

TRANSUBSTANTIATION AND ECCLESIASTICAL PHILOSOPHY

BY ROBERT P. RICHARDSON

IF you have a friend who is a good Catholic—the adjective must be emphasized in these impious days—and happen to walk with him past a church of his persuasion you will notice that he reverently lifts his hat. This act of homage is not directed towards a priest within the edifice, still less is it paid to stones and mortar. It has as its object the Host, the consecrated wafer which, if not reposing inside the “tabernacle” is liable to be found exhibited in the ostensorium on the altar.

You yourself, not being a son of the True Faith, may without giving offense, pass the Host with head unbared. But it was not always so. Only a few years ago in certain parts of the world, a non-believer who did not imitate the faithful in saluting the Host when carried by in a religious procession was liable to be mobbed, and in Austria, in the twentieth century before the fall of the Hapsburgs, Protestants have been jailed for merely refusing to uncover as the ostensorium passed by.

The devotion thus exhibited towards the Host is based on the theory that it, through the ministrations of a priest, has been actually transformed into the body of Jesus Christ, and one of the chief aims of ecclesiastical philosophers has been to justify this dogma of the “Real Presence.” Belief in the latter is, indeed, an offshoot from a widely held but erroneous philosophical doctrine sometimes known as Realism but better designated by the name of Noumenalism; a doctrine which regards as real, not the things we actually see and feel (the Phenomena of Nature) but things unknown and unknowable underlying the phenomena; the mysterious Noumena or Substrata.

The Noumenalism in vogue when the dogma of the Real Presence arose was of the variety known as Hylomorphism. The Hylomorphic theory holds that every thing, whether a stone or a tree, a wafer or a man, has an underlying "reality" a substratum made up of two factors: the primordial matter (Hyle) and the essential forms (Morphe). This primordial matter must not be confused with the matter known to science. The latter is what we deal with in daily life: what human beings see and feel. The former is far more recondite, and indeed in the view of the philosophy of experience (Phenomenalism) is a non-existent figment of muddy thought, the only matter that a Phenomenalist recognizes being that dealt with in the Arts and Sciences and continually at our fingers' ends.

Essential (or Substantial) Forms, according to the Scholastic philosophy (based on Aristotelianism) were what made a thing what it was, while its having a being at all was supposed to be due to primordial matter. Primordial matter was thus, so to speak, the existence element of a thing, the internal cause of its existence, and the more consistent theologians naturally ascribed primordial matter to God Himself. The essential forms constituted the characterizing element, and were those internal causes of a thing which made it possess its distinguishing characteristics. These two elements were held to underly as a substratum the attributes we perceive in a thing, and this substratum—the "thing in itself" or noumenon—was taken as the very type of reality, though human beings never came in contact with it or cognized it with their senses. On the other hand, the things which we can directly perceive and with which we are put in direct touch through our senses—the phenomena—were despised by the Noumenalist and contemptuously stigmatized as mere "Accidents", scarce worthy of attention in his theory of knowledge.

With a chalice of wine and a wheaten wafer ready to consecrate there are evident to human senses only what can be smelled and tasted and seen and felt, etc. (that is, mere accidents) and various chemical and physical characteristics (also mere accidents) that scientific apparatus reveals to our senses when the latter are thus aided. A priest now steps to the altar and murmuring a few words changes the wine and the wafer into flesh and blood—so at least theologians say. The wine and bread smell and taste the same as before, and will respond precisely as before to all chemical and physi-

cal tests. But what we thus perceive are, says the theologian, mere accidents: the "real" wine and bread is completely gone; existence element as well as characterizing element has been annihilated; the primordial matter and likewise the essential forms have ceased to exist. There remains only the accidents which by a miracle exist without any supporting substratum. On the other hand there have been brought to the altar the Blood and Body of Christ; the very same human Body in which the Logos toured Palestine nineteen hundred years ago. Our theologian admits that the bystander can see nothing of such a body, but in any event what could be perceived by the senses would be mere accidents, and the accidents which accompanied the Logos on his journeys are not here now. Here in the Eucharist, says the theologian, exist, not the unimportant accidents of a body but the real "thing in itself", the substratum or noumenon of a body, whose office it is to uphold corporeal accidents yet here does not uphold them at all.¹

