have poured forth pious prayers to God for the exaltation of the holy Church, the extirpation of heresies, the concord of Catholic princes, and the salvation and tranquillity (Christianipopuli) of Christendom.—Given at Rome, in St. Peter’s, in the year of Our Lord’s Incarnation one thousand eight hundred and twenty-four, on the 24th of May, and in the first year of our Pontificate.”

The reader must perceive that the terms “plenissimam omnium peccatorum suorum indulgentiam, remissionem, et veniam” (“the most plenary and complete indulgence, remission, and pardon of all their sins”) are still retained, and that Mr. Collette is mistaken in supposing that a change has taken place to some “modern form.”

* Delineation of Roman Catholicism, p. 356, London, 1859. The same expressions occur also in a Jubilee indulgence granted by the present Pope, Pius IX., in the year 1867:—“Itaque volumus ut in vestris diecesibus publice pro vestro arbitrio preces per triduum intra sex menses, pro ultramarinis vero intra annum, indicantur. Ut autem fideles ardentiore studio hisce publicis precibus adsint, ac Deum exorent, omnibus et singulis utriusque Christifidelibus, qui praedictis tribus diebus devotè eisdem precibus adstiterint, ac pro presensibus Ecclesiae necessitatibus ex nostra mente Deum oraerint, et sacramentali confessione expiati, ac sacra communione refecti fuerint, Plenariam omnium peccatorum suorum indulgentiam et remissionem misericorditer in Domino concedimus. . . . . Datum Romæ apud S. Petrum, die 17 Octobris, anno 1867, Pontificatus nostri anno vigesimo secundo.—Pius P. P. IX.”—Ex Epistola Encyclia ad omnes Patriarchas, &c.
But he challenges "the production of any evidence whatever to prove that 'pardon and remission of sins,' granted by those prior Bulls of Indulgence technically meant no more than a remission of temporal punishment." If Mr. Collette had read the Bulls himself, the evidence could scarcely have escaped his notice. It is set forth plainly in one of those identical "prior Bulls," issued more than a century before Leo X. was born. Clement VI. in his Bull for the second Jubilee (1350), the very Bull referred to by Mr. Collette, and from which he professes to quote, gives the following explanation: "Our Blessed Redeemer having shed not merely a scanty drop of His blood, which alone indeed, considering His Godhead, would abundantly have sufficed for the redemption of all mankind, but having poured it forth in a copious flood, so that 'from the sole of the foot even unto the head there was no soundness in Him,'* and not being willing that so copious an effusion should be fruitless, vain, and superfluous, was pleased thereby to purchase for His Church a heavenly treasure;" "Which treasure, indeed, He neither 'laid up in a napkin'† nor 'hid in a field,'‡ but through the ministry of St. Peter, the bearer of the keys, and St. Peter's successors, His own Vicars upon earth, He delivered in trust to be profitably dispensed to the faithful, and for proper and reasonable causes to be mercifully administered to those who truly repent and confess, sometimes for the total, and at other times for the partial remission of the temporal punishment due for their sins, as well generally as specially, according as it might seem to be the will of God."§

* Isaias i. 6. † Luke xix. 20. ‡ Matt. xiii. 44.
§ "Quem quidem thesaurum non in sudario repositum, non in agro absconditum, sed per Beatam Petrum Coeli clavigerum, ejusque successores suos in terris Vicarios commissit fidelibus salubriter dispensandum; et propriis et rationalibus causis nunc pro totali, nunc pro partiali remissione poena temporalis pro peccatis debitae, tam gene-
This is evidence at least a century and a half anterior to the date of Mr. Collette’s imaginary change.

The explanation given by Leo X. in the Decree to which Mr. Collette has referred, is as follows: “That no one in future may be able to plead ignorance of the doctrine of the Roman Church with respect to such indulgences and their efficacy, or to exculpate himself by a pretext of such ignorance, or to benefit himself by a feigned protestation, but in order that such persons may be readily convicted and deservedly condemned as guilty of notorious falsehood—We have deemed it proper to signify to thee by these presents that the Roman Church, which others are bound to follow as their Mother, hath delivered, that the Bishop of Rome, the successor of St. Peter, the bearer of the keys, and the Vicar of Jesus Christ upon earth, by virtue of the keys, the property of which is to open [heaven] by taking away its obstructions in respect of Christ’s faithful, namely the guilt and the punishment due for actual sins—the guilt indeed by means of the sacrament of Penance, but the temporal punishment due according to Divine justice for actual sins, by means of ecclesiastical indulgences,—may for reasonable causes, from the supersabundant merits of Christ and His saints, grant such indulgences to the said Christ’s faithful, who by the bond of charity are members of Christ, whether they are in this life or in purgatory, &c.”*

*...”per præsentes tibi significandum duximus, Romanam Ecclesiam . . . . tradidisse, Romanum Pontificem . . . . potestate clavium quarum est aperire [coelum] tollendo illius in Christi fidelibus impedimenta, culpam scilicet et pœnam pro actualibus peccatis debitam, culpam quidem mediante sacramento penitentiae, pœnam vero temporalem pro actualibus peccatis secundum divinam justitiam debitam, mediante ecclesiastica indulgentia, poss pro
In support, however, of his assertion that the terms "remissio peccatorum" and "venia peccatorum" were not technical expressions, but were really remissions of sins properly speaking, he quotes, in Latin only (p. 117), the second canon of the Council of Clermont: "Quicumque pro sola devotione, non pro honoris vel pecuniae adeptione, ad liberandam ecclesiam Dei, Jerusalem profectus fuerit, iter illud ei pro omni peenitentia reputetur" (i.e., "Whoever for devotion only, not for the acquirement of honour or of pelf, shall proceed to Jerusalem to free the Church of God, to him let that expedition be accounted in lieu of all penance"); and asserts that "this expression 'pro omni poenitentia' [in lieu of all penance] included the absolution of the sin [!] as well as all mortifications of the flesh. They were not," he says, "to do this for honour or money; the absolution was an adequate return, and hence they got rid of a set of cut-throat vagabonds at a cheap rate." In reference to "technicalities," he proceeds, "I will produce a witness who spoke at this very Council [?], explaining the intent and force of this Second Canon [?], but in which not one word of temporal punishments or 'canonical penance' is named, but the remission is expressly applied to the absolution of sin." He then quotes as follows from Labbe and Cossart's "Concilia" (tom. xx. col. 890): "Ordericus Vitalis expressed [has expressed?] the force of the second canon in these words, after the recorded oration of Urban II., in which he [Urban] excited the faithful to the expedition beyond the sea:—'For the provident Pope excited all who could fitly bear arms, to the war against the enemies of God, rationalibus causis concedere eisdem Christi fidelibus, . . . indulgentias ex superabundantia meritorum Christi et sanctorum," &c.—Ex Nova Decretali Leonis X. Pont. Max. de Indulg. apud Vita et Pontificato di Leone X., di Guglielmo Roscoe, tomo viii. p. 157. Milano, 1817.
and all penitents from that hour in which they assumed
the Cross of the Lord, by the authority of God he absolved
from all their sins, AND freed them from every burden
which takes place in fastings or other macerations of the-
flesh. For clearly did that prudent man, and kind chief
physician (Urban II.) consider that those who were going
abroad would in the way very often be vexed with many
and long dangers, be daily tried with many accidents, both
joyous and sad, for which, by the blood of Christ, would be
expiated the filth of all their sins.' Here, then," Mr. Collette
continues, "is a paraphrase and explanation of the Canon
given at the very time [?] by Ordericus, wherein it is expressly
stated that an absolution of sin was granted, as also a re-
mission of all fastings and macerations of the body; and
what further appears, this indulgence was to extend through-
out the campaign, that is, to operate for the future" (p. 117).

In the first place, with regard to Ordericus Vitalis,
Mr. Collette is strangely mistaken in supposing that he
"spoke" at the Council of Clermont, "explaining the
intent and force of this second canon, &c." He was not at
the time more than twenty years of age; he was not a
priest till thirteen years afterwards; and he never became
a bishop. Mr. Collette refers to no authority; his assertion
is gratuitous, and apparently without foundation. It is
further to be observed that whereas Ordericus enumerates
twenty-three of the canons of the Council, he entirely omits
the second, and nowhere explicitly professes to "explain
its intent and force." Labbe and Cossart merely state
that in those words "he has expressed the purport of it"
(sententiam expressit). The chapter in Labbe and Cossart
in which the passage occurs is entitled "Notes on the
Canons 1, 2, 7, and 28." In the introductory paragraph
they state that the Synod "granted to all those who were
preparing for the expedition to Jerusalem a remission of
penances” (indulgentiam penitentiarum): and in the section on the second canon, immediately after the quotation from Ordericus, they characterise the “ absolution” as an “ indulgence which consisted in a commutation of canonical penance” (Procter illam indulgentiam quae in penitentiae canonicae commutazione versabatur). It would seem, therefore, that their interpretation of the words of Ordericus, as explaining the intent and force of the second canon, is far from being in accordance with that of Mr. Collette. The canon provided that to those who should enter upon the crusade to Jerusalem, that expedition should be accounted as a substitute for all penance; and Ordericus says that “all penitents” (omnes pœnitentes), i.e. all those who were then in a course of canonical penance, or to whom a course of canonical penance was due, Urban absolved from all their sins, viz., as to canonical penances; and he also exempted them, as long as the expedition should continue, from all obligation of observing the ordinary days of fasting and other austerities, considering that the hardships of the war would be an equivalent. The passage, with its context in Ordericus, is as follows:—

“No sooner had Pope Urban eloquently poured forth these complaints [respecting the barbarities of the Turks] in the ears of Christians, than by the inspiration of God's grace thousands were inflamed with excessive zeal for undertaking the enterprise, and resolved to sell their lands, and leave all they had for Christ. Rich and poor, monks and clerks, townsmen and peasants, were all seized with wonderful ardour to march to Jerusalem, or to succour those that became pilgrims. . . . Robbers, pirates, and other criminals [Mr. Collette's “cut-throats”], touched by the grace of God, rose from the depths of iniquity, confessed and renounced their sins, and to make satisfaction to God for them joined the ranks of the pilgrims. The prudent
Pope stirred up all that were able to bear arms, to fight against the enemies of God, absolving by his authority all penitents, from the hour they should take the cross, from their sins, and releasing them from all obligations of fasting and other mortifications of the flesh. For he wisely considered, like a kind and prudent physician, that those who went on the pilgrimage would be constantly harassed on the road by difficulties of all kinds, and exposed to daily chances, both for good and evil, for which the worthy servants of Christ should be purified from all the corruptions of sin."

That the foregoing "absolution" had reference to canonical penances is sufficiently manifest from another of Mr. Collette's authorities, "Gul. Tyrius" (William of Tyre), who, he tells us, "testified that the grant of Urban II. expressly included those sins which the Scriptures declare do exclude from the kingdom of God" (p. 117). The passage to which he refers is the first part of the following extract from Urban's animated speech at the Council: "Those arms which unlawfully in duels you have stained with each others' blood turn now against the enemies of the Christian faith and name. Your thefts, incendiarisms, rapines, murders, and other things which they who do shall not obtain the kingdom of heaven, redeem by this service well pleasing to God; that these works of piety, and the collective prayers of the saints, may obtain for you a speedy pardon of those offences, by which you have provoked the Lord to anger. We therefore admonish and exhort in the Lord, and enjoin for the remission of sins, that, compassionating the afflictions and labours of our brethren and co-heirs of the kingdom of heaven, who dwell in Jerusalem and its borders (for we are all members one of another, heirs indeed of God, and co-heirs with Christ), you will

check with due chastisement the insolence of infidels, who are striving to subject to themselves kingdoms, principalities, and powers; and that you will resist with all your might those who are determined to destroy the Christian name.

. . . . Now relying on the mercy of God, and the authority of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, to faithful Christians who shall take arms against them, and take upon themselves the burden of this expedition, We relax the penalties enjoined them for their crimes. Let those also who shall die therein in true penitence doubt not that they shall receive pardon of their sins, and the fruit of eternal life."

But it is not only in Papal addresses and Bulls of Indulgences that the terms "venia peccatorum" and "remissio peccatorum," and similar expressions, are used in reference to temporal punishment. A further confirmation of their technical meaning may be found in the form of absolution in the sacrament of Penance, and in certain portions of the Liturgy for the Dead. In the former, immediately after the sacramental words "Ego te absolvo a peccatis tuis, In nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti. Amen" (I absolve thee from thy sins, In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen), by virtue of which, through the merits of Christ's sufferings sacramentally applied to the soul, the guilt of sin and its eternal punishment are remitted, the priest adds (in Latin), "May the passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, the merits of

the Blessed Virgin Mary and of all the Saints, whatever
good thou mayst have done, and whatever evil thou mayst
have suffered, be unto thee to the remission of sins" [viz.
as to temporal punishment], "to an increase of grace, and to
the reward of future glory: Amen."* And in the Liturgy
for the Dead, in the episcopal "Visitation of a Parish," after
a special service in the church, amongst other prayers which
are recited in the churchyard is the following:—"O God, by
whose mercy the souls of the faithful find rest, grant to all Thy
servants who here and elsewhere sleep in Christ, the pardon
of their sins ("veniam peccatorum"), that being absolved
from all guilt, they may rejoice with Thee for ever. Through
Christ our Lord. Amen." And in the Requiem Mass the
following is one of the Collects:—" O God, the Creator and
Redeemer of all the faithful, grant to the souls of Thy servants
[departed] the remission of all their sins" ("remissionem
cunctorum tribue peccatorum"), that through pious supplica-
tions they may obtain the pardon (" indulgentiam") which
they have always desired: Who livest and reignest with
God the Father, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, God, world
without end. Amen." Now the Catholic Church neither
does, nor ever did, believe that souls can be redeemed from
hell, or that sins can be remitted in the next world as to
their guilt and eternal punishment. The expressions must
necessarily have reference to temporal punishment only.

I remain, &c.

T. L. G.

* "Passio Domini nostri Jesu Christi, merita Beatae Mariae
Virginis, et omnium sanctorum, quidquid boni feceris et mali sus-
tinueris, sint tibi in remissionem peccatorum, augmentum gratia,
et praemium vitae aeternae. Amen."—A similar expression occurs in
the prayer "Sacrosanctæ," &c.
LETTER IX.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.—IV.

To * * * * *

Sir,—Mr. Collette, at page 111 of his pamphlet, makes the following statement: "Clement VI., in his Bull of the jubilee year [1350], proclaimed as follows: 'We command the angels to carry all the souls of those that come to Rome this year, out of purgatory; and we grant to all those that have taken upon them the Holy Cross, to deliver two or three souls out of purgatory' (Mandamus Angelis, &c.)." Mr. Collette ought to have known that the (pretended) Bull, from which he has taken his quotation, is a forgery. The true Bull for the said jubilee begins with the word "Unigenitus"; and its authenticity has never been questioned. Respecting the false Bull "Ad memoriam," doubts of its authenticity were entertained from the time of its first appearance. On its being printed at Utrecht by Joh. Hoornbek, in 1653, its spuriousness was fully exposed by Baluze* and Pagi,+ and is now admitted by learned and candid Protestants. The late Protestant historian Gieseler, in his Ecclesiastical History, says that "since its publication by Hoornbek, Protestant polemical writers have made frequent use of it; but, nevertheless, it is undoubtedly spurious." †

At page 120 Mr. Collette writes thus: "Dens, quoting from the 'Seraphic Doctor,' Saint Bonaventure, from the


IN ELLIOTT’S SUPPORT, HOWEVER, MR. COLLETTE SUBJOINS, IN A NOTE, THE FOLLOWING PASSAGE FROM MORINUS: “RELAXATIONIS FORMULA ERAE HUJUSMODI: QUI DENARIUM IN SEDIFICATIONEM, AUT REPARATIONEM HUJUS ECCLESIAE, VEL ORATORII, CONTULERIT,

* ELLIOTT’S REFERENCE, IN A NOTE, IS “BONAVENT. IN SENT. VENET. EDIT. P. 328.”
tertiam partem (vel quartam) *paenitentiarum imponendarum* illi in Domino relaxamus (lib. x. c. 20).” Mr. Collette does not favour his readers with the English. In the title of the chapter in which the passage occurs, Morinus undertakes to show that the “Third occasion of the diminishing of *canonical penance* was the total or partial releasing of its penalty, in consideration of a *temporal donation* applied to a *spiritual good*; and the following is the true rendering of Mr. Collette’s quotation:—“The form of this kind of releasing was: ‘To him who shall contribute a denarius towards the building, or repairing, of this church or oratory, we release in the Lord a third part (or a fourth) of *penances to be imposed*’: (i.e. of Penances which according to the Canons would otherwise have to be imposed). Mr. Collette’s misapplication of the terms "*paenitentiarum imponendarum*” is less excusable than Elliott’s mistranslation of the word “*paenitentia*.”

But further, St. Bonaventure, within a few sentences of the above-cited quotation, states that according to the common opinion of theologians, in order that indulgences, or releasings, may be of any avail, a twofold condition is requisite on the part of the recipient, viz., “*Confession with true contrition, and faith with true devotion,—that he (the recipient) be truly penitent for his sins, and truly confident that the indulgence of the pastor may be available to him*” (“*Dicendum quod communiter, secundum Doctores, ad hoc, quod Indulgentiae vel relaxationes aliquid valeant, exigitur duplex conditio . . . ex parte recipientis . . . scilicet confessio cum vera contritione, et fides cum vera devotione, ut verè de peccatis sit paenitens, et verè confidens quod Pastoris Indulgentia sibi valeat*”). Mr. Collette’s extraordinary gloss upon the whole is, “Here all repentance, confession, and absolution, and all such superfluous forms, are dispensed with for a money consideration” (! ! !)
Mr. Collette deals not less strangely with St. Thomas Aquinas and Gregory of Valentia. At page 138 we find the following statement:—"My next authority is the great scholastic divine, and 'angelic' doctor and canonized saint, Thomas Aquinas, who said that an ecclesiastical indulgence of itself could remit no punishment, either in the judgment of the Church, or in the judgment of God, but that it is a kind of *pious fraud*, whereby the Church, by promising such remission, might allure men to the devout performance of good works"; and he subjoins the following foot-note: "Errant qui dicunt indulgentias tantum valere quantum fides et devotio recipientis exigit, et Ecclesiam ideo sic eas pronunciare, ut *quodam pia fraude* homines ad bene faciendum alliciat. — See Greg. de Valent. c. ii. p. 1784. Paris, 1609; Thom. Aquin. Summæ Theol. *Sup. Pars Tert. Quest. XXV. Art. 4*; 4to. Colon. 1620."—In reply:
1. Any Latin scholar will perceive that Mr. Collette must have mistaken the meaning of his Latin quotation; he ought to have known that the author of the quotation instead of asserting, as his own belief, that it "is a kind of pious fraud, &c.," declares that they are in error who assert it ("errant qui dicunt . . . . Ecclesiam, &c.").
2. There is no such passage, beginning with the words "errant qui dicunt," either in St. Thomas Aquinas or Gregory of Valentia. 3. Mr. Collette seems again to have trusted the (supposed) accuracy of Mr. Elliott, or some other author. Elliott, in his "Delineation" (p. 314), has precisely the same quotation in a note, and the same reference to St. Thomas; but unfortunately for Mr. Collette, the reference is incorrect.*—4. St. Thomas, so far from saying that an

* 1. There is no such edition of the "Summa" as "4to. Colon. 1620"; and 2. In "Sup. Pars. Tert. Quest. XXV." there is no "Art. 4" (or 4th Article). Question XXV. ("Quest. XXV.") is divided into three articles only (in tres articulos divisa).
“Ecclesiastical indulgence of itself could remit no punish-
ment, &c.,” asserts, on the contrary, that indulgences “are
available both in the court of the Church and in the judg-
ment of God, to the extent of a remission of the penalty
residuary after contrition, confession, and absolution,
whether it (the penalty) have been enjoined or not.—
5. St. Thomas's statement is that “Some persons say . . . .
that the Church proclaims them (indulgences) so, for this
purpose, that by a certain pious fraud she may allure men
to do good. . . . But” (adds St. Thomas) “to assert this
seems very perilous; for, as Augustine says, in an epistle
to Jerome, ‘If in the Sacred Scripture anything of falsity
be detected, the strength of the authority of Scripture
immediately fails’; so in like manner, if in the teaching of
the Church any falsity should be detected, the instructions
of the Church would be of no authority for confirming the
faith.”†—6. And Gregory of Valentia, in the place referred
to by Mr. Collette, denounces as “most false” the opinion
which Albert and St. Thomas record as having been
advanced by “some persons, who said that an ecclesiastical
indulgence remits no penalty of itself, either in the judg-
ment of the Church or in the judgment of God, but that it

* “Dicendum quod valent (Indulgentiae) et quantum ad forum
Ecclesiae, et quantum ad judicium Dei, ad remissionem poenae
residuae post contritionem et confessionem, et absolutionem, sive sit
injuncta, sive non.”—Quaestio XXV. art. 1.
† “Quidam dicunt . . . quod Ecclesia ad hoc its pronunciat, ut
quadem pia fraude homines ad bene faciendum alliciat; sicut mater,
qua promittens filio pomum, ipsum ad ambulandum provocat. Sed
hoc videtur valde periculosum dicer; sicut enim dicit Augustinus
in epistola ad Hier. ‘Si in sacra Scriptura deprehenditur aliquid
falsitatis, jam robust auctoritatis sacrae Scripture perit’: et simili-
si in pradicatione Ecclesiae aliqua falsitatis deprehenderetur, non
essent documenta Ecclesiae aliquus auctoritatis ad roborandum
fidem.”—Quaestio XXV. art. 2.
is a kind of pious fraud whereby the Church, by that promise of remission, might allure men to the devout performance of those pious works which are required in the form of the indulgence. . . . But this opinion," he says, "was rejected as erroneous by all the orthodox: for it takes away certainty from the authority of the Church, which were it to deceive and act fraudulently in any matter, would deserve no credit in others, as St. Thomas rightly argues."*

And yet this opinion, thus censured and denounced both by St. Thomas and by Gregory, Mr. Collette has thought proper to submit to his readers as the genuine opinion of St. Thomas (!) Neander, indeed, to whom he repeatedly refers, might have told him otherwise. Neander says that "Thomas Aquinas cites the opinion of some who believed . . . . that the Church incited some to good works by means of a pious fraud. . . . . Yet he himself repelled such a doctrine with abhorrence, declaring it to be fraught with danger, since thereby all confidence in the affirmations of the Church would necessarily be weakened."†

Mr. Collette also ascribes to St. Thomas the invention of the "theory" of the superabundant satisfactions of our

* . . . . "excluduntur opiniones duae longe falsissimae. Una est—quam refert Albertus (in 4to dist. xx. art. 17) et D. Thomas (hic in Supplem. tertiae partis, quæst. xxv. art. 2.)—quorundam, qui dixerunt Indulgentiam ecclesiasticam nullam penam remittere per se, nec in foro Ecclesiae, neque in foro Dei, sed esse piam quandam fraudem, quæ Ecclesia per illam remissionis promissionem homines alliciatur ad exequendum devotione opera pia quæ in Indulgentiæ forma exiguatur . . . . Sed hæc opinio tanquam erronea ab omnibus orthodoxis fuit explodita. Detrahit enim certitudinem auctoritati Ecclesiae; quæ si in aliqua re deciperet, et fraudulentè ageret, nullam fidem in aliis mereretur, ut rectè D. Thomas, in dicto articulo 2. argumentatur."—Greg. de Valent. tom. iv. quæst. xx.; De Indulg. Punctum i. col. 1783.

Divine Redeemer, and the Saints, forming the treasure of the Church. "It was invented," he says, "in the thirteenth century by the scholastic divine, and doctor, and canonized Saint Thomas Aquinas" (p. 126). And at page 168 he says: "I stated as a fact that Thomas Aquinas, who died A.D. 1274, invented this theory; that it was not propounded or proposed before; and that Leo X., in the sixteenth century, first promulgated it by a solemn Bull." Mr. Collette is again mistaken; St. Thomas was neither the inventor, nor indeed the earliest writer who speaks of it. It is expressly mentioned by Albert the Great, the preceptor of St. Thomas, and by Alexander of Hales, who died before St. Thomas was twenty years of age.* The theory, moreover, was not then a new discovery. The principle had existed from the earliest times, and was exemplified in those remissions of canonical penance, which St. Cyprian says were granted in consideration of the merits of the martyrs, and in those Scriptural passages referred to in a former letter, in which Almighty God is recorded to have shown mercy to others, "for the sake of David his servant," and "because David had done that which was right in the eyes of the Lord."

At page 124 Mr. Collette states that this doctrine of celestial treasures became the law of the Church on the authority of Leo X. alone, and that "it must be accepted because it was so determined by Leo X., though there appears (sic) no reason for it. And this," he says, "is candidly admitted by their great authority Cardinal Cajetan, who said: 'We must admit without any hesitation, though

there appear no reason for it, that the dispensing of the
treasure of the Church, not only by way of sacraments as
to the merits of Christ, but otherwise than by sacraments
as to the merits of Christ and the Saints, is committed to
the Prelates of the Church, and especially to the Pope.
And this is so much the more to be confessed, because it
has been so determined by Leo X. (Absque hesitacione
aliqua etiamsi nulla adeset ratio, fatendum est dicti thesauri
dispensationem, &c.'—Cajetan, Op. p. 95, edit. Lugduni,
1558).” Mr. Collette is again mistaken. In the first place
reason does appear for it. Bellarmine, Dens, and most
other theologians, in their respective treatises, urge various
reasons in its support. Mr. Collette, however, appeals to
Cajetan, and represents him as candidly admitting that,
“though there appear no reason for it, it must be accepted,
&c.” We have here, however, another mistranslation:
Cajetan’s words are, “etiamsi nulla adeset ratio,” and the
meaning of those words is, “even if there were no reason.”
Instead of being an admission that there is no reason, it is
indirectly an assertion to the contrary.—In rejoinder, how-
ever (p. 169), Mr. Collette denies that he has “mis-
translated the words ‘etiamsi, &c.’” He contends that
his “translation of the words ‘though there appear no
reason for it,’ is rather freer than” his opponent’s “even
if there were no reason,” but that “to every correct reader
and writer of the English language it must be patent that
both translations are in the subjunctive mood.” His oppo-
nent need only reply that if Mr. Collette imagines that
they are also both in the present tense, any English school-
boy might tell him that he is again mistaken.

At page 139 Mr. Collette quotes as follows, from Coxe’s
translation of Hirscher’s “Sympathies of the Continent”
(p. 210). “A further practical and deeply-seated evil, to
which the attention of the Church must be directed, is the
idea entertained by the popular mind concerning indulgences. Say what you will, there it remains; the people understand by indulgences the remission of sins. Explain to them that not the sins, but only the penalties of sin are affected by indulgences; very well, it is the penalty, and not the guilt of sin, which the people regard as the important thing; and whatever frees them from the punishment of sin, frees them, so far as they care about it, from the sin itself.” Hirscher, according to the same translation, a few pages earlier, had written: “The people, in the widest sense of the word, regard private confession as the only way to obtain the remission of sins [thus excluding indulgences]: and, repeat to them as often as you may, that amendment of life is the first and the indispensable condition of remission, it is all of no avail towards destroying the convenient and deep-rooted notion that confession alone is the condition.”—My sufficient reply will be, 1. That such misbelievers must be either invincibly stupid dolts, or wilful and determined heretics: no Catholic who knows his religion entertains any such opinions; the Catholic Church teaches no such “convenient” doctrine. She teaches that without true repentance neither confession nor indulgences will be available for any remission of the guilt of sin, or of the penalties or punishment due to it.—2. I demur moreover to Hirscher’s evidence on the subject; his two statements are at variance with each other.

