

JUDICIA DUO.

I. A DETERMINATION

CONCERNING

THE SACRAMENT,

MADE

AT CAMBRIDGE

AFTER

THREE DISPUTATIONS HELD THERE, JUNE 20, 1549.

II. JUDICIUM NICHOLAI RIDLÆI, EPISCOPI
LONDINENSIS, DE EPISTOLIS DECRE-
TALIBUS, SCILICET CLEMENTIS
ANACLETI, LUCII, PONTIANI
ET ALIORUM VESTUSTIS-
SIMORUM PONTI-
FICUM.

THE disputations held at Cambridge before the King's commissioners, June, 1549, and which are preserved by Fox in his Acts and Monuments, were remarkable, as well for the importance of the subject discussed, as for the learning and character of those who took part in them. The commissioners were the Bishops of Rochester and Ely, Mr (afterwards Sir John) Cheke, formerly Tutor to the King, Dr May, and Thomas Wendy, Physician to the King. In the first disputation, Dr Madew was opposed by Dr Glin, Sedgwick, Langdale, and Young. The second disputation was carried on between Dr Glin on the Romish side, and Grindall, Perne, Gest, and Pilkington on the other. In the third Perne contended against Parker, Pollard, Vavisor or Vavasour, and Young.

After three days' disputations, Dr Ridley who had occasionally assisted the disputants against transubstantiation delivered the determination or judgment subjoined.

THE DETERMINATION
OF
DOCTOR NICHOLAS RIDLEY,
BISHOP OF ROCHESTER,
UPON THE DISPUTATIONS, &c.

THERE hath been an ancient custom amongst you, that after disputations had in your common schools, there should be some determination made of the matters so disputed and debated, especially touching Christian religion. Because therefore it hath seemed good unto these worshipful assistants joined with me in commission from the King's majesty, that I should perform the same at this time; I will by your favourable patience declare, both what I do think and believe myself, and what also others ought to think of the same. Which thing I would that afterward ye did with diligence weigh and ponder, every man at home severally by himself.

The determination of Dr Nic. Ridley upon the disputations.

The principal grounds, or rather head springs of this matter are specially five.

The first is the authority, majesty, and verity of holy Scripture.

Five principal grounds to take away transubstantiation.

The second is the most certain testimonies of the ancient catholic Fathers, who, after my judgment, do sufficiently declare this matter.

The third is the definition of a Sacrament.

The fourth is the abominable heresy of Eutyches, that may ensue of transubstantiation.

The fifth is the most sure belief of the article of our faith, He ascended into heaven.

The First Ground.

This transubstantiation is clean against the words of the scripture, and consent of the ancient catholic fathers. The

Transubstantiation against the Scripture.

scripture saith: "I will not drink hereafter of this fruit of the vine, &c." Now the fruit of this vine is wine. And it is manifest that Christ spake these words after the supper was finished, as it appeareth both in Matthew, Mark, and also in Luke, if they be well understood. There be not many places of scripture that do confirm this thing, neither is it greatly material; for it is enough if there be any one plain testimony for the same. Neither ought it to be measured by the number of scriptures, but by the authority, and by the verity of the same. And the majesty of this verity is as ample in one short sentence of the scripture, as in a thousand.

Scripture to be measured not by number but by authority.

Moreover, Christ took bread, he brake bread, he gave bread. In the Acts Luke calleth it bread. So Paul calleth it bread after the sanctification. Both of them speak of breaking, which belongeth to the substance of bread, and in no wise to Christ's body, for the scripture saith: "Ye shall not break a bone of him." Christ saith: "Do ye this in my remembrance." Saint Paul also saith: "Do ye this in my remembrance." And again: "As often as ye shall drink of this cup, do it in remembrance of me." And our Saviour Christ, in the 6th of John, speaking against the Capernaïtes, saith: "Labour for the meat that perisheth not." And when they asked, "What shall we do that we may work the works of God?" he answered them thus: "This is the work of God, that ye believe in him whom he hath sent." You see how he exhorted them to faith, for faith is that work of God. Again, "This is the bread which came down from heaven." But Christ's body came not down from heaven. Moreover: "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. My flesh (saith he) is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed." When they heard this, they were offended. And whilst they were offended, he said unto them: "What if ye shall see the son of man ascend up where he was before?" Whereby he went about to draw them from the gross and carnal eating. This body, saith he, shall ascend up into heaven, meaning altogether, as St Augustine saith: "It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I speak unto you, are spirit and life, and must be spiritually understood." These be the reasons which persuade me to incline to this sentence and judgment.

