

No. 5. How licence to sin with impunity is granted for money.

" 67. How more money than penitence is exacted from sinners.

" 91. How bishops extort money from the concubinage of priests.

They re-stated these grievances more at length, classifying them in chapters, and alleged that the vendors of Bulls of Indulgence "declare that by means of these purchasable pardons, not only are past and future sins of the living forgiven, but also those of such as have departed this life and are in the purgatory of fire, provided only something be contributed down. . . . Everyone, in proportion to the price he had expended in these wares, promised himself impunity in sinning. Hence came fornications, incests, adulteries, perjuries, homicides, thefts, rapine, usury, and a whole hydra of evils. For what wickedness will mortals shudder at any longer, when they have once persuaded themselves that licence and impunity for sinning can be had for money, however extravagant the sum, not only in this life but after death also, by means of these marketings of Indulgences?" Then, speaking of "Reserved Cases," the princes add:

[That is, sins which ordinary confessors are not allowed to absolve, but which are kept for the bishop, or, in some instances, for the Pope.

"But if any one have the means of paying, not only are present breaches of these constitutions allowed, but by the indulgence he has permission to transgress them with impunity for the future. Whence it happens that they who have got such a dispensation lay hold of it as a handle for committing perjury, murder, adultery, and similar atrocities, since any common priest can give them purchasable absolution by virtue of the indulgence." And the Pope, instead of indignantly denying the truth of these horrible charges, implicitly admitted the facts to be as stated. Indeed, he could not deny it, for the book entitled, "Taxes of the Sacred Apostolic Penitentiary," was then, and is still, extant, with a regular tariff for the absolution of all kinds of sins, including simony, murder by a priest, parricide, incest, arson, &c. There is even,

[NOTE.—Some items read very curiously. Thus, the price of absolution for the murder of a father, mother, brother, sister, or wife, if the murderer be a laic, is 1 ducat and 4 carlini. But if more than one of these victims have been murdered, and a single absolution be taken out for all, then only half rates are charged after the first name on the list, for which the full price must be paid. A clerical murderer, in like circumstances, is required to make a journey to Rome.

in some copies of the Taxes, a special note, stating that graces and dispensations are not to be given to poor persons. The whole question is fully treated in the reprint, by Professor Gibbings, of the Roman and Parisian editions (1510 and 1520) of the "Taxes of the Apostolic Penitentiary" (Dublin, McGee, 1872). This kind of thing had been steadily growing up for some centuries, till it reached its highest pitch under Pope Alexander VI., and then the outcry began which ended in the comparative reformation of the abuse in 1563. Nevertheless, even as reformed, the practice and doctrine are altogether diverse from those of the ancient Church, and the assertion made by Dr. Milner, Cardinal Wiseman, and others, that nothing more is intended by indulgences than the relaxation of outward guilt, or of such penances as are enjoined by canonical discipline, is untenable. In fact, when they say so, they are actually reproducing in substance two of the propositions of Luther on Indulgences, condemned, as "pestiferous, pernicious, and scandalous," by Leo X., in the Bull "Exurge" of June 25, 1520, namely, that "Indulgences do not avail, for those who truly acquire them, to the remission of punishment due to Divine justice for actual sins," and that "graces of this sort have relation only to the penalties of sacramental satisfaction, of man's appointment."

THE ROMAN DOCTRINE OF INDULGENCES.

XIII. The actual Roman doctrine is this. There are two penalties annexed to all sin, *Culpa*, or eternal punishment; *Pena*, or temporal punishment, including that of purgatory; and even after *Culpa* has been remitted by absolution of the

penitent, *Pena* still remains uncanceled. However, as one drop of Christ's blood was sufficient for the redemption of the whole world, all the rest that He shed, together with the merits and prayers of all the saints, over and above what were needed for their own salvation, technically called "works of supererogation," constitutes an inexhaustible treasury or bank on which the Pope has a right to draw, and apply the drafts in payment for the release of souls in purgatory, so that anyone who obtains an Indulgence can apply its merits to himself, or transfer it to some other, living or dead. When an Indulgence of a hundred days, or of seven years, is spoken of, it means that so much guilt is bought off as would be expiated by undergoing a penance extending over the whole of that time; while a *plenary* Indulgence means the entire remission of all purgatorial chastisements. Two plain facts will show the entire unlikeness of this theory to the ancient discipline of the Church. First, the enormous majority of Indulgences are now acquired by persons who are not under canonical penance at all, but are in full communion; nay, regarded as specially devout and obedient. Next, whereas a hundred years is the extreme limit of human life, yet in the "Hours of B. V. M., according to the Use of the Church of Sarum" (Paris, 1526), indulgences are promised for 500, 11,000, 32,755, and 56,000 years. Modern indulgences are more cautiously granted, and the highest number specified in the "Raccolta" is seven years and seven quarantines, i.e. 280 days; though there are longer periods to be had, as will be shown presently; and thus the popular notion often is that the meaning is that so many years of purgatory itself are remitted by the Indulgence.

NOVELTY OF THIS DOCTRINE.