The infallible Church tells us that what appears to our fallible senses as a little bread disc, just an ordinary creation of the baker, is now in reality the Body of Jesus Christ. And notwithstanding the diminutive size of the wafer that our senses perceive and the very moderate capacity of the ostensorium holding it, there is in that small ostensorium where we imagine we see a wafer, a full sized human body comprising head and trunk, legs and arms, heart and kidneys, stomach and intestines, and in short every anatomical part of a human male. Or rather, every part of a male Jew, for theologians with their usual delicacy, have gravely debated whether or not the Host contains that portion of the body of which a Jewish boy is deprived in accordance with the covenant of Abraham, and the consensus of opinion seems to be in the negative. Unsavory thoughts along such lines seem to be suggested even to the laity, for Count Von Hoensbroech tells us that when a priest he was once confronted after Mass by a woman who held in her hand a moist consecrated wafer. This, she said, she had duly put into her mouth when communicating, but had been unable to swallow, since there had arisen in her mind the inhibiting thought that she would be eating those male organs which women are not supposed to talk about.² Von Hoensbroech took the wafer, wet with the woman's saliva, and in duty bound ate it himself, for the Eucharis-

¹Sometimes it is held that even the accidents of Christ's Body are present, but that these are veiled from our profane gaze by a second miracle.

tic bread once consecrated, must not be thrown on a rubbish heap. When by mischance the wafer gets in a condition so foul that it cannot possibly be eaten, it must be reverently put in a vessel of water which is allowed to remain by the altar until the wafer has putrified and disintegrated. Then the Body of Christ will have departed, and the putrid liquor, having no trace of divinity in it, may be discarded.

The miracle of Transubstantiation of course, carries with it Multilocation of Christ's Body, since the latter, at one time, is being exhibited on the altars of thousands of churches scattered over the globe. To the theological mind however, being in different places at the same time offers no difficulty; the feat has been accomplished tradition tells us, by various saints. In the case of Saint Alphonsus of Liguori bilocation is so well authenticated that the legend, says modern Catholic authority, "cannot be arbitrarily cast aside as untrustworthy."² And not only is Christ's Body on different altars at one and the same time; it is even multilocated within a single wafer. For the tiniest crumb that can be broken off from a consecrated Host, every particle that can be detached down to the *minimum divisibile*, is the integral Body of Christ with its entire organization of full sized limbs and members. To a heretic this may seem impossible, but, as Guimond (who wrote against the heretic Berenger) tells us: "It is only to sense that a single part of the Host appears less than the whole, but our senses often deceive us. I acknowledge that there is a difficulty in comprehending this, but there is no difficulty in believing it." Here the heretic may perhaps feel like repeating what Winnington said to his Catholic friend, Lord Stafford, "Damn it, what a religion is yours! They let you eat nothing and yet make you swallow everything!" But the doctrine of the Totality of the Real Presence is not yet exhausted, and gives the believer still more to swallow. In preliminary explanation it must be noted that the Hypostatic Union joined the Logos, the Divine Soul, to a human body and likewise to a human soul. For by the Diphysite dogma Jesus Christ has not one but two souls,

²See *Fourteen Years a Jesuit*, by Count Paul Von Hoesbroeck, translated by Alice Zimmern, Vol. II, p. 23.

³Prof. Joseph Pohle in *The Catholic Encyclopaedia*, article *Eucharist*, p. 584. This authoritative work was published under the auspices of Cardinal Gibbons, 1907-1914. Any reader who may feel a misgiving as to whether the doctrine of Transubstantiation is fairly presented by the present writer is advised to consult the volumes of this product of Catholic thought.

welded together so to speak, but yet not fused into one, being so distinct that by the Dithelite variety of Diphysitism (the only variety that Rome sanctions in these days) Christ has two distinct Wills—which fortunately never conflict. The Hypostatic Union, theologians assure us, was dissolved but once, namely at the crucifixion, the cry on the cross, “My God, My God, Why hast thou forsaken me?” being sometimes interpreted as a reproach addressed to the Logos by the Human Soul of Jesus. After three days the Logos returned and the resurrection took place and ever since then the Union has remained unbroken. And hence Catholic theologians argue, quite logically, that each little crumb of apparent bread is at once the Logos, the Human Soul of Jesus and His entire Body! Nothing daunted the faithful churchman swallows all this without flinching, and apparently accepts the dictum of that learned divine who at the Council of Constance said to Hus that if the Council told him he only had one eye he ought to believe it, even though he knew he had two!