Mr. Collette, in the course of his pamphlet, makes the following statements, and others of a similar import; viz. 1. “The priest first pretends to absolve from the sin itself, and with it he undertakes to remit the eternal punishment, and then by the present modern theory he pretends that he can remit the remaining temporal punishment by the indulgence. He does now by two operations what they in the Middle Ages pretended to do by one” (p. 107). 2. “The priest
imposes the penalty, the priest remits the penalty by indulgences" (p. 108). 3. "The temporal punishments in purgatory are believed to be from a literal material fire. . . . The temporal punishments in this life are imposed at the will and discretion of the priest, and the nature of the sin will regulate the satisfaction: so says their Catechism, and the Council of Trent says these 'satisfactions' or temporal punishments imposed by the priest are to be 'prayers, fastings, and alms-deeds, and other works of piety'. . . . Indulgences, therefore, are to relieve us of the performance of these temporal punishments" (p. 135). Mr. Collette is strangely mistaken: 1. It is only in the sacrament of Penance (intra sacramentum) that a priest absolves from the sin itself, and thereby remits the eternal punishment; and it is only externally of the sacrament (extra sacramentum) that indulgences are granted, not indeed by the priest, but by the higher jurisdiction of the Bishop, or the Holy See. A priest has no jurisdiction, unless by virtue of a special faculty, to impart to any one the benefit of an indulgence. 2. The priest imposes "no penalty," except the sacramental penance; and he has no jurisdiction, extra sacramentum, by means of an indulgence to remit a sacramental penance. 3. No Catholic Catechism says that the "temporal punishments in this life are imposed at the will and discretion of the priest"; nor does the Council of Trent say that "the temporal punishments imposed by the priest are to be prayers, fastings, alms-deeds, and other works of piety." Mr. Collette does not distinguish between "temporal punishments" and "satisfactions." Satisfactions in this life are believed to be means of averting the temporal punishments of another. The satisfactions in question are the sacramental penance; and temporal punishments in this life are such as come from the hand of God; they are those which He denounced against Adam and his posterity.
in consequence of original sin, and they are others with which He occasionally visits the actual sins of whole nations or of individuals. To such temporal punishments in this life, Mr. Collette might have learned from Bellarmine and other theologians, indulgences have no reference: they have reference chiefly, if not solely, to temporal punishment in another life.

I remain, &c.

T. L. G.
SIR,—Mr. Collette, in common with most Protestant writers, fancies that he knows the doctrines of the Catholic Church better than its own members. His opponent has stated that the "Catholic Church teaches that, although upon true repentance, through the merits of Christ's sufferings, the guilt and eternal punishment (of sin) may be remitted, the temporal punishment may yet remain to be endured"; and Mr. Collette tells his readers (p. 131) that his opponent "misrepresents his Church's teaching"; that the "Roman Church proposes two kinds of repentance, one perfect, the other imperfect, which they call respectively contrition and attrition"; and that "they (the Roman priesthood) teach that by attrition, an imperfect repentance, from a fear of the consequences of sin, or the punishment of hell, an acknowledged unworthy motive, and by private confession to a priest with his absolution, the mortal sin is forgiven, and with it the eternal punishment due to that sin." Mr. Collette misunderstands the distinction; he seems not to be aware that "attrition" is but another name for imperfect "contrition." Now the Council of Trent sets forth that "contrition" (whether perfect or imperfect) is a "sorrow of mind and a detestation for sin committed, with the purpose of not sinning for the future." . . . . It declares further that "this contrition contains not only a cessation from sin, and the purpose and beginning of
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a new life, but also a hatred for the past, agreeably to that saying, Cast from you all your iniquities wherein you have transgressed, and make to yourselves a new heart and a new spirit.” If this contrition proceeds from the higher and purer motive of the love of God, it is called perfect contrition; if, on the other hand, it is “conceived from the consideration of the turpitude of sin, or from the fear of hell and of punishment,” or, in other words, from the fear of God and His judgments, including, however, the “hope of pardon,” and excluding “the will to sin,” it is called imperfect contrition, or, in one word, “attrition.” Now this fear of God and His judgments Mr. Collette presumes to characterise as “an acknowledged unworthy motive.” He is assuredly mistaken: the sacred Scripture is against him; our Divine Redeemer gives His sanction to this fear: “Fear not them that kill the body . . . . but rather fear Him that can destroy both body and soul in hell” (Matt. xxviii. 10). And the Blessed Virgin, in the Magnificat, declares that the Lord’s “mercy is from generation to generation to them that fear Him” (Luke i. 50). We read also in the Psalms, “Surely His salvation is near to them that fear Him” (lxxxiv. 10). “According to the height of the heaven above the earth, He hath strengthened His mercy towards them that fear Him”; and “As a father hath compassion on his children, so hath the Lord compassion on them that fear Him” (cii. 11, 13). There are also other passages in Scripture to the same effect.

In rejoinder (p. 169) Mr. Collette denies “most emphatically” that the Council of Trent describes contrition (whether perfect or imperfect) as the “sorrow and detestation which the mind feels for past sin, and a purpose of sinning no more.” This definition, he says, is exclusively applied to contrition. His mistake consists in assuming that it is exclusively applied to perfect contrition; and
hence he invariably misrepresents imperfect contrition (or attrition) as not including a purpose of sinning no more. He twice professes to quote "the decree of the Council of Trent on the subject," omitting by far the greater part, and each time asserts that "this is the only decree of the Trent Council which affects the question at issue (pp. 149, 170). The whole of the decree is as follows:—"Contrition, which holds the first place amongst the aforesaid acts of the penitent, is a sorrow of mind and a detestation for sin committed, with the purpose of not sinning for the future (animi dolor, ac detestatio de peccato commisso, cum proposito non peccandi de cetero). This movement of contrition was at all times necessary for obtaining the pardon of sins; and in one who has fallen after baptism it then at length prepares him for the remission of sins, when it is united with confidence in the divine mercy, and with the desire of performing the other things which are required for rightly receiving this sacrament" (viz. Penance). "Wherefore the holy Synod declares that this contrition contains not only a cessation from sin, and the purpose and the beginning of a new life, but also a hatred of the past, agreeably to that saying, Cast away from you all your iniquities, wherein you have transgressed, and make to yourselves a new heart and a new spirit. And assuredly he who has considered the cries of the saints: To Thee only have I sinned and have done evil before Thee; I have laboured in my groaning; every night I will wash my bed.; I will recount to Thee all my years in the bitterness of my soul, and others of this kind, will easily understand that they flowed from a certain vehement hatred of their past life, and from an exceeding detestation of sins. The Synod teaches, moreover, that although it may sometimes happen that this contrition is perfect through charity, and reconciles man with God before this sacrament be actually received, the said reconciliation
nevertheless is not to be ascribed to that contrition independently of the desire of the sacrament which is included therein. And as to that imperfect contrition, which is called attrition, because that it is commonly conceived either from the consideration of the turpitude of sin, or from the fear of hell and of punishment, it declares that if, with the hope of pardon, it excludes the will to sin (voluntatem peccandi), it not only does not make a man a hypocrite and a greater sinner, but is even a gift of God, and an impulse of the Holy Ghost, who does not indeed as yet dwell in the penitent, but only moves him, whereby the penitent, being assisted, prepares a way for himself unto justice. And although this [attrition] cannot of itself, without the sacrament of Penance, conduct the sinner to justification, yet does it dispose him to obtain the grace of God in the sacrament of Penance. For smitten profitably with this fear the Ninivites, at the preaching of Jonas, did fearful penance, and obtained mercy from the Lord. Wherefore falsely do some calumniate Catholic writers, as if they had maintained that the sacrament of Penance confers grace without any good motion on the part of those who receive it, a thing which the Church of God never taught or thought; and falsely also do they assert that contrition is extorted and forced, not free and voluntary.”

Sess. XIV. c. 4.* The parts omitted by Mr. Collette are the whole of the first part, as far as to the sentence beginning with the words: “The Synod teaches, moreover, &c.,” and the whole of the latter part, beginning with the words, “For smitten profitably, &c.” The reader is requested to observe that in the first part of the decree (omitted by Mr. Collette) the Council describes contrition, without any distinction as to whether it is perfect or imperfect, and defines

* “Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent” (Waterworth).
it to be "a sorrow of mind and detestation of sin committed, with a purpose of not sinning for the future," and it declares further that this contrition "contains not only a cessation from sin, and a purpose and beginning of a new life, but also a hatred of the old." The distinction which it afterwards makes between perfect and imperfect contrition has reference solely to the motive from which they respectively result, viz., the love, or the fear, of God. When placed in contrast with each other, the former is often designated simply as "contrition," and the latter as "attrition"; and hence Mr. Collette's strange mistakes.

In further rejoinder (p. 170) Mr. Collette somewhat qualifies his former assertion, and maintains that "if we repent only from the fear of punishment . . . . such repentance arises from an unworthy motive." The qualification, however, is irrelevant: the Council does not represent the sorrow of attrition as arising "only from the fear of punishment"; and if Mr. Collette means still to maintain that the sorrow of attrition, as defined by the Council, arises from "an unworthy motive" (the Council says that it is "the gift of God, and an impulse of the Holy Ghost"), I need only repeat that the sacred Scripture is against him. I believe indeed that very few Protestants would deny, respecting any sinner, (though styled by Mr. Collette "a murderer, perjurer, adulterer, thief, or one guilty of sacrilege, however oft repeated," that whenever that sinner, from a Scriptural fear of God and His judgments, really conceives "a sorrow of mind and a detestation for sin committed, with the purpose of not sinning for the future," "the blood of Jesus cleanses him from all sin." The sixteenth of the Thirty-nine Articles declares, that "after we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given and fall into sin, and by the grace of God we may rise again and amend our lives. And therefore they are to be condemned
which say they can sin no more as long as they live here, or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.”

Mr. Collette is further mistaken in asserting (pp. 149—170) that the decree above cited is “the only decree of the Trent Council which affects the question at issue.” The question is materially affected by the sixth and fourteenth decrees of the Sixth Session, “On Justification.” He is also mistaken in asserting (pp. 148—170) that in the case of perfect contrition there is no obligation of receiving the sacrament of Penance, that “the Council of Trent requires no more than a desire.” No theologian holds such an opinion. The Council of Trent teaches, in the decree above cited, that perfect contrition “reconciles man to God before the sacrament is actually received,” unmistakably implying that afterwards it is to be so received; and in the fourteenth chapter of the Sixth Session it sets forth that in the penitence of a Christian after his fall, are included “not only a cessation from sins and a detestation of them, or a contrite and humble heart, but also a sacramental confession of the same, at least in desire, and to be made in its season.” *

At page 132 Mr. Collette writes thus: “Delahogue expressly says, true repentance, or contrition, is not required in order that a man may obtain forgiveness of his mortal sins in the sacrament of Penance: (Contritio perfecta non requiritur ut homo in sacramento peenitentiae pecatorum mortalium remissionem obtineat).” Mr. Collette is again mistaken: Delahogue makes no such statement; Mr. Col-

* “Unde docendum est Christiani hominis peenitentiam post lapesum multum aliam esse a baptismali, eaque contineri non modo cessationem a peccatis, et eorum detestationem, aut cor contritum et humiliatum, verum etiam eorum sacramentalem Confessionem saltem in voto, et suo tempore faciendum.”—Sess. VI. De Just. cap. xiv. “De lapsis et eorum reparatione.”
lette has given us another mistranslation. No Latin dictionary with which I am acquainted gives the word "true" as one of the meanings of the Latin word "perfecta"; and neither "true repentance," nor "contrition" alone, is a correct or faithful rendering of the Latin words "contritio perfecta." In rejoinder, however (p. 171), Mr. Collette denies that in rendering the terms "contritio perfecta" by the terms "true repentance," or "contrition," he has mistranslated the Latin. Knowing that all Latin dictionaries are against him, he appeals to an English dictionary, and informs the reader that "Dr. Johnson defines true as 'genuine, real, not counterfeit'; perfect, as 'complete, pure, blameless, clear'; and asserts that "if a repentance is imperfect, it is not genuine, real, complete, pure, blameless, and therefore not true." He is mistaken; imperfection is not incompatible with truth. As a lawyer he might have known that evidence, even though "the truth," may not be perfect, unless it be "the whole truth"; it may even be so imperfect as to be equivalent to an untruth. But further, his own authority, Dr. Johnson, is against him: he gives twelve meanings for the word "perfect"; but the word "true" does not appear amongst them: and amongst seventeen that he gives for the word "true," the word "perfect" is not to be found. Mr. Collette, however, asserts that "the two words, as applied to the subject, are synonymous." He is again mistaken: Delahogue states that "perfect contrition is not required" for a valid reception of the sacrament of Penance, and consequently that imperfect contrition will suffice. Mr. Collette, by a mistranslation, misrepresents him as stating that "a true repentance is not required, &c.,” and consequently as stating that a false, spurious, unreal, or counterfeit repentance will suffice. "Falsely indeed do some calumniate Catholic writers, as if they had maintained that the sacrament of
Penance confers grace, without any good motion on the part of those that receive it."

At page 122 Mr. Collette professes to quote "a very extraordinary indulgence," which, he says, will "puzzle" his opponent: "Hoo that devoutly with a contrite heart dayly say this orison, yf he be that day in the state of eternal damnation, then this eternal paine shall be changed him in temporal paine of purgatory, than yf he hath deserved the paine of purgatory, yet shall be forgotten and forgiven through the infinite mercy of God." ("Horæ B. V. Mariæ secundum usum Sarum, p. 75. Paris, 1536.") And he adds: "There are here no terms of confession, &c., required." He is mistaken: devout prayer, and a "contrite (not attrite) heart" are required; and according to his own avowal (p. 146) "our Lord has promised a forgiveness of sins, if we approach Him in prayer, asking forgiveness with a contrite heart." His own principles in reference to "contrition" are a sufficient solution of his "puzzle."

I remain, &c.

T. L. G.
LETTER XI.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.—VI.

To * * * * *

SIR,—Mr. Collette (p. 134) denies that "an essential principle of the Catholic religion is that 'no one can forgive sins in his own right, but God alone.'" This, he says, is a "misrepresentation," and "not the teaching of the Roman Church." He asserts that the "Catechism" of the Council of Trent, speaking of the Catholic priesthood, "says that 'unlike the priests of old, who simply declared that sins were forgiven, they really absolve.'"* "The priests," he continues, "actually assume the prerogative of the Almighty to forgive sins; hence the same Catechism says that 'therefore the priests are not only properly called angels, but gods, because they possess amongst us the strength and power of the im-

* Mr. Collette has placed the words, "Unlike the priests of old, who simply declared that sins were forgiven," within inverted commas, as a quotation from Donovan's Translation of the Catechism of the Council of Trent, and his reference is "Donovan, p. 259, Dublin, 1832." The passage is a misquotation; there is no such sentence in Donovan, and there is no such edition of Donovan as "Dublin, 1832." It is not, moreover, true that the priests of old "declared that sins were forgiven"; they had no such authority, or commission. The words at page 259, in two editions in the British Museum, are, "Unlike the authority given to the priests of the Old Law, to declare the leper cleansed from his leprosy"; and at page 257, in a third, "Unlike the priests in the Old Law, who merely declared the leper cleansed from his leprosy." Mr. Collette has misquoted the passage, and given a false reference to a (supposed) edition which never existed.
mortal God.” Mr. Collette is strangely mistaken. First, the Scripture authorizes the use of the term “god” as applied to men, as well as to the Supreme Being. In the 7th chapter of Exodus, for instance, it is applied to Moses: “And the Lord said unto Moses, ‘See I have made thee a god unto Pharaoh.’” In the 22nd chapter (v. 28) it is applied to magistrates and judges: “Thou shalt not revile the gods, nor curse the ruler of thy people”: and it is used in a similar sense in the first and sixth verses of Psalm lxxxii. (ad. lxxxii.) ; and the application is sanctioned by our Divine Redeemer (John x. 34, 35). It does not therefore follow from the use of the term “gods,” that priests “actually assume the prerogative of the Almighty.” 2. Mr. Collette is mistaken in assuming that because priests “really absolve,” they forgive sins, or profess to forgive them in their own right. As a lawyer he must know that the judges in the English courts of justice really condemn criminals to their respective punishments; but they neither condemn them nor profess to condemn them in their own right; they act by a delegated power, on behalf of the Crown, and by virtue of a commission which they hold from the Crown, and their sentence is subject to revision on the part of the Crown. It is in like manner only by a delegated power that priests profess to absolve; they are successors of the Apostles, to whom God hath given the “ministry of reconciliation,” and in whom He hath placed “the word of reconciliation” (2 Cor. v. 18, 19), and as such they profess to be “ministers of Christ” and “dispensers of the mysteries of God” (1 Cor. iv. 1).

But Mr. Collette proceeds:—“They even go so far as to assert that a priest living in mortal or deadly sin himself can exercise this function”; and this he denounces as “a horrible conception of a corrupt church.” If Mr. Collette understood correctly the doctrines of his own church, he would
know that on this point the doctrine of the Church of England is similar to that of the Catholic Church. It is only as ministers of sacraments that priests can be said to forgive sins; and sacraments are not dependent for their efficacy on the merits or demerits of those who administer them. They are outward signs, instituted by Christ, as means whereby the merits of His sufferings are applied to the soul; they derive their efficacy solely from His institution; and by virtue of the same, when duly administered (provided there be no obstacle on the part of the recipient) they produce their proper effect. In the baptism of infants, for instance, though the child has neither faith nor repentance, it has no disqualifying dispositions; it has neither a love for sin nor the will to sin, and hence the merits of Christ's sufferings, conveyed through the sacrament, produce their effect, and the soul is washed from its original sin: the words of the minister are, "I baptize thee," i.e. "I wash thee" from thy sin. In the baptism of adults, as in the sacrament of Penance, the case is otherwise; in their case there must be faith and repentance, contrition perfect or imperfect; and in the absence of these, neither one sacrament nor the other would produce its effect. The sentence of the minister, "I baptize thee," or "I absolve thee," would not be ratified in Heaven.

With regard to the merits or demerits of the minister, the title of the twenty-sixth of the Thirty-nine Articles is "Of the unworthiness of the ministers, which hinders not the effect of the Sacraments": and the Article sets forth that "Although in the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometimes the evil have chief authority in the ministration of the word and the sacraments, yet forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by His commission and authority, we may use their ministry, both in hearing the Word of
God and in receiving of the sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such as by faith, and rightly, do receive the sacraments ministered unto them, which be effectual because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be administered by evil men."

Bishop Tomline, in his "Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles," says: "The sacraments are federal acts which it pleased our Saviour to institute, and to the due receiving of which He has annexed certain benefits; but it is nowhere said in Scripture, nor is it agreeable to reason, that the efficacy of these holy ordinances should in any degree depend upon the worthiness of those who administer them. If the faults of ministers vitiate the sacraments, no one can tell whether he has received the Lord's Supper, or whether he was baptized or not."—Art. XXVI.

Bishop Tomline proceeds: "Though the Church of Rome agrees with us in the doctrine of this article, yet it maintains that the intention of the minister is essential to a sacrament; that is, if a minister goes through all the forms of administering baptism or the Lord's Supper, and does not in his own mind intend to administer it, it is, in fact, no sacrament." This, he asserts, "is an opinion so absurd that it is unnecessary to say anything in refutation of it." It would seem, therefore, that according to Protestant theology, if merely as a practical joke or to vex or annoy the father, some wag were to throw water on the child of a Jew and pronounce the words, "I baptize thee," &c., the practical joke would be deemed a sacramental act; and in the event of the Jew and his family becoming converts to Protestantism, the practical joke in the case of the child would be held to be a valid baptism, and the baptismal rite would not need repetition.* Such certainly would not be the opinion

* The validity of baptism, administered by a lay person, is recog-
of Catholic theologians; and I doubt whether it would be acted upon by any Protestant minister who believes in the doctrine of original sin, and the necessity of baptism for its remission. In reference to the sacrament of Penance, the Council of Trent observes, that a penitent ought not to flatter himself so far on his own personal faith as to suppose that though there be no contrition on his part, or no intention on the part of the priest of acting seriously, and truly absolving, he would, nevertheless, be truly and before God absolved on account of his faith alone. For neither faith without repentance would bestow any remission of sins; nor would he be otherwise than most heedless of his own salvation who, knowing that a priest but absolved him in jest, should not carefully seek another who would act in earnest.*

At page 146, Mr. Collette, speaking of the Bulls of Urban II. and Boniface VIII., to which he had previously referred, asserts that they "expressly grant, in words, the most plenary pardon of sins, a pœna et a culpa, which words," he adds, "are precise, dogmatic, and clear"; and he places the words "a pœna et a culpa" as a quotation, within inverted commas. Now, the truth is, that in neither of those Bulls are those words to be found; and whether indeed any of the few Bulls in which they occur are genuine, is considered questionable. The words, however, are capable of a legitimate interpretation, inasmuch as to those who, in accordance with the terms prescribed in those Bulls, are "truly contrite of heart and orally confess their sins," the sacramental absolution would convey the remission of the culpa, or guilt; and the pœna, or temporal punishment, would be remitted by virtue of the indulgence.

Mr. Collette, however, further asserts (p. 152) that "the

nized in the Church of England. The question was decided in the case of Escott v. Martin, in the year 1842.

* Sess. XIV. De Pœn. c. vi.
contrition and confession referred to in some of the Bulls granting plenary and full indulgence and remission of all sins . . . . had no reference to the Roman doctrine of the sacrament of Penance. With the latter," he says, "we have seen that contrition is not an essential, and the confession was no more a private confession to a priest than was David's when he made his confession (Psalm xli. 4, xxxii. 5). The Papal law," he adds, "on this subject was not passed until two hundred years after Urban II." On these several points Mr. Collette is mistaken: 1. In all the real Bulls appealed to by him, "granting plenary and full indulgence and remission of all sins," both contrition and confession are distinctly expressed. It is true that in some Bulls prescribing, in addition to confession, a reception of the Holy Eucharist, the word "contriti" is omitted, as being sufficiently implied.* According to Catholic doctrine, confession without contrition would be unavailing for obtaining the remission of sin; and the subsequent reception of the holy Eucharist would be an "unworthy" communion. By neither sacrament would the guilt of sin be remitted, and no temporal punishment would be remitted by virtue of the indulgence. 2. Mr. Collette's mistakes respecting "Contrition" as not being essential for a due reception of the sacrament of Penance have already been pointed out. 3. With regard to "Confession": confession to God may be merely a movement of the heart; it requires no external expression in words; whereas the confession prescribed in the Bulls of Indulgence is an external oral confession (si verè fuerint corde contriti, et ore confessi). Now, oral confession could have been no other than private confession to a priest; public confession had been abrogated centuries before. The "Papal law," the decree of the fourth Council

* The form used is "sacramentali confessione expiati."
of Lateran, in the year 1215, enjoining that the rite of confession should be observed at least once in the year, was merely an enactment of ecclesiastical discipline. The moral obligation of its observance, as the requisite condition in ordinary circumstances for obtaining the forgiveness of mortal sin, had existed from the beginning; and were the decree of the Lateran Council to be repealed in the present Council of the Vatican, the moral obligation would equally still remain. The well-known name, however, of a certain season of the year is unquestionable evidence that auricular confession was the general practice in England some centuries at least before Urban II. All etymologists are agreed that the terms "shrive" and "shrovetide" are of Saxon (not of Norman) origin; and according to Johnson, "to shrive" means "to hear at confession—to administer confession"; and "Shrovetide" or Shrove-Tuesday, "the day on which anciently they went to confession." Hampson, in his "Medii ĀEvi Calendarium" (vol. i. p. 157), says, that the day "derives its distinctive epithet in English from the custom of the people applying to the priest to shrive them, or hear their confessions, before entering on the great fast of Lent, the following day." And Brand, in his "Popular Antiquities," observes, that "this seemingly no bad preparative for the austerities that were to follow in Lent was, for whatever reason, laid aside at the Reformation." Now, whether such confession was "no more a private confession to a priest than was that of David," referred to by Mr. Collette, the reader will form his own judgment.

Mr. Collette further asserts that the words contrition and confession are not found in the Bull on which he "relied, granting a plenary indulgence and remission of all sins, to be valid for all future time, for this reason, amongst others, that these indulgences were applicable, as an asserted dogmatic fact, to souls in purgatory, where confessedly there..."
is no room for contrition and confession." Mr. Collette is strangely mistaken: his mistakes respecting the Bull on which he professed to rely, and the meaning of the clause "to be valid for all future time," have been sufficiently noticed elsewhere. In reference to indulgences applicable to the dead he blunders most strangely throughout the whole of his pamphlet. At page 108, for instance, he asserts that "by the modern theory the Church of Rome claims a jurisdiction over the departed." At page 120 he says, "Indulgences to be applied to the dead, some assert, take effect by suffrage only—that is, by masses for the dead." At page 183 he asserts that "as to being in a state of grace, at least the dead are quite at liberty to receive the boon, without enjoying that happy or favoured position." And at page 203 he says, "where the indulgences extended to souls in purgatory, contrition and confession were impossible, and even the being in a state of grace was not required."

In reply: 1. By no "modern theory" does the Catholic Church "claim jurisdiction over the departed." No theologian maintains that she has such jurisdiction; and no indulgences, by virtue of any such (supposed) jurisdiction, are granted to the departed. 2. Mr. Collette is mistaken in supposing that it is only by masses that indulgences are applied by suffrage to the dead. Masses are available to the dead without any indulgences being attached to them; and indulgences are applicable to the dead, by way of suffrage, without the intervention of masses. Indulgences applicable to the dead by way of suffrage are gained for them by the living. In the "Communion of Saints" we believe that the Church militant on earth holds communion with the Church triumphant in heaven, and also with the Church patient, or suffering, in purgatory; we believe that the faithful on earth are benefited by the prayers of the saints in heaven, and that the suffering souls in purgatory
are benefited by the prayers, and fasts, and alms which are offered in their behalf by the faithful on earth; and we believe further that the faithful on earth, by fulfilling the conditions of an indulgence, may obtain from Heaven that the benefit of the indulgence may be applied by way of suffrage to any suffering soul, in whose behalf the conditions were fulfilled.

3. Mr. Collette is mistaken in supposing that souls in purgatory are not in a state of grace. Souls that are not in a state of grace are in hell, not in purgatory: and to souls in hell neither masses nor indulgences can be of any service; in hell there is no redemption. In support, however, of his supposition, he subjoins in a note the following Latin quotation from Ferraris, which he evidently misunderstands: — "Ut quis lucretur indulgentias pro defunctis, non requiritur quod sit in gratia, seu opera requisita adimpleat in statu gratiae" (Art. iii. n. 21); i.e., "For a person to gain indulgences for the departed, it is not required that he [not they] should be in grace, or that he should perform the requisite works in a state of grace."* Mr. Collette has mistaken the living for the departed.

I remain, &c.

T. L. G.

* Such was the opinion of Ferraris: it is not the common opinion of theologians.
LETTER XII.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.—VI.

