EASTON GAZETTE.

WHERE THE PRESS IS FREE—"Literature well or ill-conducted, *is* the Great Engine by which all Popular States must ultimately be supported or overthrown—RELIGION purifies the Heart and teaches us our Duty—Morality refines the Manners—Agriculture makes us Rich, and Politics provides for the enjoyment of all.

VOL. XXI. EASTON, (MD.) SATURDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 27, 1838. No. 34.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY *Saturday Morning*, BY

Alexander Graham.

TERMS.

TWO DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS per annum, payable half yearly in advance

ADVERTISEMENTS

Not exceeding a square inserted three times for ONE DOLLAR; and TWENTY-FIVE CENTS for every subsequent insertion.

For the Easton Gazette.

[JUSTIN CONTINUED.]

The advocate of this dogma, however, may ask, and perhaps he may imagine, triumphantly, Do not other fathers of the Primitive Church, better and more renowned writers than Ruffinus make up for all his deficiencies, and supply also the omissions of the ancient creeds? Almost a single glance at those parts of their writings, which are supposed to favour the doctrine of purgatory wil convince us that they do not. The parts of their writings to which I now allude, are those in which they speak of prayers for the dead. On these alone the Romanist relies—and must ever rely, for he has no other source of evidence—to prove that the purgatorial dogma existed in the ancient Church. Now, the manner in which these prayers, and the information furnished by ecclesiastical writers respecting them, are made to bear on the point before us, is not a little curious. It amounts to the following brief process of reasoning: The early Christians prayed for the dead; and they would not have done so, if they had believed them to be in hell: because, in that case their prayers would have been useless: much less would they have done so, if they had believed them to be in heaven; for, in that case, their prayers would have been unnecessary and absurd: They must, therefore, have believed in a third place, a purgatory, the inmates of which they, supposed, might be benefitted by their intercessions.* That the conclusion here is illogical and wholly unwarranted by the premises, must be obvious to every reader. We ought to have been told what was the nature of the prayers for the dead used by early Christians—what blessings they supplica'ed—whether there was any thing in them,† or whether there is anything in the information on record concerning them,‡ which should induce us to think they were designed to improve, in any respect, the condition and circumstances of the dead—whether, in fine, any thing resembling, in the smallest degree, the Roman doctrine of purgatory, could be gathered from them. It is shrewdly suspected that the Church of Rome, notwithstanding her *inspiration* and *infallibility*, has committed rather an awkward blunder in relation to the prayers we are speaking of, as well as in relation to the whole matter of purgatory. The Godly and pious thanksgivings of early Christian's for the holy lives and happy deaths of their martyrs and confessors, she by *some unaccountable misapprehension*, has supposed to be supplications for the deliverance of their souls from punishment, and has, in consequence established the very *lucrative* practice of praying the dead out of purgatory. One strong, and almost irresistible proof of this mistake is, that, in the Primitive Church the prayers in question were offered up for the good—those whom they would have thought it impious to imagine in a condition of suffering for sin. But even allowing that the early Christians by their intercessions for the dead, aimed at effecting a change in their condition, or place of abode, is there any reason for believing that purgatory, as held by the Roman Church, was the place from which they wished to deliver them? We have no mention of expiatory suffering in another world before the beginning of the fifth century|| and the manner in which it is spoken of, at that period, is such as thoroughly to convince those who are not under the influence of partial and prejudiced views on the subject, that the doctrine of purgatory was scarcely then in its embryo state, that it had nothing of the form and visage which it afterwards assumed, and which rendered it so terrible a bugbear to the world. And moreover, so numerous were the opinions concerning the soul and its condition after its separation from the body, common in those times, that were it at all necessary to have recourse to such a method of accounting for the conduct of Primitive Christians in praying for the dead, we could be at no loss whatever without the aid of so suspicious a tenet as the one now under consideration.*