It is obvious that those philosophies which take a phenomenalistic stand and deny the existence of “matter” (in the noumenalistic sense), and the existence of essential forms as well, are in inevitable antagonism to the Real Presence doctrine and to the religions that uphold it. An example of this is found in the philosophy of Bishop Berkeley, who denied the existence of any noumenal substratum, and took as the touch-stone of reality Perceptibility. With all bodies, he contended, the *esse est percipi*. This philosophy cannot possibly be reconciled with the teachings of Catholicism, and Arthur Collier, Berkeley’s contemporary, who in his *Clavis Universalis* took much the same ground as the bishop, pointed out as one advantage of these teachings that they do overthrow the dogma of Transubstantiation. Berkeley himself was less explicit, though he must have seen the trend of his arguments. His bow was bent, however, not against the Hylomorphists, but against the Cartesians who, subdividing the attributes of the bodies perceived by our senses into “Primary” and “Secondary”, ascribed the former to the substratum which they called “matter” and denied extra-mental reality to the latter.⁴ Berkeley’s contention was that both were equally real, or, if you refuse to ascribe reality to “mere phenomena”, both equally unreal. His doctrine implies that things are what they seem, while Noumenalists of all varieties declare that they are quite different

⁴The doctrine did not originate with Des Cartes though it bears his name.

from what they appear to be. Cartesian noumenalism, like hylomorphism has its doctrine of the Real Presence, though a heretical one. Varignon, who as a geometrician could not be very favorably disposed toward the multilocation doctrine, put forward the suggestion that every *minimum divisibile* of the Host was a miniature replica of the Body of Christ. This replica, while exceedingly minute, was a faithful copy in every respect, save for the accidents or secondary attributes, such as taste, color, etc. But this view was promptly condemned by the Church, which valiantly stuck to its guns in the question of multilocation, and disdained the idea that God would palm off on poor humanity a copy in place of the original.

The miracle of Transubstantiation has as starting point a chalice of wine and one or more pieces of bread usually in wafer form. The composition of both wafer and wine is, it seems, of considerable importance. The former must be made of unadulterated wheat flour, any substitution of barley, rye or buckwheat products being out of the question. This wheaten bread may be leavened or unleavened. Though the Roman Church prefers the former her Uniate branches are none the less permitted to use the latter. The Jacobite Schismatics of Syria knead their wheaten flour into a dough with oil and salt, the ancient Phrygian Monanists heretically mixed cheese with bread in their sacrament, and, according to Epiphanius, some of the ancient Gnostic heretics kneaded their Eucharistic dough with the blood of a child, but it would be a mistake to believe all the evil one Christian denomination says of another.

As to the contents of the chalice, it must be real fermented wine, the heresy of the ancient Hydroparastatae or Aquarians, who used plain water, and that of certain modern heretics who take unfermented grape juice, being equally reprehensible. The wine must not have turned sour, since vinegar is not a valid material. It must be the pure and unadulterated product of the grape, reinforced, if this be thought desirable with spirits that have been distilled off from pure grape wine. In this way the alcoholic contents may be brought up to eighteen per cent, which rather generous limit has been fixed as the maximum. It has not always been easy to carry out the canonical regulations and in the early days of Christianity these were even a source of danger to the faithful. In time of persecution if a man, known to be of sober habits, was, at an early hour in the morning, found redolent of wine, the authori-

ties drew the inference that he was a Christian who had just communicated and he was promptly arrested. The rise of Islam to the overhand in Christian communities was likewise a source of difficulties. Thus in Egypt in the tenth century the Moslems adhering to the anti-alcoholic fanaticism of their prophet, destroyed all the vineyards and absolutely prohibited the making or importing of wine. And for the Eucharistic Sacrament the Copts had to import raisins and make a simulacrum of wine from these, though their early canons forbade the use of such a product. American politicians under Prohibition have proved less intransigent in this respect, for notwithstanding the Eighteenth Amendment they allow the use of real wine in the Eucharistic ceremonies.

