

to the Almighty God, that he has thus watched over the work of his faithful soldier and servant, the blessed martyr, Hippolytus. We, of the Church of England, may recognise in this treatise a Catholic and Apostolic—yes, and a Roman—vindictor of our own Reformation. Here, a Roman bishop, saint, and martyr, supplies us with a defence of our own religious position with respect to Rome. In his 'Refutation of all Heresies' we see a practical refutation of that great heresy of our own day—the heresy which, either directly or indirectly, is at the root of many prevalent heresies—the heresy of Papal supremacy and Papal infallibility. Whenever, then, we are charged by Romish divines with heresy and schism for not acknowledging the Bishop of Rome as supreme head of the Church and infallible arbiter of the faith, we may henceforth refer them to the marble statue in the Vatican, and bid them consult the treatise of St. Hippolytus. Thankful, however, as we ought to be for this recent discovery, perhaps they who have cause to be most grateful are the clergy and laity of Rome. Truth is to be prized above all things, especially in matters of faith. Arguments from *adversaries*, real or supposed, and especially from contemporaneous adversaries, are often regarded with suspicion, and rejected with scorn; but here the members of the Church of Rome may read a treatise, written by one whose name they love and venerate, one who has no interests to serve, no passions to gratify—a Bishop, Doctor, Saint, and Martyr of their own Church. He speaks to them from the grave, and from primitive times. May it please the same merciful Providence, which has awakened the voice of Hippolytus from its silence of sixteen centuries, to bless its accents to their souls' health! May it be so blessed from on high, that it may promote the cause of Truth, and the Unity of the Church, and the Glory of Almighty God, now and for evermore

◆ DOES THE WORSHIP OF THE CHURCH OF ROME ANSWER THE TRUE ENDS OF DEVOTION?

THE advocates of the Church of Rome appear to rely much on the assertion that they are a more *devout* people than those of any other religion; that their practices are more agreeable to the self-denial and mortification recommended in Scripture; that God is more constantly and reverently served among them than among Protestants; and that they take more pains, and are at more cost and trouble in the worship of God, which practically evidences a good, religious mind, and one which must be most secure of God's acceptance.

We doubt not that there are many earnest and conscientious Roman Catholics who sincerely believe that the religion of the heart is not to be found, except within the pale of the Church of Rome; and as our Lord Jesus Christ has himself laid down the criterion of his true followers to be—"By their fruits ye shall know them. Not every one who saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven" (Matt. vii. 20, 21) we freely admit that there is no better test of the truth of any religion than its adaptation to produce the fruits of real virtue in those who cordially and consistently embrace it.

Without venturing to prejudge a matter of such vast practical importance, we would remark, that it is not always those who make the loudest profession of religion that are the most devout or consistent in either their feelings or their lives; and that it is one thing for a Church really to advance true devotion and piety to God, and another to appear to do so, by making a *great show and noise* about it. Sir Edwin Sandys, whose name has already been several times referred to in this journal, has observed, that "the Church of Rome has so contrived its rules and orders, as rather to comply with and fit every temper and inclination, good or bad, than to work any real good effect on any." This observation may seem severe; but whether it be justified by fact and experience we shall presently see when we have examined a little more minutely the frame and constitution of that Church, with a view to discerning whether it be really more fitted for the exciting of true devotion, and leading a good life, than that of the Church to which we belong, and which we believe to be the true Church of Christ and his Apostles.

Before we can apply the test supplied by our Blessed Lord, we must, however, understand what is the meaning of it—*what is doing the will of our Heavenly Father?* Performing "good works," says the Church of Rome. We shall discuss this hereafter; but, for argument's sake, let it pass for the present, and let us first inquire what are the *good works*, the doing of which, it is said, will gain man entrance into the heavenly kingdom?

Most dispassionate men will, we think, agree in the definition that a good work is an action useful to others, inspired by an unselfish feeling. To make a good work, there must be a pure intention as well as a generous action. In judging of other men's actions we always look beyond the mere external conduct to the internal motive which led to it. Have we not always a natural inclination to search into the intentions of those whom we see acting around us? Every one will freely admit, that patriotism inspired by vanity or selfishness is not true patriotism; that devotedness based on ambition for power or personal aggrandizement, is not devotion; liberality instigated by a desire of praise and fame, is not charity.