Exod. xii.

1 Cor. xi.

John vi.

Ibid.

Ibid.

Ibid.

The Second Ground.

Now my second ground against this transubstantiation are the ancient fathers a thousand years past. And so far off is it that they do confirm this opinion of transubstantiation, that plainly they seem unto me both to think and to teach the contrary.

The second ground against transubstantiation, viz. by the Fathers.

Dionysius¹ in many places calleth it bread. The places are so manifest and plain, that it needeth not to recite them.

Dionys. in Eccle. Hierar.

Ignatius to the Philadelphians saith: "I beseech you, brethren, cleave fast unto one faith, and to one kind of preaching, using together one manner of thanksgiving: for the flesh of the Lord Jesus is one, and his blood is one which was shed for us. There is also one bread broken for us, and one cup of the whole church²."

Ignatius ad Philadelph.

Irenæus writeth thus: "Even as the bread that cometh of the earth receiving God's vocation is now no more common bread, but sacramental bread, consisting of two natures, earthly and heavenly; even so our bodies, receiving the Eucharist, are now no more corruptible, having hope of the resurrection³."

Irenæus, lib. iv. cap. 34.

Tertullian is very plain, for he calleth it a figure of the body, &c.⁴

Tertullianus.

[¹ Dionysius, Pseudo-Areopagita, wrote about A.D. 365, Cave. Ed.]

[² Παρακαλῶν ὑμᾶς μιᾷ πίστει καὶ ἐν κηρύγματι καὶ μιᾷ εὐχαριστίᾳ χρῆσθαι. μία γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ σὰρξ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἐν αὐτοῦ τὸ αἷμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐκχυθέν· εἰς καὶ ἄρτος τοῖς πᾶσι ἐθρύφη, καὶ ἐν ποτήριον τοῖς ὅλοις διενεμήθη, ἐν θυσιαστήριον πάση τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. S. Ignat. Ep. ad Philad. Op. Ed. Lond. Voss. 1680, p. 176. Ed.]

[³ Ὡς γὰρ ἀπὸ γῆς ἄρτος, προσλαμβάνομενος τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, οὐκέτι κοινὸς ἄρτος ἐστίν, ἀλλ' εὐχαριστία ἐκ δύο πραγμάτων συνεστηκυῖα, ἐπιγείου τε καὶ οὐρανίου, οὕτως καὶ τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν, μεταλαμβάνοντα τῆς εὐχαριστίας, μηκέτι εἰσὶν φθαρτὰ, τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς εἰς αἰῶνας ἀναστάσεως ἔχοντα. S. Iren. cont. Heres. lib. iv. cap. 18. (ant. ord. 34.) Ed. Ben. Par. 1710, p. 251. Ed.]

[⁴ Sic enim Deus in Evangelio quoque vestro revelavit, panem corpus suum appellans: ut et hinc jam eum intelligas corporis sui figuram pani dedisse. Tert. adv. Marcion. lib. iii. Op. Ed. Rigalt. Paris, 1641, p. 493-4. Ed.]

Chrysost. ad
Casarium.

Chrysostom writing to Cæsarius the monk, albeit he be not received of divers, yet will I read the place to fasten it more deeply in your minds: for it seemeth to shew plainly the substance of bread to remain. The words are these:

“Before the bread is sanctified, we name it bread: but by the grace of God sanctifying the same through the ministry of the priest, it is delivered from the name of bread, and is counted worthy to bear the name of the Lord’s body, although the very substance of bread notwithstanding do still remain therein, and now is taken not to be two bodies, one body of the Son, &c.”¹”

Cyprian, lib.
i. epist. 6.

Cyprian saith: “Bread is made of many grains. And is that natural bread, and made of wheat? Yea, it is so in deed².”

Theodore-
tus.

