

Another foremost Protestant writer, the Rev. Dr. Blunt, amply bears out the testimony of Dr. Maitland. In his 'Reformation of the Church of England,' chap. x., vol. I., pp. 501-502, Dr. Blunt says:—

'There has been much wild and foolish writing about the scarcity of the Bible in the ages preceding the Reformation. It has been taken for granted that the Holy Scripture was almost a sealed book to clergy and laity until it was printed in English by Tyndale and Coverdale, and that the only real source of knowledge respecting it before them was the translation made by Wickliffe. The facts are that the clergy and monks were daily reading large portions of the Bible and had them stored up in their memory by constant recitation; that they made very free use of Holy Scripture in preaching, so that even a modern Bible-reader is astonished at the number of quotations and references contained in their sermons; that countless copies of the Bible were written out by the surprising industry of cloistered scribes, that many glosses or commentaries were written which are still seen to be full of pure and wise thoughts; and that all laymen who could read were, as a rule, provided with their Gospels, their Psalter, or other devotional portions of the Bible. Men did, in fact, take a vast amount of personal trouble with respect to the production of copies of the Holy Scriptures, and accomplished by head, hands, and heart, what is now chiefly done by paid workmen and machinery. The clergy studied the Word of God and made it known to the laity, and those few among the laity who could read had abundant opportunity of reading the Bible, either in Latin or in English, up to the Reformation period.'

Another Protestant writer says: 'Certain it is that during the middle ages the minds of the most popular preachers and teachers (and, we might add, of the laity too) were saturated with the Sacred Scriptures. With the Reformation came the disintegrating principle of private judgment, which split up Protestantism into hundreds of warring sects. In his last speech in Parliament Henry VIII. summed up the results of the religious revolution at the time by saying that 'charity was never in a more languishing condition, virtue never at a lower ebb, nor God Himself never less honored and worse served in Christendom' (Collier's 'Ecclesiastical History,' vol. v., p. 208, London ed., 1852). So much for England. Matters were even worse in Ger. any, the cradle of the Reformation. Luther lived long enough to bitterly deplore the hopeless religious dissensions that the greivous abuse of the Sacred Book by his followers and produced, and to sum up its results in the following melancholy words: 'Our evangelicals are now sevenfold more wicked than they were before. In proportion as we hear the Gospel, we lie, cheat, gorge, and commit every crime. If the devil has been driven out of us, seven worse have taken their place, to judge from the conduct of princes, lords, nobles, burgesses, and peasants: their utterly shameless acts, and their disregard of God and His menaces.' Calvin, Beza, Melancthon, and other Reformers were equally emphatic in deploring the state of things that was brought about in the German Fatherland and elsewhere by the change from the proper and respectful use of the Bible that had prevailed in the Catholic days to the new principles that came in with the great religious revolution of the sixteenth century. These new fangled principles or using the Bible began their unhappy work by creating religious disunion; they continued it by increasing and perpetuating them till they have become a laughing-stock to the heathen and a scandal to the Christian name; they have ended by leaving the Protestant denominations without any fixed belief in the Sacred Scriptures as the inspired Word of God, and with a rapid drift towards the rationalism that has made Germany—which was the cradle of the Reformation—the grave of the Reformed faith.

MAKE NO MISTAKE—You may fancy a cough is a trivial affair, but unless you take precautions you will find it rapidly develop into something very serious. Take warning, therefore, and at the first symptom of trouble try **TUSSICURA**, which everyone who has once taken it acknowledges to be the only certain remedy for complaints of the Throat and Lungs. There will be no difficulty in obtaining it, as all Chemists and Storekeepers keep **TUSSICURA**, and you should insist on having that and nothing else.—***

HOW A POPE IS ELECTED

THE CONCLAVE AND ITS STORY

The death of the Grand Old Man of the Vatican has set speculation wagging its tongue volubly in the columns of the secular press. Journalistic futurists here and in other lands are busily engaged in naming his successor—endeavoring to

'Make fools believe in their foreseeing
Of things before they are in being.'

But this is an old habit of the press. It recalls the confident, though oft-shifting, prophecies which were oracularly uttered by the London 'Times' when Pius IX. had passed to the majority. The 'Thunderer's' speculations were numerous and varied. Sometimes they were even entertaining. But they resolved themselves at least into this final, definite, and confident prediction: 'We can only be sure of one thing, and that is, that Cardinal Pecci will not be elected.' But Cardinal Pecci was elected, and speedily elected, and his reign will probably be ranked as one of the most memorable in the long history of the Papacy. And the moral of all this vain prophesying serves only to give a fresh confirmation to the truth of the saying that has been for generations current in the Eternal City: 'He that enters the Conclave a Pope, comes out a Cardinal.' The popular voice and the vaticinations of the newspaper prophets turn out, in most cases, to be alike at fault.

Various descriptions of the mode of electing a Sovereign Pontiff have of late appeared in the columns of the secular papers. So far as they go they are in the main fairly correct. Unfortunately, they are taken, for the most part, at first or second or third hand from the hostile pages of Ronghetti, the Rev. Arthur Robert Pennington, and other non-Catholic writers, and they are all, though in various degrees, marked with more or less

Ludicrous Blunders

about Catholic doctrine and the technical terms of the Conclave, and contain the usual reckless statements as to 'candidates' and 'aspirants' for the papal office, and the customary stories of log-rolling and intrigue. The object of the present article is to give the readers of the 'New Zealand Tablet' a brief general statement of the chief phases through which election to the Papal See has passed, and then to detail the various preparations for, and proceedings of, the conclave that begins on Friday evening of this week and continues its deliberations until it has appointed a successor to the late illustrious Pontiff. The facts here stated are taken from various authoritative sources, but mainly from the great work of the Chevalier Gaetano Moroni, the 'Dizionario di Erudizione Storico-ecclesiastica,' which was published in 109 volumes under the supervision of Pope Gregory XVI. in 1813. This noted work still remains the highest authority on all matters connected with elections to the See of St. Peter.

I

The office of Pope, like that of other bishops, and of priests and deacons, is of divine institution. But the

Mode of Appointment

to the papal chair was not determined by the Founder of the Church. This is one of the many matters that were left to the Church to arrange from time according as its enlightened wisdom and the varying circumstances of the passing ages might suggest. The Church, her ministry, her Sacraments, etc., are divinely appointed, but her government is necessarily carried out by human instruments and human methods. The laws determining the succession to the See of St. Peter are among the elements that are of human institution in the Church. Like all other vital functions of the Church, they have passed through a very interesting organic evolution—not revolution, for 'growth, not explosion, is the law of life.'

At the dawn of the Christian Church, St. Peter, the first Pope, occupied the See of Rome. His three first successors were Linus, Cletus, and Clement. They were probably his coadjutors in the work of his sacred office in those troubled early days of the Church, and the order of their succession is supposed to have been appointed by him. From St. Peter's day onward, for over nine centuries—to the days of Pope Gregory the Great, the reviser and reformer of ecclesiastical discipline—the Popes were elected by the joint action of the clergy and laity of the Eternal City. When, in A.D. 313, the Emperor Constantine gave peace to the Church after a long era marked with frequent and furious periods of persecution, primitive methods of election to the papal chair were still pursued. The clergy and laity took part in the choice. As time went on there came the occasional addition of a council, sometimes interference from political parties or factions, and frequent attempts by em-