There are everywhere Pharisees who make long prayers—to be seen of men; who invite to feasts—those who can invite them in return. Patriots who struggle for their country—only until they are in a position to sell and to betray it. Philosophers who worship knowledge—as the high road to the Temple of Fame. Warriors who magnanimously risk their lives—for a coronet or a kingdom. Philanthropists who erect posthumous hospitals—at the expense of their posterity. Alas! how few are there whose motives will bear a close investigation. Let each one study himself, and scrutinize a little into the secret springs of his best actions, and say whether the dismal truth be not the same still that our Blessed Lord proclaimed it to be in His time—"There is none that doeth good; no, not one!"

What are we, then, to think of the self-satisfaction of the thousands, who are trusting to their good works as a sure passport to heaven, but this, that such men take but a superficial view of their own conduct, and give little attention to the motives by which they are actuated, thinking only of the results they produce? What care ordinary men for the purity of the spring, so long as the stream, muddy or clean, fertilizes the land?

And yet these *practical* men, as they would be deemed, are not without their show of reason. If the heart be always to be thus searched and analyzed, say they, no one will be sufficient to bear the examination—the best men will be discouraged, and found wanting—and, after all, is not the *work* the essential matter? What else has the world any concern in? Is it not the *work* that relieves the wretched? Whether the *intention* be holy or vain-glorious, the result is the same. In either case, are not the poor and sick relieved and society benefitted? Ought we not, therefore, to applaud the act, and care little for the intention? Thus society connives at setting up a new definition of goodness, and lowers the standard of virtue to include works springing from the impure fountain of vanity and ambition—as if good works, done to be seen of men, could delude God, who searcheth the heart, and in whose sight the very heavens are unclean! Is this *doing the will of our Father* who is in heaven?

The next step in the downward path of those who look to good works to save them, seems to us to be this—"The law of God strictly enjoins us to constant vigilance over all the acts of our lives—to watch and pray, lest we enter into temptation." We are not to kill, nor injure, nor revenge, nor steal, nor even covet. Surely, such strict vigilance over ourselves, in every act of our lives, is impracticable, and would render life intolerable! Among good works to be done, surely a choice may be made; one may take the place of another. He to whom prayers are irksome may make it up in alms-giving—each may thus accept what he does not dislike, and overlook what is not according to his taste. Thus is a flexible law substituted for the inflexible law of God, and *good works made more easy*. This is *practical* step the second in the downward path of those who look to good works for their salvation! Is this *doing the will of our Father* who is in heaven? or is it not rather doing our own will, who are of the earth—earthly?

We have still to trace the matter further. Having got rid of the trouble of scrutinizing our motives, and allowed ourselves to choose those duties and virtues which are most palatable or easy to us, we still have *good works to do*, or we cannot be saved by them; and as moral works, even when confined to the mere outward act, are burdensome, and not always easy to be performed, we begin to think that the pain they cause must be acceptable to God, and that the more toilsome they are the more meritorious they must be—*suffering is, after all, the essential point*. Do we love repose and home?—let us go on laborious pilgrimages. Do we enjoy the indulgences of a well-provided board?—let us mortify ourselves with fasts and abstinences. Bodily pain is repugnant—let us scourge our flesh with voluntary flagellations. Pity, however, that we are in all these matters outdone by the Pagans themselves. Roman Catholic devotees are far exceeded by the idolatrous Indians. The Fakirs, among the Buddhists, will stand with their arms stretched out, till their limbs wither. A Roman Catholic devotee will perform his stations round a stone cross upon his knees; but Indian devotees will perform a pilgrimage from one end of Hindostan to the other, prostrating themselves, and measuring the road with the length of their own bodies. The Turkish fast of Ramadan far exceeds, in severity, the fast of Lent in Europe. Perhaps, you think it meritorious to wear hair-cloth next your skin, and use the scourge; but what is that to the worshippers of Juggernaut, who prostrate their bodies to be crushed under their idol's car, and run an iron hook through their ribs, and swing themselves in the air! Here are sufferings, mortifications—shall we say merits? How have these fanatics arrived at this, but by indulging the belief, that *physical pain* may be substituted for moral works, so as to purchase by suffering the liberty of indulging their passions? Man practically feeling the difficulty of doing works truly good, tries to compound with God by *substituting works of suffering*! This is practical step the third in the downward path of those who look to good works for their salvation. Is God a demon, taking a savage delight in the misery of his creatures? Is this *doing the will of our Father* who is in heaven?

