

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE



3 1761 07096545 4



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation





VW. 12

THE IRISH

ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD,

A Monthly Journal,

CONDUCTED BY A SOCIETY OF CLERGYMEN,
UNDER EPISCOPAL SANCTION.

VOL. IX.

“ Ut Christiani ita et Romani sitis.”

“ As you are children of Christ, so be you children of Rome.”

Ex Dictis S. Patricii, Book of Armagh, fol. 9.

DUBLIN:

WILLIAM B. KELLY, 8, GRAFTON-STREET,
AND 4, LOWER ORMOND-QUAY.

LONDON: BURNS & OATES, 17, PORTMAN-STREET, W.
NEW YORK, UNITED STATES: P. M. HAVERTY, 1, BARCLAY-ST.

Imprimatur,

✠ PAULUS CARDINALIS CULLEN,
Archiepiscopus Dublinensis.

Die 1^o Octobris, 1873.

ALPHABETICAL INDEX.

	PAGE
Alphonsus de Liguori, St., Vindication of the Moral Doctrine of	334, 380, 418
Ancient Philosophy; or, the Enchiridion of Epictétus	389
Apostleship of Prayer, Indulgences granted to the	428
A Visit to the Hamlet of Bois d'Haine in the Summer of 1872	65
A Word on Communism	547
Ballerini, Father, S. J., on Moral Theology	521
Blaitmaic, Saint, of Iona, Martyr	502
Bull of Pope Adrian the Fourth	49
Burke, Edmund: His Life and Times	97, 145
Camin, St., of Inisceltra, On a Manuscript written by	241
Catholicity and Protestantism, the Future of	23
Church History, Notes from	471
Church, The, and "Modern Thought"	494, 533
Clerical Friends, My	437
Conferences in the Prison at York with F. Walpole, S. J.	399
Darwinism—"The Descent of Man"	337
Decrees of the Councils of Trent and of the Vatican on the Holy Scriptures	508
Devotion to the Sacred Heart	388
DOCUMENTS:—	
Letter of the Cardinal Archbishop of Dublin to His Holiness	43
Reply (and Translation) of His Holiness	44, 45
Letter of Cardinal Antonelli to Monsignor Kirby	46
Ex Secretaria Brevium	46
Decree of the S. Congregation of the Index, 23rd Sept., 1872	94
Pastoral Address of the Archbishops and Bishops to the Clergy and People of the Catholic Church in Ireland, A.D. 1832.. ..	142
Allocution of His Holiness, Dec. 23, 1872	233
The White Scapular of the Sacred Heart	237
Acta Sanctae Sedis	238
Decretum S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, Feb. 5, 1873	240
The Irish Bishops to His Holiness the Pope, 22nd Jan., 1873, and Reply of His Holiness	278, 282
The Irish Bishops to the Bishops of the German Empire, and Reply of the Archbishop of Cologne	283, 287
Sanctissimi in Christo Patris et Domini Nostri Domini Pii Divina Providentia Papae IX., &c., Sept., 1872	326
Indulgences granted to the Apostleship of Prayer	428
Magna supplicia a Persecutoribus aliquot Catholicorum in Hiber- nia sumpta	430
Referring to a Triduum of Public Prayers, August, 1873	482
Allocution of His Holiness, 25th July, 1873	531
Address to Catholic Hierarchy from Generals of Religious Orders	578
DÖLLINGER, DR., AND THE DOGMA OF INFALLIBILITY:—	
The Vatican Council	6, 72
Dr. Döllinger's Five Theses	130, 167
Conclusion	362

	PAGE
Dove of the Tabernacle	333
Edmund Burke: His Life and Times {.. .. .	97, 145
Epictetus	389
FitzSimon, Father Henry	15, 78, 187, 272, 430
Future of Protestantism and Catholicity	23
German Empire and the Irish Bishops	283
HARMONY OF THE PASSION :—	
Introduction	319
§ 1. Conspiracy of the Chief Priests	323
§ 2. The Supper in Bethania	368
§ 3. Compact of Judas	378
Dissertation I.—On the Day of the Last Supper	445
Higher, or University Education in Ireland	485
Holycross Abbey	550
Indulgences granted to the Apostleship of Prayer	428
Iona, St. Blaitmaic of	502
IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL COLLEGES SINCE THE REFORMATION :—	
Salamanca	I, 137
Seville	208
Douay	261
Madrid	544
Alcala de Henares	545
Irish Massacre of 1641	289
Letter of Father Ballerini to the Editor of the <i>Univers</i>	521
Life and Times of Edmund Burke	97, 145
Liturgical Questions	427
LOUISE LATEAU :—	
Part I.—A Visit to the Hamlet of Bois d'Haine in the Summer of 1872	65
Part II.—Her Life and its Wonders	115
Part III.—Impossibility of Fraud	176
Moral Theology, by Father Ballerini, S.J.	521
Munchin, St., Patron of Limerick City and Diocese	569
My Clerical Friends	437
Notes from Church History	471
NOTICES OF BOOKS :—	
Devotion to the Sacred Heart	388
Dove of the Tabernacle	333
Vindiciae Alphonsianae	334, 380, 418
On a Manuscript written by St. Camin of Inisceltra	241
Pastoral Letter of Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, Jan., 1873	193
Prerogatives of the Roman Pontiff	404
Protestantism and Catholicity, Future of	23
Question of Higher, or University Education in Ireland	485
Questions concerning the Missa pro Populo	427
Rider, John, D.D., Protestant Bishop of Killaloe	222, 247
Saint Blaitmaic, of Iona, Martyr	502
Salamanca, Irish Ecclesiastical College of	I, 137
Seville,	208
State Papers, Public Record Office	399, 414
Swiss Church, The	479
Triduum of Public Prayers, August, 1873	482
Two Conferences in the Prison at York with Father Walpole, S.J.	399
University, or Higher Education in Ireland	485
Vatican, Decrees of Council of, on the Holy Scriptures	508
Vindiciae Alphonsianae	334, 380, 418
What Protestantism has done for Reason	471
White Scapular of the Sacred Heart	237



THE IRISH
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

OCTOBER, 1872.

IRISH COLLEGES SINCE THE REFORMATION.

THE two interesting notices which have appeared on the Irish Colleges abroad make us conscious of the great blanks in our ecclesiastical history, and make us feel the keenest regret at not knowing something more concerning the men, who, like Stapleton and Carney, served their Church and country in those colleges. Many of them who exercised great influence for good in their generation, and worked with zeal for the welfare of fatherland, dropped into such oblivion that even their names have remained unknown for more than two hundred years. One of these was "the very venerable Father James O'Carney," of the Society of Jesus. Although he cannot well be identified with the Father James Carney mentioned in the July RECORD,¹ he was intimately connected with the Irish College of Salamanca, and, consequently, deserves a passing notice in our sketches of the Irish Colleges of the Continent.

F. Redan or Reade, S.J., in the preface to his Commentary on the Machabees, gives the following account of this distinguished Irishman:—

"I had made up my mind to reject all the favourable judgments of my friends on this Commentary. It is quite clear from the many encomiastic judgments prefixed by other writers to their works, that such things are not so much proofs of the merit of the books as pledges of friendship or marks of fulsome flattery. However, I have made an exception in favour of one anagram, on account of the most singular virtue of its author, whose name is worthy of everlasting remembrance.

"It was discovered without my knowledge among the papers

¹ See RECORD, No. xciv., p. 469—Article by W. M'D.

of the late very venerable Father James O'Carney,¹ and without my knowledge was composed by him when he was reading the manuscript of this volume. Before he had time to report on my book to the Very Rev. F. General, death snatched him away from us. Though not advanced in years he was ripe for heaven, and had given so many and such singular proofs of his religious perfection, that he may justly be numbered among the great ornaments of his country and of our Society.

“He was born at Cashel of very respectable and pious parents. Having received a very solid classical education in his native town, he went to Spain in order to apply himself to those higher studies which English bigotry prohibited in Ireland. He had read philosophy in the Irish College of Compostella, and had already entered on his course of theology here in the Irish College of Salamanca, when he joined the Society in the year 1621. His soul, which seemed formed to virtue, soon rose to the highest perfection, and his singular integrity of life and his brilliant talents shone out with more lustre than before. These rare gifts of nature and grace were crowned by great humility. He said in all seriousness, that one of his reasons for entering the Society was, that, on account of the great number of its learned men, he might lie hid and devote himself to the lowlier functions of the service of God.

“However, he surpassed all his schoolfellows, and he defended the theological theses which only the leading theologians are chosen to defend. He sustained them first in the College of Valledolid, and afterwards before a crowded audience in the University of Salamanca. On both occasions he distinguished himself by his acumen, his dexterity, and the modesty of his words and bearing. One of the doctors of the University who argued against him, and who was not very well affected towards the Society, said: ‘I admire the genius of this Jesuit, but I admire his modesty still more.’ F. O'Carney had such absolute command over his temper and his tongue, that the heat of discussion did not wrest a hasty word, or look, or gesture from him; so careful was he in the practice of all virtues, and in the observance of even the minutest rules, that he was called a St. Aloysius Gonzaga, and was looked on as a model and mirror of religious discipline.

“This good father was worthy of admiration, not only in his scholastic career, but in all the acts of his life. During the two years previous to his death he resided in the College of Compostella as spiritual director. With the exception of those two years, his whole life was spent in governing the Irish

¹ I translate *Karnæus*, O'Carney, as I know that James's kinsman, Barnabas Karnæus, was called Bryan O'Carney.

College of Salamanca, of which he was not only the President, but *the preserver*. Most assuredly he saved it from ruin more than once. In most difficult times and most trying circumstances, he received from God greater aid than is given according to His ordinary Providence. How great was his love for God and his neighbour, how great was his passion for prayer and mortification, how mild he was to others, and how hard towards himself, and with what untiring efforts he struggled towards perfection, it were hard to tell; and all that will, doubtless, be treated of at full length by another writer.

“He was an indefatigable workman, assiduous in hearing confessions; an admirable director of consciences, and such a master of spiritual life, that he conducted many souls to a high degree of perfection. He used to attend the sick most frequently and most readily in hospitals, in prisons, and in their homes. He often spent whole nights watching by their death-beds, and preparing them for eternity; and he was so successful in this work of charity, that all whom he attended at their exit from this life, were believed to have died a most happy death. So general was this belief, that there was no one in the whole city who would wish to die without the consoling presence of F. O’Carney.

“However, his zeal was not confined to the city of Salamanca: he preached, catechised, and performed all the other functions of the Society in various towns and villages, in which his burning apostolic zeal was rewarded and crowned by most abundant and happy results for the glory of God and the salvation of souls. While at home in the College, as often and as far as his important duties allowed him, he privately devoted himself to train to piety candidates for Holy Orders or for the Irish Mission. He tried to give them a good practical knowledge of Moral Theology, and he was well qualified for that task, as he had, for some time, professed that faculty with the greatest distinction, and had been all along examiner of the clergy, having been named to that office by Diocesan Synods and by the will of the Archbishops.

“In the midst of so many distracting duties he observed the most watchful care of religious perfection; his heart and soul were always turned tranquilly to God; the composure of his countenance was a mark of the serenity of his soul; his eyes were always modestly cast down; he kept watch and ward over all his words and all his senses, and spent a long time every day in prayer and meditation. In addition to the hour’s meditation, made by every member of the Society, he often gave another hour to prayer before he began his daily work—To the examination of his soul, and to the consideration of

his state before God, he devoted more than half a day every week, and a whole day every month. Every year he spent at least eight days in the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius, during which time he often remained the whole night in earnest prayer, and always meditated for seven hours of the day. At all times he celebrated Mass slowly and most devoutly; but during Retreat, when saying Mass privately, he used to remain two or three hours at the altar. He always recited the Holy Office on bended knees, and with the greatest attention and devotion. Wherever he perceived the Blessed Sacrament exposed, there he remained a long time on his knees, praying, adoring, and immovable.

“His obedience was most prompt, his self-contempt marvellous, his dress poor and usually torn, and his cell without furniture.

“His conscience was unsullied, and far removed from all serious transgression, and this innocence he guarded with the bond of a special vow, which he kept inviolate to his last breath. Very often he took his night’s rest on the ground or on a board; his diet was very sparing, his fasts were frequent. Every day he wore a hair shirt, and took the discipline, and bore round his waist a chain armed with iron hooks and points. He used these and other instruments of penance with such earnestness and sternness that the Superiors were obliged to recommend him to moderate his love for mortification, lest his attenuated frame might sink under the severity of such treatment.

“It is no wonder that a man endowed with such rare talents and virtues was highly esteemed and dearly beloved by all who knew him. As often as the two archbishops visited their dioceses in the exercise of their pastoral office, they took F. O’Carney with them, that they and their clergy might have the advantage of his example, his learning and advice. They were Cardinal Augustin de Spinola, and Archbishop de Andrada y Sotomayor. The latter was very much afflicted at the news of the Father’s impending death, visited him during his illness, and ordered the best medical advice and help to be procured at the expense of His Grace.

“As soon as it became known to the public that his life was in danger, the whole city was filled with incredible consternation, and in some religious houses public prayers were ordered and Masses were offered up for his recovery. Meanwhile he gave, during his illness, fresh proofs of his solid virtue. His sole delight was to speak of heaven, to think of God, and to converse on spiritual things, on death and on the time of his own dissolution, which he looked on as imminent, and looked forward to with longing and a feeling of pleasure. Even on the

first day of his illness, and often afterwards, he foretold that he should soon die and how he should die. Not only so, but five years previously he foretold the time of his death, and even predicted many other things which came to pass. Hence some learned men, who were well acquainted with his many virtues, were persuaded that he was gifted with prophetic light.

“He received the announcement of his approaching death with the greatest gladness, and embraced tenderly the bearer of the good tidings, saying : ‘ Hæc dies quam fecit Dominus exultemus et lætemur in ea.’ Then he eagerly asked the Superior’s leave to receive the Viaticum kneeling on the ground, and then he earnestly asked and obtained the favour of dying on the floor on a mattress. He died, as he had predicted, as calmly as if he were only going asleep. His funeral was attended by the Archbishop, by nearly all the canons of the Apostolic Church, by great numbers of the nobility and gentry, and by crowds of the people, who gave vent to their sorrow by their loud lamentations and their tears. On the day after his burial a solemn Mass and office were celebrated for his soul in our church by the various religious bodies of the town. This excellent man died on the 26th of July, 1648, in the fiftieth year of his age, and the fourteenth after his solemn profession of four vows.”¹

The lucky epigram to which we are indebted for this notice of Father James O’Carney is prefixed to Father Redan’s “*Commentaria in Libros Machabæorum*,” and it runs as follows :—

“PETRUS REDANUS, *i.e.*, RUPES ET NARDUS.

“Rupe quid asperius? Nardo quid olentius? Et tu
 Asper es ut rupes, ut bona nardus oles.
 Asper es ut rupes, dum construis aspera bella,
 Dum recolis palmas, ut bona nardus oles.
 Asper es ut rupes Fidei dum proteris hostes,
 Dumque Fidem servas ut bona nardus oles.
 Asper es ut rupes, vitiis dum pharmaca præbes,
 Componens mores, ut bona nardus oles.
 Asper es ut rupes, patriæ pro nomine pugnans,
 Dum patriam relevas, ut bona nardus oles.
 Asper es ut rupes, dum corripis Antiochistas,
 Dum Macchabæum effers, ut bona nardus oles.
 Nardus es et rupes, ut miscens utile dulci,
 Omne probes punctum scripta tulisse tua.
 Nardus es et rupes, ut Petrus Petra voceris :
 Et mala bella dolens, et bona semper olens.”

E. I. H.

¹ Præfatio to Redan’s *Commentaria on the Machabees*. Operis hujus *Com-
 mendatio anagrammate et epigrammate significata.*

DR. DÖLLINGER AND THE DOGMA OF INFALLIBILITY.¹

BY DR. HERGENRÖTHER, PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY AND CANON
LAW IN THE UNIVERSITY OF WÜRZBURG.

(*Translated from the German.*)

IV.—THE VATICAN COUNCIL.

TO preserve in some degree his profession of Catholicity, Dr. Döllinger is obliged to call in question the œcumenical character of the Vatican Council, manifest as its œcumenicity is, not only from the presence of all those characteristics by which the œcumenicity of a Council is indicated, but also from the express and solemn declarations of the Bishops who took part in its deliberations. Nor is this all. Not satisfied with merely denying the œcumenicity of the Vatican Council, he goes on to institute a comparison between it and the assembly known in ecclesiastical history as the Robber Council of Ephesus, which was condemned by Pope Leo the Great, and the record of the proceedings at which forms one of the most disgraceful chapters in the history of the Eastern Church.

“Of all the Councils,” he says, “recorded in ecclesiastical history, which have at any time been regarded as œcumenical, I know of only one—the Second Council of Ephesus, held in 449—at which the power of those who directed the proceedings of the Council was exercised, as it was in the Council of the Vatican, to prevent a searching examination of the Tradition of the Church. At the Council of Ephesus, known as the Robber Council, this was effected by violence and tyrannical tumult: at the Council of the Vatican the same result was brought about by milder but equally efficacious means—by the Papal Decree prescribing the Order of Procedure to be observed in the Council, by the Pontifical Commission, and by the power of the majority, whose votes precluded the possibility of a systematic and searching examination of the doctrines under discussion.”²

¹ Continued from our July number.

² Even the Protestant controversialist, Hase, has not gone to such lengths as Dr. Döllinger. Treating of the Vatican Council, in the third edition of his Manual, he says:—“We have not been able to regard this Council as specially qualified, on the score either of its composition or of the freedom of its deliberations, for the decision of the questions which were brought before it. But, on the other hand, we have not found in either of these points sufficient reason for denying its œcumenicity. Even the Bishops that formed the opposition took part in all the

It would be interesting to see the parallel between the Robber Council of 449 and the Vatican Council of 1870 developed at greater length. But Dr. Döllinger does not pursue the subject further. He does not allege the existence of "violence and tyrannical tumult" in the Council of the Vatican; although, indeed, some portions of the proceedings of the Council have been represented in that light, and it is set forth in the Nuremberg Protest that "by means of the numerous instruments that are at the Pope's command," "the members of the Council, in deciding a question regarding the Papal prerogatives, acted under" at least "a moral compulsion." However, the author of the Declaration is content with referring to "the Papal Decree regulating the Order of Procedure," "the Pontifical Commission," and "the power of the majority"—"the Papal Decree," which he had assailed last year with all the vigour of a criticism well stocked with weapons borrowed from Jansenist armouries, and which is also expressly referred to in the Nuremberg Protest, as proving the want of freedom in the Council—"the Pontifical Commission" which, as far as regards the Commission on Dogma, the only Commission which had anything to do with the examination of dogmatic questions, was elected by the votes of the Bishops,—and finally, "the power of the majority" who, instead of taking Dr. Döllinger's view, that it was their duty to submit to the minority, ventured to regard it as the duty of the minority to submit to them.

But we are told that "by their votes they precluded the possibility of a systematic and searching examination of the doctrines under discussion." So far from the decrees of the

proceedings of the Council down to the 16th of July, and thus recognised it as being what it professed to be, œcumenical. They absented themselves, it is true, from the session at which the definition of Infallibility was formally and finally approved; but it is by no means necessary, according to the view of œcumenicity hitherto received among Catholics, that all the Bishops of the Church should be present, and should approve the Decrees enacted by the Council: it is necessary only that all should have been summoned to attend. Besides, it must be borne in mind that the session in question was most numerous attended; so much so, that *there have been œcumenical Councils which had not half so many Bishops present during the whole course of their proceedings*. Thus, by absenting themselves, the Bishops opposed to the definition deprived themselves of their most solid grounds of resistance; for, in their absence, *it was adopted by a morally unanimous vote*.

"And, to speak candidly, it must be confessed that apart from the fact of the Council having defined this dogma, there are no grounds on which its œcumenicity can be denied. If the dogma had not been defined, the Bishops of the minority would never have dreamt of denying the authority of the Council. *It is not, then, on account of any formal defect in the constitution or proceedings of the Council that the dogma is rejected, but the œcumenicity of the Council is rejected on account of the dogma which it defined*."—HASE, *Handbuch der Protestantischen Polemik gegen die Römisch-Katholische Kirche*. Leipzig, 1871, pp. 197, et seq.

Vatican Council having been adopted without a due preliminary examination of the doctrines proposed for definition, we should say that no definition of an Œcumenical Council had ever been preceded by a more thorough examination of the defined doctrine. The numerous works written in the period of the old Gallican and Febronian controversies, the prolific literary activity which characterized the years immediately preceding the opening of the Council, and which, of course, could not have failed to arrest the attention of the Bishops, the written "Observations" of the Bishops on the drafts of the decrees proposed for definition, the oral discussion in thirty-six meetings of the Council, at first on the general drift of the definition, and subsequently on its chapters in detail,¹ undoubtedly accomplished more in this respect than had been accomplished at any previous Council.²

But all this must count for nothing. It failed, it seems, to constitute "the most distant approach" to the "free examination" which Dr. Döllinger desiderates: inasmuch as "the immense majority of the Bishops representing the Latin races," were wanting "both in the will and the capacity necessary for justly discriminating between truth on the one hand, and falsehood and lies on the other." They were, it is true, not versed in the criticism of the Döllinger school, nor were they willing to take instruction from his "Reflections" and his two "Dogmatic Essays" in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. This "capacity," no doubt, and this "will," they did not possess.

Dr. Döllinger appeals, in proof of his statement (1) to some works published in Italy, and circulated in Rome—as, for instance, those of the Dominican Bishop of Mondovi, Ghilardi, and (2) to the fact that "hundreds of the Bishops, in advocating the definition of the Pope's Infallibility, were not ashamed to cite the authority of Alphonsus Liguori as unquestionable." This latter statement refers to the memorial criticised on a former occasion by Dr. Döllinger, which was presented to the Council by the Italian Bishops, and in which they quoted the authority of the two Italian Saints, Thomas of Aquin and Alphonsus Liguori. But how can this be regarded as a proof of the statement in support of which Dr. Döllinger now puts it forward? In the first place, whatever inference may be drawn from it in reference to the Italian Bishops, it fails to prove Dr. Döllinger's statement regarding "the immense majority of the Bishops representing the Latin races." In the second place, Dr. Döllinger has not taken into account the other writings of the Italian Bishops: had he done so he

¹ See page 14, *infra*.

² See *Historisch-politische Blätter*, vol. lxvi., pp. 500-26, 557-83, 653-81.

would have discovered grounds for a very different inference. And, thirdly, were not the Bishops fully justified in appealing to the authority of Saint Alphonsus? Purity of faith is an essential condition of canonization, and hence the teaching of the Saints has at all times been looked up to with respect in the Church. For my own part, I am free to confess that I venerate Saint Alphonsus as a saint rather than as a scholar—that the depth of his religious spirit impresses me more than the soundness of his reasoning; but, surely, I am not on this account to set aside his teaching as of no authority in matters regarding the faith of the Church.

As regards Saint Thomas, Dr. Döllinger repeats the assertion which he made on a former occasion,¹ and which has also been made by Father Gratry,² “that Thomas was led astray by a long chain of fabricated texts, and when treating this question, relies, in fact, on such forgeries *alone, never in a single instance* quoting in support of his doctrine a genuine passage from the Fathers or Councils of the Church.” And then, after referring to a work published in Rome, which he cites as evidence of the commotion occasioned by his exposure of the defective character of the evidence on which St. Thomas relied, he goes on to say that incumbent as it was on his opponents to disprove his allegations, they have never done so. He does not make the slightest reference to the fact that those allegations have been disproved repeatedly in various writings and speeches, and that the following points have been clearly established in opposition to his statements:—(1) St. Thomas, in his great work, the *Summa*, puts forward as his principal argument a proof, *ex ratione theologica*, which does not in any way depend upon quotations, fabricated or genuine. And, undoubtedly, this main proof has never yet been refuted. (2) In the Treatise against the errors of the Greeks, St. Thomas quotes, along with texts of unquestionable authenticity, such as the passages from the works of Pope Innocent I., and from the acts of the Council of Chalcedon, some others which he ascribes to St. Cyril, but which are not to be found in the works of that Saint: it must, however, be borne in mind that many of St. Cyril’s works, especially his exegetical³ and doctrinal writings, have been lost,⁴ and that

¹ *Erwägungen*, n. 26, page 17. And see *Janus*, p. 285, et seq.

² Père Gratry’s misstatements have long since met with the most complete refutation at the hands both of French and of other writers—Mgr. Dechamps, Archbishop of Mechlin, Père Ramière, and others. An example of his inaccurate quotations from Saint Thomas may be seen in *Hist.-pol. Blätter*, p. 568.

³ St. Cyril is said to have written a Commentary on the entire Bible. CASSIODORUS, *Praef. de Instit. Div. Liter.* NICEPH. CALL., H.E., xiv., 14.

⁴ FESSLER, *Instit. Patrolog.*, vol. ii., n. 339, p. 564, et seq.

while the extant editions represent those passages as spurious, no extant edition has any pretension to completeness. (3) The place of the texts in question might have been supplied by others not less cogent, of whose authenticity no doubt can be entertained. (4) St. Bonaventure, the contemporary of St. Thomas, lays down the same doctrine of Papal Infallibility without relying upon any of these spurious texts; and before the time of St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure this doctrine was widely spread through the schools of theology. (5) St. Thomas relies also upon texts of Scripture; nor was he the first to interpret them in the sense which he ascribes to them: he merely followed, in this matter, the teaching of the most renowned doctors who had gone before him.

Dr. Döllinger goes on to express his opinion, that although the "systematic and searching examination" desired by him "would undoubtedly have brought to light unpleasant and compromising truths";¹ it would have saved the Church from an "embarrassment which your Excellency [the Archbishop], as well as I myself, must regard as deplorable." The "embarrassment," deplorable as it may be, is not without its good results: it has become a test of faith for thousands; it has drawn a broad line of distinction between those, on the one hand, who are devoted to the Catholic cause, not in words alone but in deed, who will not run the risk of making shipwreck of the faith by a blind adherence to the teaching of a philosophy which they foolishly imagine to be an unerring guide, who are proof against the artifices described by St. Irenæus and employed by every heretic from the days of Irenæus down to our own time, who are Catholics not merely in name but in spirit and in sentiment, in the inheritance of the manly courage, and of the unfailing constancy of their martyred forefathers, and those, on the other hand, who, shaken like reeds by every wind of human teaching and of human error, find themselves involved, day after day, in some fresh contradiction.

That the Council of the Vatican was free, the German Bishops have already testified in the most express terms. Does Dr. Döllinger, then, who was not in Rome during the Council, and whose only sources of information are the items of news supplied by his satellites, and the gossip of the *salons*, as reported by Lord Acton, quarrel with the testimony of those who were not only present, but who took part in the various proceedings of the Council? No; but he has recourse to the two-fold

¹ As we were persistently informed in the "Letters from Rome on the Council," which were published in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* from December, 1869, to June, 1870.

expedient of (1) assuming to know only of the testimony of a single prelate, his own Archbishop, to whom this letter of his is addressed, and of (2) diminishing the weight of this testimony by representing it as not really signifying all that is conveyed by the language in which it is expressed:—"If, however, it be maintained by your Excellency that the Vatican Council enjoyed perfect freedom, the word 'free' must be used by you in a sense which has not hitherto been attached to it in theological circles."

The Archbishop, of course, being altogether outside "theological circles," does not know the true meaning of the word! Dr. Döllinger's explanation of it is subjoined:—"A Council is free, in the theological sense of the word, when a free investigation and discussion of every view and of every difficulty which is put forward, has taken place, facilities being afforded for proposing difficulties which are afterwards examined according to the rules sanctioned by the Tradition of the Church."

I regret to be obliged to find fault with this *ex cathedra* exposition, on the score of its being put forward without limitation or restriction, the manner in which the necessity of a free "investigation and discussion" is laid down being especially defective in point of scientific clearness. I shall meet it by making good the following statements:—

(1) No Council has ever entered upon an examination "of every view and of every difficulty" against the doctrines proposed for definition: nor would it be possible to do so. We should not, to the present day, have had the definitions regarding the Trinity and the Incarnation, which were adopted in the first Œcumenical Councils, nor the Canon of Scripture, as fixed by the Council of Trent, if it had been necessary to examine in those Councils "every view and every difficulty" proposed in reference to those definitions: down to our own time difficulties are urged against the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation, and against the authority of the deuterocanonical books of the Old Testament. The solution of these difficulties is furnished, no doubt, by the theological and biblical science of our day: but then, if any difficulties against the definitions of the Vatican Council still remained, why should we not be justified in looking forward with confident expectation to their gradual disappearance before the future researches of those who are engaged in the study of the ecclesiastical sciences? As a general rule, the faith of the Church is developed with greater rapidity than theological science: *scientia sequitur fidem non præcedit*,¹ and, as the Fathers have fre-

¹ CLEM. ALEX. *Strom. Lib. vii.*, n. 10: p. 864, Ed. Potter; Cf. *Lib. ii.*, n. 2, 4, pp. 432-7. CYRILL. ALEX. *Lib. vii.*, *Adv. Jul.*, pp. 247, 443: *In Isai. Lib.*, v.,

quently declared,¹ the scientific defence of a truth is usually called forth by the necessity of defending it when it is assailed. To the General Councils of the Church, and, in general, the same is true of all the Church's definitions, we look only for the rule which is to regulate our faith ;² the scientific defence of the defined doctrine must be sought elsewhere : the two things are plainly distinct ; and to confound them, as is done so persistently in this Protest of Dr. Döllinger, is plainly inadmissible.

Reserving for the next number of the RECORD the remainder of this section of Dr. Hergenröther's pamphlet, I subjoin an extract from the Pastoral Letter of the Archbishop of Westminster on the Vatican Council and its Definitions.³ It is little more than a simple narrative of the actual proceedings of the Council. But it triumphantly refutes the charges so recklessly made by Dr. Döllinger and his adherents ; and as it deals with the subject of this portion of Dr. Hergenröther's essay, entering however more fully into details, it will not be regarded as an inappropriate conclusion to this paper.

"I will endeavour," writes his Grace, "briefly to sketch the outline of the Council. . . . As I was enabled to attend, with the exception of about three or four days, every session of the Council, *eighty-nine in number*, from the opening to the close, I can give testimony, not upon hearsay, but as a personal witness of what I narrate.

"I should hardly have spoken of the outward conduct of the Council, if I had not seen, with surprise and indignation, statements purporting to be descriptions of scenes of violence and disorder in the course of its discussions. Having from my earliest remembrance been a witness of public assemblies of all kinds, and especially of those among ourselves, which for gravity and dignity are supposed to exceed all others, I am able and bound to say that *I have never seen such calmness, self-respect, mutual forbearance, courtesy, and self-control, as in the eighty-nine sessions of the Vatican Council.*

p. 740, Lib. iv., Or. i., p. 566, Lib. iv. *In Joh.* p. 393, Ed. Auberti. THEODORET. *Serm. i. De Fide.* Opp. iv., 479. Ed. Sismond. AMBROSIUS. *De Abraham.* Lib. i., cap. iii., n. 21. *In Psalm 118*, serm. 9, n. 12. AUGUSTINUS. *De Utilitate Credendi*, cap. ix., n. 21 ; cap. x., n. 24 ; cap. xi., n. 25. *De Trin.* xv. 2.

¹ AUGUST. *De Civit. Dei*, Lib. xvi., cap. 2, *De Vera Relig.* cap. v., n. 10. ORIGEN. *Cont. Celsum*, iii., 13. *In Num.* Hom. 9.

² "Neque enim est alia Conciliorum faciendorum utilitas, quam ut quod intellectu non capimus, ex auctoritate credamus." FACUND. HERMIAN. *Defensio Trium Capit.* Lib. v., cap. 5.

³ *The Vatican Council and its Definitions* : A Pastoral Letter to the Clergy, by Henry Edward Archbishop of Westminster. London, 1870.

“The descriptions of violence, outcries, menace, denunciation, and even of personal collisions, with which certain newspapers deceived the world, I can affirm to be calumnious falsehoods, fabricated to bring the Council into odium and contempt.”¹

After some further remarks to the same effect, Dr. Manning goes on to describe as follows, the mode in which discussions were conducted in the Council :—

“The mode of conducting the discussions afforded the amplest liberty of debate.

“The subject matter was distributed in print to every Bishop, and a period of eight or ten days was given for any observations they might desire to make in writing.

“These observations were carefully considered by the Deputation of twenty-four ; and when found to be pertinent, were admitted either to modify or to reform the original Schema.

“The text so amended was then proposed for the general discussion, on which every Bishop in the Council had a free right to speak, and the discussions lasted so long as any Bishop was pleased to inscribe his name.

“The only limit upon this freedom of discussion consisted in the power of the Presidents, on the petition of ten Bishops, to interrogate the Council whether it desired the discussion to be prolonged. *The Presidents had no power to close the discussion. The Council alone could put an end to it.* This right is essential to every deliberative assembly, which has a two-fold liberty : the one, to listen as long as it shall see fit ; the other, to refuse to listen when it shall judge that a subject has been sufficiently discussed. To deny this liberty to the Council is to claim for individuals the liberty to force the Council to listen as long as they are pleased either to waste its time or to obstruct its judgment. In political assemblies the house puts an end to debates by a peremptory and inexorable cry of “question,” or “divide.” The assemblies of the Church are of another temper. But they are not deprived of the same essential rights ; and by a free vote they may decide either to listen, or not to listen, as the judgment of the Council shall see fit. To deny this is to deny the liberty of the Council ; and under the pretext of liberty to claim a tyranny for the few over the will of the many.

“Obvious as is this liberty and right of the Council to close

¹ “Hundreds of the Infallibilist Bishops danced like maniacs round the pulpit when Strossmayer and Schwarzenberg were speaking, yelling and shaking their fists at them.” *Letters from Rome on the Council*, by Quirinus, Letter 8, page 134. Translator’s note. Ed. Rivington’s. London, 1870.

its discussions when it shall see fit, there exists only one example on record in which it did so. With exemplary patience it listened to what the House of Commons would have pronounced to be interminable discussions, and interminable speeches.

“On the general discussion of the Schema, *De Romano Pontifice*, some eighty Bishops had spoken—of these nearly half were of what the newspapers called the opposition; but the proportion of the opposition to the Council was not more than one-sixth. They had therefore been heard as three to six.

“But further, there remained the special discussion on the Proœmium and the four chapters: that is to say, five distinct discussions still remained, in which every Bishop of the six or seven hundred in the Council would, therefore, have a right to speak five times. Most reasonably, then, the Council closed the *general* discussion. No one but those who desired the discussion never to end, that is, who desired to render the definition impossible by speaking against time, could complain of this most just exercise of its liberty on the part of the Council.

“I can conscientiously declare that long before the general discussion was closed, all general arguments were exhausted. The special discussion of details also had been anticipated to such an extent that nothing new was heard for days. The repetition became hard to bear.

“Then, and not till then, the President, at the petition not of ten, but of a hundred and fifty Bishops at least, interrogated the Council whether it desired to prolong or to close the general discussion. By an overwhelming majority it was closed.

“When this was closed, still, as I have said, five distinct discussions commenced; and were continued so long as any one was to be found desirous to speak.

“Finally, for the fifth or last discussion, a hundred and fifty inscribed their names to speak. Fifty at least were heard, until on both sides the burden became too heavy to bear; and, by mutual consent, an useless and endless discussion from sheer exhaustion ceased.

“So much for the material liberty of the Council. Of the moral liberty it will be enough to say, that the short-hand writers have laid up in its archives a record of discourses which will show that the liberty of thought and speech was perfectly unchecked.

“Certain Bishops of the freest country in the world said truly: ‘The liberty of our Congress is not greater than the liberty of the Council.’

“When it is borne in mind that out of more than six hundred Bishops, one hundred at the utmost were in opposition to their brethren, it seems hardly sincere to talk of want of liberty. There was but one liberty, of which this sixth part of the Council was deprived, a liberty they certainly would be the last to desire, namely, that of destroying the liberty of the other five.”

W. J. W.

FATHER HENRY FITZSIMON, S. J.

(Continued from page 563, vol. viii.)

EVIDENTLY the Jesuit did not wish to fritter away his time “disputing about Antichrist,” with his cousin, whom he looked on as a conceited youth, who had just read enough to make him very impertinent. The whole Protestant account is a myth. I will do my best to prove it to be such to the satisfaction of any honest sensible Protestant. The passage is a blot and a blunder in Ussher’s biography, and I would wish it to be eliminated for the sake of the reputation of Ussher, who was a most illustrious Irishman, had an uncle a priest and several cousins Jesuits, was so much the friend of the Jesuit F. White as to invite him to dinner, and to give him the use of his splendid library, and who was a Catholic in his heart for years, and even before his death asked to be admitted into the Catholic Church.¹

Of course David killed Goliath, and Ussher is the David of Trinity College. However, we have the authority of Holy Writ for the account of David’s victory. But Doctors Bernard, Elrington, Saldenus, and Harris, were not inspired, at least from on high. So we may beg leave, with Bayle and others, not to accept their most improbable and miraculous story. Even David slew Goliath with a stone from a sling, but he did not wrestle with him; whereas Ussher actually wrestled and tried his strength with such an athlete as FitzSimon. I am sure to convince at least that class of Protestants called muscular Christians by one reflection; and that is—would a soft, untrained, butcher’s boy (no offence to Ussher), be able to cow and beat a champion of the ring like Sayers, Heenan, and Mace, whom all British prize fighters declined to encounter? Of course not. Therefore young Ussher could not have “silenced and baffled in debate the famous Jesuit Henry FitzSimon.” We shall be persuaded of this if we consider for a moment their training.

Ussher’s admirers say: “It is prodigious to tell that a youth

¹ His letter, asking admission, is in the hands of an English nobleman.

of about fourteen years of age should reduce into synoptical tables all the most memorable facts of all ancient history. Yet he did this, and he studied the Scriptures with care, and read St. Augustine's Meditations. Between fifteen and sixteen he made such proficiency in chronology, that he had drawn up in Latin an exact chronicle of the Bible, as far as the Book of Kings.

"He took his degree of Bachelor of Arts in his seventeenth year, and having got a good knowledge of Greek and Hebrew, he fell to the study of polemical Divinity. He read the 'Fortress of Faith,' written by Stapleton, and most other books in defence of Popery that were in greatest esteem at that time; and for his further satisfaction in points of controversy, he took a resolution to read over all the Fathers, from the time of the Apostles to the Council of Trent."¹

Doubtless, this desultory reading, writing, and arithmetic of a self-taught youth of eighteen was more than enough to make him very conceited, and even very impertinent; but any one, who has common sense or a slight acquaintance with the nature of controversy, must see that such passionate, gluttonous, and omnivorous study was no training for an encounter with an old, a bold, and practised disputant. What help would he get from "synoptical tables of ancient facts," and from his "Latin Chronicle of the Bible?"

Now let us look for a moment at the man whom he is said to have conquered in controversy. He was thirty-two years of age, was "endowed with great natural abilities,"² went to Oxford the year Ussher came into the world, and while in the English University, "*his natural disposition being strongly inclined to controversy, he devoted himself to the study of the disputed points of religion.*"³

At the age of twenty he went to Paris, so far overweening of his profession that he thought he could convert to Protestantism any opponent whatever, and in fact did not find any ordinary Catholics whom he did not often gravel.⁴ At last he was overcome by "an owld English Jesuit," and at once conceived a burning desire to "gravel" the ringleaders of the Reformation; then he studied divinity under Lessius most assiduously, and became *thoroughly* acquainted with all the controverted points of belief.⁵ After some time he was appointed to teach metaphysics in the famous College of Douay, where there were twelve hundred students, of whom three hundred and forty were reading mental philosophy.⁶

¹ Ware's "Irish Bishops."

² "Magnis naturæ dotibus instructus," says F. Young, S.J., his contemporary.

³ Wood's "Athenæ Oxon. ⁴ FitzSimon "On the Masse," p. 115.

⁵ Wood's Oxford. ⁶ Annuæ Belgicæ.

He so signalized himself at Douay and elsewhere, that a distinguished writer of his day called him "the subtle professor of philosophy, the athlete of Christ, renowned in his chains, strong in defending the faith, and happy in bringing wanderers back to the fold."¹ He came to Ireland and converted hundreds of Protestants in the first year or two, and thus showed great controversial power.² In 1599 there were so many entering the true Church, that in one day he received four Englishmen three of whom were men of distinction.³ He gained many proselytes by his convincing arguments, and triumphed over the few who ventured to oppose him;⁴ he challenged all the ministers in Ireland to a dispute before the Viceroy, and sent special challenges to Drs. Hanmer, Challoner, and Rider, the chief Protestants of the land. The most learned and eloquent of the Protestants were afraid of him, and he was so eager for the fray that he often said he was like a bear tied to a stake and only wanted some one to bait him.⁵ While in prison he converted seven Protestants in one month, one of whom was his head jailer;⁶ he was esteemed the most able and astute disputant among the Catholics, and was so ready and quick that few or none would undertake to deal with him;⁷ he had a fluent tongue, a stentorian voice, and *in words* he was too hard for a hundred.⁸ No wonder, then, that not one of all the Protestant ministers would dispute with him in public. They would sooner risk their pens than their persons against such an antagonist, and even only one of them ventured to write against him. His enemies themselves were unanimous in praising his eminent talents for controversy and the wonderful facility with which he spoke extempore.⁹

I think such a highly gifted man, highly trained for five years at Oxford, and for five years at Douay, could not be beaten in controversy by a young antiquary of eighteen. He challenged all the most learned Protestant clergymen of the country collectively and individually, and he undertook to accept the Protestant Viceroy and the Protestant Fellows of Trinity College as umpires in the contest, and is it likely that he would be baffled by a young student of eighteen, who most probably had not as much inborn controversial power.¹⁰

It is an outrage on common sense to state it, and perhaps I have outraged common sense by spending so much time in showing the absurdity of the whole story. But it is annoying

¹ *Vindiciæ Hiberniæ.* ² Letter of N. Leinich, 25th Sept., 1598.

³ FitzSimon's Letter of 1599.

⁴ Wood's *Athenæ*, Ryan's "Worthies,"—both Protestants. ⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ FitzSimon's Letter, April 5, 1604. ⁷ Wood's *Athenæ.* ⁸ Rider.

⁹ *Moréri's Dictionnaire.* ¹⁰ *Ibid.*

to find the tale in a Catholic writer, such as D'Arcy M'Gee, and I am anxious to see it excised from the next edition of the life of our illustrious countryman, James Ussher.

The readiness, the reality, the earnestness and straightforwardness, the indomitable courage and the perseverance, the eloquence and wit of FitzSimon frightened the parsons, who were the slaves of the State, of mammon, and of the flesh. We may gather some idea of his pugnacity and power from the following words of one of his books—"I would fain behold them in the face that would term St. Austin, St. Gregory, and St. Bernard forgers and impostors . . . *whom if I could but look at* in a Christian assembly I would not doubt but their own countenance, how shameless soever, would detect their ethnical impiety and presumption to be worthy of execration."¹ Again, he says, "Mr. Rider, you cannot conceal the confusion you ever had in talking with me, when at every word I disproved and disturbed your conceits. Mr. Tristram Eccleston, Constable of the Castle, Alderman Jans, Luke Shea, Esq., and others can tell *the plunge you and Minister Baffe wallowed in* at our last meeting. . . . You felt the brunt of my words at that time, by your own confession, to be irrefragible."²

From all this we must conclude that Ussher's victory over FitzSimon is to be relegated to the realm of myths. Ussher, most probably, never had the same polemical power as FitzSimon, and most assuredly at the age of eighteen he had not the same polemical training—or rather, he was absolutely untrained—his inquisitive mind was "solicitous about very many things," and as he was a boy of many books, he was not very formidable as a logician or controversialist.

However, how are we to explain Ussher's letter, and reconcile it with FitzSimon's account? The letter puzzles me somewhat; and, all bewildered, I rub my eyes and ask—Did Ussher really write that letter? If he did, did he send it to FitzSimon, and did the Jesuit get it, and leave it without an answer? And lastly, I ask—did the young lad tell the truth?

FitzSimon printed his account ten years after his liberation, and it was never contradicted in his lifetime; the Protestant version appeared *forty years* afterwards. I suspect some Protestant admirer wrote this letter, and fathered it on Ussher. But if Ussher *did* write it, then I say his boyish vanity got the better of his veracity. I am sorry to say this, even conditionally, of the Irish Protestant saint. At the same time we must bear in mind that the celebrated Archbishop Talbot, his contemporary, who died a prisoner in the Castle of Dublin, has the

¹ On the Masse.

² Replie to Rider, p. 44.

following words about Ussher :—"This is a notorious fraud and wilful falsification in a man of erudition and learning. He quotes against his own conscience. . . . This is an imposture—strange impudence in maintaining a falsehood. . . . Here he is convicted of two notorious frauds—of wilfully winking, of calumny, and fraud. . . . The Irish saint, Mr. Ussher, to maintain his fraud, is become an abominable impostor. . . . What credit do you think such a man deserves in his collection of antiquities? . . . Peruse Malone, the Jesuit, and you shall find that, as Ussher was one of the most learned Protestants that ever writ, so was he one of the most cunning and deceitful."¹

As Dr. Talbot mentions Malone's book, the reader may as well know that Malone really silenced Ussher, and that some Protestants, among others a Dr. Synge, tried to defend the cause of their Primate. It is curious that the upholders of Ussher against Malone never boasted of Ussher's early success against a greater man than Malone. Ussher had a discussion with a third Jesuit, who was very young, and yet obtained a signal victory over the pseudo-Primate. Francis Slingsby, S. J., was imprisoned in Dublin Castle at the request of his fond father, who brought Ussher to reclaim him from the Society and from Catholicism. The result is told by Fitz-Simon in a letter which he addressed to F. Gerard in the year 1634. "Francis was twice assaulted by the prime-pretended prelate. In the second time he craved to begin on both sides in these words of prayer—'Be he in this instant damned of both of us who varieth by mouth from his conscience.'

"The debate thereby was interrupted, the said prime man relenting. Nought can be said sufficiently in praise of Mr. Francis. He hath won his mother, brother, and sister. I seconded him as far as I might. Who were not converted were confounded publicly."²

According to many other accounts, one of which was written by the Earl of Westmeath to the Holy Father, Ussher became deadly pale, and bounced out of the room, leaving Slingsby's father, Sir Francis Slingsby, and his cruel cousin, Sir Charles Coote, who expected to witness the Primate's triumph, much astonished, but little edified at his discomfiture.

We need not be astonished at the discomfiture of Ussher, who was then in his heart a Catholic, but had not the courage of his convictions. The unfortunate man afterwards asked by a letter to be reconciled to the church, but he was dead when the answer arrived, and thus he affords another ex-

¹ Dr. Talbot "On Religion and Government," published 1670.

² Memoir of Francis Slingsby, S. J. FitzSimon's Letter of 29th Aug., 1634.

ample of the terrible danger of procrastination. However it would seem that a descendant of his was converted by Fitz-Simon's controversial works.

Dr. Milner, in his "Inquiry into certain vulgar opinions concerning the Irish," says—"The Rev. James Ussher, author of the 'Free Inquiry,' a most able and learned scholar, was the immediate descendant of Archbishop Ussher. But taking himself to the study of FitzSimon's works, he was so convinced by his arguments, that he became a Catholic. Being a widower, he became a priest, and may be said to have been the first writer who defended the faith in the face of the public, his letters having been published in the 'Public Ledger,' from which they were extracted and published apart in a work now upon sale, called 'A Free examination of the Common Methods employed to prevent the Growth of Popery.' Mr. Ussher left a son, who is still living, and whom I had the pleasure of seeing in one of the Catholic establishments in Ireland. Mr. Ussher also wrote 'Letters on the Outcry against Popery' in the year 1767; he was helped in them by my lamented friend, the late worthy, upright, and pious John Walker, author of the 'Pronouncing Dictionary,' and the 'Guido d' Arezzo of elocution.'"¹

Before we speak of FitzSimon's real controversy with Rider, Dean of St. Patrick's, afterwards bishop of Killaloe, let us listen to what he says on controversy with Protestants, and on the successful method which he followed in dealing with them. He writes to the Irish students of Douay—"Be assured, dear students, that only the younger and blinder sort of Protestants, who are most adventurous, and whose *scribendi cacoethes* and head-long itch, may never, by rule or reason, be restrained, although the comic poet adviseth them in a serious manner—

'Fit ye that write
Your matter to might.'

None, I say, but such will impugn the Eternal Sacrifice. Only they, or some one Herostratus of them by surviving infamy rather to be remembered than wholly forgotten, will perhaps give fire to more than the temple of Diana, by blaspheming this pure Host, and what thereto belongeth. These, by my counsel, you shall not once gratify, not only with an answer but also not with a look, whereof I will give you pregnant reasons, observed by long experience, and by the greatest Fathers prescribed to posterity.

"Disputation with heretics is a thing always desired by Catholics, presupposing that they will stand by any arbitra-

¹ Dr. Milner's "Inquiry into certain Vulgar Opinions."

ment, if not of some late bishop, yet of some ancient one, if not of some old writer, yet of some holy primitive Father, or of many Fathers; if not of many ancient Doctors, at least of some general Councils; if not of any or all Christian instruments, at least of God's Holy Word or Sacred Bible, without disdain of the latter, derision of the elder, depraving the Holy Fathers, dispraising holy Councils, disclaiming Holy Scriptures as often as they give verdict against them, which ever happeneth—always making themselves alone the rule of all certainty, and so thinking that to be true that is with them, and all to be false that is against them. But among the whole sort are there manie not such? Are there anie? I leave your trial to approve, testifying of my own experience, to have had little difficultie with anie that I could bring to be tried by anie settled ground of either Scriptures, traditions, Church Councils, or Fathers, severally or conjointly.

“Neither to anie other industrie may I impute it, next to the effectual and merciful grace of God, to whom alone be all glory thereof, that among hundred others by me reconciled, the ninth English minister in the very writing hereof hath been purchased to the Christian and Catholic religion. I cannot, I say, ascribe it to anie other observation, as that I ever tied them to an irrevocable foundation, from which after, upon any pretence, they should not start or appeal. Others whom you may not entreat to abide at a baile, believe me, you shall find remediless, as all ancient Fathers have delivered. You being daily to enter the lists against the enemies of the Church, must be forewarned, that you do not spend your pains, but where profit may be probably expected. Would you contend with those whom meretricious and affected lying, cauterised hypocrisy and impostures delight; with those who build and relie upon obstinacie and outfaced impudence, and whose principal confidence, according to Luther himself, is in contentions and voluntarie lying. This would not become your ingenuous education.

“I forewarn you of these their drifts, that you may know what arms and weapons you may provide. I forewarn you, as your faithful sentinel, of the designs of your enemies, not by me discovered without pains, patience, and peril.”¹

What these pains and perils were we shall see in the account which FitzSimon gives of his discussions with Dean Rider.

According to Ware's "Irish Bishops and Writers," Rider was educated in Oxford, where he took his degree of Master of Arts. Then he became successively parish minister of Bermondsey, rector of the rich church of Winwick, in Lan-

¹ Preface to the "Treatise on the Mass."

cashire, dean of St. Patrick's, Dublin, archdeacon of Meath, and at last, in 1612, bishop of Killaloe, where he died in 1632.¹ He was a fair specimen of these English bishops concerning whom Rider's successor, the celebrated Swift, puts the following words into the mouth of St. Patrick :—

“ Britain! by thee we fell—ungrateful isle!
 Not by thy valour, but superior guile.
 Britain! with shame, confess this land of mine
 First taught thee human knowledge and divine;
 My prelates and my students sent from hence
 Made thy sons converts both to God and sense:
 Not like the pastors of thy ravenous breed,
 Who came to fleece the flock, and not to feed.”

Rider published, in 1589, a Latin Dictionary, about which Doctor Fuller says that he borrowed, to say no worse, both bridle and saddle from the lexicographer Thomasius, his dictionary being the same in effect. However, Dr. Underhill wrote a distich in praise of the performance. It may be translated thus :—

“ As to Thomasius Calepin must yield,
 Thomasius so to Rider quits the field!”

He wrote also, in 1601, “ a Letter concerning the News out of Ireland, and of the Spaniards' landing, and the present state there.” In 1608, he published—“ A Claim of Antiquity in behalf of the Protestant Religion,” to which FitzSimon wrote an answer in the same year.

This learned Dean thus tells us how he came to have a discussion with FitzSimon :—

“ The cause of this provokement was a quiet and milde conference upon six propositions with an honorable gentleman, Maister W. N., who is a special friend of the priests concerning religion. He confidently affirmed that the Jesuits and Romain priests of this kingdom were able to prove, by Scriptures and Fathers, six certain propositions to be Apostolic and Catholic, and that the Church of Rome and the Romain Catholiques of Ireland now hold nothing touching the same, but what the Holy Scriptures and primitive Fathers held within the first five hundred years after Christ's Ascension. Now if the priests make such proof good, I have promised to become a Romain Catholique; if the priests fail in their proof, he likewise, before worshipful witnesses, hath given his hand to renounce this the new doctrine of the Church of Rome and become a professor of the Gospel of

¹ Ware's “ Irish Bishops.”

Christ. This was the occasion and manner of the provokement."¹

So writes Dean Rider, who soon found out to his cost that his "provokement" easily provoked F. FitzSimon, from whom we have the following account of this controversy. In dedicating his Second Book on the Mass to "the so-called ministers of the Word in Great Britain and Ireland," he says:—

"My intermeddling in any controversy in English was by no inclination in me, but by provocation of Mr. Rider, sometimes termed Dean of St. Patrick's, in Dublin, but now, as I hear—by base miscarriage—in misery and disgrace.² This man, with Thrasonic bluster, asked leave of the Lord Lieutenant to hold an oral discussion with me, and having got it, he put off the meeting from day to day, and at last, by the public sentence of the chief men of his party, was condemned as an ignoramus and a trifler.³ However, I had a few opportunities of controversial conversation with this Jubelius. For instance, one day at dinner he boldly asserted that the Ancient Fathers denied Christ's presence in the Eucharist, *secundum literam*. Here is St. Augustine, said I, and he has the very words, *secundam literam*. He read them, grew pale, sighed, and turned at once to other topics."⁴

(To be continued.)

THE FUTURE OF PROTESTANTISM AND CATHOLICITY.⁵

(Taken from the "CATHOLIC WORLD," New York.)

THIS work of serious and conscientious learning by the Abbé Martin, former curé of Ferney, noted as the residence of Voltaire when exiled from France, has been written mainly for the purpose of making known to Catholics of the old Catholic nations of Europe the real character and tendencies of contemporary Protestantism—a work not uncalled for, since those old Catholic populations, seldom coming into personal contact with Protestants, have not kept themselves well posted in the changes, developments, and transformations that Protestantism has undergone during the last two centuries, and are hardly able to recognise it in its present form, or to meet and combat it with success. The great controversial works of the seventeenth century, excellent as they were in their time, only im-

¹ Rider's "Friendly Caveat." ² Dedication of Second Book on the Masse.

³ "Britannomachia," by FitzSimon. ⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *De l'Avenir du Protestantisme et du Catholicisme.* Par M. l'Abbé Martin. Paris: Tobra et Haton. 1869. 8vo. pp. 608.

perfectly serve the present wants of Catholic polemics ; for the dogmatic Protestantism they met and vanquished is, save in its spirit, not the Protestantism that now confronts the Church. That primitive phase of Protestantism has passed away, never to re-appear, and a new and a very different phase has been developed, which demands a new study and a new and different mode of treatment.

The learned Abbé Martin, favourably situated for his task, during several years, at the gate of Geneva, the Protestant Rome, has embodied in his volume the result of much serious and conscientious labour devoted to this new study, and has so well accomplished his task as to leave nothing to be desired, till Protestantism undergoes another metamorphosis, which it it is not unlikely to do ; for to assume new forms or shapes according to the exigencies of time and place, is of its very essence. For this reason, the labour of refuting, or even explaining it, can never be regarded as finished.

It is the characteristic of Protestantism to have no fixed and permanent character, except hatred of Catholicity. It has no principles, doctrines, or forms, which, in order to be itself, it must always and everywhere maintain. It may be biblical and dogmatic, sentimental or sceptical, combine with absolutism or with the revolution, assert the divine right of kings and passive obedience with the old Anglican divines, or shout *à bas les rois*, and *vive le peuple ! vive liberté, égalité, et fraternité!* with the old French Jacobins and contemporary Mazzinians and Garibaldians, as it finds it necessary to carry on its unending warfare against the Church, without any change in its nature or loss of identity. It is not a specific error, but error in general, ready to assume any and every particular form that circumstances require or render convenient. It, like all error, stands on a movable and moving foundation ; and to strike it we are obliged to strike, not where it is, but where it will be when our blow can reach it. The Abbé is well aware of this fact, and sees and feels the difficulty it creates. Hence he regards Protestantism as imperishable, and holds that our controversy with it must, under one form or another, continue as long as error or hostility to the Church continues, which will be to the end of the world.

To those of us who were brought up Protestants, who have known Protestantism in all its forms by our own experience, the Abbé Martin tells little, perhaps nothing that had not previously in some form passed through our own minds, and not much that had not already been published among us by our own Catholic writers. It is not easy to tell an American Catholic anything new of Protestantism. There is no country in the world where Protestantism is or can be so well studied

as our own ; for in no other country has it had so free a field for its development and transformations, or in which to prove what it really is and whither it goes. It has suffered here no restraint from connection with the state, and till quite recently the Church has been too feeble with us to exert any appreciable influence on its course. It has had in the religious order everything its own way, has followed its own internal law, and acted out its nature without let or hindrance. Here it may, therefore, be seen and studied in its real character and essence.

But if the Abbé Martin has not told us much that we did not already know, or which American writers had not already published, he has given us a true and full account of the present aspects and tendencies of Protestantism throughout Europe, very instructive to those Catholics who have had no personal acquaintance with it, and not unprofitable even to those who, though converts to the Church, were familiar with it only as seen in some one or two of the more aristocratic sects, in which large portions of Catholic tradition have been retained. We, in fact, wonder how a man who, like the Abbé, has had no personal experience of Protestantism, who has never had any internal struggle with it, and has been brought up from infancy in the bosom the Church and in the Catholic faith, can, by study and observation, by prayer and meditation, make himself so fully master of its real character, and come so thoroughly to understand its spirit, its internal laws and tendencies. No doubt, one who has been a Protestant and knows thoroughly its language, can find in his work proofs that Protestantism was not his mother tongue, and that he knows it only as he has learned it ; but learned it he has, and knows it better than it is known by the most erudite and philosophical Protestant ministers themselves, and the Catholic reader may rely with full confidence on his expositions. The work is, in fact, an admirable supplement alike to Bossuet's *Variations*, and to Moehler's *Symbolik*.

It will startle some Catholics, no doubt, to hear the well-informed author assert, as he does, that Protestantism is not dead or dying, that it is imperishable, its principle is immortal, and never was it a more formidable enemy to the Church than it is at this present moment ; but they will be less startled when they learn what he means by Protestantism.

“Protestantism,” he says, “differs essentially from all the heresies that have previously rent the bosom of the Church. It is not a particular heresy, nor a union of heresies ; it is simply a frame for the reception of errors. Vinet, one of the most distinguished Protestants of the day, softens, indeed, this expression, and says that ‘Protestantism is less a religion than the place of a religion.’ He would have been strictly exact

if he had said Protestantism is less a religion than the place of any negation of religion under a religious garb. It is a circle capable of indefinite extension, of being enlarged as occasion requires, so as to include any and every error within its circumference. A new error rises on the horizon, the circle extends further and takes it in. Its power of extension is limited only by its last denial, and is therefore practically illimitable. What it asserted in the beginning it was able to deny a century later; what it maintained a century ago it can reject now; and what it holds to-day it may discard to-morrow. It may deny indefinitely, and still be Protestantism. It can modify, change, metamorphose, turn and return itself, without losing anything of its identity. Grub, caterpillar, chrysalis, butterfly, it is transformed, but dies not."—(Pp. 1, 2).

All this is perfectly true. Protestantism undoubtedly differs essentially from all the particular heresies of former times, such as the Arian, Macedonian, Nestorian, Eutychian, Pelagian, etc.; but we think it bears many marks of affinity with ancient Gnosticism, of which it is perhaps the historical continuation and development. Gnosticism was not a particular or special heresy, denying a particular article, dogma, or proposition of faith. The Gnostics held themselves to be the enlightened Christians of their times, men who had attained to perfect science, been initiated into the sacred mysteries concealed from the vulgar, professed to be spiritual men, spiritually illuminated, and looked down with contempt on Catholics as remaining in the outer court, sensuous and ignorant, knowing nothing of the Spirit. This is no bad description of contemporary Protestants. They call themselves the enlightened portion of mankind, claim to be spiritual men, spiritually illumined, and instructed in the profoundest mysteries of heaven and earth; while from the height of their science they look down on us Catholics as simply sensuous men, having only a sensuous worship, and hold us to be a degraded, ignorant, superstitious, and besotted race. We are very much disposed, for ourselves, to regard Protestantism as Gnosticism modified to suit the taste, the temper, the mental habits, and the capacity of modern times.

The author makes Protestantism not a special heresy, nor yet a union of heresies, but the receptacle of illimitable denials; yet he throughout distinguishes it from absolute unbelief in Christianity, and maintains that even as so distinguished it is imperishable, and its principal immortal. We confess that we do not see how he can make this distinction without giving to Protestantism a specific character and making it a positive heresy, and not simply a frame for the reception of heresy or heresies. Assuming it to be a positive heresy, and not the

general spirit of error adapting itself to any and every form of error, his reasoning is far from satisfying us that it is imperishable. The assertion that "its principle is immortal," can in no case be accepted; for all error must ultimately die, and only truth survive, if our Lord is to overcome all his enemies, and God, who is truth itself, is to be all in all. It is not to be supposed that they who are eternally lost continue to err and to sin for ever. They know and confess the truth at last, and it is their severest hell, that they know and confess it when it is too late for it to liberate them. Understanding Protestantism to be the general spirit of error, we can concede it to be imperishable, in the sense that the world is imperishable; for men will hate Christ and deny him as long as the world stands; but in no other sense are we prepared to concede it.

The author defines the essence of Protestantism to be hatred of the Church, and yet throughout his book distinguishes it from absolute infidelity or unbelief. We do not see the propriety of this distinction, nor understand how he can consistently exclude from Protestantism any form of error that hatred may assume. He makes Protestantism not a particular, a specific heresy, but the frame in which any negation of religion under a religious garb may be set. We see no ground for this restriction, and it seems to us that it contradicts his own assertion that Protestantism is a circle capable of indefinite extension, and practically illimitable; for if the circle can include only the denials of religion that wear a religious garb, it is not illimitable, or capable of indefinite extension.

The learned Abbé, we suspect, has been led into this real or apparent contradiction by neglecting to distinguish sharply between Protestants and Protestantism. Protestants are of all shades, from the Calvinist down to the Unitarian or rationalist, from the high-churchman down to the no-churchman. The great majority of them retain some shreds of Christian belief, read the Bible, look to Christ as the redeemer of mankind, and are governed more or less in their opinions, sentiments, and conduct by Christian tradition. It would be a great mistake, as well as gross injustice, to represent all or even many of them as actually or intentionally unbelievers in Christ, or to hold them to be, in the way of error, anything more than heretics. But Protestantism is not a form of heresy, is nothing in itself but hatred of Catholicity or hostility to the Church of God; and there are no lengths in the way of denial it will not go, if necessary for its gratification. It is potentially absolute infidelity.

This seems to be in reality the Abbé's own doctrine, and its truth is evident from the fact that the general tendency of Protestants is not towards Catholicity, but farther and farther

from it. Individuals among them, in certain times and places, even in large numbers, manifest decided Catholic tendencies, and ultimately find their way back to the Church; but whoever knows Protestants well, knows that the mass of them, if driven by Catholic polemics to choose between the Church and the denial of Christianity, indeed, of all religion, will not choose the Church. "If I can be saved only by becoming a Catholic, I do not wish to be saved," said a Protestant minister to us one day. "I would rather be damned than be a Catholic." We politely assured him he could have his choice. This minister expressed only the too common sentiment of Protestants. A certain number among them when convinced that Catholicity and Christianity are identical, will, the grace of God moving and assisting, become Catholics; but every day's experience shows that the larger number of them love Christianity less than they hate Catholicity, and will become infidels sooner than they will become Catholics. In doing so are they illogical? Do they reject Protestantism, or simply follow out its spirit to its last logical consequences?

The learned Abbé restricts Protestantism to such negations as wear a religious garb. But with us, in what is called Free Religion, we have seen infidelity itself wearing the garb and speaking the language of religion. In France there are the positivists, real atheists, who clothe themselves with a religious vestment, adopt a ritual, and observe a regular worship. These, if the author insist on his restriction, must be included within the Protestant circle, and if these are included, it will be difficult to say what class of enemies of Christ and his Church are to be excluded. We see no good reason, therefore, for any restriction in the case. Protestantism is made up of negations, without any affirmation or positive truth of its own; and no reason can be assigned why we should not hold it capable of including within its circumference, without loss of identity or essential alteration, any or all errors against the Catholic Church, and if as yet only heretical with the many, why it is not capable in its developments of becoming downright apostacy or complete denial of Christianity.

Taken in this sense, we admit that Protestantism is not dead, nor dying; but will continue to confront the Church to the end of time. The Church in this world is always the Church militant. She will always have her enemies with whom she can never make peace so long as she remains faithful to her Lord. "Think not," said our Lord, "that I am come to send peace on the earth; nay, a sword, rather." The synagogue of Satan stands always over against the Church of God, and the world will always hate the Church as it hated our Lord himself; for she is not of the world as he was not

of it. Yet we attach no great importance, if this be its meaning, to the proposition, "Protestantism is imperishable," which the Abbé Martin labors hard and at great length to sustain; for it is only saying in other words that hatred to the Church will continue to the consummation of the world.

But if the proposition means that Protestantism under its original, or even its present form, as held by the mass of Protestants, is imperishable, we can only say, nothing proves it to our satisfaction. That the essence of Protestantism, which the author defines to be hatred of Catholicity, will continue as long as the world stands, we do not doubt; but nothing proves to us that it may not change its form in the future as it has done in the past, or that the great body of Protestants may not gradually eliminate all that they have thus far retained of Christian tradition or Christian belief, reject even the Christian name, and lapse into pure Gentilism, as they are already lapsing into carnal Judaism.

The Abbé, while he is strictly correct when telling us what Protestantism is, that it is less a religion than the frame for the reception of all possible anti-Christian negations, yet seems in much of his reasoning with regard to its future to proceed as if he held Protestantism to be, not an immutable system indeed, but, after all, something definite and positive or affirmative. He knows as well as we do, and abundantly proves in his book, that Protestantism affirms nothing, contains as peculiar to itself no affirmative proposition whatever. The affirmative propositions held by Protestants are simply fragments of Catholic truth taught and held fast in their integrity by the Church long ages before Luther and Calvin were born, and constitute no part of Protestantism. The Protestantism is all in the perversion, corruption, or denial of Catholic truth. There is nothing in it of its own but its negations and hatred of the Church, her faith, her discipline, and her worship, to be continued, or that can be the subject of any predicate. Protestantism receives into its bosom one form of error as readily as another, and complete unbelief as the inchoate apostacy called heresy, though we readily grant that the majority of Protestants are not, as yet, prepared to accept infidelity pure and simple; and many of them, we trust, are, in their intentions and dispositions, prepared to accept and obey the truth when made known to them, and may yet in God's gracious providence find their way into the Catholic communion and be saved.

The Reformers, or the fathers of the modern Protestant movement, did not intend to give up Christianity or the Church. They thought they could reject the papacy and the sacerdotal order, and still retain the Christian faith and the

Christian Church. But they were not slow to discover that this was impracticable, and that, if they gave up the papacy and the sacerdotal order, they must give up the sacraments, save as unmeaning rites, infused grace, the merit of good works, the church as a living organism, the whole Mediatorial work of Christ in our actual regeneration, and fall back on immediatism, and deny all living or present Mediator between God and man. Their successors have found out that an irresistible logic carries them farther still, and requires them to reject all creeds and dogmas as superfluous, to resolve faith into confidence, and to rely solely on the immediate internal illumination and operations of the Holy Ghost. A new generation is beginning to discover that even this is too much, and is preparing to attribute to nature and the soul what its predecessors had attributed to the immediate supernatural operations of the Spirit. There is but one step farther, and you have reached the goal, that of resolving God himself into the human soul, or the identification of God with man and man with God, and not a few have already taken it.

Protestant experience has proved that the Catholic system is homogeneous, self-consistent, all of a piece, so to speak; woven without seam, and not to be parted; that it must either be accepted or rejected as a whole. We do not say that all or the majority of Protestants see this; but many of them see it, and their vanguard loudly proclaim it, and declare the issue to be, Catholicity or rationalism, that is, naturalism. There is no middle ground tenable, to a logical mind with a courage equal to its logic, between the two. It must be either the Church or the world, Catholicity or naturalism, God or atheism. We know great bodies move slow, and the great body of Protestants will not come to a full conviction of this to-day nor to-morrow; but they are tending to it, and can hardly fail, in the natural course of things, one day to reach it. Having reached it, we think the sincere and earnest Protestants, who love and study the Bible and mean to be Christians, will be gathered into the Catholic fold, and the others most likely, other things remaining as they are, will follow their Protestant spirit into naturalism, and give up Christian baptism and Christian faith altogether.

The author tells us that there are two very obvious tendencies among Protestants: the one a tendency to return to the Church, and the other a tendency to rationalism and complete infidelity; but he thinks there will always remain in the non-Catholic body a certain number of honest, pious souls who shrink from unbelief, and yet, while they hold on to certain shreds of Christianity, will, from ignorance, prejudice, and other causes, continue to protest against the Catholic

faith. He supposes that among Protestants there are large numbers of such persons who really believe in Jesus Christ, who really love his religion as far as they know it, who have real Christian piety, and actually believe themselves to be true Christians in faith and practice. These, he contends, preserve to Protestantism a certain religious and Christian character, and will prevent it from ever lapsing into complete unbelief and irreligion. They will always insist on some form of Christianity; and whatever the form they adopt, it will be Protestantism. He may be right; but we think, in discussing the future of Protestantism, he makes too much account of these pious persons; for if as well disposed as he assumes them to be, they can hardly fail, as time goes on and the real character of the Reformation becomes more and more manifest, to follow out their Christian tendency, and return to the communion of the Catholic Church.

Looking at the two tendencies among Protestants, studying them as thoroughly as we are able, and considering especially the essential nature of Protestantism, together with what we may call the logic of error—for error as well as truth has its logic—we think Protestantism, as pretending to be Christian, will, as we have said, finally disappear, and prove itself practically, as it is logically, the total rejection of the Christian religion, and therefore of Christ himself. In point of fact, Protestantism in its spirit and essence, as the author shows beyond contradiction, is only the revival under a modern form of the great Gentile Apostacy that followed the building of the Tower of Babel, and must, if it run its course, lapse either into no-religion, as it has already done with our modern scientists, or into demon-worship and gross idolatry and superstition, as is actually done with modern spiritists right under our eyes. We look, as we have already intimated, for a separation of the wheat from the chaff, and believe the time will come when the real issue will be made up, and the battle we must wage be not with heresy, but with undisguised and unmitigated infidelity, rationalism, naturalism, or pure secularism.

We cannot give a complete analysis of the Abbé Martin's work; for it is itself little else than an analysis. But an interesting and important portion of it is devoted to the Protestant revival and propaganda, beginning in the latter half of the last century, and continued so vigorously in the present. Protestantism, seeking from the first the aid and protection of the princes, soon assumed in each country that adopted it, the form and state of a national religious establishment, defended and governed by the secular power. Having no true spiritual life within, and defended without and provided for

by the government, it fell, as soon as the religious wars occasioned by its origin had subsided, into a state of torpor, and the people under it fell almost universally into a religious somnolence. The establishment was sustained even with rigor, but personal religion was generally unknown or disregarded. Some individuals, seeing this, applied themselves to awaken in the torpid masses a personal interest in religion. From them began a religious revival, or a movement in behalf of personal religion, known in Germany as Pietism, in Great Britain and elsewhere as Methodism, which holds principally from John and Charles Wesley, George Whitefield, and Lady Huntington. This revival, which has done much to increase individualism, and to weaken the influence of dogma and church principles, and which has developed a species of evangelical illuminism, resulting in a sort of infidel illuminism, as seen in our American transcendentalists and free religionists, has, upon the whole, the author thinks, injured more than it has advanced Protestantism. Such, we are sure, has been the fact in this country, unless we identify Protestantism with pure unbelief and indifference. Not one fourth of those assumed to be "hopefully converted" in revival seasons stay converted, while the backsliders are worse Christians, and those who remain pious are no better Protestants, than they were before their conversion.

The revival has, however, given birth to a vigorous propaganda in pagan and Catholic countries, and even in Protestant countries themselves, by means of Bible societies, tract societies, home and foreign missionary societies, supported on a large scale, and with apparently inexhaustible means. The author discusses this Protestant propaganda in relation to infidel nations; to mixed nations, or nations composed of Protestants and Catholics; and finally to old Catholic nations. In infidel or pagan nations he maintains that it has thus far been null. He maintains also that in all those Protestant nations, or nations in which Protestantism became the established Church, but in which some remnants of the old Catholic population still remained and adhered to the Catholic faith and worship, the propaganda has, upon the whole, proved a failure, and in nearly all of them Catholicity has gained, and is still gaining, on Protestantism. This, counting from the date of the institution of the Protestant foreign and home missions in the beginning of the present century, is certainly true in Great Britain and Ireland, in Holland, Switzerland, especially in Sweden and Norway, and in this country; though the principal gains in England, Scotland, and the United States, are due to the immigration of Catholics from

countries under Protestant governments, or governments not friendly to the Church. In the United States we are almost wholly indebted for the astonishing growth of the Church to the migration hither of Catholics from Ireland and Germany. We have numerous conversions, indeed, but they form hardly an appreciable element in our entire Catholic population. In the English-speaking world there have been many conversions from the upper classes and from the ranks of the Protestant ministry, especially of the Anglican and Protestant Episcopal communions; but very little impression is as yet made on the middle and lower classes, who must be converted before much progress is made in the conversion of a nation. We have certainly gained ground in Protestant nations, but probably not much more than we have lost in old Catholic nations.

While the Protestant propaganda has failed with infidel or pagan nations, and with the Catholic populations of Protestant nations, the author maintains that, allied with rationalism and the revolution, it has not been wholly unsuccessful in old Catholic nations, as France, Italy, Spain, Austria, and Hungary. It is, he maintains, "worse than idle to pretend that Protestant missions in these nations are wholly barren of results, or have met with only insignificant success. Their success has been considerable, not perhaps in making Protestants, but in un-making Catholics. Their missions are generally favored by the press, by the higher literature, and by the governments, which, even though nominally Catholic, are always jealous of the Church, and ever encroaching on her rights and restraining her freedom."

