

State, their rules and constitutions, instead of being persecuted and ostracised, they would be protected by the Republic; they could not admit the supremacy of the State in purely spiritual and religious matters. Hence they are considered as enemies of the State and treated accordingly. History repeats itself. The German emperors went so far in their pretensions as to wish to invest bishops and abbots with their rings and crozier. For this Henry IV. of Germany was opposed by Gregory VII., who declared deposed all bishops and abbots who would receive their appointment from a layman. The Popes were willing to concede the giving of the insignia by the emperor, provided the appointment be made previously by them. But even this concession was abused. When the affairs with Germany had been settled by the agreement between Calixtus II. and Henry V., troubles commenced in another place. Philip the Fair of France, being rebuked for his tyranny and immorality by Pope Boniface VIII., grew indignant. He was at war with the kings of England and Arragon. In vain did the Pontiff try to mediate between them. Philip sent his emissaries to Anagni, when the Pope was residing. They so ill-treated him that he died of the wounds he had received. Benedict XI., his successor, was, it is thought, poisoned. The next Pope, Clement V., being a Frenchman, went to live at Avignon. He and his successors remained there for seventy years. During the stay of the Popes at Avignon, the Imperialists and the Guelphs were fighting. Rienzi, like, later on in Ireland, Daniel O'Connell, bravely defended the independence of Italy, but, unfortunately, elated by his success, misused his authority. Pope John XXII. refused to recognise Louis of Bavaria, who had been elected emperor by a faction and was supported by the Ghibellines. The proud monarch went into Italy and entered Rome. The Romans were asking for the return of the Pope. Gregory XI. yielded to their wishes. When he died, in 1378, the Italians declared that they wanted to have an Italian Pope, fearing, no doubt, that if a stranger were appointed he might again abandon them. The Cardinals, frightened, nominated Urban VI. who was Archbishop of Bary. Five months after, they declared that his election was null for want of freedom, and they appointed Clement VII. as legitimate Pope. The new Pope returned to Avignon. Thus for about half a century there were, as it were, two Popes, one sitting in Rome, and the other at Avignon. At Avignon and at Rome a successor was appointed to replace the Pontiff who had died. The Council of Pisa, 1409, increased the difficulty by nominating a third Pope, Alexander V. The Council of Constance put an end to the schism by prevailing on the three Popes to give their resignation and nominating Martin V., who was acknowledged by the Universal Church. Let us now calmly examine these facts. The Great Schism is the result of the double election of 1378, so that, until the Council of Pisa, there were apparently two Popes, that is, until 1409. From the Council of Pisa until the election of Martin V. at the Council of Constance, that is, until 1417, there were apparently three Popes. The election of Urban VI. was at first made under pressure, the people clamouring, "*Romano lo volemo o Italiano*"—"We want a Roman or an Italian for Pope." But afterwards the Cardinals, three only being absent, ratified the election, and all the Cardinals signed the act of election and acknowledged Urban VI. as legitimate Pope. The subsequent election of Clement VII. was, therefore, invalid. However, having been elected by twenty-two or twenty-three Cardinals, he had a coloured title, as well as his successor, Benedict XIII. Both in Italy and France the supporters of the Pope were in good faith, and the anti-Popes themselves may have thought they were legitimately appointed. On that account their error was only material, and all the sacraments they administered were really valid, the Church, on account of the coloured title, supplying the deficiency of jurisdiction. The conduct of the German, French and other princes with regard to either of the contending parties has nothing to do with the case. In their adhesion to one or the other they were generally influenced by political motives, not by the canonicity or non canonicity of the election. At the Council of Constance the question was finally settled by the election of Martin V. At this Council, recognised as canonical, there were present 200 cardinals, patriarchs, archbishops and bishops, 100 abbots, 300 doctors. It was opened by John XXIII. Gregory XI. and Boniface XIII. were represented by their nuncios. There were also several princes and ambassadors. The laity were not admitted to the deliberations on point of faith or morals, but only to those on external administration or discipline, in order to put an end to the schism. For the sake of peace, to promote unity and other more weighty reasons the Fathers of the Council were empowered to insist on the resignation or deposition of all the pretenders to the Papacy. Gregory XI. and Benedict XIII. sent in their resignations, John XXIII. was deposed. He accepted the sentence of deposition, apologised for the faults he had made, and was appointed by Martin V. Dean of the Sacred College, 1419. John XXIII. had we admit, committed grievous faults, but he repented and nobly repaired the past. This is a faithful history of the Great Schism of the West. What is there in it that can be brought reasonably against the Infallibility of the Church or of the Pope? The resignation of the three Pontiffs at the Council of Constance is an admirable act of humility and shows how these Pontiffs, although they