Good works of this kind being somewhat too hard for ordinary *practical* men, means must next be found to mitigate them. Piety must be *made easy*, or it will soon be out

of fashion. Is fasting too severe for you?—a dispensation is ready at hand, if you will only pay for it. Do you dislike abstinence?—you may purchase the privilege of eating meat. Is there any rule so strict in the Church of Rome that it may not be dispensed with, at convenience, for money? To repeat prayers and submit to other penances is irksome; but if you be rich, and a chapel or convent to be built, is there not a means of escape which *practical* men can easily avail themselves of, and thereby escape the *punishment* of long prayers? Alas! that prayers should ever have been made so spiritless as to be imposed as a *punishment*. What a sad view of Christianity! Man prays to God as a punishment—as a punishment he asks God to bless him, and this prayer, instead of a privilege, is made a burden, and Christian men are driven to the task of *counting* prayers by rosaries, as the Bedouin Arabs in Algeria, or the Muftis at Cairo, who repeat the name of God ten thousand times in an hour, and call that piety. Would it not be as useful to have a thousand rosaries wound off by a steam engine? Is this *doing the will of our Father* which is in Heaven, or is it a still lower step in the downward path of him who looks to his *good works* to bring him to Heaven?

One step more, and we have done. There are men who believe they may do their good works by proxy. There are Moslem pilgrims who go to Mecca for other Musselmen. Are there not priests here, too, who say masses for anybody who will pay for them? Does not the Church of Rome boast she has a treasury of the funded merits of the supererogatory good works of the saints, which she will dispense at a small cost to those who need indulgences to make up for their own deficiencies? What is this but *good works done by proxy*? Alas! is this the way to attain Heaven, by doing the will of our Father who is in Heaven? and can any better proof be wanting that it is actually the truth, and that *practical* men feel it to be so, that by their *own good works* they cannot merit heaven or earn salvation?

Do we, then, wish to discountenance good works, or wish such good works to be deemed useless or impracticable? Our readers shall judge in our next; and in the meantime we would earnestly recommend to them the able tracts of Napoleon Roussel, to which we are largely indebted for many of the ideas we have here brought before our readers, and which are full of materials for thought worthy the attention of Irishmen at the present crisis.

◆ THE INDEX PROHIBITUS AND THE INDEX EXPURGATORIUS.

A QUESTION often arises, how far it is just or fair to take books written by individual members of a Church, as proof of the real doctrine and teaching of that Church.

For instance, if we were to produce any very extravagant doctrine from a Roman Catholic writer, and to say that this was the doctrine of the Church of Rome, we would at once be told that this was unfair; that the doctrine in question was only the doctrine of that individual, and not the doctrine of the Church.

We admit that this argument is a very fair one, in a general view; for no man is bound to believe everything that every other person in the same Church with him may choose to believe.

But other circumstances may sometimes make a Church very deeply responsible for what its writers print and publish; and may make it much more difficult for individual members of that Church to free themselves from being involved in the errors published by others.

If individual members say that their Church infallibly provides for universal agreement in doctrine among the teachers and doctors of their Church, then it is not so easy for them to reply that what those teachers and doctors print and publish is only their own opinions and errors, and not the doctrine of their Church.

And if we find a general consent and agreement among a great number of the doctors of that Church, in propagating a particular opinion, then it is still harder to say that it is not the doctrine of that Church.

For instance, in the question about worshipping of images, if we were to quote Azorius, saying—"The image is to be worshipped with the same honour and worship with which we worship those whose image it is,"* and were to say that this is the doctrine of the Church of Rome, we should, of course, be told that we were arguing unfairly; that this was only the opinion of that individual doctor, and that it is not the doctrine of the Church or Rome, and that Roman Catholics do not believe in it.

Now, while we admit that one man is not to be charged with the error of another, if he really does not hold it himself, we are at least entitled to say that the Church of Rome does not succeed in preventing her most famous doctors and teachers falling into most grievous and sinful errors.