To perform the Eucharistic miracle a "real" priest is necessary; one who has had this and other miraculous powers transmitted to him through the apostolic succession, and Protestant ministers, unless they happen to have been ordained by a bishop of proper spiritual pedigree, are void of the power. The ecclesiastics who are understood to possess it are naturally not given to self-depreciation, and just before the Reformation, priests would sometimes boast that they were greater than the Virgin Mary, as she gave birth to her Creator only once, while they created their Creator every time they said Mass. To speak of creation taking place in Transubstantiation really seems in harmony with the customary ecclesiastical statement that the noumenon of the bread is "changed into" the noumenon of the Body. The phrase "change into" would certainly imply production of something; not merely bringing an already existing noumenon to the altar. But the latter is evidently what is understood to take place, for it is held that the incoming noumena of Body and Blood already exist, and there can thus be no "change into" but at most (that is, if the old noumena are supposed to be merely driven away) an exchange, while if the old pair of noumena are deemed to be destroyed neither "exchange" nor "change into" is the proper description of the process.

While Transubstantiation can, it is held, be brought about only by a duly ordained priest, the laity sometimes thought the virtue resided in the mere words that were uttered, and the clerical habit of mumbling at Mass was interpreted as an endeavor to keep the common herd from learning the magic ritual. There was even a legend to account for the necessity of secrecy. Once, it was said, some poor peasants had mastered the hocus pocus (as it was called

by corruption of the words *Hoc est corpus*) and had committed the horrid sacrilege of using the formula to change their frugal daily fare of bread into meat. Such fables were not believed by philosophers, who denied that the Eucharist had the nourishing qualities of meat and blood, and sometimes even declared it did not nourish as the original bread and wine would. For, said they, the accidents without the substratum would not nourish, but merely comforted the stomach or the palate by their scent. And Pope Innocent III declared that after consecration there really did remain in bread and wine a certain paneity and vineity which satisfied hunger and thirst. It was however usually thought derogatory to the Blessed Body and Blood to imagine they underwent digestive processes: hence those who claimed the consecrated bread and wine went the same way as the unconsecrated were in the old days stigmatised as Stercorarists. Zonares, a Greek friar, unable to deny the patent fact that a Host would rot just like ordinary bread, put forth the doctrine that the consecrated bread, the flesh of Christ, was at first corruptible but that when once eaten, having gone, so to speak, into the sepulchre, it became incorruptible, because after the burial of the Saviour His Body did not become corrupt but rose again.

It was regarded as important that the Holy Body and Blood should not mix with ordinary food in the stomach, and for that reason communicants fast before communion and come to the ceremony with an empty stomach. This does not however mean that an ecclesiastic need put too long a time between drinks, as was demonstrated by a priest who consecrated the entire contents of a large cask of wine in his cellar, and thus could, before he went to Mass, drink to his heart's content. Jesuitism gets around such difficulties still more smoothly. At the Jesuit school at Feldkirch, Count Von Hoensbroeck tells us, Mass was celebrated at midnight Christmas eve. Pupils who were going to communicate twenty minutes after twelve were allowed to gorge themselves with cake from eleven until up to half a minute before midnight, a Jesuit Prefect standing by with a watch in his hand to give the signal to stop eating at that time. And thus the letter of the Canon Law was obeyed and prospective young Jesuits made familiar with the methods of the order!

While administering the wine to a communicant great care must be taken not to spill any of it, and should this mischance happen, it is the duty of the priest (according to the decision made by a Synod at Cologne in 1280) to get down on all fours like a dog

and lap up the "blood" like a dog! In view of this we can comprehend why, when the laity were given the Eucharist in both kinds, the priests denounced as "beasts and ribalds" those of their parishioners who insisted on coming to communion too frequently. The consecrated wafer was popularly supposed to have magical properties, and sometimes instead of swallowing it the communicant would carry it home and use it as a charm. Crumbled up and strewn on the growing crops it was thought to keep caterpillars away, and there is a record of one man who put the Body of Christ in his beehive, hoping that all the bees in the neighborhood would come and leave their honey near the sacred wafer. The bees, history says, duly gathered from the neighboring hives and built a perfect miniature cathedral in wax around the Host, but spent their time worshipping in the church they had built, instead of making honey.