The true history of the purgatorial dogma is this: Certain crude and undefined opinions relative to a future state, or the condition of mankind between death and the resurrection, derived, probably, from the speculations of heathen writers respecting the soul, and its exercises and employments after its separation from the body,† having become current among Christians of the third and fourth centuries, and having received countenance also from the notice taken of them in the writings of some of the most distinguished fathers of the Church, were eagerly laid, hold of, at a later period, when greater ignorance prevailed, as revealed truths, and believed and acted upon as parts of the Christian faith. In the insensible progress of time they put on something of the appearance of the Roman doctrine of purgatory. The doctrine itself, however, was still a mere matter of opinion; it existed only in the belief of individuals It had not yet received the countenance, much less the sanction of the Church, and its rejection was not attended by any punishment or censure. It was not until the latter part of the sixth century, that it began to assume the dignity and authority of an article of the Christian faith. About that period, Gregory the Great, by blending it with the common opinions respecting prayers for the dead, and permitting gifts and money to be received for such prayers, rendered it a source of no small emolument to the clergy.‡ In the middle ages it was recoined by the scholastic divines in their universal mint of doctrine, and having been issued in a new form, and with a more intelligible and gainful stamp, it soon filled the coffers of the Church with almost untold treasures. The first council by which it was noticed was that of Florence, held in 1438.|| By that council it was decreed to be a doctrine of the Church. And finally, the council of Trent, not satisfied with the slavery under which the human mind had groaned for ages from such unchristian opinions, and endeavoring to rivet more firmly upon it the chains of ignorance and superstition, by a new decree, imposed it forever on that branch of the Christian Chuch, in whose creed it now holds so conspicuous a place. Let that Church retain it, and defend it, as long, and with as much zeal as she may think proper; Protestants will not, as far as *it* is concerned, envy either her faith, or her practice. But while she does retain it, and with it transubstantiation, and some other tenets equally corrupt and dangerous, it is the next thing to madness for her to expect, that her claim to be considered 'the Church of all ages' will be allowed: or, in fact, that it will not be treated with merited contempt.

Respectfully,

JUSTIN.

---

* It is highly amusing and instructive to examine the various conjectures of Primitive Christian writers in relation to the State of the soul after death. Irenæus believed, as some Protestants do, in an intermediate state, as appears from the following passage of his writings: 'Communem Dominus in medio umbræ mortis abiisse, non autem mansisse eum, post declede corporaliter resurrexit et post resurrectionem assumptus est; manifestum est, quia et discipulorem ejus, propter quos et hæc operatus est Dominus, assumpsit abiisse in invisibilem locum definitum ei a Deo.' For since the Lord went to the midst of the shadow of death, where the souls of the dead were, then afterwards rose bodily from the dead, and after his resurrection was taken up into heaven: it is manifest that the souls of his disciples, on account of whom the Lord did these things, shall go into an invisible place appointed them by God. Adv. Hæres. Lib. V cap. 26. We do not perceive, in the place here alluded to, any resemblance to the Roman purgatory. No punishment or suffering is hinted at The writer merely intends to say, that the abode of souls to which our Saviour went immediately after his crucifixion, and before his resurrection, was a place different from heaven, to which he afterwards ascended. To this place the fathers generally think the Scriptures refer, when they speak of Abraham's bosom, of Paradise, and of *Hades*. There are also the souls of the prophets, and patriarchs, and holy men of all ages, waiting for the resurrection. Of this opinion were, besides Irenæus, Clemens Alexdrinus, Strom. Lib. VI Tertullian, De Anim. cap. 55. and Augustin, Epis. LVII ad Dardanum, although, perhaps he neutralizes what he there says by his strange notion of a purifying fire, through which, in other parts of his writings, he makes the souls of the dead to pass. See also Ruffinus in Symbolum Apost. cap 28.