The success of the Protestant propaganda in these old Catholic nations, the author thinks is due to the reputation Protestant nations have of surpassing Catholic nations in material well-being; of having founded civil and religious liberty; and chiefly to the unpopularity of the clergy, the supineness of Catholics, and the ignorance of the Catholic clergy of the real character of contemporary Protestantism. All these causes no doubt are operative; but the real cause, we apprehend, is to be sought in the ascendancy acquired by the world in the fifteenth century, and which has invaded Catholic nations hardly less successfully than Protestant nations. Protestantism is the child of this ascendancy, and its legitimate tendency is to place the world above heaven, and man above God; or the complete supremacy of the secular over the spiritual.

In its origin Protestantism seemed to be an exaggerated supernaturalism, denying to the natural all moral ability since the fall, and consequently assigning to the human will no active part in the work of justification or sanctification. But extremes meet; and the exaggerated super-

naturalism in relation to the world to come proved to be only an exaggerated naturalism in relation to this world. To deny all activity of the natural in the work of sanctity is only emancipating the natural from the supernatural, from the moral law, and leaving it therefore free from all moral accountability, to follow without restraint its own inclinations and tendencies ; for what is incapable of meriting is necessarily incapable of sinning. As the affections of the natural fasten on this world and the goods of this life, Protestantism soon lost practically all sense of the divine, as it is now rapidly losing it theoretically, and turned the whole activity of the nations that embraced it to the cultivation of the material order and the acquisition of material goods, leaving the spiritual order behind as a popish superstition, or an invention of priestcraft for enslaving the soul and restraining the natural freedom of mankind.

The spirit that generated and operates in Protestantism, and which its doctrine of free or sovereign grace only fortifies, is, in fact, only the old heathen spirit that seeks only the goods of this life, and so pointedly condemned by Christianity. It reverses the word of our Lord, "Seek first the kingdom of God and his justice, and all these things shall be added unto you ;" and says, "Seek first these things—the goods of this life—and the kingdom of God and his justice shall be added ; if, indeed, such kingdom or justice there be." This spirit was not originated by the Reformation. It had preceded it. It had originated the great Gentile Apostacy, and caused the carnal Jews to misinterpret the prophecies and to expect in the promised Messiah a temporal prince instead of a spiritual redeemer and regenerator. It had even entered the garden and induced the fall of our first parents. It has always subsisted in the world ; nay, is what St. Augustine called the City of the world as opposed to the City of God, and which had its type and representative in the Roman republic and empire. It is the purely secular spirit emancipated from the spiritual, and substituting itself for it.

This spirit is everywhere warred against by Christianity, therefore by Catholicity : and during the temporal calamities of the barbarous and middle ages, was held in check by the Church ; but the advancement of political and social order, the progress of well-being, the revival of pagan literature and art, the opening of new or long disused routes of commerce, and the discovery, in the fifteenth century, of a new continent with its untold treasures, gave new force and activity to the pagan spirit, and enabled it to pervade and take possession of the governments, never very submissive to the Church, of the emperor, of kings, princes, and nobles, and, in general, of the

upper classes of European society. Christendom was well prepared at the opening of the sixteenth century for a revival of Gentilism, which found able and magnificent supporters in the Medici of Florence, so dear to modern uncatholic scholars, but so fatal in their influence on Catholic interests.

With the revival of Gentilism or secularism there came the revival of the quarrel of pagan times between Germany and Rome ; and Luther's movement derived its chief strength from its appeal to the old German hatred of Roman domination, represented in the fifteenth century, it was assumed, in part by the Pope, and in part by the emperor, who pretended to revive the old Roman empire and to succeed to the Roman Cæsars of the West. The Germanic nations, never thoroughly Romanized, rebelled against the Church, not because the secular spirit was more or less rampant with them than with the Romanic nations that remained Catholic, but because the centre of her authority was the old hated city of Rome ; and they looked upon her authority as Roman, and incompatible with their own national independence. Nothing is farther from the truth than to suppose that they were moved by a desire to emancipate the human mind from its pretended thralldom under the Pope, or to establish free inquiry and the liberty of private judgment ; for they yielded from the first to the secular or national sovereign all the authority in spirituals which had been previously exercised by the Roman pontiff. Wherever Protestantism gained a political status, the two powers, as under paganism—unless we except Geneva, Scotland, and, subsequently, New England—were united in the secular sovereign or the state. Calvin in Geneva, Knox in Scotland, and the Puritans in New England, though they sought to unite the two powers in the same governing body, sought to unite them in the hands of the Church rather than of the State, in consequence of their misinterpretation of the Hebrew commonwealth, which, in fact, gave us the first example in history of the separation of the two powers, the sacerdotal and the secular, always asserted and insisted on by the Catholic Church.

The real character of the Protestant movement was a movement in behalf of nationalism—the distinctive feature of Gentilism—revived by the insurgent worldly spirit. The Church herself, in the nations that adhered to her, was defended against the so-called Reformation, except by the theologians, not on Catholic principles, but on national principles ; and hence the secular authority sought constantly to exercise a supervision over the Church, and, as far as possible, to convert her into a national church. The so-called Catholic governments did not differ in principle from the Protestant

governments, and have never done so since. They protected the Church, to a certain extent, from recognised heresies, and provided for the pomp and splendour of her worship; but restrained in every possible way her full freedom of action, and to compel her to yield to their respective national policies in order to avoid a greater evil. The Church could not fully instruct the people in any Catholic nation in the principles which should govern the relations of Church and State without incurring the persecution of her pretended protectors. Hence, there grew up in all Catholic nations a false view of those relations, which greatly weakened the Church, and aided the growth of the secular spirit. Catholicity, having been supported, not as Catholic but as a national religion, by Catholic governments and their courtiers, we find now, when the governments cease to defend it even as a national religion, and are more hostile than friendly to the Church, that the Catholic populations of old Catholic nations, never allowed by the secular authority to be fully instructed in the secular relations of their religion, and never accustomed to act personally in the intellectual defence of their faith, incrustated over with the secularism encouraged by their governments, are almost universally unarmed and defenceless before the Protestant propaganda, having in its favour the prestige of the worldly power and supposed well-being of Protestant nations, and of the championship of civil and religious liberty.

Here, we apprehend, is the real secret of the success of Protestant missions in old Catholic nations; not in the ignorance of the Catholic clergy of the real character of contemporary Protestantism, as the Abbé Martin maintains. He shows, perhaps exaggerates, the danger which the Church runs in these old Catholic nations, and admits that it is becoming apparent, if not to all, at least to many of the clergy, and asks—

“How could it be otherwise with the French clergy, so learned, so pious, so vigilant, and so zealous? They are preparing themselves for the struggle; they proceed to the battle with the energy of faith; they lack not ability; *but they lack a knowledge of contemporary Protestantism.* If they would struggle with success, if they would revive the glorious days of the Catholic apologetic of the seventeenth century, or rather, if they would create a new apologetic in harmony with the wants and errors of the times, they must study Protestantism in its latest evolutions and in its actual physiognomy.” (Pp. 178, 179.)

No doubt there is more or less ignorance even among the French clergy as to the various phases and wiles of Protestantism, and which their text-books will hardly help them to dissipate; but what seems to us to stand most in their way is

precisely their need of studying Catholic theology more thoroughly in its relations to human reason and the secular order—a study they could hardly prosecute under what are facetiously termed “the Gallican liberties ;” that is, liberties of the government to enslave the Church. No man who has learned Catholic theology as Catholic instead of national, who has learned that the Church represents on earth the spiritual order, and has the freedom and courage to maintain that the spiritual is superior to the temporal, is, in fact, the end for which the temporal exists, and therefore that which prescribes to the temporal its law, can ever be at a loss to understand or to know how to meet Protestantism the moment he sees it, whatever the particular phase it may exhibit. Protestantism is not and never was any thing but a series of negations, and all the advantage it has ever had or ever will have over Catholics is precisely in their ignorance of the real or intrinsic relation of the Catholic doctrine or doctrines it denies to the whole body of Catholic truth.

Protestantism, the author himself sees, is simply revived paganism ; but what he does not see is, that the State in all European nations has always been pagan, and never in its principle or constitution been truly Christian. The American constitution may be very imperfect, may be destined to a speedy end ; but it is the first and only instance in history of a political constitution based on Christian principles ; that is, on the recognition of the independence of religion and the supremacy of the spiritual order. It recognises, in our modern phrase, the inalienable rights of man as its basis : but what the American statesman calls the rights of man are, in reality, the rights of God, which every human authority must hold sacred and inviolable. We pretend not that the American people or American statesmen fully understand or adhere practically to the American constitution, or that they ever will till they become Catholics and understand, as comparatively few Catholics even now do, the principles of their Church in their political and social applications. Nevertheless, the constitution is based on the independence and supremacy of the spiritual order, which the secular order must always and everywhere recognise, respect, and defend. This is in direct contradiction of the principle of the pagan republic, which asserts the independence and supremacy of the State alike in temporals and spirituals.

But this pagan principle of the supremacy of the State has always been the basis of the European public law, and the Church, though she has always maintained the contrary,

has always been held in the civil jurisprudence to have only the rights accorded her by the civil government. This has always been the doctrine alike of the civil law and the common law courts, always rigidly enforced by the French parliaments, and not seldom yielded by courtly prelates, afraid, as in England, of the statute of *præmunire*. There have been individual sovereigns who personally understood and yielded the Church her rights; but their lawyers never recognised them save as grants or concessions by the prince. Hence the interminable quarrel of the legists and the canonists, and the sad spectacle of the bishops of a nation not seldom deserting almost in a body the Supreme Pontiff in his deadly struggle with their civil tyrants in defence of their own rights, and the freedom and independence of the spiritual order. Hence, too, we see Italian statesmen, while pretending to acknowledge and confirm religious liberty, confiscating the goods of the Church, and prescribing in the name of the State, the conditions on which the bishops of the Church will be permitted to exercise their pastoral functions. Hence it is, also, that we have seen pious and devout Catholics defend the revolution and preach political atheism in one breath, and the most rigid orthodoxy in another.

With all due deference to M. l'Abbé Martin, we must think that what is wanting in the Catholic populations of old Catholic countries in order to resist the Protestant propaganda, is not so much a better knowledge of Protestantism, as a more thorough knowledge of their own faith, and of Catholic principles themselves, in relation to one another and to the secular order—a knowledge which has been hindered, and to a great extent prevented, by the paganism of the State, which has disabled the Church from freely and fully giving it. Happily, the European governments, by ceasing to be protectors of the Church, have in great measure lost the power, if not to afflict and persecute, at least to enslave her. The bishops, with only here and there an exception, no longer take the side of Cæsar against Peter, and see that their interests and those of the Church can be saved only by the strictest union with and submission to the Supreme Pastor, the Vicar of Christ. The Supreme Pastor himself, without consulting earthly potentates or conferring with flesh and blood, has pronounced in his Encyclical and Syllabus, a rigorous judgment on political atheism and paganism in modern society, and set forth the Catholic principles in which the faithful need to be instructed in order to resist the Protestant propaganda, supported by rationalism and the revolution. He has asserted the independence and freedom of the Church in convoking by his own authority, almost in defiance of the secular powers, an œcumenical

council, to be held in his own palace of the Vatican, in which the universal Church, aided by the Holy Ghost, will, we presume, deliberate and pronounce upon the errors of the times, and indicate the means of arresting the evils that now so grievously afflict society, both spiritual and secular. Hereafter, we may hope, the faithful, cost what it may, will be more thoroughly instructed as to the relations of the two powers, and of faith to reason and civil society, so that an end will be put to the progress in Catholic nations of Protestantism, rationalism, and political atheism.

The Abbé Martin succeeds better in describing Protestantism as it is, and in setting forth the danger it threatens, than in pointing out the remedy to be applied by Catholics, or in assigning the causes of the defects he finds, or thinks he finds, among them. He does not see that these defects, in so far as general, are almost wholly due to the Pagan constitution of the State, which has survived the downfall of Pagan Rome, and to the fact, that the Church has never yet in the Old World had her full freedom and independence, but has always been more or less restrained in her action by the jealousy or hostility of the State. The lack of individual energy and self-reliance of Catholics in asserting and defending the rights of the Church, which the Abbé deplors, has its origin in the restraint imposed by the civil authority on the freedom of the Church.

"Catholics," he says, "relying on authority, full of confidence in its unailing promises, are quite ready to think that it is enough for them to preserve the faith in their hearts, and to perform its works, while the defence and preservation of the Church is the care of Providence. This sentiment, very commendable, no doubt, is yet, when not joined to a masculine energy which counts no sacrifices, if needed, in sustaining the work of God, only an enervating sloth. Catholics—may I say it?—need the activity of individual forces, not, indeed, of that excessive individualism which, puffed up by pride, drives the Protestant over the dark waves of doubt, but that Christian individualism which, accepting by conviction the compass of authority, knows how to employ all its personal forces in its service. This individualism, Protestants reproach us with lacking; let us prove to them the contrary, and show that individual action is quite as powerful and far more productive, when it is well balanced, measured, and subjected to wise rules, as when it wanders without law or discipline, and acts only under the varying impulses of free inquiry. It is, moreover, necessary to enter into this way; for the time has come for Catholics to understand that they can henceforth nowhere on earth count on any support but from God and themselves."—(Pp. 175, 176).

The author adds that Catholics, not only nominal but even many practical Catholics, lack the individual energy that "springs from profound faith—the faith which goes to the marrow—and enters even the centre of the soul, and radiates from it in earnest convictions over all religious practices, over the entire life, giving to them their true sense and to it the right direction and end. Protestants accuse our Church of materialism in her worship.

"The charge is false when applied to the Church and her worship, but is only too true when applied to her members. Hence the painful inconsistencies in their conduct. They are Catholics in the Church, Catholics in essential religious practices, sometimes even in works of supererogation, but are elsewhere and in other matters hardly Christians. The *petit devotion* is sterile; manly, robust piety alone is productive, and it is it alone that we must labour to diffuse. We should seek to make it enter into souls and become fused with their very substance. Catholic worship is the most admirable vehicle of the spirit of life; but souls must comprehend it, and be instructed to draw the spirit of life from it."—(Pp. 176, 177).

There is, no doubt, truth in this, and with but too many Catholics their religion is little more in practice than a lifeless form; but this, so far as due to the clergy, is due rather to their want of earnestness and zeal, which the author says they do not lack, than to their ignorance of contemporary Protestantism. We pay little heed to the reproaches of Protestants, more likely to mislead than to instruct Catholics; but we are quite willing to concede that in old Catholic nations there may be a want among Catholics of the sort of individual energy defined and demanded by the author; but, in the first place, we are disposed to think that his long study of Protestantism, which is based on individualism, and his observation of the part played by what Protestants call personal religion, have led him to overrate the importance of this outward individual zeal and energy in the Church; and in the second place, he seems not to have sufficiently considered that they can hardly be looked for in a community accustomed for ages to rely on the civil power to look out for the defence of the Church, and for her protection against heretics and heresies. In such communities the free action of the Church has been crippled by the attempt of the State to do her work and only bungling it, and in which no call for personal effort in preserving and defending the Church externally has been made on Catholics as individuals. The evil results naturally from the condition in which Catholics must be found when abandoned by the Government that had hitherto saved them from all necessity

of any personal activity in their own defence against external enemies. It can be only temporary, if the Church is left henceforth free by the Government to appeal to the individual faith, love, and exertions of the faithful under her direction.

There is, no doubt, much tepidity, formalism, and momentary imbecility in the face of the enemy in old Catholic populations ; for not the just nor the elect only are members of the Church ; but abandoned or opposed as the Church now is by the governments, and thrown back as she is everywhere upon her own resources as a spiritual kingdom, forced to be even in old Catholic nations once more a missionary Church in everything except in outward form, and obliged to appeal directly to the faithful individually, there can hardly fail to be developed in Catholics the personal qualities which the author thinks they do not now possess. The need of a robust and manly piety to struggle with the world and the enemies of the Church will very soon call it forth, where religion is free and faith is not extinct.

We cannot but think, if the author had experienced the vexations and annoyances that we have from the personal and individual zeal and activity of Protestants of the revival stamp, each one of whom acts as if he were an Atlas and bore the whole weight of the religious world on his individual shoulders, he would much prefer its absence among Catholics to its presence. Not more troublesome were the frogs of Egypt, that came up into the kneading-troughs and the sleeping-chambers. It is not easy to describe the sensation of relief a convert from Protestantism feels on coming into the Church and learning that he has now a religion that can sustain him instead of needing him to sustain it. With Protestants, the member bears the sect ; with Catholics, the Church bears the member. The Sacraments are effective *ex opere operato*. We are disposed, moreover, to believe that Catholics best serve the Catholic cause by each one's doing in his own sphere his own allotted work. The unity of faith, and the unity of the spirit that works alike in all the faithful to will and to do, are sufficient to secure unity of action, and action to one and the same end, and to effect with marvellous rapidity the grandest and most magnificent results. This, we think, is the Catholic method, quiet, peaceable, orderly, and, if less showy and striking than the Protestant method, less noisy and prosy; far more fruitful in results. The Catholic is sustained, the Protestant must sustain.

For our part, we are grateful to the author for his masterly exposition of contemporary Protestantism ; but we hope we may be permitted to say that, while we do not deny the danger with which it threatens the populations of old Catholic

nations, we think he exaggerates it, and supposes Protestant negations are more powerful than they really are. It may be that the Catholic populations are not at present very well prepared to withstand the Protestant propaganda, allied as it is with rationalism and the revolution; but they cannot long remain unprepared. The revolution having, wherever attempted, resulted in the loss of old liberties without the acquisition of any additional civil freedom, must gradually lose its credit with the people, who must ere long be disillusioned; rationalism is too cold, too absurd, and too destitute of life to hold them in permanent subjection. Scientists and sciolists may adhere to it while its novelty lasts, but both the reason and instincts of the people reject it and demand faith, religion. Protestantism, severed from the revolution and rationalism, is too much what the great Catholic controversialists met in the seventeenth century and vanquished for its revival to be able to gain and hold much new territory.

The real danger, in our judgment, is in the spread of secularism, or the secular spirit among Catholics themselves. This is the only serious obstacle we see to the conversion of the American people to the Church. Catholics here and elsewhere conform to modern civilization, and are carried away by its spirit. They follow the spirit of the age without knowing it; and though a Catholic may accept without scruple all the positive results of what is called modern civilization, he cannot imbibe and follow its spirit without great loss on the side of religion, which requires the renunciation of the world as the end for which one is to live and to labour. But there are even among Catholics very worthy men; men of excellent parts and rare learning, who virtually subordinate the spiritual to the secular. They have so far yielded to the secular spirit of the day as to place the defence of the Church on secular rather than on spiritual grounds, and defend her claims as the Church of God rather as necessary to secure civil liberty and advanced civilization than as necessary to save the soul and secure the beatitude of heaven. They are, in some degree, affected by the philanthropy or humanitarianism of the age, and occasionally confound it with Christian charity, which loves God supremely, and our neighbour as ourselves in God, or for the sake of God.

These men pursue a line of argument that draws off the Catholic mind from the kingdom of God and his justice, and fixes it on those things after which the heathen seek, secularize it, and lead it to think that our Lord's mission had for its object the multiplication of earthly goods, and securing earthly felicity. They unintentionally play into the hands of radicals and revolutionists, by influencing Catholics to strive after

social instead of spiritual progress, and making them feel that the great work for the Church is less to train men for heaven than to make the earth a more pleasant abode for them; or that the proper way for men to work out their salvation hereafter, is to work earnestly and perseveringly for the progress of civil and political liberty, and the reform of political and social abuses. It can hardly have any but a bad influence on the Catholic mind to find prominent Catholics urging their Catholic fellow-citizens to make common cause with the most notorious and irreligious infidel and radical leaders of the revolution, as if there could be any thing in common between Catholics and men who demand liberty only to emancipate themselves from the divine law and to suppress the Church, or at least to restrain her freedom.

DOCUMENTS.

LETTER OF THE CARDINAL ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN TO
HIS HOLINESS,

*Conveying to him the offerings of the Catholics of the Diocese
for the year 1872.*

WITH profound respect I present to your Holiness, through the hands of the worthy Rector of the Irish College, Monsignor Kirby, two thousand pounds sterling, portion of a collection made in our churches, on the Sunday within the Octave of St. Peter's festival. The Catholic clergy and laity of the diocese of Dublin, who are devotedly attached to your Holiness, have charged me to forward this sum to alleviate as far as possible your present wants and trials, and to assist in enabling you to provide for their own spiritual interests, and to bear the burden of the solicitude of all the Churches.

They wish that this offering, like those made in past years, should be looked on as a public manifestation of the love and veneration which they cherish for your Holiness, as well as a profession of their humble and obedient devotion to the successor of St. Peter, on whom our Lord built his Church, and to whom he gave the keys of the kingdom of heaven, with power to feed his lambs and sheep, and to bind by his infallible authority all the members of his fold together in the profession of the same faith, and to preserve them in the bonds of true charity.

Reflecting on the arduous and continual labours which this sublime dignity, conferred on you by Christ, obliges you to perform, your faithful children of this remote part of the world are convinced that they only discharge a sacred duty when

they lay at your feet a portion of the substance given to them by heaven as an humble offering to assist you in your present afflictions, and to enable you to carry on the government of the universal Church.

Allow me on this occasion to assure your Holiness that the violent and sacrilegious persecutions with which the enemies of God and His Church have so long afflicted you, are to all the people of this diocese the source of great grief and indignation. They have already frequently protested, and they never will cease to protest, against the unjust spoliation which you have suffered, and the insults which have been offered to your sacred person by men pretending to uphold the sacred cause of liberty, but who in reality encourage every deed of darkness, and promote by their example the direst despotism, that of rule by brute force, and the most destructive communism.

Moreover, I must add that, in union with the faithful of the whole world, and imitating the example of the first Christians, who prayed most fervently for the Prince of the Apostles when he was cast into prison by the impious king Herod—an event commemorated in the office of this day—the Catholics of this diocese unceasingly send forth most earnest prayers to the Almighty Ruler of all things, begging of him to free the Vicar of Christ from his present straits and tribulations, to frustrate the designs of his perfidious and sacrilegious enemies, and to give him a glorious triumph over the powers of error and darkness.

Imploring, in all humility, your Holiness to impart your apostolic benediction to the clergy, the people, and the unworthy pastor of this diocese, and kissing, with all respect, your feet, I remain, your most devoted and obedient servant and son,

✠ PAUL CARD. CULLEN,

Archbishop of Dublin, Primate of Ireland.

Dublin, August 1st,

Feast of the Chains of St. Peter, 1872.

Letter of His Holiness to the Cardinal Archbishop of Dublin.

PIUS PP. IX.

Dilecte Fili Noster salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem. Quae tu Dilecte Fili Noster, asseveras de dolore populi tui, ob eas, quas pro justitia patimur, insectationes, et de studio, quo a divina misericordia nostram Ecclesiaeque libertatem et pacem implorare nititur; ea Nobis evidenter ostendunt cum firmissima semper Hibernorum fides, tum crebra in tristissimis istis adjunctis argumenta filialis pietatis; quorum certe mini-

mum non est perpetua liberalitas. Nam arctis in rebus et calamitosis animum affectusque convertere in oppressos, et e propria exprimere inopia quae ipsis afferantur auxilia, incensae prorsus ac nobilissimae est caritatis. Stipem igitur per te Nobis oblatam, utut copiosam, multo pretiosiore hoc nomine fieri duximus; et gratos idcirco sensus animi inde excitatos in novos dilectionis Nostrae erga egregium hunc populum igniculos converti sensimus. Solus, qui pensat affectum, Deus meritam tanto obsequio amorique mercedem rependere poterit; quam sane Nos ejusmodi adprecamur piis hisce fidelibus, ut et cumulate respondeat offerentium caritati, et profusae simul liberalitati retribuendis. Dum vero Ipsum rogamus, ut votis Nostris obsecundet, favoris ejus auspiciem et praecipuae Nostrae benevolentiae testem tibi, Dilecte Fili Noster, totique Clero et populo tuo universaeque Hiberniae Benedictionem Apostolicam peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die 26 Augusti Anno 1872.
Pontificatus Nostri Anno Vicesimo Septimo.

Translation of the above Letter of His Holiness to the Cardinal Archbishop of Dublin.

DEARLY BELOVED SON,

Health and Apostolic Benediction.—What you assert concerning the grief of your people on account of those persecutions which we suffer for justice sake, and in regard to the zeal with which they are endeavouring to obtain from the divine mercy peace and liberty for us and for the Church, is fully confirmed by the unshaken faith of the Irish, and by the many testimonies of filial affection which they have afforded us in this our present most trying situation, and especially by their continued liberality. Certainly, it is the part of a most ardent and noble charity to turn one's thoughts and feelings to the oppressed in difficult and woful times, and out of one's own poverty to relieve their wants. Hence, though the offering presented by you to us is in itself most generous, yet the circumstances in which it is made, greatly enhance its value, and give a new impulse to the sentiments of gratitude to your excellent people, with which we are inspired. But it is to God alone who knows the heart that it is reserved to requite in a befitting manner, devotion and love of so exalted a nature. That such a reward, worthy of the charity of the donors, and the infinite liberality of the Remunerator, may be the portion of these devout and faithful children, is our prayer.

But whilst we ask God to show Himself propitious to our

petitions, we, as a pledge of His favour, and a testimony of our good feeling, impart with increased affection to you, our beloved son, to your clergy and people, and to all the faithful of Ireland, our Apostolic Benediction.

PIUS PP. IX.

Given at St. Peter's, 26th August, 1872.
27th year of our Pontificate.

LETTER OF CARDINAL ANTONELLI TO MONSIGNOR KIRBY,
Acknowledging the receipt of £2,000 for His Holiness.

VERY REV. MONSIGNOR,—The Holy Father was greatly moved by the offering of £2,000 which the Cardinal Archbishop of Dublin and his flock presented to him, through you, as a token of their devotion and attachment. His Holiness could not but feel most grateful for this new manifestation of filial affection, for the good wishes of the donors, and still more for the prayers which they offer to the Lord, begging of Him to put an end to the evils by which the Church is at present afflicted. Hence he imparts to the Cardinal Archbishop and to the faithful of the diocese his apostolical benediction.

Whilst charging you to convey this intelligence to the Cardinal, I am happy to assure you of the high esteem with which I remain

Your faithful servant,

✠ J. CARDINAL ANTONELLI.

13th August, 1872.

To the Very Rev. Monsignor Kirby,
Rector of the Irish College, Rome.

EX SECRETARIA BREVIUM.

LITTERAE APOSTOLICAE

Quibus Ssmus Pater, in tanta rerum publicarum calamitate, exortas fidelium societates, praeliantes praelia Domini, laudat, erigit, inflammat, ut omnes simul foedere inito charitatis vinculis efficacius ungantur.

PIUS PP. IX.—AD FUTURAM REI MEMORIAM.

“Maximas sine intermissione in humilitate nostra reddimus grates Deo, et Patri Domini Nostri Iesu Christi, Patri misericordiarum, et Deo totius consolationis, qui in tanta tribulatione nostra, tantaque amaritudine allevat dolorem nostrum suscitans in filiis suis spiritum pietatis et orationis, spiritum charitatis et fortitudinis, ut tot malis ex acerrimo potestatis tenebrarum in catholicam religionem bello opportuna per eos

obiiciantur remedia. Deo enim acceptum referimus mirabile illud ubique terrarum studium et Christifidelium ardorem, quo hi voluntate unanimes praeclarissima fidei ac pietatis edunt specimina, et omni ope, opera, et industria, iniquitatis torrenti quasi murum se opponunt, nihilque reliqui faciunt, ut fidei integritas servetur, et fidelis populus crescat in scientia Dei, et in omni opere bono fructificet, uberioribusque coelestis gratiae auxiliis munitus a perversis inimicorum Ecclesiae doctrinis constantius abhorreat. Acceptas quoque Deo referimus utilissimas Societates initas, quae aliae aliam in tot Ecclesiae necessitatibus sibi deposcentes provinciam quasi acies instructae praeliantur praelia Domini, et malitiosorum hominum conatus egregiis operibus retundere atque evertere student, impiorumque latebras prodere, et ipsum in eis, cui miserrimi serviunt, diabolum debellare. Quae omnia laudis praeconio digna et calamitosis hisce temporibus opportunissima pluries per nostras Litteras summo opere commendavimus, easdemque societates spiritualibus privilegiis auximus et indulgentiis, et ad maiora in dies e re catholica et sempiterna animarum salute in miserrima hac rerum omnium conversione atque errorum caligine praestanda inflammavimus. Idque praesertim erga eas societates praestitimus, quae in hac alma Urbe nostra constitutae sunt, quaeque Romani populi pietatem, atque illius in hanc Sedem Apostolicam fidei studiique constantiam praeclarissimo testimonio confirmant. Enimvero antequam Alma Urbs, Sedes Beati Petri ac Universi Catholici Orbis Caput in miserrimam et infelicem, in qua nunc est, conditionem sacrilegis armis nefariisque machinationibus redigeretur, iam contra impiorum hominum insidias et molitiones cum sodalitas ad pestiferam malorum librorum et ephemeridum lectionem amovendam, tum romana cohors catholicae Iuventutis, quae S. Petri circulus nominatur, constitutae fuerant. Capta autem urbe, nobis ipsis sub hostilem dominationem redactis, impietatis malitiaeque colluvie exundante, Romanorum civium pietas latius elucere coepit. Nam non modo memorati coetus novis veluti aucti viribus, sed aliae longe ampliores sive catholicis rebus provehendis, sive bonis operibus promovendis institutae sunt societates, nec minori cum laude initaet et pia Catholicarum mulierum unio, et societas a praeliis pro Sancta Sede Apostolica pugnatis, et sodalitas a continuis supplicationibus, et coetus cultorum bonarum artium atque operariorum de mutua charitate, et Societas promovendae bonorum librorum diffusioni, et sodalitas a pio ancillarum patrocinio, quae omnes in bonum rei catholicae summo studio, sanctaque aemulatione allaborant, uberesque plane fructus iam contulerunt. Verum temperare nobis non possumus, quin piis huiusmodi societatibus amplissimis gratulemur

verbis, quod hae consilio a societate ad quaecumque bona opera promovenda proposito ultro libenterque annuentes foedus, iniverint, quo unitate spiritus in vinculo pacis charitatisque servata, societates ipsae suo singulae instituto integre inhaerentes ad fidem defendendam, Ecclesiae iura asserenda eiusque libertatem vindicandam collatis consiliis et viribus conspirent. Hoc scilicet vinculo arctius inter se colligatae, ut primi credentes, quorum erat cor unum et anima una, contra adversariorum impetus terribiles, velut acies ordinata dimicare pergant. Porro ob magnam quam ex virium unione fidelibus et Ecclesiae universae nobis in tanta rerum perturbatione pollicemur utilitatem in Domino confidimus fore, ut ceterae societates omnes ubique, praesertim vero per Italiam institutae, quarum praecipuum est aerumnosis hisce temporibus qua supplicationibus ad Deum assiduis, qua recta et christiana adolescentium institutione, qua scriptis aliisque bonis cuiusque generis operibus perversae saeculi iniquitati pro virili parte occurrere et obsistere, concordibus animis unitisque viribus incedere satagant, Romanisque societatibus ad bonum certandum certamen et ipsae unico foedere iungantur. Hisce denique Litteris vehementer pias societates huiusmodi tum quae foedus iniere, tum quae iis erunt accessurae, tum fideles omnes hortamur et obsecramus, ut in hanc Sanctae Sedis petram, unicum salutis Pharum intueantur, eiusque infallibili obsequantur magisterio, sacrorumque Antistitibus gratiam et communionem eiusdem Sedis Apostolicae habentibus reverentiam et obedientiam exhibeant, utque non sua, sed quae Iesu Christi sunt, omnino quaerentes id unum summo studio et alacritate contendant ut fides nostra, quae vicit mundum integre atque inviolabiliter servetur, utque depulsis errorum tenebris, eversaque flagitiosorum hominum in Christi religionem praeliantium audacia, catholica Ecclesia triumphet. Nos pro certo et explorato habemus huiusmodi societates charitatis et pietatis vinculo studiosissime inter se devinctas id cumulate praestituras esse, atque in certam erigimur spem ut Deus respiciens ad filiorum suorum vota, lacrymas, ieiunia, eleemosynas et preces iram in misericordiam propitiatus convertat, et impii confiteri cogantur fideles Deum protectorem habere, et ob id ipsum inviolabiles esse.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris die XXIII Februarii 1872. Pontificatus nostri anno vicesimo-sexto.

✠ CARD. PARACCIANI CLARELLI.



THE IRISH
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

NOVEMBER, 1872.

BULL OF ADRIAN THE FOURTH.

THERE was a time when it would be little less than treason to question the genuineness of the Bull by which Pope Adrian IV. is supposed to have made a grant of Ireland to Henry the Second; and, indeed, from the first half of the thirteenth to the close of the fifteenth century, it was principally through this supposed grant of the Holy See that the English Government sought to justify their claim to hold dominion in our island. However, opinions and times have changed, and at the present day this Bull of Adrian has as little bearing on the connection between England and this country as it could possibly have on the union of the Isle of Man with Great Britain.

On the other hand, many strange things have been said during the past months in the so-called nationalist journals whilst asserting the genuineness of this famous Bull. I need scarcely remark that it does not seem to have been the love either of our poor country or of historic truth that inspired their declamation. It proceeded mainly from their hatred to the Sovereign Pontiff, and from the vain hope that such exaggerated statements might in some way weaken the devoted affection of our people for Rome.

Laying aside such prejudiced opinions, the controversy as to the genuineness of Adrian's Bull should be viewed in a purely historical light, and its decision must depend on the value and weight of the historical arguments which may be advanced to sustain it.

The following is a literal translation of the old Latin text of Adrian's Bull:—

“Adrian, Bishop, servant of the servants of God, to our most dear Son in Christ, the illustrious King of the English, greeting and the Apostolical Benediction.

“The thoughts of your Highness are laudably and profitably

directed to the greater glory of your name on earth and to the increase of the reward of eternal happiness in heaven, when as a Catholic Prince you propose to yourself to extend the borders of the Church, to announce the truths of Christian Faith to ignorant and barbarous nations, and to root out the weeds of wickedness from the field of the Lord ; and the more effectually to accomplish this, you implore the counsel and favor of the Apostolic See. In which matter we feel assured that the higher your aims are, and the more discreet your proceedings, the happier, with God's aid, will be the result ; because those undertakings that proceed from the ardour of faith and the love of religion are sure always to have a prosperous end and issue.

“ It is beyond all doubt, as your Highness also doth acknowledge, that Ireland, and all the islands upon which Christ the Sun of Justice has shone, and which have received the knowledge of the Christian faith, are subject to the authority of St. Peter and of the most Holy Roman Church. Wherefore we are the more desirous to sow in them an acceptable seed and a plantation pleasing unto God, because we know that a most rigorous account of them shall be required of us hereafter.

“ Now, most dear Son in Christ, you have signified to us that you propose to enter the island of Ireland to establish the observance of law amongst its people, and to eradicate the weeds of vice ; and that you are willing to pay from every house one penny as an annual tribute to St. Peter, and to preserve the rights of the churches of that land whole and inviolate. We, therefore, receiving with due favor your pious and laudable desires, and graciously granting our consent to your petition, declare that it is pleasing and acceptable to us, that for the purpose of enlarging the limits of the Church, setting bounds to the torrent of vice, reforming evil manners, planting the seeds of virtue, and increasing Christian faith, you should enter that island and carry into effect those things which belong to the service of God and to the salvation of that people ; and that the people of that land should honorably receive and reverence you as Lord ; the rights of the churches being preserved untouched and entire, and reserving the annual tribute of one penny from every house to St. Peter and the most Holy Roman Church.

“ If, therefore, you resolve to carry these designs into execution, let it be your study to form that people to good morals, and take such orders both by yourself and by those whom you shall find qualified in faith, in words, and in conduct, that the Church there may be adorned, and the practices of Christian faith be planted and increased ; and let all that tends

to the glory of God and the salvation of souls be so ordered by you that you may deserve to obtain from God an increase of everlasting reward, and may secure on earth a glorious name throughout all time. Given at Rome," &c.

Before we proceed with the inquiry as to the genuineness of this letter of Pope Adrian, I must detain the reader with a few brief preliminary remarks.

First : Some passages of this important document have been very unfairly dealt with by modern writers while purporting to discuss its merits. Thus, for instance, Professor Richey, in his "Lectures on Irish History," presenting a translation of the Latin text to the lady pupils of the Alexandra College, makes the Pontiff to write : "You have signified to us, our well-beloved son in Christ, that you propose to enter the island of Ireland *in order to subdue the people*, &c. . . . We, therefore, regarding your pious and laudable design with due favor, &c., do hereby declare our will and pleasure, that for the purpose of enlarging the borders of the Church, &c., you do enter and *take possession of that island*."¹ Such an erroneous translation must be the more blamed in the present instance, as it was scarcely to be expected that the ladies whom the learned lecturer addressed would have leisure to consult the original Latin text of the document which he professed to translate. This, however, is not the only error into which Professor Richey has been betrayed regarding the Bull of Adrian IV. Having mentioned in a note the statement of Roger de Wendover, that the Bull was obtained from Pope Adrian in the year 1155, he adds his own opinion that "the grant appears to have been made in 1172."² However, at that date, Pope Adrian had been for about thirteen years freed from the cares of his Pontificate, having passed to a better world in the year 1159.

Second : Any one who attentively weighs the words of the above document will see at once that it prescinds from all title of conquest, whilst at the same time it makes no gift or transfer of dominion to Henry the Second. As far as this letter of Adrian is concerned, the visit of Henry to our island might be the enterprise of a friendly monarch, who, at the invitation of a distracted state, would seek by his presence to restore peace, and to uphold the observance of the laws. Thus, those foolish theories must at once be set aside, which rest on the groundless supposition that Pope Adrian authorized the invasion and plunder of our people by the Anglo-Norman adventurers.

¹ "Lectures on the History of Ireland," by A. G. Richey, Esq., delivered to the pupils of the Alexandra College during the Hilary and Easter Terms of 1869. Dublin, 1869, pages 122, 123.

² *Ibid.* page 121.

Third: There is another serious error which must also be set at rest by the simple perusal of the above document. I mean that opinion which would fain set forth the letter of Pope Adrian as a dogmatical definition of the Holy See, as if the Sovereign Pontiff then spoke *ex cathedra*, *i.e.*, solemnly propounded some doctrine to be believed by the Universal Church. Now it is manifest from the letter itself that it has none of the conditions required for a definition *ex cathedra*: it is not addressed to the Universal Church; it proposes no matter of faith to be held by all the children of Christ; in fact, it presents no doctrine whatever to be believed by the faithful, and it is nothing more than a commendatory letter addressed to Henry, resting on the good intentions set forth by that monarch himself. There is one maxim, indeed, which awakens the suspicions of the old Gallican school, *viz.*: that "all the islands are subject to the authority of St. Peter." However, it is no doctrinal teaching that is thus propounded: it is a matter of fact admitted by Henry himself, a principle recognised by the international law of Europe in the middle ages, a maxim set down by the various states themselves, the better to maintain peace and concord among the princes of Christendom. To admit, however, or to call in question the teaching of the civil law of Europe, as embodied in that maxim, has nothing whatever to say to the great prerogative of St. Peter's successors, whilst they solemnly propound to the faithful, in unerring accents, the doctrines of Divine faith.

Fourth: To many it will seem a paradox, and yet it is a fact, that the supposed Bull of Pope Adrian had no part whatever in the submission of the Irish chieftains to Henry the Second. Even according to those who maintain its genuineness, this Bull was not published till the year 1175, and certainly no mention of it was made in Ireland till long after the submission of the Irish princes. The success of the Anglo-Normans was mainly due to a far different cause, *viz.*, to the superior military skill and equipment of the invaders. Among the Anglo-Norman leaders were some of the bravest knights of the kingdom, who had won their laurels in the wars of France and Wales. Their weapons and armour rendered it almost impossible for the Irish troops to meet them in the open field. The cross-bow which was made use of for the first time in this invasion, produced as great a change in military tactics as the rifled cannon in our own days. When Henry came in person to Ireland his numerous army hushed all opposition. There were 400 vessels in his fleet, and if a minimum of twenty-five armed men be allowed for each vessel, we will have an army of at least 10,000 men fully equipped

landing unopposed on the southern shores of our island.¹ It is to this imposing force, and the armour of the Anglo-Norman knights, that we must in great part refer whatever success attended this invasion of the English monarch.

To proceed now with the immediate matter of our present historical inquiry, the following is the summary of the arguments in favor of the authenticity of Pope Adrian's letter, inserted in the *Irishman* newspaper of June the 8th last, by J. C. O'Callaghan, Esq., editor of the "*Macariae Excidium*," and author of many valuable works on Irish history:—"We have, firstly, the testimony of John of Salisbury, secretary to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and one of the ablest writers of his day, who relates his having been the envoy from Henry to Adrian, in 1155, to ask for a grant of Ireland, and such a grant having then been obtained, accompanied by a gold ring, containing a fine emerald, as a token of investiture, with which grant and ring the said John returned to Henry. We have, secondly, the grant or Bull of Adrian, *in extenso* in the works of Giraldus Cambrensis and his contemporary, Radulfus de Diceto, Dean of London, as well as in those of Roger de Wendover, and Matthew Paris. We have, thirdly, several Bulls of Adrian's successor, Pope Alexander III., still further to the purport of Adrian's, or in Henry's favour. We have, fourthly, the recorded public reading of the Bulls of Adrian and Alexander, at a meeting of Bishops in Waterford in 1175. We have, fifthly, after the liberation of Scotland from England at Bannockburn, and the consequent invitation of Bruce's brother, Edward, to be King of Ireland, the Bull of Adrian prefixed to the eloquent lay remonstrance, which the Irish presented to Pope John XXII., against the English; the same Bull, moreover, referred to in the remonstrance itself, as so ruinous to Ireland; and a copy of that Bull, accordingly sent back by the Pope to Edward II. of England, for his use under those circumstances. We have, sixthly, from Cardinal Baronius, in his great work, the '*Annales Ecclesiastici*,' under Adrian IV., his grant of Ireland to his countrymen in full, or, as is said, '*ex codice Vaticano, diploma datum ad Henricum, Anglorum Regem.*' We have, seventhly, the Bull in the *Bullarium Romanum*, as printed at Rome, in 1739. The citations and references in support of all the foregoing statements will be found in the '*Notes and Illustrations*' of my edition of '*Macariae Excidium*' for the Irish Archæological Society in 1850, given in such a manner as must satisfy the most sceptical."

¹ The authorities for the statements made in the text may be seen in "*Macariae Excidium*," edited by Mr. O'Callaghan for the R.I.A. in 1850.

Examining these arguments in detail, I will follow the order thus marked out by Mr. O'Callaghan.

1.—We meet, in the first place, the testimony of John of Salisbury, who, in his *Metalogicus* (lib. iv., cap. 42), writes, that being in an official capacity at the Papal court, in 1155, Pope Adrian IV. then granted the investiture of Ireland to the illustrious King Henry II. of England.¹

I do not wish in any way to detract from the praise due to John of Salisbury, who was at this time one of the ablest courtiers of Henry II. However, the words here imputed to him must be taken with great reserve. Inserted as they are in the last chapter of his work, they are not at all required by the context; by cancelling them the whole passage runs smoother, and is more connected in every way. This is the more striking, as in another work of the same writer, which is entitled *Polycraticus*, we meet with a detailed account of the various incidents of his embassy to Pope Adrian, yet he there makes no mention of the Bull in Henry's favor, or of the gold ring and its fine emerald, or of the grant of Ireland, all of which would have been so important for his narrative.

We must also hold in mind the time when the *Metalogicus* was written. The author himself fixes its date; for, immediately before asking the prayers of "those who read his book, and those who hear it read," he tells us that the news of Pope Adrian's death had reached him a little time before, and he adds that his own patron, Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury, though still living, was weighed down by many infirmities.² Now, Pope Adrian departed this life in 1159, and the death of Archbishop Theobald happened in 1161. Hence, Gale and the other editors of John of Salisbury's works, without a dissentient voice, refer the *Metalogicus* to the year 1159.

Now it is a matter beyond the reach of controversy, that if Henry the Second obtained the investiture of Ireland from Adrian IV., he kept this grant a strict secret till at least the year 1175. For twenty years, *i.e.*, from 1155 to 1175, no mention was made of the gift of Adrian. Henry did not refer to it when authorizing his vassals to join Diarmaid in 1167, when Adrian's Bull would have been so opportune to justify his intervention; he did not mention it when he him-

¹ "Ad preces meas illustri regi Anglorum Henrico Secundo (Adrianus) concessit et dedit Hiberniam jure haereditario possidendam; sicut literae ipsius testantur in hodiernum diem. Nam omnes insulae, de jure antiquo, ex donatione Constantini qui eam fundavit et dotavit, dicuntur ad Romanam Ecclesiam pertinere. Annullum quoque per me transmisit aureum, smaragdo optimo decoratum, quo fieret investitura juris in gerenda Hibernia: idemque adhuc annulus in curiali archivo publico custodiri jussus est."

² *Metalogicus*, lib. iv. cap. ult.

self set out for Ireland to solicit and receive the homage of the Irish princes ; he did not even refer to it when he assumed his new title and accomplished the purpose of his expedition. The Council of Cashel, in 1172, was the first episcopal assembly after Henry's arrival in Ireland ; the Papal Legate was present there, and did Adrian's Bull exist it should necessarily have engaged the attention of the assembled Fathers. Nevertheless, not a whisper as to Adrian's grant was to be heard at that famous Council. Even the learned editor of "Cambrensis Eversus," whilst warmly asserting the genuineness of Adrian's Bull, admits "there is not any, even the slightest authority, for asserting that its existence was known in Ireland before the year 1172, or for three years later"—(vol. ii., p. 440, note z). It is extremely difficult, in any hypothesis, to explain in a satisfactory way this mysterious silence of Henry the Second, nor is it easy to understand how a fact so important, so vital to the interests of Ireland, could remain so many years concealed from those who ruled the destinies of the Irish Church. For, we must hold in mind, that throughout that interval Ireland numbered among its Bishops one who held the important office of Legate of the Holy See ; our Church had constant intercourse with England and the continent, and through St. Laurence O'Toole and a hundred other distinguished prelates, enjoyed in the fullest manner the confidence of Rome.

If Adrian granted this Bull to Henry at the solicitation of John of Salisbury in 1155, there is but one explanation for the silence of this courtier in his diary, as set forth in the "Polycraticus," and for the concealment of the Bull itself from the Irish bishops and people, viz., that this secrecy was required by the state policy of the English monarch. And, if it be so, how then can we be asked to admit as genuine this passage of the "Metalogicus," in which the astute agent of Henry, still continuing to discharge offices of the highest trust in the Court, would proclaim to the world as early as the year 1159, that Pope Adrian had made this formal grant of Ireland to his royal master, and that the solemn record of the investiture of this high dignity was preserved in the public archives of the kingdom ?

It must also be added, that there are some phrases in this passage of the "Metalogicus" which manifestly betray the hand of the impostor. Thus, the words *usque in hodiernum diem* imply that a long interval had elapsed since the concession was made by Pope Adrian ; and surely they could not have been penned by John of Salisbury in 1159. Much less can we suppose that this writer employed the words *jure hereditario possidendam*. No such hereditary right is granted in

the Bull of Adrian. It was not dreamt of even during the first years of the Anglo-Norman invasion, and it was only at a later period, when the Irish chieftains scornfully rejected the Anglo-Norman law of hereditary succession, that this expedient was thought of for allaying the fierce opposition of our people.

Thus we are forced to regard the supposed testimony of John of Salisbury as nothing more than a clumsy interpolation, which probably was not inserted in his work till many years after the first Anglo-Norman invasion of our island.

2.—I now come to the second and main argument of those who seek to defend the authenticity of Pope Adrian's Bull. We have *Giraldus Cambrensis*, they say, a contemporary witness, whose testimony is unquestionable. He inserts in full this letter of Adrian IV., and he nowhere betrays the slightest doubt in regard to its genuineness.

Some years ago we might perhaps have accepted this flattering character of Giraldus Cambrensis, but at the present day, and since the publication of an accurate edition of his historical works, it is impossible for us to do so.

It was not till many years after the death of Pope Adrian that Gerald de Barry, better known by the name of Giraldus Cambrensis, entered on the stage of Irish history. Twice he visited Ireland after the year 1183, and on both occasions he discharged those duties which, at the present day, would merit for him the title of special court correspondent with the invading army. The *Expugnatio Hibernica*, in which he inserts Adrian's Bull, may justly be said to have been written to order. Hence, as a matter of course, Giraldus adopted in it as genuine every document set forth as such by his royal master, and any statements that strengthened the claim or promoted the interests of his brother Welsh adventurers, were sure not to be too nicely weighed in the scales of criticism by such an historian. The editors of the works of Giraldus, just now published under the direction of the Master of the Rolls, have fully recognised this special feature of the historical writings of Giraldus. The official catalogue describing the *Expugnatio Hibernica*, of which we treat, expressly says: "It may be regarded rather as a great epic, than a sober relation of facts occurring in his own days. No one can peruse it without coming to the conclusion that it is rather a poetical fiction than a prosaic truthful history."

In the preface to the fifth volume of the Historical Treatises of Giraldus, the learned editor, Rev. James F. Dimock, enters at considerable length into the inquiry, whether the *Expugnatio Hibernica* was to be accepted as genuine and

authentic history. I need do no more than state the conclusions which he enunciates :—

“I think I have said enough to justify me in refusing to accept Giraldus’s history of the Irish and of their English invaders as sober, truthful history.”¹ And again he writes : “My good friend and pre-labourer in editing these volumes of Giraldus’s works (Mr. Brewer) says of the *Expugnatio*, that Giraldus would seem to have regarded his subject rather as a great epic, which undoubtedly it was, than a sober relation of facts occurring in his own days. . . . This is a most true and characteristic description of Giraldus’s treatment of his subject : the treatise certainly is, in great measure, rather a poetical fiction than a prosaic truthful history.”²

I must further remark as another result from Rev. Mr. Dimock’s researches, that the old text of Giraldus in reference to Pope Adrian’s Bull, from which Mr. O’Callaghan’s citations are made, is now proved to be singularly defective. I will give the pithy words of that learned editor, which are stronger than any I would wish to use : “*No more absurd nonsensical a muddle was ever blundered into by the most stupid of abbreviators.*”³ It is of course from the ancient MSS. of the work that this corruption of the old text is mainly proved ; but it should indeed be apparent from an attentive study of the very printed text itself, for, as Mr. Dimock remarks, being accurately translated, its words “marvellously contrive to make Henry, in 1172, apply for and procure this privilege from Pope Adrian, who died in 1159, and with equally marvellous confusion they represent John of Salisbury, who had been Henry’s agent in procuring this privilege in 1155, as sent, not to Ireland, but to Rome, for the purpose of publishing the Bull at Waterford in 1174 or 1175.”⁴

I will only add, regarding the testimony of Giraldus Cambrensis, that in the genuine text of the *Expugnatio Hibernica* he places on the same level the Bull of Adrian IV. and that of Alexander III. Nevertheless, as we will just now see, he elsewhere admits that there were many and grave suspicions that the supposed Bull of Alexander had never been granted by the Holy See.

The other names mentioned together with Giraldus will not detain us long. They are all writers who only incidentally make reference to Irish matters, and in these they naturally enough take Giraldus for their guide.

¹ “Giraldi Cambrensis Opera,” under the direction of the Master of the Rolls. Vol. v. London 1867. Preface, page lxix.

² Ibid. page lxx. ³ Ibid. page xliii. ⁴ Ibid.

Ralph de Diceto wrote about 1210, and like Giraldus received his honours at the hands of Henry the Second. Irish historians have not yet accepted him as a guide in reference to matters connected with our country. For instance, the Synod of Cashel of 1172, which was one of the most important events of that period of our history, is described by him as held in Lismore.

Roger de Wendover was a monk of St. Alban's, who died 6th of May, 1237. His "*Flores Historiarum*" begin with the creation of the world, and end two years before his death in 1235. He merely compendiates other sources down to the beginning of the thirteenth century. It is only the subsequent portion of his work which is held in esteem by our annalists.

Matthew Paris was a brother religious of Roger de Wendover in St. Alban's, where he died in 1259. Mr. Coxe, who edited a portion of the "*Flores Historiarum*" for the English Historical Society (1841-1844), has proved that down to the year 1235 Matthew Paris only compendiates the work of Wendover. At all events his "*Historia Major*" is of very little weight. A distinguished German historian of the present day, Scrhödl, thus conveys his strictures on its merits:—

"Se trompe a chaque instant, et, entraîné par son aveugle rage de critique, donne pour des faits historiques des anecdotes piquantes qui n'ont aucune authenticité, des légendes déraisonnables et toutes sortes de détails suspects, exagérés et calomnieux."

To the testimony of such writers we may well oppose the silence of Peter de Blois, secretary of Henry the Second, though chronicling the chief events of Henry's reign, and the silence of all our native annalists, not one of whom ever mentions the Bull of Adrian.

3.—But it is time to pass on to the third argument which is advanced by our opponents. It is quite true that we have some letters or Bulls of Pope Alexander III., connected with the Irish invasion. Three of these, written in 1172, are certainly authentic. They are preserved in the "*Liber Niger Scaccarii*," from which they were edited by Hearne, and in later times they have been accurately printed by Mr. O'Callaghan and Rev. Dr. Kelly. They are addressed respectively to the Irish bishops, King Henry, and the Irish princes. So far, however, are these letters from corroborating the genuineness of Pope Adrian's Bull, that they furnish an unanswerable argument for wholly setting it aside as groundless and unauthentic. They are entirely devoted to the circumstances of the invasion of our island and its results, and yet the only

title that they recognise in Henry is "that monarch's power and the submission of the Irish chieftains." They simply ignore any Bull of Adrian, and any investiture from the Holy See.

There is, however, another Bull of Alexander III., preserved by Giraldus Cambrensis which is supposed to have been granted at the request of King Henry in 1172, and is confirmatory of the gift and investiture made by Pope Adrian: it Mr. O'Callaghan holds that this Bull of Alexander III. sets at rest for ever all doubt as to the genuineness of the grant made by Adrian IV.¹

The question at once suggests itself:—Is this Bull of Alexander III. to be itself admitted as genuine and authentic? If its own authority be doubtful, surely it cannot suffice to prop up the tottering cause of Adrian's Bull. Now, its style is entirely different from that of the three authentic letters of which we have just spoken. Quite in opposition to these letters "the only authority alleged in it for Henry's right to Ireland is the Bull of Adrian," as Dr. Lanigan² allows. The genuine letters are dated from Tusculum, where, as we know from other sources, Alexander actually resided in 1172. On the other hand, this confirmatory Bull, though supposed to have been obtained in 1172, is dated *from Rome*, thus clearly betraying the hand of the impostor. Such was the disturbed condition of Rome at that period that it was impossible for His Holiness to reside there; and hence we find him sometimes holding his Court in Tusculum, at other times in Segni, Anagni, or Ferrara. It was only when these disturbances were quelled that Alexander III. was able, in 1178, to return in triumph to his capital.³

But there is still another reason why we must doubt of the authority of this confirmatory Bull. The researches of Rev. Mr. Dimock have proved what Ussher long ago remarked, that this Bull of Alexander originally formed part of the work of Giraldus Cambrensis,⁴ although later copyists, and the first editors, including the learned Camden, recognising its spuriousness, excluded it from Giraldus's text. The matter is now set at rest, for the ancient MSS. clearly prove that it originally formed part of the "Expugnatio Hibernica." Thanks, however, to the zeal and industry of Mr. Brewer, we are at present acquainted with another work of Giraldus, written at a later period than his Historical Tracts on Ireland. It is entitled "De Principis Instructione," and was edited in 1846 for the "Anglia Christiana" Society. Now, in this treatise Giraldus

¹ "Macariae Excidium," p. 247.

² Eccles. Hist. iv., 224.

³ Mozzoni "Tavole Cronologiche," Rome, 1867, ad. an. 1179.

⁴ "Opera Giraldi," vol. v., page 318

refers to the Bull of Alexander III., of which we treat, but he prefixes the following remarkable words:¹ “Some assert or imagine that this Bull was obtained from the Pope; but others deny that it was ever obtained from the Pontiff.” “Sicut a quibusdam impetratum asseritur aut confingitur; ab aliis autem unquam impetratum fuisse negatur.” Surely these words should suffice to convince the most sceptical that the fact of the Bull of Alexander being recited by Giraldus in his “Expugnatio Hibernica” is a very unsatisfactory ground on which to rest the argument for its genuineness.

4. As regards the Synod of Waterford in 1175, and the statement that the Bulls of Adrian and Alexander were published therein for the first time, all these matters rest on the very doubtful authority of Giraldus Cambrensis. We have no record in the Irish Annals that any general meeting of the Irish Bishops was held in Waterford in 1175. The circumstances of the country rendered such a Synod impossible; for war and dissensions raged throughout the length and breadth of our island. It was in that year, however, that the first Bishop was appointed by King Henry to the See of Waterford, as Ware informs us: and, perhaps, we would not err were we to suppose that the Synod so pompously set forth by Giraldus, was a convention of the Anglo-Norman clergy of Waterford under their newly-appointed Prelate, all of whom would, no doubt, joyfully accept the official documents presented in the name of the King by Nicholas of Wallingford.

Leland supposes that this Synod of Waterford was not held till 1177. The disturbed state of the kingdom, however, rendered a Synod equally impossible in that year, and all our ancient authorities utterly ignore such a Synod.

5.—In the Remonstrance addressed by the Irish princes and people to John XXII., about the year 1315, repeated mention is made of the Bull of Adrian. But then it is only cited there as a conclusive argument *ad hominem* against the English traducers of our nation: “lest the bitter and venomous calumnies of the English, and their unjust and unfounded attacks upon us and all who support our rights, may in any degree influence the mind of your Holiness.” The Bull of Adrian IV. was published by the English, and set forth by them as the charter-deed of their rule in Ireland, yet they violated in a most flagrant manner all the conditions of that Papal grant. The Irish princes and people in self-defence had now made over the sovereignty of the island to Edward de Bruce, brother of the Scottish King; they style him their adopted monarch, and they pray the Pope to give a formal sanction to their proceed-

¹ *De Princip. Instruct.*, page 53.

ings. Thus, throughout the whole Remonstrance the Bull of Adrian is used as a telling argument against the injustice of the invaders, and as a precedent which John XXII. might justly follow in sanctioning the transfer of the Irish crown to Edward Bruce. But in all this the historian will find no grounds for asserting the genuineness of the supposed Bulls of Adrian or Alexander. We will just now see that at this very time the Irish people universally regarded these Bulls as spurious inventions of their English enemies.

6.—Baronius, the eminent ecclesiastical historian, inserts in his invaluable *Annals* the Bull of Adrian IV. "from a Vatican Manuscript." This is the sixth argument advanced by Mr. O'Callaghan.

It is not my intention to question in any way the services rendered by Cardinal Baronius to the cause of our Church History; but at the same time no one will deny that considerable progress has been made in historical research during the past three hundred and fifty years, and many documents are now set aside which were then accepted as unquestioned on the supposed reliable authority of preceding chroniclers.

In the present instance we are not left in doubt as to the source whence Baronius derived his information regarding Adrian's supposed Bull. During my stay in Rome I took occasion to inquire whether the MSS. of the eminent annalist, which are happily preserved, indicated the special "Vatican Manuscript" referred to in his printed text, and I was informed by the learned archivist of the Vatican, Monsignor Theiner, who is at present engaged in giving a new edition, and continuing the great work of Baronius, that the *Codex Vaticanus* referred to is a MS. copy of the History of Matthew Paris, which is preserved in the Vatican Library. Thus it is the testimony of Matthew Paris alone that here confronts us in the pages of Baronius, and no new argument can be taken from the words of the eminent annalist. Relying on the same high authority, I am happy to state that nowhere in the private archives or among the private papers of the Vatican, or in the *Regesta*, which Jaffe's researches have made so famous, or in the various indices of the Pontifical Letters, can a single trace be found of the supposed Bulls of Adrian IV. and Alexander III.

7.—The last argument advanced by Mr. O'Callaghan will not detain us long. The insertion or omission of such ancient records in the Bullarium is a matter that depends wholly on the critical skill of the editor. Curious enough, in one edition of the Bullarium, as may be seen in the references of Dr. Lanigan, Adrian's Bull is inserted, whilst no mention is made

of that of Alexander: in another edition, however, the Bull of Alexander is given in full, whilst the Bull of Adrian is omitted. We may well leave our opponents to settle this matter with the conflicting editors of the Bullarium. They, probably like Baronius, merely copied the Bull of Adrian from Matthew Paris, and erred in doing so. Labbè, in his magnificent edition of the Councils, also publishes Adrian's Bull, but then he expressly tells us that it is copied from the work of Matthew Paris. We have thus, as far as the limits of this article will allow, examined in detail the various arguments which support the genuineness of the supposed Bull, and now it only remains for us to conclude that there are no sufficient grounds for accepting that document as the genuine work of Pope Adrian.

Indeed the Irish nation at all times, as if instinctively, shrunk from accepting it as genuine, and unhesitatingly pronounced it an Anglo-Norman forgery. We have already seen how even Giraldus Cambrensis refers to the doubts which had arisen regarding the Bull of Pope Alexander; but we have at hand still more conclusive evidence that Adrian's Bull was universally rejected by our people. There is, happily, preserved in the Barberini archives, Rome, a MS. of the fourteenth century containing a series of official papers connected with the Pontificate of John XXII., and amongst them is a letter from the Lord Justiciary and the Royal Council of Ireland, forwarded to Rome under the Royal Seal, and presented to His Holiness by William of Nottingham, Canon and Precentor¹ of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, about the year 1325. In this important, but hitherto unnoticed document, the Irish are accused of very many crimes, among which is insidiously introduced the rejection of the supposed Bulls: "*Moreover, they assert that the King of England under false pretences and by false Bulls obtained the dominion of Ireland, and, this opinion is commonly held by them.*" "*Asserentes etiam Dominum Regem Angliæ ex falsa suggestione et ex falsis Bullis terram Hiberniæ in dominium impetrasse ac communiter hoc tenentes.*" This national tradition was preserved unbroken throughout the turmoil of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and on the revival of our historical literature in the beginning of the seventeenth century, was registered in the pages of Lynch, Stephen White, and other writers.

It will be well also, whilst forming our judgment regarding this supposed Bull of Adrian, to hold in mind the disturbed state of society, especially in Italy, at the time to which it refers. At the present day it would be no easy matter indeed for such a forgery to survive more than a few weeks. But at

¹ Cotton, in *Fasti Ecc. Hib.*, gives his name as Precentor in 1323 to 1327.

the close of the twelfth century it was far otherwise. Owing to the constant revolutions and disturbances that then prevailed, the Pontiff was oftentimes obliged to fly from city to city; frequently his papers were seized and burned, and he himself detained as a hostage or a prisoner by his enemies. Hence it is that several forged Bulls, examples of which are given in *Cambrensis Eversus*, date from these times. More than one of the grants made to the Norman families are now believed to rest on such forgeries; and that the Anglo-Norman adventurers in Ireland were not strangers to such deeds of darkness, appears from the fact that a matrix for forging the Papal Seal of such Bulls, now preserved in the R.I. Academy, was found a few years ago in the ruins of one of the earliest Anglo-Norman monasteries founded by De Courcy.

The circumstances of the publication of the Bull by Henry were surely not calculated to disarm suspicion. Our opponents do not even pretend that it was made known in Ireland till the year 1175, and hence, though publicly granted with solemn investiture, as John of Salisbury's testimony would imply, and though its record was deposited in the public archives of the kingdom, this Bull, so vital to the interests of the Irish Church, should have remained dormant for twenty years, unnoticed in Rome, unnoticed by Henry's courtiers, still more, unnoticed by the Irish Bishops, and I will add, unnoticed by the Continental Sovereigns so jealous of the power and preponderance of the English Monarch. For such suppositions there is indeed no parallel in the whole history of investitures.

It is seldom, too, that the hand of the impostor may not be detected in some at least of the minor details of the spurious document. In the present instance more than one ancient MS. preserves the concluding formula of the Bull: "*Datum Romae,*" dated from Rome. Now, this simple formula would suffice of itself to prove the whole Bull to be a forgery. Before the news of the election of Pope Adrian to the Chair of St. Peter could reach England, that Pontiff was obliged to seek for safety in flight from his capital. Rome was in revolt, and Arnold of Brescia sought to renew there a spectre of the old Pagan Republic. John of Salisbury, in his *Polycraticus*, faithfully attests that on his arrival in Italy, the Papal Court was held not in Rome but in Beneventum: it was in this city he presented to Pope Adrian the congratulations of Henry II., and he mentions his sojourn there during the three months that he remained in Italy. This is further confirmed by the Italian chronicles. Baronius saw the inconsistency of the formula, *Datum Romae*, with the date 1155, and hence, in his Annals, he entered Adrian's Bull under the year 1159;

but if this date be correct, surely then that Bull could not have been brought to Henry by John of Salisbury, and the passage of the *Metalogicus* referring to it, must at once be admitted a forgery. Other historians have been equally puzzled to find a year for this supposed Bull. For instance, O'Halloran, in his History of Ireland, whilst admitting that the Irish people always regarded the Bull as a forgery, refers its date to the year 1167, that is, eight years after the death of Pope Adrian IV.

There is only one other reflection with which I wish to detain the reader. The condition of our country, and the relations between Ireland and the English King, which are set forth in the supposed Bull, are precisely those of the year 1172; but it would have required more than a prophetic vision to have anticipated them in 1155. In 1155 Ireland was not in a state of turmoil or verging towards barbarism: on the contrary, it was rapidly progressing and renewing its claim to religious and moral pre-eminence. I will add, that Pope Adrian, who had studied under Irish masters, knew well this flourishing condition of our country. In 1172, however, a sad change had come over our island. Four years of continual warfare, and the ravages of the Anglo-Norman filibusterers, since their first landing in 1168, had well nigh reduced Ireland to a state of barbarism, and the authentic letters of Alexander III., in 1172, faithfully describe its most deplorable condition. Moreover, an expedition of Henry to Ireland, which would not be an invasion, and yet would merit the homage of the Irish princes, was simply an impossibility in 1155. But owing to the special circumstances of the kingdom, such in reality was the expedition of Henry in 1172. He set out for Ireland not avowedly to invade and conquer it, but to curb the insolence and to punish the deeds of pillage of his own Norman freebooters. Hence, during his stay in Ireland he fought no battle and made no conquest; his first measures of severity were directed against some of the most lawless of the early Norman adventurers, and this more than anything else reconciled the native princes to his military display. In return he received from a majority of the Irish chieftains the empty title of *Ard-righ*, or "Head Sovereign," which did not suppose any conquest on his part, and did not involve any surrender of their own hereditary rights. Such a state of things could not have been imagined in 1155; and yet it is one which is implied in the spurious Bull of the much maligned Pontiff, Adrian the Fourth.

LOUISE LATEAU.—PART I.

A VISIT TO THE HAMLET OF BOIS D'HAINÉ IN THE SUMMER OF 1872.

“Opera autem Dei revelare et confiteri honorificum est.”—TOBIAS xii. 7.

THE village of Manage, on the borders of the great Belgian coal-field, is close to a busy railway station, and scarcely more than an hour's distance south from the gay city of Brussels. Late in the afternoon of a sultry day, in the month of August last, I reached this unattractive, noisy, place; and spent a somewhat uncomfortable night, disturbed as I was, ever and anon, by the heavy rumbling of the coal waggons, and the shrill whistling of the engines. I was up betimes in the morning, and set out from the village inn soon after five o'clock, to make my way to the hamlet of Bois d'Hainé, which, as I was told, was distant about twenty minutes' walk. After following the high road for not quite half a mile, I met some peasants going to their work; and asking my way, they showed me a path to the right, which led along through pleasant meadows and corn-fields, straight to the door of the Curé's house at Bois d'Hainé.

This little hamlet, embosomed in the undulations of a rich and smiling country, is the very ideal of picturesque beauty and primitive simplicity. There are no streets, no rows of houses; but a couple of hundred rustic cottages are scattered about, amid shady orchards and fragrant gardens. The inhabitants, chiefly devoted to agriculture, have most of the comforts, without any of the luxuries, of life. There is little wealth amongst them, and but scanty learning: they are ignorant or heedless of modern improvements: and, free from ambition and from care, they pass their lives in humble, contented, obscurity.

But it was not to admire picturesque scenery, or rustic simplicity of manners, that I had come to the hamlet of Bois d'Hainé. The story had gone about that, near to this tranquil and secluded spot, a peasant girl, by name Louise Lateau, had for four years borne on her hands and feet and side, the stigmas of our Lord's Passion; that from these stigmas, blood flowed copiously on the Friday of each successive week, while, at the same time, around her head, was developed a coronet of bleeding points, representing the crown of thorns. Further, it was said, that every Friday, for several hours together, she was rapt in an ecstasy, during which she became completely insensible to all material objects, and wholly absorbed in the contemplation of the Divine Passion, the various scenes of

which were vividly present to her mind, as in a vision. This story I had read, from time to time, variously told, in newspapers and magazines, and now I was come to the place itself, in the hope that I might be able to see, with my own eyes, so striking and wonderful a prodigy.

It was exactly a quarter to six o'clock when I reached the Curé's house. The outer door was opened directly I pulled the bell, and I found him walking in his garden. He told me it was not allowed to every one to see Louise, but only to very few, and that none were admitted except on a written application, made some weeks beforehand. After a little conversation, however, he kindly agreed to relax the rule in my favour; and, as this was Friday, he proposed I should come down to his house between twelve and one o'clock, when I might go with him to see her in her ecstasy.

In the meantime we had reached the little church where he was about to say Mass. Three or four priests were already there, who had come, like myself, from a distance, to see the Ecstatica. I found, on inquiry, they were now going direct to her house, to give her Holy Communion. It is her uniform practice to receive Communion daily. On all other days she comes to the church, like the rest of the faithful. But on Fridays she cannot come, on account of the bleeding: and so, by a special privilege, the Blessed Sacrament is carried to her house. I asked the Curé's permission to accompany the procession; and we set out just as the bell for six o'clock Mass had ceased to toll.

The Sacristan of the church went first, bearing a lighted torch enclosed within an ornamental lantern. Next, in soutane and surplice, and stole, followed the priest, who carried the Blessed Sacrament. Then came three other priests and myself. We took a path through the fields, the same by which I had come to the hamlet, half an hour before. As we wound our way along, the sun burst out through a thin veil of cloud that hung in the eastern sky, the dew glistened on the grass, and a light wind rustled through the ears of corn. Emerging, after a few minutes, from the path, we came on a sort of bridle road, and passed some scattered houses. There were peasant children playing in the way: there were busy housewives sweeping out their houses: there were listless idlers attracted to the doorsteps, to see the procession go by: and all knelt down to adore the Blessed Sacrament as it passed.

Then we came to a level crossing on the railway—a branch line from Manage, which penetrates into the heart of the coal country. A long train of coal waggons was coming up, and we had to wait for a minute or two. The engine-driver and

the stoker raised their caps as they hurried by : and the man in charge of the gate, fell on his knees before the Blessed Sacrament, while, at the same time, he held up his white flag to the train. The house of Louise Lateau was now in sight, about two hundred yards beyond the level crossing, and just half a mile from the parish church of Bois d'Haine.

It is a small whitewashed cottage, standing by the roadside ; unpretending in appearance, but singularly neat and well kept. As we came near, the door was noiselessly opened from within. We passed first into a room of moderate dimensions, which answers the double purpose of kitchen and work-room ; for the family is poor, an aged mother and her three daughters having scarcely any means of support but what they earn by the work of their own hands. A sewing machine stood on a deal table at one side ; and the walls, beautifully white and clean, were adorned here and there with pious pictures.

The next room, of smaller size, seemed to be the sleeping apartment of the family. In it was one of the sisters, kneeling in prayer. Directly before her was an open door ; and through this door we passed into the room of Louise. This room, about ten feet square, is a recent addition to the house. It was built for Louise, after the weekly recurrence of the bleeding and the ecstasy was fully established : for it was found desirable to give her a place of retirement, where she might remain undisturbed herself, and where she would not interfere with the routine of domestic work.

In this little sanctuary every thing was exquisitely neat and modest. Before us, a very small table, decorated with artificial flowers, and bright with burning tapers, was covered with a linen cloth of snowy whiteness, to receive the Blessed Sacrament. On the right, at the back of the door, was a tiny bed, carefully made up for the day, and at the foot of the bed was Louise herself upon her knees. She is twenty-two years of age, rather under the middle height, and somewhat plain in appearance. As she knelt there, waiting to receive Communion, her face bore a certain expression of sadness, but was not, by any means, melancholy or care-worn. Her dress, in perfect harmony with everything around, was simple and unpretending.

Over her hands was spread out a long linen cloth, which she held up under her chin. Another of the same kind, saturated with blood, was on the bed close by, as if it had been changed for a fresh one just before we came in : beside it were lying her beads. The blood stood out in drops on her forehead, which looked as if scratched and torn ; and, further

back, it could be seen oozing out through her hair, under her little black cap. She remained perfectly motionless, and never raised her eyes. After receiving Communion she took a little water from the hand of the priest. The ceremony lasted altogether, from the time we entered the room, about three or four minutes; and before it was ended, the blood, which had been accumulating every moment on her forehead, was flowing down over her face in three separate streams.

When we came back to the Church, the Curé was finishing his Mass, in the presence of a large peasant congregation. As there were two altars, we had an opportunity of saying Mass, too, without much delay; and afterwards, the Curé invited us all to breakfast. I eagerly accepted the invitation, hoping to hear, from an authentic source, an exact account of the extraordinary phenomena manifested in Louise, and to learn, perhaps, some interesting details of her life. But I was doomed to disappointment. The worthy Curé was not communicative: it was only with reluctance he would speak about Louise at all; and he seemed rather disposed to rebuke our curiosity than to gratify it. One thing, indeed, came out, which was new to me, that Louise had eaten nothing since last March twelvemonth. But even this fact was drawn from him with difficulty, and he spoke of it without any expression of admiration or surprise.

It seemed to me as if the good Curé had been so long accustomed to supernatural wonders in the person of Louise Lateau, that they have ceased to be wonders for him. As Saint Augustine says, it is not what is really most wonderful that strikes us most, but rather what is rare. The countless marvels of the earth and of the heavens pass before our eyes, day after day, and we make but little account of them; so, too, it would seem that those in daily intercourse with Louise, have grown so familiar with the prodigies which God has wrought in her, that the feeling of wonder has passed away, and they would now be more surprised at the cessation of these prodigies than they are at their continuance.

We learned, during breakfast, that Louise usually passes into her ecstasy between nine and ten o'clock on Friday morning, and comes out of it about five in the afternoon. As she is very unwilling to be made an object of exhibition, visitors are not admitted until after the ecstasy has begun, and they must leave before it is over. By this arrangement she is spared all confusion and embarrassment: for while the ecstasy lasts, she is completely unconscious of what is going on around her. Accordingly, when we were taking our leave after breakfast, the Curé directed us to return at half-past

twelve, and engaged to come with us himself to the house of the Ecstatica.