Sometimes a heretic or some one unabsolved from mortal sin would try to take communion, in which case, tradition tells us, the wafer would turn to stone in the mouth of the hapless communicant. Among the other miracles which served to strengthen the faith of the believer may be mentioned an especially noteworthy one which, history tells us, occurred at Favernav, France in 1608. On the night of May 23, the altar in the Benedictine Abbey there took fire and was completely consumed. On it was an ostensorium containing two consecrated Hosts, and although the altar burned away beneath, the ostensorium remained miraculously suspended in the air without any support whatever for thirty-three hours. The miracle was witnessed by thousands of people, and was authenticated, modern churchmen tell us, by an official investigation, records of which remain even unto this day.

Transmutation was the early name for what is now called Transubstantiation, the latter term having been introduced by Hildebert of Tours in the eleventh century. The first systematic formulation of the doctrine was made by Saint Paschasius Radbertus in the ninth century. It has been claimed that Paschasius foisted an innovation on the Church in the doctrine he expounded, but the adherents of Transubstantiation assert he simply followed the traditions of the Fathers. At all events that great ecclesiastical philosopher, Gerbert, who as Pope took the title of Sylvester II, added the weight of his authority to the teachings of Paschasius on the Real Presence, these, Gerbert declared, being perfect in every detail.

Paschasius ardently upholds the identity of the Host with the historic Body of Christ: that human Body in which the Saviour preached to the people of Palestine. He relates in support of his thesis the history of a miracle that happened in his days to a certain priest, Plegibus. The latter, after consecrating some wine (how much history sayeth not) beheld, not the drink which inebriates as well as cheers, but Jesus Christ Himself "under the sensible form of a child." Plegibus pressed the Holy Infant to his heart and then requested the Lord again to veil Himself under the appearance of wine. This request was complied with, and Plegibus was once more able to assuage his thirst. In modern days, alas! what one beholds after partaking of eighteen per cent wine is more likely to be a green snake than a smiling child.

In this ninth century the opposite view, that the Host is merely representative of Christ's Body, was upheld by Ratramnus, who like Paschasius, was a monk of Corby, and who, at the request of Charles the Bold wrote a treatise *On the Body and Blood of the Lord*, and by John Scotus Erigena. The latter, the story goes, was ultimately called to England by Alfred the Great to become reader of divinity at Malmesbury Monastery, where, at the instigation of the monks (whose animosity had been aroused, it is conjectured, by Erigena's views on the Eucharist) he was stabbed to death by the young scholars. But this account is not well authenticated, and Erigena may perhaps have died peacefully in his bed.

Another pestiferous heretic in the matter of the Real Presence was Berenger of Tours in the eleventh century. Berenger's opinion was that accidents could not exist without a substratum, and he hence denied that consecration had any effect on the noumena of the bread and wine. He was sometimes understood to uphold a heretical doctrine of the presence of Christ known as Impanation, but his enemies claimed that he and his adherents rejected the Real Presence altogether. He was accused of having said: "So many people have eaten of the body of Christ that even if it had been originally as large as yonder tower there would be nothing left of it by this time!" Great excitement was aroused by this, and in 1050 four different synods of the French clergy condemned the heretical doctrine. The bishops assembled in council at Paris said: "If the authors and promoters of this perverse heresy do not disavow it the entire French army will be mobilized, and with the clergy marching at its head will attack them wherever they may take refuge, forcing them to

profess the Catholic faith or seizing them and inflicting on them the just punishment of death." Berenger was compelled to sign a recantation and to repeat this a second and a third time, the endeavor being to frame a declaration so precise that it would not be possible for anyone save a truly orthodox son of the Church to accept it. Berenger, who had written against Paschasius, was compelled to admit that the latter's doctrine of the identity of the Eucharist with the historic Body of Jesus was indeed correct. In his recantation Berenger was constrained to profess that the bread of the altar, after consecration is the "real Body of Christ which was born of the Virgin and suffered on the cross" and that the wine becomes the "real blood which flowed from the side of Christ." He was forced to admit specifically that after consecration the bread and wine are "not merely sacramentally but also really body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ" and that "not only sacramentally but in reality the body is taken up by the hand of the priest, broken apart and macerated by the teeth of the communicant." This last item of "physical manducation" of the flesh of Jesus is one at which heretics have often balked, but Berenger accepted it and saved himself from the stake. The Catholic Church now teaches that the Host is not a single Body of Christ, but that each smallest possible subdivision that can be made of it is already a complete body of the Saviour: hence it is evident that the doctrine to which Berenger was forced to subscribe is not in harmony with other pronouncements of the Church that never changes. And if it be asked how this can be, we can only reply by quoting the words of an eminent Catholic apologist, Bossuet: "If the Church [in the case of Berenger] said also in a certain sense, that the body of Jesus Christ is broken, it was not from her being ignorant that in another sense it is not so!"