Origen believed in the temporary duration of hell torment, or at least that souls condemned to those torments, might be allowed, after a certain time, another probation This father entertained strange, and somewhat anti-Christian notions on other subjects, and which it is likely, he imbibed from the Greek Philosophy, of which he was a diligent student. But the most singular of all the opinions which prevailed in those times relative to the state of the soul after death is, that it does not leave this upper world, but wanders about the tomb in which its mortal remains are deposited, being sometimes seen upon it or near it, in the twilight, to the great terror of the living. Lightfoot and Vitringa inform us that such was the notion of the Jews; and Lactantius, Instit. Lib. II. 26 says; 'Vulgus existimat animas circa tumulos, et corporum suorum reliquias obertare.' The common people think that souls wander about the tombs, and about the remains of their bodies. Of the same purport is the following passage from Origen, which, as it would, I presume, be inconvenient for the Gazette to exhibit it in its original dress, I shall present to the reader in a translation: 'The pure soul, and that which is not weighed down by the leaden weights of wickedness, is carried upwards to the places of the more pure and ætherial bodies, having left behind it the heavy bodies, and the pollutions that are in them; but the bad soul, and that which is drawn down to the earth by its sins, and cannot respire, is carried about there; some indeed wander about the tombs, where they are seen as apparitions in the dark; but others range at large round the earth. Orig. Cont Cel. VII. p. 696. The fires of purgatory would scarcely seem to need our compassion more than such a condition as this. There however, no necessity for our believing either

† The writings of Plato having been frequently referred to by Protestants as the source of the purgatorial dogma, I will lay before the reader the passage which relates more immediately to the subject. It is in the Phædo sec. 143, according Bekker's edition; sec. 62, according to Stanford's. 'These things having been so ordered by nature, when the dead have come to that place, to which the dæmon conducts each one of them, they are first of all, judged there, both those who have lived well and piously, and those who have not And those who may appear to have kept a middle course, having gone to Acheron, and embarked in vessels provided for them, come, in them, to the (Acherusian) lake, and there they dwell, and being purified by suffering punishment for their sins, they are discharged, and receive, every one of them according to his desert, the reward of their good deeds: But those who may appear to be incurable from the magnitude of their sins, who have committed either many and great sacrilegious deeds, or many unjust and lawless murders, or other crimes of that nature, are, by a just fate, hurled down to Tartarus, from which they never escape.' Compare also Virg. Æneid. Lib. VI. vs 7 5—747. The doctrine exhibited in this extract bears so striking a resemblance to that of purgatory, that it really seems quite unfair in the Church of Rome to deprive the heathen philosopher of the credit of its invention.

‡ See Milner's Church History, p. 551. note. Burnet on the Artic. p. 300. It is a fact worthy of notice that the Greek Church, whose claim to antiquity is certainly as well founded as that of the Church of Rome, has never received the dogma of purgatory.

|| Cave's *Hist* Lit. p 152, Appendix.

[For the Easton Gazette.]

[4 C's. CONTINUED]

Having disposed of the other parts Justin's last communication, I come now to take a transient view of the rock on which Protestantism is founded, and which he supposes to be impregnable. The Protestant Church to which my remarks will be directed, and strictly confined, is the Anglo-American Protestant Episcopal Church. My reasons for selecting this church are, first; because judging from some few features of his communication, I assume it as a postulate, that my competitor is a member of that church; secondly because that church boasts of the superior firmness of its foundation; and lastly: because it will save me the trouble of going back to the commencement of the mis-named reformation.