And when we show that Azorius himself says of that very doctrine (in the place above referred to)—"*This is the constant sentence of the divines;*" and when we further show that the great St. Thomas, Alexander of Ales, Bonaventure, Albertus, Richardus, Capreolus, Cajetan, Coster, Valentia, Vasquez, and many others of the greatest authority in the Church of Rome, say the same thing, it certainly becomes much harder to clear the Church of Rome of approving of this doctrine.

But when we come further to consider the laws and in-

* Instit. Moral., par. i., l. 9, c. 6.

stitutions of the Church of Rome, her responsibility for what her authors and doctors print and publish appears to be much greater still.

Alone of all the Churches of the world, the Church of Rome undertakes to examine and decide on the merit of all books in respect of faith and morals, before she permits them to be printed and read. She undertakes not only to forbid the printing and reading of all that are bad, but she undertakes also to correct and amend all that require to be corrected, and then to give them forth with her authority and sanction, as containing nothing injurious to faith or morals.

And when we further find that she has provided tribunals over all the world to accomplish this great work, and that those tribunals are at this day actually at work in performing this task, we do not see how it is possible any longer to maintain that the Church of Rome is not responsible for the doctrines contained in the books which she thus sanctions and approves.

Our readers will see that we have been led to this subject by the letter of Mr. Brian, of Kerry, that appeared in our number for August. Our intention is now to give an historical account of the laws and tribunals of the Church of Rome about THE INDEX; and we shall afterwards go on to show what these tribunals have approved, and what they have condemned; and thus it will appear for what opinions and doctrines the Church of Rome is really responsible.

We find no general law of the Church of Rome concerning the publishing, approbation, or prohibition of books previous to the year 1515. At the fifth Council of Lateran, held in that year, under Pope Leo X., session x. (which is now counted a General Council in the Church of Rome), we find the first decree on the subject.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. xiv., p. 257. This decree mentions the late invention of printing books as the reason for this new step. The decree goes on to declare, that—"For all future times, no one should presume to print, or cause to be printed, any book or other writing, as well in our city (Rome) as in any other state or diocese, unless first diligently examined and approved by subscription under their hands, in the city (Rome), by our Vicar and the Master of our Sacred Palace; but in other states and dioceses by the Bishop, or some other qualified person deputed by him, and by the inquisitor of heretical wickedness, or of the diocese." And the decree goes on to denounce penalties against all who disobey—such as the forfeiture and burning of the books, a heavy fine upon the workmen, excommunication, the penalties of contumacy (no joke in those times), and, lastly, "the indignation of Almighty God, and of his blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul," which the Pope, no doubt, thought he had power to excite against whatever poor printer he pleased.*

This, we believe, was the first law made by the Church of Rome on the subject; but it was not the beginning of the "INDEX," for no LIST was then published of books which were "prohibited," and nothing was said about books to be corrected.

Forty-four years afterwards the first list was published, according to Van Espen (Jus Ecclesiasticum, vol. i., p. 234. Ed. Louvain and Brussels, 1700) in the year 1559, drawn up by the Inquisition at Rome, and sanctioned by the authority of Pope Paul IV. It consisted of three classes—

I. Of those writers, all whose works, upon whatever subject, although not connected with religion, are wholly forbidden; among whom (says Van Espen) the names of some Catholic writers are found.

II. Single works condemned, of writers whose other works are not forbidden.

III. Certain anonymous writings, with all writings published anonymously before the year 1519, to which are added a catalogue of sixty printers, all books published by whom, whatever the author or whatever the language, are forbidden.

It might be Chrysostom, or it might be St. Augustine; but it then became sin to read their writings, if printed by some poor printer that the Pope wished to ruin!

What is important here to be observed, concerning that decree, is this—that, by this decree, not only every bishop was hereby made an officer of the Church of Rome, to determine what books might be suppressed and what prohibited in their diocese, but every chief officer of that dread tribunal, THE INQUISITION, which so long deluged Europe with Christian blood, in every state or diocese in which that office was established. This authority, thus given to them, will be important when we come to consider the proceedings of the Inquisition in this respect.

The next step was taken at the Council of Trent. A committee was appointed (session 18) to consider how the system could be made most effectual. This committee was to report to the council; but as the council came to an end before it had considered the proceedings of the committee, a decree was passed at its last session (25th)—"that whatever was passed by them should be submitted to the Most Holy Roman Pontiff, that it should be concluded and published by his judgment and authority."