To * * * * *

SIR,—There are further mistakes of Mr. Collette's, which require to be pointed out. At page 157 he quotes the following passage as the "concluding portion of the general form of absolution sold by Tetzel, under the direct authority of Pope Leo X., as his 'Subcommissarius,'" viz.:

"I restore thee to the Holy Sacraments of the Church, and to the unity of the faithful, and to the innocence and purity conferred on thee by baptism; so that the gates of punishment may be closed against thee at thy departure, and those of the joys of paradise be opened. Or shouldst thou not presently die, let this grace remain in full force, and avail thee at the point of death. In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." His reference is, "Vide 'Forma Absolutionis Plenarise,' apud Gerdesium, Monumenta Antiquitatis, tom. i., No. vii., B. p. 74": and "Here," he says, "there is an indulgence granting an absolution and remission from sin, to an absent person, in the plainest and most unequivocal terms, and the indulgence was to remain in force until death, so that the gates of punishment may be closed against the recipient of the indulgence at his death, that is, was to operate in the future." Mr. Collette is strangely mistaken in supposing that the absolution, or indulgence, is granted to an absent person: he must have overlooked the words "praemissa confessione," which appear in the heading of the "Forma."
The absolution, or indulgence, would be preceded by a sacramental confession; and sacramental confession cannot validly be made to an absent priest in writing, nor can sacramental absolution be similarly conveyed. The whole document from which the extract is taken is a "Summary" of an eleemosynary indulgence, granted by Leo X., in favour of those who should contribute towards the building of St. Peter's Church, in Rome. It conveys special faculties to a priest, chosen by the party contributing, to administer absolution, in reserved cases, if requisite, and also to administer a plenary indulgence once in life, and again in the article of death. If Mr. Collette had himself read the document, he would have found that it expressly provides that before the absolution or indulgence be administered, the confession of the recipient be diligently heard—"Confessione tua diligenter audita."* The nature of such indulgences, and the several grants conveyed in them will be further explained in a future Letter.

In support, however, of his theory respecting absolutions, in writing, Mr. Collette cites (p. 159) a letter written by the Abbot of Clugni to the Abbess Heloise, in which, by virtue of his charge, he "absolved Peter Abelard," "a deceased member of his community, from all his sins." Abelard died in the year 1142. He cites also a passage from a certain Abridgment of Church History, recording, as a fact, that it was a "devotion of the period (the twelfth century) to apply to the confessor, or to the superior of the district where the person died, to the effect of obtaining an absolution for the defunct"; and that "this absolution consisted of a declaration in writing, whereby the superior declared that he had absolved, and that he again absolves

* For the whole document, see Appendix D.
such a one from his sins.” The truth, however, is that these absolutions of the dead were not sacramental absolutions: no theologian has ever taught that sacramental absolution, or that any sacrament, can be administered to a deceased person. It has already been shown that the indulgence granted by Urban II. to the Crusaders, in the Council of Clermont, was a remission of their sins as to canonical penance; and the “devotion” which ensued with reference to the dead, is strongly confirmatory of the general belief of Catholics, viz., that it was not merely a remission of the penance on the part of the Church, but that further, by virtue of the power of the keys, it was intended and understood to be, to those who should be “truly contrite of heart, and should make confession with the mouth,” a remission of as much temporal punishment, with reference to another world, as the performance of the penance would have cancelled. The indulgence granted by Urban beneficially affected not only those who had already entered upon a course of penance, but also those to whom, according to the penitential canons, a course of penance was due. Now similar in character to the indulgence granted to the Crusaders were these absolutions of the dead. The “devotion” in question began soon after the Council of Clermont, and continued for a century or more till canonical penances ceased. The absolutions were remissions of sins as to canonical penance, which, according to the discipline of the Church, might have been due to the parties at the time of their decease, accompanied with a hope that God would vouchsafe in His mercy to regard the remission on the part of the Church, and remit a corresponding debt of temporal punishment in the other world. To such as were truly contrite, and made oral confession, sacramental absolution would have been administered previously to death. The absolutions in question, therefore, which were ad-
ministered afterwards, had reference solely to temporal punishment as connected with canonical penance, and afford no evidence in support of Mr. Collette's theory.*

At page 181 Mr. Collette professes to quote a "Bull of Indulgence . . . . of Innocent XIII." [?], and gives as his reference "p. 249., col. 2., tom. iv., Ferraris, Venice folio edition." He does not translate the passage, but gives the following descriptive comment:—"Here is a complication of technicalities! The Pope undertakes here to absolve the happy recipient of this piece of parchment from all the divine offices badly performed or omitted; he absolves him from all his sins by which he had offended God and his neighbour by human frailty, ignorance, or malice. Now here there can be no possible mistake as to the exact meaning of words, for the exemption expressly extends also to the penances he, the recipient of the parchment, may have forgotten, or even neglected. He also grants a plenary indulgence of all his sins confessed, and even of all those which he did not recollect, or which he had forgotten, as far as the keys of the Church extended. . . . By the same authority he absolves the gay and favoured individual

* Ruinart, in his Life of Urban II., records, on the authority of Arnaldus de Verdala, that on a certain Sunday in the year 1096 (the year after the Council of Clermont), Pope Urban II. solemnly blessed the whole of the small island of Magalona, and granted to all who already were, or who might thereafter be buried therein, "absolution of all their sins." This absolution, if the account is correct, would be somewhat similar to that which was granted by the Abbot of Cluny to Abelard. It may also perhaps have been given in a precatory form; and in such form the expressions "venia peccatorum," and "remissio peccatorum," as applicable to temporal punishment, are still used in the liturgy for the dead. The authority, however, of Arnaldus is questionable; he did not live till full two centuries after the (supposed) event; and certain statements which he makes respecting the principal see are considered improbable.
—'murderer or pirate'—from the pains of purgatory, which he had deserved for his sins committed and forgotten, and finally restores him to that innocence in which he was when he was baptized." In a note subjoined he says: "It will be observed that I call this a 'Bull of Indulgence.' All indulgences are granted by Bull or Brieve [?]. It may not be technically a Bull, though it is a Papal indulgence.". In another note, at page 186, he again speaks of it as an "indulgence of Innocent XIII."; and at page 204 he says: "As a fact the indulgence I quoted in my last, from the fourth vol. of the Venice edition of Ferraris, commencing 'Ego absolve te,' being as complete an indulgence as ever was published, has no reference, from beginning to end, to 'contrition or confession,' as part of the terms to gain the indulgence; they not being named at all."

In reply, 1. Mr. Collette is mistaken, as he is repeatedly throughout his pamphlet, in supposing that the person who gains an indulgence, or undertakes to perform the conditions for gaining one, receives "a piece of parchment," or a printed or written document of any kind. Since the abrogation of the eleemosynary indulgences, no "Summary" of the indulgence, or other such document, is required.

2. He is strangely mistaken in supposing that his quotation is in any way connected with any Bull, or Breve, or any other instrument of Pope Innocent XIII.; or that it is part or parcel of any Bull, or Breve, or other such instrument of any other Pope. In Ferraris the "Articles" (or chapters) are subdivided into sections (called "Numbers"), which are distinguished from each other by small marginal numerical characters. Mr. Collette's quotation occurs in Number 65, of the Fifth Article on Indulgences, and is styled (not an indulgence, but) a "Form of Absolution," and is there said to have been taken, not from any Bull, or Breve, or other instrument of any Pope, but from a "Mani-
pulus of the Friars Minor of St. Francis, part 6th, &c."
"Hæc Forma absolvendi excerpta est ex Manipulo Fratrum
Minorum Sancti P. Francisci, &c." The preceding number
(64) is neither a Bull, nor a Breve, but a "Decree" (Decretum),
not, however, of Innocent XIII., nor of any other Pope,
but "of the Congregation of Indulgences and Relics, under
Pope Innocent XIII."—"Decretum Sacrae Congregationis
Indulgentiarum et Reliquiarum præpositæ sub INNOCENTIO
PAPA XIII." The words "Innocentio Papa XIII." are in
large capitals, and occupy one line; the words "De-
cretum, &c.," and also the first words in the following
Number, 65, are all in small type. Mr. Collette has mis-
taken the two numbers for one, and, strange to say, has
imagined the whole to be a Bull of Pope Innocent XIII.

3. He is mistaken in supposing that "the Pope here
undertakes to absolve, &c.," or that the recipient of the
absolution is "a gay and favoured individual—murderer,
or pirate." The party to administer the absolution, &c., is
not the Pope, but a priest having special jurisdiction in
the case, and the recipient is a member of one of the three
Orders of St. Francis, dangerously ill and presumed to be
in the article of death.

4. He is further most strangely mistaken in supposing
that the indulgence has no reference to contrition or con-
fusion. Had he read the first paragraph of Number 65,
he would have found that all members of the three Orders
of St. Francis, by a grant of Sixtus IV., might be plenarily
absolved by a confessor duly licensed, once in life, and
again in the article of death; and he would also have
found a reference to the 8th section of a Bull, or Constitu-
tion of Paul V., beginning with the words "Romanus
Pontifex," and forming Number 7, in the preceding Fourth
Article; in which a plenary indulgence is granted to each
member, in the article of death, "if, being in like manner
truly penitent, and having confessed, and been refreshed with the holy Communion, or forasmuch as he might not be able so to do, being at least contrite, he shall orally if he can, or otherwise in his heart, devoutly invoke the name of Jesus"—"Si pariter veré pœnitens, et confessus, ac sacra Communione refectus, vel quatenus id facere nequiverit, saltem contritus, nomen Jesu, ore si potuerit, sin autem corde, devote invocaverit." According to Catholic doctrine, the beneficial effect both of the absolution and the indulgence would depend on the fact as to whether the dying brother was truly penitent or not.

In pages 179 and 180 Mr. Collette quotes several other grants of plenary indulgence for the hour of death; but in each of them, in terms similar to the above, contrition is specified as a condition.

At page 204, however, he refers to an indulgence granted by Pope Innocent XI., commencing "Pietatis, &c." in the last two grants of which he says: "being penitent and confessing are not required terms of the indulgence; but have the futuris temporibus valituris added." In reply, 1. The said two grants are not the usual "plenary indulgence and remission of sins," but merely remissions to the respective recipients, of one and two hundred days of penances enjoined or otherwise in any way due ("centum dies . . . . ducentos dies de injunctis iis, seu alicias quomodo-libet per eos debitis pœnitentiis"). The meaning of such indulgences has been explained in a former Letter. And, 2. The remissions are granted "in the accustomed form of the Church" ("in forma Ecclesiae consueta relaxamus"), in which contrition and confession are included.

But further, in the same page, 204, Mr. Collette writes thus: "But Ferraris' collection [of indulgences] is limited and partial. Corio, of Milan, who gives a history of indulgences, says that the Pope dispensed them to all sorts of
Corio of Milan is not the author of any "History of Indulgences," nor of any work in which he professes to give such a history. The passage referred to by Gibson occurs (not in any "history of indulgences" but) in Corio's "History of Milan," in which he erroneously states that "in January, 1391 (the [jubilee] indulgence having terminated in Rome), Pope Boniface IX., at the request of John Galeazzo, granted a similar indulgence in Milan, viz., that every one who dwelt in his seignory, though he might not be penitent, nor have confessed, might be absolved from any sin." (Storia di Milano, parte terza, cap. vii.). That the questors who preached the indulgence may have made such an announcement to the people seems not improbable;† but Corio's statement that Boniface granted such an indulgence either in Milan or

* Gibson having stated respecting Boniface IX. that "the Pope at that time dispensed (indulgences) to all sorts of sinners, etiam non contritis nec confessis," says, "they are the words of Corio, who gives us the history thereof." From this observation Mr. Collette seems to have fancied that Corio wrote a "History of Indulgences," compared with which "Ferraris' collection is limited and partial." (!)

† Theodoric of Niem speaks of the questors of Pope Boniface IX. as having been guilty of most extravagant excesses, and as having remitted all sins sine penitentia, and dispensed with all irregularities for money. Their delinquencies were such that on their return to Rome "some were cast into prison, others died an evil death, others committed suicide, and others were torn in pieces by the people"—"aliquos . . . carceribus intrudebat: nonnulli eorum mala morte perierunt, aliqui vero sibi ipsi mortem conscierunt, quidam furore populi in petias (en pièces) secti fuerunt."—Theodoric à Niem apud Gieseler, "Kirchengeschichte," vol. ii. part 2, p. 286. The excesses of too many of the questors will be noticed in a future Letter.
in Rome is untrue. Bzovius, one of the continuators of Baronius, assures us that "Corio was mistaken . . . . for that neither in the indiction of the jubilee for Rome, nor in that for Milan, is any such absurdity to be found."* He refers to the passage in Corio's "History of Milan," and to the letters of induction for each of the jubilees.

I remain, &c.

T. L. G.

LETTER XIII.

ELEEMOSYNARY INDULGENCES.

To * * * * *

Sir,—I now proceed to consider the charge of venality, so frequently urged against the Catholic Church, in reference to those transactions which have generally been characterised as sales of Indulgences and pardons. An important document, appealed to by most of our opponents in support of the said charge, is the "Centum Gravamina," or List of a Hundred Grievances, said to have been "presented in the year 1523, by the princes of the Germanic Empire [who, according to Mr. Collette, "were all Romanists"] to the Pope's Nuncio, at the diet of Nuremberg, and afterwards transmitted to the Pope himself (Adrian VI.) at Rome." The late Archdeacon Hodson, referring to this document, says that its authors, in their third grievance, "complain of the increase of the intolerable burden of indulgences, alleging that under show of piety for building churches, or undertaking an expedition against the Turks, the Roman Pontiffs sucked all the marrow of their estates from the simple and too credulous Germans; and, what was far worse, that by these impostures and their hireling criers and preachers genuine Christian piety was banished;" that "the venders of these Bulls, in order to advance their market, puffed their wares as possessing wonderful and unheard of efficacy, affirming that by means of these purchasable indulgences pardon might be obtained not only of the offences past or future, of the living, but also of those
of the deceased in purgatory, on payment of a sum of money”; and that “by this traffic in indulgences, the greatest encouragement is given to the commission of all manner of crimes,—fornication, incest, adultery, perjury, murder, theft, robbery, extortions. For what wickedness will any man fear to perpetrate, when he believes that by the payment of a price, however exorbitant, he may purchase to himself a license to sin, and an immunity from punishment, not only whilst he lives, but even after he is dead; especially the Germans, who by these false colours of true piety, under the appearance of religion, are easily persuaded of anything, since Germany is plainly towards piety of a credulous disposition.” So far respecting the sale of indulgences: other quotations from the document will be considered somewhat later.

And now supposing, for the sake of argument, that the authors of this document were Catholics, that they had solid grounds for the charges which they urge, and that the document itself is genuine, to what, I would ask, does their evidence amount, as a charge against the Catholic Church? It would seem to amount to nothing more than this, that certain Roman pontiffs (how few, or how many, the document does not state) had been guilty of hypocrisy and extortion; that their hireling criers and preachers had, in Germany, sold indulgences; that in order to advance their market, they had had recourse to puffing, and had puffed the indulgences, as possessing wonderful and unheard of efficacy; that they had affirmed, among other such puffs, that by means of these purchasable indulgences pardon might be obtained both for past and future offences, and for the dead as well as for the living, on payment of a sum of money; and that they had so far duped the simple and too credulous Germans (who it seems might easily be persuaded of anything), as to be enabled to suck from them the very
marrow of their estates. But where, be it asked, is the evidence that the puffs of those impostors were genuine doctrines of the Catholic Church; or that the sales, if effected, were sanctioned by her as lawful transactions? It is manifest indeed, from the language of the document itself, that its authors had no conception that they were; their complaints have no reference to the genuine doctrines of the Church, either as considered in themselves, or as taught in any country by the resident parochial clergy; they regard merely the practices of some of her unworthy members, and the assertions of certain itinerant quacks. On the question at issue, viz., whether the Catholic Church believes or teaches that indulgences or pardons may be sold, they bear no testimony whatever.

I do not intend, however, to evade the question: I will freely admit, to the fullest extent that truth will allow me, the abuses respecting indulgences which at different times have prevailed, more especially those which are of a pecuniary character, and which have generally been stigmatized as sales of indulgences; and I trust that I shall be able to prove that the Catholic Church neither now believes or teaches, nor ever did believe or teach, that such nefarious sales were lawful, nor ever approved of or sanctioned such abuses.

I signified, in a former Letter, that a further explanation would be required of those indulgences which were called Eleemosynary Indulgences, and of the abuses to which they were subjected. To these I now solicit the attention of the reader.

Subsequent to the plenary indulgence which was granted to the Crusaders by Pope Urban II., similar indulgences, on similar conditions, were occasionally granted by his successors. The indulgence of Pope Urban II. was granted not only to those who should actually take part in the
expedition to Palestine, but to those also who, according to their means, should contribute towards defraying its expenses. And in like manner succeeding Pontiffs extended their indulgences in favour of those who, according to their means, should contribute towards the accomplishment of other works of piety, such as the building and endowing of churches, the founding of monasteries or hospitals, and the like. To excite amongst the faithful a spirit of charity on such occasions, and to facilitate the collection of the alms, it was usual for the Pope or the bishop who granted the indulgence, to depute certain preachers to explain in the various provinces and parishes which they were appointed respectively to visit, the nature and extent of the indulgence, the conditions upon which it was granted, the circumstances of the case for which the alms were solicited, and in behalf of the same to receive what the faithful might contribute. Indulgences granted for the accomplishment of such purposes were called eleemosynary indulgences; and the preachers, being also the collectors of the alms, were called eleemosynary preachers, and eleemosynary quaestors. The reader is requested to observe that the grants conveyed in the Bulls of these indulgences were not confined to indulgences properly so called, and as understood at the present day. They comprised, in addition to an ordinary plenary indulgence, faculties for administering absolution in reserved cases, and other faculties and privileges which are now confined to the year of Jubilee. A "Summary" of the Bull on each occasion was drawn up; and a copy of such summary (to be submitted to a confessor if requisite) was given to each person at the time of his depositing his alms.

The nature of such indulgences and the form in which they were published, may be further explained by some extracts from a Summary of the Indulgence of the
ABSOLUTIONS.

Crusades, which appears to have been published in Spain, in the year 1828, by the Archdeacon of Madrid, for the Principality of Catalonia, and purports to contain the substance of a Bull of Pope Leo XII. The following quotations are taken from Mr. Mendham's translation, in the appendix to his History of the Council of Trent:

"Firstly . . . . To the King . . . . and to all faithful Christians . . . . who shall be moved by zeal for the faith to fight at their own cost against the infidels, in the army of his Catholic Majesty, or perform in it any other service . . . . his Holiness grants the same plenary indulgence which is customary to those who go to the conquest of the Holy Land, and in the year of Jubilee, provided they be contrite for their sins, actually confess them, or not being able to confess truly desire to do so. And likewise to those who send other persons at their cost to the same army, to the number of such as are required by the Bull, according to the quality of each, and to that of the persons sent, if they are poor.—Likewise to the aforesaid, and to the other faithful, not being, or not sending, soldiers to the said expedition, who shall contribute liberally to it of their goods at the rate of the alms, as below specified, his Holiness grants, &c."

[The several grants being, that even in the time of an interdict they may be present at mass and at other divine offices, and be admitted to the sacraments, and if they should die, be buried with moderate funeral pomp; and that, with the approbation of their physicians spiritual and corporal, they may during the year eat flesh on the fasting days, and eggs and preparations of milk at their discretion.]—"Likewise, in order that all and each of the aforesaid persons may pray to God with more purity, and implore his Divine assistance more efficaciously, they are allowed to choose a confessor . . . . of
such as are approved by the ordinary, and obtain from him plenary indulgence and remission of whatsoever sins and censures, even those reserved to the Apostolic Chair (except the crime of heresy), once in their life and again in the article of death; and of other sins and censures, not so reserved, they may obtain the absolution and remission as often as they confess them, [the confessor] imposing upon them salutary penance as their faults require, and on condition that if satisfaction should be necessary, they make it either in their own person, or by their heirs or others, in case of impediment; and all vows, excepting those of pilgrimage beyond sea, of chastity, and of religion, may be commuted by the same confessor into some assistance to the said expedition.—Likewise, if it shall happen during the said year that such persons should, on account of the suddenness of their death, or the want of confessors, die without confession, they shall obtain the same plenary indulgence, provided they should die contrite,* and had before confessed at the time appointed by the Church, and had not been more negligent in so doing through reliance on the present concession.”—Likewise to the “Commissary Apostolic General his Holiness grants that he may dispense and compound for any irregularity, provided it be not contracted by reason of voluntary homicide, simony, apostasy from the faith, heresy, or unlawful assumption of [holy] orders.—And since you [N.N.] have contributed an alms of seven sueldos and three dineros de ardites, money of Catalonia, which is what in virtue of Apostolic authority we have charged, and you have received this Summary (which you must keep

* The Rev. J. Townsend, in his Journey through Spain, &c., has the following gross misrepresentation:—“The Indulgences (of the Crusades) are . . . . 5. That, dying suddenly without confession, they shall obtain the same plenary indulgence as if they died under contrition.”—Vol. ii. pp. 170, 1, 2.
subscribed with your own name), we declare that there are granted to you, and you may use and enjoy all the forementioned indulgences, faculties, and grants, in the form given above. Dated Madrid, one thousand eight hundred and twenty-seven."

Subjoined to the document is a list of days on which a plenary indulgence [subject to true contrition, &c.] may be gained by virtue of the indult; and also a list of "days on which a soul may be liberated from purgatory," i.e. days on which a plenary indulgence may be gained, and applied by way of suffrage to a departed soul.

To obtain, then, the benefit of this indulgence, it appears that it was requisite that a person should be truly contrite for his sins; that he should confess them to a confessor approved by the ordinary; that he should perform the penance which such confessor should enjoin; that he should either himself serve in some capacity in the expedition against the infidels, or contribute towards it, as an alms, the sum of seven sueldos, &c. (about six shillings); that he should make satisfaction to every neighbour whom he might have injured, either personally, or, in case of impediment, by his heirs or others; and whereas amongst the sins of which he had been guilty, there might be some, the absolution of which would, in ordinary cases, be reserved to the bishop, or the pope, the document would, in such case, be a certificate to any approved confessor, that he had complied with one of the requisite conditions, and that, provided he were contrite and disposed to comply with the remainder, he would be authorized to absolve him. The effect or benefit of such absolution would, according to the principles explained above, be the remission of eternal punishment, and would be subject to the condition of his true contrition, &c.; the effect or benefit of the indulgence would, according to the same principles, be the remission
of temporal punishment, but would still be dependent on his fulfilment of the other conditions specified.

Now this contribution of an alms for the support of an army in defence of religion, for the building or endowing of a church or an hospital, or for any other religious or charitable purpose for which alms may lawfully and commendably be solicited, and receiving from the party to whom the alms were intrusted, a document such as the above, in which would be found recorded the sundry other conditions with which it would still be requisite to comply, in order to obtain the benefit of the indulgence, the nature also and extent of the indulgence and the faculties thereunto annexed, is the act which has generally been stigmatized by Protestant writers and preachers, as the sale and purchase of an indulgence. It would seem that the common impression on the minds of Protestants is, that the contributions were payments avowedly made to the private emolument of the clergy, and that the documents themselves were considered by Catholics as conveying to the parties who received them the benefit of an indulgence, or absolution, as effectually as the transfer of an estate is effected by a legal conveyance of the title-deeds. That such an impression, however, is erroneous, the language of the documents themselves bears sufficiently ample testimony.

With regard to the liberation of a soul from purgatory, a plenary indulgence, "if fully obtained," is believed to be available to the soul, in whose behalf it is obtained, for the remission of "the whole debt of temporal punishment on account of past sins," and of course for its liberation. No Catholic however pretends to know, in any given case, whether an indulgence, plenary or partial, has been fully obtained or not; because no one can know whether in the sight of Heaven the party applying for it was duly penitent for past sins, or whether the other prescribed conditions
of the indulgence were fulfilled with due punctuality and
devotion. And for these and other reasons no Catholic
pretends to know with certainty, whether the soul of a
deceased friend or relative, for whom an indulgence has
been gained by way of suffræge, or for whom mass has been
offered at a privileged altar, has received its liberation or
not;* nor would any Catholic, in consequence, think of
ceasing to pray for his deceased friend or relative, or occa-
sionally gaining for him other indulgences, or procuring
other masses to be offered in his behalf, more especially on
the anniversaries of his death.

Another, and perhaps more frequently adopted form for
expressing the contribution of the alms, was “the extending
of helping hands” (manus porrigere adjutrices). Gerdes, in
his “Monumenta Antiquitatis, &c.” (Num. viii.), submits
to his readers four such “Summaries,” in which the expres-
sion occurs, characterising them as “Specimens of the In-
dulgences sold by Tetzel and Samson” (Indulgenterum a
Tetzelio et Samsonio venditarum quædam exemplaria). They
purport to be “Diplomas,” or brief Summaries of parts of
the Bull of Indulgences granted by Leo X. for the building
of St. Peter’s Church in Rome, issued respectively by
Albert, Archbishop of Magdeburgh and Mentz, and John
Angel Arcimbold, two of the chief commissaries for the
publication of the said Bull, and John Tetzel and Ber-
nardinus Samson, subcommissaries. The parties by whom
the originals were obtained, and whose names are inserted
in the blanks left for the purpose, are (1) “Meckel widow
Rodts, Peters and Adam Rodt”; (2) “Andrew Hummel-
shayn”; (3) “Tilemann de Hopenik”; and (4) “The
august (magnificus) and noble D. Antony Spilman, with
his wife D. Dorothea Rossin, and their daughters; and

* See Delahogue: Tract. de Indulg., cap. iv., art. i.
Ægidius, his father, with his whole family." Most of the grants are similar to those specified above in the Summary of the Bull of the Crusades, and in each the money payment is expressly a contribution towards the fabric of St. Peter's. A description of two will suffice to show the character of them as far as the question at issue is concerned. Gerdes himself observes that, in several respects, the commissaries exceeded the powers of their office, and attributed to the documents more than the Papal authority sanctioned. The first is the one most generally known, and is characterised by the late Mr. Mendham as "The celebrated and important indulgence of Albert, Archbishop of Magdeburgh and Mentz, in 1517." After stating that the then present Pope, Leo X., in addition to most plenary indulgences, had granted to those who should extend helping hands towards the restoration of St. Peter's Church in Rome, the liberty of choosing a confessor, and after specifying the several faculties conveyed to such confessor in reference to reserved as well as ordinary cases, the document concludes thus:—

"And whereas the devout persons Meckel widow Rodts, Peters and Adam Rodt, have shown themselves grateful and liberal in contributing of their goods towards the fabric itself, and the necessary restoration of the basilica of the chief of the Apostles, according to the intention of our most holy lord the Pope, and our own appointment; in testimony whereof they have received from us the present letters; therefore, by the same Apostolic authority committed to us, and which we exercise in this respect, we concede and grant to them by these presents that they may validly use and enjoy the said grants and indulgences. Given in Gottingen, under the seal ordained by us for these things, on the first day of the month of June, A.D. 1517." Subjoined are two forms (to be used by a confessor); one of absolution [from sin] as often as required, in life; the other of
absolution [from sin, in reserved cases] and of most plenary remission [viz. a plenary indulgence] once in life, and in the article of death.*

The second is the one referred to by Mr. Collette, and misunderstood by him as an indulgence granting an absolution and remission from sin to an absent person. It is addressed throughout in the second person, to Andrew Hummelshayn, and inasmuch as he had extended helping hands towards the fabric of St. Peter's, it conveys to him the faculty of choosing a confessor secular or regular, who, having diligently heard his confession, would be authorized to absolve him, &c. Subjoined is the form of the plenary absolution, to be administered after confession, the latter part of which is quoted by Mr. Collette, and the whole document is subscribed thus:—"Brother John Tetzel, sub-commissarius, has written this with his own hand." Gerdes states in a note that the parts written by Tetzel are the "name of the petitioner [Andrew Hummelshayn] and the pronouns Thee, Thy, to Thee, Thy" (Te, tuorum, tibi, tuis); and that the remainder of the document is printed.†

I have stated that the whole document, consisting of a Summary of the Indulgence, and the form or forms of Absolution, was subscribed by Tetzel. Now, D'Aubigné,‡ and upon his authority Elliott,§ omitting the whole of the Summary, give merely a form of Absolution, and subjoin to it Tetzel's authentication. Their readers must naturally suppose that the delivery of the said form, so authenticated, would be understood by the recipients as an absolution in writing, effectually conveying to them the remission of their sins. D'Aubigné, throughout the chapter, repeatedly refers,

for other statements, to Albert’s “Instructions” to his sub-
commissaries; but neither D’Aubigné nor Elliott gives any
reference for this their apparently spurious document; and
I cannot find that any such detached or independent form
was ever issued or delivered by Tetzel. Amongst the
“Instructions” of Albert there is a form of plenary abso-
lution (“No. 75, ‘Forma Absolutionis Universalis’”); but
it does not accord with the one in question, and has no
name subscribed.