The American Episcopal Church agrees with the Anglican Church in all its important features save one, and that one (the spiritual supremacy of the King or Queen as the case may be) it never dare to reject until the successful termination of the revolutionary war abrogated the Parliamentary Statute, by which it was made and obligatory article of faith and high-treason to impugn it. It has adopted, or rather retained, the book of common prayer, the book of homilies and, with some unimportant modifications the 39 articles of faith of the Anglican Church —In fact, the American Episcopal Church is only the Anglican Church a wee-bit reformed. They trace their origin to the same source, and date it from the same period,—from the time when Henry the VIII, in retaliation of the Pope's refusal to grant him a divorce from his lawful, innocent wife, threw off the Pope's spiritual authority, and supremacy, and assumed them upon himself, styling himself the "supreme head of the church of England"—a title the confirmation of which, afterwards, he extorted from both the Convocation-1 and Parliament-2: and which has descended to the present, pretty little Queen, or protestant Popess, Victoria. Thus Henry commenced the alteration of religion, or as it is called the reformation in England-3. He continued it, by marrying six wives devorcing five and beheading two. His character has been emphatically drawn in twelve words. "He never spared woman in his lust, nor man in his anger-4." For proof of which says Doct. Hellen page 15 cited by the R't. Rev. Dr. Challoner; it is observed that he brought to the block *two* noble ladies—one cardinal, declared, viz. Bishop Fisher, twelve Dukes, Marquieses, Earls and Sons of Earles—eighteen Lords and Knights—thirteen abbots and priors——seventy seven monks and religious persons and many more of both religions to a very great number-5. The course of his reformation, or to speak more correctly, deformation, was also marked with injustice robbery and rapine in almost every possible form. He suppressed and plundered 643 monasteries—90 colleges—110 hospitals—and 2374 chanteries and free schools, making an aggregate of 3217. -6. He made *six articles of faith* with the penalty annexed of hanging or burning any person who should dare to attack or impugn them-7. Whatever he pleased to enjoin in matters of religion, his parliament was obliged to confirm-8. Thus Henry laid the foundation of the so-called reformation, in lust murder—rapine robbery and tyrany—so much for the foundation. Now for the completion of the fabric.

Edward VI mounted the throne in the tenth and died in the sixteenth year of his age, consequently he reigned not quite seven years. "The part which he played," says Feller, "was short and bloody.1 He discovered a love for virtue and humanity, but his ministers corrupted that happy disposition." On his ministers then rests all the guilt of all the crimes committed during the short reign of this unhappy youth of which I shall give but a very brief and imperfect outline.

Henry VIII "in his last will appointed sixteen executors, and selected the same persons to compose the privy council of the young king, till he should have attained the age of eighteen years complete, with full power to govern the kingdom in his name; and to appoint to all offices under the crown-2. One of the first acts of the regency was to appoint the Earl of Hertford the kings uncle, protector of the realm and guardian to the king's person-3. The next was to create new titles and revenues for themselves, in the distributions of Titles, Hertford was created Duke of Somerset. In a short time afterwards he procured letters patent under the great seal-4 confirming his title of protector and conferring on him the whole authority of the crown, which made him independent of the council of regency, and virtually, dictator-5: and thus was a different form of government established. To establish a different religious creed was their next object.—Cranmer the metropolitan pretending that his authority to exercise the functions of a bishop being derived from the late king, expired at the death of the king, petitioned the council of regency for a new commission to discharge the functions of an Archbishop-6. The greater number, if not all his colleagues followed his example and thus was an hierachy created entirely dependant on the crown. 7-A royal visitation was next established.—Lay Commissioners were deputed into all parts of the realm, accompanied with preachers to divert the people from their ancient faith and mode of worship. 8-Parliament passed an act giving to the young king all the Chantry land's colleges, free chappels and brotherhoods, which had escaped the rapacity of the late king his father, by virtue of which act they were all or nearly all dissolved and the spoils divided amongst the court harpies. The same Parliament repealed the statue of the six articles of faith made by the late king, & by a clause in the repealing act confirmed to the young king the title of "supreme head of the Church-9. The election of Bishops was withdrawn from the deans and chapters and vested in the crown-10. A new prayer book and liturgy was drawn up and published under the sanction of Parliament, with a declaration that it had been accomplished by the aid of the Holy Ghost-11; This declaration however notwithstanding it was discovered that the new liturgy gave offence, both to Catholics and protestants, it was therefore recalled and new one published by order of the king and parliament.