Heresy, as regards the Real Presence, was also in evidence with Wyclif, who, it is noteworthy, was, in his conflict with the papacy, treated with the greatest respect by his opponents, until in 1381 he began to attack Transubstantiation. Wyclif very sensibly said that if you once admit phenomena ["accidents"] can exist without support in this particular case of the Eucharist, you have no justification for assuming such noumenal support to be at hand in any case whatsoever. He did not however reject noumenalism, but held that accidents could not exist if their substratum were taken away. He thus repudiated Transubstantiation, and he ridiculed another theory, Identification, which holds that the incoming noumena com-

bine with those already at hand, giving a nondescript bread-body substratum to support the accidents of the bread, and an equally composite nondescript wine-blood substratum to support those of wine. Wyclif sarcastically asked, supposing God should identify an ass and a man, whether the resulting compound would be an ass or a man or neither? Impanation, a doctrine according to which it is the Divine Soul of Christ, not His Body, that united with the substratum of bread, Wyclif likewise rejected. Aside from these two theories Wyclif at first seemed willing to accept almost any doctrine that would leave the substrata of bread and wine supporting their accidents. He specified three ways in which this could be done: First, since Scripture does not tell us the bread is or was Christ's body but merely gives us to understand that the Host is sacramentally Christ's Body the believer may make his confession of faith in these vague words, provided he does not violate the Decretal Ego Berengarius by regarding *Hoc est corpus meum* as merely a figure of speech. Second, the bread may be regarded as representing Christ's body. Third, it may be regarded as a sign that Christ's body is really present.

Finally however the Doctor Evangelicus broke completely with accepted doctrine, and fearlessly advocated the Berengarian heresy, saying that since none of the various theories of the Real Presence could be true the only thing left to do was to take Christ's words "tropically." He denounced, as Priests of Baal and Adorers of Accidents, the ecclesiastics who sanctioned the adoration of the Host. By parity of reasoning, he claimed, one might proceed to worship a grape vine, since in *John XI* Christ is twice quoted as saying, "I am the vine." Wyclif stigmatized as most horrible the thought of actually eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the beloved Saviour. He cast scorn on the prescription to fast before taking communion, saying that the bishops knew more about collecting gold and silver coins than about the Sacraments. Managing during his lifetime to escape the rack and the stake, Wyclif was condemned as a heretic by the Council of Constance which ordained that his books be burned and his bones be exhumed and these too reduced to ashes. The sentence was duly executed by the ecclesiastical authorities of England who cast the ashes into a running stream.

Wyclif's followers, the Lollards, likewise found the Real Presence too great a strain on their faith. To them it was sacrilegious to think the Lord's Body could become "rat's bread" or "food for

spiders" which, according to Catholic teaching may be its fate should the priest carelessly lose a crumb of the consecrated wafer. The horrible thought that, if the Real Presence were a fact, in breaking the wafer you broke the arms and back and legs of Christ was another adverse argument with the Lollards. Their denial of the Real Presence and other "damnable" thoughts about the Sacraments was the primary reason given in justification of the English law enacted against these heretics some sixteen years after Wyclif's death. Under this law the diocesan could arrest and try heretics who after conviction were turned over to the sheriff. The latter was bound to execute the sentence of the ecclesiastical court, burning at the stake being duly provided as an admissible penalty. Thus armed with the power of answering an argument about noumena by burning its proponent alive, the authorities succeeded in suppressing the doctrine of Wyclif. The comparatively late penalization of Lollardism was not due to any scruples on the part of the Church, which had long sought to have laws against heresy enacted in England, and in fact in 1382 the clergy had taken a step which, as Sir James Fitzjames Stephens remarks (*History of Criminal Law in England*, Vol. II, p. 443) "can probably not be paralleled in the history of England," deliberately forging an act of Parliament! The measure they desired for the suppression of heresy had not been passed by the House of Commons, but none the less the authorities published it as a law, and only the subsequent protest of the Commons prevented it from being applied.

(*To be continued*)