In the cheap edition of D’Aubigné, in one volume,* the
apparently spurious document is still further corrupted. A
passage in the French original † is thus correctly translated
in Scott’s edition:—“And I . . . . absolve thee from all
ecclesiastical censures, judgments, and penalties which thou
mayest have deserved: further, from all the excesses, sins,
crimes, which thou mayest have committed, however great
or enormous they may be.”‡ In the cheap edition for the
million, the passage is thus rendered:—“I absolve you from
all ecclesiastical censures, judgments, and penalties which
you have deserved; besides, of all the excesses, sins, and
crimes which you may hereafter commit [!] however great
and enormous they can possibly be”; and at the end the name
of Peter is substituted for that of “the Father,” thus: “In
the name of Peter, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.
Amen.”§ The translator does not authenticate his edition
with his name. In the Appendix the reader may see a

† “Je t’absous de toutes les censures ecclésiastiques, jugemens,
et peines que tu as pu mériter; de plus, de tous les excès, pêchés,
et crimes, que tu as pu commettre, quelques grands et énormes qu’ils
puissent être” (p. 277).
‡ Merle d’Aubigné, History of the Reformation, translated by
copy of another form, the original of which is in the British Museum. It is printed on vellum; and is one of the "Specimens of the earliest productions of the printing press in Germany." The names of the recipients, and the date of its being consigned to them, are written in the spaces left open for the purpose.*

The late Mr. Mendham, in his work entitled "Venal Indulgences," gives a long "Summary of an Indulgence" which he supposes to have been issued by Sixtus IV., "for the repair of a cathedral," and also various forms of documents called "Confessionals." Confessionals were chiefly summaries of those grants in a Bull of Indulgences, which would be administered to the recipient in confession. They conveyed to him a faculty of choosing a confessor who would be authorized to absolve him in reserved as well as in ordinary cases (the former absolution being generally limited to once in life, and again in the article of death), and also in the article of death to impart a plenary indulgence. The respective forms for the two absolutions were also usually subjoined. Mr. Mendham informs us that he had several specimens of such Confessionals, some of which had been used, the names and dates being inserted in the blanks. Most of them he briefly describes, and one he publishes in extenso, giving also a fac-simile of the original. The specimen given in the Appendix is copied from an original in the British Museum. The date is: "The last day of the month of May," A.D. 1480: the recipients were "Symon Mountfort and Emma his wife."† In this, however, as well as in those of Mr. Mendham, and, I believe, in all such documents (if genuine), wherever they may be found, the money payment, where any is required, is avowedly a contribution towards the erection or repair of some church or

* See Appendix E.  † See Appendix F.
other ecclesiastical building, or the expenses of some war for the defence of Christianity, or some other lawful or commendable object. They all, moreover, suppose the recipient to make oral confession of his sins to some approved confessor, and the subsequent absolution to be dependent on his true and sincere repentance.

I may further observe, in reference to contrition, that in Mr. Mendham's long "Summary," notwithstanding its questionable character, which will be noticed somewhat later, it expressly sets forth that by a positive law "no one can obtain remission [of sin] unless he be contrite, and confess to one who has authority and the faculty of absolving" (et quia nullus de lege posita potest consequi remissionem, nisi contritus, et confessus habenti auctoritatem, et facultatem absolvendi . . . . ). Albert of Mentz also, in his "Instructions" to his subcommissaries, having stated that the first principal grant in the Bull for the restoration of St. Peter's is the "plenary remission of all sins," viz. as to guilt and to punishment in purgatory, he prescribes that to obtain this grant each one "being contrite and having made oral confession, or, at least, having the mind and intention to make confession in due time," should visit certain specified churches, &c. The abuses which resulted from these eleemosynary indulgences will be treated in the next Letter.

I remain, &c.,

T. L. G.
LETTER XIV.

ABUSES OF INDULGENCES.

To * * * * *

Sir,—The abuses to which the eleemosynary indulgences were from time to time subjected, will be found to have consisted partly in the simoniacal misconduct of certain popes, and partly and chiefly in the scandalous excesses of the questors. The above-quoted passage from the Centum Gravamina represents that, in order to obtain money from the simple and too credulous Germans, certain Roman Pontiffs had granted and published indulgences under the mere show of building churches, &c., intending to apply the money, when obtained, to other purposes, and afterwards actually so applying it. It is moreover notorious that immense sums of money were sometimes obtained upon the credit of such indulgences, and that the Bulls, or Summaries of the Bulls, were disposed of to merchants as subjects of speculation, and traded with by them, as so many articles of merchandise. In the course of the eighteen centuries since the days of St. Peter there unquestionably have been popes, whose avarice and other vices have been a scandal to religion. Their number however has been comparatively small; and, unless it can be shown that their vices were sanctioned by the doctrines which they taught, I need not undertake to be their apologist. The Catholic Church can no more be held responsible for the crimes of bad Popes, than the three years’ moral teaching of
our Divine Redeemer can be held responsible for the denials of Peter, or the thefts* or the perfidy of Judas.

The principal delinquents, however, were the eleemosynary questors; and their offences were of various kinds. The authors of the Centum Gravamina represent them as "venders of the Papal Bulls," and state that "in order to advance their market they puffed their wares . . . . affirming that by these purchasable indulgences pardon might be obtained not only of the offences past or future of the living, but also of those of the deceased in purgatory, on payment of a sum of money." One of the most notorious of their number was a Dominican friar named Tetzel, of whom Archdeacon Hodson, in common with other writers, says that he was selected by Albert, Archbishop of Mentz, "as his agent in selling indulgences"; that he assured his hearers that "there was no crime so great, for which remission might not be thus obtained—remission not only of the temporal punishment, but of the fault itself"; that "the man who purchased an indulgence might be sure of his soul's salvation"; that the "benefit" was not "confined to the purchasers; they might redeem the souls of their deceased relatives and friends out of purgatory"; that "a man might for twelve-pence deliver his own father from purgatory"; and that "the moment the money tinkled in the chest, the souls for which it was paid escaped from purgatory and flew up to heaven."† These statements have reference chiefly to the fifteenth century and the commencement of the sixteenth.

So early, however, as the opening of the thirteenth century, the fourth General Council of Lateran records of some of them, that deceitfully assuming the monastic habit,

* John xii. 6.
† Church of Rome's Traffic in Pardons, p. 17.
they pretended to be what they were not, and in the course of their preaching had introduced several abuses.* In the year 1287, in a provincial Synod at Exeter, it is stated, of others, that they falsely pretended to be men of learning and piety; that they preached many errors and abuses; that, amongst other falsehoods, they asserted that they had more indulgences, and more ample ones, than they really had, and this to induce the unsuspecting to contribute more abundant alms, which they themselves afterwards prodigally squandered in drunkenness and dissipation; and that real and beneficial indulgences were, in consequence, by some persons undervalued.† In the Acts of the General Council of Vienne, in the year 1312, it is recorded of others, that in order to deceive the simple, and to extort from them their gold, they presumed, of their own accord, and without authority, to grant indulgences; to dispense with vows; to absolve from perjuries, homicides, and other sins; to allow the holders of ill-acquired property, provided the owners were not known, on payment of a sum of money, to retain the same; to remit the third, or fourth, part of penances actually enjoined; to deliver from purgatory and conduct to the joys of paradise, as they falsely asserted (ut mendaciter asserunt), the souls of three, or more, of the relatives or friends of those who should confide to them their alms; to grant plenary remission of sins to those who should become benefactors to the places for which they were acting as questors; "and some of them," the Council adds, "to adopt their own expression (ut eorum verbis utamur), absolve from punishment and from guilt (a pæna et a culpa . . . . absolvant").‡ Christianus Lupus says of

them, that they "pretended to be Curii, and from others' sins (ex alienis peccatis) lived like Bacchanals."* And Fra Paolo, in his History of the Council of Trent, states that, in order to "gain as much as they could, they were accustomed to use a thousand sacrilegious and wicked artifices, wearing a certain form of habit, carrying fire, water, bells, and other instruments to make a noise, that they might amaze the vulgar, and breed superstition in them"; that they told "false miracles," preached "false indulgences," asked alms "with imprecations and threats of evil and misfortunes against those that would not give"; and that they used "many other impieties like to these, so that the world was much scandalized."†

The reader, however, will observe that in all these records of the scandals and abuses of these quaestors, there is internal evidence that neither their exaggerated statements with reference to the indulgences, nor the impropriety of their conduct, was in accordance with the principles of

* In Dissert. de Pec. et Satisfact., Indulg., quoted by Van Espen, Pars ii., tit. vii., cap. iii.
† Brent's Translation, book vi. p. 468. The author of Mr. Mendham's long "Summary," as its own internal evidence would sufficiently indicate, was a quaestor; and Mr. Mendham reasonably presumes that he was the identical quaestor whose name is mentioned in the Bull, and who is therein deputed as the person to collect the alms. "Of the original Bull," Mr. Mendham observes, "perhaps not a copy is extant." One, however, of the copious extracts which the Summary professes to quote—the notorious passage, "Mandamus angelis, &c."—would alone suffice to decide its spuriousness. Mr. Mendham tells us that the name of the quaestor "was Raymundus Peraudi (Perault)," that "he was Apostolic Nuncio [and quaestor] under Paul II., Sixtus IV., and Innocent VIII., to collect money for the Turkish war; and was" afterwards "made Cardinal of Gurck by" the notorious "Alexander VI." He may probably have been as accomplished a quaestor as the celebrated Tetzel himself; and the Summary is worthy of its author.
their Church. The above-cited quotation from the *Centum Gravamina* states that their assertions were so many *puiffs*, and the subsequent quotations were merely the *puiffs of Tetzel*; Fra Paolo represents them as telling “false miracles,” and preaching “false indulgences”; and the Councils of Lateran, Exeter, and Vienne denounce their exaggerations as *falsehoods*, and their proceedings as *unauthorized abuses*, and record them merely to pass their censures upon them, more effectually to caution the public against them, and, as the sequel will show, to take measures for preventing their recurrence.

In order, then, to correct and prevent the recurrence of such abuses, the following are some of the decrees which were enacted by various councils. In the twelfth General Council, the fourth of Lateran, in the year 1215, it was formally decreed that no quaestor should be received into any parish, unless he should bring with him authentic letters from the Pope, or from the bishop of the diocese; and that then he should not be allowed to make any announcement to the people beyond the actual contents of the said letters. A form for such letters was drawn up and approved of.* And the quaestors were enjoined to be

* The form was as follows: “Quoniam (ut ait Apostolus) omnes stabimus ante tribunal Christi, recepturi prout in corpore gessimus, sive bonum sive malum fuerit; oportet nos diem messionis extreme, misericordiae operibus prævenire, ac æternorum intuitu, seminare in terris quod, reddente Domino, cum multiplicato fructu colligere debeamus in céulis, firmam spem fiduciæque tenentes quoniam qui parcæ seminat, parcæ et metet, et qui seminat in benedictionibus, de benedictionibus et metet in vitam æternam.—Cum igitur (ad sustentationem fratrum et egenorum ad tale confluëtium hospitale) proprie non suppetant facultates, universitatem vestram monemus, et exhortamur in Domino, atque in remissionem vobis injungi mus peccatorum, quatenus de bonis a Deo vobis collatis pias eleemosynas et grata cis caritatis subsidia erogetis, ut per subventionem vestram
moderate and discreet, and not to take up their abode in taverns, or unbecoming places, nor to incur unnecessary or sumptuous expenses, nor, unless they were monks, to wear the monastic habit.*

In the Synod of Exeter, in 1287, in addition to the points contained in the above decree, it was further provided that the money collected in each place should be carefully kept till the next meeting of the chapter, and that then by the ordinary of the place it should be intrusted to a faithful messenger; and further, that those who, contrary to the above-recited provisions, should admit any questor, or suffer him to preach, should be subjected to severe punishment.†

The General Council of Vienne, in the year 1312, having recorded in terms of censure the several abuses of which certain questors had been guilty, as specified above, decreed that those who in future should be guilty of the like, or should in any other way abuse any of their privileges, should be punished in such manner by the bishops of the places as to be deterred from attempting such indiscretions in future.‡

In the year 1440, the Council of Frisange, in Holland, prescribed that no rector, or vicar, or other superior of a church, should admit any person to solicit or collect alms, without first inspecting his letters, and ascertaining that he had the sanction and approbation of the diocesan or his vicar, and that the term to which such sanction and approbation were limited was not expired; that such being found

* Conc. Lat. IV. cap. lxii. Labbe, tom. xi. col. 213.
to be the case, he should neither refuse the said person admission, nor require or accept, on account of such admission, any portion of the alms which might be collected; and that any offender against such provision should forfeit threefold the amount, any remission or exemption on the part of the collector notwithstanding. It further enjoined, under pain of excommunication, that the prelates, rectors, and vicars of churches should detain, as prisoners, all pretended quaestors, whose letters should not be in every respect satisfactory, and either transmit them to the ordinary or his vicar, or denounce them as soon as possible, to be punished according to their demerits, and in such manner that others might be deterred by their example.*

In the year 1456, with a view to “obviate the refined and abusive modes in which some quaestors endeavoured to extract money from the poor, unlawfully perverting to their quaestuary purposes the preaching of God’s word,” the Council of Soissons, with respect to the province of Rheims, prohibited their preaching altogether, and allowed them merely to state their case in plain words, or to read their letters, or cause them to be read. And against the transgressors it enacted the provisions of the decretal “Cum ex eo” (from the fourth Council of Lateran), and the Clementine “Abusionibus” (from the Council of Vienne), and enjoined the ordinaries of the province to see them carried into effect.†

In the year 1466, in a general provincial Synod of the Archdiocese of York, in addition to the enactments of the Council of Lateran and of Clement V. in the Council of Vienne, which, together with the abuses therein recorded and condemned, and sundry others which had since been

† Conc. Suession. Labbe, tom. xiii. col. 1400.
perpetrated, the preamble of the decree specifically enumerates, it was further enacted, that if any questors should be guilty of the like in future, they should forthwith be expelled from their office, and on no account be appointed to the same again; and that if any rector, or vicar, or chaplain should, contrary to the forms prescribed by the councils, admit any such questor in his church or chapel, he should forfeit for such offence the sum of forty shillings of lawful English money, to be applied to the fabric of the metropolitan church of York.*

In the year 1473, in a council at Toledo, similar provisions were enacted, and a decree was passed subjecting the prelates who should violate them to exclusion from the church for the space of a month, and their officials or vicars to suspension from their office for a year. The questors who should dare to transgress them were, by order of the diocesan, to be imprisoned for the space of three months, and to forfeit twofold the amount which they had collected (sic ablata duplicata), to be equally applied to the fabric of the churches of the chamber and of the prelate (camerae et praelati). It provided further, that the rectors of churches should observe the same, and keep the decree in their churches on an open and most conspicuous tablet (in tabula patenti et praecedenti), so that no one should screen himself by a plea of ignorance, and that those who should fail to do so, should forfeit thirty regalia, to be appropriated as above.†

And finally, sir, the general Council of Trent, having previously, in its fifth session, in the year 1546, prohibited the questors from preaching, and directed that the bishops and ordinaries of the places should, by suitable remedies,

† Conc. Toletan. cap. xiii. Labbe, tom. xiii. col. 1456.
see the prohibition carried into effect, in its twenty-first session, in the year 1562, passed its final decree respecting them, enacting that "Whereas, in divers preceding councils, in order to correct their several abuses, sundry remedies had been prescribed, which of late had been rendered unavailing; and whereas, on the other hand, their depravity had been found to be in such manner daily increasing, to the great scandal and displeasure of all the faithful, as to seem to leave no hope of their amendment; from that time forward, in all places whatsoever of the Christian religion, their name and office should be utterly abolished, and that notwithstanding any privileges which might have been granted to churches, monasteries, hospitals, or holy places, or to persons of any degree, condition, or dignity whatsoever, and notwithstanding any customs, though existing from time immemorial, they should no longer be admitted to exercise the office; that the indulgences should in future be published by the ordinaries of the places, and the alms and oblations be collected gratuitously (nulla prorsus mercedem accepta) by two members of the chapter, whom the bishops should authorize for that purpose, in order that at length all men might truly know that these heavenly treasures of the Church are dispensed not for lucre, but for the promotion of piety.* And Fra Paolo states that, in passing this decree, the council was unanimous.† Now, sir, it seems to me, that if the belief of a church is to be ascertained from the formal decrees of its councils, and not from the false declarations or unbecoming conduct of individual members of its communion, here is a body of evidence sufficient to convince any candid person that the Catholic Church does not believe, with reference to indul-

* Conc. Trid. Sess. XXI. cap. ix.
† See Brent's Translation, pp. 468-9.
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gences, any of the abominations with which her opponents have thought proper to impeach her.*

I remain, &c.

T. L. G.

* Subsequently moreover to the publication of the decrees of the Council of Trent, Pope Pius V., in the year 1567, in his Constitution Etsi Dominici, in order to secure still further the prevention of abuses for the future, repealed the Eleemosynary Indulgences altogether. The decree is as follows: "Etsi Dominici gregis, &c. Sane cum ad auditum nostrum, &c. Nos . . . . omnes et singulas indulgentias, etiam perpetuas, et peccatorum remissiones . . . . tam singulariter quam universaliter, per quoscumque Romanos Pontifices predecessores nostros, ac etiam non [nos?] sub quibuscumque tenoribus et formis, ac cum quibusvis clausulis et decretis . . . . ac ex quibusvis etiam urgentissimis causis, etiam causa redemptionis captivorum, et alias quomodolibet concessas, pro quibus consequendis manus sunt porrigendas adjutrices, et quas quastuandi facultatem quomodolibet continent, tenore praesentium, perpetuo revocamus, causam, irritamus, et annulamus, ac viribus vacuumus."—Pii V. Const. XXX. In Bullar. Cherub., tom. ii. p. 223. And a few years later, in the year 1570, having learned that certain prelates of churches in Spain, in violation of the sacred canons and of the Tridentine decrees, and of his own above-quoted Constitution, had been guilty of certain grievous simonianal abuses with regard both to indulgences and to faculties for reserved cases, he issued another Constitution condemnatory of the same, and providing for their due correction.—Const. XCIX. "Quam plenum sit." In Bullar. Cherub., tom. ii. p. 323. If in any country any abuses exist at the present day, they are a subject of regret to every good Catholic who may know of them; and none more anxiously than Catholics can desire their effectual correction.
LETTER XV.

VENALITY CONDEMNED.

To * * * * *

Sir,—I trust that in a former letter it was sufficiently shown, that according to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, the sacraments of Baptism and Penance are the only ministrations by which, in ordinary circumstances, the forgiveness of sins properly speaking can be administered. I have now to show further, that, consistently with Catholic doctrine, neither of those sacraments can be sold; and I presume that the Canonical decrees of Catholic councils must be a better authority for determining the question than the assertions of prejudiced opponents.

In the eleventh General Council, the third of Lateran, in the year 1179, a decree was passed to the following effect:—"Whereas, in the body of the Church all things ought to be ordered according to charity, and what has been freely received to be freely dispensed, it is exceedingly shocking that in certain churches (dioceses) venality is found to exist, so that . . . . for burials and the funeral solemnities of the dead, and for the nuptial blessing, and the other sacraments, something is demanded, and he who needeth these things cannot obtain them unless he liberally fee the dispenser; We do therefore most strictly enjoin that such be not the case in future, and that neither for burying the dead, nor for the nuptial blessing, nor, indeed, for the other sacraments, anything be demanded (ne. etiam pro aliis sacra- mentis aliquid exigatur); and if any one shall presume to
contravene this decree, let him know that he will have his portion with Giezi, whose deed he doth imitate by the exaction of a filthy bribe."*

Previously however to this decree of the general council, and subsequently also, in sundry provincial councils in countries where the abuse was found to be creeping in, decrees were passed for its censure and condemnation. In a council, for instance, which was held at Bourges, in the year 1031, it was enacted that neither for baptism, nor for the administering of penance, nor for burial, should any one accept a fee unless the same were spontaneously and willingly given or offered.† In a council which was held in London about the year 1125, it was decreed that for chrism, for oil, for baptism, for penance, for the visiting or anointing of the sick, for the communion of the body of Christ, or for burial, no fee whatever should be demanded ("nullum omnino pretium exigatur").‡ And in a subsequent council which was held about thirteen years later, in the year 1138, the holy bishops who composed it, following, as they commemorate, the canonical institutions of the holy fathers, by apostolical authority enjoined that for chrism, for oil, for baptism, for penance . . . for the espousing of women (pro desponsatione mulierum) . . . or for burial, no fee whatever should be demanded; and that whosoever should presume to transgress should be excommunicated.§

It appears that in consequence of such decrees the pious and laudable custom on the part of the faithful of making offerings on occasions of marriages and burials began to be discontinued, and to be discommended and discouraged by factious partisans. And accordingly in the twelfth general

† Conc. Bituric. can. xii. Labbe, tom. ix. col. 867.
‡ Conc. Lond. cap. ii. Labbe, tom. x. col. 915.
§ Conc. Lond. can. i. Labbe, tom. x. col. 994.
COUNCIL, the fourth of Lateran, in the year 1215, the following decree was passed:—"By frequent report it hath reached the apostolic audience that certain clergymen for burials and marriages, and the like, do demand and extort money, and that if perchance their cupidity be not satisfied, they fraudulently urge fictitious objections; and on the contrary that laics, from a leaven of heretical depravity, though under a pretext of canonical piety, do endeavour to abrogate the laudable custom in favour of holy Church which was introduced by the pious devotion of the faithful: We do therefore both prohibit the nefarious exactions being made, and command that pious customs be observed, decreeing that the sacraments of the Church be freely conferred, but that those who maliciously endeavour to abrogate the laudable custom, the truth being ascertained, be restrained by the bishop of the place."*

* Conc. Lat. IV. cap. lxvi. Labbe, tom. xi. col. 220.—N.B. In accordance with this decree of the General Council, in a synod which was held at Oxford under Cardinal Langton, in 1222, the following decree was passed, and (if I understand correctly) still forms part of the ecclesiastical law of this country:—"We do firmly enjoin that neither burial, nor baptism, nor any sacrament of the Church, shall be denied to any one upon the account of any sum of money, nor shall matrimony be hindered therefore; because if any thing has been accustomed to be given by the pious devotion of the faithful, we will that justice be done thereupon to the churches by the ordinary of the place afterwards, as it was expressly decreed in the General Council."—Labbe, tom. xi. col. 280; quoted also in Gibson's Codex, vol. i. p. 431; and in Burn's Ecclesiastical Law, under the articles Baptism, Burial, Lord's Supper, and Marriage.—On the subject of burial Burn observes (from Lyndwood, 278) that "Burial ought not to be sold; but albeit the clergy may not demand anything for burial, yet the laity may be compelled to observe pious and laudable customs. But in such case the clerk" (clericus, or clergyman) "must not demand anything for the ground, or for the office; but if he shall allege, that for every dead person so
In the provincial Council of London, in the year 1237, in which the Pope's legate Otho presided, a decree was passed that the sacraments of the Church, in which, as in heavenly vessels, the medicines of salvation (salutis remedia) are contained, should be administered freely and devoutly (purè * ac devote), no obstacle being urged on the plea of any custom, by which payment might be said to be requisite from those who receive them. And to prevent misunderstanding on the part of the more simple, the council judged proper to set forth how many and what were the principal sacraments; and they were Baptism, Confirmation, Penance, the Eucharist, Extreme Unction, Matrimony, and Order.† And with regard to Penance, inasmuch as it was stated that certain covetous priests refused to admit to penance those who confessed to them, unless they made some contribution to their avarice, it was further enacted, that since those who do such things are unworthy of the kingdom of God and of the benefices of the Church, strict inquiry should be made respecting them by the bishops, and that whoever should be found to have been guilty of such things should be entirely deprived of any benefice which he might hold, and be for ever suspended from an office which he so ill discharged.‡

These decrees were renewed with some additions in a subsequent council, in which the Pope's legate, Otho bon, presided, in the year 1268; and further penalties were enacted against those who should violate them.§ Similar

much hath been accustomed to be given to the minister, or to the church, he shall recover it.”—Art. Burial.

* "Purè, i.e. gratis et liberè” (J. de Athon, quoted by Gibson in his Codex, vol. i. p. 432).
† Conc. Lond. cap. ii. Labbe, tom. xi. col. 531.
‡ Conc. Lond. cap. iv. Labbe, tom. xi. col. 532.
decrees moreover and declarations, condemnatory of the practice of demanding fees for the administration of sacraments, or anything of a sacramental character, were also passed in the eleventh Council of Toledo; * in the Synod held at Exeter, in the year 1287; † and in the Synod of Bayeux, about the year 1300.‡

With regard to Baptism in many places at the present day, an offering is customary as a fee for the registration; but neither the baptism, nor the registration, could legitimately be refused were the offering to be withheld. With regard to the sacrament of Penance, I am not aware that in any country, at the present day, any payment upon any plea is demanded or expected for its administration. I know not any priest, nor ever heard of one, who makes any such demand: I know not any lay person, nor ever heard of one, who supposed that such payment upon any plea was expected. I am told that an impression very generally prevails amongst Protestants, that a payment upon some plea or other is usually made to a priest upon his administering absolution. As far as an experience of more than sixty years, and all the information that I have, can enable me to judge, I believe that the impression is erroneous. To suppose however that throughout the extent of the Catholic Church no individual cases could anywhere be found would be unreasonable. One of our Saviour's own chosen Apostles was "a thief"; and He has given us to understand that there will be tares among the wheat till the harvest. But that such individual cases would not be in accordance with Catholic doctrine, and that the Catholic Church cannot reasonably be held responsible for them, must be sufficiently evident from the declarations of the above-cited councils.