But it succeeded no better with the reformers than the first: They made violent objections to it, and would have kicked it out of the kingdom, had not Queen Elizabeth, subsequently, taken it under her royal protection: she however did not deem it expedient to send it forth again until after it had undergone another revision and reformation. So that according to Dr. Hellen p 283 cited by Challoner, the public litargy underwent four changes in little more than twelve years. About the time that Edward's new liturgy came out, all the alters were taken down, and commissioners were sent to all parts of the realm, to seize all the goods remaining in any Cathedral or Parish Churches, all jewels, gold and silver, crosiers, candlesticks, censers, chalices, &c. with their ready money, and also all copes, and vestments, cloth of gold, tissue & silver together with all other copes, vestments & ornaments to the same belonging, leaving only one chalice, with certain table cloths for the use of the newly invented protestant *communion-board*-12, which had now supplanted the Catholic alter. The Bishopricks of Durham, Winchester, Bath and Wells, Worcester, Westminster, Lincoln, St. Asaph, Banger & London &c. were all dissolved-1, or reformed into the pockets of the reforming self constituted grandees of the Court,—and all this sacrilege was perpetrated under the pretence of augmenting the kings revenue, but in reality to enrich themselves; a very small portion of the avails having even reached the kings treasury.

This undiscriminate, sacriligious robbery of the Churches, which followed the publication of the new liturgy, threw the whole kingdom into a state of commotion, which in many of the counties burst out into open insurrection, several engagements ensued between the reformed liturgy-troops and the insurgents; but the latter were eventually defeated and many of them executed by martial law-2.

But of the numerous murders committed under the authority of the kings ministers for conscience sake, I shall name but two, Joan Bocher and Non Pavies 3. The first of these when excommunicated by archbishop Crammer as a heretic, and ordered to be delivered to the secular power, replied, "it is a goodly matter to 'consider your ignorance, it was not long 'ago that you burnt Anne Askew for a 'piece of bread, and yet came yourselve 'soon after, to believe and profess the 'same doctrine for which you burned 'her: and now for sooth, you will needs 'burn me for a piece of flesh, and in the 'and will come to believe this also, when 'you have read the scriptures, and under-'stood them." They were both sent to the stake and burnt, for no other crime but that of exercising the *grand prerogative of the so called reformation, the right, of private judgment.* But of the murders perpetrated in this short reign the most sacriligious was that of the Protector's brother the admiral, Lord Seymour of Sudley, who by the machinations of his brother Somerset the Protector was attainted of high Treason without being allowed the benefit of a trial by his peers, and lost his head on Tower hill, under a death warrant signed by his brother-4. In this case however retributive justice was not very tardy; three years afterwards the Protector himself, was brought to the same block, by Dudley Earl of Warwick who had now succeeded to the Protectorship, and had been created Duke of Northumberland, under whose Protectorship the work of plunder progressed whilst any thing remained to plunder. The parishes were so frittered away, and the clergy *so reformed* that almost all the good and learned had either been killed, starved to death, banished or had left the country, and those who remained were so stripped of their revenues, that the 5-parrochial clergy were obliged to labour as mechanics & frequently serve as domestics in Gentlemen's houses.

The above were some of the means made use of in the construction of the reformation edifice. It was covered in and completed with 6-forty two articles of faith drawn up by Cranmer, (under and by virtue of an order that he had previously obtained from the council of regency) approved by the reforming and reformed bishops and divines and published by authority of the king.

From what has been said it is clear that the master builders of the first English Protestant Church were Henry VIII, who laid the foundation in lust, murders, rapine, robbery and tyranny, and Edward's protectors, Somerset, Northumberland, Cranmer & Co. who erected the superstructure in persecution, pillage, robbery, rapine, sacrilege, despotism and murder.