In consequence, the TEN RULES OF THE INDEX, to-

gether with a corrected list of prohibited books, was submitted to the Pope, and authorized by him. These rules are printed at the end of the Council of Trent, and have since been followed as the laws of the INDEX.

Rule IV. says, that the reading of the Bible by all persons in general does more harm than good; and forbids any one to read the Bible, even in a Catholic translation, without a licence, in writing, from the bishop or inquisitor. Those who read the Bible without this licence are declared incapable of receiving absolution for sin until they give up their Bibles. Monks are forbidden to read or to purchase a Bible without a licence from the prelate of the order.

We may observe, by the way, that the title of these rules is, "Regule Decem de Libris Prohibitis"—that is, "Ten Rules about Prohibited Books;" and one of these ten, as we have seen, is about the Bible itself.

Rules V., VI., and VIII., provide for correcting and amending books before they are printed; and rule V. provides even for correcting the table of contents and index of a book. We will show afterwards how this power has been used.

Rule VII. forbids all books "which treat of filthy and obscene subjects . . . except ancient books, written by heathens, which are permitted for the sake of the elegance and fitness of the language!"

Rule X. confirms the law passed at the Lateran Council, which we have given above, both as to the persons who were to examine and approve, and as to the penalties. It gives power to bishops and inquisitors-general to condemn and prohibit even the books permitted by these rules themselves! And the names of all books expurgated or amended are to be sent to the notary of the Sacred Universal Inquisition at Rome, and the approbation of the authorized person is to be printed in the beginning of every book.

The Bull of Pope Pius IV., confirming the INDEX then made, with these TEN RULES prefixed to it, may be seen at the end of the proceedings of the Council of Trent. It is dated March 24, 1564.

Another great tribunal was created for the same purpose, of forbidding, correcting, and approving of books, by a Bull of Sixtus V., in the year 1588. This is called, "The Congregation of the Index." This tribunal consists of a certain number of the cardinals, chosen by the Pope. It has a secretary, and a number of officers called "Consultors," chosen from the religious orders. The duty of these officers is to examine the books given to them, and to report on them. But the decision rests with the cardinals only. This tribunal has not superseded the others; bishops, inquisitors, &c., all have the same powers that they had before in their several districts; but this tribunal has power over all the world.—Van Espen, vol. i., p. 238, &c.

This tribunal is in full operation. Its decrees may be seen, from time to time, in the *Tablet*, and other newspapers. We copy the following from the *Tablet*, published on the 20th of August:—

"DECREE.

"Thursday, 21st day of July, 1853.

"The Sacred Congregation of the Most Eminent and Reverend Lords Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, by OUR MOST HOLY LORD, POPE PIUS IX., and the Holy Apostolic See, set over and delegated to the Index of Books of unsound doctrine, and to the proscription, expurgation, and permission of the same in the Universal Christian Republic, held in the Apostolic Quirinal Palace, hath condemned and doth condemn, hath proscribed and doth proscribe, or having elsewhere condemned and proscribed, hath commanded and doth command to be placed on the index of prohibited books, the following works—

[Here follow the names of four books lately published.]

"Therefore, let no one, of what degree or condition soever, presume in future either to publish, or being published, to vend or retain, in any place, or in any language whatever, the aforesaid condemned and proscribed works; but let them be bound to deliver them to the ordinaries of the places, or to the inquisitors of heretical pravity,* under the penalties enacted in the Index of Prohibited Books.†

"Which being reported to OUR MOST HOLY LORD POPE PIUS IX., by me, the undersigned secretary of the Sacred Congregation, his HOLINESS approved of the decree, and commanded it to be promulgated. In testimony whereof, &c., &c.,

"JEROME CARD. DE ANDREA,

"Prefect, Loco Sigilli.

"F. A. V. MODENA,

"Or. Pr. S. Sad. Congr. a Ser."

Now look at the whole of this vast system.

The Pope's Vicar-general, and the master of his palace have power to prohibit, amend, and sanction, all books printed in the Roman States.

Every bishop has authority to prohibit, amend, and sanction all books printed in his diocese.

Every inquisitor has the same authority in his province or district.

Their lists are to be returned to the Inquisition at Rome. The CONGREGATION OF THE INDEX has a general power of doing the same "in the Universal Christian Republic."