Perhaps, however, an opponent might rejoin, that though such may be the discipline of our Church with regard to ordinary sins, and the absolution from them as administered by ordinary confessors, her belief and practice with regard to extraordinary sins, as comprised in the reserved cases, are altogether different. Mr. Collette tells his readers, in fact, that the authors of the Centum Gravamina allege in their fifth Grievance that "the Pope, bishops, and pillars of the Roman Church have always some reserved cases, for which you must make a fresh bargain, and pay more money, or no dispensation" ["aut absolutione tibi carendum est"], and that the sixth Grievance is, "that if any one has wherewith to pay, he may not only be indulged in a present transgression of these constitutions (above reserved cases [?]), but he may be permitted to transgress them in future; whence those who have a dispensation take occasion to commit perjuries, murders, adulteries, &c." (p. 158).

Before replying directly to the extract, let me notice to the reader—1. That Mr. Collette seems not to know the difference between an absolution and a dispensation; mistranslating the word "absolutione," he has substituted one for the other. What a dispensation really is Mr. Mendham might have informed him.* 2. That the word "always,"

* "A dispensation is differently defined; but it is really, according to the accepted doctrine of the Church of Rome, a release by authority of that Church from such laws as she has herself imposed. The great theologic oracle of the Roman Church, Thomas Aquinas, has carefully exempted from the power of dispensation all laws properly divine; and in this restriction he is followed by later authorities, perhaps to the present time."—Mendham's Venal Indulgences, p. 122. Mr. Collette may be further informed that an "absolution" has reference to the past; it is a pardon of past transgressions: a "dispensation" has reference to the future; it renders future transgressions (of the law so dispensed with) lawful.
which appears in the commencement of the extract, is an interpolation; there is no corresponding word in the original. 3. That he has taken the liberty to omit from his quotation a whole explanatory sentence, and to substitute for it a false gloss, in the words "above reserved cases." What the document states with regard to the transgression of ecclesiastical constitutions, Mr. Collette misapplies to "reserved cases"; and a permission to transgress such constitutions in future, or, in other words, a dispensation from the future observance of them, is by him misinterpreted into a permission to transgress with regard to reserved cases, which, of course, would be equivalent to a (pretended) license to commit the most enormous crimes: and 4. That he has further omitted altogether the concluding sentence of the paragraph, in which the authors of the document themselves, so far from imputing the evils complained of to any existing belief of the Church, or even representing them as evils of long standing, or generally prevalent, expressly declare that "the whole harvest of them originated in the lust of gain, and the accursed thirst for gold, with which some of the ecclesiastics [not the Church, be it observed] were at that time grievously tormented." (Quæ malorum sages, &c.) This single passage would alone suffice to refute the whole argument, as of any validity against the Catholic Church, which has been drawn from the Centum Gravamina. The two "Grievances" are as follows; viz.—"V. Moreover His Holiness the Pope, and the other bishops and pillars of the Roman Church have reserved some cases for their own absolution alone, and if you offend as to one or another of these, you must either pay or forego absolution; because they were reserved for this purpose that even from thence some money might accrue to them: which may be conjectured from the circumstance (ex eo) that in cases, however, for the season just or necessary, still they never grant dispensations unless
something be paid. But if you bring or pay nothing, you must remain perpetually without dispensation.—VI. But if any one has wherewith to pay, not only are the present transgressions of these constitutions [viz. "such laws as the Church herself has imposed"] pardoned, but permission is granted by the indulg to transgress the same in future with impunity. Whence it comes that they who have obtained a dispensation, make a handle of it to commit perjuries, homicides, adulteries, and other similar crimes, since any ordinary priest, by virtue of the indulg, may administer a purchasable absolution. Which entire harvest of evils takes its origin from the lust of gain, and the accursed thirst for gold with which some of the ecclesiastics are now grievously tormented."

In reply I may briefly observe, that what may have been the object of certain individuals, whether "Popes, or bishops, or pillars of the Roman Church," in having "reserved some

* "V. Praeterea Papalis Sanctitas, cæterique Episcopi, ac ecclesiae Romanae columnae, casus aliquot suæ tantum absolutioni reliquos fecerunt, quorum si unum aut alterum commiserit, jam aut numerandum, aut absolutione tibi carendum est, nempe quod in hoc reservati sint ut vel inde nummorum aliquid eis accrescat. Quod ex eo conicere licet, quod in casibus etiam quantumvis pro tempore honestis aut necessariis, nunquam tamen nisi numeretur aliquid dispensant. At si nihil attuleris numeraverisve, indispensatus perpetuo maneat. aut oportet.—VI. Verum, si quis undè numeret, habeat, jam nudum presentes indulgentur harum constitutionum transgressiones, sed et in futurum impunè, ut cas ipsis transgredi liceat, indulto permittitur. Quo fit, ut anam inde accipient ii, cum quibus ita dispensatum est, pejerandi, homicidia, adulteria et similia flagitia perpetrandi, quando quilibet ex sacerdotum vulgo, absolutionem emptitiam virtute indulti his impartiri potest. Quæ malorum seges tota ex habendi libidine, aurique sacra fame, qua nunc Ecclesiasticorum nonnulli miserr æxcruciantur, originem ductit."—Grav. V. et VI. ex "Grav. Cent. &c." in Fascic. Rerum Expetend. et Fugiend. tom. i. p. 355. Lond. 1695.
cases for their own absolution alone”;* or whether, or to what extent the said certain individuals, or any of them, may have been guilty of simoniaically demanding fees for absolution in such cases, or for the “granting of dispensations” from the observance of laws or ordinances imposed by the “Church herself”; or what may have been the evil consequences resulting from the indiscretion of the said certain individuals, or of others, in granting dispensations too easily, or in extending to “ordinary priests,” too indiscriminately, faculties for the reserved cases, are so many points in which the doctrine of the Catholic Church itself is in no respect compromised, and are consequently totally irrelevant to the question at issue.

The doctrine of the Catholic Church is, as I trust the reader is sufficiently aware, that absolution from sin, whether the case be reserved or not, can be administered only in the sacrament of Penance; and the canons and decrees of councils already quoted, have sufficiently set forth that for absolutions therein administered no fee whatever can be demanded. The Council of Trent moreover, when for just and sufficient reasons it extended to all bishops, in their respective dioceses, and in favour of their own subjects, the power of absolving in all (reserved) cases of a private nature (or such as would not require a public absolution from censures in the ecclesiastical court) expressly provided that

* The objects contemplated by the Catholic Church in the reservation of cases, as sanctioned and recommended by her, are, amongst others, the following; viz.—1. That the people may be more sensible of the enormity of such sins. 2. That the difficulty of obtaining absolution may deter them from the commission of them. 3. And that the more serious and dangerous spiritual disorders of Christians may be confided to the care of the more skilful and experienced spiritual physicians.—See Dens, De Cas. Reserv. No. 190; Bailly, De Pénit. cap. ix. art. 3; Conc. Trid. Sess. XIV. cap. 7.
such absolutions should be administered "gratis."* And
with regard to dispensations, it enjoined that, whenever
urgent and just cause, and a greater good, should require
that individuals should be dispensed with (from observances
of canonical discipline), the dispensations should be admin-
istered gratuitously by all the parties to whom the granting
of the same might belong ("gratis a quibuscumque ad quos
dispensatio pertinebit"); and directed that any dispensation
purporting to be granted otherwise should at once be
deemed surreptitious.†

I remain, &c.

T. L. G.

* Mr. Collette asserts (p. 201) that "the Council did not ex-
pressly provide that such absolutions should be administered gratis."
"It is a permission," he says, "and not compulsory—'Liceat.' It
is lawful for the bishop to absolve gratuitously." Mr. Collette is
mistaken; he misunderstands the purport of the decree. A Latin
dictionary may inform him that the verb "Liceat" is used to express
"power or authority," as well as mere lawfulness or permission.
Had the bishops previously been invested with jurisdiction to ab-
solve in cases reserved to the Holy See, provided they exacted a fee
for the absolution, his interpretation of the grant might be admitted.
But the truth is that previously to the decree in question they had
no jurisdiction whatever to absolve in such cases, except in articulo
mortis; and none whatever was thereby conveyed to them, except
to absolve gratuitously. The jurisdiction is limited by the term
"gratis"; and an absolution administered otherwise would have
been null and void.
† Sess. XXV. De Reform. cap. 18.
LETTER XVI.

PROTESTANT ABSOLUTIONS.—PROMISSORY OATHS.

To * * * * *

Sir,—I now beg leave to call the attention of the reader to certain portions of the Liturgy of the Church of England.—1. In the Service for the Ordination of a "Priest," the most solemn part of the ceremonial is that in which the power of remitting sins would seem to be conferred. According to the rubric, the receiver is directed to "kneel humbly upon his knees" before "the Bishop: the bishop with the priests present, lay their hands severally upon his head"; and the bishop addresses to him these words:—"Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed to thee by the imposition of our hands: Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God, and of His holy sacraments: In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."—2. In the "Absolution, or Remission of Sins, to be pronounced by the priest alone" (in the "Order for Morning Prayer") it is declared that Almighty God "hath given power and commandment to His ministers, to declare and pronounce to His people being penitent the absolution and remission of their sins."—3. In the Communion Service, "when the minister giveth warning for the celebration of the Holy Communion," he is directed to say: "Because it is requisite that no man should come to the Holy Communion, but
with a full trust in God's mercy, and with a quiet conscience, therefore if there be any of you, who . . . . cannot quiet his own conscience, let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned minister of God's word, and open his grief; that, by the ministry of God's word, he may receive the benefit of absolution, &c."—4. And in the "Order for the Visitation of the Sick," the rubric directs as follows:— "Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which confession the priest shall absolve him (if he humbly and heartily desire it) after this sort: Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to his Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of His great mercy forgive thee thine offences: And by His authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." Now unless, like certain expressions in the Pope's Bulls of indulgence, these forms are merely "technicalities," it would certainly seem that a power is here asserted on behalf of the clergy of the Church of England, to "absolve from all sins" without any restriction as to guilt or punishment, and consequently to grant pardons at least as ample as any indulgences granted by any popes.

In reference, however, to these passages, Mr. Collette states that the above-cited form of Ordination is "a comparatively modern importation," and that "no Christian communion used the words in their Ordination services for many centuries after Christ" (p. 178).—Respecting the Protestant part of the form (viz. the clauses beginning with the words "for the office," and afterwards with the words "and be thou") Mr. Collette is sufficiently correct; it dates no farther back than the year 1552. The Catholic part, however (the words in Italics) is as old as Christianity
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It was first used by our Divine Redeemer, on the day of His resurrection (John xx. 22, 23), and its use has since been continued in the Catholic Church without intermission till the present day. There is no record of its having been introduced at any intermediate period.

Mr. Collette further observes that the "benefit of absolution is to be obtained by the ministry of God's word," that the "minister proclaims the glad tidings of the gospel that there is a promise of forgiveness to the repentant sinner," and that he "acts as the minister of God, and in no way judicially." He further states, in reference to the "power and commandment" cited above, that the minister "shows what this means, by saying that 'He (God) pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent,' &c."; and he further asserts that the words (of absolution) cited above from the "Order of the Visitation of the Sick," "are only part of the absolution," and that "the prayer that directly follows is as much a part of the service as those words" (pp. 177, 178). In reply, I need not tell Mr. Collette that his assertion is incorrect; he must know sufficiently well that "the prayer that directly follows," though part of the service, is no part of the absolution; that the words in question are not "only part," but the whole of the absolution; and that his explanation of the prayer is irrelevant. I will merely remind him that in that form of absolution the Protestant minister assumes that the authority of Our Lord Jesus Christ is committed to him, and that by that authority he (the minister) absolves the sick person from all his sins, in the name, &c. There is no form of absolution in any Catholic ritual, in which the minister claims more power, or acts in a way more " judicially."

The Protestant Bishop Sparrow, in his "Rationale upon the Book of Common Prayer," writes thus: "Next follows the absolution [in the Order for Morning Prayer] to be
pronounced by the priest alone standing. For though the rubric here does not appoint this posture, yet it is to be supposed in reason that he is to do it here, as he is to do it in other places of the Service. And in the rubric, after the general Confession, at the Communion, the bishop, or priest, is ordered to pronounce the absolution standing. Besides, reason teaches that acts of authority are not to be done kneeling, but standing rather. And this absolution is an act of authority, by virtue of a power and commandment of God to His ministers, as it is in the preface of this absolution. And as we read (S. Joh. 20) Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted. And if our confession be serious and hearty, this absolution is effectual, as if God did pronounce it from heaven. So says the Confession of Saxony and Bohemia, and so says the Augustan Confession; and, which is more, so says S. Chrysost. in his fifth Hom. upon Esay. 'Heaven waits and expects the priest's sentence here on earth; the Lord follows the servant, and what the servant rightly binds or looses here in earth, that the Lord confirms in Heaven.' The same says S. Gregory (Hom. 26. upon the Gospels). 'The Apostles (and in them all priests) were made God's vicegerents, here on earth, in his name and stead to retain or remit sins.' S. Augustine and Cyprian, and generally antiquity says the same; so does our Church in many places, particularly in the form of Absolution for the sick; but, above all, Holy Scripture is clear, S. John 20, 23. Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them. Which power of remitting sins was not to end with the Apostles, but is part of the ministry of reconciliation, as necessary now as it was then, and therefore to continue as long as the ministry of reconciliation, that is, to the end of the world. Eph. iv. 12, 13. When, therefore, the priest absolves, God absolves, if we be truly penitent. Now this remission of sins granted here to the priest, to
which God hath promised a confirmation in heaven, is not the act of preaching, or baptizing, or admitting men to the Holy Communion . . . . but some other way of remitting, namely, that which the Church calls absolution. And if it be so, then to doubt of the effect of it (supposing we be truly penitent, and such as God will pardon) is to question the truth of God: and he that, under pretence of reverence to God, denies or despises this power, does injury to God in slighting his commission, and is no better than a Novatian, says S. Ambrose, l. 1. de Pœnit. cap. 2."—Rationale, pp. 17—20. London, 1657.

In D'Acher's "Spicilegium" (tom. iii. p. 724), there is a letter from Pope Clement VI. to the king and queen of France, introduced and quoted as follows by the late Archdeacon Hodson:—"We are not, however, without direct evidence that the power of granting absolution for future crimes was assumed and exercised by the Romish clergy. I subjoin an extract from an Indulgence granted by Clement VI., in the year 1351, to the king and queen of France, and their successors: 'Clement, bishop, servant of the servants of God, to our most dear children in Christ, John and Joan, the illustrious king and queen of France, greeting, and apostolical benediction . . . . We . . . . by apostolical authority, do by the tenor of these presents for ever indulge to you and your successors, who for the time being shall be kings and queens of France, and to every of you and them, that such confessor, religious or secular, as any of you or them shall think fit to choose, may commute for you and them, such vows as you may perhaps have made, or which by you or your successors may hereafter be made (the ultramarine vow, that to St. Peter and St. Paul, and that of chastity and continency excepted), and also such oaths by you and them taken, as you and they cannot conveniently keep, into other works of piety, as he may see
expedient for the health of your and their souls, agreeably to the will of God. Be it therefore unlawful for any man whatever to infringe this grant or rashly oppose it. If any man attempt this, let him know that he will incur the indignation of Almighty God, and of His blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul. Given at Avignon, the 20th of April, in the ninth year of our Pontificate." The Archdeacon proceeds:

"Now, as has been truly observed by an excellent friend of mine (Rev. Mr. Garbett, of Birmingham), in his remarks on this document, if to discharge men (particularly monarchs, upon whose public obligations national honour and safety depend) from their vows and oaths, when it is not convenient to keep them, be not leave to commit sin, what may be called so? And if such Indulgences be not for sins past, present, and to come, by what words may a license of the kind be expressed?"—Traffic, p. 32.

In reply, I may briefly observe—1. That the extract in question has no reference whatever to ABSOLUTIONS of any kind, and consequently cannot be evidence as to any power of granting them. 2. That the vows and oaths in question are obviously vows and oaths for the performance of some determined good work, and NOT such as involve any rightful obligation to any third person. 3. That the only power which is granted is one to commute the said vows and oaths into other works of piety, and extends no farther than the confessor may see expedient for the health of the parties' souls, and agreeable to the will of God. 4. That whether the popes have the power to commute such vows and oaths themselves, or to delegate such power to others, is no part of the question at issue, and consequently will not require to be discussed. 5. That whether Pope Clement VI. sold the "Indulgence" is neither asserted nor insinuated. And 6. That Mr. Archdeacon Hodson and his friend have mistaken the purport of the document, and that it is in no
respect either a leave to commit sin or an indulgence for sin past, present, or future.

Respecting the obligation of promissory oaths, the Protestant bishop Sanderson considers them subject to certain qualifications. In his treatise on Promissory Oaths, he says, that "in every oath, however plainly and exempt from exceptions it may be expressed, nevertheless, all those qualifications, whether exceptions or conditions, may and ought to be understood, which of common right are usually understood, in order to render an oath binding.

"The chief of those exceptions or conditions, and to which perhaps all the rest may be reduced, are the following:—

1. We must understand 'If God will permit' ("Si Deus permiserit"), according to that of James, 'If the Lord will, and if we shall live, we will do this or that' (James iv. 15). Hence if Caius should swear to Titius that he will be in London on the first of January and bring the money that he owes him, and if, having been seized with a serious illness, he should be at that time confined to his bed, or if on the road he should be robbed of the money by thieves, in this case he is not held guilty of perjury. The reason is, because since all things are subject to the Divine providence and will, and no man can answer for all future chances, he who has done all in his power to fulfil what he had promised has discharged the obligation of his oath. For since there is no obligation of a thing that is impossible, every oath by common law ought to be understood with the clause, 'Unless to God it may seem otherwise;' or some other to the like effect." 2. "We must understand 'as far as it is lawful' ('Quoad licet'); because there is also no obligation of what is unlawful. So that if any one should swear indefinitely to observe all the statutes and customs of some community, he is bound to observe those only which are lawful and becoming (honesta)." 3. "The clause 'Saving the au-
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The authority of a superior ('Salva potestate superioris') must be understood. Hence, if a minor has sworn to do something in itself lawful, and his father, not aware of the circumstance, should command him to do something else which will prevent him from performing what he had promised, he is not bound by his oath, because, by the Divine law of nature, he is bound to obey the command of his father. And a person who has sworn that he will not leave the house—if he be summoned by a lawful judge to appear before him—notwithstanding his oath, is bound to go forth. The reason is, because the act of one person ought not to prejudice the right of another.

4. "The clause 'Things so remaining' ('Rebus sic stantibus'), i.e., if things shall remain in the same state in which they are now—must be understood. Hence a person who has sworn to give [another] a sword, is not bound to give it to him in a state of madness ('non tenetur reddere furioso'). And if a man had confirmed a promise of marriage by an oath, and should afterwards find the promised party enceinte by some other man, he would not be bound to fulfil the promise. These, and such like conditions, although they be not expressed, may be understood in every oath; and he would be too rigid an interpreter of an oath who should exclude any of them."

I remain, &c.

T. L. G.

* Sanderson, "De Juramenti Promissorii Obligatione," Praelect. II. sect. 10. Londini, 1710.
LETTER XVII.

TAX-TABLES.—I.

To * * * * *

SIR,—I may now proceed to discuss the question of the Taxæ Cancellarìæ, &c., or “Tax Tables of the Apostolic Chancery and Penitentiary.” These, according to Archdeacon Hodson and other Protestant writers, are “catalogues of crime, in which absolutions and dispensations for sins of the deepest dye and most flagrant enormity are shamelessly bartered for pounds, shillings, and pence,” . . . . in which, “for instance, a pardon for perjury is charged at 9s.; simony, 10s. 6d.; robbery, 12s.; seduction, 9s.; incest, 7s. 6d.; murder, 7s. 6d.; and the Tax-Table makes no distinction, whether the pardon be obtained before or after the commission of the meditated crime.”* The work in which the question is treated most fully on the Protestant side, is one entitled “The Spiritual Venality of Rome,” written by the late Rev. Joseph Mendham. His work has been the text-book for Elliott and most subsequent writers; and to his work, rather than to references or quotations on the part of Mr. Collette or others, I purpose directly to reply.

The principal sources of information from which Mr. Mendham professes to have collected the materials for his work are, Bayle’s Dictionary, under the articles Banck, Pinet, and Tuppius; Marchand’s Dictionnaire Historique, under the article Taxæ; and Panzer’s Annales Typo-

* * The Church of Rome’s Traffic in Pardons, pp. 20, 21—30.
From these sources he enumerates not fewer than forty-five distinct editions of the Taxes, exclusive of a manuscript copy in the British Museum, which he partly transcribes, and of an early printed copy in his own possession, which, for reasons which he states, he supposes to have been printed at Rome "by Marcellus Franck, or some other Roman and authorized printer by authority of Leo X." * He gives the title, or description, of each edition, and in most instances the place and date of its publication, with occasionally other particulars. The first seventeen editions bear date before the Protestant era, and the first fifteen purport to have been printed at Rome. The respective dates of the Roman editions are 1471, 1479, 1480, 1486, 1489, 1491, . . . . 1503, 1508, 1509, 1510, 1512, 1514,† 1516; and between the years 1491 and 1503, three editions appear to have been published, the precise dates of which are not given by Mr. Mendham. A Protestant gentleman, however, on whose testimony I can rely, informs me that he has seen five such editions, and that their respective dates are 1492, 1495, 1496, 1500, and 1501. The Parisian editions are dated respectively 1520,‡

* Spiritual Venality, p. 93.
† Entitled "Regule, constitit. reservv. Canc. S. D. N. Leonis Pape Decimi, noviter edite et publicate. It is in 4to, at the 67th leaf of which is read Taxe Cancellarie, per Marcellum Silber, alias Franck, Rome in Campo Flore, anno MDXIV. die xviii Novembris, impresse, finiunt feliciter."—Mendham's Spiritual Venality, p. 26.
‡ Of this edition "the title-page is headed by the arms of the Medici, Leo X. being then Pope, and those of France. Then follows the title—Taxe Câcellarie apostolice et taxe sacre penitètiaire itidê aplice [apostolice]. Under a figure of St. Denis, between two angels, holding his own head, is the editor's name, Toussains Denis. Venundantur Parisiis i vico Sancti Jacobi ad crucem ligneam prope
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1531, 1533, 1545, 1624, 1744, and 1820; those of Cologne, 1515 and 1522 (or according to Banck, 1523); those of Lyons, 1544 and 1564; * of Amsterdam, 1661 and 1701 (or according to Bayle, 1700); of Bois-le-duc, 1664 † and 1706; and of London, 1625, ‡ 1674, § and 1714; || editions

Sacellum Divi Ivonis per Tossanñ Denis bibliopolam. . . . . 1520. Cû privilegio i triennii. At the end—finiút taxatiœs aplice." — Mendham's Venality, p. 28.


‡ Entitled "A Mittimus to the Jubilee at Rome, or the Rates of the Pope's Custome-House. Sent to the Pope as a New-yeeres-gift from England, this yeere of Jubile, 1625. And faithfully published out of the old Latine Copie, with Observations upon the Romish Text, by William Crashaw, Batchelor of Divinity, and Pastor at White Chappel. Lond. 1625. . . . . This is the first English edition of the Taxe." — Mendham's Venality, p. 38.

§ Entitled "The Book of Rates now used in the Sin Custom-house of the Church and Court of Rome, containing the 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 Kingdome of Ireland, and now through the mercy of God Minister of the Gospel according to the Reformed Religion—Licensed according to order. London, 1674." Mendham's Venality, p. 42.—N.B. "The Address to the Reader is not so satisfactory as it might be, respecting the source and authority of the edition." — Ib. p. 43.

|| "In R. Steele's Romish Ecclesiastical History of late years, Lond. 1714, in 12, is contained, at p. 107 and seq., 'Extract of the Taxæ Camerae, seu Canc. Apost. The Fees of the Pope's Chancery; a Book printed above 100 years ago, by the authority of the then Pope; being a Table, or List, of the Fees paid him for Absolutions, Dispensations, Licences, Indulgences, Faculties, and Exemptions.'" — Mendham's Venality, p. 45.
were also respectively published at Nuremberg in 1523; at Venice in 1532† (reprinted in 1584 and 1585); at Wittenberg in 1538; at Basle in 1554‡ (reprinted in 1561, 1566, and 1599); at Strasburg in 1565;§ at Laugingen in 1600;|| at Leyden in 1607; and at Franeker in 1651.¶ There are also three other editions mentioned, and dated respectively 1599, 1612, and 1613. The editions which are chiefly noticed by Mr. Mendham are those of 1514, 1520, 1523 (Nuremberg), 1532, 1564, 1651, 1664; the three London editions, 1625, 1674, and 1714; the Harleian Manuscript in the British Museum,** and his

‡ Inserted "in Wolfgangi Musculi Locis communibus Sac. Theologiae, tit. xxii. Basil., per Jo. Hervagium."—Mendham's Venality, p. 34.
§ Inserted in "Conc. Trid. Restitutioni . . . opposita Gravamina, &c. a Laurentio Tuppio . . . . 1565, Argentorati." "The Taxa . . . . is the same as that of Musculus and Du Pinet."—Mendham's Venality, p. 35.

** The manuscript consists of two volumes, small folio, written on vellum; and Mr. Mendham states that "these volumes were withdrawn [stolen?] from the archives of the Roman Chancery
own early printed copy.* From the Harleian Manuscript he
gives copious extracts, and his own early copy he professes
to publish verbatim. He states in the course of his work,
that he has copies of the editions of 1545, 1564, 1625,
1651, and 1664. I have myself at hand, now lying before
me (from Lord Acton's library), copies of the editions of
1491, 1599 (Basle), 1651, 1701, 1744, and the two editions of
Bois-le-duc, 1664 and 1706. I have also carefully examined
the Harleian Manuscript, the three London editions, and
others in the British Museum.

Of the editions generally Mr. Mendham tells his readers,
in the commencement of his work, that in the whole com-
pass of literature there scarcely exists any book, or set of
books, more curious, and, for several reasons and purposes,
more important in themselves . . . . and of which the
accounts are more defective, confused, erroneous, and un-
satisfactory, than the books bearing, for substance, the title
of Taxæ Cancellariæ Apostolicae and Taxæ Sacrae
Penitentiariae Apostolicae"† . . . . that "the first
French edition of a form of the Taxæ by Antoine du
Pinet, in 1564, under the title of Taxe des Parties Casuelles,
&c., and the re impressions previous to the time of Bayle,
although accompanied with prefaces, contain nothing to
satisfy almost necessary curiosity . . . . that by none of
the editors of those editions have we the information, either

on the death of Innocent XII., by John Aymo, Apostolic Protho-
notary”; and were “bought of him in Holland, at a great price,
by the Earl of Oxford.”—Venality, p. 57.

* Mr. Mendham's copy, as published in the Spiritual Venality, is
in most respects similar to the Sectio Tertia of Banck's edition;
and he himself states, that with the exception of a few unimportant
discrepancies, which he specifies, it corresponds exactly with the
Parisian edition of 1520.—See Venality, p. 108. With similar ex-
cceptions, it also corresponds with the edition of 1491.