I came punctually at the time appointed. The other priests had already arrived. But there was a varied crowd of visitors besides, assembled in the hall and parlour of the Curé's house, who had come, not only from the neighbouring provinces of Belgium, but from distant parts of France, and England, and America. It was a troublesome and unpleasant task for the poor Curé to meet them all: to listen to their several stories, to hear their urgent petitions, and yet to refuse what they sought for so earnestly. He was firm, however, though gentle. He told them he had long ago promised admission to as many as the room could hold; that those who had got his promise were already waiting for him at the house of Louise, and that it would be unfair to exclude them now, at the last moment, in order to make room for others, who had come late, and who had made no previous application.

We set out at length, and in a few minutes reached the house. Here we encountered another crowd, of perhaps forty people, many of whom had come without any arrangement with the Curé, in the vague hope of obtaining admission. Then followed the same unpleasant scene we had already witnessed, of expostulation and entreaty. In the end, the Curé, who acted with great tact, and a certain blunt courtesy, succeeded in getting together those whose claim he recognised, and arranging them close to the door of the house. He then tapped lightly at the window. The door was opened in a moment. We entered, to the number of about five-and-twenty, and the door was closed again.

Louise was alone in the inner room. She was seated on a chair at the foot of her bed, just in the same place where she had knelt to receive Communion in the morning. Her body was bent slightly forward; her hands rested on her lap, and were covered with a linen cloth, deeply stained with blood; her face, partly turned round towards her right shoulder, was directed upwards; her eyes, full of expression, were wide open, and seemed to be fixed on some object that absorbed all her thoughts; her whole attitude suggested the idea of eager and earnest attention. Though five-and-twenty people had, all at once, come into the little room, with a sort of rush, the ecstatic girl never stirred; her eyes were never for a moment diverted from the object on which they seemed to be immovably fixed; nor did she appear, in the least degree, conscious that her solitude had been suddenly invaded by an intensely eager, though reverent and awe-stricken, crowd.

There were four or five priests in the room. At a signal

from the Curé they took out their Breviaries, and began to read aloud the Vespers of the day: it was the Eve of St. Laurence, Martyr. As soon as the first murmurs of prayer were heard, the countenance of Louise seemed to be suddenly lit up with an expression of innocent delight. It was no longer plain, but beautiful and attractive. At intervals, a sweet smile played across her features, and her eyes beamed with a more brilliant lustre. This was always the case at the Gloria Patri, and at the Ave Maria. But a more striking change came with the first verse of the Magnificat. The movement of her features betokened especial emotion; she started with a sudden thrill of joy, and her hands, at the same moment, rose up from her knees, where they had before rested, into an attitude partly of wonder, partly of adoration.

By this last movement the cloth that had covered her hands was thrown off, and the stigmas became visible. At first they were somewhat concealed by the blood, which was slowly oozing through the skin. But some pious people, seeing that a favourable moment had arrived for getting a relic of this extraordinary scene, began to apply white handkerchiefs and linen cloths to the bleeding marks; and in a few moments all the blood was wiped away. The nature of the stigmas was then more distinctly seen. They are oval marks of a bright-red hue, appearing on the back and palm of each hand, about the centre. Speaking roughly, each stigma is about an inch in length, and somewhat more than half an inch in breadth. There was no wound, properly so called, but the blood seemed to force its way through the unbroken skin. In a very short time, sufficient blood had flowed again to gratify the devotion of other pilgrims, who applied their handkerchiefs, as had been done before, until all the blood had been wiped away a second time. This process was repeated several times during the course of our visit. It has been remarked, however, that the blood does not usually flow so fast during the time of ecstasy as it does before and after.

When Vespers were ended the countenance of Louise subsided into an expression of greater repose, such as it had worn when we first came into the room; but her hands still remained extended in the attitude of earnest prayer. No very remarkable change took place until twenty minutes to three o'clock. Some new and startling vision seemed then to arrest her attention: an emotion of painful anxiety flitted across her face: she rose up somewhat in her chair, but without leaving the sitting posture, and the next moment she fell forwards on the floor, her head coming gently into contact with the ground. There was something very peculiar about this fall. It was not

accomplished, apparently, by a regular series of muscular efforts, but rather by one continuous uniform movement; and though the fall was quite sudden, there was no shock, the body reaching the ground with the lightness almost, and the softness of a sponge.

The Rosary was now said, also the Litany of the Saints, the *Salve Regina*, and some other prayers. No visible effect was produced upon Louise, except that during the prayers her head was slightly raised; when they ceased, it sank down again upon the pavement. About this time a train passed by, close to the window of the little room, and the harsh whistle of the engine disturbed; for a moment, the profound quiet that reigned around. What a startling contrast was here, between the scene without, representing the busy world in its onward march, noisy and self-confident, and the scene within, representing Christ crucified—a stumbling block, indeed, to the Jews, and a foolishness to the Gentiles, but to them that are called, the power of God and the wisdom of God.

From the way in which the Ecstatica had fallen to the ground, her body was partly doubled up, and her left arm was bent in under her breast. In this position she remained for about twenty minutes. But at three o'clock exactly a remarkable movement was observed. Her body became extended to its full length, her arms were stretched out at right angles to her body, and her right foot placed itself over her left. One of the priests who were present bent up her right arm into a more convenient position; when the pressure was withdrawn, it was at once stretched out again as before. In like manner, when the Curé moved the right foot from its position, it was instantly carried back, as if by a secret spring.

After this, no further change occurred; and about twenty minutes past three, at the bidding of the Curé, we took our leave. As we passed out, we saw the mother of Louise in one room, sitting alone, apparently very infirm and stricken in years. In the next room were the two sisters, busied with their sewing machine and their needlework. All were simple and graceful; neither forward on the one hand, nor awkward or embarrassed on the other: not over eager to talk, yet entering with ease into conversation when spoken to. But the Curé was not the man to encourage idle gossip. He motioned to us, from behind, to move on, and got us out of the house as quickly as he could. After exchanging greetings with a few persons in the miscellaneous crowd, and thanking the Curé for his kindness, I turned my steps in the direction of Manage, and left, the same evening, by train for Ghent.

DR. DÖLLINGER AND THE DOGMA OF INFALLIBILITY.¹

BY DR. HERGENRÖTHER PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY AND CANON
LAW IN THE UNIVERSITY OF WÜRZBURG.

(*Translated from the German.*)

IV.—THE VATICAN COUNCIL—*continued.*

2. NO one will deny that scientific research must hold an important place in the examination of the sources of revealed truth;² for it is certain that neither Popes nor Councils can create new dogmas of faith. But who can maintain that, in a particular instance, the requisite investigation has not taken place? Who is to be the judge of this point? Obviously it has not been left to the caprice of individuals to decide whether an Œcumenical Council has employed all due diligence, or whether, in the examination of every question brought before it, all the rules have been observed which the tradition of the Church has shown to be necessary?

It is plain that if the authority of the First General Council were now assailed, we could not succeed in proving that before the publication of its definition, all the writings of the anti-Nicene Fathers had been examined, that all the objections urged by the Arian party had been heard and satisfactorily solved, and that all the requirements of strict historical investigation had been complied with. If such questions were raised, how would it fare with the Third General Council, which, in its first session, pronounced the dogmatic condemnation of Nestorius? Indeed, from the short duration of many Councils at which Decrees of the utmost importance were published—as, for instance, the Twelfth General Council—it would be much more difficult to establish the employment of the necessary diligence in their proceedings than in the deliberations of the Council of the Vatican.

It belongs undoubtedly to the supernatural providence and guidance of the Holy Ghost to provide that all human means which are necessary for avoiding error, will be employed, “that the diligent examination requisite for defining an article of

¹ Continued from our October Number.

² Dr. Döllinger cites, in support of this point, a pastoral of the Vicar of Freiburgh, and assumes that the views expressed in it are held by the other German Bishops. No proof was needed; the point is evident. It is laid down by theologians (MELCHIOR CANUS. *De Locis.* Lib. xii., cap. iii.), and taught in express terms by the Vatican Council.

faith will not be omitted. The human aids which are made use of may be different at different times and in different circumstances; but the unerring truth of the definition rests solely on the promised assistance of the Holy Ghost, and not on the scientific accuracy with which the preliminary investigations are conducted, or on the industry and care of those who are engaged in them. To question this is really to render nugatory the infallible authority of the Church.”¹

“God,” says Melchior Cano, “‘disposing all things sweetly,’ when he provides for the attainment of any end, does not neglect the means which are necessary for its attainment. If he promise everlasting life to any of his creatures, he will not fail to provide that sanctity without which everlasting life cannot be attained. So, too, since he has promised to preserve the purity of the faith of His Church, he cannot refuse her that assistance which will ensure the application of all human means necessary to preserve her from error. . . . If our Lord had said to St. Peter :—‘I have prayed for thee that thy charity fail not,’ no one would doubt that in praying for un failing charity He had prayed also for the means by which it might be secured—purity of life, watchfulness in the hour of temptation, and perseverance in prayer. So, too, from the words :—‘I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not,’ we ought to infer, without hesitation, that in securing Peter against the danger of error in matters of doctrine, He ensures that when Peter undertakes to decide a controversy regarding doctrine, nothing shall be wanting, whether on the part of God or of man, which is necessary to preserve him from error. . . .

“If God were to promise an abundant harvest, how silly would it not be to doubt that men would till the soil and sow the seed. Surely if they sow not, neither shall they reap. But God’s promise does not ensure merely the favouring influences of sun and sky, which cause the fruits of the earth to spring up abundantly; it is a guarantee, as well, of the industry and toil of those who till the ground. For the promised plenty will not come until the plough, and the seed, and the husbandman have done their work. . . .

“Since, then, our Lord has promised that the Paraclete, the Spirit of Truth, will always be with the Apostles and their successors in deciding controversies of faith, we cannot doubt that everything will be secured which is requisite to guard them from error in the discharge of their duty. And if the sufficiency of the means employed by the Pope or by a

¹ See the periodical published at Ratisbon, *Das Œcumenische Concil vom Jahre, 1869.* Vol. i., p. 106.

Council in examining a doctrine of faith, could be impugned, if the advocates of a condemned doctrine were at liberty to raise the question whether the Pastors of the Church had used all requisite diligence before publishing their definition, no one can fail to see that the authority of every decision of Popes and Councils would be undermined."¹ From the divine assistance which has been promised by our Lord, it follows that when a definition has been published, we can have the fullest confidence that all necessary means have been employed, and that the limits of right and truth have not been overstepped.²

3. Those persons who, while they recognise in theory the prerogative of the Church to publish unerring decisions in questions of faith and morals, regard themselves in practice as bound to submit only to such decisions as, in their estimation, have been framed after due and mature deliberation, and in accordance with every legal requirement, plainly set up their own authority as superior to the authority of the Church, and constitute their own private judgment as the tribunal of appeal in the last resort. No supreme court can allow those who are subject to its jurisdiction to proclaim that they recognise its authority in the abstract, but that they reserve to themselves the right of examining in every particular instance whether its decisions have been framed with a due regard to all legal requirements, and of withholding obedience if upon examination they should not be satisfied upon this point. To sit thus in judgment on the validity of ecclesiastical definitions, is in reality to deny the teaching authority of the Church.³ But a writer, who had announced before the opening of the Council that it would not be truly free, and that it never could be recognised as such,⁴ must make good his case at any cost.

The validity of a Council has never been regarded by any section of the members of the Church as depending either upon the length of the deliberations, or upon the examination of all the works written on the subject under discussion, a course which, at the present day, would make it simply impossible to define any doctrine whatever, or finally, upon the critical powers of the Bishops who take part in the

¹ MELCHIOR CANUS. *De Locis Theol.*, lib. v., cap. 5. Tournely, to whose authority Dr. Döllinger has sometimes appealed, takes the same view of this point as Melchior Cano. See Tournely, *Praelect. Theol. De Ecclesia*.

² See the Bishop of Ratisbon's Pastoral of the 22nd of September, 1870.

³ See the work on the Infallible Authority of the Pope, by Mgr. Ketteler, Bishop of Mayence. *Das unfehlbare Lehramt des Papstes*. Mainz, 1871.

⁴ *Janus*, p. 448.

proceedings of the Council. Yet the course adopted by Dr. Döllinger is not without precedent.

Almost every objection which he has urged against the authority of the Vatican Council, was urged by the Reformers against the authority of the Council of Trent.¹ Arguments against the authority of the Council of Chalcedon were drawn from the personal character of the Bishops who were present, and from the pretended opposition between its Decrees on the one hand, and the teaching of the early Fathers and the Decrees of the Third General Council on the other.² So, too, the opponents of the Sixth General Council attacked its authority in various works composed for the purpose, obtained numerous signatures to hostile declarations, invoked the aid of the civil power, under Philip Bardanes, and, not without the assistance of unfaithful ecclesiastics, endeavoured by means of sophistry to misrepresent the dogma defined by the Church.³ The authority of every Œcumenical Council that has hitherto been held, would have been paralyzed if the Catholics of the time had held the views of those who protest against the Decrees of the Vatican Council: the authority and the unity of the Church would have been destroyed if every new Tertullian, every new advocate of a doctrine condemned by the Church, had been at liberty thus to combat her decisions.

For Dr. Döllinger and his followers, the infallibility of the Church exists only in name: as far as the prerogative is vested in the Pope its existence is openly denied; as far as it is vested in the Œcumenical Councils of the Church it is indeed recognised to a certain extent, but its recognition is so fenced round with qualifications and restrictions, that without any sacrifice of principle they may deny the infallibility of any definition which is at variance with their views.

4. Unfortunately for Dr. Döllinger and his adherents, the principles laid down by theologians in discussing the question, Who is to be the final judge of the authority of a Council, and to have the power of setting aside the claims of such assemblies as those of Rimini and Seleucia, are anything but favourable to the views put forward in his Protest. Even Gallican writers, like Natalis Alexander, expressly teach that such an authority is necessary, and that the authority can be no other than that which is assigned by Ultramontane theologians—the authority of the Holy See.⁴ It is indeed

¹ MART. CHEMNITII, *Examen Conc. Trid.* 1565.

² LEONT. BYZANT., *De Sect.* Act. vi. viii.

³ GERMAN. *De Haeres. et Syn.* n. 33.

⁴ NAT. ALEXANDER. *Hist. Eccles. Saec. xv., et xvi., art. i., sec. v., n. 46.*

[The passage to which Dr. Hergenröther refers, is as follows:—“Approbare

unfortunate for our "liberal" theologians that for Catholics, in all matters of religion, "every road," in the words of our German proverb, "leads to Rome."

The history of the Council brings before us the petitions, the remonstrances, and the threats which preceded its opening, and which continued until its progress was so prematurely checked : of these many were conceived with vigour and executed with no lack of energy, and the existence of a vast conspiracy will one day be revealed, the ramifications of which extended throughout Germany, Austria, Hungary, Italy, France, England, and even more distant regions, and the object of which was to prevent, at any cost, a condemnation of the Gallican and Febronian systems. Before the opening of the Council, the leaders of this movement had declared that they would not accept its Decrees if it were to ratify by its authority, doctrines which they, from the fulness of their irrefragable science, declared to be at variance with Scripture and Tradition, with the teaching of human reason and with the facts of history. The promoters of the conspiracy succeeded in ensnaring many Bishops, and inspiring them with distrust of the Holy See ; they endeavoured also to unite into one compact party those who merely denied the opportuneness of defining the dogma of Papal Infallibility and those who denied its truth. When the bonds of this alliance began to loosen, when several of the Bishops refused to play the part which was assigned to them, when at length those who, during the deliberations of the Council, had opposed the definition, publicly professed their submission to its authority, they were violently assailed through every agency at the disposal of the conspiracy. The purity of their motives was impugned, the sincerity of their submission questioned, and their want of spirit, their weakness, and their cowardice were loudly bewailed.

The Archbishop of Munich is reminded, in Dr. Döllinger's Protest, that by his signature he took part in the petition presented by a number of Bishops, praying the Holy Father, on account of the difficulty of the question, as well as on other weighty grounds, to prohibit the discussion of the doctrine of Papal Infallibility by the Fathers of the Council. The majority of the Fathers did not desire that the deliberations should thus be checked ; neither did the Holy See approve of the course proposed by the petitioners ; and indeed, the violence of the opposition to the definition, the direct denial of the doctrine of the Church, the danger with which the faith of

the Church was threatened, rendered the definition not only opportune but necessary.

The Church could not remain silent : she could not leave the faithful in uncertainty ; nor could she consent that her doctrine should be abandoned as a prey to those who were plotting for its mutilation. She was forced to speak, and to speak in no hesitating tones ; and her voice has been obeyed by every Catholic worthy of the name—foremost among them, the Bishops of the Church.

And those who had resisted the definition have not been satisfied with merely submitting to the decision of the Council : they have taken care, moreover, to set forth the grounds of their submission. "The plain truth," writes the Archbishop of Cologne, "is, that the unparalleled irreverence and bitterness of the calumnious and slanderous attacks aimed at the authority of the Supreme Head of the Church, whilst the deliberations of the Council were in progress, practically decided the question of opportuneness, and rendered the definition a matter of necessity. Besides, it became evident, especially during the discussions of the Council, that the overweening pride of intellect, which, in so many other matters had long since undermined and shaken every principle however certain, and all authority however venerable, has now asserted itself in religious matters, and prevails to no slight extent among Catholic scholars and men of learning, so much so that many nominal Catholics have come at length to believe that no authority but their own is to be recognised as infallible. Against this pernicious tendency, absolutely incompatible with the existence of supernatural faith, which can exist in the humble alone, the doctrine of the Infallibility of the Pope, defined by the Œcumenical Council, is a remedy peculiarly appropriate, and it cannot fail to prove itself as such."

It was precisely in this point that the Bishops who opposed the Definition differed from the fanatical opposition outside the Council ; that whilst the Bishops felt themselves under an obligation to resist the Definition by bringing forward arguments which they regarded as conclusive, they did not fail from the beginning to urge upon the faithful who were committed to their care, the duty of submitting to the decision of the Church, whatever it might be, as they themselves were prepared to abide by that decision ;¹ but the fanatical opposi-

¹ For instance, Mgr. David, Bishop of Saint Brieuç, in his letter to the Pope, to which his Holiness replied on the 12th of December, 1870. The Bishop of Mayence was equally explicit on many occasions, and in particular, in his answer to the letter of Dr. Döllinger's devoted adherent, Lord Acton. Nor were the declarations of the Archbishop of Cologne, and of the Bishop of Treves and Erneland less decisive. The same protestation is expressed in the pastoral letter of the Archbishop of Munich.

tion, superior in their own estimation to episcopal authority, never ceased, on the contrary, to declare, through their organs in the press, that they would submit to no decision unfavourable to their own view.

The position of those who persist in their opposition to the decrees of the Council is thus described by the Pope, in the Encyclical of the 28th of October, 1870, already quoted:—
 “Those men, in fact, so far as in them lies, aim at nothing short of the overthrow of the Church, and of the Catholic faith, when in their pernicious writings they maintain, on calumnious and utterly futile grounds, that whether in the Decrees themselves, or in the manner in which they have been promulgated, especially that which regards the Infallibility of the Pope, something is wanting to invest them with the full authority of the Decrees of an Œcumenical Council. But, except on principles utterly subversive of that supernatural Infallibility, which is an essential property of the Church, they are unable to deny that this Sacred and Œcumenical Council acted under the guidance of the Holy Ghost. . . .

“No one can fail to see that the grounds on which they rely are precisely similar to those on which the decisions of former Councils have been impugned by those against whose errors they were published. Similar calumnies were circulated in reference to every Œcumenical Council from the earliest times, and, in particular, the Councils of Florence and of Trent were assailed with similar weapons by heretics and schismatics, to their own destruction, and the spiritual ruin of innumerable souls.”

W. J. W.

FATHER HENRY FITZSIMON, S. J.

(Continued from page 23, Vol. ix.)

ON the 29th of September, 1600, Mr. William Nugent, an honorable and learned esquire, maintained at Mr. Rider's table, that there was no diversity of belief between Catholics of the present day and those who lived in the time of the Apostles. Mr. Rider maintained that the difference was as great as betwixt Protestantcy and Papistry.

Both agreed to abide a lawful resolution of the learned. A counterfeit letter, as if from Catholics doubtful towards six articles therein specified, was written on the 21st of October, and required an answer within three months.¹ It was couched in the following terms:—

¹ “Catholic Confutation of Mr. Rider's Claim to Antiquitie.” Rouen, 1608. By FitzSimon.—Advertisement to the Reader.

“To the reverend Fathers the Holy Jesuits, Seminaries, and other priests that favour the holy Roman religion within the Kingdom of Ireland.

“Humbly praieth your Fatherly charities F. W. and P. D., with many other professed Catholics of the holy Roman religion : that whereas of late they have heard some Protestant Preachers confidently affirm, and (as it seems unto our shallow capacities) plainly prove, that these six propositions, hereunder written, cannot be proved by any of you to be either Apostolical or Catholic, by Canonical Scripture, or the Auncient Fathers of the Church, which lived and writ within the compass of the first five hundred years after Christ’s Ascension. . . . And thus, having shewed you our doubts, we desire your fatherly resolutions as you tender the credit of our religion, the convincing of Protestants, and the satisfying of our poor consciences. And thus, craving your speedy, learned, and fatherly answers in writing,¹ at or before the 1st of February next, with a perfect quotation of both Scriptures and Fathers, themselves not recited or repeated by others, for our better instruction, and the adversaries’ speedier and stronger confutation, we commend your persons and studies to God’s blessed direction and protection.”²

“To be brief, it was partly referred to me, and partly imposed, that I should decide this controversy, as well as one in prison, sequestered from all communication with my brethren, and divers other ways disabled and hindered, of my slender capacity in so short a time might accomplish.

“I accordingly dispatched brief collections of Scriptures, Fathers, and evidences of most principal Protestants as well of England as of other countries, and observed such order as from time to time I laid open before all beholders their evident demonstrations, that the cause of Mr. Nugent was most just, and the contrary altogether untrue. I sent them, the 2nd of January, 1601, in the name of the Catholic priests of Ireland, by my cousin, Mr. Michael Taylor, gentleman, who delivered them presently to Mr. Rider.”³

“He showed great contentment, great thanks, and gave great promises to reply with like expedition. He admits in his *Caveat*, that he received the answer—‘by a courteous gentleman,’ whom he takes to be a priest—and he says it was subscribed by Maister Henry FitzSimon.⁴ But it was not subscribed at that time. For, on the 6th of January he

¹ Rider was afraid of his presence and his power of speech.

² Rider’s “*Caveat*,” p. 1 ; or in p. 23 of FitzSimon’s “*Confutation*.”

³ FitzSimon’s “*Confutation*.”—Advertisement to Reader.

⁴ “*Caveat*.”

repaired to me in the Castle, applauding the aforesaid answer, and saying it was beyond his expectation, and that he would rejoin thereto, if it were approved by my name and subscription. Mistrusting bad measure by such a demand, I remained slack to condescend thereto. Manifold protestations were made on the spot, as also in his letter to that effect, of great good will to pleasure and benefit. Upon which flattering, but specially to honour my Saviour Jesus Christ and his invincible Church, I gratified him with my approbation and subscription, not fearing death or danger for my profession.

“Notwithstanding his promise of expedition, his reply came not in three months almost thrice tripled. Also, contrary to his promise, he published his reply on the 28th of September, 1602, before ever he had acquainted me therewith, in order that I might not have in readiness my answer to confront it. When at last every extended hand, yea many avoiding hands, were filled with his reply under the name of *Caveat*—then, in that liberal dole, I was presented with one copy. Whereat, considering the tenor thereof, I stood amazed like one that had seen a bear whelping. Within forty-eight hours I advertised himself, that, if he would adventure to purchase me liberty to consult books, a clerk to engross my writings, and communication with my brethren, I would join issue with him even before the Lord-Deputy and Council, yea, also before his own pew-fellows of the College; and that, if I did not convince his *Caveat* to be fraught with falsifications, deprivations, corruptions, ignorance, and impiety, I would abide any penalty and punishment whatsoever.

“This sharp admonition urged him to propound the suit to the State. They of their bounty accorded that, at his discretion, books, access, and print should be allowed me. Books I confess to have had courteously from the College, a clerk also, and that only I obtained. Other communication, but especially the prints, was debarred me, notwithstanding all possible entreaty.

“He is one of those who are ever provoking to disputation, when they are sure they cannot succeed on account of impediments objected by themselves, furthering it with a finger, and hindering it with an arm, pretending treasons instead of reasons, trusting much more inclusions and exclusions than learned conclusions. By no possible means could they be induced to an encounter against myself (the meanest among a thousand) by all the vehemency I could invent to incense them.

“Here are some extracts from my letters, in which I tried to instigate them to come into a plain field:—

“The kingdom of God is not in words but in virtue. Therefore I most earnestly crave, and instantly require you to come off to some plain ground by some commendable disputation. Yea, I adjure you by the confidence you have in your cause, that you neither decline nor delay. For my part, out of the abundance of my heart my mouth speaketh, and from my heart to my hand, and from my hand to the eyes and ears, both of the most honourable Lord-Deputy, and of them of the College, I have exhibited my supplication to that effect.

“Again : But to urge you, Mr. Rider, the more, I undertake to maintain that you are wrongful to scriptures, next to your own fathers, and thirdly to ours, etc.

“Again: I briefly crave, all tergiversation set apart, that we defend, each of us, the truth of our professions.

“Lastly, on New Year’s Day, 1604, I inserted these words : ‘Like to this is your provocation, that I would come to issue. Is it not my demand to the Deputy and College? Did I ever encounter you or write to you, but that I required it? I therefore inform you that I covet with all speed it be effected.’”

However, Mr. Rider tells his story in these words : “Mr. FitzSimon promised a present confutation of my book if I would procure his nephew, Cary, to be his clerk, which I obtained of the Lord Lieutenant. Within fifteen days after I came to Maister FitzSimon, who showed twelve sheets, and promised a perfect copy of it within one month. He keeps it since from my view, though he offereth it to most men’s sight, and proclaims still, with his stentorian voice, to every corner of the kingdom, that Rider is overthrown horse and foot. Which, when some of his best favourites had told me, I urged him more earnestly, assuring him unless he gave me a copy I would recall his clerk.”¹

“Of all this,” says FitzSimon, “nothing is true but that I promised a present confutation of his *Caveat*. Of the residue part is improbable, and part impossible. It is improbable that I, being a close prisoner in the Castle of Dublin, should proclaim in a stentorian voice to every corner of the kingdom, that Rider was overcome. And how could Mr. Rider persuade himself that I together was in the Castle (from which he knew I never did in five years depart), and also abroad in every corner, he not being able to believe that Christ himself can together be in many places? Or was my voice there without my person? Or were my agents for me, *none having access*, to know my mind. But this hyperbole of his came from fear

¹ Rider’s “Rescript,” No. 2.

and a guilty conscience. He knew good occasion of fearing that all men did discourse of his confutation, and so he affirmed that I had done what I could not do, although I would—as Seneca says—‘what he feareth he augmenteth;’¹ and as Cicero tells us: ‘they always think their punishment before their eyes that have offended.’²

“Now, it was impossible I could use delays in keeping my word good, for I wrote to the Lord Deputy, the Earl of Devonshire, *verbatim* in this manner:—

“Right honourable our most singular good Lord—Occasion of my presuming to write to your honor is tendered by Mr. Rider’s book, in which it pleaseth him to specifie my name. He hath chosen your honor and the rest of her Majesty’s Privie Council to patronize his labours, and I also, for my part, refuse not to abide your honor’s censure and arbitrament. What Varus Geminus said to Augustus—‘they that durst plead in his presence were ignorant of his greatness, and they that durst not, of his benignitie,’—I may conveniently invert and apply to your Lordships—‘they that adventure to stand to your arbitrament are audacious towards your profession, and they that do not, are timorous of your disposition and uprightness.’

“We are at issue (in a matter of fact, as was lately in France, before the king, betwixt both professions) that they of us are to be taxed for impostors, who, in our labours have wrested, perverted, and falsified the primitive Fathers of the Church. Which may easily be discerned, both by only perusing the volumes of the Fathers, and by verdict of all chief Protestants in the world, whom we undertake to testifie the foresaid Fathers to stand with us against Mr. Rider.

“Vouchsafe of your especial affabilitie but one half day’s trial, it shall appear, that either he is of whom Homer latinized speaketh—‘*Ille sapit solus, volitant alii velut umbrae*’—or, for his presumptuous dedication of his book to your Honors, that he deserveth to be treated as Aristo, whom the Athenians punished for unworthy treating their commendations; or as the silly poet, whom Sylla both warned and waged never to write; or lastly, as Cherilus, whose verses Alexander considering and finding but seven good, awarded for each of them a piece of gold, and for the residue so many buffets.

“I truly am of St. Gregory’s minde, saying, ‘Who, although weak, would not contemn the teeth of this Leviathan, unless

¹ “Quod metuit auget.”

² “Pœnam semper ante oculos versari putant qui peccaverunt.”

the terror of the secular power did maintain them?' It is a double drift; for what—

'These persuade by flattering words,
Those enforce by smarting swords.'

"Deign, noble lord, but to suspend so long the sword; and faintness and falsehood will soon be revealed. God Almighty preserve your Honor for His and your glorie. From the prison, September 28, 1602.

"Your Honour's humble client to command, assuredly in Christ, Henry FitzSimon."

"This letter being delivered ten days after that Mr. Rider's book came to light, the Deputy, being of fervent desire to further the disputation, sent for Mr. Rider, showed him the letter, and finding him relenting from the point, he sent me word by Mr. Henry Knevet, his gentleman usher, that if I would indeed come to trial, the only means was to entreat them of the College, upon the credit of their cause and champion, to sue for such a disputation, and they themselves to be umpires. A hard condition, but necessary in that place and time.

"Meanwhile Mr. Rider came to me the 2nd of October, 1602, to reclaim his resignation of these controversies to Scriptures or Fathers severally, resolving not to accept the Fathers for arbiters, unless they had the Scriptures conjointly concurring with them. A poor retreat, because by word of mouth, and in print, he had appealed to them not conjointly but severally; and again, because it is a silly imagination to think they may be separated.¹

"After my interview with the gentleman usher of the Deputy, and with the Dean of St. Patrick's, I wrote the following letter to them of the College, but endorsed to Dr. Challenor:—

"Worthy Cousin,—Great men, in confidence of their cause, have resigned their conference and controversie to unequal judges, in sundrie subjects. Origen submitted his proceedings to an infidel's arbitrament, and prevailed against five adversaries. So Archelaus, Bishop in Mesopotamia, by like arbiter did vanquish Manes. So did the Israelites surmount the Samorites.

"By whose example I have adventured to appeal unto, and endure your and the College adwardisment in this controversie betwixt Mr. Rider and me; that whither of us hath perverted, dissembled, or denied the effect and substance of authors by us alleged, concerning the consent of antiquity in Mr. Rider's cause or mine, must stand to any arbitrarie reprehension and condemnation it shall please you to denounce. Wherefore I

¹ "Confutation," p. 27.

crave that it will please you to certify whether you will deign to be umpires, to award according to equitie and indifferencie.

“Whereunto that you condescend the rather I advouch, and so God willing, will manifest, that also all chief Protestants in the world do stand with us in this controversie, confessing the ancient Fathers to be ours, and opposite to Mr. Rider.

“Let not any extraordinarie confidence procure any inconvenience, or pulpit commotions, and exclamations, that posteritie may understand our courses to have becomed Christians. I expect your answer, committing you to God with affectionate desires of your happiness. November the 7th, 1602. Yours to command in Christ, Henry FitzSimon.’

“To this letter I received a mere puritanical answer, full of sugared, affected words, vainly applied, and all the matter wrested in obscuritie with this only parcel to the purpose:—

“Concerning the judgment, which you would have our College for to yeld as touching the cause between Mr. Deane Rider and you (provided always that you make us¹ no partie), when we shall see your books, and have some small time to compare the same, by the mercie of God, we promise faithfully to perform it without all respect of person and partialitie to the cause. And I would to God that what effect Eutropius founde, and those that vouchsafed themselves to be hearers of his judgment, the same, among any of us might feel and fynde, that do err from the truth of God, of ignorance or of knowledge; for the Lord’s arm is not so shrunken in, but that he may make us yet of a Saul a Paul. To whose grace I affectionately leave you. November the 8th, 1602. Your cousin, desiring in Christ you may be his brother, L. Challenor.’

“Behold the Puritans’ letter (in style and pointing of themselves) to testifie to all the world, that I being in prison (not being able to shrink out of their hands or punishment, whensoever it should please them to cite or condemn me), yet did proffer, urge, and importunate the being confronted to Mr. Rider! Let any therefore judge how Riderly it is assured, that I sought many sleights and delays from coming to this conflict.²

“Mr. Rider says that in May, 1603, I sent him *by my clarke a scroule, blotted, interlined, crossed, and unlegible*. To make Mr. Rider confute himself, I will allege certain of his words to the Lords of the Council. Speaking of those that did condemn his writings, he says: ‘They that will censure before they see, are like such wise men as will shoot their bolt as soon at a bush as

¹ They feared he would drag them into the controversy.

² “Replie” to Rider.

at a bird.' Now, a little after this, talking of my copy, he says: '*the highest in the land had a view of his scroule, and the reverendest and learnedest perused the same. What their opinion was of it, I silence for a season.*'

"By these two clauses, say I, either Mr. Rider must confess, that my copie was legible, or that the highest in the land did not peruse it diligently; or, if they should censure it without such perusing it as being legible, that they can be no wiser in that '*than such wise men as censure before they see, and shoot as soon at a bush as at a bird.*' If he can gambol over this block without breaking the shins of his pretence, he shall have my suffrage to bear the ball on Shrove Tuesday.

"How, I crave, could such, whom he ironically calls wise men, view, peruse, and censure my *scroule* if it were not presented or were not legible? *The highest in the land* are the State, who commonly are not of the clearest sight. If they censured what was illegible, Mr. Rider termeth them in plain English but fools. So that if my writing was legible, his long pretence is utterly discredited; if it were illegible, and yet were censured as aforesaid, Mr. Rider awardeth the highest, the reverendest, and learnedest in the land to be fools. If they take it not in ill part, I covet no other benefit thereby than to have my *scroule*, as it pleaseth him to call it, to be known to have been legible.

"Concerning the copie by me exhibited to Mr. Rider, you may understand, that when I perused his *Caveat*, and at the first sight considered his spirit to say anything for his reputation's sake, and accordingly to aver the most desperate untruths, that any bearing countenance of a man might utter, I wrote to him the very next day in most instant and enticing terms, that if he had any courage in his cause he should procure me one to extract my lucubrations. . . . He no sooner required it than it was granted, and withal a warrant to protect any else that would dispute with him, and that the printer might publish his and my intermeddlings. As he confesseth, within fifteen days I had despatched twelve sheets in refutation of his *Caveat*, of which I read part to himself, and proffered to show the authors themselves. He absolutely refused all examination and disputation. For as both the Constable and his own man, Venables, will not deny, he never came at me without a covenant, that we should not confer in any matters of learning, to which his own testimony accordeth, wherein he says that *in words I should be too hard for a hundred.* He requested that we should communicate our arguments one to another, and conjointly print them at our several expenses. To this I consented, God doth know, not upon any presumption of my talent, although the meanest of

a thousand, and as a man of straw, yet in that height I was more dreadful to them than any scarecrow in a field to the dastard fowle.

“Being troubled by what I shewed him, he could never abide that I might enjoy the use of print, alleging that he must first have perused what I would print. It was his ordinarie refuge in all assemblies, that I might print what I list if I would first present him with the sight of my writings. So that on the 4th of Februarie, 1603 (or 1602 according to their date), I sent him a copie of my writing, which contained two quires of paper, and I kept a copy for myself. Judge also if it were a reprehensible delay to spend four months in the making of as much as replenished two quires of paper and, in recopying the same in as many quires. All these pains and charges must I have been at, he having upon me the wringing vie, and following it eagerly, that if I would not sustain I should lose my game.

“If he had suffered my travail to have passed to print, it might be legible to his heart’s desire, and he not pointed at for not daring to answer objections against his *Caveat*, unless he might have them a time to be well considered; which foul imbecilitie in a professor of learning, his own master in Oxford (at this time my dear brother), Mr. Sabinus Chamber, doth testify to have been anciently in Mr. Rider. These are his words, under his hand:—‘Mr. John Rider came to me to Oxford about the beginning of Lent, as I remember, in the year 1581, recommended by my aunt, by whom he was then maintained. He remained there till the Act, which is celebrated always in summer. In one and the same year he passed Bachelor and Master of Arts, by means of I know not what juggling and perjurie. I never had any scholar more indocile and unskilful. Before his answering I must have instructed him in all that I would oppose, and yet the next day he was never the wiser. The kind offices that my aunt and I did him if he deny, he must be profoundly impudent. This I testify under my hand, at Luxemburg, the 24th of December, 1604.’”¹

About this distinguished pupil of F. Chamber, FitzSimon tells the following anecdote:—

“On St. Mathias’ Eve, the 23rd of February, 1603, I, taking the air in prison on the northern tower, saw Mr. Rider repairing to see Mr. Browne, and I requested him to ascend. After a few words, he asked me to inform him in a matter made doubtful to him by a great statesman—whether I was a Jesuit, or a priest, or both? I answered that I was un-

¹ “Replie.”

worthily both. He replied : Would you prefer yourself before a single secular priest ? I answered that I never yet had any controversy with any. He now being at a demur, I craved like favour in resolving not an unlike doubt of mine, Whether himself was a bare minister, or dean, or both ? He said, ' I am a minister and no dean, it being a Papist title.' I replied : Then you are a Puritan, inasmuch as you refuse the name of Dean, and a Protestant as you hold the Deanery of St. Patrick's. He smiled at the conceit, and so departed."

"The De'il and the Dean begin with one letter,
When the De'il takes the Dean, the Kirk will be better."¹

"When King James came to the throne of England, like a burnt child, he dreaded and hated the Puritans, and many well-beneficed Puritans exclaimed against their consorts. I informed some of the crew of Rider's conference. Rider gave me the lie, and called me traitor. Now, whatever faults soever I may have, all my acquaintances will justify me that I ever from a child abhorred swearing and lying."²

In a copy of F. FitzSimon's book which is in Trinity College, and had belonged to Rider, there is a marginal note of the Dean to the following effect :—"A lying villaine ; we never had any such conference."³ But FitzSimon confirmed his account by showing from Rider's book that Rider maintained the name priest to be proper to every believing Christian.

FitzSimon began the new year, 1604, by writing a letter to Rider, in which he challenged him again to a public discussion, and, of course, wished him all the compliments of the season.⁴

On the 12th of March King James the First sent an order from Whitehall for the release and banishment of "One Henry FitzSimon, a Jesuit, who hath these five years past remained in the Castle of Dublin." On the 30th of March Rider, knowing that the order for his adversary's release had come, but would not be executed for some time, published against him his *Rescript*, dated the 30th of March, from his house in St. Patrick's Close.⁵

"He blushed not," says FitzSimon, "to pretend slackness in me. How could he make it to any, even of themselves, to seem so, considering I had obliged myself to the State and College to abide their appointment, who might at will compel me to an encounter, considering I was among and in the power of his friends, and of adversaries in the highest degree

¹ We take the liberty of intercalating these Puritan verses, which Rider might have murmured as he walked away.

² "Confutation," p. 227. ³ Mason's Hist. of St. Patrick's Cathedral.

⁴ "Confutation." To the Reader, paragraphs 8, 9. ⁵ "Replie," p. 42.

to my profession and person; from whom I could not start, they having no intention to spare me, in so much as they never used such restraints and wardings towards any criminal malefactor as towards me?

“When my answer, by him termed a scroule, yet containing near two quires of paper, had been so legible to him, as it grieved and graveled him to behold it; and when he would not permit the printing thereof, and could not reply thereto, but in a manner as after shall appear; he hearing that licence was come for my enlargement, and fearing that I would discover his shifts and faintness towards a disputation, in all haste published a second book against me, full of venomous railing, which he calleth *tart terms*; wherein he trotteth, and tottereth to a hundred shifts, to purchase the people’s opinion that he was forward and resolute to encounter any adversary to his profession. This late heart of grace he entertained, partly because he thought I would not hinder the benefit of such releasement of my five years’ endurance by such disputation, partly because he had observed a late willingness in them of the College to save and salve his reputation; and therefore thought that I would not accept, in that extremity, to hazard my granted departure by opposing myself to any person favoured by the State; or, if I would, that they of the College would plaster up all his discredit, by stretching favour and their arbitrament beyond right and conscience.

“There being a jealousy betwixt them of the College and Mr. Rider, my appeal to their arbitraments was a heavy load upon his reputation, they not being partial in my part of the cause, and yet he loath to stand to their kindness. To gain time he would be tried nowhere but in Oxford. This evasion by all men was hissed at in all meetings, at his own table, and everywhere else; so he was constrained to approach under the lee, and into the friendship of those of the College. What packing there was betwixt them I know not; but this I know, that he seemed froward to resign his cause to them. If conjecture on probable occasion be allowed, the Collegists told him that he had utterly betrayed himself in the main point, but yet that one only refuge remained—to wrest the matter of Christ’s true presence to the term of Transubstantiation: that if I should not discover this foisting in the question of the name, instead of the question of the matter, Mr. Rider might well be supported against my proofs. Such to have been the quirk of all their consultation, and the only hope whereupon Mr. Rider hanged his confidence, by diligent observation of the circumstances may be collected. But, as I said, never before the month of April, 1604, could Mr. Rider be pur-

chased to abide the arbitrament of his own pew-fellows, the Collegists.

"Now was my banishment by his Majesty licensed, to the disgust and distrust of Mr. Rider, lest that, being out of his grips, I would publish the certainty of all our courses ; and to the greater terror of him, because I certified all Protestants repairing to the castle, that I was sincerely determined to do no less than he feared, at my first leisure and commodity. Whereat new exprobrations at every instant falling on him, he made that wise 'Rescript,' to which now I answer ; which being made, the Right Worshipful Mayor of the citie, not being ignorant of all the circumstances (although to his immortal infamy, a most timorous Catholic, as one that most exactly knew their impiety, yet for wordly fear conformed himself thereto), challenged him publicly of dastardliness in wounding a man bound, trampling on one in restraint, and triumphing against one not permitted to resist, by writing publicly against me who was not allowed to defend myself. For, according to Seneca, in his proverbs, "Victoria sine adversario brevis est laus :"—It is a silly and short commendation, to brag of victory without an adversary. Or, as Faustus somewhere more plainly says: "Nil tacito quæsita dolo victoria durat"—the victory obtained by treachery doth never avail. Mr. Rider, at this importunate provocation, blustering into choler, assured him in the public market, that even to my face he would confound me to be guilty of all tergiversation used in the proceedings, if the Mayor would vouchsafe to accompany him to the castle, to which motion the Mayor condescended, in the meantime inviting him to dinner, lest he would relent or repent this vaunted resolution.

At dinner time the Mayor sent one of his sergeants to certify me distinctly of all the aforesaid occurrences. I answered (notwithstanding my former alienation for the aforesaid schism of the Mayor, not denying but he had otherwise ever obliged me), that I would most willingly that such motion in any case should not be overslipped, but brought to examination. On the 4th of April, 1604,¹ the Mayor, Justice Palmer, Captain Godl (the Councillor Sir Richard Cook, out of his chamber in the castle, being within hearing and privy to all our proceedings), and others, to the number, with them of the guard, of about a hundred, standing in the castle court, I was summoned by my keeper to appear. Some little pause there was before I came, and suddenly Mr. Rider, thinking that contrary to my custom, I would temporize in the heat I ever professed

¹ In reply he says May ; but in "Confutation," in Advertisement to Reader, he says 4th of April.

towards maintaining religion, began to glorify that he knew I durst not come. At length I came, and inquired their pleasure. Mr. Rider declared that he came to have a promised legible copy, or my subscribing that which I had delivered, or my going to trial before them of the College.

“To the first of these three points I answered, his own mouth should confess the copy to be legible, which I proved in manner premised. To the second, that if I could not prove his falsification of my private letter, I would subscribe my whole answer; which when I did prove (as all or any then present will avow) so directly and perspicuously that he blushed, and they all blamed him for falsification, I told them there should need no such approbation, considering that our issue should be not upon the future, but even upon the ‘Caveat,’ and my allegations therein contained in legible print. To the last, of going to the College, I accepted it at that instant, reaching him a gold ring, which he should not deliver me but in that place. He took it, and now (as Julius Cæsar said, when he had passed the river Rubicon,—*jacta est alea*—the die is cast) there could be no tergiversation; either we must have gone forward with main force, or we could not retire without foil and dishonor. What was, think you, the issue? Mr. Rider would needs restore me my ring, pretending ‘that he must have license of the State for so public an act, which license he doubted not to obtain at their sitting the day following.’ Nay, said I, you have had license from the beginning for this disputation, by lawful warrant, as you showed me yourself: so that I will not receive my ring until you present it me (unless you have other excuse) in place accorded. His own associates, the Reformed crew, what in wailing, what in railing, sought to draw or drive him from so ignominious revolting from the trial by himself first sought, in three years’ space daily boasted of, at this time before my departure to be effected or not at all, and then disclaimed in the face of the world, until needless new license might be obtained. But he dividing up and down sparkles of railing rage, gave them leave to say their pleasure and to swallow their displeasure, and threatened, if I would not receive the ring, to throw it away, which, notwithstanding, I would not accept, alleging the bargain for a lawful disputation to have been fully and authentically contracted, and now to be irrevocable. But he would not retain it, and so the Mayor took it into custody, till hope and speech of a disputation vanished.

“All the Protestants were ashamed of their champion, whose provocation was a perfect imitation of the challenge sent by Francis the First to Charles the Fifth. It is not long since

this happened in the sight of so many witnesses, that it may be well remembered, and I am not so prodigal of my good name that I would forge in a matter subject to so much censures as might fall on an untruth of like quality, if the thing were not notorious and beyond all disproof. The aforesaid Justice Palmer, the Captain, and all the others publicly censured him, and said my copy was legible and correctly written. They exclaimed against him, that I so resolutely presented to go instantly with him, to hold a disputation in the College; that he was known to have long before allowance and warrant from the State towards such conference, and yet would not enter the lists; and that being publicly come to provoke, and the combat being accepted, he, like a Jubelius, would, to the dishonour of his cause, flinch away and retire most dastard-like. Surely there was among the soldiers so great hissing of their champion after his departure, and so great jealousy against the profession whereunto such sleights and acts of hypocrisy were the chief defence, that eight or ten of them thereupon shortly after came to be reconciled.¹ Thus, Mr. Rider remained confounded—

‘*Et clypeo simul et galea nudatus et hasta.*’

“The next day the Council was sitting close upon accounts, and Mr. Rider, for his credit’s sake, having attended till full dinner time, to have their allowance to dispute, and not willing to depart until he had motioned to the State what he intended towards the disputation, he came up at length to dine among us prisoners. Some gentle bickerings chanced betwixd us about the Angelical Salutation to our Blessed Lady in Greek. He and his fellow, Balfe, in presence of the Constable, who, I imagine, will not lightly lie on either side, were found so exorbitantly confounded and disgraced, and wallowed in such a plunge, that the Constable, ashamed to impose silence, could remain no longer, and Mr. Rider, according to his wont, fell from reason to railing, not sparing or respecting me more than his father’s son’s companion. I was no less with him than traitor, fool, liar, knave, etc.” This is, no doubt, the controversy to which FitzSimon thus refers in his “*Britannomachia*.”

“I remember well also the nonsense which a certain young minister, the chaplain to Oliver Lambert, uttered in the presence of Tristram Eccleston, Lieutenant of Dublin Castle, of Mr. Mark Shee, and Mr. Patrick Archer, who to-day are in honour with all, but then, as illustrious confessors of Christ, were detained in prison with me. Well, this young wight

¹ “Confut.” Advert. to Reader, par. II. “Replie,” p. 12-13.

affirmed to me on oath that he had seen, read, and long studied the Hebrew Gospel of St. Luke, in which the first word of the Angel's Salutation was not *Ave* but *Chavech*!¹ Like ignorance was shown by Keltridge in the Tower of London. He had been chosen by public authority to preach to the prisoners, both Jesuits and Seminarists, one of whom was the Irish Jesuit Fr. Christopher Holiwood. Not content with exhibiting his folly in the pulpit, he published through the press that 'The Septuagint, and the best of the Greek copies, had not 'gratia plena,' but 'κεχαριτωμενη.'²

"This discussion on the Greek of the Angelical Salutation of our Blessed Lady, reminds me that Mr. Rider often in his books bids us read texts in Greek. Gentle reader, he bids us do what he cannot do himself, to my particular knowledge and experience. Every-halfpenny scholar knows things that he is ignorant of, and his ignorance and juggling deserveth at least to have his hood in School-lane pulled over his head. There is not a more naked linguist or unfit proctor of the Greek tongue than Rider. He, before Alderman James and the Constable of the Castle, gave a trial of his skill in Greek on the words of the Angelus. My study was much more in other matters than in Greek; yet before them I found Rider not only tripping in Greek, but mute in my presence ever after on that point.

"I admire this man's mistaking all points of learning—Divinity, Philosophy, Geography, Arithmetic, History, Sacred and Profane, Greek and Latin, English and French, and Orthography, etc.³

"By the time Rider and Balfe had uttered their absurdities and insults, the Lords of the Council were vacant, and, having dined, prepared themselves to give audience to suitors. Mr. Rider before others propounded his demand. He was called, as his own phrase is, to *repetitions*, and attainted with gross errors by Sir James Fullerton, and with great ignominy by Sir Richard Cook, for betraying in a manner their cause into such disproof as that it never after could be brought off or disengaged. All the Council conjointly rebuking his presumption, condemning his demeanor, reproaching his ignorance and his over-matching himself and his discrediting the cause, he thought first to stand in the defence of his writings; in a very great rage he burst into the cry of the old heretic Felix, 'That he would be burned himself and his books if anything were written by him erroneously.'⁴ These were his very words;

¹ This was Balfe, I think, and it happened at the time of Rider's dinner and discussion.

² "Britannomachia." ³ "Catholic Confutation."

⁴ St. Aug. lib. 1, De Gestis cum Felice, cap. 12.

but there was no place there to bolster out his vanities. In the end, sharply rebuked for his arrogancy towards them, having hardly escaped from prison, reconciling himself to me for his late insolent demeanour, and requesting me to shut up all variances, he omitted till now to molest me further.

“When he was for such palpable impudence to be imprisoned, he became so abject as every one might stand with Mr. Rider afoot, and equal his haughtiness. At that time I thought convenient to sue for reparation for all defectiveness by him pleaded against me: but he in so miserable countenance came to meet me, imploring that I would not exasperate further the State against him, that I refrained. For what reparation was needed further, when by the highest in the land (to whom he had consecrated his *Caveat*, and by whom he said in his *Rescript* my answer was perused and censured) an authentical sentence, in open Council-chamber, was publicly given against him (I neither being present nor producing any disproof), that in the controversy between him and me, he was faulty, surmounted, and condemned? Thus, God in his Providence wrought, without my co-operation (that all the honor might to him solely be imputed), that he should be condemned by them, whom all men might condemn of folly not to have supported him, unless they had in their wisdoms judged him beyond all defence, and unable to be licenced toward trial, even themselves being umpires.

“After this public sentence given by the State on my side, he repaired to the College for some protection against the infamy incident to his condemnation. There was friendship to be tried: there was brotherhood to assist: there was the saying of Wisdom exemplified: ‘Let us circumvent the innocent, because he is unprofitable to us, and contrary to our works, and doth reproach against us the sins of the law, and diffameth against us the wickedness of our discipline.’ Upon his solicitation, this sentence following was among them concluded:—

“Being hereto for the seventh of November, 1602, earnestly entreated, and of late solemnly appealed unto, before the right wor. M. Mayor of this City of Dublin, and other wor. persons, by one Henry FitzSimon, Jesuit, prisoner in the Castle: and John Rider, Dean of St. Patrick’s: to become Judges and Umpires between them (they having promised to stand to any arbitrary reprehension and condemnation we should denounce) whether of them in their handling the controversy of Transubstantiation (as the same is publicly printed in Dublin, 1602), hath perverted, dissembled, denied the effect and substance of the Author’s minds, concerning

the consent of antiquity in the same. We who were appealed unto, after due search and deliberation had, do hereby publicly declare and testify, that the said FitzSimon hath alleged no Council, Father, or Antiquity for 500 years after our Saviour's ascension, that proveth transubstantiation, whereas allegations are brought by the said Dean, in the same time, that evidently convince the contrary. From the College, this 15th day of May, 1604.

'Concordat cum Originali
'Per me, Ambrosium Ussher, Collegii Notarium.'

(To be continued.)

DOCUMENT.

DECREE OF THE S. CONGREGATION OF THE INDEX, 23RD
SEPTEMBER, 1872.

Sacra Congregatio Eminentissimorum ac Reverendissimorum Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae Cardinalium a SANCTISSIMO DOMINO NOSTRO PIO PAPA IX. Sanctaque Sede Apostolica Indici librorum pravae doctrinae, eorundemque proscriptioni, expurgationi, ac permissioni in universa christiana Republica praepositorum et delegatorum, habita in Palatio apostolico vaticano die 23 Septembris 1872, damnavit et damnat, proscripsit proscribitque, vel alias damnata atque proscripta in Indicem Librorum prohibitorum referri mandavit et mandat quae sequuntur Opera.

Roberto Ardigò: La Psicologia, come scienza positiva. Mantova presso Viviano Guastalla editore, 1870.

Delle principali questioni politiche-religiose per Giacomo Cassani, Professore di Istituzioni canoniche nella R. Università di Bologna. Volume I. Dei Rapporti fra la Chiesa e lo stato. Bologna, Regia Tipografia 1872.

Il Rinnovamento cattolico: Periodico Bolognese. Bologna, Regia Tipografia.

De l'organisation du Gouvernement Républicain par Patrice Larroque. Paris 1870.

Die Macht der römischen Päpste über Fürsten, Länder, Völker und Individuen etc.—*Latine vero*—Potestas Romanorum Pontificum in Principes, Regna, populos, singulos homines juxta ipsorum doctrinas et actus ad rite extimandam eorum infallibilitatem, illustrata a Dre Ioh. Frid. Equite de Schulte

O. P. Professore Canonici et Germanica Juris in Universitate Pragensi. Pragae 1871, apud F. Tempsky *Decr. S. O. FERIA IV die 15 Martii* 1871.

Haeresis Honorii et Decretum Vaticanum de Infallibilitate Pontificia Auct. Prof. Emilio Buckgaber. *Decr. S. O. FERIA IV die 26 Aprilis* 1871. *Auctor laudabiliter se subjecit et opus reprobavit.*

San Giuseppe Patrono della Chiesa Universale, Autore Sig. D. Giuseppe Morena della Congregazione della Missione. Verona 1870. Tipografia Vescovile di S. Giuseppe. *Decr. S. O. Fer. IV Die 7 Junii* 1871. *Auctor laudabiliter se subjecit et opus reprobavit.*

Ist die Lehre von der Unfehlbarkeit des Römischen Papstes katholisch? Von Wenzel Joseph Reichel. Wein, 1771—*Latine vero*—Doctrina de Infallibilitate Romani Pontificis estne catholica? auctore Wenceslao Iosepho Reichel. Viennæ 1871. *Decr. S. O. FERIA V die 22 Junii* 1871.

La Chiesa Cattolica Romana e la Chiesa Greco-Russa-Ortodossa ed in che differiscano fra loro. Firenze 1869. Tipografia Barbera *Eod. Decr.*

Die Stellung der Concilien, Päpste und Bischöfe, von historischen und kanonischen Standpunkte und die päpstliche Constitution von 18 Julii 1870 mit Quellenbelegen—*Latine vero*—Jura Conciliorum, RR. Pontificum et Episcoporum ex historicis et canonicis fontibus expensa; atque pontificia Constitutio 18 Julii 1870 cum documentis probantibus. Auctore T. F. Equite de Schulte, ord. professore Canonici et germanici juris in Universitate Pragensi. Pragae 1871 apud F. Tempsky. *Decr. S. Off. FERIA IV. 20 Septembris* 1871.

Das Unfehlbarkeit—Decret von 18 Juli 1870 auf seine Verbindlichkeit geprüft. *Latine vero*—Decretum 18 Julii 1870 de infallibilitate atque ejusdem ecclesiastica vis obligandi in examen vocatur: Opusculum editum a Dre. J. F. Equite de Schulte etc.. Pragae 1872 apud F. Tempsky (auctor anonymus). *Eod. Decr.*

Denkschrift über das Verhältniss des Staates zu den Sätzen der päpstlichen Constitution von 18 Julii 1870, gewidmet den Regierungen Deutschlands und Oesterreichs. *Latine vero*—Memorandum de relatione status ad sententias Constitutionis Pontificiae 18 Julii 1870, dedicatum guberniis Germaniae et Austriae a Dre. J. F. Equite de Schulte etc. Pragae apud Frid. Tempsky 1871. *Eod. Decr.*

Die Unvereinbarkeit der neunten päpstlichen Glaubensdecrete mit der bayerischen Staatsverfassung. *Latine vero*—Novorum decretorum fidei a R. Pontifice editorum inconciliabilis pugna adversus constitutionem Bavaricam demonstrata

a Dre. Josepho Berchtold extraord. professore Juris in Universitate Monachiensi. Monachii 1871. *Eod. Decr.*

Katholische Kirche ohne Papst. *Latine vero*—Ecclesia Catholica sine papa, auctore Thoma Braun Sac. Dioecesis Passaviensis. Monachii 1871. *Eod. Decr.*

Sendschreiben an einem deutschen Bischof des vaticanischen Conciles von Lord Acton. *Latine vero*—Epistola ad unum ex Episcopis Germanis Vaticani Concilii missa a Domino Acton. Nördlingae 1870. *Eod. Decr.*

Zur Geschichte des vaticanischen Conciles von Lord Acton. *Latine vero*—Ad Historiam Concilii Vaticani, auctore Domino Acton. Monachii 1871. *Eod. Decr.*

Das vaticanische Concil mit Rücksicht auf Lord Acton Sendschreiben, und Bischof v. Ketteler's Antwort kritisch betrachtet. *Latine vero*—Concilium Vaticanum in relatione ad Epistolam Domini Acton et ad responsionem Episcopi de Ketteler critice consideratum a Dre. Eberhardo Zirngiebl. Monachii 1871. *Eod. Decr.*

Tagêbuch während des vaticanischen Concils geführt von Dr. F. Friedrich Professor der Theologie etc. *Latine vero*—Diarium tempore Concilii Vaticani exaratum a Dre. T. Friedrich Prof. Theologiae etc. Nordlingae 1871. *Eod. Decr.*

Kleiner katholischer Katechismus von der Unfehlbarkeit: Ein Büchlein zur Unterweisung, von einem Vereine katholischer Geistlichen. *Latine vero*—Parvus Cathechismus Catholicus de infallibilitate: libellus ad instructionem conscriptus a societate Catholicorum Ecclesiasticorum. Coloniae et Lipsiae 1872. *Decr. S. O. Feria IV. 31 Julii 1872.*

Itaque nemo cujuscumque gradus et conditionis praedicta Opera damnata atque proscripta, quocumque loco, et quocumque idiomate, aut in posterum edere, aut edita legere vel retinere audeat, sed locorum Ordinariis, aut haereticae pravitatis Inquisitoribus ea tradere teneatur, sub poenis in Indice librorum vetitorum indictis.

Quibus SANCTISSIMO DOMINO NOSTRO PIO PAPÆ IX. per me infrascriptum S. I. C. a Secretis relatis; SANCTITAS SUA Decretum probavit, et promulgari praecepit. In quorum fidem, etc.

Datum Romae die 1. Octobris 1872.

ANTONINUS CARD. DE LUCA PRAEFECTUS.

Fr. Vincentius Maria Gatti

Ord. Praed. S. Ind. Congreg. a Secretis.

Loco ✠ Sigilli.

Die 10 Octobris 1872 ego infrascriptus magister Cursorum testor, supradictum Decretum affixum et publicatum fuisse in Urbe.

Philippus Ossani Mag. Cours.

THE IRISH
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

DECEMBER, 1872.

EDMUND BURKE: HIS LIFE AND TIMES.¹

THE Catholics of Ireland are now a free people. No badge of Protestant ascendancy is flaunted in our faces by the laws of the land. One hundred years is a short time in the life of a Nation. Yet, when we look back to what Catholics were in Ireland a century ago, and then turn to what they are to-day, the change is truly marvellous.

We have obtained freedom from religious disabilities, and, as a natural consequence, a fair start is, at last, given in the race of life for social and political equality. One hundred years since—say 1772—a Catholic could not be a judge, a member of parliament, a magistrate, a barrister, nor a guardian of our municipal and civic rights. Now, Catholics are to be found in the corporations, in both houses of parliament, and in the very highest positions on the bench, placed there for the good of the people to administer impartial justice. Some do honour to that position, such as Lord Chancellor O'Hagan; some disgrace that position, such as the panegyrist of Oliver Cromwell.² That is the result of personal malignity, and not

¹ A Lecture delivered by the Rev. James Gaffney, C.C., at the request of the Right Rev. Dr. Moran, Bishop of Ossory, for the Kilkenny Catholic Young Men's Society.

² In a very beautiful Lecture, entitled "The Spirit of Irish History," by the most eloquent and philosophical Lecturer in the United States—Henry Giles, a Unitarian clergyman of Irish birth and descent—the following passage occurs:—

"It is not my province here, even if my power answered to the task, to draw a complete moral portrait of Cromwell. I am simply to speak of him in relation to Ireland, and in that relation he was a steel-hearted exterminator. I have no inclination to deny him grandeur, and if I had, the general verdict would stand independently of my inclination. . . . How much in Cromwell was the honesty of a patriot; how much the policy of a designer; how much was purity; how much was ambition—which so predominated, the evil or the good, as to constitute his character. This will probably be decided in opposite directions by opposite parties to the end of history. Whatever be the decision on the man, measured on the whole, the facts of his career in Ireland, show him to have been most cruel and most sanguinary."—*Giles's Lectures*, p. 19.

the fault of the law of the land. What other religious disabilities affected the Catholics, we shall see farther on.

In our hours of freedom and ease, I think we should cherish the memories of those great Irishmen who stood by us when the day was darkest.—Men, differing from us in their creed, yet who were not blinded by prejudice, or hardened by Protestant ascendancy—enlightened men, who, although living in an intolerant age, lifted their voices to denounce the injustice and tyranny under which Irish Catholics suffered, and to claim for the proscribed and persecuted, equal rights and equal liberties with their Protestant fellow-countrymen. Such were Edmund Burke, and John Philpot Curran, and Henry Grattan. Their names ought to be revered, their lives studied, and their memories embalmed in the gratitude of this Catholic nation. Hence, I venture to ask your attention to a few observations on the life and times of Edmund Burke—one of the most illustrious of our Protestant benefactors. Burke was born on Arran-quay, in the City of Dublin, in 1728, the same year that gave birth to Oliver Goldsmith.¹ Burke's father was a Protestant by creed, and a solicitor by profession. Burke's mother was a Catholic; her maiden name was Nagle. It is stated that through the Nagle family, who resided at Ballyduffe, county Cork, Edmund Burke was related to the celebrated Edmund Spenser, whose name is associated with the city of Kilkenny by his having stiled the river which flows sluggishly through its centre, "the stubborn Nore."

I don't think that Burke would set much value on the claim which would seek to connect him with a man, who, although one of England's greatest poets, was, at the same time, as heartless a scoundrel as any adventurer sent over here to civilize us. If any should doubt this, let them read Spenser's "View of the State of Ireland," and see there the gentle poet's plan to exterminate the Irish race—by murder and starvation.

As Edmund Burke was a delicate child, he was sent, when young, to his mother's family to be strengthened by the bracing air of country life. His health was thereby much

¹ The year of Burke's birth is much disputed. Professor Robertson, in his valuable "Lectures on the Life, Writings, and Times of Edmund Burke," says that he was born in 1729, others assign 1730; the date, 1728, seems most probably correct. In the first vol. of the correspondence of the Right Hon. E. Burke, edited by the Earl of Fitzwilliam, it is observed—"the registry of Burke's admission to the College of Dublin, dated the 14th of April, 1743, states him to have been then in his sixteenth year, which would place his birth, as stated in this note, in 1728. No more authentic evidence of his age than the College register affords has been discovered. The registry of his baptism has been sought for without effect."

improved. Surrounded in his boyhood by his Catholic relations, he is said to have drawn from them those deep impressions of liberality and sympathy with the oppressed, which distinguished his after career, and made him always a fast friend to the Catholics.

When sufficiently strong to face the discipline of the schoolmaster, he went, in his thirteenth year, to Ballitore, a small village in the county Kildare, where a school of high repute had been opened in 1726 by a member of the "Society of Friends," whose name was Abraham Shackleton. The teacher was an accomplished classical scholar. The advertisement of his school, which appeared in the public prints of the time, was as follows:—

"Ballitore Boarding School.—Abraham Shackleton informs his friends and the public that, being placed guardian over the morals of the youth under his care, he declines, from conscientious motives, to teach that part of the academic course which he conceives injurious to morals, and subversive of sound principles, particularly those authors who recommend, in seducing language, the illusions of love, and the abominable trade of war; those who design their sons for the College will take their measures accordingly. He professes to fit youth for business, and instruct them in polite literature. His terms are six pounds per quarter; no entrance money demanded."

Shackleton paid unremitting attention to his pupils. Burke remained with him nearly three years, and then left for Trinity College, Dublin, bringing away with him a great sense of gratitude to his kindly and assiduous teacher, and a great attachment to his son, Richard Shackleton, who was about Burke's own age.

That friendship lasted, bright and strong, throughout all Burke's career of subsequent fame, till the death of Richard Shackleton in 1792.¹

"Give me that man
That is not Passion's slave, and I will wear him
In my heart's core; aye, in my heart of hearts,
As I do thee."

Burke entered Trinity College on the day after he left Ballitore. The date of his entrance was the 14th of April, 1743. So soon as he passed his examination and was admitted

¹ Richard Shackleton died of fever, caught by being shaved, on his way to Mountmellick, by a village barber, with a razor employed immediately before in shaving the corpse of a man who had died of putrid fever.—*Leadbeater Papers*, vol. i., p. 199.

he wrote to young Shackleton. A passage of the letter shows how carefully Shackleton's father had taught him:—

“Dublin, April.

“Dear Dicky—I arrived pretty safe at this city, and was sent, in company with Jack Baily, immediately after breakfast next morning, to Dr. Pelissier, Fellow, T.C.D.—a gentleman (since it falls in my way to give his conjectural character, accounted one of the most learned in the University), an exceedingly good-humoured, cleanly, civil fellow. N.B.—I judge by outward appearances. To be short, I was examined very strictly in the Odes, Satires, and Epistles of Horace, and am admitted. I cannot express—nor have I the knack of doing it—how much I am obliged to your father for the extraordinary pains and care he has taken with me, so as to merit the commendation of my tutor, and all I can do is, to behave myself so as not to bring a scandal upon him or his school.” This was a very touching acknowledgment from a grateful lad, only in his sixteenth year.¹

Many years later, Burke, in the House of Commons, “paid a noble tribute to the memory of his early teacher, and readily acknowledged it was to him he owed the education that made him worth anything.”²

Burke's Career in Trinity College.—Amongst Burke's college chums was Oliver Goldsmith: and fitting recompense it is, that they, who stood side by side in their collegiate days, unhonoured and unknown, should now be commemorated at the threshold of their University by those exquisite statues, which, for beauty, grace, and power, are not surpassed by any monuments in Europe.

It is a strange fact, that three men who studied in Trinity College, and whose names are emblazoned in the story of the last century, should have received at the University no mark of literary eminence—Swift, Goldsmith, and Burke.³ Goldsmith was, undoubtedly, an idler, and therefore in the exact sciences he could make no progress. But what of that poetic spirit that has adorned the language by the “Deserted Village,” and the “Traveller?” Was there no professor of English Literature with ken enough to discern

¹ Abraham Shackleton resigned the school to his son Richard (Burke's chum) in 1766. Richard's daughter, Mary, was married to Leadbeater. She wrote the “Annals of Ballitore,” and the “Leadbeater Papers.”

² See also a very touching letter of condolence to Richard Shackleton's daughter, Mrs. Leadbeater.—Prior's *Life of Edmund Burke*, p. 417. Richard Shackleton visited Burke annually for several years before his (Shackleton's) death in 1792.

³ Henry Grattan entered Trinity College, Dublin, in 1763, exactly twenty years after Burke; unlike Burke, he carried off all the highest honours of Trinity in his day.

his refined poetic genius, though concealed by a plain and clumsy exterior ?

And what of Swift ?¹ How could he go through college, like a ship through the waters, or an arrow through the air, and leave not a trace behind. Swift got his degree of Bachelor of Arts, with the adjunct "Honoris Causa," a term conveying, in college phrase, that he was all but a dunce. Swift, a dunce ! "A magnificent genius," writes Thackeray, in his *English Humourists*, "a genius wonderfully bright, and dazzling, and strong to seize, to know, to see, and flash upon falsehood."

So also Edmund Burke. He went his way without any college fame.² Why, you may say, was this ? Was he an idler, like Oliver ; was he distracted or corrupted by town dissipations ? Not at all. Whilst his chum, Goldsmith, was lying in the feathers of his bed-tick, without a blanket to cover him, because he had given the last shred of flannel that he possessed to a shivering beggarwoman at the College gates, Burke was deep in study, not of the abstract sciences, or metaphysics, but of general literature and the history of his country. In one of his letters to young Shackleton he writes : "I am endeavouring to get a little into the history of this our poor country."

Noble words, which should ring in the ears of all Irish men and women, and direct their studies !

Such studies were not prized then nor are they now at Trinity College, and so Burke made no name at that university. It is but a few years since the Catholic University was founded, and it has been crippled, and snubbed, and cheated out of its legitimate position and rights by the influence of party and bigotry combined ; yet it has, at its sole cost, published a work which alone does more for Irish history than Trinity College has done during the three hundred years of its existence. I refer to O'Curry's MS. Materials of Irish History.

Designed by his father's wishes for the Bar, Burke went, in 1750,³ to keep his terms in London.⁴ He must have been comparatively poor and friendless, and that is a very sad plight in which to be found alone in the terrible streets of London. His first impressions of that great capital are given in a letter as follows :—

"A description of London and its natives would fill a volume. The buildings are very fine ; it may be called the

¹ "Swift went to school at Kilkenny, and afterwards to T.C.D., where he got a degree with difficulty, and was wild, witty, and poor."—*Thackeray*.

² He took out his degree of B.A. in 1748, but he won no honours, &c.

³ Burke went to London to begin life there (1750), the year that John Philpot Curran was born.

⁴ He never was "called to the Bar," and therefore did not practise as a barrister.

sink of vice, but its hospitals and charitable institutions, whose turrets pierce the skies, like so many electrical conductors, avert the wrath of heaven."

How is this poor and friendless young Irishman, now in his twenty-third year, to get on in the vast metropolis? That was a question of life and death for him. Not much enamoured of the law, he set himself to live by literature. He published "The Sublime and Beautiful." It brought him favourably before the reading public. He started the "Annual Register" (A.D. 1758), for which he wrote the historical articles. The "Register" was far in advance of any similar publication of the day. Its writers began to be talked of—their acquaintance sought—and thus scanty earnings came to the rescue, and extending notoriety prepared the way for Burke's future success.

I believe it is De Quincey, in his "Opium Eater," that warns the young against looking to literature as a profession by which to live. Burke tasted the evils of such a course. He had to work so hard as a literary drudge that he injured his health very much,¹ and was obliged to sell his books, in 1756, to support himself. So much for his first six years of literary life in London.

At this time there were assembled in London some men of genius, who might aptly be designated as "The Poor Scholars." Foremost in the rank was Dr. Johnson. His poverty, and its effects upon his temper and manners, are most graphically described in Macaulay's biographies. He had gone to Oxford to study for his degree. "At Oxford, Johnson resided about three years. He was poor even to raggedness; and his appearance excited a mirth and a pity, which were equally intolerable to his haughty spirit. He was driven from the quadrangle of Christ Church by the sneering looks which the members of that aristocratical society cast at the holes in his shoes. Some charitable person placed a new pair at his door; but he spurned them away in a fury. Distress made him, not servile, but reckless and ungovernable."

"In the autumn of 1731, he was under the necessity of quitting the university without a degree. In the following winter his father died. The old man left but a pittance; and of that pittance almost the whole was appropriated to the support of his widow. The property to which Samuel succeeded amounted to no more than twenty pounds! His life, during the thirty years which followed, was one hard struggle

¹ This delicacy led to his marriage. Dr. Nugent took him into his house at Bath; Miss Nugent was very attentive to the patient; he grew well—they got married. Dr. Nugent was an Irishman.

with poverty." Yet this poor scholar was, beyond all question, one of the most learned men, and most original thinkers, of the last century!

We read of him, in Boswell's pages, that he and some of his companions used to dine in the Strand, in London, at a cost of sixpence each, and that the waiter was specially civil to Johnson because he handed him one penny for himself, an amount of perquisite the other poor scholars seldom thought of bestowing.

Oliver Goldsmith was another genius who belonged to this poverty-stricken fraternity. He had travelled over most of the countries of Europe on foot, his only resources being a pair of stout legs to carry him, and a flute in his hand, with which he won the hearts and the alms of the humble peasants, for whom he played such strains of witching music as evoked tears and laughter by turns, and set many pairs of young people merrily dancing—

"For mine is the lay that lightly floats,
 And mine are the murmuring dying notes
 That fall as soft as snow on the sea,
 And melt in the heart as instantly!
 And the passionate strain that, deeply going,
 Refines the bosom it trembles through,
 As the musk-wind over the water blowing,
 Ruffles the waves but sweetens it too!"—*Moore.*

Goldsmith has by this time settled down in London, and he meets, in that cheap chop-house in the Strand, with many kindred spirits. He devotes himself to literature with spasmodic fits, relieved by a good deal of sheer idleness. He criticises, with Johnson, current events—men, manners of the age, books—everything except politics.¹ Burke, poor as any of them, joins in their gatherings.

1764.—*The Literary Club.*²—This motley assemblage soon formed themselves into a Literary Club, and their conversation was so racy, so brilliant, and so attractive, that membership of the Club was speedily sought by many appreciative listeners. Mr. Reynolds, (afterwards Sir Joshua Reynolds) was then rising steadily into fame as a painter. Garrick was at this time the hero of the dramatic stage.

¹ When Goldsmith landed at Dover in 1758, his finances were so low, that he with difficulty got to London, his whole stock of cash amounting to no more than a few pence.

Savage, Chatterton, Dermody, and Gerald Griffin, were great sufferers from want of funds.—See "Giles's Lectures," pp. 243, 244.

² In 1764 (the year of the formation of the Literary Club) Goldsmith had, as his residence in London, one room for which he paid three shillings per week! *Forster's Life of Goldsmith*, p. 197.

Garrick heard of the Club, yet thought he might compromise his dignity if he joined such a set of needy scribes. Hesitatingly he said to one of the members that "he thought he would join it!" Although the most natural and easy of men on the stage, in private life he was full of conceit and pedantry. Johnson was told of Garrick's patronising manner in allusion to his "probably becoming one of the body." *He* hated all sham, pedantry, and conceit. "He thinks he'll join us," scornfully grumbled out the Doctor, "will he be let?" That phrase decided Garrick's fate for the present; his impertinence was summarily rebuked, and for many a day he eat humble pie before Johnson consented to accept his humiliation.