The book of Theodoret, in Greek, was lately printed at Rome, which if it had not been his, it should not have been set forth there, especially seeing it is directly against transubstantiation: for he saith plainly, that bread still remaineth after the sanctification³.

Gelasius in
Epist. de
dubus na-
turis in
Christo.

Gelasius also is very plain in this manner. “The sacrament (saith he) which we receive of the body and blood of Christ, is a divine matter: by reason whereof we are made partakers by the same of the divine nature, and yet it ceaseth not still to be the substance of bread and wine. And certes, the representation and similitude of the body and blood of Christ be celebrated in the action of the mysteries, &c.”⁴”

After this he
recited cer-
tain places
out of Au-
gustine and
Cyril, which
were not
noted.
Hesych.
Comment.
in Levit. lib.
ii. cap. 8.

Hesychius also confesseth that it is bread⁵.

[¹ ³ ⁴ See Treatise on Transubstantiation. Ed.]

[² Quo et ipso sacramento populus noster ostenditur adunatus, ut quemadmodum grana multa in unum collecta et commolita et commixta panem unum faciunt, sic in Christo qui est panis celestis unum sciamus esse corpus, cui conjunctus sit noster numerus et adunatus. S. Cyp. Epist. ad Cæcil. Ordo novus LXIII. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. 1726, p. 108. Ed.]

[⁵ Quomodo ergo in his non admiranda sit sapientia Spiritus? nullam quippe dubietatem hujusmodi intellectui dereliquit; propterea carnes cum panibus comedi præcipiens, ut nos intelligeremus, illud ab eo mysterium dici quod simul panis et caro est, sicut corpus Christi, panis vivi qui de cælo descendit. Hesychius, Comment. in Levit. lib. ii. cap. 8, Op. Ed. Basil. 1527, p. 49. c. Ed.]

Also the judgment of Bertram in this matter is very plain and manifest. And thus much for the second ground. Bertram.

The Third Ground.

The third ground is the nature of the sacrament, which consisteth in three things, that is, Unity, Nutrition, and Conversion. The Third ground. Three things in a sacrament. 1. Unity. 2. Nutrition. 3. Conversion. Cyprian.

As touching unity, Cyprian thus writeth: “Even as of many grains is made one bread, so are we one mystical body of Christ.” Wherefore bread must needs still remain, or else we destroy the nature of a sacrament.

Also they that take away nutrition, which cometh by bread, do take away likewise the nature of the sacrament. For as the body of Christ nourisheth the soul, even so doth bread likewise nourish the body of man.

Therefore they that take away the grains or the union of the grains in the bread, and deny the nutrition or substance thereof, in my judgment are Sacramentaries: for they take away the similitude between the bread and the body of Christ. For they which affirm transubstantiation are indeed right Sacramentaries and Capernaïtes.

As touching conversion (that like as the bread which we receive, is turned into our substance, so are we turned into Christ’s body), Rabanus⁶ and Chrysostom⁷ are witnesses sufficient. Conversion. Rabanus. Chrysostom.

The Fourth Ground.

They which say that Christ is carnally present in the Eucharist, do take from him the verity of man’s nature. The Fourth ground. The real presence in the sacrament standeth not with the truth of Christ’s humanity.

[⁶ Rabanus Maurus de Sermonis Proprietate. The work itself is lost, and is not noticed by Cave; but Gesner in his “Bibliotheca” mentions two persons who had it in their possession in MS. Flacius Illyricus must have had access to it, for he quotes the very passage to which Ridley most probably refers; the words of Rabanus are, “Sacramentum in alimentum corporis redigitur: sicut ergo illud [sacramentum] in nos convertitur cum id manducamus et bibimus, sic et nos in corpus Christi convertimur cum obedenter et pie vivimus.” Flacius Illyricus refers this to the fifth book and second chapter of the above-mentioned work. Rabanus Maurus was Abbot of Fulda, and died A.D. 856. Ed.]

[⁷ See notes to Disputations, infra. Ed.]

Eutyches granted the divine nature in Christ, but his human nature he denied. So they that defend transubstantiation ascribe that to the human nature, which only belongeth to the divine nature.

The Fifth Ground.

The Fifth ground.