XIII. The first thing to remark upon as to its doctrine is its novelty. The system cannot be traced back earlier than the quarrel of Gregory VII. with the Emperor Henry IV., when remission of sins was offered in 1084 to such as would take up arms against the Emperor. Then it was used for the Crusades, and it was extended by Innocent III. to all who took up arms against the Albigenses and other heretics. Since then it has been applied indiscriminately. The Eastern Church has never had anything even remotely like it. Next, the whole doctrinal basis on which it rests was denied as late as 1141 by Peter Lombard, Bishop of Paris, in that famous work, for centuries a text-book in the theological schools of Western Christendom, which earned him his title of "Master of the Sentences." He lays down there explicitly that God only can remit either the *Culpa* or the *Pena* of sin ("Sentt." iv. 18); while man can dispense only with the penalties man has instituted.

A PLEA FOR UNITED RESPONDING.

THERE is nothing more common in the present day than to hear people making complaints of the dullness of our English Church worship. These complaints are made not only by those who are "not of us" as by Romanists, Dissenters, and others,—but even by our own people,—even by those who wish to be devout and holy, but who nevertheless, strive against it as they may, cannot help confessing to a certain weariness which will creep over them long before service is ended. They seem not to delight in the public worship of their God with that true joy of heart which should be, they are well aware, one of the chief characteristics of a Christian's worship, but attend upon it rather as a *positive duty* which it would be sinful to omit; but which, if they did not feel it a *duty*, they would not, from any delight they take in the thing itself, frequent.

Now the object of these remarks is to discover, if possible, whether any reasonable ground exists for these complaints; and if so, to suggest the means for its mitigation or removal.

No doubt part of the evil lies in the unchastened heart and affections of the worshipper; and consequently, part of the remedy lies in himself, in the better preparation of his own heart; and it may as well be observed once for all—That were we admitted to the choirs of the blessed angels themselves we must have chastened hearts and affection, or we

should not enjoy the service or appreciate the privilege.

A portion, however, of the evil complained of may lie elsewhere; that is, either in the service itself, which may be in its own nature unedifying and dull, or in our mode of celebrating it, which may be faulty and wearisome. Is there any thing in these or either of them calculated to chill rather than to foster the affections, to check rather than to promote the flow of religious emotions? Is there any thing needlessly uninviting to those (unhappily too many) who are yet to be won over to take delight in the things of the Spirit? It is not the service itself which is to blame; even enemies allow that our form of worship is most edifying and beautiful, entirely calculated for its purpose. The fault then, if any, must be in our mode of celebrating it.

Now, in order that we may determine whether this is so or not, the question first has to be settled, How ought the service to be celebrated? Is there any rule or principle laid down to which we can refer? At present no rule seems to be practically recognized. The minister, in reading, pursues his own way, the clerk his, the children theirs, the rest of the congregation theirs. The responses in most Churches, so far from affording an agreeable sound, are, without exaggeration, a jumble of discords. Is there then *no rule* on the subject by which a Christian congregation ought to be guided? There is indeed such a rule, and it is because we have, except to a very limited extent, lost sight of this, that fault must be found with our ordinary mode of celebrating the public worship of God. Hence it is that people complain of God's worship being heavy, and tedious, and dull. They are unconscious of the cause perhaps, and would be the very first, possibly, to quarrel with the remedy about to be proposed; but however this may be, the secret why our service appears dull and uninviting to so many is because the service is so generally performed in defiance of those principles which nature and reason jointly inculcate, and which have been recognized in the most express terms by public authority. For where any thing is done in such a way as to contravene principles founded in nature and reason, it is not in man to take delight in it; to his nature order, and beauty, and harmony recommend themselves; whilst on the other hand deformity, confusion, and discord are an abomination to him. Now as in the public worship of God the sound of the voice is an essential element, what must be the effect if no regard is had to the laws which regulate sound? If a number of persons attempt to speak together without regard to these, discord and confusion must ensue: the effect of which cannot but be wearisome. The public worship of God therefore ought to be conducted so that the laws which regulate sound be not contravened. On this natural and reasonable proposition is founded the express injunction of Queen Elizabeth as to the way in which the service should be performed, viz., "We will that there be a modest and distinct song so used in all parts of the common prayers of the Church, that the same may be as plainly understood as if it were read without singing." This is what is meant in the directions of the Prayer Book by the word "say," for it is quite evident from the injunction, that the service was never intended to be "read," as one would read a sermon or a book; but to be "said" in such a manner as to admit of many persons joining together without discord or confusion. It is for this cause that Evening Prayer in the calendar is called "Evensong."

It might be objected here that this injunction and these observations are all very well as regards cathedrals, but that they cannot be meant for ordinary congregations in parish churches. But this is not so; the injunction is based on a broad and general principle, and relates to all kinds of public worship. Not that the modest parish church will vie with the cathedral in the decorations of its song any more than of its architecture. Yet as one principle may well be observed in the architecture of both places, so, unless we love dullness and weariness, must one principle be observed in the worship of both; the only difference being in the extent to which the principle admits of being carried out.

But is it not very strange and difficult to perform the service thus? Strange it may be, but surely not difficult. On the other hand, if a number of persons were already speaking in the same voice it would be difficult not to join in with them. That there are, however, difficulties to be overcome, cannot be disputed, but these are occasioned by timidity and prejudice, not by the thing itself. What we plead for is *Natural*, and what we should do spontaneously, were we really left to ourselves, and nothing can be more certain than that whatever is thus "natural," cannot be really difficult, and would very soon cease to appear strange.

But in order that the divine service be conducted thus, as it should be, in compliance with the laws of reason and nature and Queen Elizabeth's injunction, what must be done? What steps must be taken? First, the minister and the congregation must understand one another, and realize the fact, that for the