We are not now inquiring whether it be right that any Church should assume to itself powers so vast, or whether it be possible that such powers can actually be exercised for the real good of religion and knowledge. We are only showing that this vast system is really in existence, and in actual operation in the Church of Rome, for more than 300 years past; in order that all may consider whether the doctrines which, in those 300 years, have never been condemned nor corrected, but always sanctioned and approved by her tribunals, are not fairly and justly to be charged upon the Church of Rome; and whether she be not really hostile to those doctrines which have been expurgated and erased out of books, as the condition of obtaining her sanction and approval and her permission that those books should be published and read.

We propose, in our next number, to show what those tribunals of the Church of Rome have done; what doctrines they have sanctioned, and what they have condemned; and we expect that our readers will look with interest for what is to follow.

IS THE PROTESTANT BIBLE A CORRUPT AND MUTILATED TRANSLATION OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES?

NO. VI.

WE conclude our comparison of the Douay and Protestant Bibles, with the most important difference between them. There are seven books—Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, and first and second books of Maccabees—about which the two Bibles are at issue. The Council of Trent (decree, sec. 4) pronounces these books "of equal authority with the other books of Scripture," for proving doctrines and reforming morals; and pronounces anathema, or a curse, against all who do not receive them as canonical Scripture. The Church of England and Ireland declares that these books are not canonical, nor to be used for establishing any doctrine.

The question comes to this—were these books written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, as the unquestionable books of Scripture were?

If these books were written by inspiration, then the Church of England and Ireland has mutilated the Bible by leaving out those books. If those books were not written by inspiration, then the Church of Rome has corrupted the Bible by putting in those books. We repeat that the question is, "did the authors of those books write them by Divine inspiration?" It must be clear that if the books were not written by inspiration at first, they could never come to be inspired afterwards; either these books were the Word of God from the first, or they are the word of man now. This, truly, is a question well worthy of being examined.

And how are we to examine it? By what evidence are we to decide?

We observe that all the books in dispute are books professing to belong to the Old Testament. Those books profess to have been written, and it is admitted that they were written before the birth of our Saviour.* If those books were then inspired, they were part of the Jewish Scriptures, and the Jews were bound to receive them as such: here, then, we have to inquire "did the Jews acknowledge these books as part of their Scripture? and if they did not, did our Saviour or his apostles reprove or correct the Jews for not receiving those books as Scripture?" This is a question that should certainly be inquired into. If the Jews did receive those books as Scripture, and if our Lord never reproveth them for so doing, then we may be sure that those books were really Scripture, and that we ought to count them Scripture now. If, on the contrary, we find it to be certain that the Jews in our Saviour's time did not count these books as Scripture, and that our Saviour never reproveth or corrected them for rejecting those books, then we may be equally sure that our Lord did not think that those books were Scripture. And, besides this, we may fairly inquire, "were those books looked on as inspired Scripture in the churches which the apostles founded;" we may be sure that the apostles took care that the churches should be furnished with correct copies of the Old Testament, and that the copies read in the Church in the earliest times were the right copies; and we should, therefore, inquire whether those seven books were acknowledged in the early Church as canonical Scripture.

Our readers will like to know how the facts really stood: and it may be satisfactory to them that we should give them the answer out of Roman Catholic writers of the greatest learning and character. We quote first from Du Pin, a learned doctor of the great Roman Catholic University of the Sorbonne, in Paris. His "History of Ecclesiastical Writers," which was examined and approved by that university, contains a dissertation on these books.—Vol. I., Preliminary Dissertation, sec. 2.

First, he quotes Josephus, a very learned Jewish historian, who lived about our Saviour's time, and who wrote a full history of the Jews, and he gives Josephus's account as follows:— "We only receive and approve of

* This is admitted of all these books except, perhaps, Wisdom. Some think this book was written by Philo the Jew, who lived about the time of our Saviour.

* This law did not pass without opposition. It was opposed in the Council by Alexius, Bishop of Melitaneus, who said he was willing to consent as to books published afterwards, but not as to ancient books. Labbe et Coss., vol. xiv., p. 258. When we come to see how some of the Fathers have been dealt with, we may think that Alexius was a far-seeing man.

* We recommend this to the consideration of those who suppose that THE INQUISITION is not now in existence or operation.

† It is said by Van Espen, vol. i., p. 236, xix., that these words refer to the ten rules above mentioned.