The fifth ground is the certain persuasion of this article of faith, "He ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand, &c."

August. super Ioan. Tract. 30.

Augustine saith: "The Lord is above, even to the end of the world; but yet the verity of the Lord is here also. For his body wherein he rose again, must needs be in one place, but his verity is spread abroad every where¹."

Tract. 50.

Also, in another place he saith: "Let the godly receive also that sacrament, but let them not be careful (speaking there of the presence of his body².) For as touching his majesty, his providence, his invisible and unspeakable grace, these words are fulfilled which he spake, 'I am with you unto the end of the world.' But according to the flesh which he took upon him, according to that which was born of the Virgin, was apprehended of the Jews, was fastened to a tree, taken down again from the cross, lapped in linen clothes, was buried and rose again, and appeared after his resurrection, so you shall not have me always with you. And why? because that as concerning his flesh he was conversant with his disciples forty days, and they accompanying him, seeing him, but not following him, he went up into heaven, and is not here, for he sitteth at the right hand of his Father, and yet he is here, because he is not departed hence, as concerning the presence of his divine majesty³."

Matth. xxviii.

Mark and consider well what St Augustine saith: "He is ascended into heaven, and is not here," saith he. Believe

[¹ Sursum est Dominus: sed etiam hic est veritas Domini. Corpus enim Domini in quo resurrexit, uno loco esse potest: veritas ejus ubique diffusa est. S. Aug. in Johan. Evan. Tract. xxx. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. 1685, tom. iii. col. 517. Ed.]

[² Accipiunt hoc et boni, sed non sint solliciti: loquebatur enim de presentia corporis sui. S. Aug. in Johan. Evan. Tract. l. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. 1685, tom. iii. col. 633-4. Ed.]

[³ See Treatise on Transubstantiation. Ed.]

not them therefore which say, that he is here still in the earth.

Moreover, "Doubt not (saith the same Augustine) but that Jesus Christ, as concerning the nature of his manhood, is there from whence he shall come. And remember well and believe the profession of a Christian man, that he rose from death, ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of his Father, and from that place and none other (not from the altars) shall he come to judge the quick and the dead, and he shall come, as the angel said, as he was seen to go into heaven; that is to say, in the same form and substance, unto the which he gave immortality, but changed not nature. After this form (meaning his human nature) we may not think that it is every where⁴."

August. Epist. 57.

And in the same epistle he saith: "Take away from the bodies limitation of places, and they shall be no where: and because they are no where, they shall not be at all⁵."

August. Ibid.

Vigilius saith: "If the word and the flesh be both of one nature, seeing that the word is every where, why then is not the flesh also every where? For when it was in earth, then verily it was not in heaven: and now when it is in heaven, it is not surely in earth. And it is so certain, that it is not in earth, that as concerning the same we look for him from heaven, whom, as concerning the word, we believe to be with us in earth⁶."

Vigilius contra Eutychen. lib. iv.

[⁴ Noli itaque dubitare ibi nunc esse hominem Christum Jesum, unde venturus est, memoriterque recole et fideliter tene Christianam confessionem, quoniam resurrexit a mortuis, adscendit in cœlum, sedet ad dexteram Patris, nec aliunde quam inde venturus est ad vivos mortuosque judicandos. Et sic venturus est, illa angelica voce testante, quem-admodum ire visus est in cœlum, id est, in eadem carnis forma atque substantia; cui profecto immortalitatem dedit, naturam non abstulit. S. Aug. Ep. ad Dard. (Ordo novus clxxxvii.) Op. Ed. Ben. Par. 1685, tom. ii. col. 681. Ed.]

[⁵ Nam spatia locorum tolle corporibus, nusquam erunt; et quia nusquam erunt, nec erunt. Ib. col. 683. Ed.]

[⁶ Deinde si verbi et carnis una natura est, quomodo cum verbum ubique sit, non ubique inveniatur et caro? namque quando in terrâ fuit, non erat utique in cœlo, et nunc quia in cœlo est, non est utique in terrâ; et in tantum non est, ut secundum ipsam Christum spectemus venturum de cœlo, quem secundum verbum nobiscum esse credimus in terrâ. Vigil. cont. Eutych. Tiguri, 1539, p. 73. Ed.]