may have been mistaken as to the validity of their election, yet one and all loved the Church and were willing to sacrifice their rights, real or apparent, sooner than to see the Church distorted by schism and Christian nations divided in their allegiance to the legitimate successor of St. Peter. Instead of militating against Church Infallibility I think that this last scene in that painful historical drama is a most glorious manifestation of Church Infallibility. In a well-constituted monarchy, there can be but one legitimate sovereign, but there can be many pretenders to the throne. The claims of the pretenders do not affect the legitimacy of the real king. It may happen that the pretenders may imagine they have a real title to the throne, and they may have influential partisans who may think the same. These may denounce the lawful king as a usurper, oppose him and denounce him as they themselves are denounced and opposed by the lawful monarch. There is, perhaps, no nation in the world where such things have not happened. Do people on that account contest the hereditary rights of the lawful monarchs? Do they make it an argument against royalty? Why then should the Great Schism of the West be continually paraded against the unbroken succession of the Roman Pontiffs or their Infallibility, with which it has nothing to do? Clement V., the first Pope who retired to Avignon, was certainly a legitimate Pope. He transmitted his privileges to his successors, John XXII., Benedict XII., Clement VI., Innocent VI. and Urban V., who transferred his residence to Rome. Gregory XI. also returned to Rome. Until then there is no break in the succession. It is, indeed, a pity that, on account of the war between the Ghibellines and the Guelphs, the stay of the Popes in Rome was rendered morally impossible, but this momentary exile in no way affects their rights and privileges of the Papacy or the unity of Christendom. Urban VI. and his successors until Alexander V. continued the line of legitimate Popes, and the election of Martin V. at the Council of Constance put an end to the lamentable schism. The Councils of Pisa and Constance had a perfect right to insist on the resignation or deposition of the pretenders to the Papacy, just as any country might force pretenders to the crown to give up their claim when it is shown to be unfounded or their abdication may be necessary to re-establish peace and harmony. In order to fully understand the many rival claims to the Papacy it is necessary to attentively and impartially study the state of Italy and Europe at that time and the unjust interference of princes with the affairs of the Church, which was the principal cause of all these difficulties. In this the Church is to be pitied, not to be blamed.

OBJECTION VIII.—The Council of Basil or Basle.

"Nicholas, as specimen of unity at the fountain-head, decreed the Council of Basil an assembly of men filled with the Holy Ghost; Eugenius an assembly of madmen, barbarians, wild beasts, heretics, miscreants, monsters, "a pandemonium." And yet our friend tries to make a great point against Protestantism out of the unity of the Roman Church."

REPLY.

The Council of Basil was convened by Martin V. and was about to assemble when he died. When the Council assembled, under Eugenius IV., on the day appointed, March 3, 1431, on account of the wars between the dukes of Burgundy and Austria, and the intention Eugenius had expressed to transfer the Council to Bologna, there was only one abbot. Cardinal Cesarini had been sent by the Pope to preside at the Council if there was a sufficient number of prelates. At the first session there were only three bishops and seven abbots. They declared that they represented the Universal Church. Eugenius ordered the dissolution of the Council and convened a Council to be held at Bologna within 18 months. The city of Bologna was more suitable, it being more easy of access to the Greeks who were anxious to be present at it. The members of the Council of Basil refused to obey the Pope. Cesarini, the Pope's legate, resigned the presidency. Many temporal princes, and among others Charles VII. and the Emperor Sigismund supported the rebellious members of the Council of Basil. The Pope replied that except there were at least 75 prelates he could not recognise the Council as a representative one. However, on the representations of the Emperor Sigismund he formally permitted it to be continued. One hundred prelates assembled. Being displeased with the proceedings of the Council and wishing to please the Greeks who wanted a Council to be reunited with the Latin Church the Pope transferred the Council to Ferrari. The majority of the prelates submitted; a small faction resisted. This happened on July 31, 1437. From that time the Council of Basle ceased to be representative; its members were rebels against legitimate authority. Supported by temporal princes they made decrees against the supremacy of the Pope which, it is manifest, were only the expression of their angry feelings and proud dispositions. The sessions XVI to XXV, which were presided over by the Pope's legate, were valid, after the Pope had proclaimed the dissolution of the Council and the majority of the prelates had withdrawn, it was indeed a disgraceful and scandalous assembly and a kind of pandemonium. I doubt very much if Pope Eugenius ever used the expressions put in his mouth by the Rev. J. Dickson. This gentleman seldom gives an authority or a reference for what he asserts, so that, not knowing from whom he took his would be information, it is difficult, nay, sometimes

SMOKE "ROYAL COLORS" TOBACCO.

(IMPROVED AROMATIC)