It is pleasant now to recall the names of the great men who formed that Club, nine only in number at the beginning, yet gradually extending to thirty-five; extending upwards too, as Lord Charlemont and others of social rank were soon enrolled. Let us take a peep at their habits. Boswell, who became a member, and was a constant attendant, tells us:—"They met at the Turk's Head, Gerrard-street, Soho, one evening in every week at seven, and generally continued their conversation till a pretty late hour. After about ten years, instead of supping weekly, it was resolved to dine together once a fortnight during the meeting of Parliament."

There is an amusing inference suggested by the change from supper to dinner. When the original members began to meet there were some of them, at all events, who could not afford to pay for anything that might be called a dinner. But in ten years' time Goldsmith was earning and spending recklessly large sums of money.¹ Burke, who had to sell his books through poverty, was now well to do. Johnson, indeed, was always poor, and, sad to relate, was put twice in prison for debt, the very year he published his famous Dictionary.

The members, however, who were by this time, generally speaking, well circumstanced, met weekly to dine and to enjoy each other's highly intellectual company. Their conversation was probably the most brilliant, witty, and attractive that ever was listened to. It is so happily described by Macaulay, that I give the passage at considerable length.

In his biographical notice of Johnson, the head of the Club, Macaulay writes:—"The influence exercised by his conversation directly upon those with whom he lived, and indirectly upon the whole literary world, was altogether without a parallel.

¹ Dr. Johnson, having read the MS. of the "Vicar of Wakefield," took it at once to a publisher, and brought back a cheque for £60, far more than Goldsmith, then unknown, expected for it. Goldsmith was at the time under arrest for debt in his odgings.—*Forster*, p. 205.

His colloquial talents were indeed of the highest order. He had strong sense, quick discernment, wit, humour, immense knowledge of literature and of life, and an infinite store of curious anecdotes. To discuss questions of taste, of learning, of casuistry, in language so exact and so forcible, that it might have been printed without the alteration of a word, was to him no exertion but a pleasure. He loved, as he said, to fold his legs and have his talk out. He was ready to bestow the overflowings of his full mind on anybody who would start a subject, on a fellow-passenger in a stage-coach, or on the person who sate at the same table with him in an eating-house. But his conversation was nowhere so brilliant and striking as when he was surrounded by a few friends whose abilities and knowledge enabled them, as he once expressed it, to send him back every ball that he threw. Some of these, in 1764, formed themselves into a club, which gradually became a formidable power in the commonwealth of letters. The verdicts pronounced by this conclave on new books were speedily known over all London, and were sufficient to sell off a whole edition in a day, or to condemn the sheets to the service of the trunk-maker or the pastry-cook. Nor shall we think this strange when we consider what great and various talents and acquirements met in the little fraternity. Goldsmith was the representative of poetry and light literature; Reynolds, of the arts; Burke, of political eloquence and political philosophy. There were Gibbon, the greatest historian, and Jones, the greatest linguist of the age. Garrick brought to the meetings his inexhaustible pleasantry, his incomparable mimicry, and his consummate knowledge of stage effect. To predominate over such a society was not easy, yet even over such a society Johnson predominated. Burke might indeed have disputed the supremacy to which others were under the necessity of submitting; but Burke, though not generally a very patient listener, was content to take the second part when Johnson was present, and the Club itself, consisting of so many eminent men, is to this day popularly designated as Johnson's Club." We take leave of this famous society with the lines of Lytton Bulwer:—

“Immortal conclave, learning, genius, wit,
And all, by stars that moved in concord lit—
Who could believe ye lived, and wrote, and thought
For that same age the schools of Diderot taught?
That gospel truths spoke loud from Johnson's chair,
While the world's altars reel'd beneath Voltaire?
That Rousseau polished for the maids of Gaul,
The virtuous page designed to vitiate all;
While Goldsmith's vicar tells his harmless tale,
Smiles at the hearthstone, and converts the jail.”

And so we close this part of Burke's social career, seeing him now known in London to the most remarkable men in the intellectual society of the metropolis. Up to this time his life has been almost exclusively that of a private individual. He has not come before the public in any other capacity than that of a writer of some singularly able articles and essays. Official life has just opened upon him. Through the influence of Lord Charlemont he was appointed private secretary, at a salary of £300 a year, to single-speech Hamilton, who became Chief Secretary to Ireland in 1761, three years before the regular formation of the Literary Club.¹ Thus we retrace our steps for a few years, and begin with Burke as a public man.²

1761.—*Burke as a Public Man.*—Had Burke remained in London, satisfied to live upon the scanty proceeds of his literary exertions, and to rest contented with the social and intellectual intercourse of his friends, we, the Catholics of Ireland, would have lost a great expounder of our wrongs. In that society there was scarce one Catholic. "The Papists," as they were contemptuously styled, were nowhere. Hence their cause was that of an inferior caste, with whom it was a chivalrous thing to have any sympathy. None of the members of that proscribed Creed presented themselves in London society: they were to that society like a mere abstract idea, having "no local habitation," and no name.

As the early training of the delicate child had thrown Burke entirely into the hands of his Catholic relatives in Cork, so his first official experience of public life withdrew him from

¹ Hamilton made one speech only in the English Parliament, and one only in the Irish House of Commons. He was content with the fame he got from one able performance in each place.

² *Great Conversationalists.*—Byron, Curran, and Coleridge were probably as brilliant conversationalists as any in the Literary Club. It was said that Coleridge's talk was worth many guineas a sheet. Shelley tells us, in the preface to the poem entitled "Julian and Madalo," under which latter name Byron was designated, that "His more serious conversation is a sort of intoxication; men are held by it as by a spell."

In Moore's "Life of Byron," a letter from Byron is printed. In it Byron describes his meeting for the first time with Curran:—"I have met Curran at Holland House; he beats everybody; his imagination is beyond human, and his humour (it is difficult to define wit), perfect. Then he has fifty faces, and twice as many voices when he mimics. I never met his equal."

Giles, the eloquent and philosophical lecturer, who has charmed his Irish fellow-countrymen in America by his essays on many distinguished Irishmen, says of Curran—"Throughout life Curran's conversation seems to have given to all that heard it the pleasure of constant enchantment and surprise." However, they formed no club, nor did Coleridge ever meet Byron in society. Byron had lashed him as one of the lake poets in his "English Bards and Scotch Reviewers." Byron, however, was intimate with another great conversationalist, R. B. Sheridan. He writes of him, "Poor dear Sherry! I shall never forget the day he and Rogers and Moore and I passed together; when *he* (Sheridan) talked and *we* listened without one yawn from six o'clock p.m. till one in the morning."

London, and thus "sentenced him"¹ to pass some three years in Ireland, during a time marked by fierce and savage religious persecution of his Catholic fellow-countrymen. McKnight, in his able political History of Burke, says—"Burke particularly takes the year 1761—the year in which Lord Halifax became Viceroy—as that in which a truly savage period began with regard to the Catholics, and was continued by succeeding Lord Lieutenants until 1767." During these years, in which the persecuting spirit of the age vented itself relentlessly against the helpless majority of this Irish Catholic nation, it was Burke's fate to stand face to face in Dublin Castle with this detestable and atrocious tyranny. Hence, his generous nature was keenly aroused to the iniquities of that time. Burke, witnessing the action of those infamous penal laws which destroyed the peace and prosperity of the country,² began himself to collect materials for an elaborate work on the penal laws. Some years after his death a part of the work was published. It is what he himself called it:—"An Essay, Systematic and Logical, on the Nature, Causes, and Consequences of the Penal Laws," treated in the highest spirit of the political philosopher. No equal portion of Burke's writings is superior to this fragment either in manner or matter; it is remarkably suggestive in its spirit, and will well repay the most diligent study."³

After three years servitude to his exacting master, Burke threw up his appointment, and returned to London in 1764. Those three years in Ireland had a great influence on Burke's Parliamentary action in favour of Catholics. In 1766 he was sent into the House of Commons as member for Wendover; "and from that date," says Craik,⁴ "almost to the hour of his death, besides his exertions as a front figure in the debates, and other business of Parliament, from which he did not retire till 1794, he continued to dazzle the world by a succession of political writings, such as certainly had never before been equalled for brilliancy and power."

1766.—*Burke as an M.P.*—The position which Burke held as a public man is to be estimated from his acts, writings, and speeches on the great questions of his day. These great questions related to the oppressed and enslaved Catholics; the American War of Independence; the first great French Revolution; and the tyranny that ground the vast millions of

¹ As Swift termed his obligation to reside here.

² McKnight. vol. i., pp. 151, 152.

³ Burke threw up the position of Private Secretary to Hamilton with indignation, and returned permanently to London in 1764.—See "Illust. Life," pp. 44. 45.

⁴ Hist. of English Literature.

India into serfs and slaves, and robbed them of their savings to enrich English adventurers.¹

The Penal Laws—First in order presents itself the action of the Penal Laws, and Burke's relations thereto.

What were these Penal Laws? Lest I should seem to overdraw them and their effects, I give the summary of them presented in the pages of an English Protestant writer. McKnight writes, in his *Political Life of Burke*:—"They form a code which every tyrant might study, and find his knowledge of the surest means of producing human wretchedness extended. He would see at once a terrible engine made perfect with all the science of political mechanism, for those who, with devilish malignity, would reverse the end of government, and instead of improving the well-being of the community, deliberately set about the destruction of a race. In comparison with this unrelenting penal code, embracing generation after generation in the pall of its deadly animosity, even the tremendous policy of Cromwell, as it was exhibited amid the ruin and bloodshed of Drogheda, was merciful. In a few years Cromwell's object would have been attained, and the Roman Catholics would have disappeared from the face of the land.

"But the evil effects of the penal code extended far beyond one generation or one century, slowly corrupting, impoverishing, degrading, tormenting, and at last destroying, through the unpitied suffering of three hundred years, all whose misfortune it was to be born Roman Catholics in Ireland. The mere statement of these laws, as they appeared to Burke in 1761 makes the flesh creep and the blood tingle in the veins. They struck at all property by abolishing, in the case of the Catholic proprietor, the right of primogeniture and any power of testamentary disposal; they struck at all paternal authority by allowing the eldest son, the moment he conformed to the established religion, to acquire the reversion and inheritance to the estate, and to reduce his father's right to a mere interest for life; they struck at all the domestic and social affections by placing the Catholic husband in the power of the Protestant wife, who at her pleasure could deprive him of the management and education of his children; they struck at all the rights of citizenship, by not only preventing the Catholic from filling offices in the State, but by excluding him from the army, from

¹ When the Marquis of Rockingham became Prime Minister, he appointed Burke as his Private Secretary, July 17, 1765. The Lord Chancellor (the Duke of Newcastle) got alarmed, told Rockingham that Burke was a Papist—a Jesuit in disguise, &c. Rockingham, on inquiry, found that these statements were all false.—See "Prior," pp. 92, 93.

the law, from the bench of magistrates, from the freedom of a corporation, and from being a mere lawyer's clerk ; they struck at all the security of social life, by giving a premium to relations and servants to betray their benefactors and masters. The priest was liable to be hanged, drawn, and quartered ; common informers were encouraged by prodigious rewards ; the State nurtured a spy at every Roman Catholic hearth ; all the laws of nature and Providence were reversed. The effect had been produced ; the country was thoroughly divided against itself ; in one land there were two distinct races. The worst feature of all, obvious to the passing stranger, was that fatal scowl of hereditary hatred with which the oppressors and the oppressed regarded each other."

Professor Morley writes as follows¹ :—

"Protestants love to dwell upon the horrors of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes—of the proscriptions of Philip the Second—of the Inquisition. Let them turn candidly to the history of Ireland from 1691 down to 1798, and they will perceive that the diabolical proscription of the penal laws, and the phrenzied atrocities with which the Protestants suppressed the Catholic rising at the close of the century, are absolutely unsurpassed in history. The penal code has often been transcribed. In a country where the toleration of Protestantism is constantly over-vaunted, it can scarcely be transcribed too often. The creed of the greater part of Christendom was viewed as if it had been the bloody superstition of a tribe of cannibals. To hold the belief which a Bossuet and a Fenelon still lived to adorn, while these laws were being conceived, was enough to debar a man from the ordinary privileges of ownership, from sending his children to be educated in his own faith, from the guardianship of his own child if the mother were a Protestant, from keeping a school, from following the professions of law and physic, and, in certain circumstances, from the benefit of trial by jury."

Such was the state of this unfortunate country when Burke came from London to reside at Dublin, as private secretary of Hamilton, in 1761. Now let us consider what Burke's action was with regard to these laws.

He set himself at once, as already stated, to collect materials for an exhaustive treatise on the action of this infamous code, in order to hold it up to the scorn and contempt of the civilized world. He knew that mere reasoning would not soften the hearts of the haughty persecutors of our creed ; but

¹ Morley's "Burke," p. 191.

he knew also that they were a proud race, who would shrink from infamy when brought home to their doors, as was sure to be the case by a public exposition of their cruel legislation and its effects. Armed with the information thus acquired, he came before the House of Commons, and by his exertions mainly the first relaxations of the rigours of the penal code were carried in 1778.

But although he had so far succeeded in the House of Commons, there were fanatics abroad who were not to be enlightened or civilized. The London rabble, fit successors to those slanderers who fixed the burning of London, in the great fire of 1666, upon the inoffensive Catholics, and to perpetuate that infamous brand upon their memories, erected the column, known as "the Monument at London Bridge," which, in the words of Pope—

"Like a tall bully, rears its head and lies,"

the London rabble met at the call of Lord George Gordon in 1780. Thousands of them, infuriated at any toleration of their Catholic neighbours, burned down their houses, wrecked their chapels, and massacred many of the defenceless Catholics. If any of my audience will turn to Dickens's "Barnaby Rudge," he will find there one of the finest passages in the English language, wherein Dickens describes the maddening riots of the lawless street mobs, encouraged by the weakness of the government, and venting themselves with a fury of uncontrollable malice upon the helpless Catholics in the midst of them.

Burke was denounced for being the cause of the motion carried two years before in the House of Commons, whereby the smallest instalment of justice was extended to the proscribed. His dwelling-house was threatened to be wrecked, "he was reviled as a Jesuit in disguise, nick-named Neddy St. Omers, and caricatured as a monk stirring the fires of Smithfield, in addition to much more vituperation."¹ He was warned by his friends that his life was in danger from the enraged mob, and advised to hide or to leave London. However, he boldly faced the danger. He went amongst the excited rabble, proclaimed who he was, and, by his intrepid bearing, shamed the cruel cowards out of their malignity against himself.²

¹ Prior's "Life of Burke," p. 233.

² Burke describes the horrors of the Gordon riots in his speech, seeking in vain re-election for Bristol, 6th September, 1780.—(Duffy)—*Extracts from Burke's Speeches*, p. 159.

Other troubles awaited him. He had sat as Member of Parliament for Bristol since 1774—six years. By his course of action towards his country and our creed, he had offended his constituents. The people of Bristol coveted the honour of being represented by Burke from the great fame he attained in the House of Commons. By his first two speeches in Parliament, when M.P. for Wendover, he had “filled the town with wonder,” as Johnson exultingly wrote.¹ Hence, Wendover (nor Malton, for which he was elected) were no longer worthy of so distinguished a representative. He was returned for Bristol (free of all expense), and its citizens rejoiced in his increasing fame. As time went on, bills were introduced to cripple and destroy the woollen trade in Ireland. Burke opposed these measures, originating from the selfish jealousy of the merchants of Bristol and other manufacturing districts in England. He denounced them as oppressive to Irishmen, and unjust on the part of those who brought them forward. He succeeded in defeating them. Bristol was angry, and determined to be avenged.—He was at once called upon to answer for his two grave offences—1st, That he had not supported the demands of Bristol to crush the Irish woollen trade; and 2nd, That he had advocated the redress of the grievances weighing upon the Catholics of the United Kingdom. In his defence he published two letters to the sheriffs, &c., of Bristol. In reference to the Irish woollen trade he writes;—“Do they (the people of Bristol) forget that the whole woollen manufacture of Ireland, the most extensive and profitable of any, and the natural staple of that country, has been in a manner so destroyed by restrictive laws of ours, and (at our persuasion and on our promises) by restrictive laws of their own, that in a few years, it is probable, they will not be able to wear a coat of their own fabric? Is this equality? Do gentlemen forget that the understood faith upon which they, the Irish, were persuaded to such an unnatural act has not been kept, but a linen manufacture has been set up and highly encouraged against them? Is this equality? Yet if the least step is taken towards doing them common justice in the slightest articles for the most limited markets, a cry is raised as if we were going to be ruined by partiality to Ireland.” In these words of truth, seasoned by sarcasm, he disposed of the first charge levelled at him by his constituents. But might it not be said that he had deceived his constituents? Was he not bound, as

¹ Johnson sat in a neighbouring coffee-house, awaiting in great anxiety the return of some of his friends from the House of Commons to report to him how Burke got on in his first speech. The newspapers were not then allowed to report the Members' utterances.

their representative, to carry out their views, and not his own? Nothing of the kind can be imputed to Burke. When, six years before, in 1774, they had nominated him, without his leave, and then, by deputation, begged of him to allow them to put him in, free of all election expenses, upon his acceding he gave them distinctly to understand his position and their claims upon him in words of singular wisdom.¹ "Certainly, gentlemen, it ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him, their opinions high respect, their business unremitting attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasures, his satisfactions, to theirs; and, above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interest to his own. But his unbiassed opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you, to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does *not* derive from your pleasure; no, nor from the law and constitution. They are a trust from Providence, for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your representative owes you not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion." In these terms of great political wisdom he emancipated himself from the narrow selfish views sought to be thrust upon him by his constituents, the people of Bristol. In 1780, six years later, he vindicates the course he had taken, in despite of their representations.

"I did not obey your instructions. No: I conformed to the instructions of truth and nature, and maintained your interests against your opinions with a constancy that became me. A representative worthy of you ought to be a person of stability. I am to look, indeed, to your opinions; but to such opinions as you and I must look to five years hence. I was not to look at the flash of the day. I knew that you choose me in my place, along with others, to be a pillar of the state, and not a weathercock on the top of the edifice, exalted for my levity and versatility, and of no use but to indicate the shiftings of every popular gale."²

The second offence, in the eyes of his constituents, was his vigorously supporting a bill for the relief of the Catholics, then much oppressed by the severity of the laws. "The Irish," said Dr. Johnson, at his time, "are in a most unnatural

¹ Prior's "Life of Burke," p. 172, &c.

² See the entire of page 180 (Prior's "Life of Burke") for more thoughts, most powerfully expressed on the duties of an M.P. to his constituents.

state, for we see there the minority prevailing over the majority. There is no instance, even in the ten persecutions, of such severity as that which the Protestants of Ireland have exercised against the Catholics. Did we tell them we have conquered them, it would be above board ; to punish them by confiscation and other penalties, is monstrous injustice."

This was worthy of the great Dr. Johnson, and of his friend Edmund Burke.¹ Such liberality, however, was very uncommon in those days. Burke lost his seat for Bristol because of his enlightened policy, so much in advance of that intolerant age.² Nor can we be surprised thereat. The greatest popular leader that appeared in Ireland from the days of Hugh O'Neill to Daniel O'Connell was Dean Swift. He was the ruling spirit of the first half of the eighteenth century in Ireland. Now, Swift lent all the sanction of his great name, power, and abilities to support and enforce these atrocious penal laws. John Mitchell has put this fact with his accustomed graphic force. The sixth chapter of the first volume of his "History of Ireland" should be read by all desirous to know the practical action of the penal code. I extract only the passage relating to Swift :—"He was a country clergyman, in Ireland, during all the period of the enactment of the whole penal code, both in William's reign and in Anne's : he was himself witness to the ferocious execution of those laws, and the bitter suffering and humiliation of the Catholic people under them ; yet neither then nor at any other time, not even in the full tide of his popularity as 'a patriot,' did he ever breathe one syllable of remonstrance or of censure against those laws." In his "Letter concerning Sacramental Test," as quoted by Mitchell, Swift writes :—"The Popish priests are all registered, and without permission (which I hope will not be granted), they can have no successors." Let us hear another authority on this point.

Swift and the Penal Laws—"The letter of these laws, it may be said, was not in force. It was not because it could not, but their spirit was not inactive or without result. It kept the people from wealth ; it kept the people from education ; it kept the people from the means of education ; it broke their spirit, bowed them down into submission, and went far to extinguish in them for ever the life of independent manhood—this is the truth, and there is nothing to be gained in denying or concealing it. Read the pamphlets and speeches of those times, and you cannot but feel to what social degradation the Catho-

¹ See Burke's defence of his conduct in speech at Bristol (Duffy), pp. 156 to 167, all very fine and noble.

² Burke was re-elected for Malton, when Bristol had turned him out.

lics of Ireland were reduced. Swift, in his political and polemical writings, always refers to the condition of the Catholic Irish as that of the lowest and the most hopeless submission. And this was such as Swift approved: such as from principle and inclination, he would counsel, confirm, and perpetuate. For the physical destitution he beheld around him, he had a sort of savage pity; he would willingly have relieved the distressed, and he was zealous for the general prosperity of the country; but if a proposal were possible, in his day, to extend civic freedom to the Catholics of Ireland, or even religious toleration, Swift would have been the first to denounce it with all the fierceness of his temper, and with all the vigour of his genius."¹

Whether the Dean was an Irishman or not, we leave to the critics. Thackeray denies that he was Irish, and assigns as his reason the most complimentary thing he ever said or wrote of this country:—"He (Swift) insulted a man as he served him, made women cry, guests look foolish, bullied unlucky friends, and flung his benefactions into poor men's faces. No; the Dean was no Irishman. No Irishman ever gave but with a kind word and a kind heart."

Certain it is that Swift was a very great power in Ireland. He bound the middle and trade classes together so firmly that they were able to defy the English Government in its jealous malignity against Irish trade. His "Drapier Letters" evoked a spirit of union and intelligent resistance to unjust aggression upon trade rights that dare not be defied or despised. But Swift was no advocate of Catholic claims. The masses of the Irish nation might remain enslaved, and their priests be exterminated with Swift's sanction, because they were Catholic; and so the intolerant bigotry, which was always a mark of the Protestant Church as a body, from the time of the learned Ussher to the present day—that bigotry warped and stained the genius of Swift, of Berkeley,² Bishop of Cloyne, of Lord

¹ Giles's Lectures, pp. 86, 87.

² *Berkeley's Intolerance of Catholics.*—"He lived at a time when the greatest political crime recorded in our history was deliberately perpetrated—the enactment of the Penal Code against his Catholic fellow-countrymen—the code justly described by Macaulay as having polluted the Irish Statute Book by intolerance as dark as that of the Dark Ages. But he never uttered a word against its unexampled and vindictive cruelty. He was a member of the Irish Parliament for seventeen years, when the same atrocious policy, of which we are still reaping the bitter fruits, was in the ascendant. But he never seems to have urged the relaxation of Penal Laws that were a reproach to human nature, and a legalized assault on the welfare, and even the existence, of the Irish race."—*Edinburgh Review*, p. 40, July, 1872.

Sir Walter Scott was one of the most amiable of men, yet Lockhart is compelled to write thus of him:—"He, on all occasions, expressed manfully his belief that the best thing for Ireland would have been never to relax the strictly political enactments of the penal laws, however harsh these might appear. Had they been kept

Charlemont, and of many other celebrated Irishmen of the last century. This, then, is the first great claim that Burke has upon our love for his memory. He watched over our rights as Irishmen; he denounced our persecutions as Catholics; and he gained the first instalment of our emancipation from oppression for conscience' sake.

(To be continued.)

LOUISE LATEAU.—PART II.

HER LIFE AND ITS WONDERS.

“Mirabilis Deus in Sanctis Suis.”—Ps. lxxvii. 36.

§ I.—INTRODUCTORY.

HAVING seen so much of Louise Lateau it was impossible not to wish to know something more about her. A hundred questions arose in my mind, as to the details of her life, and the history of those extraordinary phenomena of which I had witnessed but a single manifestation. I was delighted, therefore, to learn that an eminent Belgian physician, Doctor Lefebvre, Professor of Pathology and Therapeutics in the University of Louvain, had been called upon professionally to study the physical condition of the ecstatic girl; that he had conducted a long and patient investigation of the case, extending over eighteen months; and that the results of this investigation he had recently given to the world in a Volume, which bore all the marks of calm deliberation and scientific accuracy.

Few men could be found better qualified than Doctor Lefebvre to conduct an inquiry of this kind. He had been,

in vigour for another half century, it was his conviction that Popery would have been all but extinguished in Ireland.”—*Life of Scott* (abridged), pp. 579, 580.

Hence, O'Connell's eldest brother refused Scott a stag-hunt at Killarney in 1824-5, and served him quite as he deserved from a Catholic.

Burke was offered £500 by the Irish Catholics for his defence of them. He declined the offer, and advised any money they collected to be spent in getting up schools at home, when the Government would allow of such. The last interview that he had with the Ministers of the Crown, was occupied by Burke in seeking to protect the Irish Catholics from tyranny and oppression.—All useless.—See Letter of Burke in 1797 to Right Rev. Dr. Hussey. It is very interesting.—*Fitzwilliam edition of Burke's Correspondence*, vol. iv., p. 450.

for fifteen years, at the head of the medical staff of two lunatic asylums ; and for the same period, had been engaged in giving lectures on mental diseases. Thus he had been led, as he tells us, by his duties as well as by his tastes, to explore both practically and theoretically the whole range of nervous affections. For the purpose of his inquiry, he was allowed free access to Louise at all times, even without previous notice ; and he was requested by the ecclesiastical authorities, under whose sanction he acted, not to shrink from any test or experiment which the severe exigencies of modern science might seem to demand.

In the execution of his task Doctor Lefebvre did not trust to his own judgment alone. To make sure that he was not deceived in his observation of the facts, and to guard himself against one-sided views, he generally took with him, on the occasion of his visits to Louise, some other witness of professional eminence. In this way, during the course of his investigation, he submitted her case to upwards of a hundred Physicians. Furthermore, it is worthy of notice that he entered on the inquiry himself with a strong feeling of distrust. "A suspicion," he says, "generally prevailed that this was some pious fraud, which the first glance of science would be sufficient to unmask : and I frankly confess that I was completely under the sway of this prejudice, when I entered, for the first time, the humble cottage of Bois d'Haine."

A memoir carefully elaborated by so competent an authority, under such favourable circumstances, could not but be regarded as singularly authentic. I eagerly sought out Doctor Lefebvre's book, as soon as I heard of it, and having procured a copy, with some difficulty, as it happened unfortunately to be out of print, I read it with great pleasure and intense interest. It furnished an answer to most of my questions, and dispelled some light clouds of doubt which had been floating in my mind. Possibly these doubts and questions may have occurred to my readers as well as to myself ; and a short account of the facts, laboriously verified and recorded by Doctor Lefebvre, will not be uninteresting.

§ 2.—HER LIFE.

Louise Lateau was born at Bois d'Haine, in the house where she now lives, on the thirtieth of January, 1850. Her father, who was then twenty-eight years of age, was a plain labouring man, employed at a neighbouring foundry. He is represented as having been upright and industrious, frugal in his way of life, robust and vigorous in his physical constitution. Before the end of three months, however, from the birth of

Louise, he was attacked with small-pox, and died on the seventeenth of April, 1850.

He left behind him a widow and three daughters. The eldest, Rosine, was just three years old ; the second, Adeline, a little more than two ; the third, Louise, not quite three months. Nothing could be imagined more helpless and desolate than the condition of this little household. The poor mother, who had been ill ever since the birth of Louise, was not yet able to leave her bed ; Louise herself was already suffering from the malignant disease which had carried her father to the grave ; and, to crown their misery, friends and neighbours all shrunk away, in terror, from the infected dwelling.

Little Rosine did all that a child could do. Passing back and forward between the sick bed of her mother and the cradle of her infant sister, she managed to bring to them, with her tiny hands, the absolute necessaries of life. Days passed by : the scanty resources of the labourer's cottage were soon exhausted, and hunger began to be felt. In this extremity, succour came at length from the hands of a good peasant, named François Delalieu. This worthy man, suspecting how matters must be, made his way into the house, twelve days after the father's death. Louise he found almost in a dying state, while the rest of the family were reduced to the last extreme of want. He sent at once for provisions, and relieved their most pressing necessities : nor did he cease, from that day, to watch over and assist them, until they were all restored to health and strength.

The mother's illness was grave and protracted : and when, at the end of two years and a half, she had completely regained her former health, she found herself with scarcely any means of support except the little bit of ground on which the cottage stood, and which, in happier days, had been her own marriage portion. But she accepted her hard lot with a bold and courageous spirit. She resolved to struggle against poverty, and to keep herself independent. Evening and morning she devoted herself to the care of her children, and all day long she toiled for their daily bread. While she was away at her work, she had to leave them at home by themselves, putting the two younger under the charge of the elder. Poor little children, they had many privations to endure : they had to bear the cold of winter without a fire, and we are told that their food was more than frugal. Nevertheless, they grew up strong and healthy ; and the time soon came when they were able to take their share of work.

At the age of eight, Louise was placed, for a short time, with a feeble old woman of the neighbourhood, who required

attendance while her son was absent at work. Later on, she was sent to school for five months. There she manifested good dispositions, learned her catechism, and made some progress in reading and writing. This was all the schooling she ever got. At eleven, she made her First Communion; and then went to live with her grand-aunt, at Manage. This good woman was seventy-eight years of age, and very infirm: she died two years afterwards; and Louise, who had served her, during that time, with rare zeal and devotion, went next into the service of a lady in Brussels.

Here she got ill; and was obliged to leave at the end of seven months. But her mistress has never ceased to regard her with affection; and still comes to see her, from time to time, at Bois d'Haine. In a few weeks, Louise was well again, and once more at work; having found a new engagement in the family of a small farmer at Manage. From this place she was, soon after, called back by her mother; and has since remained at home, devoting herself entirely to needlework and household duties.

Early in the year 1867, Louise, having reached a critical period of life, began to show signs of delicacy. Her appetite failed: the colour disappeared from her cheeks: and, later on, she suffered severely from neuralgic pains in all parts of her body. But, throughout that year, she was not regularly ill, and was able to continue her accustomed duties. In the following March, however, her malady reached a crisis: and for a whole month she scarcely ate or drank anything but the medicine prescribed by the doctor. To such a degree of weakness was she reduced, by the fifteenth of April, that her life was in danger, and she received the Last Sacraments. From this out she got better: and so rapid was her recovery that, on the twenty-first of the same month, she walked to the Parish Church to Mass, and back again, a distance altogether of somewhat more than a mile. Since that time she has continued to enjoy unbroken good health.

Three days after she had given this signal proof of restoration to health, that is to say, on Friday the twenty-fourth of April, 1868, the first trace of the Stigmas appeared. She noticed that some blood flowed, on that day, from her left side. With her usual reserve she made no mention of it to any one, not even to her mother or sisters. On the next Friday, blood came again, from the same spot, and also from the upper surface of both feet. She now confided the matter to her spiritual director. The priest, though greatly struck by so extraordinary a phenomenon, wisely judged it expedient not to excite her imagination. He tried to restore her tranquillity, and told her to say nothing about it.

On the third Friday, May the eighth, blood flowed, during the night, from her left side, and her feet ; and towards nine o'clock in the morning, it came also abundantly from the palms and backs of her hands. She passed; for the first time, into an Ecstasy, on Friday the seventeenth of July, in the same year: and two months later, on Friday, September the twenty-fifth, the coronet of bleeding points appeared around her head. All these phenomena, from the time of their first appearance, have been repeated, on each successive Friday, with little or no interruption: the only exceptions being, that the bleeding coronet was occasionally wanting during the first year, and that the other Stigmas failed to bleed on two occasions.

From the time that blood began to issue from her hands, the extraordinary condition of Louise could no longer remain a secret. The news spread abroad. Crowds assembled weekly round her mother's house ; and the excitement soon became so great that the ecclesiastical authorities felt it their duty to take some action in the matter. It was then that they asked Doctor Lefebvre to institute a scrutiny of the whole case, from a medical point of view. His attendance commenced on the thirtieth of August, 1868, and has continued down to the present time.

Louise Lateau is described as a person of simple upright character, and of a cheerful, kindly, unselfish, disposition. She is intelligent, without being brilliant or acute ; and is wholly devoid of imagination. Downright common sense seems to be her distinguishing characteristic. Her piety, too, is practical and unobtrusive. Entirely free from affectation, she follows the beaten paths ; but she follows them with fidelity. She loves solitude and retirement ; and, except in obedience to her ecclesiastical superiors, she never speaks about the extraordinary phenomena of which she is the subject.

On this last point Doctor Lefebvre made very minute inquiries ; and he assures us that, though she has some female friends of her own age, to whom she has been affectionately attached from her childhood, the question of her Ecstasies and her Stigmas is never spoken of between them. Nay, she maintains the same reserve even with her mother and her sisters : and they, on their part, never introduce the subject in her presence.

Though her life is, for the most part, hidden and obscure, yet in times of sickness and affliction her beautiful character shines forth with a bright radiance, and she is then the good angel, not of her own home only, but of the whole village.

Doctor Lefebvre, had special facilities for observing her conduct, under very trying circumstances, towards the close of the year 1868. Her eldest sister was attacked with typhoid fever, and during six weeks required the most assiduous care. At the same time, her mother was ill with inflammation of the lungs. The charge of both devolved upon Louise ; for her second sister could not be spared from her work. Night and day she was on her feet ; and for more than a month she scarcely ever slept. Some harsh words, too, she had to bear from the poor old mother, whose temper, none of the best even in sunny times, was now embittered by sickness and pain. "In the midst of these contradictions and fatigues," says Doctor Lefebvre, "I found this young girl always the same ; serene, calm, smiling."

Even before the Stigmas first appeared, her charity and devotion to the sick were strikingly manifested on a remarkable occasion. In 1866, the cholera, then prevalent in Belgium, made its appearance at Bois d'Haine. It broke out first in a workman's family, consisting of seven persons. Three were at once laid prostrate, father, mother, and daughter ; while the four sons fled in terror from the plague-stricken house. The Curé, in this emergency, sent for Louise. With a fortitude beyond her years,—she was then but sixteen,—this brave girl took up her post in the infected and deserted dwelling. The father and mother died soon after, soothed to the last by her tender care ; and she continued to watch over the surviving daughter, until she was removed to a more fitting asylum. Then, left alone with the dead, she prepared the bodies for burial, and calling in the aid of her sister Adeline, put them in their coffins, and left them outside of the house to be carried away to the grave yard. And so she went on with her pious work, from day to day, as long as the epidemic lasted ; soothing the sufferings of the sick, and performing the last rites of charity for the dead. When the pestilence ceased to rage, she retired again into obscurity.

The mother of Louise is a straightforward religious woman, greatly esteemed by her neighbours. She has had much rough work to do in her time, and has been obliged to struggle hard against poverty ; but she is nevertheless distinguished by a certain high spirit, and delicacy of feeling, not always to be found in her position. Though often in sore distress, she would never consent to sell her cottage, saying, she would not barter for money the home where her husband had lived, and where her children were born. And sometimes, of late, when a visitor would imprudently offer money to her, she not

only refused to accept his gift, but took care to let him see that she regarded it as an insult.

It is said she is of bilious temperament, and subject to fits of testy humour; which she discharges sometimes on her visitors, sometimes on her children. Nevertheless, she dearly loves Louise, and has often declared, with simple earnestness, that she never knew her to commit a fault, or to be guilty of the smallest disobedience.

The wonderful condition of her daughter she looks on, not so much as a favour, but rather as a trial sent by God, to which it is her duty to be resigned: and she feels no small irritation and displeasure at the crowds that gather round her house from week to week. The Bishop of the diocese came from Tournay to pay her a visit in the year 1869. Before taking leave, he graciously wished to know if she had any favour to ask. In reply, she earnestly begged—and her daughters joined their prayer with hers—that his Lordship would be good enough to forbid all visits to her house in future, and let them live thenceforth in retirement and peace.

§ 3.—THE STIGMAS.

The Stigmas have been often and carefully examined by Doctor Lefebvre, sometimes with the naked eye only, sometimes with the aid of a powerful magnifier: and he gives us a minute account of them, in his book, with all the deliberation and precision of exact science. Those on the back and palm of each hand are oval in shape: those on the upper and lower surface of each foot are described rather as oblong parallelograms, with rounded angles. When accurately measured, they are found to be not all of exactly the same size; but the difference is so slight as to be scarcely sensible to the eye. The average length may be roughly set down at about an inch; the average breadth, at something more than half an inch. Besides these, there is another stigmatic mark on the left side, circular in shape, and a little over half an inch in diameter.

All these nine Stigmas are permanent and indelible: but only on Friday do they bleed. During the rest of the week, they are distinguished by a bright red colour, and a certain glossy appearance. No fracture of the skin is observable, even when they are scrutinized through a magnifying glass. The forehead, on the other hand, shows no permanent marks; and on Fridays only is it possible to recognise the points from which the blood escapes.

The bleeding of the Stigmas usually sets in between twelve

and one o'clock on Thursday night. It continues all day on Friday, and generally ceases towards evening ; though it has sometimes lasted up to midnight. The quantity of blood that comes is variable. Before the Ecstasy first appeared it was generally more copious than it is now. The earliest witnesses computed the amount, on some days, at about a quart. When Doctor Lefebvre came into attendance, he tried to make a more exact estimate : but he found it difficult to do so, because the blood is always absorbed by the linen cloths in which the bleeding members are enveloped. He states, however, with confidence, that, on several days, the quantity could not have been less than two hundred and fifty grammes ;—about nine ounces avoirdupois, or nearly half a pint of liquid measure.

In order to understand exactly the way in which the blood flows from the Stigmas, it is necessary to bear in mind that the skin of the human body consists of two distinct layers. The upper layer, which constitutes the actual surface of the body, is called the *epidermis*, or over-skin ; the under layer is called the *dermis*, or true skin. The former is a thin semi-transparent membrane, composed of minute horny particles, which are constantly passing off in the form of little scales, and are as constantly renewed. It is quite insensible to pain, and does not bleed when cut. The *dermis* is thicker, very sensitive, and bleeds freely.

In the case of a blister this distinction between the upper and the under skin, is very clearly brought out ; the former being separated from the latter, and swelled out, by a quantity of watery liquid which is forced in between them. Every one knows that the membrane thus puffed out may be cut or torn, without drawing blood, or causing any pain. But when this is removed, and the liquid matter flows away, the under skin is seen below, very tender, and traversed by a vast number of minute blood vessels.

Now it is precisely in the form of blisters that the first symptoms of an approaching flow of blood show themselves in the case of Louise Lateau. These symptoms generally begin to appear, about the middle of the day, on Thursday. Without any apparent cause, the *epidermis* of each Stigma is separated from the *dermis*, and a watery liquid is interposed between them. A blister is thus established in each case, of exactly the same form and extent as its corresponding Stigma. This blister continues to rise until it attains its full development : then, contrary to what happens in the case of an ordinary blister, it burst open of itself ; the watery liquid passes off ; and the blood begins to flow from the true skin underneath.

As to the coronet around the head, it consists of a large number of bleeding points which are visible on Fridays only, and which present an appearance peculiar to themselves. They cannot be conveniently examined under the hair. But on the forehead, where they are from twelve to fifteen in number, they form a band about an inch wide, midway between the roots of the hair and the eyebrows. There is no permanent discoloration of the surface, no appearance of a blister, no exposure of the under skin. But, with the aid of a magnifying glass, it is possible to detect exceedingly minute punctures of the *epidermis*, through which the blood escapes.

There can be little doubt that the bleeding of the Stigmas is a source of pain, though Louise never speaks of it. During the Ecstasy, indeed, she is probably unconscious of pain, as she is of every other bodily sensation. But before the Ecstasy has set in, and after it has ceased, Doctor Lefebvre is convinced that she suffers acutely; judging as well from pathological considerations, as from the expression and movements of her countenance.

Towards evening on Friday, the bleeding usually stops; but not always at the same hour. On the next day, the Stigmas are dry and somewhat glossy. Here and there may be observed some scales of dried blood, but they are soon cast off: and a new *epidermis* is furnished by Nature instead of that which was destroyed. Early in the morning Louise is at her ordinary work: and she only interrupts her work, to go to hear Mass, and to receive Holy Communion at the Parish Church.

§ 4.—THE ECSTASY.

The Ecstasy, at present, begins between nine and ten o'clock on Friday morning, and lasts until about five in the afternoon: formerly, it used to begin one or two hours earlier, and last one or two hours later. Louise, being unfit for work on Friday, on account of the bleeding Stigmas, is generally at her prayers when the Ecstasy comes on. But it comes on, all the same, even though she be engaged in distracting conversation. Doctor Lefebvre has been present on many an occasion of this kind: and of one, in particular, he has given us a very exact record.

“It is half-past seven in the morning. I open a conversation with the girl, and I make it a point to engage her attention with things the most indifferent. I ask her about her occupations, her education, her health. She answers my questions simply, exactly, briefly. During the course of this conversation, her look is calm, the expression of her face is natural, and it wears its accustomed colour. Her skin is

cool: her pulse beats seventy-two in the minute. After some time the conversation languishes, and there is a pause of a few moments. I wish to begin again, but I perceive that Louise is motionless, with her eyes raised up and fixed in contemplation. She is rapt in Ecstasy."

An account very similar to this, and written, like it, on the spot, is given to us by Doctor Imbert Gourbeyre, professor in the medical school of Clermont, in Auvergne. "I had been examining and questioning Louise," he says, "for an hour and a quarter. My last question was about the cholera patients whom she had attended. She told me she had seen nine or ten of them die. I ask her if she was afraid. She answers that she was not. 'Are you then fond of nursing the sick?' I say; and I go on writing this question, with my eyes fixed on the paper. Louise gives no answer. I look up at her, and see that she is already in her Ecstasy."

In the summer of 1869, Louise was directed by her spiritual superiors, to resist the Ecstasy, as far as lay in her power. This course was considered desirable for the purpose of a strict investigation of her case, from a Theological point of view. It was even prescribed that, on Friday mornings, she was to remain at her ordinary work, whatever difficulty or pain she might experience in doing so. About this time, the Bishop of British Columbia, Doctor d'Herbomez, obtained permission from the ecclesiastical authorities to see the Ecstatica: and he presented himself at the house, attended by the Abbé Mortier, on Friday, the thirteenth of August, about eight o'clock in the morning.

When he entered, Louise was at work with the sewing machine. Her hands and feet were bleeding profusely. On her forehead, too, and round her head, in a complete circle, blood was flowing copiously, and it was streaming down over her face and neck. The sewing machine was covered with it; and only by the most painful exertions, was the poor girl able to continue her work. The Bishop entered into conversation with her, and asked her some questions. She answered with her usual quietness of manner, and with perfect intelligence; going on meanwhile with her task, according to the instructions she had received. All at once, the machine stopped short: her hands were still: her body motionless. The work had ceased, the Ecstasy begun.

The condition of Louise during the time of Ecstasy has been already partly described. But some points, well worthy of record, have fallen under the observation of Doctor Lefebvre, during the long period of his attendance, which could not be noted in a single short visit. He tells us that the

attitude as well as the countenance of the Ecstatica undergoes many and frequent changes. Now her body moves slowly round, as on a pivot, and her eyes seem to follow the progress of some invisible procession : anon she rises from her seat, advances a few steps, and raises up her hands in prayer. At one moment, her features expand, and a smile of delight plays across her face : at another, her eyelids fall, her features contract, and tears roll down her cheeks : again, she trembles and grows pale ; an expression of terror is depicted on her countenance ; and a stifled cry escapes from her lips.

Most startling and solemn of all is the closing scene of the Ecstasy. The Ecstatic girl rises, with a bound, from the floor, on which she has lain so long prostrate. Her pulse, which in the early stages was healthy and regular, beating seventy-five strokes a minute, has gradually become extremely rapid, and at the same time feeble. It is now hardly perceptible, and, when distinct enough to be counted, is found to be going at the rate of a hundred and twenty to the minute. Her breathing, too, has got fainter and fainter, and often cannot be recognised at all, except by having recourse to artificial means of observation. Death at length seems to be approaching. The body is cold : the eyes are closed : the head falls down on the chest. A deadly pallor overspreads the face, and a cold sweat breaks out through the skin : even the rattle comes in her throat.

This condition lasts about ten minutes ; and then the current of life flows back. The body gets warm : the pulse revives : the cheeks resume their wonted colour : the contracted face expands again. Then the reanimated girl looks gently round ; her eyes fall softly first on one, then on another of the familiar objects around ; and the Ecstasy is over.

No one who has seen Louise in her Ecstasy, or who, without having seen her, gives any credit to the facts which have been just set forth, can doubt for a moment that, while she remains unconscious of the visible world around her, she is actively engaged in the contemplation of another world, which is vividly present to her mind. At all events the fact is so. And furthermore, she carries back from her Ecstasy a lively recollection of the scenes she has witnessed. She does not, indeed, talk of them freely : but, under the command of her Bishop, she answers Doctor Lefebvre with precision and simplicity, whenever he examines her about them. Her account is, that as soon as the Ecstasy comes on, she finds herself plunged in a sea of light : then figures begin to appear ; and

the various scenes of the Passion are enacted before her eyes. Not a word is spoken that she can hear : but the processions move sadly along, as if in living reality. The Apostles are there, and the Jews, the Roman soldiers, the holy women. She sees the Saviour, too, and can describe minutely his appearance, his clothes, his wounds, the crown of thorns, the cross.

But it would seem that Louise is favoured, in her Ecstasy, with a still higher degree of illumination, akin to the spirit of prophecy. While she remains insensible to every other voice, she recognises at once, and obeys, the voice of one who has spiritual jurisdiction over her ;—whether it be her Bishop, her parish priest, or any other priest to whom, for the occasion, jurisdiction has been given, unknown to her. In like manner, sacred objects of any kind, presented to her lips,—blessed beads, or medals, or crosses,—are sure to bring a smile of joy over her face : while the very same material things, if not blessed, produce no effect whatever. This prophetic instinct, as it may be called, has been often tested, and never known to fail. On one remarkable occasion, it was manifested in a very wonderful way indeed.

The reader will remember that Louise was visited, one Friday in August, by Doctor d'Herbomez, Bishop of British Columbia, attended by the Abbé Mortier ; and that she passed into her Ecstasy, on that day, whilst at work with her sewing machine. Her distinguished visitors, having seen the Ecstasy thus wonderfully begin, resolved to remain throughout the day, and to watch its progress. About ten o'clock the Curé of the parish came in. He had been attending a sick woman in the neighbourhood ; and had with him, enclosed in a silk bag, a small silver case, called a Pyx, in which he had carried the Blessed Sacrament to her house. In the same bag was another silver case, which contained the Holy Oil used for the Sacrament of Extreme Unction.

As the Curé had taken but a single consecrated Host from the Church, and had given that to the sick woman, he believed that the Pyx was now empty : and it occurred to him that he might, without irreverence, employ the silk bag, with the two sacred vessels it contained, as a test for Louise. Accordingly, he took it out, just as it was, and gave it to the Abbé Mortier, who wished to make the experiment. The result was far more striking than had been expected. Before the Abbé Mortier had come within two yards of the chair on which the ecstatic girl was seated, she started up, as in a transport of joy, and fell on her knees in adoration. The Abbé retired a little : she followed him. He retired further : she followed still. And so he drew her round the room.

Her attitude, during this scene, was very peculiar. She was partly kneeling, but her knees did not touch the ground : her body leaned forward : her hands were joined as in prayer. She did not walk, but rather glided over the floor : and wherever the bag with the sacred vessels was carried, there she followed, as a needle follows the loadstone. At length, the silk bag, with its contents, was put aside. She then resumed her seat, and subsided into her wonted state of motionless contemplation.

This extraordinary scene was repeated several times that day ; the sacred vessels being presented sometimes by the Bishop, sometimes by the Abbé Mortier. At first, the only witnesses present, besides the mother and sisters of Louise, were the three ecclesiastics ; and it was wisely judged expedient to secure, if possible, the presence of some distinguished layman. A message was accordingly despatched to an eminent statesman, who happened, just then, to be staying at his country seat, not far off. He came at once to the house of Louise ; and in common with the rest, witnessed, again and again, the strange phenomena above described.

The Bishop conjectured that, by some chance, a consecrated host, or possibly a part of one, had remained in the Pyx, without the knowledge of the Curé : and that this was the cause of all the emotions, and the movements of adoration on the part of Louise. He proposed, therefore, to separate the sacred vessels, and to try the effect of each by itself alone. First he took the case containing the Holy Oil, and presented it to the Ecstatica. No effect was produced until it touched her lips ; and then she smiled, as she is accustomed to do, at the contact of things that are blessed. The Pyx was next presented. When it was yet two yards off, the transport of joy returned : she fell upon her knees, in adoration, as before, and followed the sacred vessel whithersoever it was carried.

It was five o'clock in the afternoon, when the Bishop and his three fellow-witnesses left the cottage. They went at once together to the Parish Church. There, in the presence of all four, the Pyx was opened, and it was found to contain a pretty considerable fragment of the consecrated species. The statesman, who had been so unexpectedly called from his villa in the morning, and had passed the greater part of the day in the house of the Ecstatica, went home deeply impressed with the scenes he had witnessed, and drew up, at his leisure, a careful report of the facts. This report was subsequently confirmed, even to the smallest details, by the ecclesiastical witnesses ; and from it has been mainly derived the account which is here set forth.

The events of this memorable day were soon brought to the knowledge of Doctor Lefebvre. He recognised, at once, that the facts were established by evidence which few would call in question. But he fancied that some might be found who would attempt to account for these facts by natural means, and would refer them, perhaps, to those mysterious powers, supposed by some philosophers to be developed in certain peculiar states of the mind, and known under the name of Clairvoyance. They would say, that the girl, in her trance, enjoyed an exceptional keenness of intellectual vision, by virtue of which her mind was enabled to pierce through the silk bag and the two silver cases; and thus she became conscious that the one contained only the Holy Oil, the other, a consecrated Host. To meet this explanation, Doctor Lefebvre devised a new test, which he appropriately calls a counter proof.

On Friday, the nineteenth of November, in the same year, the Curé of Bois d'Haine came to the house of the Ecstatica, accompanied by an eminent professor from Tournay, the Reverend Canon Hallez. It was nine o'clock in the morning when they arrived, and Louise was already in her Ecstasy. They had brought with them a Pyx, exactly resembling the one that had produced such wonderful effects on the thirteenth of August; and it was enveloped in the same silk bag that had been used on that occasion. In the Pyx they had placed a small host, not consecrated. Here, then, all the material conditions were exactly the same as before. Yet when the silk bag, with the Pyx in it, was presented to Louise, and even pressed against her lips, there was no transport, no act of adoration, not even a faint movement of the features: she remained fixed in contemplation, insensible, motionless.

It was plain, therefore, so far as these experiments went, that the fanciful theory of Clairvoyance, even if admitted to be true, would not be sufficient to account for the facts. Louise was vehemently affected by the presence of a consecrated Host, while she was insensible to the presence of a host that was not consecrated. Consequently she possessed, for the time being, not only the extraordinary power of penetrating, with her mental vision, through the silk bag and the silver case, but the still more extraordinary power of discerning a Host that was consecrated from one that was not: and such a faculty of discrimination as this, has never yet been ascribed, even by the wildest visionary, to the powers of Clairvoyance.

The complete insensibility of Louise to ordinary material

objects is scarcely less remarkable than her sensitiveness to those that are sacred. During the time of her Ecstasy, the functions of all her senses are suspended. She sees nothing, though her eyes are wide open. She hears no sound but the voice of those who have spiritual jurisdiction over her. Doctor Lefebvre has employed various expedients to test the extent and the genuineness of this insensibility. He flashed a light in her face, and there was no movement of the eyes or eyelids. He applied liquid ammonia, a most pungent and irritating substance, to the interior of her nostrils, without producing any apparent effect upon one of the most delicate and sensitive membranes of the human body. He got a person, standing behind her, to emit suddenly a piercing cry, close to her ear; yet not the faintest trace of sensation could be detected.

The insensibility of her skin he tested with still greater severity, one would almost say cruelty. He pricked her hands and face with a needle. He gathered up a fold of the skin between his fingers, and pierced it, through and through, with a large pin, working the pin about, afterwards, in the hole it had made. He drove the point of a penknife into her flesh so as to make the blood spurt out. All these experiments were repeated several times, in the presence of various witnesses, many of them Doctors, and none could ever detect any symptom of sensibility, or even the slightest muscular contraction.

Next he tried the efficacy of electric shocks. The apparatus he employed produced currents so powerful that a strong man could not endure them for more than five or six seconds at a time. After several preliminary trials, he applied the two conductors to the inner surface of the arm, where the skin is naturally very fine and sensitive. For the space of seventy seconds, he continued to send the electric current, at its full intensity, through this delicate membrane, without producing any effect whatever. Then he applied the conductors to the face of the Ecstatica, and passed the current through various muscles. The muscles were violently contracted, but there seemed to be no sensation properly so called, no consciousness. The eyes never blinked, nor did the ecstatic girl lose, for a moment, her singular look of calm and profound contemplation.

DR. DÖLLINGER AND THE DOGMA OF INFALLIBILITY.¹

BY DR. HERGENRÖTHER PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY AND CANON
LAW IN THE UNIVERSITY OF WÜRZBURG.

(Translated from the German.)

V.—DR. DÖLLINGER'S FIVE THESES.

DR. DÖLLINGER lays down five theses which, he says, "are of vital importance both as regards the present situation of the German Church, and" his own "personal position." And it is that he may have an opportunity of demonstrating the truth of these propositions, that he wishes to appear before an assembly of the German Bishops at Fulda, or, failing this, to have the question discussed in a conference at which he would be allowed to defend his views. Let us examine his theses in detail.

"First—The new Articles of Faith depend for Scriptural authority upon the texts Matthew xvi. 18, John xxi. 17, and, as far as Infallibility is concerned, upon the text Luke xxii. 32, with which this doctrine, in its relation to Scripture, must stand or fall.²

"Now we are bound by a solemn oath, which I myself have taken on two occasions, 'to accept and to explain the Holy Scriptures, not otherwise than in accordance with the unanimous consent of the Fathers.'³ But the Fathers of the Church have all, without exception, explained the texts in question in a sense totally different to that of the new Definitions, and

¹ Continued from our November Number.

² [The texts in question are—"Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."—St. Mathew xvi. 18.

"Jesus saith to Simon Peter : Simon, son of John, lovest thou me more than these? He saith to him ; yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. He saith to him : feed my lambs.

"He saith to him again : Simon, son of John, lovest thou me? He saith to him : yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. He saith to him : feed my lambs.

"He said to him the third time ; Simon, son of John, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved because he had said to him the third time, lovest thou me? And he said to him ; Lord, thou knowest all things : thou knowest that I love thee. He said to him : feed my sheep."—St. John xxi. 15-17.

"And the Lord said ; Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not ; and thou being converted, confirm thy brethren."—St. Luke xxii. 31-32.

³ Dr. Döllinger refers of course to the clause in the Profession of Faith prescribed by Pope Pius IV. in the Bull *Infunctum nobis* :—"Item sacram scripturam juxta eum sensum, quem tenuit ac tenet sancta mater ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione sacrarum Scripturarum admitto ; nec eam nisi juxta unanimem consensum patrum accipiam et interpretabor."

especially in the text of St. Luke, have found anything but a promise to confer on the Popes the prerogative of Infallibility. If, then, I were to accept with these Definitions the interpretation which they set forth, and without which they are devoid of all Scriptural authority, I should be guilty of perjury. This, as I have already stated, I am prepared to prove to the Bishops assembled in Council."

This statement, perfectly in harmony with the views of Janus, had been already made, and indeed more fully developed by Dr. Döllinger in his Notes for the Bishops of the Council, published in October, 1869. But does it not seem incomprehensible that he should have remained until then in ignorance of the perjury which, according to this view, he must have committed many years before, when in his work on Christianity and the Church, published in 1860, he put forward an interpretation of those texts, identical in substance with the interpretation which is adopted by the defenders of the doctrine of Infallibility.

The oath which, as Dr. Döllinger informs us, he has taken on two occasions, has been taken also by other theologians, and by some even more frequently; nor is he more conscientious in his regard for it than many of those who have taken it only once. Does he wish to convey that all other theologians are ignorant of the nature of the obligation which it imposes, and that it is understood only by him and by the few adherents to whom he is a leader and a guide?¹

Nor is it true that "the Fathers of the Church have all, without exception, explained the text of St. Luke in a sense totally at variance with the new Definitions." Did not the exposition given by Pope Agatho meet with the approval and acceptance of the Fathers of the Sixth General Council, as Bossuet admits?² And had not the same exposition been

¹To say nothing of the absence of any authoritative enumeration of the ecclesiastical writers who are to be regarded as Fathers, it is plain that the terms of the oath cited by Dr. Döllinger exclude only such interpretations as are opposed to the express and unanimous teaching of the Fathers. They do not, as his reasoning implies, render it unlawful to interpret a text when the Fathers are not unanimous in their interpretation of it. And the Fathers are not unanimous in interpreting the three texts which regard the institution of the Primacy, and from which theologians undertake to prove the existence of the prerogative of Infallibility. Indeed, there are very few texts which have been unanimously interpreted by the Fathers: it frequently happens, especially amongst the earlier Fathers, that when one gives the literal sense, another explains the text mystically, and a third accommodates it to different circumstances: frequently the same Father puts forward several interpretations without deciding in favour of any.

But it must be added that the Patristic expositions of the texts, which are in question here, are of such a nature that they can easily be reduced to the same.

²After quoting the words of Pope Agatho, Bossuet says:—"Haec praeclara, haec magna, haec vera sunt ita ut ab Agathone dicta et a sexta synoda suscepta esse vidimus." *Defens. Declar. Cleri Gallicani*. Part 3, lib. x., cap. 8.

already put forward by several of St. Agatho's predecessors?¹ Were not the words which our Lord addressed to St. Peter explained by St. Cyril of Alexandria in a sense which establishes in the clearest way his authority as supreme teacher of the universal Church?² Are not similar expositions to be found in the works of other Greek Fathers who wrote subsequently, and whose interpretation is plainly derived from the ancient tradition of their Church?³ And has not the interpretation which is now sanctioned by the Council been for several centuries accepted generally throughout the Church, which, according to Catholic faith, can never err?⁴

Besides, in order to overturn the Scriptural proof of the Infallibility of the Popes, Dr. Döllinger should deal not only with the text of St. Luke, but also with the two other texts quoted by the Council, especially the text of St. Matthew,⁵ for many writers derive their most cogent proof from the

¹ "Specialis a Domino Petri cura suscipitur et *pro fide Petri* proprie supplicatur, tamquam aliorum status certior sit futurus, si mens principis victa non fuerit. In Petro ergo omnium fortitudo munitur et divinae gratiae ita ordinatur auxilium, ut firmitas, quae per Christum Petro tribuitur, per Petrum apostolis conferatur." S. LEO MAGNUS. SERM. 4, cap. 3.

"Veritas mentiri non potuit nec fides Petri in aeternum quassari poterit vel nutare; nam pro solo Petro se Dominus rogasse testatur et ab eo voluit caeteros confirmari." PELAGIUS II. *Ep.* 3, *ad. Episc. Ist.*

² After quoting (*In Lucam.* xxii. 31) the words addressed by our Lord to St. Peter, St. Cyril adds the following explanation:—*Τουτέστι γενοῦ στήριγμα καὶ διδάσκαλος τῶν διὰ πίστεως προσίοντων ἐμοί* ("That is to say, be the firmer and teacher of all who come to Me by faith.")

³ JOHANN. VI. CONSTANT. PATR., *Ep.* ad Constant; THEOD. STUD., *Lib.* 2, *ep.* 12; THEOPHYLACT *in Luc.* c. 22; SOPHRON ap. Steph. Dor. in Conc. 649.

⁴ It is plain, from the decrees of the Popes, that they have always understood this text as referring not merely to St. Peter, but also to his successors. It is sufficient to mention Gelasius I., (*Jaffé*, n. 384, p. 54), Gregory I. (*Lib.* vi. 37, iv. 32), Vitalian (*Migne*, tom 87, col. 1002), John VIII. (*Ep.* 76 *ad Petr. Com.*), Leo X. (*Ep.* *ad Mich. Caerul.* cap. vii.), Gregory VII. (*Lib.* iii. *Ep.* 18; *Lib.* viii., *Ep.* 1; *Lib.* ii. *Ep.* 31), Innocent III. (*Lib.* ii. *Ep.* 209) writes to the Patriarch of Byzantium—"Ex hoc manifeste insinuans quod *successores ipsius* (Petri) a fide Catholica, nullo unquam tempore deviant sed revocarent magis alios et confirmarent etiam haesitantes; per hoc *sic ei confirmandi alios potestatem indulgens, ut aliis necessitatem imponeret obsequendi.*"

⁵ This text of St. Matthew is quoted in the Decree of the Vatican Council. It was cited in the same sense by Pope Hormisdas in the Profession of Faith which he obliged the Eastern Bishops to sign in the year 517.

[The Archbishop of Westminster, in his Pastoral Letter on the Œcumenical Council (London, 1869), gives the following translation of this document, by signing which, in obedience to the Pope's command, 2,500 Bishops submitted to the Holy See, and thus brought the Acacian schism to a close.

"The Rule of Faith:—The first act of salvation is to keep rightly the rule of faith, and in no way to deviate from the decrees of the Fathers. And inasmuch as the words of our Lord Jesus Christ cannot be passed over, who said, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.' These words are confirmed by their effects: for *in the Apostolic See religion has been always preserved without spot.*"—LABBE, *Concil.* tom. v. p. 583. Ed. Ven. 1728.]

comparison of these various passages.¹ In fact, the Fathers, Councils, Bishops, and theologians in treating these texts have usually considered them in their relation to one another. Caspar de Fosso, a theologian of the order of St. Francis of Paula, and Archbishop of Reggio, said, in the address which he delivered at the opening of the seventeenth session of the Council of Trent:—"This Holy and Apostolic Church, the Mother of all the Churches of Christ, has never strayed from the path of apostolic tradition, never yielded to the seductions of heretical teachers, but has always, through the mercy of God, preserved the Christian faith, preached in the beginning by her founders, the Princes of the Apostles, pure and inviolate, in fulfilment of the promise made by our Lord, 'Behold, Peter, Satan hath desired to have you, that he might sift you as wheat; but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not . . .' This Church alone has preserved the faith pure and undefiled; to her alone, as St. Cyprian writes, no error has found admittance.² Jerusalem has fallen, the Church blessed by the labours of the Apostle James; and Asia, and Achaia where John and Andrew laboured. Other churches, too, have fallen, over which disciples and apostles once presided. The Church of Rome alone, pre-eminent as the See of the Prince of the Apostles, has never been overcome by error, strengthened as she has been by the promise of Christ, that the gates of hell should never prevail against her.³ And if the gates of hell, which, as the Fathers teach, are heresies and

¹ *Etudes Religieuses*. Paris, 1868, n. 1, p. 616. *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, n. 10, p. 177.

² S. CYPRIAN. *Ep.* 55, *ad Cornel.*

³ "Οὐδέμια πύλη ἄδου κατασχύσει τῆς πέτρας ἢ ἐκκλησίας ἣν ἐπ' αὐτῇ Χριστὸς οἰκοδομεῖ."—ORIGEN (*In Matt.* t. xii. n. 12.) "Petri sedes ipsa est petra, quam non vincunt inferorum portae."—S. AUGUST. (*c. part. Donati*).

It should be observed that this interpretation of the clause "and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," is by no means necessary for the argument in support of the Pope's Infallibility, which theologians usually derive from the text of St. Matthew. For whether we understand our Lord to have promised that the "gates of hell," should never prevail against His Church, thus built upon the Rock of Peter, or that they should never prevail against the Rock on which His Church was built, the text affords a decisive proof of the Catholic doctrine. The former interpretation is adopted by Dr. Murray in his exhaustive analysis of this text (*Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi*. Disp. vi. nn. 130-2; and *Theological Essays*, vol. iii., pp. 294-6 Dublin, 1852). Father Perrone remarks that this interpretation, like the other, furnishes a decisive proof of the Catholic doctrine, but he rejects it as totally at variance with the traditional exposition of the text.

Maldonatus, however, states that it is adopted by the Fathers, with scarcely an exception. Indeed, Origen, whose words, quoted by Dr. Hergenröther, point to the other exposition, of which he is usually regarded as one of the few supporters, holds as the more probable opinion, that the promise refers to the Church as well as to the Rock. Τίνος δὲ αὐτῆς; ἄρα γὰρ τῆς πέτρας, ἐφ' ἣν Χριστὸς, οἰκοδομεῖ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν; ἢ τῆς ἐκκλησίας; ἀμφίβολος γὰρ ἡ φράσις. ἢ ὡς ἐνὸς καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τῆς πέτρας, καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας; τοῦτο δὲ οἶμαι ἀληθὲς τυγχάνειν. ('Non praevalerent adversus eam, quam autem eam? An

false doctrines, can never prevail against her, how can these venture to proclaim with unblushing audacity that centuries ago she fell from the purity of the faith? Let no man say he claims God as a father, who does not regard the Church as his mother."

How few theologians would be free from embarrassment if called upon to defend the interpretation of the words of St. James (St. James, v. 14) which is ratified by the Council of Trent in its decree regarding Extreme Unction, by adducing passages from the writings of the Fathers as weighty and as numerous as those which can be cited in support of the interpretation ratified by the Vatican Council in its definition of the Infallibility of the Popes? Dr. Döllinger himself would find the task a difficult one, and after addressing himself to it, he would probably feel inclined to modify his view regarding the necessity of an unanimous *consensus* of the Fathers.

Finally, it would be necessary for Dr. Döllinger to refute the theological reasoning by which the supreme and infallible authority of the Pope, in matters of doctrine, is deduced from the existence of the Primatial office which, according to Catholic faith, is vested in St. Peter and his successors. Nor should he overlook the arguments brought forward by theologians, to show that if the Infallibility of the Church be once admitted, the Infallibility of her Supreme Pastor follows as a necessary consequence.

"Secondly. In several episcopal pastorals and mandates which have lately appeared, it has been asserted, and not without an attempt to establish the truth of the assertion by historical evidence, that the doctrines lately proclaimed at Rome of the Omnipotence [!] of the Popes and their Infallibility in matters of faith, have been universally, or, at least, generally believed and taught in the Church from the beginning down to the present time. This assertion, as I am prepared to prove, is based upon an entire misconception of the tradition of the Church for the first thousand years, and upon an entire distortion of her history. It is, moreover, in direct contradiction with the most express testimonies of ecclesiastical writers and with the plainest matters of fact."

Statements, substantially identical with these, were put forward by Dr. Döllinger in his "Notes," and in the "Declaration," published in the *Augsburg Gazette*, on the 21st enim *petram* super quam Christus ædificat ecclesiam? An *ecclesiam*? Ambigua quippe locutio est: an quasi unam eandemque rem, *petram* et *ecclesiam*? Hoc verum esse existimo.

And it is not unworthy of notice that Father Perrone, in another portion of the same treatise, *De Locis* (Pars. i., n. 479), interprets the clause as referring directly to the Church.

of January, 1870. It is plain that the misconception which, as I have already pointed out, underlies Dr. Döllinger's first thesis, underlies his second also. The distinction between explicit and implicit belief in a doctrine must not be overlooked; nor ought the rule of St. Vincent Lerins [*quod semper, et ubique, et ab omnibus*] to be interpreted in an absolute and exclusive sense foreign to the intention of the Saint himself. And if some portions of the Church, under the influence of exceptional circumstances, have, at times, adopted less accurate views on any point of doctrine, the error cannot be regarded as involving any prejudice to the faith of the Catholic world.

It must be remembered that doctrines, the germs of which were always contained in the faith of the Church, may be evolved, and their truth placed in a clearer light by her teaching,¹ especially when the purity of her faith has been imperilled by their being called in question; so that, in the course of time, what was in reality revealed from the beginning, becomes recognised and received as such by all the faithful.

Before the Definition of the Vatican Council, the children of the Church had been accustomed to submit unreservedly to the decisions of the Holy See, regarding them as final, and yielding to them, as such, internal assent as well as external submission, whilst the teachers of false doctrine have endeavoured, by means of evasive quibbles, to ward off the condemnation with which they were visited. The Definition of the Vatican Council has put an end to those evasions by formulating, in clear language, a truth which Catholics have always believed; it has made no change in the doctrine of the Church; it is not an alteration but a development of doctrine.

As the Fathers of the Latin Church pointed out during the controversy with the Greeks, that the doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son was contained in the doctrine of His Procession from the Father, so that the addition of the words *Filioque* involved no alteration of doctrine, but only a fuller exposition of the doctrine previously received; so, too, ecclesiastical writers of the present day explain that the doctrine of the Church's Infallibility implies, and necessarily involves, the doctrine of the Infallibility of the Pope, her head.

Those who regard this doctrine as new, because it had not previously been defined—although it was undoubtedly the doctrine commonly received, at least for centuries, throughout the greater portion of the Church—must be prepared to main-

¹ "Quid unquam aliud Conciliorum decretis enisa est (Ecclesia) nisi ut quod antea simpliciter credebatur, hoc idem postea diligentius crederetur; quod antea lentius prædicabatur, hoc idem postea sollicitius prædicaretur; quod antea securius colebatur, hoc idem postea sollicitius excoleretur?"—VINCENT LERIN, *Commonil.* n. 32.

tain that all the General Councils of the Church have defined doctrines which were new at the time of their definition. In the last century, Benedict XIV. pointed out that the doctrine of Papal Infallibility was universally received throughout the Church with the exception of France,¹ where, as is still the case to some extent, the free expression of Catholic doctrine was impeded by the power of the State.

And if it be urged that for centuries the Popes have acquiesced in the denial of this fundamental doctrine by entire nations and theological schools, it must be remembered (1) that even Gallicans and Febronians never assailed the See of Peter with such audacity as the writers of *Fanus* and their colleagues; that they never put forward a naked denial of the Infallibility of the Popes, but merely required the *consensus* of the universal Church; and that the Bishops, with scarcely an exception, accepted both in theory and in practice the Papal condemnations of Baius, Jansenius, and Quesnel; (2) That the forbearance of the Holy See never extended so far as to allow a doubt to be cast upon the doctrine of the Roman Church, which, at various times, found expression in Pontifical censures;² and (3) That the Popes could afford to wait with confidence for the time when the differences of opinion amongst Catholics regarding the tribunal in which the Infallibility of the Church was vested, would disappear, and the necessity of a clear definition of the true doctrine in opposition to the encroachments of its adversaries, ever growing bolder by toleration, would be universally recognised.

W. J. W.

¹ BENEDICT XIV., *Ep. ad Inquis. Hisp.*

² [In 1479 Sixtus IV. condemned as *heretical* the proposition of Peter de Osma:—"The Church of the City of Rome may err."]

In 1690 Alexander VIII. condemned thirty-one propositions, of which the following is the twenty-ninth:—"The assertion of the authority of the Roman Pontiff over Œcumenical Councils, and of his Infallibility in defining questions of faith is futile, and has often been refuted."

Three weeks after the publication of the famous Articles enacted by the Gallican Assembly of 1682, they were condemned by Innocent XI. (*Paternae Charitatis*, 11 April, 1682). His successor, Alexander VIII. (*Inter multiplices*, Jan., 1691) followed his example. And on the accession of the next Pontiff, Innocent XII., the French King, Louis XIV., and the Bishops who had taken part in the proceedings of the Assembly, submitted without reserve to the judgment of the Holy See. "Inasmuch," wrote the king, "as I desire to testify my filial respect by the most effectual means in my power, I most gladly make known to your Holiness that I have given the necessary commands that the things contained in my Edict of the 22nd of March, 1682, . . . shall not be observed." And the Bishops in their letter to the Pope declare:—"We vehemently, and beyond all that can be expressed, lament from our hearts the acts which were done in the aforesaid assemblies . . . And therefore . . . we hold them as not decreed, and declare that they ought to be so esteemed."

Subsequently, Pius VI. (*Auctorem fides*, 27th Aug., 1794), condemned the Synod of Pistoia for incorporating the Gallican Articles in its Decrees, and declared that the insertion of those Articles, already condemned by Pontifical authority, was temerarious, scandalous, and greatly injurious to the Apostolic Sec.]

IRISH COLLEGES SINCE THE REFORMATION.

SALAMANCA.

BEFORE we begin our brief outline of this famous College, we feel bound to acknowledge our obligations to the writer of the able and original article in our July Number on the College of Lisbon. He has many sources of information not open to us, and we trust that he will kindly assist us in our present inquiry ; also, as it is a subject with which he must be, from his position, perfectly familiar.

The College of Salamanca, in the Kingdom of Leon, in Spain, was founded in 1582 by the Rev. Thomas White, and endowed by the States of Castille and Leon for the education of Irish secular priests, and was one¹ of the first establishments the Irish Catholics obtained on the Continent after the Reformation. From the earliest times Ireland was, perhaps, more closely connected with Spain than with any other foreign country. The traditional belief of our people, was that their ancestors had come immediately from Spain. Identity of national usages favoured this belief, which was further strengthened by frequent commercial intercourse. During the latter part of the sixteenth century a new motive of friendship was found in the unity of religious interests. Queen Elizabeth provoked a war with Spain by openly supporting the Dutch Protestants, who, from fanatical zeal, had risen against Philip ; at the very same time she was persecuting her Catholic subjects in Ireland, and using every means to root out the ancient faith. The Irish chieftains fled to Spain for protection, and sought that religious freedom there which they could not enjoy at home. Thus were the Irish Catholics bound more closely than ever to their Spanish brethren, who, on the other hand, never failed to protect and support them in their distress. The first and most urgent want of Ireland was to provide for the education of her priesthood, and Spain was the first nation in Europe that founded Colleges for this purpose.

The College of Salamanca, called *Collegio de Irlandeses*, was not opened until 1592, though the building was commenced ten years before. Its founder was the Rev. Thomas White, S.J.,² a native of Clonmel, in the county Tipperary, but it was

¹ The very first of all, according to Primate Lombard, p. 315.

² Juvencius, *Histor. Soc. Jesu*, xiii., p. 215, says that White was an elderly secular priest when he founded Salamanca : and that in his old age he joined the Jesuits, after putting the College under their care.

endowed and much enlarged by King Philip III., who took a special interest in its welfare. The revenues of the College were derived from the provinces of Castille and Leon, as appears from an inscription on a marble slab, placed in the year 1610 over the door-way at the chief entrance to the College. From another inscription over the chapel-door we learn that the College was dedicated to the Apostle and Patron Saint of Ireland; who is also revered as the patron of one of the chief provinces of Spain. It further states that Pope Paul V. gave to the high altar, in the College chapel, special privileges, and to St. Patrick's image "many graces and indulgences." Soon after its foundation, Salamanca was placed under the Jesuits, who continued to govern it until the expulsion of the Society from Spain in 1762, and afterwards it was under the administration of two Vice-Rectors successively, Fathers O'Brien and Blake, down to 1778, when Dr. Birmingham was appointed Rector and Visitor by King Charles III. He was succeeded by Dr. Curtis, afterwards Primate of Ireland, whose name shall be ever associated with the history of Salamanca, and of whose services, for the thirty-six years that he was rector, we shall give a further account presently. Dr. Mangan was Rector from 1817 to 1830, and succeeded by Dr. James Francis Gartlan, who died in 1868. For three years after his demise, the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland—who are the patrons of the College, and as such have the right of electing the superior—made no provision for its government.