† Venality, p. 1.
for kind or degree . . . which it was obviously of most importance to communicate”; that, “evidently, the point most essential in such inquiries is, to describe with precision the documents and authorities produced, and to establish their authenticity by such evidence as not the most practised and dexterous artifice, nor the most shameless counter-asseveration . . . . can elude or demolish”; and that “in this point all the preceding writers . . . . have, in various degrees, egregiously and unaccountably failed”;* that “the first author who may be said not to have failed, is Prosper Marchand, in his Dictionnaire Historique, &c., published in 1759, under the word Taxe, &c.”; and that “that article certainly exhibits the fullest, the most correct, and, in all respects, the best and most satisfactory account to be found of the extraordinary documents under consideration” . . . . that Marchand’s work “must be the foundation on which any future similar work is to be raised. But”—that “however meritorious and successful his inquiry may be, it is not so full and correct as it might be”; that “there is room for much important addition, some rectification of error, and some more accurate statement of fact.”† And speaking of an “edition of Du Pinet’s Taxe, published so lately as 1820,” he states, that “instead of advancing in information,” it “has actually retrograded, and left us more ignorant than we were when Marchand wrote”; and that “it were well if defects alone were chargeable upon this reprint; its additions are highly reprehensible.”‡

Of the Protestant editions, the one of Bois-le-duc (1664)

* Venality, pp. 2, 3.
† He considers that “these may be supplied partly from a careful examination of the well-known and useful Annales Typographici of Panzer, and partly from a more accurate examination in the editions which are accessible, of the Taxae themselves.”—Venality, p. 4.
‡ Venality, pp. 3, 4.
appears to possess the most plausible claim to genuineness. Mr. Mendham considers it "the most exact and important reprint extant," and states that it "faithfully represents an undoubted and most valuable Roman edition, the existence of which, and the fidelity of the present copy, are attested by two of the clerks, and subscribed by the Secretary of the City.* And Bayle observes that "it shows that this book [the Book of the Taxae] was printed at Rome, in the year 1514, and at Cologne in 1515, and was entitled 'Regule Constitutiones, &c.,' and that in fol. 67 it has these words, 'Taxe Canc. &c. per Marcellum Silber, &c.'; and that this is attested by two of the Eschevins of Bois-le-duc, together with the Town-Clerk, who had collated, word for word, this edition of Rome with that published by Stephen du Mont, bookseller, of Bois-le-duc, in the year 1664, and entitled 'Taxe Canc., &c.'"† And yet we learn from Mr. Mendham that there are sundry discrepancies between them; that "in the copy [of 1514] which Marchand had inspected, there were only, 1. The Taxe Sacre Penitentiarie Aplice incipiant, in 4 leaves or 8 pages, containing iv. titles; and, 2. the Taxe Canc. Apost., in 18 leaves, or 35 pages, with lxviii. titles"; whereas, "in the reprint" by Du Mont, "in 1664," first, "the order of the two classes of Taxe is inverted"; and, secondly, "neither does the number of the titles in each agree; there are but 37," instead of lxviii. "in the latter; and the others are not numbered, though the divisions are certainly more than four."‡

With regard to the Lyons edition of 1564 by A. D. P. (Antoine Du Pinet), Bayle observes, that the editor "was greatly to blame in not mentioning on what authentic copies he formed his edition," for that "it differs from the others both in the order of matters, and in the denomination of

* Venality, p. 41. † Bayle, art. Banck.
moneys”; that the one “mentions only tournois, ducats, and carlins,” and the others “only gros, at least the ducat and carlin is very rarely mentioned” . . . that “Du Pinet has rendered these words (turonensis, ducatus, and carlinus) tournois d’or, ducat de chambre, and carlin,” and that thereupon “he makes this observation: ‘As to the gold tournois some take it for a livre Parisis; others say that it is an old crown; others are of opinion that it is worth a philippus. In short, I have not hitherto found out anything certain concerning that money, though the tournois de chambre is commonly worth a real, a ducat is worth a pistolet and fourpence Tournois, and a carlin is worth fourpence.’” Bayle states, moreover, that the author of the preface to the Amsterdam edition of 1700 “tells us, that all possible care has been taken to reduce to our money the tournois, ducats, and carlins . . . but that nothing could be found out to clear that matter, and that if any discovery be made about it hereafter, it shall be inserted in a new edition”; that the author “alleges what Du Pinet has observed concerning the value of those three sorts of coins, and adds, that the author of the Notes upon the Confession of Sanci assures, that there is at the end of the book of the Taxes of the Roman Chancery a tariff, which reduces the gross to fourpence Tournois, the ducat to forty pence, and the carolus to eight blanks.”* In the English Protestant editions the denomination of the moneys as pounds, shillings, and pence appears to be totally unauthorized.

And now to compare some few of the individual charges. According to the late Archdeacon Hodson and Steele’s “Extract,” a pardon for perjury is charged at nine shillings; according to Crashaw, and the edition of Bois-le-duc, it is charged six grosses; according to the Amsterdam edition

* Bayle, art. Pinet.
and Musculus the charge is thirty-six turonenses, nine ducats; according to Egan, £36. 9s. 0d.; and according to Elliott and Mr. Collette, £7. 2s. 3d. According to Archdeacon Hodson and Steele's "Extract" the charge for a pardon for incest is seven shillings and sixpence; according to Crashaw and five others (viz., Banck, Mr. Mendham's copy, the edition of 1491, and the editions of Bois-le-duc), it is five grosses; according to the Harleian manuscript, twenty grosses;* and according to Elliott and Mr. Collette, £4. 6s. 0d. Archdeacon Hodson further informs us, that a pardon for murder is also charged seven shillings and sixpence; according to Crashaw (and the five others) the charge is five grosses; according to the Harleian manuscript, twenty carlins; according to the Amsterdam edition and Musculus, 3 tur. 1 duc. 4 carlins; and according to Elliott and Mr. Collette, £3. 2s. 4d. Again, sir, in Crashaw's edition, the Roman edition of 1491, the editions of Bois-le-duc, and also in Mr. Mendham's copy, and in the Third Section of Banck (p. 132), the pardon for murdering one's father, or mother, or brother, or wife, is charged five or seven grosses. In Banck's Fourth Section (p. 139), it is charged one ducat and five carlins; in the Amsterdam and Musculus, 4 tur. 1 duc. and 8 carlins; in Steele's "Extract," ten shillings and sixpence; and, according to Egan and Elliott, and Mr. Collette, £4. 1s. 8d.

By the Canon law, clergymen are forbidden to "bear arms," under pain of excommunication ("Clerici armaportantes . . . excommunicentur")†; and amongst the absolutions for clergymen ("Absolutiones pro clericis")‡ in Banck's edition, and that of Bois-le-duc, one is "for a clergyman who has been engaged in warfare" (pro eo qui interfuit

* Venality, p. 67 (at p. 68, twelve grosses).
† Decretal Greg. IX. lib. iii. tit. 1, can. 2.
‡ Index Rerum et Verborum, p. 35, Banck.
In bellicos actibus;* and the tax is thirty grosses. In the Amsterdam edition† and Musculus, the absolution is: "For one who has been engaged in war, and nevertheless has not killed or wounded any one, nor rendered assistance thereto (pro eo qui interfuit bellis, neminem tamen occidit nec mutilavit, neque ad id auxilium contulit, Tur. 36, duc. 9") ; and a note in the Amsterdam edition expressly states that the article is to be understood of clergymen and priests ("Ceci s'entend des clercs et des prêtres"). Now, the article in Egan is as follows: "He that being a soldier for the Catholic cause, and neither kills nor wounds in war, nor causeth none to do it, is to pay £36. 9s. 0d."; and Elliott and Mr. Collette give it a further gloss, thus: "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. 9s. 0d."‡ What strange mistakes, under the influence of prejudice, some Protestant writers allow themselves to make.

There are several considerable articles in the Amsterdam edition, and the editions of Musculus and Egan, which are not found in the Harleian MS., nor in Mr. Mendham's copy, nor in the edition of 1491, nor in Banck's edition, nor the editions of Bois-le-duc; and respecting which no comparison, of course, can be made. Mr. Mendham's opinion seems to be that all the editions which have been published since the commencement of Protestantism may be said to belong to two classes; that the editions of Musculus, Du Pinet, and Wolfius (in 1600), and the Paris editions subsequent to Du Pinet, that of Tuppius also, and "substantially" that of Egan, have been copied from that of Nuremberg in 1523;§

* Bois-le-duc, p. 58 (in bellicos actibus, Banck).
† Amsterdam, p. 41.
‡ Elliott, p. 369.—Collette (Milner, §c.), Part 2, p. 125.
§ Venality, p. 47 and p. 35.
and that the greater part of the others have been either
"extracted from" or "probably derived from," or have
"pretty closely followed" the Parisian edition of 1520.
Respecting the former of these two parent editions, he ob-
serves, that "from what sources the German princes at the
Diet of Nuremberg derived their information does not
appear."* And respecting the latter he says, that it has
"a short address of the printer to the reader, in which he
states that he had received several copies of the Taxe Canc.
ac Penit. Apost., which he did not incorporate into one book,
lest he should fall into some omission, and which, therefore,
he printed in four parts, designated by the capital letters
A. B. C. D."† And it is to be remarked that not one of the
said parts or copies is either authenticated by any signature,
or declared by the writer to have been sanctioned by any
individual pope; nor does the editor give the name of any
one of the parties from whom he professes to have received
the said copies, or any one of them. How far the arms of
the Medici and of France, and the words "cum privilegio in
triennium," which appear on the title-page of the book, may
be considered satisfactory evidence of its authenticity, I
leave to the judgment of the reader. I humbly submit that
I cannot reasonably be called upon to defend or reply to any
individual charges contained in documents so strangely dis-
cordant with each other, and so questionable as to their
genuineness and authenticity. The nature and object of the
genuine Taxae I purpose to explain in the next letter.

I remain, &c.

T. L. G.

* Venality, p. 47 and p. 35.   † Venality, p. 50.
LETTER XVIII.

TAX-TABLES.—II.

To * * * * *

Sir,—It was stated in the last letter that eighteen known editions of Tax-tables had been printed at Rome before the Protestant era. These Roman editions are unquestionably genuine; and of one such edition an undoubted copy lies open before me.* The fact, therefore, that in the

* The edition of 1491 is the sixth in Mr. Mendham’s list of known editions; and the present copy comprises all that is contained in the two preceding editions of 1486 and 1489. It commences thus: “Regule Ordinationes et Constitutiones Cancellarie Sanctissimi dni nostri domini Innocentii divina providentia pape VIII. scripte et correcte in Cancellaria Apostolica . . . . in crastinum assumptionis sue ad summii apostolatus apicem, videlicet die xxx mensis Augusti, Anni a nativitate dni. M.cccclxxxiiii.”—On leaf 11, a. we read, “Lecte et publicate fuerunt suprascripte regule Rome in Cancellaria aplica, die lune, xiii mensis Septem. Anno dni M.cccclxxxiiii: Ponti. prefati S. D. N. dni Innocentii divina providentia pape viii. anno primo.” Additional regulae were made from time to time in each of the six ensuing years: the date of the last being August 4, 1491.—After the “Regule” follow (I.) “Taxe Cancellarie Apostolice.” (II.) “Taxe Sacre Penitentiarie Apostolice.” (III.) “Stilus Romane Curie.” The “Regule, &c.,” occupy 39 leaves or 78 pages; the “Taxe” of the Chancery, 34½ pages; the “Taxe” of the Penitentiary, 8 pages; and the Stilus 18½ pages. The pages are not marked; the character is uniform throughout—the whole Gothic. The date of the edition, and the name of the printer (Stephen Planck), are thus certified at the end of the Regule: “Sanctissimi dni nostri Innocentii pape viii. Regule Cancellarie finiunt feliciter. Impresse Rome per Stephanum Planck: Anno dni Millesimo
ecclesiastical courts, the Chancery and Penitentiary of Rome, there were genuine Tax-tables, specifying the various amounts which were charged, under certain circumstances, for absolutions, dispensations, licenses, &c., I am prepared at once to admit. Mr. Mendham, moreover, informs his readers that Rome, in her Indexes, has never yet censured any Protestant edition, except on account of its having been corrupted by heretics (ab hereticis depravata, or, cum ab hereticis sit depravata).* And the fact is, that instead of being abolished at the commencement of Protestantism, as far as regards this country, they were merely transferred by Act of Parliament from the courts of Rome into the court of the Archbishop of Canterbury. The Act was passed in the year 1533; and it is therein provided, "That there shall be two books drawn up, and made, of one tenor: In which shall be contained the taxes of all the customizable dispensations, faculties, licenses, and other writings wont to be sped at Rome . . . to the which books all suitors for dispensations, faculties, licenses, and other writings afore rehearsed, shall have recourse if they require it . . . . and that no man suing for dispensations, faculties, licenses, or other rescripts or writings, which were wont to be sped at Rome, shall pay any more for their dispensations, licenses, or rescripts, than shall be contained, taxed, and limited in the said duplicate books of taxes, only compositions excepted, which being arbitrary, no tax can be made; wherefore the tax thereof shall be set and limited by the discretion of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Lord Chancellor of England, or Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, for the time being." . . . And likewise "That the tax, or sum, appointed to be paid for every such dispensation, quadringentesimo nonagesimo primo, mensis Decembris die vicesima tertia." The volume is a small quarto; bound in vellum.

* Venality, p. 74.
license, faculty, instrument, rescript, or other writing, to be granted by authority of this Act, shall be employed and ordered as hereafter ensueth; that is to say, if the tax extend to £4 or above . . . . then the said tax so extending . . . . shall be divided into three parts, whereof two shall be perceived(sic) by the said Clerk of the Chancery . . . . and the third shall be taken by the said Clerk of the Archbishop to the use of the same Archbishop and his Commissary, and his said Clerk and Register, &c. . . . And if the tax be under £4 and not under 40s., then the said tax shall be divided into three parts as is afore said, &c. &c. &c."

An important distinction must be made between an absolution from sin with reference to its guilt, and an absolution from sin with reference to ecclesiastical censures only.† In the Catholic Church, as we have previously shown, the former can be administered only in the sacrament of Penance; and in cases of a private nature, or in which the commission of a crime to which censures are attached is not publicly known, it is usual for the latter also to be administered in the self-same sacrament. In cases, however, of a public nature, and in which the parties have been personally denounced, both the cognizance of the cause, and the granting, or refusing, of the absolution, belong exclusively to the forum externum, or the external, or public, ecclesiastical court. And the same distinction will be equally applicable both to dispensations and licenses. The courts at Rome in which formerly public cases for absolutions, dispensations, and licenses were discussed, and, according to circumstances, indults for imparting the same were granted

* See the Act in Gibson's Codex, vol. i. p. 102; and in Burn's Ecclesiastical Law, art. "Dispensation."

† Censures are of three kinds; viz., Excommunication, Suspension, and Interdict.—Dens, De Censuris; Van Espen; et alii.
or refused, were the Court of Chancery, and (previously to the time of Pope Pius IV.) that of the Penitentiary also. The court to which the cognizance of private cases, and with reference to conscience only, has always been exclusively confined, is that of the Penitentiary only.

Now, the points which I propose to establish are—1st. That the absolutions, dispensations, and licenses specified in the Catholic Tax-tables, have reference solely to external discipline, and belong exclusively to the ecclesiastical court; 2nd. That the taxes which are charged for them are not proposed as the estimated value of the same, but are merely charged as compensation for services; and 3rd. That the object in instituting and publishing the said taxes was not to offer the absolutions, &c. for sale, but chiefly to prevent inmoderate charging on the part of individual officers.

1. The first position may be proved sufficiently for the present from internal evidence alone. It may almost be assumed from the circumstance that the absolutions, dispensations, and licenses are throughout the Tax-tables intermixed with other articles indisputably belonging to external discipline and the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical court, and that there is no marked or specified distinction between them. With regard, moreover, to the Absolutions, the only offences specified are those to which censures are attached; nearly half of them are breaches of canonical discipline applicable only to ecclesiastics; such, for instance, as "receiving holy orders before the legitimate age,"* or "officiating in the presence of excommunicated persons";† and they are further occasionally accompanied with expressions such as "lata sententia," "inhibitio," and the like, which

† Banck, p. 126.
are either exclusively applicable to censures, or are otherwise peculiar to the style of the ecclesiastical court. The Dispensations are chiefly exemptions from the laws of canonical discipline, in favour of ecclesiastics with regard to holy orders and benefices, and in favour of laics with regard to the contracting, or solemnizing, of marriage. And the following may be taken as specimens of the Licenses; viz., "A license to have a portable altar, for one person, 10 grosses;* a license to have Mass celebrated in a place under interdict, in form, 10 grosses; a license to eat flesh-meat, butter, eggs, and other lacticinia, in Lent, as well as on other fasting days, 7 grosses";† "a license to officiate in a chapel not consecrated, 12 turonenses, 3 ducats, 6 carlins; a license to receive the fruits (of a benefice) during absence, the party residing on one of his benefices, or in the Roman Court, or studying in some university, 9 turonenses, 2 ducats, 9 carlins; a license of non-residence for a titular bishop, 18 turonenses, 4 ducats, 9 carlins."‡ Now the following, which are to be found in the English Protestant Ecclesiastical Courts, are not very dissimilar. In Burn's Ecclesiastical Law, we read that in the Faculty Court of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the chief officer is called the "Master of the Faculties"; and that "his power is to grant Dispensations, as to marry, to eat flesh-meat on days prohibited,§ to hold two or more benefices incompatible, and such like."|| In the Diocesan Table of Fees,¶ the following Licenses occur; viz., "License of

* Banck, pars i. tit. xvii. p. 25.
† Banck, p. 130.
‡ Musculi Loci Communæ, pp. 223, 224, 225.
§ See the "Days of Fasting or Abstinence" in the "Book of Common Prayer."
|| Burn's Ecclesiastical Law, art. "Faculty Court."
¶ The 135th of the "Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical"
non-residence, three shillings and fourpence”; “License to
a preacher, curate, or schoolmaster, three shillings and four-
pence”; “License to solemnize marriage in the time of
prohibition of banns to be published, three shillings and four-
pence”; and “Absolution from Excommunication
(for a lay person) or “Suspension” (for a Clergyman) “one
shilling and sixpence.”* Now where, may I ask, is the
difference, in principle, between the charges in the Roman
Catholic and the English Protestant courts?

2. The taxes charged for the said absolutions, dispes-
sations, and licenses, are not proposed as the estimated
value of the same, but merely as compensation for services.
This will sufficiently appear from articles in the Tax-tables
themselves. Mr. Mendham assures us that the First Part
of Banck’s edition of the Taxes agrees exactly with the
corresponding part of the Parisian edition of 1520, and also
with that of the Roman edition, as reprinted by Du Mont
in 1664. Now throughout the said First Part of Banck’s
edition, and also that of Du Mont (Bois-le-Duc), there is
abundant evidence that the articles therein specified and
taxed, whether absolutions, dispensations, or licenses, are
no other than so many written documents, and that the
taxes are charged as the fees for writing them. In the first
title, for instance, is the following article: “And if in the
aforesaid grants (gratiis) there shall be the clause ‘Ante-

of the present Church of England provides that “No Bishop . . . .
nor any other exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction . . . . shall here-

See the “Table” in Burn’s Eccles. Law, art. “Fees.”
ferri, or 'Prærogativa ad instar,' &c., let there be added 25 grosses." In the second title is the following: "And if in any of the aforesaid cases the clause (respecting a benefice) 'Motu proprio' should be given, let there be added 4 grosses." The third title commences with the article "LITERÆ de beneficio, &c." (Letters, respecting a benefice, &c.), the twenty-fourth with the article "LITERÆ absolutionis cum dispensatione, &c." (Letters of Absolution with Dispensation, &c.) There are sixteen other titles which commence in a similar form, and there is scarcely a single title in the whole thirty-seven which does not contain repeated indications to the same purport.—In the very first title, moreover, there is an article which expressly apportions the tax as a fee for writing, viz. "If there shall be the clause 'Quam primum fuerit, &c.,' let there be added for the labour of writing two grosses (propter laborem scribendi addantur g. 2"). In the third, sixth, twelfth, fourteenth, and twenty-sixth titles it is further stated that the labour is to be estimated by a computation of the lines; in the twelfth and twenty-sixth, that "to the number of thirty lines two lines are to be given for one gross"; and that "beyond that number" one gross may be charged "for each line." The thirty-fifth title also contains a similar statement, and adds, that "in all the taxations of letters, whether of favour or of justice, the line must be understood to comprise twenty-five words." Now it would seem to me that, from internal evidence, this point is sufficiently proved.

3. The object in instituting and publishing the said Taxes was, not to offer the absolutions, &c., for sale, but chiefly to prevent immoderate charging on the part of individual officers.

Mr. Mendham states with regard to the origin of the Tax-tables, that "the Chancery Taxes may, with certainty, be traced back to Pope John XXII., who reigned at the
beginning of the fourteenth century,” and that “the frequent and exclusive reference to the Liber Jo. XXII.” in the edition of 1514, “places the fact beyond a doubt.”* He considers, moreover, that from “this repeated . . . . and exclusive reference . . . . a reasonable inference may be drawn,” that “to the time of Leo X. considerable deference was paid, in this class of taxes, to the former pontiff, as their presumed author, or first reducer to form.”† Now that such was the object of the said John XXII. in instituting the said Chancery Taxes, may be inferred from certain principles expressed in two Bulls respecting them, and the penalties enacted therein against those who should exceed the said taxes. The preamble of the former sets forth that “Whereas it seems unworthy of the times that favours should be converted into occasions of murmuring, or that that which liberality has made acceptable the act of writing should render oppressive, it appears desirable to appoint such a moderation in the taxing of letters, &c., as that those to whom such favours are granted may feel that they obtain them liberally from the Apostolic See, and that the various officers of the court, who often devote to them considerable exertions, should be duly remunerated for their trouble. To remove, therefore, excesses, &c.,” he enjoins, respecting the taxing of certain clauses, that “no account shall be taken of the greater or less value of the favour which is granted, or of the greater or less amount of revenue, or income, which may probably accrue from the same, so as on that account proportionately to tax the letter containing the said clauses, but that such regard shall be paid to the labour, as that a longer writing shall be charged more, and a shorter writing less.” And in the conclusion of the Bull he ordains, that if any officer of the Court shall violate any of

* Venality, p. 20.
† Venality, p. 51.
its provisions by taxing such documents at a higher rate, or by demanding or receiving for them more than may accord with the rate therein specified, he shall, for the first offence, be suspended from his office for the space of six months, and for the second offence shall be deprived of the same for ever. He subjects, moreover, any “abbreviator” who may be guilty of the same, to the additional penalty of excommunication. The Bull is dated Avignon, in the first year of his pontificate (A.D. 1316).* And in the other Bull, which he published in the year 1326, he ordains, respecting the notaries, that the auditors shall see that in receiving their stipends they do not exceed, nor receive more than the amount described, taxed, and ordained. And that if there are or shall be any who by reason of their poverty may not be able to redeem the deeds of their cause (acta redimere suae causae), the notaries writing in the same shall be required to give them a copy of such deeds gratuitously, if to the Auditor of the cause their poverty shall appear considerable.—And in the sixteenth section he ordains still further, that the said notaries be diligent and attentive in the office committed to them . . . . and that neither from the parties themselves, nor from any other person in their name, they receive anything but what has been described, and taxed, and ordained; and that those who do otherwise shall be bound to restore two-fold.†

Succeeding pontiffs enacted similar decrees: Pope Martin V., in his Constitution Romani Pontificis, sect. ix., enjoins that the said notaries, in demanding their stipends, shall be bound to observe the taxes, and the limitations of the same, ordained by John XXII.; that if beyond the

said tax they shall in any manner either demand, or ask for, any thing, recourse shall be had to the Vice-Chancellor or his deputy, and the said excess shall be reduced to a due proportion, according to the aforesaid Taxes: and that if any notary shall have actually received the oyer-charge, he shall be bound to restore to the injured party two-fold. He also ordains that for compulsory citations and inhibitions . . . . and for any other documents whatsoever, twice written in the same proceeding, only one taxation shall be made.*—He had previously decreed, in a Constitution published in the year 1418, that the party through whose fault such second writing should be requisite, should be bound, within three days from the day of its being required, at his own expense, and without any remuneration, how trifling soever, or even gratuitously offered, to write the same, or cause the same to be written under pain of suspension from his office, &c.†

There is also a similar decree, enacted by Innocent VIII., in the Roman edition of the "Regule Ordinationes, &c.," of 1491. It is headed, "Inhibitio contra scriptores Apostolicos ne ultra taxam quicquid accipiunt"; and was published June 1, 1487.—May I hope that in the candid judgment of the reader the three points are sufficiently established?

I remain, &c.,

T. L. G.

* In Bullar. Cherubini, tom. i. p. 300.
LETTER XIX.

To * * * * *

SIR,—In a former letter I observed, with regard to the Absolutions, that the offences specified in the Tax-tables are those which would subject the delinquents to ecclesiastical censures, such as excommunication or suspension. Now in England at the time when Blackstone wrote, and indeed until the year 1813, excommunication subjected a person to serious civil disabilities. Blackstone writes thus: “By the Common Law an excommunicated person cannot serve upon juries, cannot be a witness in any court: and which is worst of all, cannot bring an action, either real or personal, to recover lands or money due to him.” * Burn also makes a similar statement; but observes that if the party has commenced an action, and the defendant has pleaded that “he who sueth is excommunicated,” the writ in such case “shall not abate,” because when the plaintiff hath purchased his letters of absolution, and showed them to the Court, he may have a re-summons, &c.” † Does not this statement powerfully confirm my former position, that the absolutions in the Tax-tables were written documents, § to be produced and exhibited as

* Book III. c. vii. 102.
† “To abate (in Law), to come to nought, be abolished, quashed, or rendered of no effect.”—Bailey’s Dictionary.
‡ Eccles. Law, art. “Excommunication.”
§ Originally all the documents must have been entirely manu-
circumstances might require, in other courts; and is it not further evidence that such absolutions were as purchasable in the English Protestant Ecclesiastical Courts, as they are said to have been in any of the Catholic Courts of Rome?

A writer frequently referred to by Protestant controvertists, in reference to the Taxae, is the celebrated Claude D’Espence. A well-known passage in his writings, severely censuring the publication of the Tax-tables, is quoted by Mr. Mendham in his Venality (p. 78). In the course of the passage is the following clause . . . . “in quo [libro] plus scelerum discas licet, quam in omnibus omnium vitiorum summis et summariis, et plurimis quidem licentia, omnibus autem absolutio empturientibus proposita”; which Mr. Mendham translates thus: “in which [book] more wickedness may be learned than in all the summaries of all vices, and in which are proposed license of sinning to most, and absolution to all who will buy it.” Mr. Mendham, and from him Elliott and Mr. Collette, have here inserted two words which do not occur in the original; and these two words would make Claude D’Espence the author of a false statement. Mr. Mendham and his copyists have inserted the words “of sinning.” Now throughout the whole collection of licenses, as specified by Banck, or Musculus, or any of the editions which I have been enabled to examine, there is not a single instance of a license for the commission of sin. It is sufficiently apparent from the context of the passage that the licenses contemplated by D’Espence were licenses, not to sin, but chiefly to authorize those who had sinned, and were now repentant (ad cor reversos) to enter into holy orders, and to script. The art of printing was not invented till a full century after the death of John XXII. Subsequently printed forms were used, with blanks for the insertion of particular clauses.
be admissible to ecclesiastical honours and dignities. To suppose indeed that in any state of civilized society either "license of sinning," or absolution for having sinned, could be publicly recognized as venal, and avowedly proposed for sale by the lawfully constituted authorities, would seem to be little short of absurdity; and few persons, unless blinded by prejudice, could honestly entertain the supposition. The continued existence of such a system in operation would be subversive of civil society.