Also, the same Vigilus saith: "Which things seeing they be so, the course of the scripture must be searched of us, and many testimonies must be gathered, to shew plainly what a wickedness and sacrilege it is to refer those things to the property of the divine nature, which do only belong to the nature of the flesh; and contrariwise, to apply those things unto the nature of the flesh, which do properly belong to the divine nature¹." Which thing the transubstantiators do, whilst they affirm Christ's body not to be contained in any one place, and ascribe that to his humanity, which properly belongeth to his divinity: as they do which will have Christ's body to be in no one certain place limited.

The Third conclusion.

Now, in the latter conclusion concerning the sacrifice, because it dependeth upon the first, I will in few words declare what I think. For if we did once agree in that, the whole controversy in the other would soon be at an end. Two things there be which do persuade me that this conclusion is true: that is, certain places of the scripture, and also certain testimonies of the fathers.

Heb. ix.

Sacrifice of Christ's body.

St Paul saith, "Christ being become an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is, not of this building, neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, entered once into the holy place, and obtained for us eternal redemption, &c. and now in the end of the world he hath appeared once to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself."

Heb. x.

And again: "Christ was once offered to take away the sins of many." Moreover he saith: "With one offering hath he made perfect for ever those that are sanctified."

Christ never offered but once.

These scriptures do persuade me to believe that there is no other oblation of Christ, (albeit I am not ignorant there are many sacrifices) but that which was once made upon the cross.

August. ad Bonif. Epist. 23.

The testimonies of the ancient fathers which confirm the same, are out of Augustine ad Bonifac. Epist. 23. Again in

[¹ Quæ cum ita sint, series nobis divinarum percurrenda est literarum, et plurima testimonia congerenda, quibus demonstratur, quam sit impium et sacrilegum ea, quæ sunt propria carnis Christi, ad naturæ verbi proprietatem referre, et quæ sunt propria verbi, proprietati naturæ carnis adscribere. Id. lib. v. p. 88. Ed.]

his book of Questions, in the 61st Question. Also in his book against Faustus the Manichee, Book xx. Chap. 21. And in the same book against the said Faustus, Chap. 18. thus he writeth: "Now the Christians keep a memorial of the sacrifice past, with a holy oblation and participation of the body and blood of Christ²." Fulgentius in his book *De Fide* calleth the same oblation a commemoration. And these things are sufficient for this time for a scholastical determination of these matters³.

August. Quæst. 61. August. contra Faust. lib. xx. cap. 18.

[² Unde jam Christiani peracti ejusdem sacrificii memoriam celebrant sacrosanctâ oblatione et participatione corporis et sanguinis Christi. S. Aug. cont. Faust. lib. xx. cap. 18. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. 1685, tom. ix. col. 345. Ed.]

[³ The other passages from St Augustine are to be found in the notes to the Treatise on Transubstantiation: see pp. 39, 40, 41. Ed.]

JUDICIUM DE EPISTOLIS DECRETALIBUS.

Nicolai Ridlei episcopi Londinensis iudicium de epistolis decretalibus, sc. Clementis, Anacleti, Lucii, Pontiani, et aliorum vetustissimorum pontificum.

E MSS. Bibl. Coll. Emm. apud Cantab.

Ego sane censeo esse supposititias et ab impostoribus subornatas, ut crederentur falso esse patrum decreta—nec possum adduci ut credam quæ citantur ex decretalibus epistolis Gelasii et Vigili et [*aliorum*] Pontificum Romanorum, esse vere illorum. Nunquam credam tam doctos viros tantopere delirasse, ut Petrum Cephaz dictum dicerent quia esset caput, quod Cephaz caput significaret. Et Jacobum mortuum esse constat priusquam Clemens in sede Romanâ constitutus est. Multaque præterea illic scribuntur, quæ ab illius temporis conditione prorsus sunt alienissima. In unâ epistolâ, sicut memini, dicitur, quòd, sicut uxor ob nullam viri culpam potest virum deserere, ita nunquam ecclesia potest deponere suum episcopum propter ulla crimina, &c.