Last year, however, they appointed the Very Rev. William M'Donald, of the diocese of Armagh, once himself a student of Salamanca, rector and visitor; and under his wise rule the College is likely to become, in a short time, the first Irish educational establishment on the Continent.

Even after the incorporation of Santiago, Seville, and Alcala with Salamanca, all the affiliated students on the College register did not exceed thirty, and the number was still less, reduced perhaps to ten, after the War of Independence. Now there are about thirty students, who pay only a nominal pension. Next year there will be probably as many more, owing to the zealous and persevering efforts of the Very Rev. Rector, Dr. M'Donald. Such is a brief outline of this once famous College, which will, we trust, ere long, regain its former splendour. At no period did Salamanca send forth more distinguished men than while it was under the charge of Dr. Curtis. Within less than five years after his appointment, there were on the roll three names that would shed a lustre on any College—Dr. Murray, of Dublin; Dr. Laffan, of

Cashel; and Dr. Kelly, of Tuam. Thus, our four Archbishops were at the same time preparing for the Irish mission in the same College.

Among the other distinguished students then within the walls of Salamanca, may be mentioned Dr. Everard, subsequently President of Maynooth College, and Archbishop of Cashel; and Dr. Kyran Marum, Bishop of Ossory. What other College could boast of so many honored names on its roll at any one time?

Of all these illustrious prelates, the greatest benefactor of Salamanca was decidedly the Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of Ireland, Dr. Curtis; and of his signal services we must, therefore, add some further details, beginning with a brief notice of his early life. Dr. Patrick Curtis was born in the year 1748, in the diocese of Dublin,¹ where he was also educated up to his sixteenth year. At that early age he resolved to enter the ecclesiastical state, and proceeded to Salamanca to complete his studies. After a most successful course, he received the holy order of priesthood in 1772, having at a preparatory examination taken out, *nemine discrepante*, all the usual degrees in philosophy and theology. In the next year, in reward of his zeal and varied acquirements, more especially his intimate acquaintance with modern languages, he was appointed by His Eminence Cardinal de la Cerda, chaplain to the regiment of foreign volunteers in the service of Spain, commanded by Col. Count de Campo de Alange, afterwards Secretary of State. Not long after the foreign regiment was broken up, or rather incorporated with the Royal Marines—and Dr. Curtis zealously served for more than a year at the Royal Hospital of Marines, at Cadiz—he was then named first chaplain on board the “St. Ines,” which was soon ordered to sail from Manilla, in the Philippine Islands. On her voyage homewards, the “St. Ines” fell in with two English ships on the 24th of August, 1779. Her captain was called upon to surrender. Up to this he had not heard that war had been proclaimed between Spain and England. He asked for a few minutes to consult with his officers. Their ship was badly provided after a long voyage, and yet every man on board resolved to die rather than lower the national flag. The Spaniards fought with their wonted courage for three hours, and only yielded when resistance became hopeless, and after a heavy loss in slain and wounded. The “St. Ines” was disabled and brought in as a prize into the Cove of Cork.

¹ Stamullen, in county Meath, is put down as his birth-place in the Catholic Magazine for 1834, but our authority seems to be decisive.

Dr. Curtis found himself thus in the strange position of prisoner of war in his native land. Of course no one could reproach him with disloyalty, having entered the service of Spain while at peace with his own country. With the justice of the war or its immediate cause, he had clearly nothing to do. He was bound to administer the rites of religion to the dying soldiers, and to instruct and comfort them in their last struggle. And this, his only duty, hitherto he discharged nobly and zealously even during the action, exposing his own life in order that he might prepare others for a happy death. He had now, from his position, to provide for the temporal wants of those who were thus unexpectedly held as prisoners on a foreign shore. He became their interpreter, their agent, their willing servant in all their needs. He treated with the utmost tenderness the wounded, and devoted most of his time to their care. He was thus employed for more than a year, when he received a most pressing invitation from the Spanish agent in London, requesting him, by order of the Ambassador in Paris, the Count de Aranda, to visit at once some of the prisoners in England, where a fearful epidemic had broken out among the Spanish soldiers, who were dying in vast numbers without the last rites of the Church. Dr. Curtis complied instantly with this request. Wherever a poor sufferer was to be found in prison or hospital, this zealous priest sought him out, ministered to all his wants, temporal and spiritual, and saved the lives of many by his timely zeal and charity. His services were gratefully recognised by the Spanish agent, who brought them under the notice of the ambassador, whilst he in turn forwarded to the king a formal certificate, attesting Dr. Curtis's success in his holy mission, and his claim to the lasting gratitude of Spain. A royal decree was issued, December 28, 1780, authorizing the Prime Minister to bestow some special mark of the king's favour on Dr. Curtis, in proof of his devotion to duty in the midst of war and pestilence. New honours were awaiting him in the mean time from the Irish prelates. The four Archbishops of Ireland presented a petition to the Spanish monarch, praying his Majesty to sanction the appointment of Dr. Curtis to the rectorship of Salamanca. The king not only granted the prayer, but expressly ordered that Dr. Curtis should enjoy two-thirds of his salary as chaplain until provided with a prebend, or other suitable ecclesiastical benefice, which would bring him an income equal to his salary. The royal writ was issued March 29, 1781, appointing Dr. Patrick Curtis "Rector and Visitor of the Royal College of the Irish nobles." By virtue of the same writ he was named Visitor of the Irish

College of Alcala, which was soon after¹ united, through his exertions with Salamanca.

His first business as Rector was to draw up a new code of discipline, and thus to reform some of the abuses which had crept in during some of the violent political changes that began then to convulse the whole Continent. These rules were submitted to the Irish bishops, and approved in an official document, signed by the four Archbishops, and dated April 30, 1792. In it the zeal of the new Rector is highly commended, and his claim to the lasting gratitude of his country gracefully recognised.

Just two years before, in April, 1790, Dr. Curtis obtained by public *conkursus*, or, to use the term then in use, by opposition, the chair of Regius Professor of Philosophy in the University of Salamanca; but the king's order in council, sanctioning the appointment, was not issued, or at least published, until March, 1791. It is not likely, therefore, that the Irish prelates knew anything of the change in Dr. Curtis's position, as they did not allude to it in their letter approving the statutes. And it may even seem strange that he accepted or proposed for a Professor's chair while he had so many other heavy duties to discharge. But so perfectly had he restored the discipline of the Irish College by this time, that it required very little exertion to keep the system in good working order. Dr. Curtis was, therefore, free at times not only to preside at the public exercises for degrees, but also to act as Synodal Examiner for the good Bishop of Salamanca, Dom. Andrew Joseph del Barca, and for other Spanish prelates, who had entire faith in his zeal and prudence. That these varied employments did not, on the other hand, interfere with his success in teaching, is clear from the fact that, before 1805, he was appointed first or primary Professor of Astronomy.

In an official document, now before us, dated May 4, 1805, he signs himself "Institutionum Philosophicarum olim, nunc vero Primarius Astronomiae prof. pub. in hac alma universitate." Indeed, there was hardly an office of distinction in the University that he did not fill with ability and marked success. And yet his administration of his own College was watchful and disinterested. He sought no other reward than the glory of God, and the affections of the pious youths of whom he had received the charge. For the long period of 36 years, from 1781 to 1817, when he was promoted to the highest dignity in the Irish Church, Dr. Curtis laboured zealously to promote the interests of the Irish College of

¹ In 1785 Alcala was conducted chiefly by secular clergy. The last Rector was F. Patrick Magennis.

Salamanca. That he succeeded in his pious efforts may be inferred from the position of trust to which he was raised in his old age at the unanimous request of the Bishops of Ireland, and from the official documents, published by authority of the Spanish government, from which we have taken nearly all the facts stated in this brief notice.¹

For the later history of Salamanca, we are indebted to a Rev. Friend, who completed his theological course in that College.

DOCUMENT.

*Pastoral Address of the Archbishops and Bishops to the Clergy
and People of the Catholic Church in Ireland, A.D. 1832.*

DEARLY BELOVED BRETHREN IN CHRIST :

The same holy zeal that influences the Church in the decreeing of her laws of discipline, "for the perfecting of the Saints, unto the edification of the Body of Christ," urges her to mitigate their severity, and to dispense in their observance, as the circumstances of times and countries may render conducive to the interests of the Faithful. Like a tender mother she watches over her children with unceasing solicitude, to know their wants, and to minister to them out of the abundance of her charity, according to the dispensation God has confided to her.

Her precepts of abstinence on particular days, by which "we chastise the body and bring it into subjection,"² have been subject to the changes incident to disciplinary laws, and have been modified by her as expediency might require. In the primitive days of Christianity, adapted to the circumstances of the happy times for which they were enacted, they were austere in proportion to the fervor of the Faithful. But as piety waxed cold, we observe her accommodating her discipline to the weakness of her children, and gradually lessening their burden according to the diminution of their strength. You, dearest Brethren, a cherished portion of her obedient children, have yourselves, from time to time, experienced the same

¹ This State paper is entitled :—"Relacion de los titulos, meritos, servicios, grados, y exercicios literarios de Don Patricio Cortes, Presbytero. . . . rector y visitator por. S. M. del real Collegio de Nobles Irlandeses," &c. There is probably not a second copy of this interesting document in Ireland.

² 1 Cor. ix. 27.

tender indulgence relative to the observance of Lent. However venerable for its Apostolic origin, sacred in the ends for which it was instituted, and at all times sanctified by your cheerful observance of its austerities in the spirit of Christian mortification by which the Elect of God are made conformable to the image of His Son, it has not always been enforced in your regard according to its rigour, but has been mitigated in seasons of great distress, by a dispensation in the law of abstinence, out of compassionate consideration for the miseries of the poor.

We have now to announce to you, beloved Brethren, an Indult of our Holy Father Pope Gregory XVI. by a Rescript bearing date the 17th day of December, 1831, extending to Ireland a change in the law of abstinence, similar to that already granted to England and Scotland. His Holiness, having taken into consideration the peculiar circumstances of this country, and compassionating as a Father the weakness of his children, as well as the increasing poverty and the extreme destitution of many, has granted to us the power of dispensing in our respective dioceses, in the law of abstinence on Saturdays throughout the year, *except those on which the precept of fasting obliges*, as we might deem most expedient in the Lord.

We, therefore, having consulted with each other, and having maturely considered the circumstances of this country, and also the expediency of maintaining a uniformity of discipline in the several dioceses of Ireland, connected as they are by the closest ties of mutual intercourse, have unanimously resolved to extend to our flocks respectively the above-mentioned dispensation, which we hereby grant in virtue of the power delegated to us by the Holy Apostolic See.

Instructed in Religion from your youth, you require not to be reminded of the difference that exists between Faith and Discipline. You know that Faith, unchangeable in its nature, like the Infallible Truth who revealed it, cannot be changed or altered. Like him it is "Yesterday, and to-day, and the same for ever."¹ "One iota of it cannot pass away."² Not so Discipline. It is variable in its nature. The same authority that enacts can dispense. The same power that binds, can loose the conscience from laws however venerable for their antiquity, or the Universality of their observance. Thus we see the Apostles in the Council of Jerusalem command the converted Gentiles "to abstain from blood, and from things strangled,"³ yet when the circumstances that gave rise to this Apostolic ordinance were changed, the Faithful were relieved from its observance.

¹ Heb. xiii. 8.² Matth. v. 18.³ Acts xv. 29.

We, at the same time exhort you, dearly beloved, to bear in mind, that though the law of abstinence is dispensed with on all Saturdays, that are not *fasting days*, the spirit of mortification is at all times the spirit of Christianity. That "*they that are Christ's have crucified their flesh with the vices and concupiscences.*"¹ "*We are heirs indeed of God, and joint heirs with Christ, yet so if we suffer with him, that we may also be glorified with him.*"² "*Always bearing about in our body the mortification of Jesus, that the life also of Jesus may be made manifest in our bodies.*"³

As for the rest, beloved Brethren, we are enabled to say with the Apostle, "*we are in spirit with you—rejoicing and beholding your order, and the steadfastness of your faith, which is in Christ; as therefore you have received Jesus Christ the Lord, walk ye in him, rooted and built up in him, and confirmed in the faith, as also you have learned, abounding in him in thanksgiving.*"⁴ "*The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you. Amen.*"⁵

Dublin, the 5th of March, 1832.

- | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| ✠ PATRICK CURTIS, D.D. | ✠ OLIVER KELLY, D.D. |
| ✠ DANIEL MURRAY, D.D. | ✠ ROBERT LAFFAN, D.D. |
| ✠ PETER McLAUGHLIN, D.D. | ✠ CORNELIUS EGAN, D.D. |
| ✠ PETER WALDRON, D.D. | ✠ EDMOND FFRENCH, D.D. |
| ✠ JOHN MURPHY, D.D. | ✠ WILLIAM CROLLY, D.D. |
| ✠ THOMAS COEN, D.D. | ✠ JOHN RYAN, D.D. |
| ✠ EDWARD KERNAN, D.D. | ✠ THOMAS KELLY, D.D. |
| ✠ PATRICK McNICHOLAS, D.D. | ✠ JAMES BROWNE, D.D. |
| ✠ JAMES KEATING, D.D. | ✠ MICHAEL COLLINS, D.D. |
| ✠ PATRICK BURKE, D.D. | ✠ WILLIAM KINSELLA, D.D. |
| ✠ JAMES DOYLE, D.D. | ✠ WILLIAM HIGGINS, D.D. |
| ✠ PATRICK McMAHON, D.D. | ✠ WILLIAM ABRAHAM, D.D. |
| ✠ PATRICK McGETTIGAN, D.D. | ✠ JOHN CANTWELL, D.D. |
| | ✠ GEORGE J. BROWNE, D.D. |

¹ Gal. v. 24. ² Rom. viii. 17. ³ 2 Cor. iv. 10. ⁴ Col. ii. 5. ⁵ 1 Thes. v. 28.

THE IRISH
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

JANUARY, 1873.

EDMUND BURKE: HIS LIFE AND TIMES.

PART II.

WE shall now consider Burke in the House of Commons dealing with the three great events which aroused the attention of Europe towards the close of the last century:—

1. The American Revolt and Declaration of Independence (1765-83).
2. The French Revolution (1789-94).
3. The impeachment of Warren Hastings (1788-95).

The most bitter taunt ever uttered against Burke was affixed to his name by his friend Oliver Goldsmith. There had been a dinner at the Literary Club. Goldsmith was made the sport and butt of the evening. Garrick, with his "inimitable mimicry," had shown up the clumsy manner and foolish talk of Goldy, of whom he said that—

"He wrote like an Angel,
And spoke like poor Poll."

The laughter was hearty, loud, and infectious. The members roared with delight, and the fun grew fast and furious. Burke could not resist any more than the others. Oliver bore up as well as might be expected, retired in due time, and took a summary revenge on all round. At the next Club meeting he produced his poem, entitled "Retaliation." How completely he turned the tables on Garrick and his tormentors will be readily seen by a perusal of the entire composition. In it he said of Burke:—

"Here lies our good Edmund, whose genius was such,
We scarcely can praise it, or blame it too much:
Who, born for the Universe, narrow'd his mind,
And to party gave up what was meant for mankind."

It is hard to blame Goldsmith for striking with impartial hostility at all who had joined in the laugh against him. But history compels us to say that the imputation of Burke being a mere party man is utterly unfounded. We find his actions in public life directed by one sublime, unselfish principle. He hated oppression in every form: hence he sided with the weak against the strong. He detested irreligion and irresponsible power: hence he flung himself heart and soul, intellect and vigour, against the English Government for its treatment of the American colonists; against the infidel, atheistic mobs of France, which tore down the throne, murdered its occupants, and set up the teachings of Voltaire in place of God, and infamous profligacy in the seat of Religion. He devoted his energies during the best years of his life to bring to justice that high-handed criminal, Warren Hastings, who had plundered the vast millions of Hindostan, and reduced its most powerful princes to be his mendicant dependents, in order that he, and adventurers like him, might fatten on the wealth of the Indian Empire.

Writing of the War of American Independence, Professor Morley says, in his *Historical Study of Edmund Burke*:¹—

“Burke’s attitude in this great contest is that part of his history about the majestic and noble wisdom of which there can be least dispute.”

The inhabitants of America then numbered but 2,000,000 or 3,000,000.² They acknowledged the supreme power of England, but they claimed to have a voice in the levying of the taxes which they should pay. England, haughty and powerful, disdained their claims, because she thought they were unable to resist her oppression. She scornfully despised their appeals to the British Constitution, under which they still lived. “She was able to trample upon them—therefore she had the right to do so.” Such was her logic and her political morality—logic and morality which we have seen acted upon recently by Victor Emmanuel, when robbing the Pope of his dominions, and seizing upon those religious foundations which were the fruit of ages of unselfish Catholicity.

“The result of the whole transaction,” writes Professor Morley,³ “was the birth of a very strong sense in the minds of the colonists that the mother country looked upon them as a sponge to be squeezed. This conviction took more than a passing hold upon them. It was speedily inflamed into inextinguishable hate; first, by the news that they were to be taxed without their own consent; and next, by the tyrannical

¹ *Historical Study of Burke*, p. 124.

² *Burke’s Speeches, Extracts*, p. 79 (Duffy). ³ *Historical Study of Burke*, p. 156.

and atrocious measures by which it was proposed to crush their resistance, viz., to execute the leaders for high treason. The rebellion may be characterized as having first originated in the blind greediness of the English merchants, and as having then been precipitated by the arbitrary ideas of the patricians in the first instance, and afterwards of the King and the least educated of the common people." The Ministry of the day were determined to enforce the right of taxation without allowing the colonies to have any voice in the matter. They were backed up by the nation, spoiled by power, and glutted with prosperity. Burke tore in pieces the flimsy sophistry of the right of the mother country to tax.¹

"The question with me is, not whether you have a right to render your people miserable, but whether it is not your interest to make them happy?" Then, turning to the people who cheered on the Ministry, he says:—"I know, and have long felt, the difficulty of reconciling the unwieldy haughtiness of a great ruling nation, habituated to command, pampered by enormous wealth, and confident, from a long course of prosperity and victory, to the high spirit of free dependencies, animated with the first glow and activity of juvenile heat, and assuming to themselves, as their birthright, some part of that very pride which oppresses them."²

And so it was reserved for the son of an Irish attorney to vindicate in that hostile House of Commons the eternal principles of right above might, and of liberty above legalised oppression. But his vindication was unheeded; the voice of pride and passion drowned the voice of reason and justice. The Ministry was obstinate—the Colonists became rebels.³

¹ It was urged that the dignity of the nation would be compromised by yielding to the demands of the Colonists.—See Burke's rejoinder, Extracts from Speeches, pp. 33-37 (Duffy).

² *American Colonies and Taxation*.—"Again, and again, revert to your old principles. Seek peace and pursue it. Leave America, if she has taxable matter in her, to tax herself. I am not here going into the distinction of rights, nor attempting to mark their boundaries. I do not enter into these metaphysical distinctions. I hate the very sound of them. Be content to bind America by laws of trade; you have always done it. Let this be your reason for binding their trade. Do not burden them by taxes. You were not used to do so from the beginning. Let this be your reason for not taxing. These are the arguments of states and kingdoms. Leave the rest to the schools; for there only they may be discussed with safety. But if intemperately, unwisely, fatally, you sophisticate and poison the very source of government, by urging subtle distinctions and consequences odious to those you govern, from the unlimited and illimitable nature of supreme sovereignty, you will teach them, by these means, to call that sovereignty itself into question. When you drive him hard, the boar will surely turn upon the hunters. If that sovereignty and their freedom cannot be reconciled, which will they take? They will cast your sovereignty in your face. Nobody will be argued into slavery."—(Extract from Burke's Speech, vol. i., pp. 57, 65).

³ Burke, writing to his friend, Richard Shackleton, in 1776, says of the American war, then raging:—"We are deeply in blood. God knows how it will be. I

“When rebellion prospers, 'tis no longer treason.” All the world knows the rest; and if we be asleep or unmindful, the Geneva award of £3,100,000 paid by free England to free America might serve to show us, as a little specimen, what England lost by the disruption of her American colonies, because she was too haughty to profit by the wisdom of Burke.

“Rebellion! foul, dishonoring word,
 Whose wrongful blight so oft has stain'd
 The holiest cause that tongue or sword
 Of mortal ever lost or gain'd—
 How many a spirit, born to bless,
 Has sunk beneath that withering name,
 Whom but a day's, an hour's success,
 Had wafted to eternal fame!
 As exhalations, when they burst,
 From the warm earth, if chill'd at first,
 If check'd in soaring from the plain,
 Darken to fogs, and sink again;
 But if they once triumphant spread
 Their wings above the mountain head,
 Become enthroned in upper air,
 And turn to sun-bright glories there.”—*Lalla Rookh.*

The next great question that forced itself on the astonished gaze of bewildered Europe was the French Revolution of 1789. As the action of Burke in the American contest was founded upon a love of rational liberty—a sympathy with those struggling for freedom—so in the war declared by the French Revolutionists, Burke vehemently opposed them, because, with the foresight of political genius, he saw 'twas not liberty, but licence—not freedom, well-ordered and enlightened, but heartless all-levelling despotism that was sought by the unprincipled leaders in that stormy struggle. “I flatter myself,” he truly observed, “that I love a manly, moral, regulated liberty—the liberty, the only liberty I mean, is a liberty connected with order.”¹

do not know how to wish success to those whose victory is to separate from us a large and noble part of our empire. Still less do I wish success to injustice, oppression, and absurdity. Things are in a bad train, and in more ways than one. No good can come of any event in this war to any virtuous interest. We have forgot or thrown away all our ancient principles. This view sometimes sinks my spirits.”—*Leadbeater Papers*, vol. ii., p. 126.

¹ Fox hailed the French Revolution with acclamation. He denounced privately and publicly the “Reflections on the French Revolution.” Sir James Mackintosh wrote against that work—so did Thomas Paine, in a powerful style, like that of Swift, for directness of statement and homeliness of expression. Fox and Sheridan spoke in the House of Commons in favour of the French Revolution.

Therefore, he was not one of those many Whigs who, in the House of Commons, welcomed the uprising as the dawn of a new era of political and social happiness for the human race! For several years Burke had worked with the Whigs, because they represented progress—now he cut himself adrift from them, because his wisdom foreshadowed the awful crimes to which unbridled passions lead. He foretold that the Revolutionists would deluge Paris with innocent blood.¹ We have lately had a new theory about the causes of the great Revolution broached by Judge Keogh in Galway. Let us examine it for a moment or two, and we shall see that it is in keeping with some other historical pronouncements of that learned ornament of the Irish bench.

I quote from the official report, p. 14 :—

“Talk of the parrot cry of ‘Revolutionists ;’ talk of religion being lost if the influence of the priest is interfered with ; talk of the French Revolution having led to its unmentionable horrors, because they neglected the advice of the priests ! That is not historically true. . . . There were profligate priests ; there were profligate curés ; there were profligate abbés ; aye, and there were profligate bishops.” Therefore, the Judge insinuates, the horrors came because of this profligacy of the ministers of the religion to which Judge Keogh does the honour to belong.

I suppose many here have read Edmund Burke’s “Reflections on the French Revolution,” published in 1790. It is a production of splendid genius, characterised by profound thought, far-seeing wisdom, and wondrous power of language.

When Burke wrote it, the French clergy were plundered, persecuted, driven into exile—many of them murdered. The murderers and robbers justified their conduct towards them in the very terms used by Mr. Justice Keogh. Burke

Sheridan charged Burke—“as a deserter from his former principles, as an assailant of the basis of freedom itself, as the advocate and apologist of despotism, and the libeller of men struggling in the most glorious of all causes.” The reply to these unmeasured terms was calm but decided. “Such terms,” Mr. Burke said, “might have been spared, if for nothing more than as a sacrifice to the ghost of departed friendship ; they were but a repetition of what was said by the reforming clubs and societies with which the honourable gentleman had lately become entangled, and for whose applause he had chosen to sacrifice his friend ; though he might in time find that it was not worth the price at which it was purchased. Henceforward,” he added, “they were separated in politics for ever.”—*Prior’s Life of Burke*, p. 358.

¹“Behold,” says Taine, in his *History of English Literature*, “what Burke wrote in 1790, at the dawning of the French Revolution :—‘France will be governed by the agitators in corporations, by societies in the towns formed of directors of assignats . . . attorneys, money-jobbers, speculators, and adventurers, composing an ignoble oligarchy founded on the destruction of the Crown, the Church, the nobility, and the people.’” Every word of this solemn warning was verified with terrific results.—*Histoire de la Littérature Anglaise*. Tome iii., p. 104.

examined those sweeping charges personally, and on the soil of France. I give his opinions at some length:—

“When my occasions took me into France, towards the close of the late reign, the clergy under all their forms engaged a considerable part of my curiosity. So far from finding (except from one set of men, not then very numerous, but very active) the complaints and discontents against that body, which some publications had given me reason to expect, I perceived little or no public or private uneasiness on their account. On further examination, I found the clergy in general persons of moderate minds and decorous manners. I include the seculars and the regulars of both sexes. I had not the good fortune to know a great many of the parochial clergy, but in general I received a perfectly good account of their morals, and of their attention to their duties. . . . With some of the higher clergy I had a personal acquaintance, and of the rest in that class very good means of information. They were, almost all of them, persons of noble birth. They resembled others of their own rank, and where there was any difference, it was in their favour. They were more fully educated than the military noblesse, so as by no means to disgrace their profession by ignorance, or by want of fitness for the exercise of their authority. They seemed to me beyond the clerical character, liberal and open, with the hearts of gentlemen and men of honour, neither insolent nor servile in their manners and conduct. They seemed to me rather a superior class; a set of men amongst whom you would not be surprised to find a Fenelon. I saw among the clergy in Paris (many of the description are not to be met with anywhere) men of great learning and candour, and I had reason to believe that this description was not confined to Paris. What I found in other places I know was accidental, and therefore to be presumed a fair sample. I spent a few days in a provincial town, where, in the absence of the bishop, I passed my evenings with three clergymen, his vicars-general, persons who would have done honour to any church. They were all well-informed; two of them of deep, general, and extensive erudition, ancient and modern, oriental and western, particularly in their own profession. They had a more extensive knowledge of our English divines than I expected, and they entered into the genius of those writers with a critical accuracy. One of these gentlemen is since dead, the Abbé Morangis. I pay this tribute without reluctance to the memory of that noble, reverend, learned, and excellent person; and I should do the same, with equal cheerfulness, to the merits of the others, who I believe are still living, if I did not fear to hurt those whom I am unable to serve.

“Some of these ecclesiastics of rank are, by all titles, persons deserving of general respect. They are deserving of gratitude from me, and from many English. If this letter should ever come into their hands, I hope they will believe there are those of our nation who feel for their unmerited fall, and for the cruel confiscation of their fortunes, with no common sensibility. What I say of them is a testimony, as far as one feeble voice can go, which I owe to truth. Whenever the question of this unnatural persecution is concerned, I will pay it. No one shall prevent me from being just and grateful. The time is fitted for the duty; and it is particularly becoming to show our justice and gratitude when those who have deserved well of us and of mankind are labouring under popular obloquy and the persecutions of oppressive power.”¹

And upon this authority of Edmund Burke, the high-minded Protestant, we dismiss the Galway Judgment on the French clergy. That tribute of Burke constitutes another claim upon our admiration and reverence for his unsullied memory.

Burke and Warren Hastings.—It is impossible, in any outline of Burke’s career and character, to omit his Indian policy; that the cause of people at our doors, like the

¹ From Mr. Justice Keogh’s ironical exclamation—“Talk of the parrot-cry of revolutionists,” he seems to admire and adopt as a model the career of these worthies. It is interesting to observe in what way Burke regarded those wretches whose cause Mr. Keogh has made his own. *En passant*, we should like to ask is the solemn denunciation by Burke of their villany to be regarded as a “parrot-cry?” Burke writes:—“Our present danger from the example of a people, whose character knows no medium, is, with regard to government, a danger from anarchy—a danger of being led, through an admiration of successful fraud and violence, and an imitation of the excesses of an irrational, unprincipled, proscribing, confiscating, plundering, ferocious, bloody, and tyrannical democracy. On the side of religion the danger of their example is no longer from intolerance, but from atheism, a foul unnatural vice, foe to all the dignity and consolation of mankind, which seems in France, for a long time, to have been embodied into a faction, accredited and almost avowed In all that we do, whether in the struggle or after it, it is necessary that we should have constantly in our eye the nature and character of the enemy we have to contend with. The Jacobin Revolution is carried on by men of no rank, of no consideration, of wild, savage minds, full of levity, arrogance, and presumption, without morals, without probity, without prudence. What have they, then, to supply their innumerable defects, and to make them terrible even to the firmest minds? One thing, and one thing only; but that one thing is worth a thousand—they have energy. In France all things being put into an universal ferment, in the decomposition of society, no man comes forward but by his spirit of enterprise, and the vigour of his mind. If we meet this dreadful and portentous energy, restrained by no consideration of God or man, that is always vigilant, always on the attack, that allows itself no repose and suffers none to rest an hour with impunity—if we meet this energy with poor commonplace proceeding, with trivial maxims, paltry old saws, with doubts, fears, and suspicions, with a languid, uncertain hesitation, with a formal official spirit which is turned a side by every obstacle from its purpose, and which never sees a difficulty but to yield to it, or, at best, to evade it, down we go to the bottom of the abyss.”

French, should command the attention of neighbouring nations, was inevitable. A king and queen, with many leading nobles, sent to the guillotine—an entire nobility proscribed, and hunted out with complete forfeiture of their estates—an ancient religion foresworn and abandoned—its bishops and priests maligned and traduced, that they might become the victims of popular rage, and so be exterminated, or chased into exile—and all this within a few hours' sail of the British shore—made the heart of the nation palpitate with deep emotion, and filled the minds of the people of all classes with tremulous anxiety.

But who cared for, or thought of, the doings of Warren Hastings in India? When stifled rumours of robbery, and murder, and wholesale ruin of the Indian princes, and wholesale oppression of the Indian people, came across the vast oceans that divide England from that far-off dependency, were they not as the idle winds? All the nation cared to know was that she got great tribute therefrom, and so the taxes at home were lightened, that many of her sons went out empty-handed, and came back in a few years with great fortunes. And thus the whole gain was for the British people. The voice of wailing came from every district comprised within the vast Hindoo regions, but every ear was deaf to its cry. Young adventurers went there in the service of the Crown, to spend their time in rioting and dissipation, and to return in a short time from the land of exile with ample fortunes wrung from the natives. To attack the Government of India was to array against the claims of justice and humanity all the violence of unscrupulous men, who had become directors of a Company practically irresponsible, and all the venality of the British upper and middle classes, who looked to India merely as a place for their younger sons unscrupulously to acquire rapid wealth to be spent at home in England.

There was one man who resolved to put an end, if possible, to the tyranny, speculation, and crime which marked the Government of India.

Burke devoted himself, without pay or reward, without any personal interest, solely from the purest sense of public justice, to the redress of Indian grievances. The thoroughness with which he went to work has no parallel in our history.

Before he entered on the question of American taxation, he had, by intense study, mastered all the details of its colonial policy.

"Good God!" cried out Lord John Townsend, from the gallery of the House of Commons, as he listened to Burke's

defence of the American colonies—"what a man this is: how could he acquire such transcendent powers."¹

With still greater earnestness, and inconceivable industry, he set himself to study the laws, the institutions, and habits of the people of India, in order to see things "from their platform." The testimony of so accomplished a witness as Lord Macaulay, who had himself lived as Commissioner in India, is decisive as to Burke's motives and labours.

"The plain truth is, that Hastings had committed some great crimes, and that the thought of these crimes made the blood of Burke boil in his veins. For Burke was a man in whom compassion for suffering, and hatred of injustice and tyranny, were as strong as in Las Casas or Clarkson. And although in him, as in Las Casas and Clarkson, these noble feelings were alloyed with the infirmity which belongs to human nature, he is, like them, entitled to this great praise, that he devoted years of intense labour to the service of the people of India, with whom he had neither blood nor language, neither religion nor manners in common, and from whom no requital, no thanks, no applause could be expected. His knowledge of India was such as few, even of those Europeans who have passed many years in that country, have attained, and such as certainly was never attained by any public man who had not quitted Europe."

Armed with that wonderful amount of accurate knowledge, and spurred on by his innate scorn of oppression, he demanded the impeachment, for high crimes and misdemeanours of Hastings, the Governor-General of India. Amidst what solemn pomp and splendid presence that trial began in Westminster Hall, can be read in the glowing pages of Macaulay. How the trial was adjourned, and taken up year after year, for upwards of seven years, history tells. The public at last got thoroughly tired, and all the excitement created by the wondrous speeches which opened the impeachment, died out. Interest and pride prevailed over truth and justice. Hastings was finally acquitted. Yet Burke made it impossible to repeat the crimes which disgraced the rule of Hastings. Mr. Pitt proposed and carried, on the 20th of June, 1794, a motion, that the thanks of the House of Commons be given to the managers of Hastings' trial. Burke acknowledged, on the part of the managers, the compliment so paid.

In a letter of Burke to his friend, Dr. Laurence, he writes as follows, in reference to the iniquitous acquittal:—

"Bath, July 28, 1796.

"As it is possible that my stay on this side of the grave

¹ He was then only in the second session of his being an M.P.

may yet be shorter than I computed, let me now beg to call to your recollection the solemn charge and trust I gave you on my departure from the public stage.¹ Let not this cruel, daring, unexampled act of public corruption, guilt, and meanness, go down to a posterity as careless as the present race, without its due animadversion, which will be best found in its own acts and monuments. Let my endeavours to save the nation from that shame and guilt be my monument, the only one I ever will have. Let everything I have done, said, or written, be forgotten but this. I have struggled with the great and the little on this point during the greater part of my active life ; and I wish, after death, to have recorded my defiance of the judgments of those who consider the dominion of the glorious empire, given by an incomprehensible dispensation of the Divine Providence into our hands, as nothing more than an opportunity of gratifying, for the lowest of their purposes, the basest of their passions, and that for such poor rewards, and, for the most part, indirect and silly bribes, as indicate even more the folly than the corruption of these infamous and contemptible wretches. Above all, make out the cruelty of this pretended acquittal, but in reality this barbarous and inhuman condemnation of whole tribes and nations, and of all the classes they contain. If ever Europe recovers its civilization, that work will be useful. ‘Remember—Remember—Remember.’”

Many of you have, I suppose, seen Foley’s statue of Edmund Burke in front of Trinity College, Dublin. The artist has embodied in that figure those impressive words of Burke. The attitude of that defiant form proclaims Burke’s denunciation of Hastings’ villany, and thus we have in permanent shape the only monument our glorious countryman desired—a monument which is a double tribute to Irish genius, to the departed genius whom it commemorates, and the living genius by whom it has been designed and executed.

Under his portrait, Sir Joshua Reynolds wrote those lines of Milton, as singularly applicable to Burke :—

“ Unmoved,
Unshaken, unseduced, unterrified,
His loyalty he kept, his love, his zeal ;
Nor number, nor example with him wrought
To swerve from truth, or change his constant mind,
Though single.”

Burke’s Death.—The “*Illustrated Life*” of Burke, by Peter Burke, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, is a charming biography. From

¹ Burke resigned his seat as M.P. in 1794. Heart-broken, by the death of his son Richard, he retired from public life.—See *Illustrated Life*, pp. 273, 4.

its pages is here transferred, somewhat abbreviated, the graphic description of the last illness and death of Burke:—

“Burke’s bodily health giving way, he, early in 1797, went to Bath to try the benefit of the waters. Burke remained at Bath four months, but without any material improvement. At length, despairing of a change for the better, he resolved on a removal to Beaconsfield, there, as he said, ‘to await his end with unfeigned humiliation, and to prepare to submit to the will of God with trembling hope.’ He thus expressed himself in a letter to Mrs. Leadbeater:—‘I have been at Bath these four months to no purpose, and am, therefore, to be removed to my own house at Beaconsfield to-morrow, to be nearer to a habitation more permanent, humbly and fearfully trusting that my better part may find a better mansion.’

“On Friday, July the 7th, he spent the morning in a recapitulation of the most important acts of his life. Dwelling particularly on the French Revolution, and on the separation from admired friends which it had occasioned, he spoke with pleasure of the conscious rectitude of his intentions, and entreated ‘that if any unguarded asperity of his had hurt them, to believe that no offence was meant.’ He earnestly declared his forgiveness of all who had either on that subject, or any other cause, endeavoured to injure him.”

“His end was suited,” wrote his friend Dr. Laurence, “to the simple greatness of mind which he displayed through life—every way unaffected, without levity, without ostentation, full of natural grace and dignity. He appeared neither to wish nor to dread, but patiently and placidly to await the appointed hour of his dissolution. On the 8th July, he had conversed for some time with his usual force of thought and expression on the state of his country, for the welfare of which his heart was interested till it ceased to beat. His young friend and relative, Mr. Nagle, coming to his bed-side, he expressed a desire to be carried to another apartment. Mr. Nagle, with the assistance of servants, was complying with his request, when Burke faintly uttering, ‘God bless you,’ fell back, and expired on the night of the 8th, or, rather, the morning of the 9th July, 1797, in the sixty-eighth year of his age.”¹

¹ Fox was the head of the great Whig party to which Burke was long allied, and from which he separated, owing to its leading members—Fox, Sheridan, and others—receiving the news of the French Revolution of 1789 with enthusiastic welcome, and lauding it with no stinted praises, in the House of Commons. It is much to be regretted that any political differences of opinion should have broken up such friendship. However, Fox’s esteem for Burke’s high character, and the purity of his motives, remained unchanged. When he learned that Burke’s illness was of a fatal character, he at once wrote to Mrs. Burke a letter of tenderest condolence, and requested her to convey to her husband the expression of his grief and sympathy.

The private character of Burke I must dismiss with brief notice.

Great men have often been bad—very bad men—very vicious, corrupt, and profligate men. If Burke were not a good man as well as a great man, I should not venture to occupy your attention with his career.

Lord Byron, a great poet, and a very great profligate both in his life and writings, says of the letters of Robert Burns:—“They are full of oaths and obscene songs. What an antithetical mind!—tenderness and roughness—delicacy, coarseness, sentiment, sensuality—soaring and grovelling—dirt and deity—all mixed up in that one compound of inspired clay.” These words may most fitly be applied to Byron as well as to Burns.

Very different were the writings and the life of our countryman Burke. By him no principle of high honour was disregarded; no immorality proclaimed nor tolerated: by him irreligion and atheism were scornfully denounced as debasing to mankind. Of his writings we can say, with far more truth than Sir Walter Scott said of his own productions:—

“I am drawing near to the close of my career. I have been, perhaps, the most voluminous author of the day; and it is a comfort to me that I have tried to unsettle no man’s faith—to corrupt no man’s principle.”

Burke’s domestic and social worth may be summarised in a few very comprehensive sentences:—

I. He was the best of husbands, and was blessed, as he well deserved, with a most devoted wife. He lived in stormy

When Burke died, Fox was the first to propose that Burke should be interred with public honours in Westminster Abbey. Burke’s will prevented this result. as he directed his remains to be laid in the little country church, near to his residence at Beaconsfield. Long before his death, he had, when a young man, written these simple and pathetic lines:—

“I would rather sleep in the southern corner of a little country churchyard than in the tomb of the Capulets. I should like, however, that my dust should mingle with kindred dust. The good old expression, family burying-ground, has something pleasing in it, at least to me.” His wishes were realized, for he was interred beside his brother and his son.

Burke’s last will is an extremely interesting document. It reveals the unclouded happiness of his married life—“the sunshine spoken” of true and lasting devotion to all his wishes and comforts on the part of that lady, whom he styles “his entirely beloved, faithful and incomparable wife,” and whom he makes “the sole inheritor of all his real and personal estates.” It shows his abiding warm-hearted friendship for “his friends and relations, and companions through life, and especially the friends and companions of my son, who were the dearest of mine.”

Its last clause is very affecting and Christian-like. It relates to friendships sundered by political conflicts. “If the intimacy which I have had with others has been broken off by political difference on great questions concerning the state of things existing and impending, I hope they will forgive whatever of general human infirmity, or of my own particular infirmity, has entered into that contention. I heartily entreat their forgiveness.”

political times—"Every care vanishes," he used to say, "the moment I enter under my own roof."

2. He was a most affectionate son. His father was cross-grained and irritable, yet Burke was ever most respectful and deferential to him. But he loved his mother most dearly all through his life, as we learn from one of her letters. Great honours had been paid to her son on his visiting Loughrea, in the year 1766. He was presented by the people of Galway with the freedom of the city in a silver box. The poor mother was naturally overjoyed at such honours. She related them in a letter to a friend, and thus concludes:—"My dear Nelly, I believe you will think me very vain, but as you are a mother, I hope you will excuse it. I assure you that it is no honour that is done him, that makes me vain of him, but the goodness of his heart, which I believe no man living has a better, and sure there can't be a better son, nor can there be a better daughter-in-law than his wife."

3. He was a most devoted father; with an ardent and doting affection his heart centred in his son Richard, who grew to man's estate, gave great promise of a brilliant future, yet was cut off in the prime of youthful manhood at the age of 36. His death broke his father's heart. He was about to accept a peerage, which was ready to his hands. The death of his only surviving son extinguished all desires of fame and family. He retired from public life, and never recovered the blow inflicted by the loss of his darling son.

"O dolor atque decus."

"Oh, my grief and my pride,"¹

was his heartrending meditation for his few remaining years of life.

"Generous as brave,
Affection, kindness, the sweet offices
Of love and duty were to him as needful
As his daily bread."

4. He was a most affectionate, sincere, and unselfish friend.² When the news of Oliver Goldsmith's death (on the 13th December, 1784), reached him, he burst into tears.

When Dr. Johnson was lying upon his dying bed, Burke visited him. After some time he wished to withdraw, lest his

¹ "Mine," he exclaimed often, "is a grief that cannot be comforted." He lived in retirement till the close of his life, 9th July, 1797.

² Burke, in a letter of condolence to Mrs. Leadbeater, on the death of her father, Richard Shackleton, writes: "His annual visit had been for some years a source of satisfaction that I cannot easily express." When Burke visited Ireland he always spent a day at Ballitore with Richard Shackleton.

conversation might weary the sinking patient. Johnson grasped his hand, would not allow him to leave, and assured him that his presence was not a source of embarrassment or fatigue, but of real pleasure.¹

"No, sir; it is not so," said Johnson, "and I must be ill indeed when your company would not be a delight to me."

Burke also assisted at the closing scene of the life of Sir J. Reynolds, a most true-hearted, noble-minded man. So deeply did Reynolds prize the friendship of Burke that he appointed him his executor, and left him a legacy of £4,000, a portion of the large fortune he had realized at his profession.

There was another great artist, a college chum of Burke's, named Barry. The latter was so poor (like one of the "poor scholars"), that he had not means to follow the art of painting, by a study of the works of the great masters, gathered in Continental galleries. Burke took his struggling fellow-countryman by the hand, sent him, at his own expense, to Rome, the capital of the fine arts, paid his way out of his limited resources for five years, and thus gave him, by such unselfish and substantial patronage, a fair open to eminence. When Barry's jealous temper was making many enemies for him, Burke wrote to him a most friendly letter, full of sound advice, in which he sketched the consequences of Barry's conduct, should it be persevered in. The counsel was disregarded, and every line of warning that Burke wrote was realized to the letter. The cynical bitterness of the artist against his brother professionals brought upon him neglect, contempt, and ruin.

Barry survived Burke some eight or nine years. He always spoke in reverence of his memory. "The peace of God be for ever with Edmund Burke," he was heard to say—"He was my first, my best, my wisest friend."

Burke's genuine benevolence was also practically manifested to the poet Crabbe; the latter, when young, was poor and unknown. He got heavily into debt, was about to be thrust into prison, and saw no hopes of escape from the miseries of a jail life and jail companions. He wrote to Burke, to whom he was utterly unknown, and asked for help. Burke sent for him, paid his debts, took him into his own house procured a church-living for him, and so made him independent for life, and secured for literature a poet of true worth. Is it, then, any wonder that, with all his great qualities of head and heart, his resplendent genius, his inflexible love of principle, his hatred of oppression and injustice, his social and

¹ Boswell, vol. iv., p. 379.

domestic virtues—is it any wonder that the student of his life and times should say :—

“ Take him for all in all,
“ We ne’er shall look upon his like again ?”

“ Burke is a great man by nature,” said Dr. Johnson—“ He is the first man everywhere.”

“ Burke,” wrote Sir James Macintosh,” is the greatest philosopher, in practice, whom the world ever saw.”

“ So long,” says an American publication—Alliborne’s Dictionary—“ so long as virtue shall be beloved, wisdom revered, or genius admired, so long will the memory of this illustrious exemplar of all be fresh in the world’s history ; for human nature has too much interest in the preservation of such a character, ever to permit the name of Edmund Burke to perish from the earth.”

Hitherto we have considered Burke as the man in public and private life ; we have passed in review his political action and influence—his domestic and social virtues.

One question alone awaits an answer. What was the character of his genius, absolutely in itself, and relatively to the age in which he lived, and the many great men with whom he consorted as colleagues, or whom he confronted as opponents ? Many estimates have been made of Burke’s genius—some by friends and partisans, some by political opponents, others by writers having no sympathy with his country, but impelled by a sense of historical justice and truth to write what was forced upon their reluctant convictions.

It would be too tedious to enter upon all their reviews of Burke’s merits as writer, politician, and orator. I shall indicate one or two striking authorities.

The *Edinburgh Review*, which has never been friendly to Ireland or Irishmen, says in an article (vol. xlvi., October, 1827), “ There can be no hesitation in according to him (Burke) a station among the most extraordinary men that have ever appeared, and we think there is now but little diversity of opinion as to the kind of place which is fit to assign him. He was a writer of the first class, and excelled in almost every kind of prose composition. Possessed of most extensive knowledge, and of the most varied description—acquainted alike with what different classes of men knew, each in his own province, and with much that hardly any one even thought of learning—he could either bring his masses of information to bear directly upon the subjects to which they severally belonged, or he could avail himself of them generally to strengthen his faculties and enlarge his views ; or he could turn any portion of

them to account for the purpose of illustrating his theme or enriching his diction. His views range over all the cognate subjects ; his reasonings are derived from principles applicable to other theories, as well as the one in hand. Arguments pour in from all sides, as well as those which start up under our feet, the natural growth of the path he is leading us over ; while to throw light round our steps, and either explore its darker places, or serve for our recreation, illustrations are fetched from a thousand quarters, and an imagination marvelously quick to descry unthought-of resemblances, points to our use the stores, which a lore yet more marvellous has gathered from all ages and nations, and arts and tongues. We are, in respect of the argument, reminded of Bacon's multifarious knowledge, and the exuberance of his learned fancy, while the many-lettered diction recalls to mind the first of English poets and his immortal verse, rich with the spoils of all sciences and of all times. . . . Mr. Fox might well avow, without a compliment, that he had learned more from him alone than from all other men and authors. . . . No one can doubt that enlightened men in all ages will hang over the works of Mr. Burke, and dwell with delight even upon the speeches that failed to command the attention of those to whom they were addressed. Nor is it by their rhetorical beauties that they interest us. The extraordinary depth of his detached views, the penetrating sagacity which he occasionally applies to the affairs of men and their motives, and the curious felicity of expression with which he unfolds principles and traces resemblances and relations, are separately the gift of a few, and in their union probably without any example. This must be admitted on all hands."

One more authority, anti-Irish at all times, will serve to convince the most incredulous of Burke's abiding fame. The *London Times* of the 9th April, 1852, writes as follows :—

"The intellectual prowess of Edmund Burke is the admiration of the world. Since Bacon quitted life, England had not possessed so marvellous a son. Philosophy dwelt in his soul, and raised him to the dignity of a prophet. Gorgeous eloquence was his natural inheritance ; practical wisdom his chief accomplishment ; while all the intellectual graces were his hourly companions. Politics, when he dealt with them, assumed a grandeur which they had never known before, for he raised them above the exigencies of his own fleeting day, to apply them to the instruction and the wants of future ages. It has been justly remarked that the contemporaries of Burke, great and illustrious men, bravely fought and nobly conquered ;

but they were content with the victory of the hour. Burke, too, achieved his conquest for the day, but did not rest satisfied until he had won from the conflict wisdom, intelligence, and lofty principle for all time to come. Fox was the creation of his age. Burke is not the statesman of a period, or of a place, but the enduring teacher of the universal family—the abiding light of the civilized world. When Fox spoke, says Chateaubriand, it was in vain that the stranger tried to resist the impression made upon him. ‘He turned aside and wept.’ We read the speeches of Fox at this not very distant day, and marvel at their declared effect; for our tears do not flow from the perusal; our blood is not warmed by the syllables. Still more are we astonished to learn that the pregnant and singularly profound language of Burke fell too frequently upon stony ears, and that the rising of the orator was often a signal for the flight of his audience. Yet the double wonderment is easy of explanation. That which will render Shakspeare familiar to our hearths, while a hearth can be kindled in England, will also secure the immortality of Edmund Burke. There was nothing local, nothing temporary, nothing circumscribed in his magnificent utterance. His appeals were not to the prejudices of his contemporaries, or to the ever-changing sentiments of the time. He marched with a solemn movement ever in advance of the multitude. Every generation can point to its popular chief, and there are few epochs which do not boast of their Fox. In what political age shall we look for a statesman in all respects so illustrious as Burke?”

Burke's Pension.—Having now gone over the career of Burke as a public man, it is really painful to be met by a charge put forward occasionally by purists or by the malevolent, viz:—that Burke accepted a pension from the government, and that the fact of his doing so was discreditable; such pensions, they allege, are only given for party services; and Burke had the weakness, or worse, to accept the bribe. This grave charge has sometimes been advanced by educated Irishmen. Nor should this surprise us. Dr. Johnson once wittily and bitterly observed that one Irishman never spoke well of another, whereas the Scotch carry out their clan-spirit by upholding each other at all odds as against outsiders.

It may be worth while to dwell a little on the circumstances connected with the grant of the pension, as we shall thus see how unjust is this cruel imputation on a stainless public career.

By a warrant, dated 24th September, 1795, Burke received

a pension¹, made to commence from 5th January, 1793, of £1,200 for his own life, and that of his wife, whilst two other pensions of £2,500 a-year for three lives were made to commence from 24th July, 1793.

The head of the house of Russell, the Duke of Bedford, attacked the Government of the day for granting the pension, and sneered at Burke's change of political principles, and at his inconsistency in accepting, in despite of his ancient protests against lavish expenditure, a bounty from the Crown. We are to remember that Burke, at the time of the granting of his pension, had retired from public life, and was a broken-hearted, desolate, childless father, mourning in retirement over his lost son.

The charge came upon him as imputing dishonour. His sensitive nature was stung to the quick by the unseemly and heartless attack of one of the wealthiest noblemen in England. The lion was aroused.

A case somewhat similar has occurred in our own times. Some few years ago, a flippant utterance of the Rev. Charles Kingsley imputed to a sermon of Dr. Newman's an approbation of lying. Dr. Newman is one of those who, to use Burke's graphic language, "shrink from dishonour as from a wound." He was brought out from his religious retirement and silence, and gave to his reviler a literary flagellation unparalleled in its truthful severity. And to that occasion we owe a masterly work ("The History of My Religious Opinions,") which has been read by every educated man that speaks or reads the English language. Burke, in like manner, took up his pen, and addressed, in self-defence, a letter to Earl Fitzwilliam. Therein he pours out the vials of his righteous wrath and indignation, and draws in lines of fire, the contrast between the way in which he received the bounty of the Crown, and the infamous services and practices through which the Bedford estates were acquired by the founder of that house, "the minion of Henry VIII." The entire of that letter is worthy of most attentive perusal, and cannot fail to delight as well as to convince all who read it. Quotation might mar its wondrous power and beauty, so we refer the student to it as to a most delicious specimen of literary flaying alive. We pass on to note a few facts which will serve to vindicate our great countryman.

¹ In a letter, dated 26th September, 1795, Edmund Burke writes to the Right Rev. Dr. Hussey:—"My private business is in a good train, and seems nearly finished. But even if it were better than it is, and if I had not a domestic feeling that makes circumstances of fortune (other than as they are subservient to justice) incapable of giving me any delight, the state of the public would leave my mind in the thickest gloom of sorrow."—*Correspondence*, vol. iv., p. 326.

It is to be borne in mind that Burke was not supported by the ministry of the day in any of the great questions with which his political life was most signally identified. He opposed the Government on their policy relative to the American Revolt, to the French Revolution, and to their treatment of Irish rights in trade, and freedom of religion. Upon the recall of the Earl of Fitzwilliam, as Viceroy in Ireland, after only two months rule, because the Earl was determined to be just and conciliatory to the afflicted Catholics, the Right Rev. Dr. Hussey, Catholic Bishop of Waterford, wrote to Burke as follows:—

“The disastrous news, my dear Sir, of Earl Fitzwilliam’s recall has come, and Ireland is now on the brink of a civil war.”

On this sad occasion Burke wrote to Sir Hercules Langrishe a letter expressive of his deep sorrow at the unwise as well as cruel measure adopted by the English Cabinet. “I really thought,” he says, among other things, “that in the total of the late circumstances with regard to persons, to things, to principles, and to measures, was to be found a conjuncture favourable to the introduction and to the perpetuation of a general harmony, producing a general strength, which to that hour Ireland was never so happy to enjoy. My sanguine hopes are blasted. I must consign my feelings on that terrible disappointment to the same patience in which I have been obliged to bury the vexation I suffered on the defeat of other great, just, and honourable causes in which I have had some share, and which have given more of dignity than of peace and advantage to a long and laborious life”¹

That pension was the tribute of the English nation, given very tardily, only two years before Burke’s death—the tribute to his having devoted his life and his prodigious talents in the most unselfish manner to vindicate the cause of justice and humanity. It was the tribute of a great people—great in their good qualities, when passion and pride and self-interest do not blind them—to the wisdom of Burke, to his genius, and to his noble public life. This was fully appreciated by the distinguished German scholar, Frederick Schlegel, who writes of Burke as follows:—²

“If we are to praise a man in proportion to his usefulness, I am persuaded that no task can be more difficult than that of doing justice to the statesman and orator, Burke. He

¹ See the “Lectures on the Life and Writings of Burke,” by Professor Robertson, of the Catholic University. To this work I feel greatly indebted for much valuable assistance.

² F. Schlegel’s “Lectures on Literature,” vol. ii., p. 278.

has been to his own country, and to all Europe, in a very particular manner to Germany, a new light of political wisdom and moral experience. He corrected his age when it was at the height of its revolutionary frenzy, and without maintaining any system of philosophy, he seems to have seen further into the true nature of society, and to have more clearly comprehended the effect of religion, in connecting individual security with the national welfare, than any philosopher, or any system of philosophy, of any preceding age."

It is impossible to realise the entire character of Burke in its nobility of soul, and calm philosophic wisdom, without reading carefully Burke's correspondence, edited by the Earl of Fitzwilliam. It is also impossible for any enlightened Catholic to read that part of the correspondence which contains Burke's letters to the Right Rev. Dr. Hussey, Catholic Bishop of Waterford, without profound emotion at its liberality of tone and jealous regard for the honour and independence of the Catholic Church in Ireland. An extract or two will suffice, like the straw on the stream, to show how the current ran.

"Beaconsfield, February 27, 1795.

"My Dear Sir—I wish very much to see, before my death, an image of a primitive Christian Church: With little improvements, I think the Roman Catholic Church of Ireland very capable of exhibiting that state of things. I should not by force, or fraud, or rapine, have ever reduced them to their present state—God forbid! But being in it, I conceive that much may be made of it, to the glory of religion and the good of the State. . . . This is a great crisis for good or evil. Above all, do not listen to any other mode of appointing your bishops than the present, whatever it is; no other election than those you have; no Castle choices. I shall say more to you on that subject, since you suffer me to thrust in my opinion, &c.

"Your's ever,

"E. B."¹

Bearing upon the same most important subject, the election of Bishops, Burke writes to Bishop Hussey, on Patrick's Day, 1795:—

"My Dear Friend— . . . I strongly suspect that an insidious court will be paid to your clergy; what friends would bestow as gifts, enemies will give as bribes. There has been for certain, amongst your Irish politicians, a scheme (amongst other schemes for the ruin and distraction of the kingdom) for dividing the clergy from the laity, and the lower classes of Catholic laity from the higher. I know that they already value them-

¹ Correspondence, vol iv., p. 285, &c.

selves on their success in this wicked and senseless project, and they hope that the Catholic clergy will be brought by management to act their part in this design against the people of consideration and property amongst them. I have no doubt that the sagacity and vigilance of the Catholic clergy will soon convince them of their mistake; and that they are never to be seduced into a separation from the higher orders, or intimidated into a dereliction of the lower orders, but that they will take one common fate, and sink or swim with their brethren of every description.

“I have heard of the election of priests to parishes, and of bishops to dioceses, with an election by their enemies out of three candidates to be presented to their choice. My opinion is, that the old course, because it is the old course, and because it has been the successful course, should not in any instance be departed from by them.

“Great changes and dreadful seem to be impending. The Church of France has fallen; but she has attained great glory in her fall. No Church, no State, is secure from external violence; but the internal part is under the protection of their own virtues and of God’s justice.

“Adieu, my dear Sir, your most faithful and unhappy friend,
“Edmund Burke.”¹

At this time negotiations were on foot for the purpose of establishing the College of Maynooth. In reference thereto Burke wrote to Dr. Hussey:—

“It is my poor opinion that, if the necessary money is given to your own free disposal (that is, to the disposal of the Catholic prelates), that it ought to be readily and thankfully accepted from whatever hand it comes. It is my equally clear opinion, that they ought not only to consent, but to desire, that an account of the expenditure, with proper vouchers, should be annually or biennially, according to convenience, laid before a committee of the House of Commons to prevent the very suspicion of jobbing to which all public institutions in Ireland are liable. All other interference, whatever, if I were in the place of these reverend persons, I would resist; and would much rather trust to God’s good providence, and the contributions of your own people, for the education of your clergy, than to put into the hands of your known, avowed, and implacable enemies—into the hands of those who make it their merit and their boast that they are your enemies—the very fountains of your morals and your religion. I have considered this matter at large, and at various

¹ Correspondence, vol. iv., pp. 392-393.

times, and I have considered it in relation to the designs of your enemies. The scheme of these colleges, as you well know, did not originate from them. But they will endeavour to pervert the benevolence and liberality of others into an instrument of their own evil purposes. Be well assured that they never did, and that they never will, consent to give one shilling of money for any other purpose than to do you mischief. If you consent to put your clerical education, or any other part of your education, under their direction and control, then you will have sold your religion for their money. There will be an end not only of the Catholic religion, but of all religion, all morality, all law, and all order in that unhappy kingdom."¹

These letters constitute the last claim I shall refer to that Burke's memory has upon our enduring reverence and affection. As we read them, can we believe that we are listening to the views of an Irish Protestant of the last century? Forster, in his delightful Biography of Oliver Goldsmith, says:—"Almost alone in that age of indifference the citizen of the world raised his voice against the penal laws, which then, with wanton severity, disgraced the statute book." Do not the sentences, taken almost at random from Burke's letters to Dr. Hussey, sound more like the warning voice of our own great Tribune of the people, who, with the instincts of faith and love of fatherland, willed his heart to Rome and his body to Ireland? Or are they not like the trumpet notes of the illustrious "J. K. L.," as he sought to protect our Church from state thralldom? Or, like the clarion tones which are rung in our ears to day by the watchful Irish Prelates, who cry out aloud, in sermon and pastoral: "Education without religion is a curse to the state, to society, to human nature?"

In conclusion, we may most fitly apply to Burke those lines of Tennyson's "In Memoriam":—

"Heart affluence in discursive talk,
From household fountains never dry;
Seraphic intellect, and force
To seize and throw the doubts of man;
Impassion'd logic which outran
The hearer, in its fiery course;
High nature, amorous of the good,
But touch'd with no ascetic gloom;
And passion pure, in snowy bloom,
Through all the years of April blood."

¹ Correspondence, vol. iv., pp. 298-9.

DR. DÖLLINGER AND THE DOGMA OF INFALLIBILITY.¹

BY DR. HERGENRÖTHER, PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY AND CANON
LAW IN THE UNIVERSITY OF WÜRZBURG.

*(Translated from the German.)*²

V.—DR. DOLLINGER'S FIVE THESES—(*continued*).

“**T**HIRDLY :—I am prepared,” he says, “to prove, that on the question of the authority of the Pope, the Bishops of the Latin countries, that is to say, of Spain, Italy, South America, and France, who formed the immense majority of the Council, were, as well as their clergy, misled by the class-books from which their first impressions regarding this question were derived during their education in the seminaries; the quotations on which the proofs given in those books depend, being, for the most part, distorted, falsified, or fabricated.

“I shall prove this, first, in reference to the two works which are in most general use in theological schools and seminaries, the Moral Theology of Saint Alphonsus Liguori (especially the treatise which it contains concerning the Pope), and the Dogmatic Theology of the Jesuit Perrone; also in reference to the writings of Archbishop Cardoni and of Bishop Ghilardi, which were distributed in Rome during the Council; and finally in reference to the Theology of the Viennese Theologian, Schwetz.”

Now, even if Dr. Döllinger were able to establish the want of genuineness not merely of the greater part, but even of all the quotations relied upon in the works to which he refers—the Moral Theology of Saint Alphonsus, which, however, is by no means so generally used in ecclesiastical seminaries as the Compendiums of Voit and Gury—the Dogmatic Theology of Father Perrone, whose candour he had impugned on a former occasion, in reference to some quotations from the Alexandrine writers Origen and Saint Cyril—the works of Archbishop Cardoni, whom he has already charged with quoting a text that is not genuine—and, finally, the writings of Bishop Ghilardi and of Dr. Schwetz—he would still be far from having established his general proposition: and it would still be necessary for him to prove its truth in reference to several other books which are not less generally used, and which furnish additional, and

¹ Continued from our December number.

² The notes which are enclosed in brackets [thus], have been added by the translator.

perhaps more satisfactory evidence in support of the Catholic doctrine of Papal Infallibility. Nay more, even if he were able to prove that not a single one of the passages quoted in any compendium of Theology is genuine, his argument would not be complete: for the Catholic doctrine must not be confounded with the proofs by which theologians undertake to establish its truth, especially with such proofs as are to be found in mere manuals of Theology. Every one familiar with works on jurisprudence knows how frequently it happens that arguments which will not stand the test of a strict logical, or critical examination, are put forward in support of the most salutary laws.

Again, it must be remembered that quotations, the reasoning of which, if they are viewed merely as theological *arguments*, must be regarded as inconclusive, may be cited as conclusive *evidence*, that at a certain period a particular doctrine was believed throughout the Church; such, for instance, are several of the arguments used by the Fathers of the Eighth and of some other Œcumenical Councils. The fact that a doctrine has been commonly taught by theologians for several centuries, is, in itself, and independently of the reasoning on which they may have relied, an argument which cannot be ignored:¹ for if a false doctrine were received thus commonly throughout the Church, the faith of the Church herself would be compromised.

The passages, then, from the Second Council of Lyons, from the Council of Florence, and from the Eighth Œcumenical Council, which are quoted in the Vatican Definitions, have not been deprived of their force by anything which has been urged by Dr. Döllinger and his adherents.

Besides, does it not seem too violent an assumption to suppose that the Bishops had not become aware, before their adoption of the Definition, that the passages to which Dr. Döllinger refers, were inaccurately quoted in the books which they had used during their theological course? Surely it is incredible that they should not have come to a knowledge of the fact, at least during their stay in Rome, when their attention was directed to it almost every day, not only by the pamphlets which were so officiously served upon them at their lodgings, but also by the speeches of the "Opposition," and when the liberal press, so suddenly filled with solicitude for their good repute, never ceased to admonish them that an indelible brand of ignorance or of cowardice would be stamped upon them if they

¹ "Concordem omnium Theologorum Scholasticorum de fide aut moribus sententiam contra dicere si hæresis non est, at hæresi proximum est."—MELCH. CANUS. *De Locis Theol.* Lib. 8, cap. iv., concl. 3.

failed to profit by the warnings which they were receiving through this latest development of the functions of the journalist. But the Bishops knew too well what their duty and their dignity demanded: with both sides of the question before them, prudently and deliberately they made their choice. For we are not prepared to admit that the presumption is in favour of a few scientific historians and theologians, and against the united decision of the Fathers of the Council.

“Fourthly,” continues Dr. Döllinger, in the words of his next Thesis, “I appeal to the fact, which I undertake to prove in public, that two General Councils and several Popes have already decided, in the fifteenth century, by solemn Decrees, issued by the Councils and repeatedly confirmed by the Popes, the question as to the extent of the Papal power, and especially as to Papal Infallibility, and that the Decrees of the 18th of July, 1870, are in the most glaring contradiction to these decisions, and, therefore, cannot possibly be regarded as binding.”

Dr. Döllinger refers, of course, to the Councils of Constance and Basle, of which he has treated also in his “Notes,” (nn. 15, 17, pp. 10, 11). But he seems to have forgotten on both occasions that if his Thesis were true, if “two General Councils” and several Popes had really decided this question, it would follow that we should regard as heretics, in the strict sense of the word, everyone who has adopted the opposite view, from the fifteenth century down to the present day, that is to say, the great majority of theologians, the Popes, at least since Leo X., and even Dr. Döllinger himself, for in 1843, in his examination of the Decrees of Constance, he fully accepted the “Ultramontane” view.¹ How singular that he should have emancipated himself from this heresy, just when the whole Church by its solemn and authoritative Definition, was becoming hopelessly entangled in its snares! Are we really asked to believe that Dr. Döllinger and his adherents alone retain the true Catholic faith, whilst all the millions of Catholics, who remain in allegiance to the Pope, have become heretics? Let us, at least, see upon what foundation this strange theory rests. What arguments do Scripture and Tradition afford in support of the doctrine contained in the Decrees of Constance? How will those Decrees stand the tests which Dr. Döllinger wishes us to apply to the Definitions of the Vatican Council?

A careful, searching investigation of the question to be defined, and perfect freedom in the deliberations of the Council,

¹ See note 3, pp. 171-2.

are regarded by the learned Provost as essential to the binding force of a Definition. Is he satisfied that the Decrees of the fourth and fifth sessions of the Council of Constance were adopted by the Council, acting in perfect freedom, after such an investigation, and not precipitately or without mature deliberation such as the importance of the question demanded? Or does he apply a different standard according as the Decrees of a Council happen to favour his own views, or to be at variance with them?

It was on the 23rd of March, 1414, in the midst of the perplexity caused by the flight of John XXIII., whose claim to the Papacy was the only one recognised at Constance, that the French theologians, single-handed, developed their theory as to the limits of the Papal power and the relations between the Pope and the General Council; but the proceedings of the general congregation held on that day were almost exclusively confined to the case of John, so that neither then, nor at the third session, on the 26th of March, did the theory receive any sanction from the Council. On the 29th of March, the theologians of three nations drew up four articles, the two first of which embodied the Gallican system.¹ On the next day, the fourth session was held, in which, after a protest from the Cardinals, five articles were promulgated, the first of which, with the exception of one clause, was in substantial accordance with the first of the articles framed by the general Congregation on the preceding day. Afterwards, when John XXIII. had retired to Lauffenberg, at a still greater distance from Constance, and when several Cardinals had left the Council, the fifth session was held on the 6th of April, at which the two first articles of the Congregation of the 29th of March were adopted. The necessity of devoting even the interval of nine days, to a thorough examination of the question to be defined was not suggested. And yet the Decree adopted by the Council was directly at variance with

¹ [The first and second articles drawn up in the Congregation of the 29th of March, were as follows:—

“1. The Council derives its authority immediately from God: and everyone, even of Papal dignity, is bound to obey it in all things regarding faith, the destruction of the schism, and the reformation of the Church in its head and members.

“2. Whoever shall obstinately oppose the decrees of this, or of any other Œcumenical Council, is to be punished according to the canons.”

The clause regarding the reformation of the Church, was omitted from the article as approved in the fourth session of the Council. It was, however, afterwards inserted, and the article in its original form was approved, in the fifth session, on the 6th of April.

The second article, which was a plain assertion of the authority claimed by the Council over the Pope, was not brought forward at all in the fourth session. But in the fifth session, like the suppressed clause of the first article, it was brought forward and adopted by the Council].

the doctrine which had been commonly received, and taught throughout the Church for centuries before! And, moreover, a formal demand for such an examination had previously been presented by the Cardinals.

It has been established over and over again by ecclesiastical writers that these Decrees of the Council of Constance are invalid for many and most weighty reasons. In the first place, the Council was convened by Alexander V., who had been appointed by the Council of Pisa, and whose claim to the Papacy was, to say the least, doubtful; indeed the authority and investigations of the most trustworthy writers leave little room for doubt that the real Pope was Gregory XII.,¹ who afterwards resigned voluntarily on the 4th of July, 1415.

Again, the Council was composed of the Obedience, that is the adherents, of John XXIII. alone, the other two Obediences, the adherents of Gregory XII., and of Benedict XIII., were not represented; and it cannot be contended that both of these were certainly schismatical, or that they were plainly outside the unity of the Catholic Church. Nor was the Roman Church represented, for there was no representation of the College of Cardinals as such, and not one of the three claimants to the Papacy was either present in person or represented by his legates²; nor did any Pope subsequently ratify these proceedings.

Moreover, the rights of the Bishops were totally disregarded in the voting, which was conducted in a manner directly at variance with the old canonical rules—laymen as well as ecclesiastics being allowed to vote, and the votes being counted according to nations, although the numbers representing the various nations were in a marked degree unequal.

It is plain that Decrees thus enacted, cannot be regarded as having the authority of Œcumenical Definitions.³ And thus Hefele writes:—"When the assembly at Constance adopted

¹ S. ANTONIN. *Summa Histor.* p. iii., tit. 22; RAYNALD, an. 1409, n. 79, Cf. ann. 1378, 1397; PETRUS BALLERINI, *De Potest. Eccles.*, cap. ix., sec. 4: PHILLIPS, *K.R.*, vol. i, sect. 31, p. 253.

² The proposition of Melchior Cano (*De Locis*. lib. v., cap. 6), used to be regarded as all but unquestionable:—"Quando Concilium sine capite est, non habet dogmatum certitudinem."

³ [Dr. Döllinger, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, writes of the Decree of Constance as follows:—

"Thus, in consequence of the new regulation by which *the voices of the consulting theologians and canonists were made all-powerful*, and by which *the twenty voices of the English nation counterbalanced the two hundred of the French or Italian*, . . . the doctrine that the Pope was subject to the Council was solemnly declared.

"But much was wanting that was necessary firmly to establish this principle. The assembly itself assumed indeed the authority of an Œcumenical Council representing the universal Church: but it, in truth, consisted of only those who were in obedience to the Pisan Pope, whilst those who were in obedience to the others had neither been formally called, nor were they represented. Even the Roman

this Decree, it claimed, of course, the authority of a General Council; but posterity cannot endorse this lofty pretension, except, indeed, so far as the later sessions are concerned, when the Council and the Pope (Martin V.) acted in unison.¹

The defenders of the Gallican theory, which Dr. Döllinger now adopts, were fully aware of the irregularity that characterized this portion of the proceedings of the Council, and hence they have always been anxious to sustain the authority of the Decrees by referring to the Papal ratification by which the acts of the Council were confirmed.² But those Decrees were never approved by the Pope. The Bull of Martin V., as Hefele writes, approved only the Decrees which regarded matters of faith, and in reference to which the Council had proceeded in accordance with the forms by which the proceedings of Councils are regulated, and not otherwise—*in materiis fidei, conciliariter, et non aliter nec alio modo*—but the Pope himself and the whole College of Cardinals, as we learn from D'Ailly,³ considered that those Decrees, which were approved merely by the majority of nations, and without the consent of the Cardinals, were not adopted *conciliariter*. And this was exactly the case of the Gallican Decrees.⁴

Moreover, in the last session of the Council, on the 10th of March, 1418, Martin V. prohibited every appeal from the Apostolic See, and thus “set aside all the principles on which the Councils of Pisa and of Constance had based their proceedings relative to the schism and the reformation of the Church, and which had been approved as fundamental principles of the Catholic system, by the Decrees of the fourth and fifth sessions of the Council of Constance.”⁵ Gerson understood this thoroughly, and as these principles formed the foundation also of his view of ecclesiastical authority, he wrote as the final assertion of his theory, in the closing days of the Council, his Treatise on Appeals from the Roman See, in Questions of Faith. Elsewhere he describes the doctrine

Church was not represented: for there was no Pope present, and the Cardinals did not give their suffrages as a College, but divided into different nations.

“In Constance, too, the contrary doctrine of the superiority of the Pope was maintained at a later period by many.

“Indeed, D'Ailly afterwards, in his writings, defended the superiority of Councils, but without considering the question as definitively decided, and without appealing to the authority of this Decree of the fifth session.

“Finally, succeeding lawful Pontiffs never gave their sanction to this Decree.”—DÖLLINGER. *History of the Church*. Translated from the German by the Rev. Edward Cox, D.D., vol. iv., pp. 164-5. London, 1842].

¹ HEFELE. *Concil.*, vol. vii., p. 104.

² *Declarat. Cler. Gallican, An. 1682*, art. 2.

³ GERSON. *Opera*. Ed. Dupin, vol. ii., p. 940.

⁴ HEFELE. *loc. cit.*: PHILLIPS. *K. R.*, p. 257; vol. iv., p. 438, *et seq.*

⁵ SCHWAB. *Joh. Gerson*, pp. 665-6.

affirming the unlawfulness of such appeals, as one which, previous to the Council of Constance, had been held by many who clung to the letter rather than to the spirit of the Christian religion, so that those who opposed it were in danger of being condemned as heretics; and he complains that even after the Council, the doctrine was still publicly taught, a fact which, from his party stand-point, he ascribes to the desire of flattering the Roman Pontiff. We have here a plain confession that the doctrine which was so distasteful to him, had been the prevalent doctrine before the opening of the Council; and that even after it had been formally condemned in the fourth and fifth sessions of the Council, it was still publicly defended—facts which we learn also upon the authority of other writers,¹ and which Æneas Sylvius,² when writing in defence of the Gallican theory, did not undertake to contradict.

In fine, there is some room for doubt as to the true meaning of the Decrees of the Council of Constance. Their assertion of the authority of a General Council over the Pope, has been understood by many writers as referring only to the case of

¹ S. ANTONIN. *Summa*. Part ii., tit. 33, cap. iii., sec. 3. Cf. RAYNALD, an. 1457, n. 54: PIGNATELLI, *Consult. Canon.* tom x., cons. 92, p. 240 *et seq.*: BEN. XIV., Const. *Altissimo* (26 Junii, 1745): ZACCARIA *Antifebr.* tom. iv., capp. 5, 6, p. 163, *et seq.*; *Antifebr. Vindic.* tom iv., diss. 12, cap. iv. p. 387.