The supposition moreover is irreconcilable with certain indisputable historical facts. Let the reader take, for instance, the case of King Henry VIII., and ask himself why—when Henry wished to discard his lawful wife, and to marry another—instead of fruitlessly suing for a divorce, he did not look to the Tax-tables, and purchase the most appropriate license?* Why did no one of his courtiers or flatterers, clergy or laity, suggest to him the idea? And why, whereas the question of the divorce was agitated throughout Europe, and all the foreign universities were formally consulted on the subject, not a single theologian or canonist, nor a single individual in any of the foreign courts, is recorded to have hinted even, that the point might be determined by a reference to the Tax-tables. The circumstantial evidence, which this point alone would supply, would abundantly suffice for a triumphant refutation of so incongruous a theory.

In the second part of Banck’s edition of the Tax-tables

* "Parricidium, matricidium, fratricidium, sororicidium taxatur, pro uno tantum, Turon. 4, Duc. 1, Carl. 8." Uxoriciidium " taxatur perinde atque parricidium. Si oocior petierit licentiam contrahendi cum alia, Tur. 8, Duc. 2, Carl. 9." Edd. Musculi, Amstelodami, &c. "Dispensations of crimes: For the murder of a father, mother, brother, sister, or wife, each £4. 1s. 8d.; For marrying another wife after murdering the former, £8. 2s. 9d."—Egan, Elliott, Collette, &c.
(tit. xix. De Matrimonialibus), and probably in most of the others which, according to Mr. Mendham, have been formed from the Paris edition of 1520, there is a passage which is generally noticed and censured by Protestant writers. The author of the passage, having specified certain dispensations, directs the reader to "observe diligently that such dispensations and favours are not granted to the poor, because they are not, and therefore cannot be consoled" (et nota diligenter quod hujusmodi gratiae et dispensationes non conceduntur pauperibus, quia non sunt, ideo non possunt consolari). The dispensations specified are for contracting and solemnizing marriage within the second degree of relationship. The Council of Trent directs that such dispensations are not to be granted except to great princes, and only on public grounds. (In secundo gradu nunquam dispensetur nisi inter magnos principes, et ob publicam causam. Sess. XXIV. De Reform. Matrim., cap. v.) The reason assigned in the Tax-table for not granting such dispensations to the poor is one that admits of no defence. It is a profane allusion to a passage of scripture; and whether the passage is genuine, or not, whoever inserted it must be held responsible for it. It has not, however, any other authority than that of the original anonymous compiler; it is not sanctioned, even indirectly, by the decree of the Council of Trent; nor is it in accordance with the principles of the Catholic Church. In the genuine Tax-tables, as set forth in the Papal Bulls, there are generally exemptions and modifications in favour of the poor. In the above-quoted Bull of Pope John XXII. for the institution of certain taxes, there is an express provision to that effect; and there is an exemplification of the principle in Banck, p. 21, in which the tax is reduced, for the poor, from 50 to 20 grosses. In the Roman courts, moreover, in criminal cases as well as in civil actions, there are advo-
cates, notaries, and other officers, who are paid by the
State, and are required to undertake the causes of the poor
gratuitously. In a work published in London in the year
1658, entitled The Court of Rome, by H. C. (Henry Cogan),
Gent., it is stated that "the Advocate of the Poor's care is,
to write gratis for all poor and miserable persons" (p. 62).
Benedict XII., in his Constitution Decens et necessarium,
sect. ii., expressly forbids the advocates, "in the causes of
the poor, to accept from them anything, though freely and
from gratitude spontaneously offered"; and enjoins that
"those who have received anything shall by no means
acquire the dominion thereof; but that they shall be in
such manner held and bound to restore two-fold the amount,
that not even the said poor themselves shall be authorized
to remit the same; and that such restitution shall be en-
forced by the Vice-Chancellor by virtue of ecclesiastical
censures."* Similar injunctions with reference to other
officials are to be found in other Bulls.†

In the Fourth Part (Sectio quarta) of Banck's edition
there are four articles charged "in foro conscientiae" (in the
court of conscience); and in Musculus and others the

† See for instance Const. Loo X., Sicut prudent Pater familias,
cap. vi. (id., tom. i. p. 588); Const. 56 Pii IV., Cum ab ipso,
sect. 36, 37, 83 (id., tom. ii. p. 81); Const. 87, Cum inter ceteras,
sect. 19 (id., tom. ii. p. 130); Const. 105, Cum nuper (id., tom. ii.
p. 185); et Pii V., Const. 113, Inter illa, sect. 37 (id., tom. ii.
p. 339).

A question may perhaps be suggested here, which was omitted in
a former letter, viz.: Whether dispensations are granted without
payment in the Church of England. 1. Are Dispensations for mar-
rriages without banns granted without payment? 2. Are Dispen-
sations for marriages in private houses—which can only be granted by
the Archbishop of Canterbury—granted by him without payment?
3. Are such Dispensations granted to the poor?
instances are more numerous.—In reply it may be observed, first, that the instances themselves supply a negative argument that throughout the Tax-tables the other articles are not to be considered as in foro conscientiae; and, secondly, with regard to Musculus, and the other editions in which the articles appear, the class of Tax-tables to which they belong, according to Mr. Mendham, is "perhaps the least authentic of the two." The parent edition indeed from which they were formed does not purport to have been published by any pope, or by any of the Roman courts. It appears to have been compiled by certain German princes in the diet of Nuremberg; and "from what sources they derived their information," Mr. Mendham informs us, "does not appear." He also admits that it has "never appeared in any Roman edition," and that none but Protestant editions have been formed from it.* And a similar observation may be made respecting the Fourth Part of Banck; for, 1. In the denomination of the moneys it does not agree with the preceding parts of the same edition; and, 2. there is no part corresponding with it in Mr. Mendham's early printed copy, nor in the Harleian manuscript, nor in the edition of 1491, nor in that of Bois-le-duc, nor probably in any that has a plausible claim to genuineness; nor, as far as my information can enable me to judge, is there in any such edition a single article specified as "in foro conscientiae."

Amongst Mr. Collette's specimens of the Taxae there is an "Absolution," which, if genuine, would be equivalent to a license to sin; viz., "For absolution to keep a concubine, . . . . with a dispensation to hold a benefice, £4. 5s. 6d." Mr. Collette also refers in his pamphlet (p. 197) to the 91st of the Centum Gravamina, and says: "Here it is

* Venality, p. 48.
openly charged against the Pope for permitting priests to keep concubines on payment of a certain sum. The same tax was levied upon those who lived continently, because the bishop wanted cash, and they were at liberty to do otherwise at their option by payment.” Mr. Collette’s specimens of the Taxae seem to have been copied from Elliott’s, and Elliott’s are apparently a selection chiefly from Egan. Egan and his English predecessor Crashaw repeatedly misapply the respective terms “Absolution” and “Dispensation” in a sense which no dictionaries authorize, and which does not accord with any of the Latin versions. An absolution has reference to the past, and not the future: and according to Johnson, is “an acquittal; a remission of sins.” The Latin of the Taxa in question is “Absolutio pro concubinario, cum dispensatione ad ordines et beneficia, Tur. 21, duc. 5, carl. 6” (Amsterdam, p. 66). Neither the Latin word “absolutio,” nor the English word “absolution,” can be understood to mean a license, or permission; and the true meaning of the Taxa is “An absolution for one who has been guilty of concubinage, with a dispensation in reference to (holy) orders and benefices, 21 Turonenses, 5 ducats, 6 carlins.” The absolution, being taxed, must be presumed to belong to the open ecclesiastical court; but neither consistently with Catholic theology could sacramental absolution be administered, nor consistently with the principles of Catholic Canon Law, could an absolution from censures be granted in the ecclesiastical court, unless the delinquent had so far given evidence of his repentance and amendment, as to have dismissed the concubine.

The 91st of the Centum Gravamina is as follows: “Item in locis, plerisque episcopi et eorum officiales, non solum sacerdotum tolerant concubinatum, dummodo certa person 3olvatur pecunia, sed et sacerdotes continentes et qui absque
TAX-TABLES.

concubinis degunt, concubinatus censum persolvere cogunt, asserentes episcopum pecuniae indigum esse, qua soluta licere sacerdotibus, ut vel coelibes permaneant, vel concubinas alant. Quam res haec sit nefanda nemo non intelligit."

In the first place, the charge is not against the Pope, as alleged by Mr. Collette, but against the "bishops and their officials in many places."—2. The authors of the document do not refer to any canon, or to any principle of Catholic theology, which would authorize the abuse complained of; and the Catholic Church is not responsible for the delinquencies of individual bishops in any places.—3. The truth of the charge is very questionable, more especially respecting the demand upon the innocent clergy: there is no Catholic canon or ecclesiastical law, by virtue of which in any court the infamous demand could be enforced.—4. May it not be considered a fictitious charge, formed from a misinterpretation of the word "absolution" in the foregoing article in the Taxae, "Absolutio pro concubinario, &c.?"*

And now with regard to absolutions from guilt, as administered in the sacrament of Penance, and dispensations and licenses having reference to conscience only, we have stated above that the Court in Rome from which, in cases reserved to the Apostolic See, the requisite faculties for administering the same must be obtained, is exclusively the Court of the Penitentiary. We have also stated that pre—

* Eadmer relates that Henry I., in order to raise money, appointed a commission to inquire into the conduct of the clergy, and to fine those who might be found to have transgressed against the canons respecting celibacy. But finding that the number was too small to raise any considerable sum, he imposed a most oppressive fine on all the parochial clergy without regard to their guilt or innocence; and the fine was most rigorously exacted. Some, who indignantly resisted the unheard-of exaction, and others who from poverty were unable to pay it, were rudely seized, and thrown into prison, and tortured.—Hist. Novorum, lib. iv.
viously to the pontificate of Pius IV., the jurisdiction of that court was twofold. In one department it was limited, as at present, to cases of conscience; in the other, in common with that of the Chancery, it extended to cases of external discipline. In the latter department it had, of course, its table of taxes; and owing to that circumstance the taxes upon many points were then styled indifferently Taxes of the Chancery, or Taxes of the Penitentiary. Mr. Mendham seems studiously to conceal from his readers the fact of this twofold jurisdiction; he repeatedly insinuates that the taxes of the Penitentiary, as distinguished from those of the Chancery, were essentially taxes upon absolution from guilt, &c. He is unquestionably mistaken. The fact that the jurisdiction of the Penitentiary was not, at that period, limited to cases of conscience, but extended also to the cognizance of cases with reference to external discipline, is positively asserted in the Constitution of Sixtus IV., Quoniam nonnulli, A.D. 1484; and also in one of Paul III., quoted and confirmed in that of Julius III., Rationi congruit, A.D. 1550.—It is also manifest from the Constitution In sublimi, published by Pius IV. A.D. 1563.* By virtue of the latter constitution, inasmuch as the chief concern of that court is the “censorship of morals and the health of souls . . . . in order to check the progress of sundry and divers abuses which, owing to the licentiousness and recklessness of past times, were found to have crept in,” its jurisdiction upon many points of external discipline was transferred to another court.† And Mr. Mendham admits

† The court to which the business of the “forum externum” (the external, or open ecclesiastical court) with regard to absolutions from public censures, dispensations, &c., was in great measure transferred, is called the Datary; or rather, perhaps, the Datary, from being one of the subdivisions, or distinct offices of the Peni-
that since that period, and indeed since the pontificate of Leo X., "no originals" of taxes of the Penitentiary, nor indeed any copies but Protestant versions and editions, "appear to have been issued." *

In the following pontificate of Pius V., its jurisdiction with reference to absolutions, dispensations, and licenses became limited and restricted almost exclusively to the forum internum, or internal tribunal of conscience; and the fact is that neither taxes nor taxed fees, nor any payments of any kind whatever, whether for written documents or for personal service, have since been claimed, or allowed in the Roman Penitentiary.† Ferraris's Bibliotheca, and the Penitentiary was formed into a separate and independent court. In this court, when dispensations for marriage within prohibited degrees, and in certain cases for the retention of benefices, &c., are granted, a sum of money, in proportion to the applicant's ability, is required for alms and for other pious purposes, partly by way of compensation, or reparation, for the encroachment made upon canonical discipline, and partly, also, to operate as a check against such dispensations being applied for too frequently. From the circumstance of the amount being regulated by the applicant's means, it is called a Composition; and in sundry articles in the Tax-tables there is a clause, "et componitur cum Dataria." In reply to sinister observations which have been made respecting such "compositions," the reader may be reminded that at the time of the Reformation, in this country, they were transferred into the Faculty Court of the Archbishop of Canterbury. In the Act of Parliament above quoted (p. 168), it is stated that the Compositions "being arbitrary, no tax can be made; wherefore the tax thereof shall be set and limited by the discretion of the Archbishop of Canterbury, &c."

* Venality, p. 93.

† Mr. Butler, in his Book of the Roman Catholic Church (p. 112), makes the following statement: "There are some sins so enormous, that in order 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
other theological dictionaries and treatises on canon law, inform us that "all the 'expeditions' of the Penitentiary are gratuitous."* De Luca, in his Curiae Romanae Relatio, tells us that they are granted gratis, without any payment, even of a fee to the writers or procurators.† Cogan, in his Court of Rome, states that the absolutions are granted "gratis ubique."‡ Marcus Leo, in his Praxis Penitentiariae, states that all its letters (of absolution, &c.) are officially subscribed within and without "Gratis ubique."§ Van Espen adds that all its members are bound by an oath

the Roman See, when it thinks the circumstance of the case renders 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 the purpose, and to defray the expenses attending these applications, a fee is required for the document in which the power of absolution is granted." Mr. Butler must have been misinformed: in no country would a fee be required for the document, or on any other plea; the absolution would be administered in the confessional; the document would not be available, or needed, for production in any public court, and would not be returned to the party. In common with all documents procured from the Court of the Penitentiary, it would be stamped "gratis." Mr. Butler's mistake is excusable, inasmuch as in this country, as in other missionary countries, the bishops hold faculties for all such cases; and no application to the Roman See is requisite. Dispensations for marriages between cousins are occasionally required in this country; and the indulgences which are obtained from Rome are subscribed "Gratis, sine ulla omnino solutione quocumque titulo" (Gratis, without any payment whatever upon any plea).

* Pénitentiariae expeditiones omnes . . . . gratis sunt.—Ferraris, tom. iv. art. Pénitentiaria Apostolica.—"Nous remarquerons seulement que les expéditions de ce tribunal (la Pénitencerie de Rome) se font toutes gratis."—Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique, &c., par M. Durand de Maillane, art. Pénitencerie.

† Quoted by Van Espen, Pars 1, tit. xxxiii. cap. iv. sect. 33.
‡ Page 29.
§ Pars 1, cap. i. num. 14.—Van Espen, ut supra, sect. 17.
of office "not to accept of anything from any individual, though freely offered, on account of their office, excepting only their appointed salaries."* And Pius V., in his Constitution In omnibus, sect. xii., expressly decrees, that being provided with salaries supplied from another quarter, they shall "neither from the parties, nor otherwise, for quickness of despatch, nor for any other extraordinary labour, whether in procuring, or writing, or revising, or examining, accept of anything, though freely offered; and that whosoever shall presume to do so shall be thereby deemed to have forfeited his office, and to have incurred the penalty of excommunication, from which no one but the Pontiff, except in the article of death, shall be authorized to absolve him."† In the seventeenth section he enjoins, that "it be sacredly and inviolably observed, that neither for the making up (pro confectione) nor the expediting of letters, nor even for the parchment, ink, sealing-wax, case, or tape (cordulis), or for any other thing appertaining to the expediting of the same, any payment whatsoever be made."‡

* Juramento interposito promittunt quod officium suum fideliter exercebunt, ejusque ratione nihil ab aliquidus, etiam sponte oblatum, vel donatum, accipient, præterquam salarium sibi constitutum, &c.—Van Espen, ut supra, sect. xx.—See the form of the oath in the Constitution of Benedict XIV., In Apostolicae Pænitentiaris, sect. xxii.

† Illud autem sanctè et inviolàtè apud officium prædictum volumus observari ut nihil prorsus pro literarum confectione et expeditione, nec aliàs, etiam pro charta, atramento, cera, capsula, cordulis,
In the nineteenth section he enjoins still further, that “in order to preserve integrity in the said office, and to confirm the fidelity of each of its members, the oaths which they were required to take upon their first admission to office they shall annually renew before the Grand Penitentiary.” * And finally, in the twenty-third section, he exhorts them that, “banishing all turpitude of avarice, they each of them direct their minds sincerely and honestly to discharge the duty imposed upon them, for the glory of the eternal God, and the salvation of Christ’s faithful people.” † And subsequently, in the year 1744, similar injunctions and admonitions were still more explicitly enacted by Benedict XIV. in his Constitution In Apostolicae Poenitentiarii.

In conclusion, I would briefly observe that I have explained the doctrine of the Catholic Church on the “forgiveness of sins,” as I learned it from childhood upwards, and as I have taught it for nearly half a century; and in reply to the mistaken opinions of opponents, I hope that I have sufficiently shown that consistently with that doctrine no license can be granted for the commission of any sin, and that neither indulgences nor pardon of sin can be sold.

I remain, &c.

T. L. G.

* Ad retinendam vero in dicto officio puritatem, et confermandam singulorum fidem, distincte præcipimus ut juramenta quae in admissione officialium requiritur . . . . quotannis in manibus dicti majoris Poenitentiarii debeant iterari.—Id., sect. xix.

† Depulsa igitur omnis avaritiae foeditate, pro se quisque, piam castamque mentem ad impositum sibi munus pro Dei eterni gloria, et Christi fidelium salute acriter intendant.—Id., sect. xxiii.
Respecting the future state the Catholic Church teaches that finally there will be but two receptacles for the souls of men,—a heaven for the everlasting recompense of the just, and a hell for the never-ending punishment of the wicked. We believe, that from the fall of Adam till the ascension of our Divine Redeemer, a period of more than four thousand years, no human soul had entered heaven. Its gates were closed against Adam and all his descendants, until the atonement should actually be made: “And no man hath ascended into heaven, but he that descended from heaven, the Son of man who is in heaven.” (St. John iii. 13.) The souls of the just, who died in the course of that period, were detained in a place of rest, the place into which the soul of our Saviour descended, and in which it remained from the moment of His death till that of His glorious resurrection. The place is characterised by various names. On the cross our Divine Redeemer called it Paradise, when He told the penitent thief that he should be with Him that day in Paradise. In the Apostles’ Creed the same place is called Hell: “He descended into hell.” In the parable of Dives and Lazarus it is called Abraham’s bosom; and by ecclesiastical writers it has been called Limbus, or Limbo. That place no longer exists: the atonement having been made, the souls that were there detained went to heaven with their Deliverer on the day of His ascension: “Ascending on high He led captivity captive”
And since that time the souls of the just who die in their baptismal innocence, or free from every defilement of sin, and from all debt of temporal punishment, are received immediately into heaven.

We believe however that very few persons die so pure and innocent. The Scripture assures us that "the just man shall fall seven times" (or many times) "and shall rise again" (Prov. xxiv. 16). We are also assured that "in many things we all offend" (St. James iii. 2); and that "if we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us" (1 St. John i. 8). The sins however into which the just man falls, and from which he will rise again, and from which indeed the most innocent are not wholly exempt, are not such as the wicked man commits; or he would not be a just man. They do not deprive him of justification, nor subject him to the danger of everlasting torments. He may sin, for instance, by being "angry with a brother"; he may sin still further by an angry word, such as is expressed in Scripture by the word "Raca." In each case proportionately he would be deserving of punishment; but not unless he should so far give way to his anger as to use a still more offensive expression, signified by the words "Thou fool," would he be "in danger of hell fire." Now both Scripture and experience teach that, generally speaking, men die as they have lived; the wicked, for the most part, die in the guilt of their more grievous sins, and are at once consigned to the everlasting torments of hell; and many of the just also die in the guilt of their less grievous transgressions, and before they can enter heaven, into which "there shall not enter anything defiled," are punished respectively as much as those sins deserve. The place or state in which such punishment is endured the Catholic Church calls Purgatory, the word signifying a place or state of purification. Where the place is, or what individuals are consigned to it, or for how long a time they are respectively detained, no Catholic professes to know. All that the Catholic Church has defined, and all that a Catholic, as such, is required to believe, is, that there is a Purgatory (or middle state of temporal punishment), and
that the souls therein detained are helped by the prayers of
the faithful, especially by the acceptable sacrifice of the
altar. It is on the doctrine of a middle state that the
practice of praying for the dead is founded. It presup-
poses a state distinct from heaven and from hell. To pray
for the souls in heaven would be superfluous; they stand
not in need of our prayers: and to pray for the souls in
hell would be nugatory; in hell there is no redemption.

Such is the doctrine of the Catholic Church with regard
to the world of departed spirits. The opinions of Protestant
writers on the subject seem considerably to vary. Some
profess to believe that there never were, nor ever will be,
more than two receptacles of departed souls; viz., heaven
for the just, and hell for the wicked; and that punishment
and reward will both be everlasting. These, it would seem,
believe that the soul of our Saviour descended into the hell
of the reprobate; * and to be consistent, they must also be-
lieve that the penitent thief, as well as the impenitent, went
there also, and that the hell of torments was characterised
by our Saviour as "Paradise."

Others, and probably many, are of opinion that there are,
and will be, but the said two places, but that the wicked
will not be punished everlastingly; some maintaining that
the words in the original languages do not necessarily mean
"everlasting, &c.," and others, that though the place may
be everlasting, no human beings will be its everlasting
inmates; for that though God threatens everlasting punish-
ment, it does not follow that He intends to execute the
threat (1).† These in reality believe in Purgatory, and not

* That the soul of our Saviour descended into this hell is set
forth in The Manual adapted for general use. By Wm. Heygate,
M.A., &c. See p. 35.—It was also the opinion of Calvin.
† Archbishop Tillotson's opinion is but a shade less objectionable;
for though he "strenuously contends that there can be no doubt as
to the words of Scripture denoting an absolute eternity, and admits
that it cannot accord with the veracity and other qualities of the
Deity, to threaten what He never intends to execute," and though
he "also allows it to be necessary that these threatenings should be
believed in order that sinners may not presume on the mercy of
God . . . . still he intimates (Serm. 35) that 'He who threatens
in hell. Hell without eternity would no longer be hell. It would be merely a place of temporal punishment; and whether its duration should be comparatively long or short, or whatever the nature of its pains might be, it would be but Purgatory under another name.

There are others who hold that no child of Adam is yet gone to heaven or to hell, and that none will go to either place till the day of judgment; some believing that there is one common receptacle for the souls of all indiscriminately;* and others, according to Dr. D'Oyley, that "in this intermediate state . . . a distinction is made between the condition of the good and the bad." (Doctr. Sermons, Serm. xv. p. 374.) Of these the former seem to believe that the state of Limbo still exists, and will continue to exist till the day of judgment; and the latter, to believe both in Limbo and Purgatory. There are others, moreover, according to Dr. D'Oyley (and against them his sermon on the intermediate state is chiefly directed) who imagine

---

* Bishop Tomline, in his Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles (Art. 3), understands that the place into which our Saviour descended was "the common receptacle for departed souls . . . the place appropriated for the common reception of departed souls in the intermediate time between death and the general resurrection." —Elements, &c., part iii. art. 3. Bishop Horne, in his Commentaries on the Psalms, says that "although our mortal part must see corruption, yet . . . it shall be raised again, and reunited to its old companion the soul, which exists meanwhile in secret and undiscovered regions, there waiting for the day, &c."—Vol. i.; Ps. xvi. 10. And Bishop Pearson, in his Exposition of the Creed, says that our Saviour's body "was laid in a grave, as ordinarily the bodies of dead men are"; and "His soul was conveyed into such receptacles as the souls of other persons use to be."—Art. v. p. 250. The same explanation is also given in the Rev. W. How's Plain Words, &c. At page 107 he says "the hell spoken of in the psalm" (xvi.), "and in the Creed, is the place of the departed, the unseen world, the abode of the spirits of the dead."—Plain Words, &c. (Second Series). By the Rev. W. Walsham How, M.A., Rector of Whittington, Shropshire, &c.
that neither reward nor punishment will be awarded till the
day of judgment, and that the souls of all men in the
mean time remain in a state of unconsciousness and torpor.

Dr. Johnson, on the other hand, and other learned Pro-
testants, have admitted the reasonableness of the Catholic
document as far as they understood it. Boswell, in his Life
of Johnson, records a conversation from which the following
is an extract:—"Boswell: 'What do you think, sir, of
Purgatory, as believed by the Roman Catholics?' Johnson:
'Why, sir, it is a very harmless doctrine. They are of
opinion that the generality of mankind are neither so
obstinately wicked as to deserve everlasting punishment,
nor so good as to merit being admitted into the society of
blessed spirits; and therefore that God is graciously pleased
to allow of a middle state, where they may be purified by
certain degrees of suffering. You see, sir, there is nothing
unreasonable in this.' Boswell: 'But then, sir, their
Masses for the Dead?' Johnson: 'Why, sir, if it be once
established that there are souls in purgatory, it is as proper
to pray for them as for our brethren of mankind who are
yet in this life.'" (Anno 1769. Ætat. 60.)

B.—Page 34.

In the year 1805 the Irish Catholic bishops had subscribed
a petition to Parliament, and affixed to their names the
titles of their respective sees. On its being presented in
the House of Lords, an objection was urged respecting their
titles; and in reply to a noble duke who had spoken in
defence of the petitioners, Bishop Horsley spoke thus: "A
noble duke on the opposite bench has said, in exculpation
of them, that these Roman Catholic bishops are really
'bishops.' Most undoubtedly they are bishops as truly as
any here. They are of the episcopal order; and men, I
dare say, in their individual character, highly worthy of 
that pre-eminence in the Church. But I am sure the noble 
duke knows enough of our ecclesiastical matters to be ap-
prised of the distinction between the ‘power of order’ and 
the ‘power of jurisdiction.’ The power of order these Roman 
Catholic prelates possess. But the power of jurisdiction 
does not of necessity attach upon the power of order. A man 
may be a bishop, and yet it follows not of necessity that he 
is bishop of a diocese. The two powers, that of order and 
that of jurisdiction, are quite distinct, and of distinct origin. 
The power of order is properly a capacity of exercising the 
power of jurisdiction conferred by a competent authority; 
and this power of order is conveyed through the hierarchy 
itself, and no other authority but that of the hierarchy can 
give it. The only competent authority to give the power of 
episcopal jurisdiction in this kingdom is THE CROWN. It is 
true that in this part of the United Kingdom, that power 
may seem in some degree to flow from the hierarchy, because 
we have the form of an election of a person to be a bishop 
of a vacant see, by the clergy of the cathedral. But this is 
a mere form; the Chapter cannot proceed to elect without 
the King’s license. The King’s license to elect is always 
accompanied with his Majesty’s letter missive, recommend-
ing a fit person to their choice; and it always so falls out 
that the Chapter agree with the King in their opinion of 
the fitness of the person. In substance, therefore, the colla-
tion of the diocesan jurisdiction is from the Crown. In 
Ireland, the collation of the power of jurisdiction is both in 
form and substance from the Crown solely; for the prelates 
of that part of the kingdom are appointed to their respective 
sees, without any congé d’élie, or any form of election, by 
letters patent under the great seal. In neither part, there-
fore, of this kingdom, can there be any legitimate power of 
jurisdiction but what is conferred by the Crown, and the 
claim of such a power, independent of the Crown, is a most 
outrageous violation of the very first principles of our ancient 
constitution.” (Hansard, First Series, vol. iv. col. 800.) 
In the year 1825 (May 17), Bishop Van Mildert made a 
similar declaration: “Spiritual power, my Lords, is twofold;
and the two parts of which it is composed have been clearly defined by one of the most distinguished ornaments of our episcopal bench, whom many of your lordships must have often heard in this house with admiration and delight—I mean Bishop Horsley. In a speech on the subject we are now discussing, that eminent prelate remarked the just and proper distinction between the 'power of order' and the 'power of jurisdiction,' both appertaining to spiritual authority, but quite distinct, and of distinct origin. The power of order, my lords, is simply and purely spiritual, and can emanate from none but a spiritual authority. It is that power which confers the capability of exercising spiritual functions, or in other words, qualifies a person to minister in sacred things. This power the Sovereign, the temporal ruler of the State, being a layman, cannot possibly confer. He has it not himself, and therefore cannot communicate it to others. It originates in another and a higher source. And this is all that properly belongs to the power of order. The power of jurisdiction goes much further than this; it extends to the entire government of the ecclesiastical body, to the appointment of particular persons to exercise spiritual functions throughout the State, and regulations by which they shall be directed; to their respective remunerations according to the stations they hold in the ministry; in short, to everything which in ecclesiastical, no less than in civil polity, it is the duty of the legislative and executive government of the country to provide, for the general benefit of the community.