But this new Church was of short duration. Mary the Eldest daughter of Henry VIII ascended the throne on the death of her brother Edward, but not without powerful efforts on the part of Northumberland &c. to cheat her out of her right of succession. Regardless of herself, she directed her chief efforts to the restoration of the ancient Catholic faith, under the influence of which the kingdom had flourished happy and great for so many centuries. She could not restore the gold and silver, cencers, candlesticks, chalices &c. they were squandered away and converted to other uses, by the plunderers: but she ousted from the Churches the uxorious reformation parsons and the new-fangled protestant communion-boards, and restored the Catholic priesthood and Catholic alters. And the two houses of Parliament, who a few years before, established the reformation Church, and declared the liturgy to be compiled by the aid of the Holy Ghost, now after having their plunder secured to them, turned about and confessed "that they had been guilty of most horrible defection, from the true Church; professed their *sincere repentance for their past transgressions*; and declared their resolution to repeal all laws, enacted in prejudice of the Pope's authority." In presence of this declaration they petitioned the King and Queen on that subject, and the result was the restoration of the spiritual authority and supremacy of the Pope. She restored to their sees the Catholic Bishops, who had been turned out by Cranmer, and ousted those appointed by him. Cranmer himself was shortly after not only deprived of his ill-gotten see, but sent to the Tower as a traitor, and afterwards suffered the punishment he had inflicted upon so many others. He was sent to the stake and burnt to death. Mary determined to retain none of the property or revenues which her father and brother's Protectors had plundered from the Church. She therefore restored to the Church the tenths and first fruits—She restored all the Church and Abbey lands in possession of the Crown, applying the revenues as nearly as possible to their ancient purposes. She first restored Westminster Abbey, then the Friary at Greenwich—Black Friars, in London—the Nunnery at Sion, near Brentford—the Priory at Sheen—She restored and liberally endowed the Hospital of St. John Smythfield—She re-established the Hospital in the Savoy for the benefit of the poor, and allowed it an annual revenue out of her own purse. In short she subverted the new Protestant Church and re-established the ancient Catholic Church throughout the kingdom. That there were some persecutors in her reign is not denied nor are they defended: but some of them were superinduced by actual high treason, not for worshiping God according to the dictates of conscience, which Elizabeth made treason by statute, but for plotting against her life, her throne and her government: and the rest of them susceptible of considerable palliation. Mary died in the sixth year of her reign, and was succeeded by her sister Elizabeth.

Elizabeth began her reign with premeditated perjury. She was crowned according to the Catholic pontifical, and took the accustomed oath to conform to all the rites and ecclesiastical ceremonies contained in that pontifical, that is she swore to maintain the ancient Catholic doctrine and worship, an oath which every subsequent act of her reign proves she never intended to keep.

Mary in the begining of her short reign had abrogated, the statute conferring on the Crown the ecclesiastical supremacy, and re-established the spiritual authority and supremacy of the Pope.—But as this title ("the supreme head of the church") was an object of Elizabeth's ambition, one of the first subjects to which she directed her attention, was to procure from Parliament the passage of an act, to restore and re-annex, the spiritual supremacy to the crown. She however proceeded cautiously. Her first apparent movement was the issuing of a proclamation-1 prohibiting all disputes about religion, and all preaching except by such persons as should be licensed by her authority. About the same time she published another proclamation-1 forbidding any alteration in religion, or any innovation on religious rites and ceremonies, till further orders &c. The first-2 act of her first Parliament provided for the suppression of the monasteries erected by Mary, and for restoring the tenths and first fruits to the Queen. The second, granted her the object of her desire, abolished the spiritual authority and supremacy of the Pope; and conferred them upon the Queen-1. "By this act the crown, without the concurrence either of the parliament, or the convocation, *was vested with the whole spiritual jurisdiction:—might repress all heresies, establish or repeal all cannons, alter every point of discipline, & ordain or abolish any religious rite or ceremony, and might delegate that jurisdiction to any person or persons whatsoever,*" moreover all clergymen taking orders or in possession of livings and all persons in public employments, were obliged under pain of deprivation and in capacity to take an oath, declaring the Queen to be supreme *governor* as well in all ecclesiasticle and spiritual, as in temporal things and causes-2. The same Parliament authorised the Queen to reserve to herself the lands belonging to the *Bishopricks* as they became vacant, giving in lieu of them their full value in impropriated tythes-2; and annexed all religious houses to the crown-2. The statues enacted in king Edward's reign with regard to religion were revived and confirmed, and consequently the deprivation of popish Bishops in that reign was declared valid. The nomination of bishops was given to the crown without any election of the chapters-2. Finally Parliament passed an act, abolishing the mass, and also enacted "that the book of common prayer with certain additions and emendations, should alone be used by the min-

---

* See the Bishop of Strasburg's Answer to Faber's Difficulties of Romanism. p. 244.