² “Æneas Sylvius,” not Pius II, whose authority the *Augsburg Gazette* (10th Feb., 1871), claims for the work *De Gest. Concil. Basil.* “When only twenty-six years of age, he took a leading part in the proceedings of the Council of Basle, as one of the spokesmen of the ultra-liberal party. He was soon appointed by the Council to several positions of trust and responsibility, among others, to one of the secretaryships of the Council; *in this capacity* he defended with considerable vigour the authority of the Council in opposition to the acts of Pope Eugene.” DUX. *Der Deutsche Cardinal Nikolaus von Cusa*. Regensburg, 1847, tom. i., p. 168.

[“In August, 1458, Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini was elected Pope. . . . This highly intellectual man had before been attached to the Council of Basle, and, for a short time, to the anti-pope Felix . . . He now took the title of Pius II. . . .

“With the consent and approbation of the ambassadors who were in Mantua, he issued a Bull, prohibiting, under pain of excommunication, all appeals from the Pope to a General Council. He declared that . . . such appeals would . . . effect the dissolution of all ecclesiastical order, and that it was in itself absurd to appeal to a judge who was not in existence, and to a tribunal which, if the Canon of the Council of Constance were to be followed even to the letter, could be erected only once in ten years

“But as Pius himself, when an official of the Council of Basle, . . . had laid down principles . . . of the untenable nature of which he had long been convinced, even before he had been created Cardinal; and as many persons referred him to these his earlier writings, he considered it necessary to recall them, which he did in a Bull to the Rector and to the University of Cologne in 1463.

“He had, he said, in his youth, ‘being deceived and in ignorance like St. Paul, persecuted the Church of God and the Apostolic See.’ Many may now say ‘thus wrote Æneas, who afterwards became Pope,’ “and may imagine that Pius II. recognises . . . all that Æneas wrote. But let them give no faith to those earlier writings, but believe and teach with me that the Pope receives supreme power over the whole Church immediately from Jesus Christ, and that from him all power is imparted to the inferior members of the body of the Church.” DÖLLINGER. *History of the Church*, vol. iv., p. 217.]

schism, when from the conflicting claims of rival Pontiffs, a doubt may exist as to the lawful occupant of the Apostolic See. This was the sense in which the Decrees were explained at Trent by the Augustinian Cardinal, Seripandus, in replying to the French Ambassadors.¹

But no such explanation can be given of the Decrees of the Council of Basle; for that assembly, not content with repeatedly asserting the authority of a General Council over the Pope, endeavoured to give effect to this doctrine in the case of Pope Eugene IV., the lawfulness of whose election was not questioned.² But with the exception of a few Decrees which derive all their authority from subsequent ratification, the proceedings of the Council of Basle, animated as they were by the spirit of schism, and conducted under the dictation of a few ecclesiastical demagogues, have never been recognised as having any authority in the Church.³ If it had been an Œcumenical Council, the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God, which was defined in its thirty-sixth session, would have been an article of Catholic Faith long before the year 1854.

Hence, the advocates of the Gallican theory have strained every nerve to demonstrate that the Decrees in which the Council approved their doctrine were subsequently ratified by the Pope. But Eugene IV., who had repeatedly declared that he would lay down his dignity and even his life rather than consent to sacrifice a single prerogative of the Apostolic See,⁴ expressly guarded himself from approving any of the Decrees of the Council, when recognising it in 1433.⁵ His recognition of the Council contains two conditions (1) that the authority of his Legates should be recognised as Presidents of the Council, and (2) that everything which had been enacted by the Council against his person, his authority, or his liberty, or against the rights and privileges of the Holy See, or of the Cardinals, should be regarded as null and void, so that all such matters should be restored to the condition in which they stood before the opening of this Council.⁶ But these conditions were not

¹ PALLAVICINI. *Historia Concilii Tridentini*, lib. 19, cap. xiv., n. 4: RAYNALD. An. 1563, n. 3.

² ["Such was the presumption of an assembly in which there were no more than seven or eight Bishops, and, together, with the Abbots, only thirty-nine prelates." —DÖLLINGER. *History of the Church*, vol. iv., p. 203.]

³ [Dr. Döllinger speaks in his *History* (vol. iv., p. 199), of "the violent and anarchical proceedings of this assembly," and the "dangerous tendency of its principles, by which all ecclesiastical order was essentially threatened."]

⁴ See his letter to the Doge of Venice. Raynald, an. 1563, n. 3.

⁵ TURCREMATA, *De Summa Ecclesiae*, lib. ii., cap. 100. "Nos quidem," are the Pope's words, "bene progressum Concilii approbavimus, volentes ut procederet ut inceperat, non tamen approbavimus ejus decreta."

⁶ HARDOUIN, *Concil.*, Tom viii., p. 1587. The omission of these words from some editions does not, as Phillips (*K. R.* tom. ii., sec. 85, p. 267) points out, affect the substance of the question.

observed, and it is plain that from the non-observance of the conditions imposed by the Pope, his ratification of the proceedings failed to take effect.¹

Almost the same remarks are applicable to the clause contained in the Papal confirmation of the two Councils of Constance and Basle:—"without prejudice to the dignity and pre-eminence of the Apostolic See, and to the authority vested in it and in its canonical occupants." Every influence was brought to bear upon Eugene IV., who not only steadfastly refused to the end of his life to approve the Decrees in question, but even disclaimed, in a special Bull, the intention of doing so.

As to the Bull of Nicholas V., declaring that, in publishing the Rules of the Roman Chancery, he did not intend to supersede the Concordats previously entered into between the Holy See and the German Princes—a proposition which Roman canonists themselves have never questioned,²—I am utterly at a loss to understand what connexion it can have with the present controversy.³

In fine, the Decrees of Constance and Basle were deprived of all weight by the Definitions of the Council of Florence and of the Fifth Council of the Lateran: nor did they receive any sanction from the proceedings at Trent. The majority of the Fathers at that Council endorsed the view of the Archbishop of Otranto, who contended strenuously for the Roman doctrine in opposition to the views of the French Cardinal Guise.⁴ The Decrees were defended by the French and the German theologians alone, who were united on this question by an identity of interest.

During the progress of the Vatican Council, efforts not altogether unsuccessful, were made to construct an opposition out of the same materials: the organisers of the movement have not yet abandoned their efforts. But it will be impossible to resuscitate those Decrees: the Church has spoken and even though the opposition were to clamour with tenfold energy, her voice will be heard and obeyed by Catholics to the end of time.

W. J. W.

¹ See Phillips, tom. iv., sect. 195, p. 455.

² RIGANTIUS. *Comment. in Regul. Cancell. Apost.* Romae 1744, tom. i. Præm. n. 61, et seq.; in Reg. 2, sect. i, n. 56 et seq.

³ See SCHEEBEN, *Period. Bl. über das Concil.*, vol. ii., p. 397, et seq.

⁴ RAYNALD. An. 1563, n. 119.

LOUISE LATEAU.—PART III.

IMPOSSIBILITY OF FRAUD.

“Veritatem tantum et pacem diligite.”—Zach. viii. 19.

§ I.—GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS.

THOSE who are familiar with the history and the daily life of Louise have never entertained against her, even for a moment, the suspicion of fraud. It is inconsistent alike with her extreme simplicity of character, and with her solid, unpretending piety. But at the present day, and in this country more particularly, whatever seems to bear upon the supernatural relations of man, and upon the unseen world, is sure to be received with scepticism by unbelievers, and with keen criticism even by the friends of religion. It may be well, therefore, to examine this question of fraud a little more closely, and to demonstrate, with some degree of minuteness, that the prodigies displayed in the ecstatic girl of Bois d’Haine, are not counterfeit, but real and genuine.

The supposition of fraud means simply that Louise is an impostor ; that she produces the bleeding Stigmas herself, and that the Ecstasy is only a pretence. Furthermore, if we accept this supposition, we must be prepared to believe that she has successfully carried on this imposture, week after week, for four years together, not only in the presence of an eager crowd, watching all her movements, but under the cold and sceptical scrutiny of scientific men. Not to speak of high ecclesiastical dignitaries and distinguished Theologians, she has been visited, we are told, by more than a hundred Physicians, whose special purpose it was to investigate her case, according to the strict principles of their science. Now it is hardly credible that a peasant girl, brought up in poverty and hardship, without education, without knowledge of the world, was more than a match for such critics as these ; nay, that she was so skilled in the ways of deceit as completely to delude and baffle them all, while, at the same time, she submitted freely to the most searching inquiries, the most painful tests.

Nor must it be imagined that these witnesses approached the case with a prepossession in favour of Louise. Many went doubting, many disbelieving ; some even went for the express purpose of exposing what they believed to be a fraud. Of these last was a certain free-thinking doctor whose testimony is deserving of especial notice. He was chosen by a section of the infidel party in Belgium, to represent them at Bois

d'Haine, and to unmask, as they said, the clerical comedy which was there enacted.

It was on the eighth of January, 1869, that he presented himself at the house of the Ecstatica. As he had obtained no special authority to visit Louise, and as there was a great crowd in the house that day, he was, at first, refused admission. Afterwards, however, he was recognised by one of the medical visitors, through whose influence he was allowed to enter. He remained several hours, and went away an altered man. His friends were waiting for him, at the railway station, and immediately on his arrival, began to question him, in scoffing words, about the prodigies he had seen. But he checked them, and said: "My friends, there is nothing to laugh at in what I have witnessed to-day, but rather much to make me think very seriously." Soon after, he was converted from his evil ways, and he died a good Catholic two years later.

Any one suspecting Louise to be an impostor, would naturally wish to look into her little cell, on some Friday, when no visitor was there, and none was expected,—in other words, to take the impostor by surprise. This has been done several times during the last four years, and always the ecstatic girl has been found to present the same appearance, in the midst of profound solitude, as she is wont to present when surrounded by a crowd of eager spectators. An interesting record of one such visit is given to us by Doctor Lefebvre. On the eleventh of February, 1870, he found himself, most unexpectedly, in the neighbourhood of Bois d'Haine; and remembering that it was Friday, he thought of looking in to see Louise. The door was opened directly he knocked; and without pausing in the outer room, where her sisters were at work, he passed at once into her own little chamber. And this is what he saw, as he tells us himself.

"It was a quarter to four o'clock. The most complete solitude reigned around the Ecstatica. She was prostrate on the floor, her arms extended in the form of a cross, insensible, and perfectly unconscious of what was passing around her. The linen cloths which had enveloped her bleeding limbs were lying there: I counted nine of them. The blood which had trickled from her forehead, was dried up, and appeared in the form of fantastic arabesques extending down upon her cheeks. The little white cap that covered her head was stained with bright red spots, forming a semicircle, which completed the bleeding coronet of the forehead."

An impostor would hardly have been so well prepared for a visit altogether unforeseen. At all events, between the recurrence of such unexpected visits, and the scrutiny of science,

and the prying curiosity of the crowd, it is difficult to believe that an unlettered peasant girl could have carried on an elaborate and complicated fraud, for more than four years, without detection.

But further, it may be asked, what plausible motive can be suggested for a fraud involving so much pain for the impostor, and demanding such unceasing watchfulness. The motives that commonly impel to frauds of this kind, are vanity and cupidity,—the desire of notoriety, and the desire of money. But no suspicion of these motives can be entertained in the case before us : for Louise shuns notoriety, except in so far as it is forced upon her by her superiors ; and money she will not have, except what she earns by her daily toil.

No doubt, indeed, she has attained a certain degree of notoriety : but it has not been of her seeking. When the Stigmas first appeared, she concealed them as long as she could, except from her spiritual director, to whom she felt bound to have recourse for guidance and advice. Afterwards, when the weekly flow of blood became a well known fact, and visitors were attracted to the house, she refused persistently to show her bleeding hands, until she was commanded to do so by her superiors. And now, even among her familiar friends, she never touches on the subject of her Stigmas and her Ecstasies ; nor in the domestic circle, is there ever a word spoken, during the week, of the crowds that press around her, in her little cell, on Friday.

It has been already told how, when the Bishop of Tournay came to see her, on Good Friday in the year 1869, and expressed a wish to bestow some mark of favour on the family, they all begged of him, with earnestness, to put an end to the visits by which they were so tormented and disturbed. On a similar occasion, in the previous year, Louise herself had pressed the same petition on the Archbishop of Mechlin. She has exacted, too, from her mother and sisters, a solemn promise that they will never allow her portrait to be taken ; a thing which she feared might be attempted, some Friday, whilst she was herself unconscious in her Ecstasy. And this promise has been faithfully kept to the present day. These surely are not the acts of a girl who has devised a systematic fraud for the purpose of drawing on herself the eyes of the world, and making herself the talk of society.

One incident, in particular, attested by Doctor Lefebvre, may be cited to illustrate this argument. At a time when curious visitors, especially Physicians, were still admitted, without much difficulty, to see Louise,—in the month of January,

1869,—her mother, wearied with the incessant throng of strangers in her house, begged to be allowed a respite of one week, at least : and it was arranged that, on a certain Friday, the door should be closed, and no visitors admitted. It so happened that, on this very day, the Princess de Croy came to see the Ecstatica. When she presented herself at the cottage, she was told she could not enter. She gave her name, and produced letters of recommendation ; begging, at the same time, with great earnestness, to be admitted. But it was all no use. She was refused with courtesy, but with inexorable firmness ; and had to go away without getting even one glance at Louise.

An unexpected event had brought Doctor Lefebvre, that same day, to a locality not far from Bois d'Haine. "It had been well understood," he says, "that I was not to present myself on this Friday, no more than the rest. But the opportunity was a good one, and my curiosity was excited by the reflection, that as no one was to be received, I should take Louise absolutely by surprise. I went, therefore, to the house, and arrived just an hour after the Princess de Croy had left. The door, which was never closed to me, was opened without hesitation. And here is what I discovered. Not only had the accustomed phenomena been developed in solitude, just as well as in the presence of a crowd,—the Ecstasy in all its intensity, the Stigmas bleeding copiously,—but an extraordinary fact presented itself, which I had never seen before ; which, in truth, appeared now only for the second time, and which few persons had seen on its first appearance. I mean the bleeding coronet around the forehead."

On this incident we may well argue, as does Doctor Lefebvre, that people do not get up a comedy for bare walls. If the whole scene had been simply a piece of acting, would the actors have turned away spectators from the door ? Would it not rather have been hailed as a rare piece of good fortune, that just at the opportune moment, when the new feature of a bleeding coronet had been added to the exhibition, a Princess should arrive, eager to witness the wonderful display, and sure to carry back the story into the great world in which she lived ?

As for the motive of cupidity, it may be disposed of in a few words. Louise and her family were poor before the Stigmas and the Ecstasy appeared ; and poor they have ever since remained. They used to earn their bread, in old times, by the work of their hands ; and they do so still. If any one has offered them money, it has been always peremptorily refused. But few have ventured to do it. Visitors are too deeply impressed with the lofty spirit and the refined tone that pervade

the modest cottage at Bois d'Haine ; and they feel instinctively that no base desire of gain can find a place within its humble walls.

If money had been the object in view, it is plain that money could easily have been gathered in abundance, from the constant stream of rich and noble visitors who, during the last four years, have eagerly sought access to the Ecstatica. Yet though many hundreds have succeeded, and many hundreds, too, have failed, it does not appear that money was in any case a help, or the want of it a hindrance. One young man, who essayed the power of money, and found it a hindrance rather than a help, has himself told, with great simplicity, the story of his failure. It will serve to illustrate the character of the Lateau family, as regards the question of cupidity.

This young man came from Châtelet, not far from Charleroi, for the purpose of seeing Louise. Having failed to get in, when he first presented himself at the house, he remained in the neighbourhood all day, hoping to find a more favourable opportunity for attaining the object of his wishes. Towards evening, some friend inside begged of the family to let him in, for a few minutes, as he had shown himself so patient, and besides, was now quite alone. They consented, and one of the sisters went to open the door. The young man, in the meantime, had been thinking with himself how he might best manage to obtain admission : and having come to the conclusion that he would try the efficacy of gold, he was, just at the moment, looking for an opportunity to make the experiment. As soon, therefore, as he saw the door open, never thinking it had been opened for him, he came up and slipped a twenty-franc piece into the girl's hand, For a moment she was taken unawares, and looked bewildered. But quickly recovering, she handed him back his gold, and telling him with some warmth, that no one could enter there for money, she shut the door in his face.

One grave consideration yet remains to be urged against the hypothesis of fraud. It is surely not reasonable to ascribe these wonderful phenomena to the ingenuity of a peasant girl, if they cannot be produced even by the highest degree of trained and cultivated skill. And yet this is literally true. Let us take first the Stigmas only. If not genuine, they must be caused by instruments or medical appliances of some kind. But no such instruments or appliances are known to exist. It is simply a fact, that the most skilful and experienced surgeons, with all the resources of medical science at their command, are absolutely incapable of producing, on the

human body, those appearances which are witnessed every week in the person of Louise Lateau. Are we to believe, then, that the untutored village girl, slaving, her whole life long, at menial drudgery, has herself invented a fraud, which all the science of the world can neither imitate nor detect?

But the Stigmas are only one part of the wonder. The impossibility of fraud is not less evident, when we come to consider the Ecstasy. Persons gifted with a certain dramatic power are, no doubt, able to feign unconsciousness, and to assume an air of complete abstraction. But this pretence would very soon give way before the severe and painful tests that have been applied to Louise. Does any one believe it possible for an actor, however skilled in his art, to continue pretending insensibility, and never shrink or move, while his hands and face are punctured with a needle, his skin perforated, his flesh cut open, his muscles convulsed by the action of powerful electric currents? And if we do not believe this possible for a strong man, and a trained actor, how can we believe it possible for a simple peasant girl?

Finally, it must be remembered that we have to account for the two phenomena, not separately, but conjointly. Besides the extreme difficulty of producing each, considered in itself, there is a very special difficulty in bringing them on together, and maintaining them together for several hours at a time. For, if they be regarded as the result of art, it is plain they are, in a certain sense, contradictory. To keep up a constant flow of blood, it must be necessary to employ, from time to time, some contrivance or other, whatever it may be: whereas, for the Ecstasy it is necessary to remain, all the time, apparently unconscious and, for the most part, motionless.

§ 2.—SPECIAL TESTS.

When the Stigmas of Louise are carefully examined, by the light of medical science, it is at once apparent that they are not the work of instruments in the ordinary sense of the word. For instruments act by cutting or piercing; and there is neither cut nor puncture in the Stigmas of Louise, but only a blister. Some writers have suggested a cupping glass, as affording a possible explanation. But a cupping glass will not produce a flow of blood, without the aid of an instrument to make an incision. Besides, when the cupping glass is withdrawn, the flow of blood will cease.

Others, again, have talked of cautery, that is, the application of a hot iron, or of some corrosive substance. But the effect of cautery has no resemblance to the appearances presented by the Stigmas. By cautery the substance of the skin is

corroded, and a dry crust, or eschar, is formed, which after some days falls off. In the case of Louise, the skin is not corroded, and no eschar is formed. Moreover, there is no flow of blood produced by cautery ; or if a little blood sometimes comes, when the eschar falls off, it is sure to cease in a few minutes. Lastly, by the application of cautery to the same parts of the hands and feet and side, week after week, for four years, the natural structure of the skin, in these parts, would have been utterly destroyed : whereas, in the Stigmas of Louise, the structure of the skin remains unchanged.

These various suppositions it has been necessary to mention, only in order to set them aside. But there is another theory, deserving of more extended notice, which ascribes the Stigmas of Louise to the action of a vesicant, or blistering application. It is quite true that the effects of a vesicant bear some resemblance to the appearances presented by the stigmatic marks. Doctor Lefebvre has, therefore, devoted particular attention to this branch of the question. He has instituted a careful comparison between the two sets of phenomena, and he has shown very clearly, not only from the general principles of his art, but from actual experiment on the person of Louise, that the Stigmas, in her case at least, are not the work of a vesicant.

First of all, it must be remembered that the resemblance between the appearance of a blister and the appearance of the Stigmas is confined to one point only. In both cases a vesicle is formed by the separation of the surface skin, or *epidermis*, from the true skin below, the space between being filled with a watery liquid. The points of difference, on the other hand, are numerous and important. (1) The vesicle of a blister is always surrounded by an inflamed ring, called an areola. This is wanting in the vesicle of the Stigmas. (2) Whenever the vesicle of a blister is rent open, though the under skin is laid bare, there is no flow of blood. In the Stigmas, bleeding at once begins, when the vesicle opens. (3) If bleeding be artificially produced, in the former case, as it may, by friction, it stops as soon as the friction ceases. In the Stigmas, the flow of blood continues for a good part of the day, sometimes for four and twenty hours at a time.

Still it might perhaps be argued, that there is possibly something in the peculiar temperament of Louise, which so modifies the action of a vesicant as to produce those extraordinary effects that are seen in the Stigmas. This supposition, groundless and extravagant as it would be, Doctor Lefebvre has taken the pains to refute beforehand by the test of actual experiment. He produced a blister by ar-

tificial means, side by side with one of the Stigmas; and while the Stigma bled profusely not a drop of blood flowed from the blister.

This experiment was made on the twenty-seventh of November, 1868, in the presence of two distinguished members of the medical profession, Doctor Lecrinier of Fayt, and Doctor Severin of Braine. While all the Stigmas were bleeding copiously, Doctor Lefebvre applied liquid ammonia, a very powerful vesicant, to the back of the left hand, over a space equal in size to the stigmatic mark, and close beside it; taking care, however, to leave a clear band of sound skin between. At the end of twelve minutes, a well developed blister appeared, filled with a colourless liquid: and it may be observed in passing, that, though the process would, in ordinary circumstances, have been intensely painful, the ecstatic girl never exhibited the slightest trace of sensation.

The blister, thus formed, showed no tendency to burst open of itself: so Doctor Lefebvre, after waiting some time in vain, cut it open, and removed the fragments of the *epidermis*, leaving the true skin bare. An artificial Stigma was thus produced beside the real one; situated on the same tissues, covering the same extent of surface, and exhibiting the same anatomical character. But there was this essential difference; the genuine Stigma bled, the artificial one did not. Doctor Lefebvre watched them closely for two hours and a-half. During the whole of that time, the genuine Stigma continued to bleed freely. The artificial Stigma, on the other hand, gave out only a colourless liquid, which ceased to flow at the end of half an hour; and then the skin dried up.

After this, Doctor Lefebvre, with a view to force the blood by friction, rubbed a coarse linen cloth over the raw surface of the blistered skin. The cloth, during the process, was slightly stained with blood; but when the friction ceased, the blood refused to flow. From this experiment, then, it seems plain, that a blister produced by artificial means on the hand of Louise, is a blister and nothing more; and though it resembles one particular phase in the development of the bleeding Stigmas, it offers no parallel to their most striking and characteristic features.

A still more decisive test, perhaps, because it holds good, not against one form of fraud only, but against every possible form, is that known as the experiment of the gloves. This test was suggested, at an early period in the history of the case, by Monseigneur Ponceau, Vicar-General of the diocese of Tournay. But when the simple-hearted mother of Louise

heard of it, she was very indignant, and gave vent to her feelings with a warmth, which, if it cannot be altogether defended, may well be excused. "Do they take me and my daughters for impostors?" she said. "They think, perhaps, it is we that are making Louise bleed. Did *I* ever ask any one to come to see her? I ask only one thing, and that is, that they will leave us alone, and that no one shall ever put a foot into my house on a Friday again."

Louise, on her part, offered no objection to the experiment; as, indeed, she never did, to any test that was proposed. She only begged that they would not annoy her mother. It was agreed, therefore, to make the experiment at some time when the absence of the mother would afford a favorable opportunity. Such an opportunity occurred towards the close of the year 1868.

On Tuesday, the sixteenth of December, the hands of Louise having been first carefully examined, and found in their ordinary condition, a well-fitting leather glove was placed on each, fastened tightly round the wrists, and sealed. A similar covering was drawn over the left foot, and fastened in the same way. The next day, Wednesday, these contrivances were examined by Doctor Lecrinier, Monsieur Dupont of Fayt, and the schoolmaster of Bois d'Haine, who satisfied themselves that the seals were intact, and that, without breaking them, there was no access to the stigmatic marks. For additional security, they removed the glove from one hand, and having ascertained that the skin showed no symptom of inflammation, no sign of a blister, they replaced it with the same precautions as before.

When Friday came, great care was taken, in the first instance, to make sure that the seals had not been tampered with. Then Doctor Spiltoir of Marchienne, in presence of eight witnesses, some of whom were Doctors, took off the two gloves. The Stigmas were bleeding profusely on the palms of both hands: those on the backs were not yet bleeding, but blisters were fully developed, and ready to break. As to the feet, though one had been left free, and the other had been covered, both were found in exactly the same state. No blood was flowing, but blisters had been formed on both; and, after a little, both commenced to bleed.

This experiment of the gloves was made a second time, early in the following year. On Wednesday, the third of February, at four o'clock in the afternoon, Doctor Lecrinier, Monsieur Henri Bussin, and the Curé of Bois d'Haine, went to the house of Louise. They brought with them a pair of leather gloves, thick and strong. After they had made a

close scrutiny of both hands, and found them quite free from any appearance of blister or inflammation, they got Louise to put on the gloves, which fitted very closely. Each glove was then fastened in the following manner: a string, attached to the glove, was passed five times round the wrist, and tied in a black knot; the projecting ends of the string were sealed; and the seals were enveloped in a small linen bag, to protect them against accident. The extremities of the thumb and first finger of the right hand glove had been cut off beforehand, that Louise might be able to go on with her ordinary work.

At seven o'clock, on the following Friday morning, a distinguished party met together in the room of the Ecstatica. First, there was Doctor Lefebvre and Monseigneur Ponceau, Vicar General of Tournay; next, the three persons named above, who had taken part in fastening on the gloves; and lastly, two other Physicians of some note, Doctor Moulart of Bruges, and Doctor Mussely of Deynze. Every one present examined the apparatus on each hand, and expressed his conviction that the seals were intact; and further, that it was impossible to insert any instrument between either glove and the hand it covered.

When this investigation was over, Doctor Lefebvre cut the cords, and took off the gloves. They were full of blood. With some tepid water the Doctors washed the hands clean, and found them to present exactly the same appearance as they were wont to do on Fridays. The *epidermis* had been raised and burst open: the under skin was laid bare: and blood was flowing copiously.

To sum up the argument in a few words. The Stigmas and the Ecstasy of Louise Lateau are not the work of fraud: First, because any attempt to produce them by fraud would have been detected, long ago, if not by the eager curiosity of the crowd, at least by the severe scrutiny of scientific men. Secondly, because the girl had no motive which could induce her to devise and carry on so difficult and so painful a fraud: not vanity, for she loves solitude and obscurity; not cupidity, for she spurns money. Thirdly, these phenomena are not the work of fraud, because no human ingenuity, so far as we know, is able to produce them. The bleeding Stigmas of Louise cannot be imitated by the most skilful surgeon: the ecstatic insensibility of Louise cannot be simulated by the most trained actor. It can hardly be maintained, then, that the one and the other are both produced simultaneously, in her own person, by the untutored ingenuity of a peasant girl.

Besides these general considerations, we have special experiments devised for the express purpose of detecting fraud, if it existed. First, there is the experiment of the vesicant, or blistering preparation. A vesicant is the only appliance, known in surgery or medicine, capable of producing effects at all resembling the Stigmas of Louise. Yet a vesicant has been tried on the back of her hand, under the most favourable circumstances, and has completely failed : it produced simply a blister and not a bleeding Stigma. Next, there is the experiment of the gloves. The hands of Louise were completely covered up, for two or three days, so as to shut out the possibility of applying any artificial means whatever, for the purpose of drawing blood. And yet, when Friday came, the blood flowed as usual. It is plain, then, that the phenomena witnessed in Louise are not the result of artifice, but are real and genuine wonders.

If genuine, they are certainly supernatural. No doubt, some people, who do not believe anything to be supernatural, have tried to persuade themselves, and others, that they are a disease, like measles, or scarletina : with this difference only, that the disease of Louise Lateau is one of rather rare occurrence ; hers being, in fact, the first case of the kind which has been thoroughly investigated by medical men, and entered on the records of science. Doctor Lefebvre has taken a vast amount of trouble to refute this hypothesis. He has gone over a long list of diseases,—common diseases, and extraordinary diseases, and what are called rare cases of disease,—and he has shown, with great learning and elaborate care, that there is not the smallest foundation in medical science for the supposition that these phenomena are, in any true sense of the word, a disease. This argument I do not purpose to discuss ; partly because I do not possess sufficient knowledge of the various diseases enumerated by Doctor Lefebvre, and partly because I consider the argument unnecessary. There are very few, I believe, who while admitting the phenomena to be genuine, will yet maintain that they are natural. If I have succeeded in showing that there is no imposture, I am quite content to leave the question of disease to the instinctive judgment and good sense of my readers.

FATHER HENRY FITZSIMON, S.J.

(Continued from page 94, No. xcvi.)

“THIS sentence among themselves agreed upon, all the difficulty was, how after the foresaid act of the Council, it might either be thought available, or adventured to be published. Therein this course was holden. The Mayor was requested by Mr. Rider to send for it to the Colledge. He by no entreaty daring to disable the opinion of the State, and of himself instructing Mr. Rider how notorious the cause was made already and how frivolous such sentence would among all be esteemed, I neither being in place, nor any bond of Mr. Rider known to abide the Collegial arbitrament; they not knowing what else to do with their sentence, sent it freely and unwished to the Mayor, and he to me with a letter of the specified circumstances.

“Now, consider the villany and iniquity of these Puritans in this judgment. If you please to read over my epistle of appellation to the Colledge, you may find a recital of certain infidels, that had awarded right to Christians, against their own sects, when they had engaged their words to be true arbiters. Than which pre-occupation, to have them deal uprightly, I could not excogitate any more convenient. For as I said, what barbarian, Jew, or cannibal would betray one committing himself to his fidelity, where he needed not to be in his danger? But now we need not to exemplify in Hannibal, of whom Livy saith: ‘That he never stood to his word, but while it was profitable for him.’¹ We need not reproach the punical compared with the puritanical perfidy. Witness but his excellent Majesty that now reigneth, in his book of kingly instructions to his son, how perjured, how treacherous, how inhumane is the puritanical spirit. Witness the condemned treachery against his person in Rutheven, anno 1582, and in Striveling, anno 1585, beside all other treasons against him and others in Scotland.² Witness our own Challenor’s Andronical treason, against Dr. Haddoc, a second Onias; after giving him the right hand with protestation of friendship,³ yet he secretly trained a draught to apprehend him: fulfilling the saying of the prophet Jeremy:—‘*In his mouth he speaketh peace with his friend, and secretly he layeth ambushes for him.*’⁴

¹ Liv. b. 25, c. 30.² 2 Machabees iv.² Acts of Parliament in Scotland, c. vii., &c.⁴ Jerem. ix. 8.

“So, then, if they use any legerie, treachery, and dishonesty, in this cause which we examine (whereof I refuse no enemy to be judge), it is but a usual act of punical puritancy. But let us debate the matter in order. First, they affirm, there was a late solemn appeal unto them before the Right Wor. Mayor of Dublin. There was, I say, none such. Only I alone had consented to go according to an ancient appeal to the College, giving to that effect a ring; but my provoker in public presence, repealed to a further licence. Also I crave of them, how were they solemnly appealed unto, without form of appellation; without themselves, or any for them, to accept our appeal; without bond of both parties, and other requisite ceremonies?

“Secondly, whereas I alone had appealed unto them, and Mr. Rider ever repealed from them, and never entered into bond to stand to their decision, he himself neither in his printed books, nor private letters mentioning any such appeal, or bond; and refusing publicly to give me any gage of coming to trial before them; behold how with faces of a puritanical varnish, such double appeal, and forged bond is fraudulently by them here protested! They are now engaged to show such obligation of Mr. Rider, of a true and not falsified date, if any regard of reputation and sincerity remain in them.

“Thirdly, they affirm that the case resigned to their decision was of the controversy of Transubstantiation, and the consent of antiquity in the same. Fie upon all falsehood—what will all the world think, when to infer a partial and preditorious sentence, such shifting one controversy for another, by a reforming deformation of counterfeit evangelists (to whose sincerity the adversary party had confidently relied) is disfigured? For, as it shall shortly appear, even by Mr. Rider himself, we were at no diversity for the name of Transubstantiation, but for the signification thereof. So that to rack the controversy to the name, by none can be accounted but a profound dishonesty. Could not the first occasion of this disputation, to wit, whether the ancient Fathers stood for Catholics or Protestants, it being imprinted by Mr. Rider in his *Caveat* and *Rescript*; or my expressing the case in my letter to you, that you were only to judge, *whether for the consent of antiquity in Mr. Rider's cause or mine, he or I had perverted, dissembled, or denied the effect and substance of the Authors' minds, in our allegations*; could not the terror of disproof (as for fear of God or shame, I will not object them against you); could not fidelity (which, even according

to Cicero, among all nations is 'commune omnium praesidium;' 'the common sanctuary of all';¹ and according to Valerius Maximus is 'Numen, ac certissimum humanae salutis pignus;' 'The oracle and certainest pledge of human safeguard'²— could not that fidelity hinder you from changing *quid pro quo*, as false apothecaries do, when they intend to poison? Be it, that you thought such juggling to be the only counterpoise of Mr. Rider's credit, considering that Scriptures, Fathers, Councils, Histories, Protestants, Jews, and Infidels are irrefragably condemning him in the matter signified by the word of Transubstantiation, although they have not the word; could not you suppose, that the very Protestant discreet readers, perceiving him so overthrown in the matter, would also condemn you, with St. Augustine, saying: 'What is a more contentious part, than to strive about the name, when the signification is apparent?'³ But let Cicero, a pagan, convince what you are in these words: 'Calumniatorum proprium est verba consecrari, et contra sententiam torquere;' 'It is the right quality of forging impostors, to chaunt upon words, and to adulterate them from their signification.'⁴

"Fourthly, they resolve that I have alleged no Council, Father, or Antiquity proving Transubstantiation. In this again they deprave the question committed to their arbitrament, in two manners. First, the perverting, dissembling, denying, of the authors' minds in our several causes, was by them to be judged, and not what I proved or not proved. Secondly, by intimating that I intended to prove the name and not the matter of Transubstantiation.

"For the position of Mr. Rider was, 'that Transubstantion, or the corporal presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament, was never taught by the ancient Fathers.' By which even he (whom you defending have destroyed yourselves) sheweth, that he consisted, not in the word, but in the signification; newly explicating it with the disjunction *or*. Take that fling as a reward of Mr. Rider's mule. Nay, you shall not (by your leave) be quit of him so. We alleging St. Ambrose saying, 'The bread is bread before the consecration: but when it is consecrated, of bread it is made the flesh of Christ'⁵; sayeth Mr. Rider thereupon: 'all that we grant to be true, but you come not to the point, whether Christ's flesh be made of bread by way of Transubstantiation; that is, by the changing of one nature into another, by *hoc est corpus*

¹ Cicero, pro Sexto Roscio.

² Val. Max., lib. 6, in principio.

³ St. Aug., Ep. 174.

⁴ Cic., b. i., ad. Heren.

⁵ St. Ambrose, b. 4, De Sacr., c. 4.

meum. This is our question.' So that, not the word of Transubstantiation, but the changing of one nature into another, by *hoc est corpus meum*, is maintained to be the question; and consequently the former infidelity of the Collegists is evidently, even by Mr. Rider, contested.

"Yet again, they shall have from their beloved brother a Joab's kiss to Amassa,¹ a Dalila's tears to Samson,² a Triphon's feast to Jonathas,³ in this his answer to the fore-said words of St. Ambrose. He granteth all to be true, but requireth a conversion of one nature into another by the fore-said words. In such grant of truth he giveth perspicuously the lie to both himself and his supporters. For if it be true that by consecration the bread is made the flesh of Christ, then must the nature of bread be converted into the flesh of Christ, and so one nature is transubstantiated or converted into another. Which also St. Ambrose in all that chapter intendeth to prove, saying: 'Moses, his rod was changed into a serpent, and again into a rod; the rivers of Egypt into blood, and again into rivers, etc. And cannot, then, the words of Christ transform bread and wine? The heavens, the earth, and sea were not, nor any creature, and by a word they were made—He commanded, and they were created; if, then, of nothing His powerful word could make things to be, how much more can He alter one thing into another?'⁴ The changing, then, of one nature into another, or Transubstantiation, according to Mr. Rider's mind and mine, being true, I say that disproof is given by Mr. Rider against himself in pretending that the ancient Fathers, within the first five hundred years, had no such matter; and against the judgment of the Collegists in his favor containing that I had proved no such matter.

"Beside which sufficient confutation of their arbitrament even by Mr. Rider, let all the rest of my proofs in sifting Mr. Rider's *Caveat* (without recapitulation of them in this place) declare these Puritans to be the schismatical Collegians, or uncircumcised gymnasists of Jerusalem, of whom the Scripture saith—'They have departed from the Holy Testament, and are joined to the Gentiles, and are sold to do evil;'⁵ not at this time for any price, but to dispawn Mr. Rider's credit.

"Lastly, they affirm that allegations are brought by Mr. Rider in the same time, that evidently convince the contrary; to wit that no Transubstantiation was acknowledged for 500

¹ 2 Reg. 20. ² Judic. 14. ³ 1 Mach. 13. ⁴ St. Ambrose, loc. cit.

⁵ Recesserunt a testamento sancto, et juncti sunt nationibus et venundati sunt ut facerent malum.—1 Mach. viii. 16.

years after Christ. But first, the late answer of Mr. Rider himself to the place of St. Ambrose, who lived within 400 years after Christ, confessing it to be true, wherein the change or Transubstantiation of one nature into another is plainly verified; such his answer, I say, doth refel this favourable sentence as false. Next, I crave of these Puritans (not how some time they durst control the contrary sentence of the State; for that demand would imply an ignorance of their general inclination, which is by me elsewhere detected), how at least they durst condemn in such covert contradiction, so malapertly the wisdom of the State, as either to be ignorant of such Mr. Rider's sufficient proofs; or knowing them, of not confronting us together, to so manifest advantage thereby of the public cause, by my being convicted by them; and in particular, how injurious they have made Sir James Fullerton to the whole profession, that not only he did not commend Mr. Rider's proofs in their manner, but that in greater vehemency he did condemn them to be guilty of all defectiveness? To these demands, if they refuse to answer by words, yet they will never escape the infamy engendered in the minds of all that will look on them, by not daring to justify their no less punical censure towards me, than their desperate presumption against the body of the Council, in so thwarting their act and discretion.

“This judgment, had it been under King Cambyses, how he would punish¹ it, appeareth from his memorable justice against a corrupt judge, ‘whose skin he caused to² be flayed off, and to be nailed on the chair of judgment. Then, electing the very son of the said judge, and installing him in his father's office and seat, he willed him now to learn how to judge by such his father's example.’ If, as I said, a Cambyses had the Collegists in hand, for this judgment (by themselves, by him whom falsely they defended, by the State, by all learned of the world, detected to be treacherous, filthy, and unchristian), how would he uncase and dismember them? But I leave them as they are.

“Mr. Rider says I broke my promise of putting my hand to I know not what. Yet I have been ever known free to trust as much, if not more, than I ought, so that unless I had apparent cause to fear depravation I would not subtract my subscription to anything of mine. Again, he says, my reluctance to give him a legible copy ‘argueth weakness of my cause, a shame of my bubbering, and insufficient handling of

¹ Valer. Max. l. c. 3.

² Helinand, l. 15, hist.

the same, a blemish of my priesthood and profession.' I answer nothing to all this, but that, if he would have permitted me to print my book, it would be legible, it would need no subscription of my hand; it would testify that I was not ashamed of my cause and priesthood; whereas he must rather be most ashamed and terrified, who durst least have his cause made openly known.

"In his letter of the 27th of December, 1603, he says 'you shall be allowed to print, provided ever I may print mine with yours in the same volume, sheet, form, and page, every one of us bearing his own charges. But, *if you desire* to print your own without mine, your request is unreasonable.'

"To this conditional suspicion, which he now maketh an absolute accusation, I presently answered 'your doubt to be at charges with printing my labours, or that yours shall not be inserted with mine, or that we should seem to think you have not of yourself confuted your and your brethren's cause—I say, such your doubt you may at will depose as wanting all desert and occasion.' Yet in the face of this he says 'I wrote that I would print alone.' Pardon him for this. It is but his ordinary condition to misstate or at least misreport absolute for conditional, grants for denials, affirmations for negations, one matter for another.

'In his printed 'Answer' he says print was never spoken of, nor was it fitting it should be granted. To this I oppose his printed words in his *Caveat*—'You shall have my good leave and love, and my best furtherance with the State, that it may be printed, and also your person for further conference be protected.' Both his saying and his gainsaying are in print, and being opposite, one must be untrue. His saying that my copy delivered to him was not very legible, is also untrue, for at every step he carpeth after his manner thereat, with like success as the gudgeon carpeth at the bait and line."¹

¹ "Replie" 23.

(To be continued.)

THE IRISH
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

=====
FEBRUARY, 1873.
=====

PASTORAL LETTER OF THE ARCHBISHOPS AND
BISHOPS OF IRELAND,

Assembled in Dublin on the 21st and 22nd January, 1873.

TAUGHT by the authority of St. Augustine,¹ that love for the Church of Christ is a proof and pledge of close union with the Holy Spirit, we cannot but account as a great grace from heaven that intense love of the Catholic Church which has at all times been cherished in Ireland. Of the depth and tenderness of this love in your hearts, dearly beloved Brethren, our own daily intercourse with you furnishes us with many and striking proofs. How often have we seen the afflicted among you forget their own sorrows in reflecting on the sorrows that have come thick upon the Vicar of Christ? How often have the very poorest held out to us the alms with which their generous poverty sought to make some compensation to the Church for the sacrilegious outrages of which she had been made the victim? How many acts of prayer and penance have been performed by you to move God to shorten the Church's trials by converting and humbling her enemies? And whenever the defence of Catholic interests called for a public expression of feeling, no class or rank among you was found wanting in Catholic spirit; the noble and the peasant, the learned and the unlearned, the rich and the poor, were of one mind and of one heart in grieving over the Church's losses and rejoicing at her gains. But at no time, perhaps, have your religious sentiments been more painfully outraged than at the present day, when, throughout the world, iniquity seems to have reached the height of its triumph. Lest, however, the harrowing spectacle of the Church's trials should utterly dishearten you, our Holy Mother addresses you to-day, through

¹ Credamus, fratres, quantum quisque amat Ecclesiam Christi, tantum habet Spiritum Sanctum.—*Tract. 32 in Joan.*

us, in the words of the Apostle St. Paul to the Ephesians : "Wherefore I pray you not to faint at my tribulations for you, which is your glory. For this cause I bow my knees to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . That he would grant you, according to the riches of His Glory, to be strengthened by His spirit with might unto the inward man, that Christ may dwell by faith in your hearts."¹

And in truth, beloved Brethren, there would be much to discourage us in the tribulations at present endured by the Catholic Church, were it not for the strengthening power of our faith in the promises made to her by Christ her founder. For, as our Holy Father has recently declared,² "the entire Church is groaning under the vexation of a protracted and savage persecution," which seeks to compass "her total destruction, and the blotting out of the name of Christ living and reigning in her." Not, indeed, that those who assail the Church everywhere and under all circumstances, openly avow that their purpose is utterly to destroy her, for it is a special feature of this persecution that with violence the most audacious, they couple the most subtle hypocrisy. Hence, the better to secure success, they very frequently mask their attacks, and by professing to secure some interest of country or of modern enlightenment, they abuse the good faith of the simple or unwary. But, however various the form of attack, however specious the advantage ostensibly aimed at, the one ultimate object of all their efforts, to which all are directed beforehand, is nothing less than the final overthrow of the Christian religion.

Three things are essential for the good estate of the Church here below. First, the preservation of the Christian faith, which is the principle of her life ; second, the maintenance of the authority of the hierarchy, which is her vital organization ; third, her free action on the souls of men by the word of God and the Sacraments, which action is the condition of her growth. To destroy any one of these is to destroy the Church herself. Now, it needs but a glance at the state of the world to be convinced that against each and all of them assaults are now daily made, which, for their duration, their continuity, their extent, and their variety, are not surpassed in all the blood-stained annals of persecution.

And, first of all, what mighty forces are at present at work in the world with the object of overthrowing the Christian faith ! There is no need to dwell upon the hostility to

¹ Ephes. iii., 13, seq.

² Allocution of 23rd December, 1872.

Christianity of which the signs are apparent in the apostasy of so many modern politicians, or half shrouded in the machinations of secret societies; amongst which, that of Freemasons, notoriously exists in our own country, and is abetted by those who ought to discourage it. But the appalling list of errors condemned in the Vatican Council,¹ proves that even in the fundamental doctrines regarding God, the soul, rational certitude, and the entire supernatural order, what is called the thought of the age has assumed a position directly antagonistic to the teachings of the Catholic Faith. No doubt, not now for the first time in the world's history, has the fool said in his heart—there is no God; nor now for the first time has the materialist found in his unbelief a reason why he should rush on sensual pleasures. But never before has infidelity been found so thoroughly organized, so aggressive, so powerful to destroy. It neglects no channel by which anti-Christian influences can be made to reach men's souls. It is master of the press. In the newspapers which lie even upon the tables of Catholics, in the periodicals edited by infidels, which have circulation, in the works of fiction wherein they seek their pleasure, in the handbooks which popularize the discoveries of science, and in the learned treatises which are the boast of universities, its baleful forces are constantly at work, now subtly impregnating men's minds with dislike of creeds, now crushing faith at a blow, and now again sapping it, by undermining the natural truths upon which the Christian demonstration rests. It assumes to be the dictator of the physical sciences; and its apostles, though they superciliously disdain even the bare knowledge of what Revelation teaches concerning the origin and destiny of man and of the world, loudly proclaim to the youth, who, obeying the materialist tendencies of the age, throng in eager crowds to their schools, that faith cannot be reconciled with science. It aims at political power; and when it secures it, opposes an iron barrier to all legislation, however just, which might seem to favour the religious interests of the people, while it forces upon millions of believers social institutions based on principles condemned by the Christian faith. And thus the name of Jesus—that name which is above every name, and than which no other under heaven has been given to men whereby they may be saved—is made a sign to be contradicted and blasphemed; and the Catholic Church, which, with adoring love, ever has that name in her heart and on her lips, has been doomed by an aggressive infidelity to perish beneath its blows.

¹ *Constitutio de Fide Catholica.*

But in spite of all these exertions, the sacred name of Jesus still commands the love and awe of millions. Never has the Church exhibited a unity more perfect than that which now binds throughout the world the faithful to their Bishops, and the Bishops to the sacred Head of the Church, the Roman Pontiff. This majestic spectacle of two hundred millions of believers, held together in the unity of one mystic body by the living power of the authority of the Infallible See, maddens the enemies of Christ into anger mixed with fear. On the one hand, their rage against the Church urges them to open violence against her; on the other, the dread of arousing formidable opposition, counsels more guarded proceedings. Hence, for the most part, they prefer indirect attacks upon the Church. Professing to tolerate, nay even to respect the Catholic Church for its many services to society, they declare their aim to be merely the destruction of priestcraft, or of Ultramontaniam, by which names they designate the divine authority given by Christ to the Pastors of His Church. This hypocrisy can deceive no one. The Emperor Decius was undoubtedly one of the most deadly enemies who have at any time sought utterly to annihilate the Church. And yet, when St. Cyprian would describe in a single phrase the implacable rage that drove this man to drown, in the blood of the faithful, the very name of Christ, he could find none more fitting to portray the cruel persecutor than this—that he was *tyrannus infestus Dei sacerdotibus*¹—a tyrant who hated the priests of God. And do not the same words most truthfully depict the Deciuses of our own day, who seek to justify every iniquity to which their hatred of the Church urges them by the plea that it is intended for the repression of priestcraft?

And as in the third, so also in the nineteenth century, the first blows of the haters of God's priests should naturally fall upon the great High Priest of the Vatican, sitting at Rome "in the place of Peter, and in the rank of the sacerdotal chair." When St. Cyprian² praises Pope St. Cornelius, who "sat fearless in the sacerdotal chair at Rome at the moment when the tyrant who hated God's priests uttered every horrible threat, and with much more patience and endurance heard the rise of a rival prince than the appointment of God's priest at Rome," does not the holy martyr paint to the life the successor of St. Cornelius, the glorious Pontiff Pius IX.? Fearless, he sits at Rome in the infallible chair of St. Peter, confronting the rage of the haters of God's priests; fearless, he listens to them as they utter their terrible threats—*fanda*

¹ Epist. 52.² Epist. 52.

et nefanda; fearless, he smites with the authority of Peter and of Christ each fresh attempt against the authority of the Church. Nay, more, he warns his enemies that the forces of evil which they have let loose against that authority will infallibly sweep away in their recoil the authority of civil government; but his words are unheeded, and the rulers of the world—dupes or accomplices of a darkly secret power standing behind their thrones—are forced, like Decius, to witness with patience the rise of the revolutionary rivals who will hurl them from their place of pride.

But, though impervious to fear, the heart of Pius IX. is but too open to sorrow, not indeed for his own sufferings, or for loss of sovereignty, or for loss of personal liberty, but for the desecration of Sion, for the abominations he is forced to see standing in the holy places of Rome, and, above all, for the persecution inflicted on the Church by the attacks made on ecclesiastical authority. Like Mathathias beholding the evils come upon the conquered Jerusalem, he cries out:—"Woe is me, wherefore was I born to see the ruin of my people, and the ruin of the holy city, and to dwell there, when it is given into the hands of the enemies? The holy places are come into the hands of strangers: her temple has become as a man without honour. All her ornaments are taken away. She that is free is made a slave. And behold our sanctuary, and our beauty, and our glory is laid waste, and the Gentiles have defiled them."¹ In the two years that have elapsed since the capture of Rome, Pius IX. has seen his palaces rifled, churches and ecclesiastical buildings seized by violence for profane uses, numerous charitable institutions in his States confiscated, the enforced alienation of the property of the religious orders, religion completely banished from the schools, episcopal authority even over ecclesiastical seminaries set at naught, and the possession of their own houses refused to the Bishops themselves. He has seen clerical students, even when in priests' orders, dragged by the cruel conscription from the altar of the God of peace, and forced to serve as soldiers in the army, and he now has the crowning sorrow of beholding the final ruin coming upon religious orders by the suppression of their principal houses. All these outrages against the authority of the Church are so many attempts to destroy the Church herself. "These pretensions on the part of the State," thus write the Bishops of Tuscany to King Victor Emmanuel, "to grant or refuse its sanction to our evangelical mission, and fetter at its discretion the liberty of our ministry, which is the liberty of God, constitute an offence against the Divine autonomy of the Church,

¹ I Machabees, ii. 7, et seq.

and high treason against the majesty of God. This is what the royal *Placet* and *Exequatur* amount to, which, in religious matters, your Majesty's government grants or withholds at pleasure. It is not now a question of mere ecclesiastical discipline, which is changeable, but of principles and of dogma, and it is a dogma of faith that the Catholic Church has the full right of self-government, and this is the right that is outraged. It is not within our power to alter in any degree the constitution of the Church, such as it came to us from the Apostles, and to the Apostles from Christ, and to Christ from His Father: *Ecclesiae ab Apostolis, Apostoli a Christo, Christus a Deo.*¹

“Notwithstanding these truths, which are the basis of Christianity, and deeply rooted in every Catholic conscience, we have been deprived not only of the liberty of providing pastors for the flock entrusted to us, but we are not free to give parochial jurisdiction even for an hour to priests whose services may be necessary for the spiritual wants of the faithful. This being so, you, Sire, as a child of the Catholic Church, will feel in the depths of your heart that we are but doing our duty when we firmly, but respectfully, tell you that there is not and cannot be any hesitation as to the line of conduct we will pursue in such cases, for it is written:—‘*But Peter and the Apostles answering, said: We ought to obey God, rather than men.*’²

“For the discharge of our duty, curses, imprecations, insults, have been heaped upon us, and we bore them with resignation, reflecting that, before us, Christ our Lord had been loaded with curses, imprecations and insults. We were threatened with confiscation and exile, and we took comfort, as we thought how sweet on the one hand was the liberty and sanctity of evangelical poverty, while on the other, we considered that the whole earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof. And if we shall be threatened even with death, with God's help we will meet it with calmness and serenity, reflecting that our life ought to be Christ, and that at times death is a gain: *for to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain.*”³

“We have never paltered with error; we have not burned a single grain of incense to the idol of popularity; we have never allowed the pastoral staff or the Cross to stoop to the meannesses, or the injustice, or the prejudices of the age. So may God give us his help to continue in the path of suffering and of duty.” So far the Bishops of Italy on the sad condition to which they have been reduced.

¹ Tertull. de Præscript. 37.

² Acts v. 29.

³ Phil. i. 21.

Equally harrassing is the persecution of which the Church is at present the object in the German Empire. Flushed by their newly acquired power, those who have put themselves at its head, and take on themselves to speak and act for the Empire, have assumed towards the Catholic religion the same attitude precisely as that of the Pagan Emperors of Rome towards Christianity in the earliest age of the Church. The capital offence of which the primitive Christians were guilty in the eyes of the Imperial law was this, that they refused to admit the omnipotence of the State in religious as well as in civil matters. "We are charged," says Tertullian,¹ "as being guilty of sacrilege and of treason: this is the chief, nay, the only accusation against us."

It is plain, from even a cursory view of the recent acts of hostility towards the Church which have occurred in Germany, that the German Catholics may repeat this statement, and say: the only offence of which we are guilty is, that we cannot give to the State in religious matters the ready and loyal obedience which we yield to it in civil affairs.

Thus, in the question concerning the so called Old Catholics, when a handful of proud professors and their pupils refused to submit to the dogmatic definition of the Vatican Council, and separated themselves from the faith of the entire Catholic Church, the State insisted that they should still be accounted as Catholics, and strove to compel its Catholic subjects to receive from them, as from Catholics, religious instruction, and even the Sacraments themselves. Does not such a proceeding involve the usurpation by the State of the Church's authority to decide matters of doctrine, by defining what is heresy and what is not? And when the State, by virtue of this usurped authority, forbids the Bishops to excommunicate apostates, does it not thereby equivalently forbid the very existence of the Church herself?

The same principle of persecution underlies the action taken by the Government against the Bishop Chaplain-General of the Army, for having placed under interdict the military Church of Cologne, upon the altar of which an apostate priest had sacrilegiously dared to offer the sacrifice of the Mass. For this act the Bishop was subjected by the military authorities to a military court, forbidden in any way to exercise his episcopal office, and deprived of the insignia of his episcopal rank. Nay, more, his priests were commanded to break off all official relations with him, and some were even dismissed because they declared themselves bound in conscience to obey their Bishop in things spiritual. Could reli-

¹ Apol. 10.

gious liberty be more flagrantly violated than in this instance?

Again, the expulsion of the Society of Jesus and of kindred orders and congregations, including the Redemptorists, the Lazarists, the Trappists, and the Christian Brothers, is an act of revolting tyranny and injustice towards the Church. It assails her doctrine, for it is an article of Catholic faith that the observance of the evangelical counsels is part of Christian perfection, and that God does really call men to this state. To prohibit the religious life, therefore, amounts to a prohibition of the free exercise of the Catholic religion. It assails her jurisdiction, for it forbids to priests belonging to religious orders all exercise of the sacerdotal functions. It assails her sacred right of property, for it inflicts upon her the loss of so many religious houses built and maintained by the alms of the faithful. Finally, it inflicts the penalties of confiscation and of exile upon men who have never been brought to trial, much less convicted of any crime against the State. And in the common ruin are involved the convents even of religious ladies, who are now condemned to spend in exile the lives they so nobly risked in tending the wounded on the battle fields and in the hospitals, or which they had consecrated to the education and service of the poor of Christ. We will not dwell upon others of the penal laws lately passed, such as that against preachers, whose discourse may be interpreted to be antagonistic to the policy of the Empire; or the law forbidding the young to become members of religious confraternities; or the decree forbidding the dedication of an ecclesiastical province to the Sacred Heart of Jesus Christ. Nor will we speak of the still more stringent measures, which, with growing shamelessness of persecution, are now openly announced as to be put into operation against Catholics. We have said more than enough to show the violence of the German persecution.

If to all that has been done against the Church in Germany we add the laws lately enacted in the Spanish Cortes, to complete the impoverishment and enslavement of the illustrious clergy of Spain; if, furthermore, we observe the acts of the civil government in several of the Helvetic Cantons, in which the State presumes to issue decisions upon Catholic dogmas, to usurp the episcopal jurisdiction over parishes, to expel religious bodies, to provoke to schism; if we consider how, in Belgium, the Bishops are forced to refuse Christian burial to the departed children of the Church, in consequence of the desecration of Catholic cemeteries by the action of civil authorities, we have one vast picture of perse-

cution, in which the brutal tyranny of Pagan Rome is combined with the malicious cunning of Julian the Apostate, and the petty meanness of the Low Empire, in one grand assault against the fundamental liberties of the Catholic priesthood, in the hope of thereby putting an end, if it were possible, to the very existence of the Church of God upon earth.

A third phase of persecution remains, which, while it invariably accompanies the open assaults upon the Christian faith, and the violent usurpation of ecclesiastical authority, of which we have hitherto spoken, presents itself also in countries where either of the former methods might be held to be impossible or inexpedient. The leading principle of this species of persecution is to weaken as much as possible the influence of the Catholic Church upon men, by narrowing in every way her field of operation, and by restricting her especially in her action upon the family and in the school, which are the two chief elements of society. To this principle we may trace, as to its source, the entire system of modern legislation on marriage and on education.

Modern legislation on marriage is, in several countries, a strictly practical rendering of the 65th Proposition condemned in the Syllabus, which says: "*The doctrine that Christ has raised marriage to the dignity of a sacrament cannot be at all tolerated.*" It is intolerant in the highest degree: it will not allow that the marriage contract between Christians is a sacrament, and hence it will not admit that the Church has any Divinely given rights with respect to it. The institution of the Divorce Court is the natural consequence of the introduction of the so-called civil marriage, and the natural result of both is, not only the profanation of the great sacrament, typifying the union of Christ and his Church, but the loss to society of all that purity of feeling with which the graces of nineteen centuries of Christian faith had sanctified the nuptial state. Besides, once the maintenance of the unity and indissolubility of marriage has been made dependent on the caprice of human legislators, liable, as they are, to be swayed by the worst passions of corrupt human nature, who can say that the hideous doctrines of the Communists, more foul than those of Mahomet, may not yet be legalized even in countries once the centres of Christian civilization? And under a system through which the very springs of individual, domestic, and civil life have thus been poisoned, what place will be left, in a degraded and brutalized society, for the Spouse of Christ, the Holy Church of God?

But the supreme effort to weaken the Church's influence is made on the Educational field by banishing religion from the schools, whether of higher, middle, or primary instruction. In a pastoral letter which we addressed to you several months ago, we endeavoured to set before you at some length, dearly beloved Brethren, the dangers which threaten your faith from pernicious systems of education. The experience of every day that has since passed has but strengthened the convictions we then expressed, sanctioned the warnings we then gave, and rendered us more determined than ever to struggle to the last, with all the energy of our hearts, helped by the grace of God, against every form of un-Catholic education, no matter from what source it may come, or by what patrons it may be recommended. It is chiefly for the consideration of difficulties arising on this all-important subject of Education that we are now assembled; but we reserve for a future occasion the resolutions we have adopted, confining ourselves at present to express our deep regret that the generous grants lately made by the Legislature in behalf of Education, have been accompanied by conditions which have, up to the present time, deprived many meritorious teachers of the long expected rewards of their labours—rewards which should have been made dependent on their certified efficiency. Without faith it is impossible to please God; and what doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his own soul? These are, in brief, the eternal truths which must govern our conduct in this matter, which directly concerns the eternal salvation of our flocks, and amid all the difficulties and perplexities with which the question is surrounded, the heavenly simplicity of these words of God will be “a lamp to our feet, and a light to our path;” and the “law of His mouth will be good to us above thousands of gold and silver.”¹

On the other hand, with an uniformity which reveals a plan of united action and obedience to the same word of command, the infidel party in France, in Germany, in Belgium, in Spain, in Australia, in America, and in countries nearer home, has put forth a scheme of universal education, the essential feature of which is, that it shall be gratuitous, secular, and compulsory.

What chiefly recommends these three qualities of the modern educational system is, however, that they ensure the exclusion of religion.

The Catholic Church can never look with dislike upon a

¹ Psalm cxviii.

system of education merely because it is gratuitous. She loves too well Him who said, "*Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not,*" to allow any considerations of human interest to hinder the approach of the very poorest children to the sanctuary of her maternal bosom. If to be gratuitous be a merit in education, then should religious schools be admittedly the most perfect the world has ever seen, for they gratuitously give not only an education of the best kind, but they give also the unpaid, the unpurchasable service of holy men and women, who expend their energies and talents in teaching the poor of Christ without other reward than the insults heaped upon them by the well-paid official patrons of gratuitous education. When the novel systems of education shall have produced teachers equal in silent, loving, patient, unpaid labour, to the members of the religious congregations, then, but not till then, shall we believe the new-born admiration of gratuitous education to be sincere. But as long as gratuitous education means that Catholic parents shall be heavily taxed to pay enormous salaries to an army of inspectors and teachers, whose chief work it will be to slay the Catholic faith in the souls of children, we cannot but consider the cry for gratuitous education to be a piece of mocking hypocrisy. And can that education be called gratuitous in which a Catholic parent is forced to pay for what he believes to be the moral ruin of his own child?

It is unnecessary to dwell upon the evil consequences that must follow to faith from the second special quality of the new schools; namely, their secular character. "Without Christian schools," say the Bishops of Germany, "in which the Church can exercise the influence that belongs to her, there is no religious education. A school which is not in full harmony with the Church and with the Christian family, is a most deadly foe of both; it is an anti-Church and an anti-family (school), which alienates the children from the heart of their parents and from the spirit of the Church, rendering them, in a fashion hitherto unknown in history, either absolutely irreligious, or, at best, indifferent to religion."¹

Finally, in open violation of the natural rights of parents, and of the sacred rights of the Church, and to leave to the rising generation no loophole of escape from anti-Christian influences, education must be compulsory. What a bitter satire on the vaunted liberty of the age is this, that the people must be

¹ "Memorandum of the German Bishops," § 5.

compelled by fine and imprisonment to receive educational liberty! If the public opinion of the age be in reality enlightened, why should it be necessary to proclaim compulsory education as one of the great wants of society? And if it be so unenlightened as to deserve for its persistent ignorance the severe treatment awarded to thieves and evil-doers, what are we to think of the pretensions of those men who make war on the Church in the name of the enlightened nineteenth century? These inconsistent compulsory educational laws would have been unnecessary had there been no fetters placed on the action of the Catholic Church. She binds her sacred ministers continually to impress on the minds of parents, that the education of their children is a duty imposed on them by God himself in the Fourth Commandment of the 'Decalogue'; and on the minds of children, that they are bound to devote themselves to such studies as may suit their state in this world, and prepare them for eternity in the next. This is the sweet power of compulsion of which the Catholic Church possesses the secret, and when she places it in the hands of some meek brother or gentle nun, whose hearts, emptied of all earthly affections, beat only with love of Christ and of his little ones, she promotes the spread of education more efficiently than can ever be done by a penal code bristling with fines and penalties. We cannot but look with alarm on these growing attempts to substitute physical for moral compulsion in matters of such sacred importance. When the sense of moral obligation has been weakened in the community, when men have forgotten how to obey for conscience' sake, when the jail and the police supply the chief sanction which is to protect the law, the dissolution of society is not far distant. And yet this will undoubtedly be the outcome of the system of gratuitous, secular, and compulsory education, for the moral force of law languishes where it is not supported by Religion, and Religion will have no hold upon the generations that shall be trained apart from the blessed influences of the Holy Catholic Church.

And now, beloved Brethren, what duties devolve upon the children of that Church against whose very existence these manifold acts of persecution are daily directed by so many unscrupulous foes? Foremost among these duties, beyond doubt, is the duty of resisting with all the energy we can command the attempts that are made to destroy the Catholic Faith. Bearing in mind that faith is a divine virtue, and that like other virtues it may perish in temptation, we must protect it in our own souls, and in the souls of those who depend on us, from the pernicious influences of dangerous reading. When

you know that a book, however remarkable, or a journal, however brilliant, is openly or covertly hostile to the spirit of faith, let no weak deference to public opinion induce you to run the risk of perusing it. And besides protecting, you must strengthen your faith. For this purpose, to prayer and to constant hearing of the Word of God you should add the reading of works written in defence and explanation of Catholic doctrine. Be not led away by the example of those who defend the reading of dangerous books on the ground that in these days it is necessary to know what is said against religion. When men, the whole amount of whose Catholic knowledge is limited to indistinct recollections of the Catechism, learned by them in childhood, spend the best part of their lives over books in which infidelity parades its blasphemies, now with assumed gravity as scientific conclusions, now brilliant with wit and literary grace, is it wonderful that they should suffer the sad shipwreck of their faith? The more so, seeing that while they unceasingly expose themselves to the influences hostile to faith, these unhappy persons sedulously avoid the sermons and other religious instructions which our Holy Mother the Church provides for her children. Finally, we should avail ourselves to the fullest extent of all our rights as citizens to protest against the attacks made on the authority of the Church, and especially against the injustice done to us in the matter of education.

“But, beloved Brethren,” says St. Cyprian, “we ought not in this matter to overlook the truth, nor should the shadow of this fell persecution so blind our mind and sense, as to leave us without light to understand the Divine ordinances. By learning the cause of these calamities, we shall discover the remedy for our wound. The Lord has wished to try his household, and as long repose had corrupted the discipline which had come down to us from God, the Divine judgment has awakened our faith from a declining, and, if I may so speak, an almost slumbering state; and whereas we deserved yet more for our sins, the most merciful Lord has so moderated all, that what has passed seemed rather a trial of what we were than an actual infliction.” Thus spoke St. Cyprian,¹ when he sought to explain to his stricken flock the designs of Divine Providence in permitting the terrible persecution of Gallus; and if the sins of the faithful, in the third century, were not without their share in bringing sufferings on the Church, can we flatter ourselves in the belief that the sins by which we daily provoke the Divine anger, have no part in causing the persecution that rages to-day. “Long ago was it foretold,” says St. Bernard, speaking of the Church,² “and

¹ St. Cyprian, de Lapsis, ap. 1, 2.

² Serm. 33 in Cant.

the time of fulfilment has now come : *behold in peace is my bitterness most bitter* : it was bitter when the martyrs were slaughtered, more bitter still when heresy raged, but most bitter at the present time, on account of the morals of her own children. . . . In these our days is heard the voice of the Church lamenting aloud : *I have brought up children and exalted them ; but they have despised me* : they have despised me and dishonoured me by their shameful lives, by their foul greed of gain, by filthy intercourse, by the business that walketh about in darkness." O how this mother of our souls mourns over the guilt of those Christians who, not only among the disobedient Armenians in the East, but elsewhere, to the scandal of the faithful, dare, with sacrilegious hand, to rend by schism the seamless robe of the Church's unity. How she mourns for the thousands who in Ireland render fruitless all her maternal care for their salvation, by their persistence in the awful crime of drunkenness, which is the fertile source of so much sin !

Dearly beloved Brethren, let us no longer cause our mother's tears to flow, or strengthen the arm of her persecutors by our sins, but rather in the spirit of humility, and in a contrite heart, let us strive to appease the anger of the God of justice. The rains, the tempests, and the epidemic diseases with which the world has been so continually visited, bear evident marks of a chastisement from heaven, and make our present position and future prospects gloomy in the extreme. Let us then humble ourselves under the powerful hand of God, and by frequent supplications to the Virgin Mother, and to St. Joseph, the Protector of the Universal Church, let us endeavour to avert the calamities that impend over us. And since the enemies of the Church have refused to allow the Sacred Heart of our Divine Lord to be invoked by the victims of their persecuting laws, how better can we show our grief for His injured honour, and our love for His suffering Church, than by the solemn consecration of Catholic Ireland to the most Sacred Heart of Jesus. To this act of devotion and reparation we now invite you. The Heart of the Word Incarnate is the fountain whence flows the blood that cleanses us from all sin. Let us place as a sign on our sin-stained souls the blood of the Lamb, and the exterminating angel of persecution will not be able to hurt us. Then shall we see the "woe that shall come upon the nation that riseth up against our people : for the Lord Almighty will take revenge on them, in the day of judgment He will visit them."¹ Then shall be fulfilled in our regard the Church's prayer that we may not be disheartened

¹ Judith, xvi. 20.

by the tribulations which she may have to bear for our sakes ; they rather shall be our glory, for "none of us shall suffer as a murderer, or a thief, or a railer, or a coveter of other men's things ; but if as a Christian, let us not be ashamed, but let us glorify God in this name."¹ To the Sacred Heart of Jesus Christ, then, dearly beloved, we, your unworthy pastors, this day commend your souls, so dear to Christ who redeemed them with His precious blood, so dear to us who must so soon give an account of them to the Prince of Pastors, that, "being rooted and founded in charity, you may be able to comprehend, with all the saints, what is the breadth, and length, and height, and depth. To know also the charity of Christ, which surpasseth all knowledge, that you may be filled unto all the fulness of God. Now to Him, who is able to do all things more abundantly than we desire or understand, according to the power that worketh in Him, to Him be glory in the Church, and in Christ Jesus, unto all generations, world without end, Amen."²

Dated this 22nd day of January, 1873.

- | | |
|--|--|
| ✠ PAUL CARDINAL CULLEN, Archbishop of Dublin, and Primate of Ireland. | ✠ PATRICK DORRIAN, Bishop of Down and Connor. |
| ✠ DANIEL M'GETTIGAN, Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of all Ireland. | ✠ GEORGE BUTLER, Bishop of Limerick. |
| ✠ JOHN MACHALE, Archbishop of Tuam. | ✠ NICHOLAS CONATY, Bishop of Kilmore. |
| ✠ PATRICK LEAHY, Archbishop of Cashel, &c. | ✠ THOMAS NULTY, Bishop of Meath. |
| ✠ THOMAS FEENY, Bishop of Killala. | ✠ JAMES DONNELLY, Bishop of Clogher. |
| ✠ WILLIAM DELANY, Bishop of Cork. | ✠ JAMES LYNCH, Coadjutor Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin. |
| ✠ FRANCIS KELLY, Bishop of Derry. | ✠ GEORGE CONROY, Bishop of Ardagh and Clonmacnoise. |
| ✠ WILLIAM KEANE, Bishop of Cloyne. | ✠ JAMES MACDEVITT, Bishop of Raphoe. |
| ✠ PATRICK DURCAN, Bishop of Achonry. | ✠ PATRICK DUGGAN, Bishop of Clonfert. |
| ✠ J. P. LEAHY, Bishop of Dromore. | ✠ HUGH CONWAY, Coadjutor Bishop of Killala. |
| ✠ DOMINICK O'BRIEN, Bishop of Waterford and Lismore. | ✠ E. J. M'CORMACK, Coadjutor Bishop of Achonry. |
| ✠ JAMES WALSHE, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin. | ✠ JAMES RYAN, Bishop of Killaloe. |
| ✠ LAURENCE GILLOOLY, Bishop of Elphin. | ✠ PATRICK FRANCIS MORAN, Bishop of Ossory. |
| ✠ THOMAS FURLONG, Bishop of Ferns. | |
| ✠ JOHN MACEVILLY, Bishop of Galway. | |
| ✠ MICHAEL O'HEA, Bishop of Ross. | |

The solemn Consecration of Catholic Ireland to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, as appointed in the Pastoral, will take place in every Diocese on Passion Sunday next.

¹ 1 Peter, iv. 15, 16.

² Eph. iii. 16.

IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL COLLEGES SINCE THE REFORMATION.

SEVILLE.

IN the issue of the IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD for the month of October, I have read the very interesting notice of the religious life and virtues of Father James Carney, quoted by an esteemed contributor, E. J. H., from Redan's Commentary on the Machabees, and occasioned by the very curious epigram written by Father Carney on that work. E. J. H. says it is difficult to identify this James Carney with the priest of the same name who was first rector of the Irish College of Seville; but I have no doubt they are one and the same. There are three things which I suppose create the difficulty of identification: 1st, in the article published in the July number of the RECORD it is said:—"That he (Theobald Copleton) procured for their direction a priest from the College of Salamanca, called James Carney, who did them great service for a considerable time, till he determined on going to Ireland," &c., and the Father Carney, eulogised by Redan, died in Spain; 2nd, James Carney, of Seville, is described as a secular priest, and the other was a Jesuit; and, 3rd, what Redan says of his entering the Society in 1621, after he had commenced his theology in the College of Salamanca. But I think I can remove these difficulties. As regards the first, it simply arose from an oversight in transcribing the note. The sentence should have run thus:—"He procured for their direction a priest from the College of Salamanca, called James Carney, who did them great service for a considerable time; and he spared no toil till he determined," &c.; from which it is clear the determination of going to the Irish Mission refers to Copleton and not to James Carney. As regards the second, Zuñiga says the *devout and zealous priest* who laboured for the establishment of the College, afterwards entered the Society of Jesus; and as Copleton never became a Jesuit, and James Carney did, as I find from a note by one of the Jesuits of the College of Seville, his remarks can only apply to the latter, and consequently refers to the efforts made by him, after coming from Salamanca, to interest the pious and charitable in the good work he had on hands. The third difficulty I confess is harder to get over; but if we consider that, like many other Irish students, some of whom even came to Spain already ordained, he may have received ordination

before completing his course, which he interrupted to attend to the call of Stapleton, and returned to finish in Salamanca after leaving Seville, it will not appear so insuperable as at first sight. In that case, however, we must doubt Redan's accuracy when he says he was only fifty years of age at his death; but the identity of name, place, time, character, and religious profession, makes the identity of person so probable to my mind, that I have no hesitation in coming to that conclusion if necessary.

E. J. H. expresses "regret at not knowing more concerning the men who, like Stapleton and Carney, served their Church and country in those colleges." Well, I shall try in this article to give an account of some other men of note connected with the College of Seville, and a few more additional items of its history, which, though, perhaps, of no great importance in themselves, may not be uninteresting to some of the Irish readers of the RECORD.