Et doctrina talis multa est in illis, quæ, collata cum classicis scriptoribus et veteribus, facile meo iudicio ostendit illas non esse istorum pontificum Romanorum, qui fuerunt viri doctissimi et sanctissimi. Hæc ego respondenda esse censeo Bradfondo meo ad suam quæstionem de autoritate harum epistolarum.

De phrasi in epistolis ascriptis Pontiano, in quâ dicitur, “Presbyteri ore conficiunt corpus Christi”, nihil est quod quemcunque offendat, si more veterum intelligatur verbum: ita enim loquitur Hieronymus; “Absit ut aliquid mali suspicietur de iis qui ore sacro dominicum corpus conficiunt¹.”

[¹ The following passage was probably that to which Ridley referred, “Absit ut de his [clericis] quidquam sinistrum loquar, quia Apostolico

“Conficere corpus Domini” illis nihil aliud erat quam conficere sacramentum corporis Domini, quæ pars erat ministerii nostri Domini; nam qui ministrabant verbum Dei, iidem et panem perpetuo frangebant, et ut Tertullianus² ait, antiquitus “non nisi de præsentium manu panem dominicum sumere consueverunt,” hoc est, non [*nisi*] ab illis sanctificatum. Et quod ad honorem presbyterorum pertinet, si modò tales essent quales esse deberent, qui et in verbo et doctrinâ laborarent, quales multos fuisse in illo tempore valde est credibile, status est vere venerabilem et honorabilem virorum.

Paulus,
Act. ii.
Act. xx.

gradui succedentes, Christi corpus sacro ore conficiunt, per quos et nos Christiani sumus. S. Hieron. Epist. 5. ad. Heliodorum Monachum. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. tom. iv. pars 2. p. 10. Ed.]

[² The words of Tertullian are: “Eucharistiæ sacramentum et in tempore victus, et omnibus mandatum a Domino, etiam antelucanis cætibz, nec de aliorum manu quam præsentium sumimus.” De Corona, cap. 8. Op. Rigalt. Paris, 1641. p. 121. Ed.]

A JUDGEMENT CONCERNING THE DECRETAL EPISTLES.

From the MSS. in the Library of Emmanuel Coll. Camb.

[The Judgement of Nicholas Ridley, Bishop of London, concerning the decretal epistles, to wit, those of Clement, Anacletus, Lucius, Pontianus, and other most ancient pontiffs.

I fully believe them to be supposititious and suborned by impostors, that they might falsely be deemed to be the decrees of the fathers. Nor can I be induced to believe those passages which are cited from the decretal epistles of Gelasius and Vigilius, and of [other] Roman pontiffs, to be truly theirs. I will never believe such learned men so to have raved, as to say that Peter was called Cephias because he was the head, for that Cephias signifies "head." And it is evident that James was dead before Clement was appointed to the Roman see. And many other things besides are there written which are altogether inconsistent with the circumstances of that period. In one epistle it is asserted, as I remember, that as a wife may not on account of any fault in her husband desert her husband, so neither could a Church, on account of any crimes, depose her Bishop.

And much of such doctrine is there in them, which, when compared with the old and classical writers, shews them easily, in my judgement, not to be the works of those Roman Pontiffs, who were most learned and holy men. Thus then do I think it well to answer my Bradford's question concerning the authority of these epistles.

As to the phrase in the epistles ascribed to Pontianus, in which it is said, "the priests with their mouth make [*conficiunt*] the body of Christ",—there is nothing which can offend any body, if the word be understood after the usage of the ancients—for so also speaks Jerome: "Let there be

no evil suspected of those who by their sacred mouth make [*conficiunt*] the Lord's body [*corpus dominicum*]. For with them to make [*conficere*] the body of the Lord, was no other than to make [*conficere*] the sacrament of the Lord's body, which was a part of the ministry of our Lord; for they who ministered the word of God, the same also perpetually broke bread—and as Tertullian says, "anciently they were not accustomed to receive the bread of the Lord save from the hands of those presiding over them—i. e. unless it had been sanctified by them." St Paul, Acts ii. xx.

And as to what concerns the honour of the priests, if only they were, as they ought to be, men who laboured both in the word and in doctrine, such as in that period it is highly credible that many were, [*then*] is it truly the position of venerable and honourable men. ED.]