† The prayers for the dead contained in ancient Liturgies that are extant afford not the slightest ground for supposing that those who used them believed in a purgatory. See Wharton's Answer to Abp. Carrol. p. 76.

‡ See Eusebius's Life of Constantine, chap. 71.

|| Augustin is the first Christian writer who has expressed himself with any sort of distinctness on the subject of purgatorial suffering after death *He* seems to think it probable that the soul undergoes a cleansing process by fire, before it is admitted into heaven. But he wavers, and doubts, and even contradicts himself so often, that it is scarcely possible to ascertain what his sentiments really were.

1 Rapin Hist. Eng'd. Vol 1. p 792. Hume Vol. 3. p. 104.—2 Rapin 1. p. 803.—Hume 3, p. 114.—3 Dr. Heylen in the preface to his history of the reformation.—4 Feller Hist Dict. Tom. 6, p. 460.—5 see Rap. vol. 1, p. 801-806. and note 3, & p. 811, &c. Hume 3, p. 125,127,128.143,161,179.187, &c. Feller. Hist. Dict. Tom. 6, p. 460.—

6 Sir Rich'd. Baker, cited by the R't. Rev'd. Dr. Calloner p 410—Rap. 1, p 821, and note 7, refering to Herbert and page 823—Hume vol. 3. p 187—Feller. Tom. 6, p 460.—7 Rapin 1. p 821—*Hume*. 3, p 167, Andrews review of Foxir book of martyrs vol. 2, p 206-7.—8 Rapin 1, p 822—Hume 3, p 146, 148.

1 Feller Hist. Dict. vol. 5, p 18.—2 Rapin 2, p 3—Hume 3, p 230—Ling VI p 272.—3 Rap. 2, p 5—Hume 3, p 233—Ling. VII p 11.—4 Rap. 2, p 6—Hume 3, p 235—Ling. VII p 16.—5 Rap 2, p 7—Hume 3, p 235—Ling. VII p 16.—6 Rap. 2, p 10—Ling. VII p 22—7 Heylen p 34 by Challoner—Rap. 2, p 7—Hume 3, p 238—Ling. VII p 22.—8 Rap. 2, p 10—Ling. VII p 24.—9 Rap. 2 p 10—Hume 3, p 250.—10 Rap. 2, p 10—Ling. VII p 26.—11 Heylin p 65 by Challoner (63)—Ling VII p 30.—

12 Heylen p 134, by Chal'r. (67).

1 Heylen p 54, 100, 101, 121, 129, 136, cited by Challoner—Rapin 2 p 18, 24—Ling. VII p 54, 56, and 58.—2 Rap. 2, p 15—Hume 3 p 267—Ling. VII p 41.—3 Hume 3 p 262, 263—Ling. VII p 64, 65.—4 Rap. 2 p 14—Hume 3 p 259—Ling. VII p 36.—5 Heylen p 91, 114, by Challoner.—Hume 3 p 286.—6 Rap. 2 p 21—Hume 3 p 280—Ling. VII p 79.

1 Heylen p. 276, referred to by Challoner (p 92)—Rap. 2 p 52—Hume 3 p 358—Ling. 7 p 204.—2 Hume 3 p 360.

1 Rap. 2 p 53—Hume 3 p 360.—2 Hume 3 p 361—Rap. 2 p 54—3 Hume 3 p 361.—2 Lingard VII p 208-9.—4 Hume 3 p 362—Rap. 2 p 54—Ling. VII p 208.—5 Rap. 2 p 54—Hume 3 p 364—Ling. VII. 210, and note referring to Cambden.—

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc2940_scm11031-0457.jpg