"Now it is manifest, my lords, that this latter power, though spiritual in its purpose and effect, cannot be exercised by any other authority than that of the State. . . . . "

"The true line of distinction, I apprehend, my lords, to be this: spiritual functions belong exclusively to the Church; spiritual jurisdiction belongs to the State as allied to the Church, and although exercised by the Church, is derived from the State." (Hansard, Second Series, vol. xiii., col. 696.)
ALBERTUS Dei et Apostolicæ Sedis gratia Sanctæ Moguntinensis sedis ac Magdeburgensis Ecclesiae Archiepiscopus, Primas et Sacri Romani Imperii in Germania Archi-cancellarius. . . . Universis et singulis presentes literas inspecturis Salutem in Domino.

Notum facimus quod Sanctissimus Dominus noster Leo, divina providentia Papa decimus modernus, omnibus et singulis utriusque sexus Christi fidelibus, AD REPARATIONEM FABRICÆ BASILICÆ principis Apostolorum sancti Petri de Urbe juxta ordinationem nostram MANUS PORRIGENTIBUS ADJUTRICES, ultra plenissimas indulgentias ac alias gratias et facultates, quas Christi fideles ipsi obtinere possunt, juxta literarum Apostolicarum desuper confectarum continentiam misericorditer etiam in Domino indulsit atque concessit, ut idoneum possint eligere confessorem presbyterum ecclesiastriam, vel cujusvis etiam mendicantium ordinis regularem, qui EORUM CONFESSIONE DILIGENTER AUDITA, pro commissis per eligentem delictis et excessibus, ac peccatis quibuslibet, quantuncunque gravibus et enormibus, etiam in dicte sedi reservatis casibus, ac censuris ecclesiasticis, etiam ab homine ad aliquos instantiam latis, de consensu partium, etiam ratione interdicti incursis, et quorum absulutio esset eidem sedi specialiter reservata, praeterquam machinationis in personam sanctissimi Pontificis, occasionis episcoporum aut aliorum superiorum praetorium, et injectionis manuum violentarum in illos aut alios prælatos, falsificationes literarum apostolicarum, delationis armorum et aliorum prohibitorum ad partes infidelium, ac sententiarum et censurarum, occasione aluminum Tulfæ apostolici de partibus infidelium ad fideles contra prohibitionem apostolicam delatorum, in-
cursarum * semel in vita et in mortis articulo quotiens ille imminebit, licet mors non subsequatur, Et in non reservatis casibus totiens quotiens id petierit, plenarie absolvere, et eis peenitentiam salutarem injungere, Nec non semel in vita et in dicto mortis articulo plenariam omnium peccatorum indulgentiam ac remissionem impendere, et eucharistiae sacramentum (excepto die Paschalis et mortis articulo) quibusvis anni temporibus ministrare, Nec non per eos emissa pro tempore vota quaecumque (ultramarino, visitationis linimum apostolorum et sancti Jacobi in Compostella, religionis et castitatis votis, duntaxat exceptis) in alia pietatis opera commutare, auctoritate apostolica possit et valeat. Indulsit quoque idem sanctissimus Dominus noster, praefatos benefactores, eorumque parentes defunctos qui cum charitate decesserint in precibus suffragiis eleemosynis, jejuniiis, orationibus, horis canonicis, disciplinis, peregrinationibus, et ceteris omnibus spiritualibus bonis, quae siunt et fieri poterunt in tota universalii sacrosanctii Ecclesiae militante, et in omnibus membris ejusdem in perpetuum participes fieri. Et quia devoti Meckel relicta Rodis, Peters et Adam Rodts † ad ipsam fabricam et necessarium instaurationem supra dictae Basilicae principis Apostolorum, juxta sanctissimi Domini nostri Papae intentionem et nostram ordinationem de bonis suis contribuendo se gratos exhibuerunt et liberales, in cuius rei signum presentes literas a nobis acceperunt, ideo eadem auctoritate apostolica nobis commissa et qua fungimur in hac parte, ipsis, quod dictis gratii et

* In the middle of the fifteenth century the best alum was procured from Asia Minor, and the Turks made an annual profit of 300,000 ducats by the quantity sold to Christians. In 1463 alum was discovered at Tulfa (or Tufa), on the hills near Civita Vecchia, superior in quality to the Turkish, and in greater abundance. Pius II., who was then preparing for an expedition against the Turks, proclaimed the excellence of the newly discovered alum, in his Mandy-Thursday Bull; and in order to diminish the supplies of the infidels and increase those of the Christians, forbade any further purchases of alum to be made from the Turks, or from other infidels. (Arnaldi, ad annum 1463, num. 86.)—The conveying of Tufa alum (the kind produced at Tulfa) from infidel countries to Christians was subsequently prohibited under pain of excommunication.

† The words, and parts of words in Italics, are manuscript.
indulgentiis uti, et iisdem gaudere, possint et valeant per præsentes concedimus et largimur. Datum in Gottingen sub sigillo per nos ad hæc ordinato, die prima mensis Julii, Anno Domini m. CCCC.XVII.

Forma Absolutionis totiens quotiens in vita.


Forma Absolutionis et plenissimæ Remissionis, semel in vita, et mortis articulo.


D.—Pages 101, 119.

DIPLOMA Indulgentiærum Arcimboldi, una cum subscriptione Tetzellii ejus Subcommissarii.

Joannes Angelus Arcimboldus, Juris utriusque Doctor, &c. super executione plenissimarum Indulgentiærum immensæ Fabricæ basilicæ Principis Apostolorum cælorumque
Clavigeri de urbe Nuncius et Commissarius, a Sanctissimo in Christo Patre et Domino nostro D. Leone Papa X. specialiter deputatus, prout in literis ejusdem Sanctissimi Domini nostri Papæ sub plumbo editis plenius continetur. Dilecto nobis in Christo Andrea Hummelshayn salutem in Domino sempiternam.

Exigente piae devotionis affectu, quem nos erga Deum, et dictam basilicam te habere cognovimus, eo quod pro continuatione tam immensi operis ex pinguedine charitatis juxta Apostolicum indultum manus porrexit ad adjunctices. Ideo auctoritate Apostolica nobis tradita te* concedimus facultatem eligendi idoneum sæcularem, vel cujusvis etiam mendicantium ordinis regularem confessorem qui confessione tua diligentem audita, pro commissis per te excesibus, criminiibus, delictis atque peccatis quantumcumque gravibus et enormibus, etiam sedi Apostolice reservatis, etiamsi talia forent, propter quae sedes ipsa Apostolice esset merito consulenda, ac censuris Ecclesiasticis, etiam ab homine ad alicujus instantiam latis, de consensu partium etiam ratione interdicti incursis, et quorum absolutio dictae sedi esset reservata, Praeterquam machinationis in personam summii Pontificis, occasione Episcoporum et aliorum superiorum Praelectorum, et injectionis manuum violentarum in illos et alios Praelectos, falsificationis bullarum et literarum Apostolicarum, delationum armorum et aliorum prohibitorum ad partes infidelium, et sententiarum et censurarum occasione aluminum Sanctæ matris Ecclesiæ de partibus infidelium ad fidèles, contra prohibitionem Apostolica, delatorum incursarum, Semel in vita, et in non reservatis casibus toties quoties id petieris, et in mortis articulo plenariam omnium peccatorum tuorum indulgentiam et remissionem impendere, ac penitentiam salutarem injungere, neconon Eucharistiae sacramentum, præterquam in die Paschæ et in mortis articulo, aliis anni temporibus ministre, et emissa per te vota quæcumque, ultramarino, ingressus religionis et castitatis votis duntaxat exceptis, in utilitatem dictæ fabricæ

* Ita contra syntaxim habet litera diplomatis, cui caetera omnia impresso Tetzelius nomen petitoris indulgentiarum, et pronomina applicationis te, tuorum, tibi, tuis, manu sua inscriptit.—Gerdes.

Forma Absolutionis plenariae, PRÆMISSA CONFESSIONE.


FR. JOHANNES TETZEL,

Sub-Commissarius manu propria scriptit.*

* Gerdes, Monumenta Antiquitatis, &c., p. 73.
Universis Christi fidelibus presentes* litteras inspecturis Paulinus Chappe Consiliarius Ambasiatior et procurator generalis Serenissimi Regis Cypri in hac parte Salutem in Domino.—Cum Sanctissimus in Christo Pater et Dominus noster Dominus Nicholaus divina Providentia papa quintus afflictioni Regni Cypri misericorditer compatiens contra perfidissimos crucis Christi hostes Theucros et Saracenos gratis concessit omnibus Christi fidelibus ubilibet constitutis, ipsos per aspersiunem sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi piè exhortando, qui infra triennium a primo die Maii anni Domini Mcccclii. incipiendum, PRO DEFENSIONE CATHOLICE FIDEI et regni predicti DE FACULTATIBUS SUIS, MAGIS VEL MINUS PROUT IPSORVM VIDEITUR CONSCIENTIIS, procuratoribus vel nunciis substitutis PIÈ EROGAVERINT, ut confessores ydonei seculares vel regulares per ipsos eligendi, CONFESSIONIBUS EORVM AUDITIS, pro commissis etiam sedi Apostolice reservatis, excessibus, crinimibus atque delictis, quantumcumque gravibus, pro una vice tantum, debitam absolutionem impendere et penitentiam salutarem injungere, neconon si id humiliter petierint ipsos a quibuscunque excommunicationum, suspensionum et interdicti aliisque sententiis, censuris et penis ecclesiasticis, a jure vel ab homine promulgatis, quibus forte innodati existunt, absolvere; inuicta pro modo culpe penitentia salutari, vel aliis que de jure fuerint injungenda, ac eis VERE PENITENTIBUS ET CONFESSIONIS, vel si forsann propter amissionem loquele conftteri non poterint, signo contritionis ostendendo, plenissimam omnium peccatorum suorum de quibus ore confessi et corde contriti fuerint Indulgentiam ac plenariam remissionem, semel in vita et semel in mortis articulo ipsis auctoritate apostolica concedere valeant; satisfactione per

* In many manuscripts of the Middle Ages a simple "e" is substituted for the diphthongs. See Nouveau Traité de Diplomatique, Partie II. sect. iv. chap. ix. art. iv.
eos facta si supervixerint, aut per eorum heredes si tunc transierint: sic tamen quod post indultum concessum per unum annum singulis sextis feriis vel quadam alia die jejunament, legitimo impedimento, ecclesie precepto, regulari observantia, penitentia injuncta vel alias non obtante: Et ipsis impeditis in dicto anno vel ejus parte, anno sequenti vel alius quamprimum poterint jejunabunt: Et si in aliquo annorum vel eorum parte dictum jejunium commodè implere nequiverint, confessor ad id electus in alia commutare poterit caritatis opera que ipsi facere teneantur: Dummodo tamen, ex confidentia remissionis huysmodi quod absit, peccare non presumant: Alioquin dicta concessio quod plenariam remissionem in mortis articulo, et remissio quod peccata ex confidentia ut premititur commissa, nullius sint roboris vel momenti. Et quia devoti dominus * Hinricus mais, pastor in Roselden, Greta pinen Krans ejus soror, Stina K[r]usen cum filiabus suis Helena et Congunde Guda Krusen et bela Kluten ejus filia juxta dictum indultum de facultatibus suis pie eroguverint merito huysmodi indulgentis gaudere debent. In veritatis testimonium sigillum ad hoc ordinatum presentibus litteris testimonialibus est appendendum. Datù in oppido Nussien. anno dì Mcceclquito, die vero penultima mensis Aprilis † [A.D. 1455, April 29].

Forma plenissime Absolutionis et Remissionis in vita.

Misereatur tui, &c. Dominus noster Jesus Christus per suam sanctissimam et piissimam misericordiam te absolvat. Et auctoritate ipsius beatorumque Petri et Pauli apostolorum ejus ac auctoritate apostolica mihi commissa et tibi concessa Ego te absolvo ab omnibus peccatis tuis contritis confessis et oblitis, Etiam ab omnibus casibus excessibus criminibus atque delictis quantumcumque gravibus sedi apostolice reservatis, Necnon a quibuscumque excommunicationum suspensionum et interdicti, aliique sententiis censuris et penis ecclesiasticis a jure vel ab homine promulgatis si quas incurrísti, dando tibi plenissimam omnium

* The words and parts of words in Italics, in this and the following article, are manuscript in the originals.
† The few copies that are extant of this Letter of Indulgences are the earliest specimens of the art of printing bearing a date.
peccatorum tuorum indulgentiam et remissionem in quantum claves sancte matris ecclesie in hac parte se extendunt. In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti. Amen.

Forma plenarie Remissionis in mortis articulo.


F.—Page 121.

Frater Johannes Kendale Turcipolarius Rhodi ac Commissarius a Sanctissimo in Christo Patre et Domino nostro Domino Sixto divina providentia papa quarto, et vigore literarum suarum pro expeditione contra perfidos Turchos CHRISTIANI NOMINIS HOSTES, in defensionem Insule Rhodi et FIDEI CATHOLIOE facta et facienda concessarum ad infrascripta per universum orbem deputatus Dilecto nobis in Christo Symoni Mountfort et Emme uxori ejus* Salutem in

* By some strange mistake two names are inserted in the blank, whereas the form was composed and printed for one only.

In the same collection (Fragmenta Antiqua, &c., c. 18, c. 2) in the British Museum, there is another copy of the same form of Confessional (the blank still open), under another Commissary, "Frater Johannes de Cardona;" to which is subjoined the following—

"FORMA ABSOLUTIONIS.

"Misereatur tui, &c. Absolutionem, &c. Dominus noster Jhesus Christus per suam piissimam misericordiam te absolvat. Et ego auctoritate ejusdem et beatorum Petri et Pauli apostolorum ejus, ac Sanctissimi Domini nostri Pape mihi commissa, absolvo te ab omni vinculo excommunicationis, ac aliis census ecclesiasticis si incidisti, Ab omnibus quoque peccatis criminibus excessibus delictis quantumcumque gravibus et enormibus etiam sedi apostolice reservatis
Domino sempiternam. Provenit ex tue devotionis affectu quo Romanam Ecclesiam revereris, ac te huic sacre et necessarie expeditioni gratum reddis et liberalem, ut petitiones tuas, illas presertim que conscientie pacem et anime tue salutem respiciunt, ad exauditionis gratiam admittamus. Hinc est quod nos tuis devotis supplicationibus inclinati tibi ut aliquem idoneum et discretum presbiterum secularem vel cujusvis ordinis regularem in tuum possis eligere confessorem, qui confessione tua diligentem audita pro commissis per te quibusve criminibus excessibus et delictis quantumcumque gravibus et enormibus, etiam si talia fuerint propter que sedes apostolica sit quovis modo merito consulenda: Injectionis manuum in Episcopum vel superiorem, ac libertatis Ecclesiasticæ offense, seu conspersionis in personam aut statum Romani Pontificis, vel cujusvis offense inobediencie aut rebellionis sedis ejusdem, ac presbitericidii casibus duntaxat exceptis: In reservatis semel tantum, in aliis vero non reservatis totiens quotiens fuerit opportunum, debitam absolutionem impendera et penitentiam salutarem injungere, ac omnium peccatorum tuorum de quibus corde contributus et ore confessus fueris semel in vita et semel in articulo mortis plenariam remissiæ et indulgentiam eadem auctoritate in mortis articulo tibi conferendum reserve.

juxta apostolicæ indulgii tenorem, dando tibi plenariam remissionem omnium peccatorum tuorum, et restitutæ te gremio et unioni sancte matris ecclesie et ejusdem sacramentis. In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti. Amen.”

Pro simoniaeis post punctum “Ab omni vinculo excommunicationis,” addatur:

“Et a simonia labe ac censura quas inde incurrísti et dispenso tecum super irregularitatibus incursis, abolendo a te omnem inabilitatis et infamie maculam inde secutam.”

Et nota quod in mortis articulo adjungenda est hec clausula.

“Si tamen ab hac egritudine non decesseris, plenariam remissionem et indulgentiam eadem auctoritate in mortis articulo tibi conferendam reservo.”
G.—Introduction, p. viii.

The following challenges, on the part of Mr. Green, for the verification of quotations, &c., are extracted from letters of their respective dates:—

**November 9, 1867.**

I. Mr. Collette, in his letter of September 28, asserted that the "Contrition and Confession, referred to in some of the Bulls . . . . are not found in the Bull on which he relied, granting a plenary indulgence and remission of all sins, to be valid for all future time." Now, Sir, if Mr. Collette can verify that assertion, and produce from Ferraris a Bull containing the part of his quotation to be found at page 111, and not containing the said "Contrition and Confession," he may publish the same [the said Bull], as an advertisement, in the fourth page of your next number, at my costs and charges, and I will give to the Hospital the sum of five pounds.—N.B. No Bull was published, nor any passage from any Bull, or other document, "containing the part of his quotation to be found at page 111." The irrelevant passages to which he referred are answered in Letter XII.

**November 16.**

II. Mr. Collette, in his letter of last Saturday (Nov. 9), reminds your readers that he had quoted a Bull containing the following words:—"Plenarium omnium peccatorum suorum indulgentiam et remissionem misericorditer in Domino concedimus, præsentibus perpetuis, futuris, temporibus valuituris, cum facultate etiam eandem plenarium indulgentiam applicandi animabus in Purgatorio," Which he translates as follows:—"We mercifully grant in the Lord a plenary indulgence and remission of all their sins, to be
valid for the present, in perpetuity, and for all future times, with the power of applying the same plenary indulgence to the souls in Purgatory.” This, he says, he “transcribed verbatim from the ‘Bonon.’ or Bologna edition (1758) of Ferraris..........tom. iv. p. 98.”—The whole, be it observed, is one sentence; he had borrowed the edition, moreover, from a friend, for the purpose; and to satisfy himself that all editions were alike, he had compared it with another edition. Were it not for these statements, it might have been supposed that he had quoted the sentence and its reference, second hand. But what judgment can your readers form, when they know that there is no such sentence to be found in the whole volume. I herewith send you a copy of the Bologna edition; and if Mr. Collette can refer you to any Bull, in any page, in which the said sentence may appear, you will oblige me, for your readers’ satisfaction, by publishing the whole Bull in your next number, at my expense; and I will give to the Hospital the sum of five pounds.

III. Mr. Collette asserts in his last week’s letter, that in the Bologna edition, in the sentence which he professes to have quoted, there is only a comma before the word “praesentibus.” This is simply untrue. In every instance in which the word “praesentibus” is preceded by the former part of his quotation, it has a full stop before it, and its first letter is a large capital. If, however, Mr. Collette can verify his assertion, and refer you to a Bull, in which you will find the case otherwise than I have stated it, you may publish that Bull also, in your next number, at my expense; and I will give to the Hospital an additional five pounds.

N.B.—On the part of Mr. Collette, no Bull, nor other equivalent document, was produced in reply to either of the above-stated challenges. Respecting the former, he did not refer the editor to any Bull (or other such document), in any page of the volume in which the passage in question might be found; and a long explanation respecting the two pages 98 and 111, was irrelevant. In reply to the second, he produced from a Bull of Alexander VII., in three Venice
editions, the following sentence, as the "form required;" viz., "Plenariam omnium peccatorum suorum Indulgentiam et remissionem in Domino concedimus præsentibus in perpetuum valituris;" and procured certificates from three public-library officials to the effect that, in the said sentence, in the said three Venice editions, "præsentibus is printed with a small p, and there is no stop before it." The reader will at once perceive that the sentence is not the "form required;" the word "misericorditer" is deficient, and the words before "valituris" are not the same. In the Bologna edition, in the self-same Bull of Alexander VII., there are the full stop and the capital letter. In a subsequent number appeared the following reply:—

THE BULL, THE WHOLE BULL, AND NOTHING BUT THE BULL.

To the Editor of the Midland Counties Express.

SIR,—Mr. Collett tells your readers again that I have forfeited my pledges to the Hospital, and am liable to the charges for his advertisements. He is again mistaken.

Mr. Collette asserted respecting a certain sentence that he had transcribed the same verbatim, from a Pope's Bull, at page 98 in the fourth volume of the BOLOGNA edition of Ferraris; that he had borrowed the said edition from a friend in the country for the purpose; and that to satisfy himself that all the editions were alike, he had compared it with another edition. He further asserted that in the said sentence, in the said Bologna edition, there was only a comma before the word "Præsentibus." The truth of these assertions I flatly denied; I sent you a copy of the said Bologna edition, and my pledge was, that if Mr. Collette could refer you to any Bull, in any page, in the said fourth volume of the said Bologna edition, in which his said assertions could be verified, you might publish in each instance, for your readers' satisfaction, the "whole Bull," at my expense, &c. No such Bull has been published; no such Bull can be found; and my honest pledge remains untouched. Mr. Collette's assertions on the other hand are
untrue; and for his own advertisements, in consequence of such assertions, he must himself be held responsible.

Mr. Collette's assertions, and my pledges, had reference solely to the Bologna edition; and his "false issues," in your last number, as to other editions, need no reply.

I remain Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

T. L. GREEN.

November 23, 1867.

IV. Mr. Collette, in his letter of November 9, professes to quote from a Bull of Pope Innocent XIII. a passage which "seems," he says, "to embrace in itself every form which could be devised to contradict all Mr. Green's theories and assertions." The passage begins with the words "Ego absolvo te;" it occupies eleven lines, and his comments upon it occupy twenty-three more. Now, Sir, if Mr. Collette can produce a Bull of the said Pope Innocent XIII. or of any other Pope, containing the said passage, he may publish the said Bull in your next number at my expense, and I will give another five pounds to the Hospital. The passage in question is no part of any Pope's Bull; and is no more a pardon of sins future, or a license of sinning (as Mr. Collettewould represent it to be), than the Protestant form of absolution in the Protestant "Visitatio of the Sick." *

V. Mr. Collette, in the same letter of November 9, states when Mr. Green "was of Tixall, Archdeacon Hodson had quoted from Bishop Stillingfleet a certain indulgence," without referring to the authority; that Mr. Green "became particularly urgent to obtain the reference;" but that "the call was suddenly dropped, because, on consulting Ferrariis, under 'Indulgences,' he found three distinct Indulgences containing precisely the same form, one of Benedict XIII., and two of Benedict XIV.;" and "that this was rather awkward for Mr. Green." — The

* See Letter XIII. p. 103.
only truth in that statement respecting myself is, that I was particularly urgent to obtain the reference; and the further truth is that I ceased not to be so until Archdeacon Hodson told me that his letters were in the press, and that any further application must be made through that medium. The whole of that controversial correspondence was published, with the exception of one letter, the copy of which Mr. Archdeacon Hodson had not kept. I send you that letter in the Archdeacon's own handwriting, and the whole of the published correspondence, and if Mr. Collette can refer you to any page, or pages, in which the remainder of his statement may appear, at his request you may publish the same in your next number at my expense, and I will give the Hospital another five pounds.*

VI. In my letter of November 9 I noticed a "second-hand" quotation on the part of Mr. Collette; and I observed that he might "well consider if the cutting reproaches with which he had lashed others for such quotations ought not to be administered to himself." I will now give another instance of unmistakable second-hand quotation. Mr. Davidson, in his letter of July 6, and Mr. Collette, in his of September 7, professed to quote from Morinus, as follows:—"Morinus says that the Indulgences (of the middle ages) did not merely absolve from canonical penance, but that a remission of such sins was granted by them, upon which eternal life depends." Neither of them gave the Latin; they both gave the same English, and both the same reference, namely, Book X. chapter 20. Now, Sir, the chapter consists of twelve paragraphs, each of them numbered; and if Mr. Collette can find in any one of those paragraphs the corresponding Latin words for his (supposed) quotation, he may publish the said paragraph, with the said corresponding words in capital letters, in your next number, at my expense, and I will give the Hospital another five pounds.

* No "remainder" of Mr. Collette's statement appeared in the next number. Sundry Indulgences for the hour of death, to which he referred in his pamphlet (pp. 179, 180), are sufficiently noticed in Letter XII. p. 106.
N.B. In reference to this last paragraph Mr. Collette addressed to his opponent a private letter, the controversial passages in which are answered in Letter VII. pp. 53, 59. In reply to the charge of second-hand quotation he stated that he had "transcribed the reference" from one of his own books, that "the reference there is a misprint," and that "being then in the country, away from his books . . . . he had transcribed the misprint." The facts are that he transcribed not only the reference, but the words also, and that the words themselves, as well as the reference, in his own book, are a second-hand quotation. The book consists, to a certain extent, of articles written by various authors, and for the article on Indulgences, in which the quotation occurs, Mr. Collette states that he is "indebted to the Rev. John Evans, of Whixall, Frees, Shrewsbury." The passage, therefore, as it stands in his own book, is avowedly a quotation of the Rev. John Evans; in his letter in the Express, and in his pamphlet, he has given the quotation as his own.

The following, however, is a still more palpable instance of second-hand quotation. Elliott, in a note at page 314 (Delineation, &c., London, 1859), quotes a passage beginning with the words "Errant qui dicunt, &c." and gives as his reference, "Thom. Aquin. Summæ Theol. Supp. Part Tert. Quest. XXV. Art. 4; 4to. Colon. 1620" (i.e. "Thomas of Aquino's Sum of Theology; Supplement, Part the Third; Question XXV., Article the Fourth: Quarto [edition] Cologne 1620"). Mr. Collette in a note, at page 138 of his pamphlet, quotes precisely the same passage, and gives precisely the same reference. Now the reference is a blunder from beginning to end. In the first place there is no such edition of the "Sum" or the "Supplement," as a "4to. Colon. 1620." 2. In no edition of the "Sum" or the "Supplement" in "Part the Third, Question XXV.," is there a Fourth Article. The Question is divided into three Articles only ("in tres Articulos divisa"). 3. And in no part whatever of the "Sum" or the "Supplement," in any edition, is the quoted passage to be found. The words are not Thomas of Aquino's. The
work in which it occurs is Carbo's "Compendium Summæ Theologiae, 4to. Colon. 1620;" not indeed in any (non-existing) "Fourth Article," but the Second of the said Question XXV. Now whether Mr. Collette copied the passage and the false reference from Elliott, or whether both writers copied them from some third, is of little consequence: in either case, on the part of Mr. Collette, it is unquestionably a second-hand quotation.