As soon as the Society of Jesus took possession of the College, in 1619, Father Richard Conway and Father Michael de Morales proceeded to make an inventory of the property of the house, and a list of its benefactors and students, and to draw up a *relatio* of its state. They found everything in a miserable state through the neglect of those who had the lay administration in their hands, who robbed it of all the linen, did away with beds, tables, books, and other things of the kind, and even stole a donkey which was employed in bringing water. The few remaining chattels were valued at £12. In the shape of provisions, there was only a small quantity of wheat, which would barely suffice for a month; and in addition to this poverty, there were several large debts which had to be paid afterwards. There were eighteen persons in the house, including the Rector, collegians and servants. The *relatio* drawn up by Father Conway brought the institution under the notice of people of quality, and the fathers contributed to spread, by their sermons from the pulpit, a knowledge of its object, and want of means; so that the zeal of some, and the charity of others, in a short time "lifted it out of the mud, and the collegians were able to prosecute their studies with less embarrassment." The paper called the *Origin, Progress, and State of the*, &c., in 1623, says:—"A female servant of God gave another 100 ducados (£10), &c. With this addition to our funds we manage to keep sixteen collegians, four members of the Society, and two servants, although the provincial advised, in his late visit, that only twelve students should be admitted, till God would send more means. Thanks be to

the Lord, ever since the Society took this house in charge, we were able to send two missionaries every year to Ireland, and singular are the fruits they have produced in bringing back souls to God, and confirming the weak. I have learned that one, whom we sent last year, had converted nineteen heretics, and reaps a most extensive harvest. And although when here, he was of known zeal, he seems to have exceeded himself in Ireland, and to have received a particular grace from God.¹

“And another of our collegians became a martyr, being burned alive last year, because he would not renounce the faith, in Algeria. He was chaplain to the Irish forces, and served the king in his royal armada; but it would take me a long time to recount all that occurred in this way. In conclusion, it is certain that the faith and Christianity now in Ireland (and it is great) is, in a great measure, due to those reared in this Seminary, and other kindred ones. And what is to be deplored, is our inability to rear more for so great a harvest as there is in four archbishoprics and thirty-six bishoprics. If we could only send one to each diocese in every seven years, we would regard it as a great blessing. *Rogamus ergo Dominum nostrum ut mittat operarios in vineam suam.*”

Even when preparing for the arduous duties of the Irish mission, our young collegians had many opportunities of exercising their zeal among the soldiers of their native country in the service of his Catholic Majesty. Many of them came out ordained, or were ordained early in their course, and these priests were accustomed to go on missions to the Irish soldiers, among whom they administered the sacraments, corrected abuses, and suppressed enmities. So well pleased were the soldiers with the services rendered them, that officers and men always received the missionaries with great respect, and manifested an ardent desire to have one of the priests from the College always with them to attend to their spiritual necessities.² They voluntarily offered a certain sum of their pay

¹ This was, probably, William Suple, who was one of those found by Father Conway in the house in 1619, and in February, 1620, stood a public general thesis in Theology, and gave proof of great talents and extensive acquirements.

² “Among the many cases of edification which resulted from their labours, was the conversion of an Englishman. He was properly instructed in the mysteries of our holy religion, and a day was appointed for receiving him into the Church. He was to attend before the Commissioner of the Holy Office of the Inquisition to make a recantation of his errors, but as he should have to travel a distance of six miles, and was very unwell, he was advised to postpone the ceremony, as he was quite unfit to undertake such a journey. However, the poor fellow would brook no delay, but started on foot, and performed the journey as if he were in excellent health. He made his recantation with tears, was received, and after

for the support of some students; and we are told of one Captain French who not only allowed the College an annual offering of considerable value while he remained in the country, but continued to remit his generous contribution even after he went to the Indies. The Irish merchants of Seville and Cadiz likewise undertook to pay a percentage on every pipe of wine they should export to the British Isles. These offerings were of great moment in the struggling state of our infant College, and afforded great relief. No less so was the privilege granted by His Holiness to the fishermen to fish on six Sundays in the year for the benefit of the College. These poor men had offered their services to Father Conway, who immediately petitioned the Holy See in the following terms:—"Most Holy Father—In the year 1605, at the request of the Protectors and Students of the Colleges of the Irish Nation in Lisbon and Salamanca, your Holiness benignly granted to the fishermen of Setnual and Casquaes, and other districts of Portugal, Galicia, and the provinces of Biscay, permission to fish on six Sundays or festivals every year, and to sell the fish thus taken for the benefit of the aforesaid Colleges, to aid them in their temporal support. It happens that the Seminary of the same Irish nation, in Seville, is now in the like need of succour and maintenance. Wherefore we humbly supplicate your Holiness to grant a similar permission to the fishermen of the coast of Andalusia, that this Seminary may thus receive some succour and emolument," &c.

Paul V. graciously acceded to this request, and in Sancta Maria Major, on the 9th of September, 1619, expedited an Indult, addressed *Dilecto Filio Officiali Hispalensi*, in which he commanded him to grant, by apostolic authority, to all and each one of the fishermen of the province of Andalusia, bordering on the Mediterranean and the ocean, permission for four years to fish on six Sundays or festival days, in the seas, rivers, lakes, and ponds, even by night (*post tamen Divinorum Officiorum celebrationem*), the fruit of their toil to be given freely and without condition to the Irish College of Seville, for the support of the rector and students and the persons employed in their service; and to declare, by the same apostolic authority, that these fishermen were not to be molested, hindered, or impeded in any way, by any person, no matter what his authority; and to pronounce null and void anything which any person of whatsoever authority,

confessing and communicating, went away, filled with holy joy, not only resolved to persevere in the grace bestowed on him, but to endeavour to bring all his countrymen, whom he might meet, to a participation in a like favor."

knowingly or in ignorance, should attempt to the contrary, &c.¹

This Indult was presented to Don Gonzálo de Campo, Archdeacon of Niebla, Vicar-General of Seville and Apostolic Judge, who, by decree of 22nd February, 1620, commanded it to be put in execution for the term and ends mentioned by His Holiness; and by another decree of 8th January, 1621, ordered all parish priests and vicars to throw no obstacle in the way of its execution, and to make no changes whatever in the days selected by the Seminary for this pious labour, &c. What the emoluments arising from this alms might be we are not distinctly told, but are given to understand they were considerable.

Maurice Riegan, who succeeded James Carney in the government of the College, solicited faculties for the ordination of the students with the mere dimissorial letters of the superiors of the College, which Paul V. granted in 1617. The preamble runs thus:—"Paulus Episcopus Servus Servorum Dei in perpetuam rei memoriam. Decet Romanum Pontificem in hoc potissimum invigilare ut juvenes quicumque praesertim a patria sua causâ fidei Catholicae exulantes et litterarum studiis intendere volentes, absolutis suis studiis Altissimo ministrare et pro suo cujusque talento uberes in vinea Domini fructus facere possint ac exinde Christi fideles eorum exemplo et piis operibus moti avitam majorum suorum religionem conservare satagant et procurent. Exhibita nobis nuper pro parte Mauri Riegani Presbyteri Ibernici, Praesulis infrascriptae domus illius scholariumque petitio continebat quod dilectus Filius Hieronymus de Medina Farragut quamdam domum in Civitate Hispalensi possessam per eum legitime, donatione irrevocabili, elargitus sit, ac in illa ad praesens jam viginti, vel circa, studiosi, ac inter illos sex presbyteri, &c. Datum Romae apud Sanctam Mariam Majorem, anno Incarnationis Dominicae 1617, 6 idus Julii, Pontificatus nostri anno 13."² His Holiness also gave permission, on the 3rd of August

¹ See *Lives of the Archbishops of Dublin*, by Right Rev. Dr. Moran, chap. viii., I. I have used the translation of the petition given there, except in the date (1615) and some of the proper names, which I have taken from a publicly authenticated copy of the original Indult referred to, now before me, *Datum apud Sanctam Mariam Majorem anno Incarnationis Dominicae millesimo sexcentesimo quinto, duodecimo Kalendas Octobris, Pontificatus nostri anno primo*. In the other dates of the text I have also followed the manuscript in the archives of the College of Salamanca, written by one of the Jesuits belonging to the College of Seville, but I will not guarantee them, as they clash with those given by such an authority as Dr. Moran, who had such exceptional means of ascertaining them. I merely give what I find.

² See *Lives of the Archbishops of Dublin*, chap. viii., I, p. 282. The date of the foundation of the College of Seville is 1612, not 1617. The MS., from which

of the same year, to say Mass and administer Holy Communion in the little chapel which had been prepared in the College with all the necessary ornaments.

On the 19th Oct., 1615, Philip III. sent a royal order from Burgos to his officers in Seville, commanding them to set aside £200 of the property left by intestates who die without heirs, and hand it to the Rector of the Irish College for the support of the same. This document commemorates *the great number of students, sons of Irish gentlemen, the principal Catholics of the Kingdom of Ireland*, who, flying from the tyrannical persecution of the English, sought refuge here. He allowed a viaticum of £10 to every student when returning ordained to the Irish Mission.

We have now wandered long enough through those higher regions sacred to the tiara and the crown, admiring the charity and munificence we met with at every step; and as the most delicious food, if partaken of too often without change, becomes nauseous in the end, we shall now, for variety sake, come down by the back stairs to the lowly precincts of the kitchen: and here we find a humble individual, as deserving in his own sphere of a grateful corner in the annals of the Irish College of Seville, as the most exalted personage among them all. This was Juan Pobre, or John Poorman, a servant of the College, whose name was in strict keeping with the circumstances of his situation. John was a Galician, with a real Milesian heart, which could not only *feel* for the poor struggling exiled Irish youths, robbed by their persecutors at home in the Green Isle of the West, of almost all they possessed but the bright treasure of their faith, and deprived of all intercourse with their friends and relatives who might, perhaps, have made unheard-of sacrifices to supply them with the means they needed for the prosecution of those studies by which they were to prepare themselves for the life of prolonged martyrdom they were afterwards to lead amid the privations and dangers of their future ministry¹—a warm impulsive heart which could prompt him to *act*; and so he, one day, came and offered his services in the kitchen gratis, and besides put whatever little means he had

I quote, says this brief was for the *Extra Tempora*: see however memorial of Dr. Mathews in *Lives*, &c., p. 283, petitioning the Holy See for this privilege in 1623. See also concession granted in 1623, on petition of Dr. Thomas Fleming, *Lives*, &c., chap. x., p. 299. The revocation of the powers to give dimissorials on 10th April, 1835, was immediately notified to Dr. Gartlan, Rector of the Irish College, Salamanca, by Dr. Murray, Archbishop of Dublin.

¹ See *Persecution of the Irish Catholics; Memoir of Dr. Plunket; Lives of the Archbishops of Dublin*, by Right Rev. Dr. Moran.

managed to scrape together in the hands of the Rector for the use of the Community ; regarding it, no doubt, as a great privilege to be allowed to contribute in his own humble way to the conservation of the faith of a country once peopled from the shores of his own native Galicia. " Not content with his daily toil, he voluntarily undertook the collecting of offerings, and often placed in the Rector's hands considerable sums he procured from charitable people, and so doubled the merit of his service."

The cession of all the rights and property of the College made to the Society of Jesus by the students was very extensive and explicit : it was to the following effect :—" The students of the Irish College of Seville renounce, of their own free will, all the rights which belong to them as such students of said Seminary, as well on their own behalf, as of that of all others who may pretend to have a claim to such rights, by privilege of His Holiness, by authority of His Majesty, or by suits of law gained in any of the courts of the kingdoms of Spain, or beyond them ; and they yield and give them up to the free disposal of the Society of Jesus, and to its Rev. Father General, and to the Provincial for the time being of the province of Andalusia, who shall have liberty to appoint in said Seminary, a Rector of any nationality they wish, whether a Spaniard or other ; and they renounce the right they may have, or could have had, to the rents, legacies, alms, or other bequests, which may have been made at any time to said College ; and they renounce the constitutions and rules of said College they might have had in their favor, and all the goods of said College and its Church, and deliver all up to the Society of Jesus. And, finally, they now engage that never shall they, nor their successors, make any claim to them, nor pretend any right to said house and church, and if they ever should, their claim is to be regarded as null and void. For we, who at present form said College, deliver all to the said Society of Jesus, and we beseech the Father Provincial and the Rector of said College, and the superiors and rectors of the other houses of the said Society of Jesus, and all else whom it may concern, to regard this renunciation of ours as valid ; and we authorize the said Society to obtain from his Majesty letters patent to legalize this our renunciation."

This cession was afterwards probably the cause of some dissatisfaction among the students, who sometimes broke out in open rebellion against the authorities of the College. At the very beginning of the Jesuits' government, complaints were made of the strictness of the discipline, and we find an

ordained student on the point of being expelled ; but having submitted, and done penance, his fault was pardoned. On several subsequent occasions students were sent away for disobedience, and we are told the "Fathers had often, through the ungovernable disposition of some of our youths, many opportunities of meriting before God." In 1637, Father Thomas O'Brien was succeeded in the rectorship by Father Anthony de Quinteneduenas, who expelled three students, Michael Lynch, Mark Tully, and Bernard Daly. Father Richard Lynch, who had been Rector, and at the time held some other position in the house, says, in a note, of Mark Tully, that he was *expelled without fault, because it was thought necessary for the better government of the College*, which seems contradictory enough. This expulsion gave great dissatisfaction to the rest of the students ; and on the 26th of May they wrote to the Provincial complaining of the action of the Rector. The letter was signed by eighteen students, among whom were twelve priests. It appears the cook of the College soon after met Captain Pedro de Rivadeneyra, who was a great benefactor, and told him of the dissatisfaction of the students at the expulsion of their companions. He immediately came and offered the Rector twelve fanegas of wheat for the support of those expelled, besides the wine, wax, and altar-breads required for all the masses during the year, and oil for the lamp of the Blessed Sacrament. Through his and the Provincial's mediation the expelled students were re-admitted. This Rector seems to have been rather unfortunate in his measures, for soon after this, when he wanted to take down the *I.H.S. Ma.* which was over the door, and put in its place *I.H.S.* simply, the students opposed the change, alleging that the College was specially under the advocacy of the Blessed Virgin, and he had to yield. He was finally deprived of the office in September, and was succeeded by Father Alonso de Aguilar.

Up to 1738, the feast of our glorious patron St. Patrick, though always kept in the College, at least since 1620, was not celebrated with that publicity and pomp the Irish merchants of Seville desired. They had often complained that the College did not do our Saint enough public honour at its own cost, nor ask them to contribute to the expenses which might be incurred. These merchants were always great benefactors of the house, and ever took a deep interest in it ; so to please them in that year the Rector determined to celebrate the feast of our great Apostle with all the pomp the little church and his limited means would allow of. The Irish

merchants were all invited to the ceremony, and they came, with their wives and families, as also did the English College, and many Irish religious and secular priests who were here prosecuting their studies in the different Colleges of Seville. This reunion is said to have extinguished some enmities and disagreements which had existed among the merchants. High Mass was sung, a sermon suited to the occasion preached, and the day was wound up with a splendid banquet. Then the Irish gentlemen determined to celebrate the feast annually at their own cost, through two deputies appointed from their number, the second deputy of each year becoming the first of the year following; and they erected an altar and statue of St. Patrick, which occupied their old place in the collateral chapel on the epistle side. On another occasion these representatives of Irish commercial enterprise endowed six burses for Irish students in this College.

We now come to notice—concisely, indeed, but yet as extensively as is in our power—some of the rectors and students who deserve to be remembered particularly. Passing over Copleton, Carney, and Regan, we begin with

FATHER RICHARD CONWAY.

Father Conway was the first Rector of the College after the Jesuits took charge of it in 1619, for which purpose he was called from Castille. It was he drew up the reasons and motives which should induce the Society to undertake its government, and during his term of office he laboured hard to provide funds for the infant College. After completing his rectorship we find him in Madrid in 1624, in the capacity of Superintendent of the Irish Colleges in the Peninsula. At his request, Philip III. wrote a letter dated *St. Laurence* (the Escorial) 31st Oct., 1624, recommending the Irish students to the bishop of Zamora, as he had recommended them, he says, to the prelates of Seville and Jaen. We again find him Rector of the College of Seville in 1625. He died in December, 1726, and his memory was venerated in all the Irish Colleges, but particularly in this one of Seville.

Father Thomas O'Brien became Rector in 1631, and had previously been Rector of the Irish College of Salamanca. He drew up a document in answer to some questions of Don Francisco Salinas de Mercado, Canon of the Cathedral of Granada, in which he gave ample information about the officers, government, end, and objects of the College, which contributed largely to make it better known, and procured it many friends and patrons, so that when Father Juan de Cassarubios made

his visit in 1635, and audited the accounts, he found the state of the College very much improved. His term of office expired on the 17th March, 1637.¹ He left the College well provided with everything, the collegians decently clothed, and all the debts paid. In a memorial he drew up, he says:—"When I entered on office there were only sixteen students in the College, and I myself supported two of them. Since then I have had twenty, and even sometimes up to twenty-three and twenty-four, and had to support them, besides the members of the Society and the servants, even in these last two exceptionally scarce and dear years. After sending two some time ago to the Mission of Ireland, there are yet twenty-three students, all well and decently clad; and very little linen is wanting in the house, although I found none on my coming: nor were there even sheets, or bed, or mattress for myself; and even some of the priests had to go without a shirt! In my time there have been eight general theses, which were conducted to the entire satisfaction of our Fathers and others. I have sent ten students to Ireland, who are excellent labourers, and on their leaving I gave them clothes and a viaticum," &c. He again became rector in 1641, and died in 1645.

"Father Peter White was made rector in 1647. Up to this time the students wore in the house a soutane of blue cloth, with an overdress of brown cloth and a cap; outside they wore the soutane and a cape and hat, and on the left breast of the soutane a green, red, and white cross was worked. But Father White did away with the overdress in the house, and outside substituted a *beca* and cap for the cape and hat. It was in his time the first Spanish pensioners were received, or, at least, in the year 1651, in which his term of office expired. He left his memory fresh by a supply of chalices and other necessaries for the altar. He died on the 8th July, 1678, in Xerex de la Frontera. Father Thomas de Leon (Lyons), in a letter he wrote from Granada, testifies that 'Father White was a native of Waterford, a very Catholic city of Ireland; that he was son of noble Catholic parents of great importance; that he was a near relative of Andrew Wise, Grand Prior of Capua, of the order of St. John of Malta, and of the Most Rev. Thomas Walshe, Archbishop of Cashel, and was well known for his splendid qualities throughout Europe.' The apostolical Father Thomas White, the celebrated founder of nearly all our Irish Colleges in the Peninsula, was uncle to

¹ There are some few instances of long terms of office, particularly when the rector was an Irishman and successful in his administration, but the generality is from year to year.

Father Peter, who was reared by him in his youth, and sent to the College of Santiago, in Galicia. When he conceived the desire of entering the Society, he was sent to the College of Seville, where his virtues and talents procured for him the fulfilment of his wishes, and he passed his noviciate with the complete approbation of his superiors. He studied philosophy in the College of St. Hermenagild, and theology in Granada, having previously studied rhetoric in Guadix and other Colleges. He then went to Madrid as superintendent of the Irish Colleges, which office he discharged with ample success. He had great influence in Madrid with people of high station, who from a sense of his virtue and prudence, made him their confessor. From Madrid he went to Seville as rector. During his term of office Seville was visited by a great plague, which committed awful ravages in the town, and carried off five of the Irish students. Thomas Luttrell, a priest, and first year's theologian, voluntarily dedicated himself to those in the town afflicted with the plague, to whom he assiduously administered the sacraments, till he himself fell a victim to his heroic charity, and passed to a better world to receive his reward. In this year Father White and the collegians made the vow *pro collegio*, as they had previously done individually, before the Blessed Sacrament and the image of the Blessed Virgin, 'to defend with their blood and life (if necessary) the sovereign mystery of the pure and Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, tutelar and titular patroness of this her own College.'¹ On the same occasion they also made a vow of fasting during life on the eve of the feast of the Immaculate Conception of our Blessed Lady. Father White's first term of office ended in 1651, and in 1655 he again became rector, on the death of Father William Molony, on the 13th August, at the age of seventy-two years. He was a native of Dublin, and had been in the Society fifty-two years, and thirty-two from the profession of four vows. In 1659 Father White translated from Latin to Spanish, and published a pamphlet written by the Right Rev. Nicholas French, Bishop of Ferns, and called a *Protest and Supplication by the Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland, addressed to Cardinal Julio Mazerin, and his Excellency Don Louis Mendez de Haro y Sotomayor, Count-Duke of Olivares, Plenipotentiaries of their Catholic and Most Christian Majesties in Irun, for the Settlement of Peace between Spain and France*; which

¹ At one time the *College de las Becas* disputed the right of the Irish College to the title "of the Immaculate Conception," but the Irish students successfully defended the point.

was probably the occasion of bringing in some good offerings, in the year 1661, when the College was deeply in debt, and reduced to such straits that the students had to go without breakfast the greater part of the year. His second term of office expired on 7th September, 1666, and he was succeeded by Father Ignatius Lombard."¹

"Father Thomas Butler was appointed rector in 1673. He was a man of great energy, and he left no stone unturned to forward the interests of the College. He is the author of a long memorial drawn up to make the world better acquainted with its object and means. He describes the persecution the Catholics suffered from their heretical rulers; the necessity of supporting these Colleges, as all assistance from home was interdicted to the students by the laws of England; and how, on the completion of their studies, they had to return to their native country in disguise, to avoid being apprehended, &c., &c. In 1685 Father Butler, with anxious zeal for the welfare, not only of this, but of the other Irish Colleges, wrote to the General, Charles de Nogette, representing the necessity of appointing a permanent Procurator-General in Madrid for all the Colleges. His request was granted on the 29th March, as we find from another letter of Father Butler's." His term of office expired in June, 1687, but I have been unable to discover any particulars of his after life or the date of his death.

We come now to some students of note this College has produced; and taking them chronologically, we first meet with:—

"John Bathe.—He entered the College in the year 1630, and in 1638 left it for the Irish mission, where he fought the good fight for many years, like a valiant soldier of the Society in which he had enlisted, till he was hanged for the faith in Pontana (Drogheda), on the 16th August, 1649."

"Cornelius Carthy.—In May, 1652, Cornelius Carthy obtained the glorious crown of martyrdom. He was a native of the diocese of Ardfert. He entered the College in 1634, and left for the Irish mission in 1642. Labouring apostolically in Ireland, refuting the heretics and administering the holy sacraments, he was apprehended as a Catholic priest and defender

¹ The Father Thomas de Leon, mentioned above, is himself commemorated in the following terms, in the year 1628:—"Since 1625 Father Thomas de Leon was a pensioner in this College, a man well known in the literary world for his erudition and wisdom. Up to 1627 he studied grammar and rhetoric, and at fourteen years of age he left this College of his native country for our Noviciate of St. Louis; and he afterwards shed great lustre not only on this College and province, but on the whole Society of Jesus."

of the faith, and hanged by John Hersens, the heretical governor of the duchy of Kerry, in the 44th year of his age." His name appears among the priests who wrote to the Provincial protesting against the expulsion of the students in 1637.

"James Cusac entered the College in 1638. He defended conclusions in philosophy on 3rd April, 1642. He went to Madrid in the beginning of 1648, and returned in November, when he received his viaticum (£10) for his journey to Ireland, whither he went by Alcala. But he was there detained, and made professor of first year's rhetoric and arts, in the recently-established Irish College of that town, and gave general satisfaction in the discharge of his duties. He afterwards governed the College for some time, and then went to Ireland, where he gloriously laboured, employing his great talents of prudence, virtue, and learning in the cultivation of that vineyard."

James Lynch.—"James Lynch entered the College in 1651, and in 1653, as he had become delicate, he left by the doctor's advice, and returned to Ireland. The College gave him over £3 as a viaticum for his journey. When still very young he was consecrated Archbishop of Tuam, where, after some time, he was taken prisoner, and exiled for the Catholic Faith. He came to Spain in 1675, and received a pension from the king. He officiated pontifically in the diocese of Cuenca for the Right Rev. Fran. de Zarate (who was sick) till 1679, when, on the death of that bishop, he retired to Madrid. In the beginning of 1680 he came from Madrid to Seville, to the consecration of the Bishop of Bona, Father Fran. Omonte, Mercinarian, which took place on the Sunday within the octave of the Ascension, and on Pentecost Sunday he consecrated the Archbishop of Caller, Father Nicholas Bengara, Dominican. On the 5th of June he said Mass and dined in his old College, whose poor walls he patted and kissed with the greatest affection and devotion. He afterwards officiated pontifically in the archdiocese of Seville for some time. In 1682, his nephew, John Lynch, on account of his uncle being then officiating in Seville, came from Lisbon already ordained, and entered the Irish College to complete his theology."

"Edmund Murphy studied philosophy, and stood a general public thesis in it in the College of Santiago, and first year's theology in some other College of Seville. He was received as a collegian of the Irish house on 20th of November 1672; and in 1674 he completed his studies, and defended, conclusions of theology with great credit, giving evident

proofs of his wonderful talent. He took the degree of doctor in the University of Seville, and was approved as confessor in that archdiocese. He laboured gloriously in Ireland, and was confessor to his Serene Majesty James II. He died in Kilkenny on the 19th January, 1705."

"Edmund Byrne was admitted as student in 1674. In 1681 he finished his studies and defended general conclusions in philosophy and theology. He gave ample proofs during his course of great talents, sound judgment, and extensive acquirements. Having laboured gloriously for many years in Ireland, he was consecrated Archbishop of Dublin in the year 1707. He appears to have died on the 27th December, 1723, at the age of 69 years."

"Luke Fagan was received, already ordained, on the 15th October, 1682. In June, 1689, he left for the Irish mission. He was approved of as confessor in the Archdiocese of Seville, with great credit to his extensive acquirements and his prudence. These merited for him in Ireland, where he displayed great zeal in defence of the Catholic faith, first, the mitre of Meath, and afterwards of the Archbishopric of Dublin."

"On the 10th of August, 1737, were received Patrick Fitzsimons, and his relative and namesake. The latter had been in the English College, Seville, and is now (about 1760-7) Vicar-General of the Archdiocese of Dublin. In a letter to the Rector, Father James Roe, he says: 'James Gennet, Daniel Nolan, Eugene M'Parland, Bernabe Feran, Christopher Bermingham, and Sylvester Doyle, all children and collegians of that holy house, are labouring at present in this vineyard, either here in the city or its neighbourhood.'"

The readers of the RECORD have now, I think, all the information it is at the present day, or at least from the documents within my reach, possible to give them. The history of the foundation and vicissitudes of the other Irish Colleges of Spain, would, I dare say, be full of interest to Irish readers, but I am afraid the documents throwing light on it are not, in every case, in such a good state of preservation as those of Seville. However, I have not examined them satisfactorily or exhaustively yet, and more light than I imagine may be hid under the dust of years.

WM. M'D.

DR. JOHN RIDER,
PROTESTANT BISHOP OF KILLALOE (FROM 1612 TO 1632),
ONE OF THE ENGLISH IN IRELAND.

DR. RIDER was a native of Wigan, a Master of Arts of Oxford, Parish Minister of Bermondsey, compiler of a poor Latin Dictionary, Rector of the rich Church of Winwick, Dean of St. Patrick's, writer of some controversial books, Arch-deacon of Meath, and "Bishop of Killaloe"—

"A ravenous pastor of the British breed,
Who came to fleece the flock and not to feed."¹

This is the sum of what is found in "Ware's Bishops," and Mason's "History of St. Patrick's," to which we have taken the liberty of tacking on an elegant extract from Rider's most celebrated successor, Dean Swift. We now subjoin some interesting and edifying details from the vigorous pen of FitzSimon.

"Rider begs 'all the priests and Jesuits in the country to tell me that he would not digest my omissions to answer his objections.' I have answered them abundantly and so little to his appetite, that I warrant you he had rather swallow down his old sustenance, the gruel of Wigan, newly from the fire, than have his stomach charged therewith. For were he an ostrich that could digest iron and steel, yet the matter now requested to his digestion is made such an ingredient or drug, so vehemently working on the stomach, that it will burst his midriff and burn his bowels if it be not instantly quit. by purge or surfeit."²

"He falsely boasts that he 'has sifted my answer and proved it to be bran.' This saying is in part borrowed and in part natural. It is borrowed from Martin Mar-Prelate. It is natural, as Rider's father was a miller and himself a baker."³

"You call crosses and Agnus Deis 'trash;' more beseeeming had it been for you all your life in Wigan to have patched old 'trashes,' as they call slippers, than to blaspheme such godly things, which the ancient belief of Christians had in such veneration. Alas! by such men the cross is in Ireland hanged in derision, trampled under foot in disdain, scornfully broken and sacrilegiously burned—O cæcas hæreticorum mentes!"⁴

"Now mark how illogical Mr. Rider is! From this argument of his it would follow, that because a son cannot despise his mother he may marry her! Who would not pity Rider's

¹ See Sketch of Father FitzSimon, RECORD of October, 1872.

² "Replie," p. 38. ³ "Replie," p. 23. ⁴ FitzSimon on the "Masse."

father if he had been at any charges (as he was not able) for his son's bringing up."¹

"His master at Oxford, Sabinus Chamber, who is at this time my dear brother, doth testify to Rider's foul imbecility:—

"Mr. John Rider came to me to Oxford about the beginning of Lent, as I remember, in the year 1581, recommended by my aunt, by whom he was then maintained. He remained there till the Act, which is celebrated always in summer, ordinarily after the 14th of July. In one and the same year he passed Bachelor and Master of Arts, by means of I know not what juggling and perjury. I never had any scholar more indocile and unskilful. Before his answering I must have instructed him in all that I would oppose, and yet the next day he was never the wiser. The kind offices that my aunt and I did him, if he deny, he must be profoundly impudent.

"This I testify under my hand, at Luxemburg, this 24th of December, 1604."²

"Mr. Chamber has told me that although he took, in New Park, great pains with him, at the request of two of his own aunts by whom he was relieved, yet he never could make entrance for Rider's head into philosophy, nor for philosophy into his head.

"This aforesaid gentleman is at this hour in place and account of great trust, who, to be better believed, has added this secret token, that Rider, contrary to the laws of the University, proceeded Master in the self-same year of his Bachelorship, not without perjury in his witnesses."³

"Oh, rich Deanery of St. Patrick, how wouldst thou groan if thou didst feel the heft of the divinity of thy Dean!

"No wonder, then, he never minds my arguments, but is, like the cuckoo, always repeating the same song over and over again. And for all his repetitions I must say to him, as a gentleman said to a piper that eftsoons reiterated the same tune, he having once given him fourpence—'Friend, vary thy note, if thou wilt have me increase my grote.'⁴

"However, when he does vary, he does so with a vengeance. As weak bed-ridden people never remain quiet, but turn from side to side, seeking repose, he diverteth from matter to matter, to depester and quiet his diseased and crazed cause and conscience, never remaining on the point in controversy.⁵ If our late queen, Elizabeth, industrious in giving names, termed an abrupt jumping dance 'frog-gaillard,' how would she have named Rider's reasoning?

"Against men of that stamp it is idle to write, and espe-

¹ "Confutation," p. 331.

² "Replie," p. 10.

³ "Confutation."

⁴ "Replie," p. 23.

⁵ "Confutation," p. 215.

cially for me, as few could be better employed than I, and few are more desirous to be well employed. The Psillians tormented by south winds took arms against them—such was my folly when I encountered a bag-pipe and a sack of wind not the sweetest. Not merely does he not follow my arguments, but he does not attend to my assertions, and attributes to me opinions which I hold not, and then runs after falsehood in me as a cat runs after his own tail. O Muses, what stepmothers you have been to Mr. Rider!

“To all his railing at me I only say, as Titus Tacitus said to Metellus:—‘It is easy to reproach me, whereas I am not to reply. You have learned to revile; I, having testimony from my conscience, have learned to condemn your railing, and as you are lord of your tongue, so am I of my ears.’¹ He reproaches me with being ‘brought up in the brazen-faced colleges of the Jesuits, etc.’ This is spoken by a man, either brought up in Brazen-nose College of Oxford, wherein his countrymen are only trained; or, at least, which to all men is known, if not often brought up, thrust down in the iron-faced *counters* of London, for debts and cheating. What think you, would not another beside a Jesuit, having such evident advantages over him, interchange some quips with him? But one brought up in the Jesuits’ Colleges, wherein the greatest number of princes in Christendom is brought up, cannot esteem a minister lately, beside all other infamies, by public court condemned for a simoniacal cozener, in selling one and the same benefice, as Beza did his priory, to two or three different persons, to be an equal copesmate for him to contend with for bringing up.”²

“In spite of his training at Brazen-nose, he translates *quae lingua*, “which tongue,” as “whose tongues;” and what a learned reader and dictionary maker we have in him, who was not able to find out the word Transubstantiation in John Huss! He meddles in grammar, and talks of the active and passive voice. Unfortunately this active and passive gloss is produced by him against himself, claiming to have him by all Protestants careful of their honour, sued to be a *deponent*.³

“Mr. Rider often bids us read these and those in Greek; gentle reader, for ostentation he biddeth us to do what he cannot do himself. For in my particular knowledge and experience, a blind man hath as much sight in his eyes as he hath good Greek in his head.⁴ I told you, Mr. Rider, that you would carry your empty pitcher so oft to the Greek stream

¹ Valer. Max. l. 7.

² “Replie.”

³ “Confutation,” pp. 173, 174.

⁴ “Confutation,” p. 81.

that it would come home broken. What! did Christ speak Greek? In what Greeking will all scholars think your head to have been?

"I have three causes not to justify our Latin translation compared with the Greek against Mr. Rider. The first is, that there is not a more naked linguist in the country, or more unfit proctor for the Greek tongue, as is shown by his ignorant meddling in such matters. It was his chance during my being in prison, in the presence of Alderman Janns, the Constable, and others, to have presented a trial of his skill in Greek about the words of the Angel to our Blessed Ladie. I confess that my study was much more in other matters than in the Greek tongue; yet, as the above-named are witnesses, I found Mr. Rider not only tripping in Greek, but mute from ever after mentioning Greek in my presence.¹

"What needeth this moth to intermeddle with the candle of learning, whereby his wings are so often scorched?² By God's good providence he has been reprobated to confusion in all matter and sciences whereof he hath made any mention. Of his ignorance in Scripture, in the Fathers, in History, in Orthography, in Greek, in French, in Latin, in English, and now in spelling, against my will, he would needs convict himself ignorant. He writes '*scilence*,' '*scholler*,' which never scholar would have done; also '*circumscision*,' and '*Lattin*.' But of his palpable ignorance in Latin hereafter.³

"Doth Mr. Rider understand any hard Latin? Of his skill in Greek, whereby he affirmed Christ to have spoken Greek, as if Greek and Hebrew were all one, as his knowledge in them both is all one, we have already treated. His skill also in Scriptures, Councils, Ancient Fathers, Scholastics, Histories, Grammar, and Orthography is not obscurely notified. At least, he that glories in his grammarian labours, he that made the Latin Dictionary, into which he introduced nothing new but ridiculous words—is he ignorant of Latin? This figurative Latin locution is beyond your capacity. Before you betake yourself to new grammarian labours and dictionary inventions, learn to understand a plain Latin metaphor, that your denials thereof, because it is not in plain dunstable terms, be not reputed, if not profoundly impudent, yet profoundly ignorant. In your first sermon in Dublin you five times accented as long the short '*i*' of *sculptile*, and you said *templum Fanum* instead of *templum Fani*. Whereupon the Lord Chancellor rebuked your audacious temerity in meddling in that papistical language. Why then would you wade further in so unfortunate a ford, wherein

¹ "Confutation," p. 186. ² "Confutation," p. 211. ³ "Confutation," p. 311.

you had been so publicly overplunged? But as by your name Rider, you are a cavaliero and adventurous, I will instruct yourself, and others (who perhaps will be therefor more thankful) of some few as great slips and trips of ignorance in Latin, testified in this your discourse, as would wrest shame out of impudence itself." Here FitzSimon gives half a dozen slips, and refers to others noticed previously, and then says he deals favourably "in not riding Mr. Rider more vehemently on this point."¹

"One that fails to be a physician might perchance not be an ignorant musician, or, not being a gardener, might yet be a horse-courser. So in degrees of learning, he that cannot write might yet, perhaps, indite well; he that is no rhetorician might yet be a grammarian; he that is no poet might yet be a linguist; he that is no divine might yet be antiquarist or chronicler. But to fail in all degrees and sciences, without knowing any one faculty soundly, and yet to profess a general skill universally, and to possess such a Deanery entirely, sheweth the Muses to be stepmothers to his constitution, himself to have lost great time in following some other more convenient profession, and Church livings to have run clean out of their wonted channel—as soon to a dunce as a doctor."²

"Mr. Rider complains that my preface is biting. Yes, so every breath is to a scabbed head, and touch to a boil. He taketh upon himself to talk doctrinally on the Sacrifice of the Mass, but is ignorant therein, and in God's book and sound divinitie. Not knowing so much as the first priesthood, his reading must have been careless or none at all. The name of priest is no more proper to him than to every believing Christian; yet he wresteth from his Deanery, as being a priest, as I have been credibly informed, seventeen hundred of corn to which he is no more entitled than others. The name of minister he may wear, as, when without addition, it is taken in evil part in the Bible."

Having given a sketch of Rider's education, FitzSimon enters into some details regarding his faith and morals, from which it would appear—

"That his religion it was fit
To match his learning and his wit;
'Twas Presbyterian true blue,
For he was of that stubborn crew. . . .
Who prove their doctrine orthodox
By apostolic blows and knocks;
Compound for sins they are inclined to
By damning those they have no mind to."

That these words of Hudibras were true of Rider we have seen already, and we shall perceive it more clearly.

¹ "Confutation," p. 368.

² "Confutation," p. 96.

from the following elegant extracts. If we perchance should not mark the page from which we have copied, we beg the reader to attribute it to the hurry of short, furtive visits to St. Patrick's Library. FitzSimon writes :—

“How do you like, Mr. Rider, this dislike of St. Jerome and Tertullian towards your women's scripturing? But plead well for them, and make much of them; for, in my own knowledge, you have need to seek credit among them, considering that few or none of them, how base soever, but disdain marriage with the ministers of the word, and accept of them only for want of others.¹

“Mr. Rider is specially troubled that a word by me was miswritten *bless* for *break*, and he exclaims at it as at the most wicked infidelity in the world. Now this very word *bless* he delivers *Bess*, as if he were thinking of some sister in the Lord of that name. I say nothing else thereto, but that your Fidd (for so you are wont to name Fidworth, your wife) might enjoy your mind also from all Besses and business that your bonds and brains cannot brook, and consequently contain your homeliness in homely matters, without engaging them in school points; wherein, even by your physiognomy, you are denied to have any interest.

“He often tells us he is a man *sine fuco et fraude*; yet the London Counter Prison often embraced him, the Dublin Senate House, or Tholsel, denounced him as a Sir; and now lastly, for like *fuco et fraude*, as Beza used in selling his benefices to divers, and for such enormities he is deposed from his ample Deanery of St. Patrick's, and is also likely in time to pass from holding a Provostry to be holden in a Provostry.²

“He promises and threatens to prove many things in print. But he will perform these promises in his printed books, when he performeth other promises in merchants' books, the frustration whereof in London was otherwise *encountered* than in Dublin. If he performed his promises, many a merchant would be rejoiced, and many a long expectation satisfied.³

“He is a plain Puritan, and yet will take to himself the name of Protestant—imitating the nature of the Polypus, a fish which borroweth the colour of whatsoever it sticketh to, whereby not being mistrusted it deceiveth, and receiveth all prey passing by. Being ‘a man of all times and professions,’ ‘*omnium horarum homo*,’ he will lose nothing within his reach, though he should change his shape and name from Puritan to State Protestant, and back again. Now he is, as the new phrase of soldiers beareth, *reformed* from the Protestants among the Puritans.⁴

“I confess myself to be sometimes offended with our learned

¹“Confutation,” 269. ²“Replie,” 71. ³“Confutation,” 243. ⁴“Confutation,” 302.

controversialists, because they suffer the adversaries, without any right, to harp upon every mention of the *spiritual* being of Christ in the Blessed Eucharist as being favourable to them; whereas indeed their doctrine is *carnal*, not only by gross and pharisaical conceiving of the word *corporal*, but also by not enduring the word *spiritual* to belong to that mystery—which hitherto few seem to have duly observed, and of which these two proofs may serve for a taste. . . . The *spiritual* Mr. Rider thinks he has as good a right to all testimonies containing the word *spiritually*, although otherwise they be most repugnant to him, as to *all tithes and fruits of his Deanery* bequeathed for purposes altogether opposite to his wonted offices of *spirituality*, as if he fulfilled them. As often as he hath denied, or shall deny the Fathers to be of our opinion, which happeneth in most of his discourses and sermons, and in all his books, so often he hath been and will be to himself such a disprover as Daniel was to the discordant judges.

“This tender-hearted gentleman, for so he is now lately by God’s permission and good St. Patrick, is shaking and quaking to deliver doctrine by us, as he saith, printed, but indeed only by himself forged. To term this an untruth is more courteous, and expresseth sufficiently the matter. He wrote against the Cross when he was a Puritan; now, perhaps, he dares not christen without it. In the meantime, in his great wisdom he hath made to Protestants and Catholics many points known, which had been more to his behoof unrevealed.

“Can he seem to any men worthy to be held a lawful preacher or faithful witness (when so many his betters are in great extremity), who hath yearly above 1500 raziers or combs of corn, besides other commodities in such a choice Deanery? Mr. Rider testifies that a certain author denies the Real Presence. He no more denies the matter than if one should confess you to have the rich Deanery of St. Patrick’s; and muse by what means, whether by assured simony, or unknown desert, or blind choice you came thereto—whereof, God willing, I will treat in the Explication of the Mass.

“You boast that you have proved my answer to be bran. A speech in season, ‘tractat fabrilia faber!’ Being a baker, it is a pity you changed white for black. However, as a second Melancthon, you have again forsaken your book to be a baker; but as you have so many barrels of corn, without any more function, as you say, than any believing Christian, should be commanded to sell double size to that of the poor Dublinian bakers, who buy their corn in the market and must bear cess and press, watch and ward, &c.¹ You make an apostrophe to the city of Dublin. Dublin knows you too well,

¹ “Replie,” 23.

and few of your sort better, not only for your former hindrance of the bakers therein, but also for your transferring their trade of merchandize into your house and liberties among your own sons-in-law—they being foreigners and very fleshworms in Dublin; such as neither cess nor press, watch nor ward, toll nor custom, and in the meantime suck the juice of the city into their private purses under the warmth of your wings (to use your own phrase) and under the protection of your liberties.¹

“Since you have appealed to Eusebius, to him you shall go. I will once again, as the proverb says, exalt the baker to the pillory, and make no other than the witness by him alleged to nail his ears Your conclusion is, then, that treason is committed by injury to the pictures and persons alike. Then woe and well away to all your brethren image-breakers. Then woe and well away to Waller the murderer, under-minister of Swords, who, in the year 1603, hanged on a gibbet the image of Christ crucified. Then woe and well away to Mr. Rider, who, only to have stones to build an oven to bake bread (to impoverish the bakers of the city, not having idly or without price seventeen hundred barrels of corn yearly, as he hath), pulled down the fair Cross in St. Patrick’s, which all others his predecessors of that profession had permitted unviolated; and to the same use to have fire, pulled down all the trees therein. This sentence of his, given against himself and brethren, made his own son, in May, 1604, when he attempted to pull down an image, to be by God’s judgment precipitated from a height and altogether crushed, and at the same time caused his servant to be stricken with the plague.²

“The keeping away of certain books from the Faithful is, you say, our ‘strongest tenure.’ First I answer, the phrase of ‘tenure,’ in that sense wherein it seemeth intended, is new and improper. However it bringeth to my memory, how you, reprehending minister Hicoxe for keeping a trull, and he you for you know what, you called him *base* and he called you *counter*. Whereunto if you conjoin your word ‘tenure,’ it may be forgotten how close the counter in London and you were married together; and divers will or may think by such conjunction thereof with ‘tenure,’ that his meaning was only that you sang a counter in London, and in Dublin reached to a tenure; and that your meaning was only that he sang a base and never could reach higher. I also observe among yourselves that you debar several books of ours from reading; rifling men’s houses for them, and forfeiting all them you find as lords over all men’s goods.³

¹ “Confutation,” 286. ² “Confutation,” pp. 210, 370.

³ “Confutation,” p. 270.

“Mr. Rider, by you, and such as you, the churches have been turned into stables, the vestments to cushions and breeches, the chalices to swilling bowls, churchmen have been pursued, and thousands of religious houses have been profaned and burned. Yet you, Mr. Rider, quote St. Bernard against the Catholic priests, though all he says belongs to your last attire, wherein I did behold you, when you came forth in your short cloak and cassock, ungirded and lifted before on both sides, to present in sight a great trunk pair of French russet, or dawk purple velvet breeches. And at other times when you glisten and rustle in your satin gown, faced with velvet, in your silks and in your pontificalibus, upon my conscience, among all the Princes of blood of the clergy whom I viewed in Rome or elsewhere, I did behold none so player-like, or whose altars were so far less bright than their spurs, as yours and your own self.¹

“This Mr. Rider was pronounced infamous by the voice of the public crier, from a Wigan miller turning Oxford student, by perjury he became an abortive little master. This bad grammarian and worse vocabulary-maker, this convicted simoniac turned master of the word; the notorious impostor, who was often imprisoned as well in England as in Ireland; the spendthrift become Dean; the quarrelsome rake metamorphosed into a bishop. Such is the wood from which these Mercuries and minister-bishops are made.”²

FitzSimon hits hard. There is an aroma of the Elizabethan era in his words. What a character he gives of Rider, who was mitred soon after FitzSimon had rubbed shame on his face! He was not as bad as his contemporaries Bishop Tod, or Bishop Atherton of Waterford, who was hanged for an abominable crime, or as the founders of the Elizabethan Church, who, says the Protestant Dr. Littledale, “were such *utterly unredeemed villains* for the most part, that to compare them to the Jacobin leaders would be somewhat unjust to Robespierre, Danton, and Marat.”³

As to the Dean’s veracity we find the following assertions in FitzSimon:—

“His words are continually true, like dreams, contrariously, for, upon my credit, St. Chrysostom hath neither any such homily nor any such doctrine. Behold how contrarious to all Christianity, yet how courageous he is! My good sir, afford us some citation of such our doctrine, according to your promise to allege book, leaf, etc., or else we will think that we may lawfully say you *ride*, so great an itching vexeth you to

¹ “Confutation.”

² “Britannomachia.”

³ “This conviction,” says Dr. Littledale, “has been built up in me by years of careful reading.”—Dr. Littledale’s Letter to the *Guardian*, May 20, 1868.

corrupt and deprave. You only want to delude, and only for purchasing of time during your not being confuted, you audaciously affirm what all Christians, as well Catholics as Protestants, do deny, and you deny what they affirm, you being in fact disabled by the State for your enorme ignorance.

“In your *Claim to Antiquitie* you have been guilty of at least two hundred and eight lewd, loud, and palpable untruths, which I have pointed out and confuted. All your untruths tend to one capital untruth, and thus all your allegations are converted into a main sea of one falsehood. Spit out, man, and let truth have once a clean seat in your mouth.¹ ‘*Contradict not the truth by any means, and of the lie of thy unlearnedness be confounded.*’—(Eccl. 7.)

“Lying is intrinsic to your profession. I know not what this assertion of yours is, if it be not to *ride* as fast as your tilt can gallop, and that you may not ride alone, Luther has sent this sentence as a footboy to accompany you: ‘He that once lieth is in all things to be suspected.’

“If denials were disproofs, if the dissembling of our arguments were the dissolving of them, if hypocritical protestations be allowed for lawful pleadings, our cause will lose its process. Your hundred and thirteenth untruth is, that there is scarcely a line in the seven chapters of such book of St. Athanasius but containeth a lie. I remember one Mistress Kirie, an Englishwoman, who dwelled in St. Thomas-street in Dublin, in 1580, to have been replied to by a poor begging woman who had craved her alms for the sake of God and our Ladie; when Mistress Kirie said she would give nothing for our Ladie, because she was better than she herself. ‘Mischief,’ said the beggar, ‘take the worse of you both.’ The same might be said of the most lying lines in your book, and the one here specified. You have gotten the habit or facility and perfection of falsifying, that now it is ingrafted in you as a second natural inclination.²

“In whom is the lie here? Mr. Rider dareth not say it is in Theodoret. He can bestow it nowhere so well as on his own lips, where it is in a proper freehold and habitation of inheritance. There it is as in the most impregnable sconce, out of which truth is banished and hath lost all jurisdiction. Of which sconce the teeth are the walls, the lips the rampart, the beard the trenches. There it is as a cock crowing on its own dunghill, whom as the lion, king of the beasts, cannot terrify, so is falsehood in that mouth, teeth, lips, beard and dunghill not surmountable by veritie. My cavaliero has a resolution to trample all truth under foot, like the Protesfant,

¹ “Confutation,” 355.

² “Confutation,” 380.

who not long since, being admonished of his unmeasurable lies, said, 'I will do all the damage I can; the lies will lie as long as they may, but they will avail among the people.' Mr. Rider's base affirmations have long cracked their credit. His flying Pegasus, namely, his deceitfulness, enables him to jump over all. Unless we take as sufficient proof your faith, truth, and honesty, which many merchants would refuse to take for their silliest wares, unless we take your attestation that your dreams are documents of Scripture, we cannot swallow this.

"Anaxagoras is reprehended by all men, as contrary to sense he affirmed snow to be black as ink. Have we not found an heir to him who can face out black to be white—that is, reproof to be approbations, denials affirmations, old to be young, falsehood to be truth, darkness to be light, substance to be figure, preaching to be communion, the Old Testament to be as fruitful as the New, the primitive Church and Fathers to have been late sectaries, Catholic to be heretical, etc. I bequeath then as in my testament to posterity, that hereafter, when men desire to specify people of such resolution as Anaxagoras and his said successor, they bestow on them for a perpetual memorial of such ancestors, not that they are impudent, contentious, frantic depravers, desperate falsifiers, corrupters against all palpable truth, but only that they *ride* or are Riders.¹

"Behold now the forehead of Mr. Rider, and think in equity whether impudence enjoyed ever a more ordinary tabernacle to seat and plant itself therein. Contrary to his declaration, worthy to wrest blushing out of a flint, Cajetan says . . . This is a loud and lewd fifty-first untruth of Mr. Rider. Upon my conscience and honesty, if I could, I would follow him only by mildest method and modestest manner; but his inveterated and reiterated falsifications and blasphemies by no Christian mind might be less vigorously pursued than is done by me. Who could in any piety or peaceable disposition say or do less to his blasphemy than to apply to it the words of St. Cyril . . . but at the following words, Christians, stop your ears:—'O pestiferous Puritancie! could not St. Paul bridle you from *riding* against his express testimony?' But of this elsewhere, when I shall prove Mr. Rider a profound Puritan.² I was resolved to be courteous to him, if by reason of the craggy knots of my work I were not forced, against my will, from my planer to my axe.³

¹ "Confutation," page 95. ² "Confutation." ³ Introduction to "Confutation."

DOCUMENTS.

I.—*Sanctissimi Domini nostri Pii, divina providentia Papae IX., Allocutio habita die XXIII Decembris MDCCLXXII. ad S. R. E. Cardinales in aedibus Vaticanis.*

VENERABILES FRATRES,

Iustus et misericors Deus, cuius inscrutabilia iudicia et investigabiles viae sunt, sinit adhuc Apostolicam hanc Sedem totamque cum ipsa Ecclesiam ingemiscere divexatam diuturna saevaque insectatione. Non immutata sane est, sed praegravata quotidie magis conditio Nobis vobisque facta, Venerabiles Fratres, ab occupatione Nostrarum provinciarum, et potissimum postquam ab annis iam plus duobus haec alma urbs Nostra subtracta fuit paterno regimini Nostro. Iugis autem experientia docuit, quam merito ab ipsis huius insectationis exordiis, impiarum sectarum machinatione promotae et ab earumdem alumnis rerum summa potitis patratae ac provectae, saepe in Allocutionibus Litterisque Nostris Apostolicis asseruerimus aperte, non alia de causa suprema civilis Nostri Principatus iura tanto nisu fuisse impetita, nisi ut ita via sterneretur ad abolendum, si fieri posset, spiritualem Principatum, quo fulgent Petri successores, delendamque catholicam Ecclesiam ipsumque Christi nomen in illa viventis et regnantis. Clarissime quidem id passim ostensum est ab infensis subalpini Gubernii gestis; sed in primis ab iniquis illis legibus, quibus vel clerici ab altaribus divulsi suaque privati immunitate ad militiam vocati sunt, vel Episcopi proprio destituti fuerunt iuventutis instituendae munere suisque alicubi seminariis orbat; tamen lucidior adhuc eiusdem consilii demonstratio nunc Nobis exhibetur. Et sane; in hac ipsa urbe exturbatis ob oculos Nostros, aut etiam violenter depulsis e propria sede compluribus religiosis familiis, bonisque Ecclesiae gravissimo subiectis tributo, nutuique mancipatis civilis potestatis; iam nunc Coetui, ut aiunt, legislativo proposita fuit lex illi non absimilis, quae, non obstantibus Nostris denunciationibus et gravissimis condemnationibus, exequutioni in reliquis Italiae partibus gradatim demandata, in hoc etiam catholicae fidei centro religiosas familias extinguere debeat, bonaque Ecclesiae addicere fisco et publicae obicere licitationi. Porro lex ista, si tamen legis nomine scitum honestare licet ipsi naturali, divino et sociali iuri repugnans, multo iniquior et funestior Romae et circumpositis obtingit provinciis. Profundius enim et acrius iura vulnerat et possessiones universalis Ecclesiae, fonti ipsi insidiatur veri cultus socialis, quem religiosae familiae immani labore parique constantia et magnanimitate non in

regionibus tantum nostris promoverunt et perfecerunt, sed ad exterarum quoque gentes et efferatas, posthabitis difficultatibus, molestiis, aerumnis ipsaque vita, attulerunt et porro afferunt; ac demum proprius refragatur apostolatus Nostri debito et iuri.

Siquidem, deletis Religiosis Familiis aut exinanitis, cleroque saeculari ad inopiam redacto et militaris conscriptionis causa rarescente, non solum hic, ut alibi, desiderabuntur qui panem verbi populo frangant, qui fidelibus sacramenta ministrent, qui adolescentiam instituunt et muniant adversus innumeras insidias ei quotidie structas; sed Romano quoque Pontifici subducuntur auxilia quibus, uti universalis Magister et Pastor, ad totius Ecclesiae regimen tantopere indiget: spoliatio vero Romanae Ecclesiae ea occupabit bona, quae plusquam a nostrorum donationibus, ab omnium catholicorum largitate congesta fuerunt et in hoc unitatis centro constituta; atque ita quae Ecclesiae universalis usui et incrementis fuerant addicta, in extraneorum lucrum impie convertentur. Vix itaque didicimus, alterum e Subalpini Gubernii ministris significasse Legislativo Coetui propositum ei subiiciendi legem huiusmodi; monstrosam eius indolem illico prodidimus per epistolam die 16 iunii huius anni datam ad Cardinalem Nostrum a Publicis Negotiis, ipsique mandavimus, ut novum hoc periculum Nobis impendens, sicuti cetera quae patimur, nuntiaret Legatis apud hanc Sanctam Sedem exterorum Principum. Verum cum proposita iam fuerit comminata lex, exigit omnino munus Apostolatus Nostri, ut editas antea expostulationes coram Vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, et Ecclesia universa elata voce iteremus, uti reapse facimus. Nefarium proinde hoc facinus in Iesu Christi nomine, cuius vice fungimur in terris, execrantes, auctoritate Sanctorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli ac Nostra illud damnamus una cum quolibet schemate legis, quae sibi potestatem arroget angendi, vexandi, minuendi, supprimendi Religiosas Familias Romae et in circumpositis provinciis, ibique Ecclesiam privandi suis bonis, eaque addicendi fisco aut aliter erogandi. Irritum propterea pronunciamus iam nunc quidquid fieri velit contra iura et patrimonium Ecclesiae: cassamque prorsus et nullam declaramus quamlibet praedatorum bonorum acquisitionem quocumque titulo factam, quorum alienationi Apostolica haec Sedes numquam reclamare cessabit. Auctores autem et fautores huius legis meminerint censurarum poenarumque spiritualium, quas ipso facto incurrendas Apostolicae Constitutiones iurium Ecclesiae invasoribus infligunt; et animae suae, vinculis hisce spiritualibus obligatae, miserti desinant thesaurizare sibi iram in die irae et revelationis iusti iudicii Dei.

Verum acerrimus, quo perstringimur, dolor ob istas aliasque

passim illatas Ecclesiae iniurias in Italia, non leviter exacerbatur praeterea a saevis, quibus eadem obnoxia est alibi, persequutionibus; maxime vero in novo germanico Imperio, ubi non occultis tantum machinationibus, sed aperta quoque vi illi funditus subvertendae adlaboratur. Siquidem viri, qui non modo non profitentur sanctissimam religionem nostram, sed nec ipsam norunt, potestatem sibi vindicant praefiniendi dogmata et iura catholicae Ecclesiae. Et dum eam praefracte divexant, impudenter asserere non dubitant, nullum illi a se inferri detrimentum: imo calumniam ac irrisionem addentes iniuriae, saevientem persequutionem vitio vertere non verentur catholicorum; scilicet quod eorum Praesules et Clerus una cum fidei populo praeferre renuant civilis Imperii leges et placita sanctissimis Dei et Ecclesiae legibus et a religioso officio suo desciscere idcirco recusent. Utinam publicarum rerum moderatores diuturna docti experientia sibi tandem suadeant, ex eorum subditis neminem accuratius catholicis reddere Caesari quae sunt Caesaris, ideo praesertim quod religiose reddere studeant quae sunt Dei Deo.

Eandem, quam Germanicum Imperium, viam iniisse videtur civilis auctoritas nonnullorum e pagis Helveticae Foederationis, sive decernendo de dogmatibus catholicae fidei, sive favendo apostatis, sive exercitium intercipiendo Episcopalis auctoritatis. Genevensis vero tractus Gubernium, licet solemnino pacto adstrictum ad custodiendam tuendamque in suo territorio religionem catholicam, postquam per praeteritos annos aliquot edidit leges infensas auctoritati libertatique Ecclesiae, recentius catholicas scholas suppressit, alias e religiosis familiis eiicit, alias docendi munere Institutum proprio privavit; nuperrime vero abolere contendit auctoritatem, quam pluribus iam ab hinc annis ibi legitime exercet Venerabilis Frater Gaspar Episcopus Hebronensis, eumque spoliare parochiali suo beneficio; imo eo etiam progressum est, ut, publica excitatione proposita, cives illos invitaret et alliceret ad ecclesiasticum regimen schismatico subvertendum.

Non levia etiam Ecclesia patitur in catholica Hispania a Civili potestate. Siquidem didicimus, propositam nuper fuisse, et iam a Legislativo Coetu ratam habitam legem de Cleri dote qua non modo solemnina franguntur pacta conventa, sed omnis prorsus recti iustique norma proculcatur. Quae lex, cum spectet ad exasperandam inopiam servitutemque Cleri, et ad irritanda augendaque mala illustri illi nationi illata per postremos hosce annos in perniciem fidei et ecclesiasticae disciplinae a deploranda actorum Gubernii serie; sicuti Venerabilium Fratrum in Hispaniis Episcoporum iustissimas eorumque firmitate plane dignas querelas iam excitavit, sic nostras nunc poscit solennes expostulationes.

Tristiora quoque commemoranda forent de exigua illa sed impudentissima schismaticorum Armeniorum manu, quae Constantinopoli praesertim, per audaciam fraudis et violentiae suae, opprimere nititur multo copiosorem eorum numerum, qui constantes in officio et fide permanserunt. Ementito namque catholico nomine, perstant ipsi in perduellione sua adversus supremam Nostram auctoritatem ac legitimum suum Patriarcham, qui eorum artibus eiectus exul ad Nos confugere debuit. Versutia vero sua eam apud civilem potestatem inierunt gratiam, ut non obstantibus Legati Nostri extraordinarii illuc ad res componendas missi studio et officiis, ac etiam Litteris Nostris ad serenissimum Turcarum Imperatorem datis, armorum adhibita vi, converterint in proprium usum aliquas e catholicorum Ecclesiis, coiverint in conciliabulum, sibi que statuerint schismaticum Patriarcham; atque effecerint, ut catholici sua iam priventur immunitate, qua hactenus per publica pacta gavisi fuerunt.

De perstrictis tamen hactenus Ecclesiae vexationibus alias Nobis explicatius agendum erit fortasse, si acquissimae Nostrae denunciationes contemni pergant. Sed tot inter moeroris causas gaudemus, Venerabiles Fratres, recreari vos posse, sicuti et Nos erigimur, ab admirabili constantia et operositate catholici Episcopatus commemoratarum regionum non minus quam ceterarum; quarum Antistites succincti lumbos in veritate et induti lorica iustitiae et huic Petri cathedrae devinctissimi nullis territi periculis, nullis aerumnis deiecti, sive singillatim, sive coniunctim, voce, scripto, expostulationibus, pastoralibus Litteris, Ecclesiae, Sanctae huius Sedis, suaque sacra iura fortiter, alacriterque propugnant una cum Clero et populo suo fidei; ac iniustam vim cohibent, calumnias refellunt, insidias detegunt, frangunt impiorum audaciam, veritatis lucem omnibus ostendunt, confirmant honestos, compactaeque unitatis robur opponunt hostium undique irrumpentium incursum, Nobisque tot ecclesiae malis afflictis iucundissimum solatium exhibent et potens auxilium. Quod certe validius etiam evadet, si vincula fidei et caritatis, quibus mentes iungantur et affectus, arctiora quotidie et contentiora fieri curentur. Ei porro rei assequendae nemo peropportunum non censeat, ut qui Metropolitana auctoritate ecclesiasticis praesunt provinciis, cum Suffraganeis suis, meliori, qua per adiuncta temporum fieri possit, ratione consilia conferunt, per quae se invicem omnes in eadem mente eademque sententia obstringant et confirment, et ad difficile certamen contra impietatis ausus efficacius obeundum unanimi nisu se comparent.

Visitavit profecto Nos Dominus, Venerabiles Fratres, in gladio suo duro et grandi et forti; ascenditque fumus in ira eius et ignis a facie eius exarsit. Sed numquid in aeternum

proiiciet Deus, aut non apponet ut complacitior sit adhuc? Absit: Non enim obliviscitur misereri Dominus, nec continet in ira misericordias suas; sed qui multus est ad ignoscendum, ac propitiatur invocantibus eum in veritate; effundet in nos divitias misericordiae suae. Divinam iram acceptabili hoc Dominici adventus tempore placare studeamus; Regique pacifico, qui proxime venturus est, ut pacem annuntiet hominibus bonae voluntatis, in novitate vitae ambulantes humiliter occurramus. Iustus et misericors Deus, cuius arcana dispositione nati sumus videre contritionem populi Nostri et contritionem Civitatis Sanctae, et sedere illic cum datur in manibus inimicorum, Ipse inclinet aurem suam et audiat, aperiat oculos suos et videat desolationem nostram et civitatem, super quam invocatum est nomen Eius.

II.—THE WHITE SCAPULAR OF THE SACRED HEART.

BEATISSIME PATER,

Paulus Cardinalis Cullen, Archiepiscopus Dublinensis Beatitudini Vestriae eo quo par est obsequio exponit, Fideles in Hibernia, Anglia alibique ab aliquot annis solere gestare parvam imaginem Sacri Cordis Jesu lana alba acu depictam vel alias eidem lanae affixam e collo supra pectus pendentem, modo fere parvi scapularis et cum hisce verbis in lingua vernacula impressis: Cessa, Cor Jesu nobiscum est (italice: Fermati il cuor di Gesù è con noi). Orator ad magis augendam fidelium devotionem ac fiduciam erga Sacratissimum Cor Jesu vestram Beatitudinem enixe rogat ut benigne concedere digneris aliquam indulgentiam iis fidelibus qui praedictam imaginem ut supra devote gestaverint.

Die 28 Octobris, 1872.

Indulgentiam centum dierum semel in die lucranda benigne concedimus Christifidelibus deferentibus figuram supra dictam, recitando aliquam piam precem, videlicet, Pater—Ave—Gloria.

PIUS PP. IX.

Praecons rescriptum manu SSmi. exaratum exhibitum fuit in Secretaria S. Congnis. Indulgentiarum hac die 18 Decembris, 1872, ad formam decreti ejusdem S. Congnis diei 14 Aprilis, 1856. In quorum fidem, &c.

Datum Romae ex eadem Secretaria die et anno ut supra.

Dominicus Sarra, Substitutus.

III.—CONSTITUTIO APOSTOLICAE SEDIS.

Instructio S. Officii.

Ad supremam hanc Congregationem nonnulla dubia delata sunt ab Amplitudine Tua proposita, quibus Feria IV., die 15 Junii labentis anni 1870, ita responsum est.

In quarto dubio, plura a Te congesta sunt. Et primo quidem anxium Te exhibebas circa magistratus catholicos et Gubernii servos, qui immunitatem asyli ecclesiastici violant, veritus nimirum ne omnes excommunicationi subjaceant, quae in Constitutione *Apostolicae Sedis* 12 Octobris 1869, est quinta inter excommunicationes latae sententiae R. Pontifici reservatas eaque est tenoris sequentis:—Immunitatem asyli ecclesiastici violare jubentes aut ausu temerario violantes. Qua Te anxietate ut eximerent Emi Patres, audito etiam SSmi oraculo, monitum Te voluere in ea formula verba: *ausu temerario*, utrumque membrum complecti. Ex quo intelligas eum tantum excommunicationem incurrere, qui ab aliis minime coactus, prudens ac sciens immunitatem asyli ecclesiastici aut violare jubet, aut exequendo violat, quem porro utpote omnis excusationis expertem excommunicationi subjacere mirum esse non debet.

Deinde similem aperiebas sollicitudinem quoad eosdem Magistratus et Gubernii servos trahentes clericos ad suum tribunal propter violationem legis civilis sive alio modo, quos omnes timebas excommunicatione esse irretitos quae in dicta Constitutione, *Apostolicae Sedis*, est septima inter excommunicationes latae sententiae R. Pontifici speciali modo reservatas. Sed in ea formula attendere debes verbum *cogentes*, quod sane indicat, excommunicationem eos non attingere, qui subordinati sint, etiamsi iudices fuerint, sed in eos tantum esse latam qui a nemine coacti vel agunt talia vel alios ad agendum cogunt, quos etiam indulgentiam nullam mereri facile perspicias.

Mirum autem visum est, quod tertio loco de iisdem censuris addebas, an revera excommunicationem incurrunt illi, qui vix ideam habent legum a longo tempore obsoletarum sive in Anglia sive in Gallia. Agitur enim de Constitutione *Apostolicae Sedis*, quae non a longo tempore, sed die 12 Octobris anno 1869 edita est, et in qua Summus Pontifex expresse monet censuras omnes, quae in ea continentur—non modo ex veterum canonum auctoritate, quatenus cum hac nostra constitutione conveniunt, verum etiam ex hac ipsa Constitutione Nostra, non secus ac si primum editae ab ea fuerint, vim suam prorsus accipere debere.—Non igitur adeo recentis legis, regulariter loquendo, ignorantia obtendi potest, cum fuerit ea Constitutio et pro tota Ecclesia in Urbe promulgata et ad omnes Ecclesiae partes reapse propagata et ubique jam celebretur.

Quarto loco quaerebas, an ii qui praedictas censuras incurerunt, admonendi sint, quod porro minime constabat; utrum de interno an de externo foro quaereres. Sed si de interno res est, licet Theologi doceant, aliquando (hoc est debitis factis exceptionibus, de quibus iidem agunt) dissimulari cum poenitente posse, cum duo haec simul concurrunt, bona fides et indubia praevisio nullum ex admonitione fructum perceptum iri: heic tamen apertum est, sive ob personarum qualitatem quae excommunicationi subjiciuntur, sive ob qualitatem Constitutionis eamdem censuram inferentis, quae recentissima est ac plane notoria, difficile dari posse bonam fidem quae admonitionem omitti posse suadeat. Quod si de externo foro sermo sit, distinguendum erit inter pastoralemente admonitionem ac judicalem sententiam, qua reum de quo agitur excommunicationem incurrisse declaratur. Sententiam hanc declaratoriam, utrum ferri expediat definiri generatim non potest, sed facti personarumque circumstantiis sedulo expensis dignosci debet. Ad pastoralemente admonitionem quod attinet, quid Theologi doceant probe nosti, qui, si deficiente probabili spe emendationis ac fructus, prudentique metu gravioris cujuspiam mali concurrente, differri admonendi officium, quod ex proprio munere Pastorem urget, posse consentiunt; nihilominus monent si scandalum a Pastoris silentio oriatur, intermittere illud non licere. Quod denique quinto loco addebas, *utrum habeas facultatem absolvendi a praedictis excommunicationibus*, censuerunt Emi Patres, id a Te quaeri ob clausulas derogatorias, quae in Constitutione *Apostolicae Sedis* leguntur; nam ceteroqui, quid facultatum Tibi datum sit, nosse ipse debes. Itaque decreverunt, ut declaratio circa praedictas clausulas de mandato Sanctitatis Suae ab hac suprema Congregatione edita Tibi communicetur, quae est tenoris sequentis: *Colla detta Costituzione il Santo Padre non ha punto inteso di recare la menoma alterazione alle facolta di qualsiasi natura dalla S. Sede innanzi alla promulgazione della medesima accordate, sieno esse quinquennali, o straordinarie, o relative ad presente Giubileo, e vuole che rimangano nel pieno loro vigore durante il termine nelle rispettive concessioni od indulti prefinito.*

In quinto dubio non satis Te intelligere indicas, cur in Constitutione *Apostolicae Sedis*, sub numero quarto excommunicationum latae sententiae quae Romano Pontifici reservantur, ea quoque recensetur, quae est contra non denunciantes occultos coryphaeos ac duces sectae massonicae aut carbonariae, aliarumve ejusdem generis sectarum, quae contra Ecclesiam vel *legitimas* potestates, seu palam, seu clandestine machinantur, eaque dubii ratio a Te proponitur, quod nomina praesidentium et membra cujusque Logiae publice typis dentur. Sed ne in re tam gravi, quaeque tanti interest incolumitatis

Ecclesiae, salutis animarum, publicaeque tranquillitatis, quempiam indormire sinas, persuadere Tibi debes, non sine gravissimis causis Romanum Pontificem e sua specula ex qua totam Ecclesiam omnesque simul circumstantias circumspicit, excommunicationem illam jampridem latam, multo mitioribus terminis cohibitam retinuisse. Quamquam haud difficile cuique erit aliquam per se causam videre injunctae denunciationis, licet, ut ais, praesidentium ac membrorum nomina, saltem in secta Massonica et Carbonaria, publice typis dentur. Ceteris enim praetermissis, quis sane dicere aut nosse valeat, utrum qui in publicis ephemeridibus apparent, specie tantum ac nomine tenus coryphaei ac duces sint, veri autem machinationum artifices directoresque delitescant? Aut, quis etiam divinet, utrum perpetuo et constanter ducum nomina evulgare velint? Vides igitur, non inutiliter neque sine causa praeceptum esse, ut coryphaei saltem qui occulti sint denuncientur.

At quaeris cui et a quibus fieri ejusdem denunciationes in missionibus debeant. Obscurum esse minime potest, a quibus faciendae sint. Generale quippe est praeceptum omnibus fidelibus injunctum. Cui vero sunt faciendae manifestum quoque est, nimirum ei, qui pro pastoralis officio vigilare et cavere debet, ne oves sibi concreditaee in lupos incurrant, neve peste inficiantur; cujusmodi est quicumque episcopale vel quasi episcopale munus in Missionibus gerit, Vicarius videlicet vel Praefectus Apostolicus, vel ab eis ad hunc effectum delegatus.

IV.—DECRETUM S. CONGREGATIONIS DE PROPAGANDA FIDE, DIE 5 FEB., 1854.

Ssmus. Dominus Noster Pius Divina Providentia PP. IX., referente infrascripto S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide Secretario in audientia die 5 Februarii 1854, benigne concessit omnibus Episcopis Hiberniae ut formulae VI. quae iisdem concedi consuevit numerus tertius ea ratione extendatur ut complectatur matrimonia, tum contracta, tum contrahenda, idque pro matrimoniis, tam Catholicorum quam eorum qui ab haeresi convertuntur servatis caeteroquin servandis et contrariis quibuscunque haud obstantibus.

Datum Romae ex Aedibus dictae S. Congregationis die et anno ut supra Gratis sine ulla solutione quocunque titulo.

AL. BARNABO, *a Secretis.*

Concordat cum originali.

✠ JOSEPHUS DIXON,
Archiep. Armacanus, &c.

THE IRISH
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

MARCH, 1873.

ON A MANUSCRIPT WRITTEN BY ST. CAMIN,
OF INISCELTRA.¹

AMONGST the Irish MSS. recently transferred from the Franciscan Convent of St. Isidore's, at Rome, to the Franciscan Convent in this city, by the favour of the authorities of the Seraphic Order both here and in Rome, there is one of especial interest, the history of which I desire, with the permission of its present obliging custodians, briefly to bring under notice.

This MS., which is only a small remnant of what must have been a large work, consists at present of but six leaves of thin vellum, measuring fourteen inches in length by ten in breadth. It contains a large fragment of the Psalm "Beati Immaculati," the 118th Psalm in the Douay Bible, and the 119th in the Protestant Authorized Version. The portion remaining is divided into twelve chapters of eight verses each. Every chapter begins with a large illuminated letter of most exquisite pattern; and each verse with an ornamental capital of smaller size.

The text, which is in Latin, is interspersed with explanatory glosses in the same language; and additional glosses and scholia are written in the spaces between the chapters and along the margins.

The writing of the Scriptural text is unusually large, the letters being nearly half an inch in length, and not rounded as in the Book of Kells.

The penmanship is not so beautifully executed as that of the Book of Kells; and the attempts at ornamentation are, in general, rather rude, compared with the exquisite

¹ The substance of a paper read before the Royal Irish Academy, 10th June, 1872, by W. M. HENNESSY, Esq., M.R.I.A.

style of illumination which characterizes that splendid volume; but the St. Isidore MS. is probably no less ancient.

The MS. which I have endeavoured thus briefly to describe, formed a portion of the extensive collection of Irish historical monuments accumulated in the Franciscan Convent of St. Anthony of Padua, at Louvain, during the period extending from 1630 to 1643. But before it became part of the Louvain Collection, it seems to have belonged to the Franciscan Convent of Donegal, that venerable sanctuary of Irish history from which came forth the Annals of the Four Masters; for a memorandum on the first page, in Colgan's handwriting, describes it as "ex libris Conventus de Dunnagall."

The object for which these Irish MSS. were accumulated in the Convent at Louvain, was to secure materials towards the execution of a project conceived by Father Hugh Ward, also a native of Donegal, and an eminent member of the Franciscan Order, who contemplated the publication not alone of the annals of his own Order, but also of a complete *Acta Sanctorum Hiberniæ*, and other ecclesiastical antiquities.

The steps taken by the learned Franciscan to enable him to carry out this project, are described in a valuable paper contributed to a French journal, entitled *Etudes religieuses, historiques et littéraires* (Paris, 1869), by the eminent Bollandist, Père Victor De Buck. Speaking of the labours of Father Ward, he says:—

"Pendant qu'il était gardien à Louvain, un homme déjà avancé en âge, qui ne savait pas le latin, vint frapper à la porte du couvent pour y demander l'habit des Frères laïcs. C'était Michel O'Clery, dont le nom sera toujours cher aux archéologues et aux historiens d'Irlande. Cet homme, né vers 1580 dans le comté de Donegal, avait été antiquaire de profession, et passait parmi ses collègues en archéologie celtique pour un des plus versés en cette science. Le P. Ward le demanda pour aide à ses supérieurs et l'obtint facilement. Bientôt il vit que ce collaborateur pouvait lui être plus utile en Irlande qu'en Belgique. Les supérieurs en jugèrent de même, et ils chargèrent la Frère antiquaire d'aller dans sa patrie chercher et transcrire les Vies des saints et autres vieux documents ecclésiastiques qu'il pourrait découvrir, comme bon nombre de ces reliques du passé étaient en Irlandais ancien, nul n'était plus apte à ce travail que le Frère Michel. Il y consacra près de quinze ans, pendant lesquels il copia plusieurs vies, trois ou quatre martyrologes et une foule d'autres pièces qu'il envoya au P. Ward."

Father Ward having died in 1635, before the return to

Louvain of Michael O'Clery, the execution of the contemplated task devolved upon Father John Colgan; and his invaluable works, *Trias Thaumaturga*, and *Acta Sanctorum* for the months of January, February, and March, published in 1645, were the first fruits of Father Ward's patriotic project.

The death of Michael O'Clery, in 1643, would seem to have interfered with the further progress of the work undertaken by Colgan; for though the latter lived until 1658, he published no continuation of the *Acta Sanctorum*, although he had not entirely given up the task; for amongst the MSS. now in the Franciscan Convent on Merchants'-quay are two volumes of lives prepared for printing.

The history of this Louvain Collection of MSS., from the time of Colgan's death to a recent period, has not been satisfactorily defined. The late Professor O'Curry, who took a lively interest in the subject, says that "the materials collected by Michael O'Clery, as well as any that may have been obtained through other channels, remained at Louvain after his and Father Colgan's death, and down, it is presumed, to the French Revolution (1789), at which time they appear to have been dispersed, and in such a manner that all knowledge of their existence was for a long time lost." "But it would appear," he observes; "from what has been since learned, that this great collection became subdivided into two principal parts, one of which found its way to Brussels, and the other to Rome."—(*Lectures*, p. 645.)

It would seem that, shortly before the death of O'Clery, viz., in the year 1642, some of the more patriotic men amongst the leaders of the National party entertained the project of founding a National Irish University or school, in which the pupils were to be educated through the medium of the Irish language; and for this purpose they desired that the Irish MSS. in Louvain should be returned to Ireland. The result of the conflict in which they were then engaged having proved adverse to their interests, the project was necessarily abandoned; but had the fortune of war leaned to the National side, it is probable that an attempt would have been made to establish an Irish College under the presidency of Flann MacAedhagan, who was considered the most accomplished Irish scholar of that age. This project, of which the historians who have hitherto written upon Irish affairs seem not to have been aware, is disclosed in the correspondence of that period, now in the Franciscan Convent of this city. In a remarkable letter addressed to Father Hugh De Burgo, at Brussels dated Wexford, the 20th of September, 1642, and

signed in the Irish character by the celebrated Rory O'More, the writer says:—

“If we may afore Flann M'Egan dyes, we will see an Irish schoole oppened, and therefore could wish heartylie that those learned and religious fathers in Lovayne did come over in hast with their monum^{ts}. and with an Irish and Lattin print. Father Brandon would snatch himself over now to this end, and to informe you of all things past and present, but that we cannot part with him, and that his provincially commanded him to wait upon us,”

The “Father Brandon” here referred to, who seems to have been Rory O'More's secretary, as the body of the letter is in his handwriting, was a learned member of the Franciscan Order, and a good Irish scholar, as appears from a volume of excerpts from the Annals of Roscrea, compiled by him, collated with the Four Masters, now preserved in the Burgundian Library, Brussels.

To return, however, to the MS. with whose history I am more immediately concerned. After two centuries of absolute silence regarding them, the existence of the St. Isidore collection of Irish MSS. was brought under the notice of Irish scholars in the year 1842, by the late Dean Lyons of Belmullet; and two years afterwards Mr. Laurence Waldron drew attention to the collection preserved in the Burgundian Library. Dean Lyons sent home tracings of the St. Isidore MSS., which were subsequently inked over by Professor O'Curry, and are now in the R. I. Academy's Library; but neither in these tracings, nor in the list compiled from them by O'Curry, and published in the Rev. J. Donovan's work on “Ancient and Modern Rome,” is there any reference to the MS. under consideration.

In October last, however, His Excellency the Chevalier Nigra, Italian Minister in Paris, an accomplished Irish scholar, and an admirable philologist, during a vacation tour, in which he examined the Irish MSS. in the Libraries of St. Gall and St. Isidore's, devoted an hour's attention to the MS. containing the “Beati Immaculati.”

His Excellency was good enough to acquaint me, in a letter dated 28th of October last, with the results of his examination of the MS.; and his description of its nature and contents led me to suppose that it was the MS. to which Usher referred as alleged to have been written by St. Camin of Inis-Celtra. And this it is.

Usher does not say where he saw the MS., or rather the surviving fragment of it; but it was probably shown to him by O'Clery. His words, which occur in connection with a reference to Inis-Celtra, are as follows:—

poor friar aforesaid. And let every man that sees them pray for our souls respectively.”

This note is not dated, but it was probably written before the time that Usher and Ware saw the MS., if the latter ever did see it, and, therefore, between 1636 and 1639; for the Mac Brody referred to was that Conor Mac Brody whose name is appended to testimonials prefixed to the MSS. of the Annals of the Four Masters and the Martyrology of Donegal. These testimonials are dated 11th November, 1636, at Kilkeedy, in the barony of Inchiquin, Co. Clare, and profess to have been given at the request of Michael O'Clery, who “came into the writer's presence to read and exhibit” his books, in obedience to his superior. It would appear from O'Clery's note that he had made another visit to Mac Brody's place, between 1636 and 1639, at which latter date the old fragment was in the Library of the Franciscan Convent of Donegal, according to Ware; but although it may be possible, with a little time, and by the aid of the materials now at our command, to indicate the proximate, if not the exact date of this visit, I have not yet had time to investigate the subject. It may be taken as proved, however, that O'Clery obtained the MS. from the sons of Conor Mac Brody, who was slain in November, 1636; and that he had deposited it in the Library of the Convent of Donegal before 1639.

It is not improbable that O'Clery paid more than one or two visits to Mac Brody's home during his fruitful tour in search of materials of Irish history; for most intimate relations seem to have existed between the families of these learned men. In 1595, for instance, the Four Masters record that Mac Con O'Clery, ollave in history to O'Donnell, died in Leiter-Maelain, Mac Brody's residence in Clare; and about 1604, a friendly discussion regarding the merits of the Northern and Southern branches of the Irish race seems to have been concerted, in a friendly way, between one of the Mac Brody's (Tadhg) and Lughaidh O'Clery, a cousin of Michael O'Clery's. It is worthy of remark, as illustrating the amenities of literature at a period which it was lately the fashion to consider rude and uncivilized, that one of the Northern advocates, Annluan Mac Egan, charges Lughaidh O'Clery with having allowed himself to be worsted by Mac Brody, out of mere friendly feelings towards Mac Brody, because Lughaidh had received his education in Clare, or rather at the hands of the Mac Brodys.

Regarding O'Clery's statement, in the note which I have read, that the Mac Brody's resided in the termon of Caimin, it is to be observed that Killkeedy and Letter-Moylan, which are both situated in the parish of Dysart, barony of Inchiquin, are some twenty miles from Inis-Celtra. But these

townlands, and others, which, in 1641, were in the occupation of members of the Mac Brody sept, are described, in the survey of that time, as belonging to the See of Killaloe, and formed, probably, some of the ancient possessions of the Abbey of Inis-Celtra. And in the same survey (Petty's), only one person of the name is mentioned as occupying any land in the vicinity of the Abbey.

The truth of the tradition referred to by O'Clery, according to which the MS. was written by a holy man who died in 653, may be a matter of question, although handed down from sire to son in a family identified with the preservation of historical tradition from a very early age. The Abbey, of which he was the founder, produced many eminent literary men, including St. Coelan, who lived within half a century of St. Camin's time, and St. Corcran, who died in 1040, and who is described as the most celebrated ecclesiastic of Western Europe in his time. But St. Corcran's age would certainly be too late a date to which to assign the writing of the MS.

The MS. contains some Irish glosses, which will be illustrated in a future number of the IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

DR. JOHN RIDER,

PROTESTANT BISHOP OF KILLALOE (FROM 1612 TO 1632),

ONE OF THE ENGLISH IN IRELAND.

(Continued from page 232, No. ci.)

“TO expect logic from Mr. Rider were to ask wool at a goat's house. His digressions are made to dazzle the reader's eyes, that in such a mist he may sneak off from his matter without being perceived. As painters, that by skill could not make a difference between a cat, a horse, or a dog, were wont to tell, by words under their pictures—‘this is a cat,’ ‘this is a horse,’ ‘this is a dog’—even so Mr. Rider, when he maketh an argument in his own opinion substantially, lest you should not so conceive it, he addeth before, behind, or in the margin—‘this is an unanswerable argument.’¹

“A serpent that is crushed in the head, wresteth and wryeth himself up and down, infolding his whole body into many vain circles, with' all his struggling purchasing nothing else but that others may conceive the extremity of his pains : so Mr. Rider, being wholly suppressed by this powerful testimony of Scrip-

¹ “Confutation,” p. 71.

ture, with manifold writhings tumbleth up and down to talk of all by-matters. What a mind he must have to discuss the Real Presence, when he makes a preface so far wide of it, and ranges roving to antiphonaries, to prelates' lives, to ——— to the Pope's supremacy, to the plots of the King of Spain, and the habitations and weapons in Naples and Milan! He gamboled over my preface, and never so much as saluted it in passing by, but rather, with a squint given thereto, turned his back towards it. What had any, much less all of these points to do with all or any of the things propounded by him—by what engine or cable can they be hauled thereto? But a tottering religion is like a giddy drunkard, who must waver to and fro whether he will or no. The objections and matters of my opponent are handled by him in a manner worthy of all deploration, and are huddled, shuffled, and juggled miserably, disorderedly, intricately, and erroneously.¹ His objections are out of date, too, like a cracked grote, not lawfully current any longer. A tub is never so full of sound as when it is emptiest; so is Mr. Rider not more full of noise than when he is destitute of all other matter, for then he flourisheth in his exceptions, exclamations, apostrophes, etc., as a mere circulator or tooth-drawing physician, under a banner of rotten teeth and impostumes, when his stomach and purse are most empty, then he pleadeth and prateth most endlessly.

“Behold a desperate dealing in my gentle friend, Mr. Rider. He leaves the point and bids us read elsewhere, here and there, and we should find wonders. There was a certain preacher in Paris, who pointed his audience to authors by him named, without quoting from them, but saying: ‘seek here in such a one, and there in such another, and you shall find store.’ For this he was named ‘the poster over to seek where nothing could be found.’ Judge you whether my cavaliero was not his scholar. Think you that to the passage alleged Mr. Rider hath said nothing? You are deceived, for he answers thus:—

“If a great divine be asked to prove the manner, and he proves the matter, what will the reader think of him? When all the Catholics in the kingdom (who so liberally relieve you and so dearly have loved you)² hang their souls on your saying, are these the contentments you give them? And yet you will be called Fathers, Doctors, and what not.’

“He says we run from the manner to the matter: marry, he telleth not how. But because these two words have some consonance in sound, having coupled them together as hunters

¹ “Confutation,” p. 60.

² Rider says this in another page, the number of which I have lost.

do hounds of like colour and proportion, he taketh his leave and gallops away. I have some time noted the same refuge and evasion in Latimer. It serveth as a commonplace or answer to all objections, and as a harbour against all foul weather; as they that know not what *matter* and what *manner* are, surmise that some answer is given.¹ For this Mr. Rider deserves to be capped with a hood of eight colours in School-Lane. I have seen many nimble riders gambol over stools and stocks in Dublin on Shrove Tuesday; but such stools and stocks, as Damascene objecteth, so lightly vaulted over by Mr. Rider, I never could hitherto observe.

"This Puritan says the adoration cannot be but spiritual, because the man coming to receive is spiritual. One would think that the man to receive is not only spiritual but also corporal, and therefore that the adoration might be not only spiritual but also corporal. If such sequel had any force, Protestants should not hereafter bow their corporal knees to the supper, nor to God himself; nor put off their corporal hats, nor hold up their corporal hands, because the adoration can, by his saying, not be corporal to any spiritual things adored. O Riderian reasons, how pleasant you are!² Here, again, is good stuff! 'St. Ambrose did not write upon the ninth psalm, because he did write but upon a part thereof.' If, therefore, one buffeted Mr. Rider upon the ear, he could not be said to have struck Mr. Rider, because he struck but part of him!³ Again, Mr. Rider, you say the Mass is not spoken of in a text, because it is not mentioned expressly. Yet you would think him to cavil in the Close of St. Patrick's, who, when anything is well affirmed of Mr. Dean, would deny it to be understood of you, because, forsooth, your name, John Rider, is not expressed.⁴ Again, to infer that what cannot be proved out of the Gospel is condemned by the Gospel, is a blasphemous Riderian sequel.

"In your fourth answer is your 158th untruth—'that whatsoever Christ giveth by promise must be received by faith.' He giveth damnation to wicked infidels, which he had often promised, yet they had no faith. He giveth by promise food to the birds of the air, to the fishes of the sea, and to the beasts of the earth. Can these be said to have faith? Yet, I confess, they have as much as the Puritans, and have none at all. O rich Deanery of St. Patrick's, how wouldst thou groan if thou couldst feel the heft of the divinity of thy Dean, wherein such falsehood standeth for infallible principles, and such impiety is termed the word of the Lord!⁵

"You say there is an ill use of miracles, therefore no good

¹ "Confutation," pp. 261, 262. ² "Confutation," 317. ³ "Confutation," 314.
⁴ "Confutation," 373. ⁵ "Confutation," 299.

use. So you might prove that eating and drinking were not to be used because abused. Your reasoning is quite Riderian, that is, more than ridiculous and preposterous. If it were allowable, this would follow as reasonably. Sometime Mr. Rider hath been known in London to use legerdemain, and all to have abused divers by the deceitful suggestions of the devil. Therefore, in all other places he is to be accounted not seen but by legerdemain and deceit of the devil.

“He affirmeth that I said Scriptures and divine service had been in *unvulgar tongues*, but should prove that they were *unvulgar and unknown of that people wherein they were practised*. Have you ever heard the like? I shewed, according to him, that they were unvulgar, and yet I am willed to prove that they were unknown of the common people. Who are the *vulgar* sort but the common people? Must not, then, it that is unvulgar be unknown to the common people? ‘He that teacheth a fool, is as one that glueth a potsherd:’¹ he may well propound learning to his brains, but never glue them and it to hold together.

“The words of Beda are:—‘This island at this present to the number of the five books of Moses, with five sundry languages, doth study and set forth the knowledge of one perfect truth, that is, with the language of the English, the Britons, the Scots, the Picts, and the Latin, which, by study of the Scriptures, is made common to all the rest.’² If of these words, saith Mr. Rider, with all my Jesuitical and transmarine logic, I can make one sound syllogism to prove Scriptures to have been in an unvulgar tongue, I shall be to him Magnus Apollo, a great prophet. You behold what a high preferment is offered to me for so small pains in the thing itself; although to the party it may be a hard task, by reason that ‘The man accustomed in words of reproach, in all his days will not be instructed.’³ Nevertheless, if I can, by a vulgar similitude I will accommodate this easy matter to his capacity. There is no doubt, but if four divers families by right did draw water out of one common well, you might well say the water of those four families not to be in the private possession of any one of them. So Beda, saying that the Latin tongue became common to four divers nations by their meditation of Scriptures, doth not he intend that the meditation of Scriptures was not in the private language of any one of them? An enthymeme is less than a syllogism, and yet this hard riddle is dissipated in less than an enthymeme, and consequently I must be more than a great Apollo to Mr. Rider. I had rather, by much, to enjoy my old privilege during his prejudicated conceit that he esteem me an apostate rather than an Apollo, a pro-

¹ Ezech. xxii., 9.² Beda, l. 2, cap. i.³ Eccl. xxiii., 20.

selyte rather than a prophet, a dolt rather than a doctor. For, “quod ille maledictum vehemens existimat laudem ego duco maximam”—“his greatest dispraise is my desired disblame.”

“His argument from a text about married priests proves nothing. For Dublin is well acquainted that Mr. Hall, of happy memory, and Mr. G. B., of rare virtue, had been married; yet both were exemplary priests. And at this instant of my writing this, a gentleman, called Mr. Anselm Crucius, of exceeding ability, being married, and his wife living and recently entered into a cloister of nuns, after having lived thirty years with his aforesaid wife in inviolable chastity, only for more exact devotion towards God, she having entered into religion, he became a priest and Jesuit. With him I am daily familiar, to my great delight and edification.

“Upon the true and literal meaning of Christ’s words of the Institution, you walk as nicely as if you were treading upon eggs—fearing, saith Luther, to stumble and break your necks at every word which Christ pronounceth. I trust in God’s mercy before I die, to justify the least syllable and parcel of the Mass against the gates of hell and all thereto belonging. You say you will show that in all the Mass, from the first word to the last, there is nothing but magical superstition, heresy, and idolatry. I trust you will not be as ill as your word. Is the Psalm of David, ‘Judica,’ magical superstition, etc.? Is the ‘Gloria in excelsis Deo,’ the song of Angels, magical superstition, etc.? Are all the Epistles and Gospels, which are parcels of Scripture? Is the Creed of the First Council of Nice? Are Christ’s words? Is the Lord’s Prayer? All are included betwixt ‘the first and last words’—are they but superstition, heresy, or idolatry? But soft, Mr. Rider, your time is not yet come to abolish juge sacrificium, which is reserved for Antichrist, as Scriptures and Fathers affirm.

“Alas! let St. Augustine alone; in his life he was a Catholic monk, in his books a Catholic Doctor, in both an enemy and triumpher against heretics. Hitherto you have never brought St. Augustine’s testimonies, but as Urias took unfortunate letters, to your own destruction. You object to certain expressions of ours towards the Mother of God. Listen to Ascham’s Latin epigram to our late Queen Elizabeth, which I will thus do into English:—

‘Hail, England’s fame *divine*: hail, Princess bright!

Elizabeth, the Briton’s *Goddess* great!

Give us new times, new bliss, by ruling right;

Appease this world from furies’ hateful heat;

Grant joyful times, for joy we humbly pray,

Thou Briton’s *only bliss* and *only stay*.’

"Alas! what misery and impiety is every line fraught withal in this exposition of Mr. Rider. Would not any other (but myself) display all the figures of rhetoric against this figure of a learned man, who makes himself ridiculous by such palpable contradictions? This is the fourteenth untruth, besides others that I have winked at. I never in my life, nor, I think, any other noted such implications before in any book hitherto printed; are not these discourses resembling buckets in wells, of which the drawing up of one is the letting down of another. Good Mr. Rider, spare your own reputation, so much engaged in this discourse, else the State will testify their dislike of your defence, wherein you are made every foot to disprove and refel yourself. . . . I deny your major, which adds *only*, which is not in the text; I deny your minor, for Whitaker even confesses it. The conclusion is also false, for having a fourth term. But what careth or knoweth Mr. Rider what is pertinent or not.¹

"Tell me, gentle readers, whether Mr. Rider be not an extraordinary writer since he is made every foot to disprove himself?

"Mr. Rider, I intend to make you seem a viper by showing your own brood and conceits not to have issued but by tearing your bowels. Perhaps you had rather than the price of the prebend, wherewith you would have corrupted me to concur in one form of speech with you, that I did not in this manner concur by making your own words, like young vipers, tear and rip up your own entrails. Yet have I no desire to grieve you, but only to gravel the errors which captivate your understanding. I deserve thanks if you could conceive good offices.²

"You affirm plainly that St. Augustine telleth what we declare; but like a bad cow, you strike down with your heel all this milk in the very next word, which maketh the hundred and thirty-fifth untruth, saying that St. Augustine is contrary to us.³

"You say that a certain objection of mine is slanderous. But, by your leave, *you* are made to object so slanderously to your face. . . . Why then do you not confess that you are your own slanderer? But we part not so; as the proverb saith, 'the baker's ears must be nailed to the pillory.'

"You say in one place, that 'the Mass was hatched and patched within *five hundred years* after St. Basil,' and in another place you say 'the founders of the Mass were Durandus and Guido,' who lived a *thousand years* after St. Basil. 'Homo homini lupus,'—'a man is a wolf to a man,' that is, Mr. Rider is continually made his own wolf to devour himself.

"In number 130, he says he has sufficiently confuted the real

¹ "Confutation," p. 42.

² "Confutation," pages 271, 273.

³ "Confutation," pages 276, 277.

presence of Christ's natural body in the Eucharist. This is the 182nd untruth, as he shall contestate against himself, saying in number 28, that 'Christ is really in the blessed Sacrament, a thing never denied by us, and never in question betwixt Protestant and Papist.' If it was never denied or in question, how could it be sufficiently confuted? All the glue in Christendom will never make these two stick together.¹ Could, I say, by all the wit of man or angels, any accord be made betwixt Protestants as one Church? Could any hammering or soldering conjoin their unsuitable doctrines? Therefore, Mr. Rider, it cannot be denied but your new patch hath torn your old cloak, and your new wine hath burst your old vessels. In this rueful obligation, printed by you against yourself, to stand to such confederates as Foxe's Martyrs, besides your making yourself an idiot, you have bound yourself fast to ratify their damnable blasphemies.²

"If you had not been such as Mr. Sabinus Chamber testi-fieih, you would never have brought your Oxford conclusion, 'Ergo falleris,' without some premises or proofs. Every woman and child might say as much when they had nothing else to answer.³ What idiot but might do as much, and deny in one hour more than all the learned in the world may prove in an age?

"Gentle readers! you get not any rhetorical apostrophes at my hands to aggravate his confusion, nor yet any help to get him up again after his disgraceful stumbling against the head of his own opinion during his leaping short at the founder of our doctrine. But if you of his profession will assist him to rise, I doubt not, by God's grace, to accompany him to his journey's end, and so often to occasion you to support him in his slipperiness as affection could require, and yet to renounce him in the end as past remedy and recovery. I will not trample on one prostrated, but yet I will leave him to himself to rise again; yet lest he should start far from me, I will add this spancel to his horse's feet, which is presented by Calvin. . . . Perhaps before I part with him, I will make him beshrew the fingers of him who printed these horrid words, although I know it was not the printer's fault. I thought to take no notice of his last *Rescript*, but to leave him a spectacle to God, angels and men, by the manifestations in my answer already imparted. But as he only huddles up controversies by me already discussed, I will shape him a further succinct disproof, yet not only of him, but also of the censure of the Puritan Collegists of Dublin.⁶

¹ "Confutation," page 321.

² "Confutation," page 309.

³ "Confutation," page 391.

DR. DÖLLINGER AND THE DOGMA OF INFALLIBILITY.¹

BY DR. HERGENRÖTHER, PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY AND CANON
LAW IN THE UNIVERSITY OF WÜRZBURG.

(Translated from the German.)²

V.—DR. DÖLLINGER'S FIVE THESES—(continued).

“FIFTHLY. I consider that I shall be able to prove that the Definitions of the Vatican Council are simply incompatible with the Constitutions of the European States, and, in particular, with the Constitution of Bavaria, and that, bound as I am to maintain this Constitution, in virtue of the oath which I have lately sworn on my admission to the Chamber of State Councillors, I find it impossible to accept the Definitions with their necessary consequence, the Bulls *Unam Sanctam* and *Cum ex Apostolatus Officio*, the Syllabus of Pius IX., and many other Papal declarations and decrees, which are now declared to be infallible decisions, but which are in irreconcilable antagonism to the laws of the State. I appeal on this subject to the opinion given by the Legal Faculty of Munich, and I am ready to abide by the decision of any German legal faculty which your Excellency may be pleased to name.”

Janus had already asserted the incompatibility of the Vatican Decrees with the constitutions of the modern States of Europe, constitutions which, of course, are to be regarded as incapable of either improvement or alteration, and as adapted to the circumstances and exigencies of every time. A similar view, in reference to the Bull *Unam Sanctam*, was put forward by Dr. Döllinger in his “Notes” (sect. xix., p. 13). In fact, the whole substance of this Fifth Thesis has been long since instilled, in various forms, through the columns of the *Augsburg Gazette*, into the minds of the credulous readers of that journal, the organ of the party who profess the doctrines of Janus, and, indeed, of all those who resist the Definitions of the Œcumenical Council. And bearing in mind the consternation into which they have been thrown by the bugbear of “Hildebrandism” thus set before them, we can hardly wonder that they should be blind to the existence of much more serious and imminent dangers, which threaten not only the stability of our institutions, but the very fabric of our

¹ Continued from our January number.

² The notes which are enclosed in brackets [thus], have been added by the translator.

civilization, or that they should fail to be reassured by the clearest proofs of the utter groundlessness of their fears.

Not long since, it was proved to demonstration by a German Professor of Civil Law, that, even accepting the principles assumed by the opponents of the Council, the States of Germany¹ are exposed to no new danger, and are plainly in a position to resist, with a certainty of success, every attempt that could be made to put into practical operation any deductions from the "New Dogmas" which might be distasteful to them.² But all to no purpose. Those who entertain such fears do not wish to have them removed. There is, on the contrary, a demand for sources of anxiety and peril, and Dr. Döllinger, who, on the occasion of his admission to the Chamber of State Councillors, has lately renewed his pledge of allegiance to the Constitution of Bavaria, by taking once more the oath of allegiance that he had formerly taken as a University Professor and as Provost of the Chapter of Munich, is now doubly pledged to ward off the blow by which, as he gravely informs us, the political existence of Bavaria is imperilled. He rests his case upon a legal opinion, which, in reality, affords a plain proof that whilst its authors were thoroughly conversant with one side of the question with which they had to deal—the principles of the Bavarian laws regarding the relations of Church and State—they were far from having the same intimate knowledge of what was equally necessary for a just appreciation of the question, the meaning and application of the principles and decisions of Catholic Theology and Canon Law.³ He is prepared "to abide by the arbitration of any legal faculty in Germany;" for he is confident that they will all regard the question from the same standpoint, an assumption, the truth of which, even in the present constitution of those faculties, is not by any means so obvious as he imagines.

Again, a learned Bishop, the Secretary of the Vatican Council, has published an Essay, in which he clearly proves that the assertions put forward by the framers of the Nuremberg Protest, in reference to the Bulls of Boniface VIII., Paul

¹ It cannot be questioned that the States of Germany now occupy a position in every way more secure than they enjoyed in the seventeenth century. Yet the Protestant Grotius, writing at that period, said:—"Ne Papae jura Regum invadant, video nunc Reges ita bene sibi cavere, ut non sit cur *privatos* ea cura mordeat."—(*Animadversiones in Anim. Andreae Riveti*, p. 27. Ed. Paris, 1642. *Opera*, Ed. 1679, tom. iv., p. 643). Are there not many so-called Catholics who should be put to shame by the candour of Protestant writers?

² *Die Unfehlbarkeit des Pöpstes und der moderne Staat. Histor.-Polit. Blätter*, 1871, vol. 67, nn. 6, 7, pp. 405-24, 485-504.

³ See the paper by Professor Vering of Heidelberg, in the *Archiv. für Kath. Kirchenrecht*, 1870, vol. xxiii., p. 335.

IV., and other Popes, are utterly untenable.¹ The same view had already been established by other writers relying on principles admitted by the opponents of the Dogma, as well as by Theologians and Canonists at Rome and elsewhere.² But still to no purpose. These Bulls, like the Syllabus of 1864,³ must serve their turn as bugbears. The old senseless cry is repeated for the thousandth time, and the arguments brought forward in reply are simply ignored.

So long ago as 1869, it was pointed out in the Protest drawn up by the minority of the Theological Faculty of Munich that at least many of the Bulls in question are capable of another interpretation, and that the claims to authority in temporal matters which have been put forward by the Popes, have been put forward by Œcumenical Councils as well. But again to no purpose. Dr. Döllinger and his adherents, whilst they do not venture to deny, at least explicitly, the Infallibility of Œcumenical Councils, or to take exception to the expressions found in their Definitions, assail the doctrine of Papal Infallibility on account of expressions and acts which are precisely similar, or rather identical with those that they altogether overlook in the case of the Councils, including, indeed, the Councils of Constance and Basle,⁴ which are now in such high repute with all the opponents of the Vatican Definition.

It has long since been proved that the "New Dogma" as it is called—a dogma, however, which even its opponents must admit to have been commonly received throughout the Church, at least for several centuries—does not in any way extend the sphere of Papal authority, and that the Infallibility of the Pope, like the Infallibility of the Church, which has at all times been believed by every Catholic, regards only those matters which belong to the sphere of religion, that is to say, questions of faith and morals. It has been shown, moreover, that this is plainly stated in the Definition of the Vatican Council.⁵ But all in vain. The Definition must be misinterpreted and misrepresented, the interests of the party opposing it require that it should be represented as putting forward

¹ FESSLER. *Die Wahre und die Falsche Unfehlbarkeit der Päpste*. Wien, 1871, pp. 38, et seq. 44 et seq.

² RIVE. *Die Unfehlbarkeit des Pöpstes*, pp. 192, et seq. *Anti-Janus* pp. 133-7. The point is fully developed in the theological *Votum*, published in a recent number of the *Katholik*.

³ See the opinion of Theological Faculty of Würzburg in July 1869 (Würzburg, 1869). Also *Archiv. für Kath. Kirchenrecht*, vol xxv., pp. 127 et seq.

⁴ I shall take another opportunity of developing this point.

⁵ [The words of the Definition are :—"Definimus . . . Romanum Pontificem . . . cum pro suprema sua Apostolica auctoritate *doctrinam de fide vel moribus* ab universa Ecclesia tenendam definit . . . ea infallibilitate pollere," etc.]

a "claim which is subversive of the authority of states and governments, and of the whole existing political order," and defining as an article of faith, "the doctrine of the absolute authority of the Popes, as teachers and rulers, both in Church and State."

There are Protestants who maintain, in spite of every argument that can be brought forward in disproof of their allegations, that Catholics pay divine honour to the Mother of God and to the other saints, that forgiveness of sins can be obtained by purchasing an indulgence, that every Catholic priest is a monster of immorality, and every cloister a den of wickedness. In such calumniators alone, deaf to every argument by which their calumnies are refuted, can we find a parallel to those who obstinately defend this Fifth Thesis of Dr. Döllinger.

Dr. Döllinger takes exception also to the third chapter of the Vatican Constitutions, "which ascribes to the Pope the whole plenitude of power—*totam plenitudinem potestatis*," and from this clause, which when understood of the Church alone—a limitation sufficiently indicated by the whole tenor of the Constitution—is in perfect conformity with the Decrees of former Councils,¹ and with the teaching of Catholic Theology,² he infers that "no other position is left to the Bishops than such as would be enjoyed by Papal agents or plenipotentiaries,"³ and that "the episcopacy of the ancient Church, an office of apostolic institution," is thus "reduced to an unsubstantial shadow."

It is in vain that Catholic writers have pointed out that no such inference is warranted, and that this very chapter of the Constitution of the Council expressly declares that the supreme authority of the Pope in no way excludes or supersedes the

¹ The Fourth Council of Lateran (A.D. 1215) speaks, in its fifth chapter, of the "*principatus ordinariæ potestatis super omnes alias ecclesias*." The Formulary recited in the Second Council of Lyons (A.D. 1274) contains the phrases "*summus et plenus primatus et principatus super universam Ecclesiam*;" and again, "*plenitudo potestatis*." And it is hardly necessary to quote the well-known words of the Council of Florence (A.D. 1439)—"*primatus in universum orbem*," and "*plena potestas pascendi, regendi ac gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam*."—See SCHULTE. *Lehrbuch des Kirchenrechts*, p. 192. Ed. 1868.

² PETRUS BALLERINI. *Vindiciæ Auctoritatis Pontificiæ contra Opus Justinii Febronii*, cap 3, et seq., p. 165, et seq. Ed. Monaster. 1847. CARD. GERDIL. *De Plenitud. Potest. Episcopalis* (*Opera* tom. xi, p. 116, et seq.), and *Animadv. in Comment. Febron.* Posit. xxv. (*Op.* tom. xiii., p. 305).

³ The Protestant, Hase, in his *Handbuch* (p. 187), puts the same idea more pointedly:—"assistants," he says, "or deacons of the Pope." And in the *Augsburg Gazette* of the 2nd of June, 1870 (Forty-ninth Letter from the Council), we have it thus:—"passive, unintelligent promulgators and executors of Papal commands and decrees on faith."

authority of the Bishops, whom in fact it recognises as the successors of the Apostles, constituted as such by the Holy Ghost, and whose jurisdiction it declares to be ordinary and immediate (*ordinaria et immediata*), like the jurisdiction of the Supreme Pontiff himself.¹

In spite of all this, the calumny is repeated,² the Bishops are informed, with sarcastic solemnity, that in the impending overthrow of their office by the Papal power, they must find their consolation in the few rays which will be reflected upon them from the throne of Papal Omnipotence; and a sneer is added in reference to the quotation by the Council of a passage from Saint Gregory the Great, who "repelled the idea of a universal episcopacy with profound and outspoken aversion, as a blasphemous and anti-Christian usurpation." But Saint Gregory, humble as he was, knew thoroughly well that he was invested with authority over all the Bishops of the Church, and whilst, on the one hand, he upheld the dignity of his brethren, on the ground that it could not be compromised without compromising his own, on the other hand, he did not fail to uphold his own dignity, as necessary for the maintenance of theirs.

The theologians most thoroughly imbued with the Roman spirit have always taught, with Saint Bernard, that the Papal dignity, although the highest, is not the only dignity in the Church (*summa sed non sola*), since the Bishops are invested with authority *jure divino*, to govern these churches over which they are placed by the ordinance of God; and, consequently, the Pope, although invested with authority over them, to moderate and restrain, within certain limits, the exercise of their authority, cannot exercise his power arbitrarily, but only so far as the good of the Church may require it, nor can he concentrate all ecclesiastical matters in his

¹["*Tantum autem abest,*" are the words of the Council, "*ut haec Summi Pontificis potestas officiat ordinariae illi episcopalis jurisdictionis potestati, qua Episcopi, qui positi a Spiritu Sancto in Apostolorum locum successerunt, tanquam veri Pastores assignatos sibi greges, singuli singulos, pascunt et regunt, ut eadem a supremo et universali Pastore asseratur, roboretur ac vindicetur, dicente Sancto Gregorio Magno: 'Meus honor est honor universalis Ecclesiae, Meus honor est fratrum meorum solidus vigor. Tum ego vere honoratus sum, cum singulis quibusque honor debitus non negatur.'*"] ACTA CONCIL. VATICAN. *Constit. de Ecclesia* cap. 3.]

² Dr. Döllinger, after referring to the clause in question, goes on to say:—"The Decree provides that the power of the Bishops is an 'ordinary' one, that is to say, in the language of the Roman Canonists, a *potestas ordinaria subdelegata*." Where did the learned Provost meet with such an expression? By what canonist has it ever been used? All canonists distinguish between the two sorts of jurisdiction with which every Bishop is invested—(1). The "ordinary episcopal jurisdiction;" and (2). That which is communicated to him as a delegate of the Pope. Here, as in so many other portions of Dr. Döllinger's Protest, we trace the pen of the journalist, rather than of the ecclesiastical professor.

own hands, treating all the Bishops of the Church merely as his vicars.¹ The Decrees of the Vatican Council are in strict accordance with this teaching; and, whatever assertions to the contrary may be put forward in the columns of the *Augsburg Gazette*, the Bishops are in exactly the same position now that they occupied before the 18th of July, 1870. To the end of time, the saying of Saint Jerome will retain its truth: "The well-being of the Church depends on the authority of her Supreme Pastor: if he were not invested with an extraordinary and universal jurisdiction there would be in the Church as many sects as there are priests."² And hence the Pope has been placed to govern the Church as Pastor, Father, and Head of all.

Towards the close of his protest, Dr. Dollinger writes:—"I would earnestly recommend everyone who wishes to form a just conception of the vast extent of the authority claimed for the Pope in the Decrees of the Vatican Council, carefully to compare the third and fourth chapters; he will then be able to realise what a system of universal government and spiritual dictatorship is there set before us. All Catholics are now commanded to believe, and to make practical recognition of their belief in the existence of a plenary power over the whole Church, as well as over each individual member of it, such as the Popes, since Gregory VII., have claimed for themselves, and such as is set forth in innumerable Bulls since the *Unam Sanctam*. This power is boundless:³ it is incalculable in its extent:⁴ it can make itself felt, as Innocent III. proclaimed, wherever sin exists: no one is

¹ ["Ita ut illius [R. Pontificis] potestas, quamvis summa atque plenissima, non tamen sola sit, sed Episcopus in partem sollicitudinis vocatos debeat agnoscere; et siquidem possit pro potestatis plenitudine eorum facultates moderari ac limitare quoad exercitium et usum, prout in Ecclesie bonum expedire judicaverit, non tamen possit omnes eorum facultates ad se attrahere, nec ipsos quasi suos vicarios efficere, neque dioceses omnes quasi unam diocesim habere."—BALLERINI. *De Potestate Ecclesiastica Summ. Pontiff.* cap. iii., n. 12.]

² "Nec enim Rom. Pontifex per episcopos veluti per administratos aut vicarios suos ecclesiam regit, sed eos constituit tanquam totidem principes ordinaria potestate instructos ad uniuscujusque ecclesie particularis bonum, quamvis cum debita subjectione in hujus potestatis exercitio a Romana sede."—PERRONE, *De Locis Theol.* Pars i., n. 618.]

³ S. HIERON. *Dialog. contra Lucifer.*

⁴ [It is hardly credible that Dr. Döllinger can have regarded this statement as a fair exposition of the Roman doctrine regarding the authority of the Popes. Father Perrone puts the matter very plainly:—"Nullo alio limite voluit Christus primatium circumscribi dignitatem praeter illum quem praefigere^e ejus abusus in destructionem ecclesiae. Nihil enim pontifex potest efficere quod vergeret in ecclesiae destructionem ac si quid ejusmodi moliretur nulli censerentur ejus actus. At in aedificationem omnia potest." *De Locis Theol.* Pars i., n. 716].

⁵ It is unnecessary to comment upon this gross perversion of truth. Never were the words of John of Salisbury more applicable than at present (*Polycrat.* Lib. viii., cap. 23):—"Romano Pontifici minimum, eo ipso quod plurimum, licet."

exempt from its jurisdiction: sovereign and arbitrary, it allows no appeal; for according to the declaration of Boniface III., 'the Pope carries all rights in the shrine of his bosom.'¹ As he has now become [!] infallible, he can at any moment, by that little word *Orbi* [that is, by addressing the universal Church], make any proposition, any doctrine, any pretension, an unerring and irrefragable article of faith. In opposition to his pretensions, no right can be maintained, no liberty, personal or corporate, can be asserted, or—to use the phrase of some canonists—the tribunal of God and of the Pope is one and the same. Such a system, bearing as it does, the stamp of its Latin origin, will never make good its footing in Germany."

What then are we to say of the system which is embodied in Dr. Döllinger's Five Theses; does it bear no trace of a Latin origin? Is it the pure creation of the German mind? Or, rather, is it not notorious and unmistakable that the contrary is the fact?

And as the question of nationalities has been raised by Dr. Döllinger, may we not ask whether at such a time as this, when France lies prostrate before her German conquerors, a system French in its conception and in its origin, is likely to make good its footing in Germany? Nor should we lose sight of the fact that not merely the system itself, but also the means employed for giving practical effect to its principles, are, unquestionably, of French origin. They are the same which were employed when the authority of the Holy See was assailed by the Jansenists and their allies of the infidel party, whose combined machinations prepared the way for the great Revolution. No one who examines carefully the internal history of France, from 1682 to 1789, and especially that portion of it which describes the violent opposition offered to the reception of the Bull *Unigenitus*, can fail to be struck by the parallel between the stormy disturbances of that time, and the agitation at present existing in so many parts, especially of southern Germany.

As to the statement with which Dr. Döllinger concludes his Protest, expressing his conviction "that as one of the results of the doctrine" which he combats "was the downfall of the old German Empire, so, too, if it should be accepted now by German Catholics, it would at once sow the seed of incurable

¹ The maxim in reality says that this is what is *believed* regarding the Pope: *censetur* habere. It is a maxim borrowed from the old Roman Law; it refers, as Reiffenstuel (Proem in Jus. Canon., sect. xii., p. 213, et seq.) explains, in the first place, to the legislative power of every supreme lawgiver; and, secondly, to the learned councillors and assistants, who are presumed to be the constant attendants of the legislator.

decay in the new Empire which has so lately sprung into existence;" the former portion of the statement thus put forward, is a purely gratuitous assertion which Dr. Döllinger, as he has made it, is undoubtedly called upon to prove, and which has, at least, the appearance of having been dictated by a spirit of partizanship, since so many other causes of the catastrophe to which he refers lie nearer at hand. The verification of the second portion of his statement, dealing exclusively with the future, may possibly be helped out by the misrepresentation of the "New Dogmas," which he has thought fit to set before the public, and by the prejudices which he has been able to excite in the circles to which his influence extends.

W. J. W.

IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL COLLEGES SINCE THE REFORMATION.

THE IRISH COLLEGE OF DOUAY.

To the as Reverend as Honorable Descended, Mr. Christopher Cusake, Beginner and President of the Duacian Irish Seminarie; and to all studentes out of his, and all other Seminaries of our Countrie, wheresoever—Grace and Peace.

From about the yeare 1555, as is well known, these late heresies by force, never by voluntarie allowance, oppressed religion in our countrie, banished teachers, extinguished learning, exiled to foreign countries all instruction, and enforced our youth, either at home to be ignorant, or abroad in povertie rather to glean eares of learning, than with leisure, to reap any great abundance thereof. Yet such as travelled to foreign countries, notwithstanding all difficulties, whom their friends in their absence, as is the notorious unkindness in our nation, abandoned, they often attained singular perfection and reputation of learning in sundrie sciences, to principal titles of universities, to high prelacies, of whom some are yet living, some departed in peace. But of those that by their pains advanced the public good of our countrie, as well departed this mortal life, leaving their glorious memory in continual benediction, as yet travailing for it without all private and provincial respects, these to my knowledge were and are the principal: Patrick and Henry Seagrave, Leonard FitzSimon,

Richard Stanihurst, John Lea, David Rooth, Thomas Deis, Lawrence Segrave, John Roch, Thomas Whyte, Thomas Massingham, that nothing be said of Jesuits, F. Rochfort, F. Howling, F. Thomas Whyte, F. Richard Conway, F. William Bath, F. Corneilius Carrig, and others, studiously advancing the public cause of our country to their greatest power. By whom our said countrie received many rare helps and supplies, especially in these later days, to the great advancement of God's glory, and discomfiture of heretics.

Satan and other heretics observing such good to God's Church and ruin to heretics, by recourse of these fortunate triarian champions, and not knowing easily how to debar the crossing over of students to Catholic countries, Filii iniqui ex Israel, the most perverse of our nation employed themselves immoderately to erect "Gymnasium in Hierosolymis secundum leges nationum"—a College in Dublin for Catholics according to the impious sects of other nations.

In which striving against the stream and against the privilege obtained by the intercession of St. Patrick to our nation, that neither infidelity or heresy should possess the country, they expected to seduce at least simple innocents, since that all judicious persons did palpably behold and avoid their as vain as vanishing delusions. So then this College by none of account approached, by no number of reckoning frequented, notwithstanding all fraud and force that might be to the contrary, came to little effect according to the prediction of our Saviour:—"All planting which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up." Of which collegists we will take our Saviour's advice following in the next words:—"Let them alone; blind they are and guides of the blind."

Now did it belong to the wisdom of our Almighty Saviour and God, when malice began to molest his flock, and to machinate the destruction of the abovesaid children, to find out some zealous rather than deeply learned guide, it being his wont to elect the weak things of this world to confound the strong, to open a larger way than hitherto for them whom he had predestinated "into an elect generation, a kingly priesthood, a holy nation, a people of purchase, that they may declare His virtues which from darkness had called them into his marvellous light." I do seem to behold in heaven, betwixt the Blessed Trinity and all saints of our country, together with all angel guardians, general and particular, a deep consultation who this guide might most conveniently be, and by public adoption divers to be chosen, but for these parts of the low countries, without all opposition to have been elected Mr. Christopher Cusake, of honourable descent and alliance with

the noblest ranks, of great virtue, zeal and singular sincerity. Who being unexperienced in foreign countries, meanly languaged, and meanly furnished with requisites for a building to reach to this height, in human wisdom little success seemed to be expected. Yet beholding now such unexpected increase beyond all human imagination, in reason and right we are to magnify God's over-reaching wisdom, and to register the glorious fame and name of Cusack in the golden book of immortal gratitude, as conformable to distressed Ireland as Chusay to distressed David.

This is the banished Joseph, whose banishment is the remedy and comfort of his famishing and perishing nation. This is Ireland's brightest sun, by which Ireland's darkness is most avoided. This is Ireland's famous glory, by whom the infamy of supposed barbarity of Ireland is exchanged into daily increasing reputation of extraordinary bringing up and piety. But his modesty will frown at these applauses, and I, linked in such kindred, acquaintance, inveterated love, cannot strain either his modesty or my own impartiality by further particular commendations.

During these seventeen years since he began, first upon his own provision, and afterwards on the bounty of the Catholic King, to maintain together students in this city of Douay, upon which city God hath poured out plentifully, and, as it may be said, in comparison of most other places, prodigally his blessings, as well of extraordinary learning as incomparable virtue, considering that year by year only one college thereof yieldeth unto the clergy above a hundred learned travellers; since I say he began to maintain and assemble our young students in this place, wherein at this instant I am resident, it cannot be imagined how much the obscurity of our nation's renown hath been diminished and glory thereof increased; how much the name of Irish became venerable, nay, admirable for peculiar towardness to learning, forwardness to virtue, modesty of conversation, facility to be governed, consent among themselves, promptitude to all that might be exacted, yea, or in reason expected of any of most complete and conformable education or condition. Let none think that any partial affection has had place in this attestation, considering such to be the public and private letters patent and testimonies of Princes, Prelates, universities, cities and colleges, extant to all men's view, that little may rather seem affirmed than their desert duly declared. In so much as in sundry provinces and cities they easily obtained habitation, relief, favour, and reputation, as in Tournay, Louvain, Paris, Bourdeaux, Rouen,

Thoulouse, Antwerp, Lille, Cologne, etc., besides particulars entertained with charitable benevolence in manifold other places. I speak here of those of this seminary alone, and I omit to speak of other Irish seminaries in Spain of no less commendation, increase, and accompt.

I trust the wonted spirit of our nation is returning, since the wonted hospitality and liking thereof returneth in foreign countries. Whatsoever our Albanian Scots have or do enjoy by title of our ancient name of Scots, much good may it do them! yet without great wrong they cannot deny, and, as I hope, will not repine, but that only by us, even Camden being umpire, was purchased Luxovium, Bobium, Herbipolis, S. Gallus, and other places in France and Germany, into which they as issued from us, when we were assaulted with continual invasions of foreigners, or, like Cadmus' brethren, devoured one another at home by civil uproar, entered into possession. If they doubt thereof and will be satisfied with any reasonable resolution, I remit them to the histories of S. Malachy, S. Gertrude, S. Columban, S. Rumold, S. Fursœus, etc., in which is shown by and for only Irish, as then only known Scots, the aids and other foundations, refuges, and, as it were, provocations for their resort were erected, rented, frequented.

And not to omit a consideration of principal respect and edification, wherein I have ever had singular contentment, you might and may still, to God's greater glory be it spoken, observe so the union and spirit of primitive Christians in the Ducian or Cusacian family, whereby they had *cor unum et animam unam*, that it was ordinary and in a sort universal, even in commensals, so to communicate their exhibition, apparel, books, etc., as that against them the demand of St. John could have no effect. But of other proofs of their devout spirit there can seem none greater, than that in the space of so few years about a hundred and twenty have heroically entered into the ecclesiastical state, therein are eminent and to all God's Church beneficial, and that of so great number but one only apostate, and he in mouth not in mind, and but only for lust of the flesh, can be specified.

Would you have yet a greater proof of their generous and more than human magnanimity? Not contented in their choice of religious with those of less discipline and perfection, with those of greater commodities for flesh and blood, with those of freer passage to ecclesiastical dignity, they rather tend to others in which sensual delights are most mortified, humility, charity, obedience, contemplation, zeal of souls, and all religious discipline is most observed.

As water doth more inflame the smith's forge, as repugnance doth animate the lion's couragè, as tartness eggeth the languishing appetite, so doth it embolden them if they know they are to find opposition to their natural inclinations. I speak by experience of those who have resorted to our Profession, that they have not been thereto more inclined that they perceived in outward appearance, for diet and apparel, for cheerful conversation, for plausible credit among men, greater conformity to sensual ease; but their incentive motives have been for greater abnegation of their judgment and will, greater adventures to chilling colds and scorching climates for advancing God's glory and their greater union with God, to undertake greater pains for his Church, greater contradiction of the world, the devil, and heretics, and, in their opinion, the greatest austerity proportionable to human infirmity.

Believing the doctrine of S. Thomas, that such are the perfectest religious which are ordained to teach and preach, the chiefest and ripest of them tend and travail to be received in orders more excelling in the said functions; as knowing, according to the said Doctor, such as teach Divinity, controversies, sermons, cases of conscience, with a spiritual and direct intention, to hold that rank of perfection among the most contemplative orders of religion which the instructing master of works beareth among the handicraftsmen—by as much as it is more meritorious to indoctrine many preachers and pastors than to be alone fervent. So that it was not the least part of their wisdom, that they yielded no credit to contrary imaginations buzzed often as fraudulently as erroneously into their brains, that to teach forsooth public schools, especially of liberal sciences, could be no exercise of contemplative religion, but at the most of the active life, as being not only subject to frequent distractions but also to imminent dangers of destruction.

Against which in itself no less absurd than pernicious error, S. Thomas, the sun of knowledge, and a religious man incomparably contemplative, most learnedly disputeth, and in disputing disproveth by manifold reasons and examples of eminent saints in God's Church, who being religious taught not only Scriptures but also liberal sciences. And he addeth, that they are particularly fit to teach who enter into the depth of contemplation.

The resolute pressing of the Duacians to such teaching religious Orders doth well demonstrate their legitimate conformity with our ancient glorious predecessors, of whom, at home and abroad, the fame of rare industry for instructing was most glorious, as to all readers is not unknown, and now deserveth,

for our imitation, to be succinctly revealed, although in my Dedicatory upon Rider's Caveat, it was in part declared.¹

Whereof being more amply to treat in the ecclesiastical history of our country, and having, as is said already, discoursed thereof before, this foretaste may serve to sharpen your appetites towards the treatise now in preparation, and the abrupt brevity thereof will gratify the repining horror against such our quondam incredible glory in any, if any be, subject to emulation.

But doth the good and redress of our country require such religious teachers, and may they not be spared and their stead supplied as well by others? I will not answer, lest I might seem over partial in the defence of such religious. But I will afford certain parcels written by a most excellent late Martyr of our country, the thrice glorious primate Creagh, of whom it is uncertain whether Catholics have had more triumph by his evident justification for the rape reproached at the bar at Westminster Hall, than heretics confusion of being discovered in their fraudulent shifts and shameless impostures, to which despair of otherwise defending their cause enforceth them.

He, in a letter bearing date 1580, from the Tower of London, which, with his own hand he wrote to the Rev. F. Oliver Manarè, at that time Vicar-General of his Order, which letter I have now in custody as a precious pledge and relique, he answereth so to the former demands, as first acknowledging corruptions of great deploration in the country, particularly a rude and ignorant clergy in many places, a danger of heresies' increase, great incivility in many places and persons, &c., at length he declareth that he had been humble petitioner to His Holiness to send thereto certain teaching religious persons, as the only mean of Ireland's reduction, by whom also all Christian countries received principal reformation, for whose maintenance he offered to apply certain vacant benefices.

Did modesty permit to impart such high commends as he presenteth, the whole letter might be inserted. Now, the only conclusion must testify his good will gratefully by the said religious accepted, the rather that their mission was by him first procured, and the allowance thereof by supreme authority after due deliberation by this his conclusion testified.

“What I thought of about certain Religious Fathers being empowered at once by Apostolic authority to open schools and

¹ He here gives as an instance St. Olcan and St. Finane, and the Irish saints teaching in England, and he quotes a prophecy of Merlin from Camden, which says: “Sapience hath flourished in Oxford, in time to come being to depart into Ireland.”

found a university, I undertook and, with God's grace, accomplished, as far as in me lay. For Pius the Fourth granted *motu proprio* whatever I asked, the matter having been first examined in a congregation of Cardinals, at which was, if I remember aright, his present Holiness, who was then not a Cardinal, but a Doctor returned from the Council of Trent, In case the times did not allow me to carry out the business. it was committed by the diploma to the care of my successors."

Wherefore, now to the former questions this so public a prelate, a primate, a Martyr would and doth in this manner answer:—"In my opinion, together with the judgment of all well-willers of our Nation the said religious are so necessary to our reformations, as that they cannot only not well be spared, but no others to us are, in these times, so needful, and, therefore, by me, in behalf of the whole country, before and above all others they were first and most coveted."

So that from first to last appeareth the repugnance and error against such godly functions of teaching religious to be by examples of Christ, Apostles, Saints, even of our own country, as also by a late martyr, not only preposterous, but also to Ireland and all the world prejudicious, and to the parties themselves, if I be not foully deceived, not a little dangerous, for many censures by God's Church objected against such temerity—the Holy Ghost, governor of the said Church, thinking it to belong to His providence to defend them peculiarly by whom he did foresee the Church was peculiarly to be defended, and therefore they for so doing to be peculiarly impugned by as well malignant emulators as professed adversaries. All which is adduced to approve the judicious assenting of our Duacians, of themselves, without all advice of other instructors, from the privy but palpable impostures of inveigling envy suggesting the contrary.

This being said of their valourous and victorious entrance into religions, maugre the world, flesh, and devil—and that in the very prime and spring of their youth, many of them being heirs of land. I cannot overpass further a principal commendation of this seminary, that hitherto none of the whole multitude ever aspired to ecclesiastical dignity, to that sublimity dreadful even to the innocency and shoulders of angels.

I know both at other times many worthy prelates to have been, since the suppression of religion, and at this time to be undertaking the charge, not for any pharisaical pre-eminence, but only for the goodness not of the worth, but of the work belonging to the office. I cannot be ignorant of our illustrious Primate Peter Lombard, so clearly reshining even in the theatre of the world, if not above, yet among

the brightest prelates, for rare learning, episcopal mildness, integrity of life, and singular benignity and favour towards myself. Him and others I know, especially our late Archbishop of Dublin, of whom the whole country receiveth, and probably is to receive, wished honour and advancement of renown.

These I know and dutifully honour, such being my disposition to approve whomsoever God's Church electeth, never to malign or envy, but only to pity the worst or most scandalous, and not to flatter or fear worst or best.

But omitting such as were not seminarists of Douay, I intend to inculcate their modesty of whom only I now treat. I have read of St. Mark cutting his tongue to frustrate ecclesiastical exaltation, of St. Isaac, St. Goar, St. Gregory, St. Nazianzen, of our St. Malachy, St. Laurence, and infinite others, trembling to take that honour upon themselves, but abiding to be called by God as Aaron; yet may I boldly affirm to have observed if not equal resistance to these eminent Saints, at least not much less in divers of the Douay Seminarists. Of two, among others, for future imitation and present admiration, I will make mention, although I hazard to incur thereby their grievous indignation. Both are graduates, yea Doctors of Divinity, in the two most famous universities of Christendom. Both are, for piety, virtue, edification, sufficiency, if not incomparable in all the nation, yet in the highest rank of the foremost. Both are pillars and planters, ornaments and upholders of our country's religion and credit, and with all domesticals and foreigners in great authority, love, and reputation. Their names cannot be dissembled, they being by these qualities suddenly conceived in the minds of all them that know them, and who knoweth them not?

I therefore say that David Rooth and Thomas Deis, the two aforesaid, to my knowledge, by divers earnest and vehement letters, most studiously, most instantly, most shamefacedly, to have prevented, diverted, frustrated their generally wished, yea, and much procured advancement and sublimation to ecclesiastical prelacy.

Neither their countrie's clamours, nor her tears, lest ambitious, ignorant, and scandalous intruders, as, alas! is the manner, should preoccupate the seats; neither their due by birth and ability claiming their being preferred to all others in benefices vacant in their own provinces; briefly, neither these nor any other motives were able to violate their resolution, or hinder their tergiversation. And should such modesty and humility, or virtuous scrupulosity, not be propounded among the commendations of the Cusacians? But omitting these whom for honor I name, and for fear of sus-

pected assentation, whereof no cause may be imagined, I do but name, I proceed to what I further intended.

Having from first to last such president and such posterity, of such dignity, virtue, and learning, and of so great sufficiency and affection to patronize this my Treatise of the Mass, had I not been simple and inconsiderate to covet other more powerful defenders or patrons? Doubtless I had been culpable the more by how much I had imitated the prodigal's perversity, who, not contented with the paternal store, with a far fetch leaving competent food, was forced to feed on husks. The saying of our Saviour: "There is no prophet without honour but in his own country, and in his own house, and in his own kindred," hath ever indoctrined and induced me to be content with domestical provision, to which from abroad like may not be purchased.

To these, therefore, I do resign the amendment and protection of my co-operation in this Treatise of the Sacrifice of the Mass, although in itself it be inviolable, as being the institution, yea, the oblation of the very Son of God. It is no marvel, if the first rude delineation with the coal of one so much interrupted shall require the pencil of others to give the perfection in due and decent colours. I know they can do it; I crave they would do it. Their reward and merit will be in some measure comparable to the oblation of this sovereign Sacrifice, because, as S. Rupertus, a saint of our own country, said, "We offer well the sacrifice if we teach others to offer it."

Of all other faults of mine this seemed most grievous, that S. Augustin and other Fathers, being timorous and unwilling to divulgate the secret mysteries of this incruental propitiation for sin, yet that without such scrupulous caution I should seem to cast the bread of children, yea, of angels, before dogs. But if anything may disblame me, it is the example of this age, wherein in most countries the same is done upon surmised necessity to disabuse heretics, and all that believe them, that in this heavenly Mystery not only all is not "magic, idolatry, superstition, and heresy," as M. Rider believeth, but contrariwise all is piety, religion, devotion, yea the pith and quintessence of the Gospel, even by the confession of Luther, and that the truest that ever he made, saying: "The Mass is part of the Gospel, yea the very sum and abridgment thereof." I did also behold upon like motion, as also is testified in the preface of the Old Testament in English, newly set forth in Douay, that the holy Scripture is therefore lately divulged by Catholics, contrary to the ancient

custom, to manifest the shameless impostures in feigning that they had in or by them any advantage.

It is only the younger and blinder sort of Protestants who will attack the Holy Sacrifice. They are most adventurous, and their scribendi cacoethes and headlong itch may never, by any rule or reason, be restrained, although the comic poet adviseth them in a serious and sound manner—

“Fit you that write your matter to might.”

Only they, I say, or some one Herostratus of them, by surviving infamy rather to be remembered than be wholly forgotten, will, perhaps, give fire to more than the temple of Diana, by blaspheming this pure Host and what thereto belongeth : whom by my counsel you shall not once gratify, not only with answer, but also not with regard. Whereof I will give you pregnant reasons observed by long experience.

Disputation with heretics is a thing always desired by Catholics, presupposing that they will stand to any arbitrament, if not of some late Bishop, yet of some much more ancient, if not of some old writer, yet of some holy primitive Father, or at least of many together consenting, if not of many ancient Doctors, at least of some General Councils, disclaiming holy Scriptures as oft as they give verdict against them, which ever happeneth—always making themselves alone the rule of all certainty, and so only that to be true that is with them, and all to be false that is against them. But among the whole sort are there many not such ? are there any ? I leave to your trial to approve, testifying of my own experience to have had little difficulty with any that I could bring to be tried by any settled ground of either Scriptures, Traditions, Church, Councils, Fathers, severally or conjointly.

Neither to any other industry may I impute it, next to the effectual and merciful grace of God, to whom alone be all glory thereof, that among hundred others¹ by me reconciled, the ninth English minister in the very day of writing hereof, this 26th of October, 1611, hath been purchased to Christian and Catholic religion. I cannot, I say, ascribe it so much to any other observation as that I ever tied them to some irrevocable foundation, from which after, upon any pretence, they should not start or appeal.

Others whom you may not entreat to abide at a bay, believe me you shall find remediless ; as all Fathers have delivered and is convenient to you, being daily to enter into the list

¹ “With very many others,” he says in “*Britannomachia*.”

against the enemies of Christ and His Church, to be forewarned, and by you also to be believed, that you do not spend your pains but where profit may be probably expected. Would you contend with them whom meretricious and affected lying, cauterized hypocrisy, and impostures delight? It would not become your ingenuous education nor peaceful condition. "For their books," says Luther, and the same must be thought of their disputations, "there is no pith nor substance, but only frivolous cracking." Let them believe Luther in this, whom to believe they have forsaken all true belief. This sort of people, says Tertullian, "molest the strong, deceive the weak, dismiss neutrals with uncertainty: with whom to confer you shall only alter your stomach, gaining nought else but loathsomeness by their blasphemies," yea, Heshusius, a brother of their own, and Calvin confirm that opinion of our modern heretics, where of much to like effect may be upon "Rider's Caveat," page 100, etc.

Not only do they build on obstinacy and outfaced impudence, but also in contentions and voluntary lying, as is assured by Luther himself. And if you crave of them what they mean by such their determinate lying, one of themselves giveth this reason:—As long as I can I will destroy, let my forgery remain as secret as it may, seeing these lies will get credit among the common people.¹ This was an old perversity of sectarists according to Tertullian and S. Gregory Nazianzen. By these forgeries they are so infamous, that generally it is holden, yea, by their own confession, "to be more secure to take the word of a broker than of a reformed gospeler."²

Lastly, they ground willingly and wittingly upon seared impostures, "preaching plausible to the itching ears of the multitude, inflecting, fashioning, and refashioning their religion to the will and wantonness of their lords and congregations, whose glory they more esteem than the glory of God." Themselves confess it, and in treating upon their creed, in the article, "I believe in the Catholic Church," more may be perused thereon.

For this cause Seminarists and Jesuits are persecuted and calumniated; for this only cause they are maligned and circumvented, "because they do reproach against them the sin of the law, and defame against them the wickedness of their discipline." For this cause the edge of persecution's sword is too dull against us, the search of promoters too slack, the

¹ Vide Remund. Rufum duplicat. con. Patronum Molinaei, f. 76.

² Sarcer in Postilla Dom. 10.

magistrate's moderation too irreligious, the spoil of our goods great favour, our oppression great equity and glory.

Which to have forewarned of our adversaries' drift, that coming among them, their malice and machinations against you and your cause being discovered, you may know what armour and weapons you must provide. It shall suffice to conclude my epistle, and to testify how desirous I am of your safety, whereupon both the defence and fruit of this treatise and all spiritual weal of our country most dependeth, for which, as your faithful sentinel, I display and forewarn the said designs, not by me discovered without pains, patience, and peril.

Yours most affectionately and assuredly in Christ Jesus,

Henry FitzSimon.

Douay, Oct. 26, 1611.

FATHER HENRY FITZSIMON, S. J.

(Continued from page 192, Nq. c.)

WITH "thrasonic bluster" Rider asked leave to attack Fitz-Simon, but was afraid to avail of the permission. At first, like the donkey famous in fable, who was disguised as a lion,

"He roared so loud and looked so wondrous grim,
His very shadow durst not follow him."

But he soon showed and dropped his ears. As FitzSimon says:

"Mr. Rider, as the hare is wont, before he seats himself in his form, had a great desire to strain himself to greater girds towards the end. As far as my remembrance serveth me, I read in Sir Philip Sydney's *Arcadia* a pleasant fiction of one Dametas, who had earnestly provoked one Clinias to combat, thinking he would not accept the challenge; but finding the challenge accepted, he declined to fight, on some trivial grounds of time, place, and manner.

"So my Dametas relents on the main provocation, and excepts at trifles most timorously and impertinently.¹ Mr. Rider, you might have had my answer long ago, but that your invitation to discussion was conformable to the new requesting of friends to meals—with many caps, but without hospitality.

¹ "Confutation," circa, 364.

You provoked me to labour it, but debarred me to publish it ; and your conduct has been such that many of your most judicious surmisers suspect that by some promised promotion of the Papists you had prejudiced, and in a manner, betrayed your profession to infamy.¹

“Cœcolampad said to the Landgrave of Hesse, ‘ I would, most Excellent Prince, this right hand of mine were chopped off when first I began to write anything of the Lord’s Supper.’ Renew, renew the same cry, Mr. Rider.

“ For, 1^o, as is evidently shown, you insinuated all the State, Lords and Council, to be fools and heretics.

“ 2^o. You directed us to authors most repugnant to your profession, testifying them to be against the Catholic Church, and by so testifying, leaving yourself forlorn and abandoned of all excuse.

“ 3^o. You have, by necessary inference, implied your own profession to be wicked and damnable, late, base and counterfeit.

“ 4^o. You have betrayed your profession, by the testimony of all the chief of the same, to a jury condemning you and them.

“ 5^o You have violated and corrupted, depraved and falsified the Sacred Scriptures themselves, perspicuously to all men’s eyes.

“ 6^o. You have paragoned or compared the Mysteries of Christ’s Gospel, with all the sacraments and sanctification thereof, to base, beggarly ordinances of the Old Law.

“ 7^o. You have disdained the words of Christ’s institution of his Blessed Sacrament, and corrected them with a new institution of your own.

“ 8^o. You have denied the whole merits of Christ’s life and death, and imputed your salvation to that which happened after Christ’s death.

“ 9^o. You have made Christ’s institution, by your active and passive commentary, to contradict itself and to be absurd and false.

“ 10^o. You have made princes and people, great and small, who ever did break images of Christ, to be traitors against Christ.

“ 11^o. You have testified yourself manifoldly to be a Puritan—that is—a seditious resister, by your own private diversity of judgment, to princes and parliament ordinances of late reformation, and a deadly enemy of the Protestantry which hath been established.

“ 12^o. You have bound yourself to believe and not to believe Christ really and not really, literally yet not literally, spiri-

¹ “ Epistle to Master John Rider” in the “ Confutation.”

tually yet not spiritually, sacramentally yet not sacramentally, etc., in the Blessed Sacrament.

“13°. You have concourse and association with Jews and Jewishness in yourself and your Patriarchs, as also with the most heinous heretics; and you also disproved all and every one of the most famous Protestants, and by them you as generally are refuted—which also is done by your own confessors and martyrs.

“14°. You have entered bond and obligation in print to aver in unity and verity of doctrine all that ever might be blasphemed against God and godliness.

“15°. You have most puritanically censured the acts of parliament, since the suppression, to be heretical, abominable, repugnant to God’s truth, to the ancient Fathers, and the practise of the primitive Church.

“16°. You have, contrary to your claim, disavowed the General Council of Nice, and have allured the nobility of Ulster in Ireland to imitate them, who intended to kill their king and rebelled against his constitutions.¹

“Briefly, what untruths, denials, interpretations, sequels, arguments, contradictions, impudencies, and impieties you have, beside all the former, run into—they are not so obscurely or seldomly incident, but that all who favour your profession may think you were hired, or of yourself intended to disgrace, disable, and condemn your and their cause. Since you cannot deny any syllable of these imputations, you may worthily cry the cry of Cæcolampad, you may worthily shun the light of the sun, and thereby profess plainly and simply that heresy hath no defence but in a lie, and can but by lies and darkness be protected, and that coming to light it is suddenly discomfited.

“Invincible and infallible Spouse of Christ, the Catholic Church! I resign and devote my travails and writings to thy sacred doom. With thee I say and unsay, commend and condemn all doctrine by me and others professed.”

Father FitzSimon was sometimes distracted from his controversial labours and his sufferings by witnessing from his tower in the Castle some sights of the outer world, which amused, if they did not edify him. Here is a little incident which we shall let him tell in his own words, begging the reader to imagine himself for a moment living in the early years of the seventeenth century. However, we shall take the liberty of representing by stars certain Elizabethan expressions, which are *too Saxon* for our times.

“Adam Loftus was an apostate priest, Lord Primate, etc.,

¹ FitzSimon refers to the articles, in which all these things are proved.

by which office he exalted his plentiful brood to knighthood, to noble alliance, and lofty estates. Time bringing him to old age, and to anguish and torment of mind for his straying courses,¹ he betook himself to read Catholic books, and, as was blundered abroad, meditated how to recant and repent before being called to account.

“Sir George Carie, Lord Justice, having a tooth against Loftus, upbraided him with the reported ‘infamy of his revolt.’ Adam had to justify himself privatelie, and after that publiclie by a sermon on Catholic doctrine. Purgatorie seemed fittest, lest he might seem to aspire thereto. Great was the assemblie to hear the old man purge himself from the imputation. He purged himself, not as you may think ; for after his text scantly uttered, he was suddenlie * * * his colour changed, his voice grew weak, his memorie failed, he bit his lips, let fall his hands, and to the hearing and * of all the admiring and confounded audience (save your honour, reader!), he * * * himself in the pulpit. He was borne * * * to his man Robert Leicester’s house, in the Fishamble-street, on men’s shoulders, and there was * with much ado comforted. This happened in the year of our Lord 1602, and of no small part thereof was I, being then in prison, a beholder : namely, of the abrupt dispersion of the hearers, of the mournful countenances of our Puritan Collegists, returning in all shame, and of the headlong running of Adam’s servants to fetch new apparel, new cordial restoratives, and all that was needful. And of what I was not a beholder I was manifoldly assured by all certainty that in any case might be required. Some said Adam had taught purgatorie of * * * while he would disprove purgatorie of soul ; others, that the sterile faith of reformers was now * to see whether it would be brought to bear fruit ; others, that he was to preach the cloacal doctrine of Luther, who never had but devil’s * * in his mouth ; others, that God had struck inimicos suos in posteriora ; others, that this copronymous belief came with * breath, and was ending in * * as that of Arius ; others, that it did that * * corporally what it did in the soul spiritually ; others recited the verse :—

“Putidus es qui sic fecisti, Adame, quod in te est.”

Let me be believed on the word of a religious man, that not private hate, nor any desire to gravel any of Adam’s issue, part whereof is linked to me in kindred,² but only irrefragable

¹ He was the brute that got Archbishop O’Hurley tortured and hanged.

² Perhaps “ the nephew of the Archbishop of Dublin,” who, according to Cretinean-Joly, was converted by the Jesuits at this time, was a convert and kinsman of FitzSimon.

truth in my own knowledge, and to reveal the works of God, occasioned me to relate this otherwise unclean storie."¹

About the time that this extraordinary incident occurred among the Puritans, FitzSimon heard of their sacrilegious acts in and around Dublin. For instance, he writes in his work on the Mass: "In the year 1603, one Hewetson, Vicar of Swords, and his chaplain, Waller, a murderer, hanged upon a gibbet a crucifix of their own making, with this subscription: 'Unless the Papists help me better than I can help them, I shall rot on the gallows.' The sacrilege moved Mr. Barnwall of Dunbro, to present to the Lords of the Council the said crucifix and subscription—he thinking that if O'Roerk was lawfully executed for trailing disdainfully the Queen's image, it could not choose but that exemplar correction would be taken of the sacrilege. But the issue was, that some present in the council chamber dismembered the crucifix, and threw it into the fire."²

History repeats itself.—One hundred and fifty years afterwards, Cobbe, Rector of St. Audoen's, took down the cross and put in its stead a crown with a boar's head. He was punished severely by a man, who had more sense than Barnwall of Dunbro, and who wrote the following lines on the act of Parson Cobbe:—

"Christ's Cross from Christ's church cursed Cobbe hath
plucked down,
And placed in its stead what he worships—the Crown.
Avenging the cause of the Gadarene people,
The scoundrel hath placed a swine's head on the steeple:
By this intimating to all who pass by,
That his hearers are swine, and his church but a sty."³

Father FitzSimon gives some instances of punishment inflicted on these wicked Puritans. He says:—

"I will relate a fact which I have got lately in a letter from men most worthy to be believed. I have many other things of the same kind to tell, but I reserve them for their own time.

"In the year 1594, Sir J. Dowdal commanded the garrison of Youghal in Ireland, and a Mr. Lyth was the preacher of it. He was in the pulpit one day, and he declaimed most violently against the embassy of the angel Gabriel to Mary. Having gone home from the church, feeling weak, he got into bed, and said to a soldier who was in his room—'Please lend me your dagger, for I am obliged by the order of the devil, my master, to put an end to my life.' The soldier

¹ "The Masse."

² "On the Masse," by FitzSimon.

³ See Mr. Gilbert's "History of Dublin."

ran away with fright, and the old parson got up and dressed, and leaning on a stick, went to the sea shore, and with the stick wrote in large letters—‘Thomas Lyth has drowned himself.’ He then walked into the water, and when he was up to his breast, seeing people coming to save him, he put his head under the waves till he was drowned.

“Dowdall, the commanding officer, hearing this, and fearing the awful scandal given to the Reformation, in a towering rage ordered his body to be buried in the sand, with a stake driven through his middle. That very night the carcass was taken away either by wolves or by devils.”¹

“A Protestant captain lately, in the year 1600, while in possession of the Castle of Caer in Ireland, threw the crucifix of the chapel into the fire, and then threw himself from the highest top of the castle and broke his neck. Also an apostate priest, named James Devereux, who became a minister, caused an image of St. John the Baptist, in the Morrouse, Leinster, to be cast into a loathsome puddle, and thereupon was stricken with a dead palsy and an insupportable stink, and in the same place suddenly died.

“A corporal of Captain Peerse’s pulled down a crucifix in the Dominican’s Church of Youghal in the year 1581, and after burned it, and thereupon became blind and frantic. Why may not these and other examples be objected to our Iconoclasts?”

He then gives a Latin distich, and translates it into English verse, as he does generally when he quotes Latin poetry. This shows that he was something of a poet. Whether the following verses have the ring of the Shaksperian age or not we leave the reader to judge:—

“Christ’s picture humbly worship thou, which by the same dost pass :

Yet picture worship not, but Him for whom it pictured was.
Not God nor man this Image is, which thou dost present see ;
Yet whom this Blessed Image shows, both God and Man
is He.

For God is that which Image shows, but yet not God *it* is ;
Behold the form, but worship that thy mind beholds in this.”

¹ Britannomachia.

(To be continued.)

DOCUMENTS.

I.—*The following Letter was addressed to the Pope by the Irish Bishops assembled in Dublin, on the 22nd January, 1873.*

BEATISSIME PATER.

Paternus amor quo omnia Christi membra complecteris et sollicitudo illa Apostolica qua universalem Ecclesiam pascis et regis, ejusque libertatem et jura a divino fundatore eidem collata defendis nos recreant mirifice et reficiunt atque argumenta suppeditant cur in tristissimis rerum adjunctis in quibus versantur fideles meliorem rerum conditionem et tempora feliciora speremus. Verum quamquam de invicta tua fortitudine et sapientia et de tot rebus pro Dei gloria et religionis augmento a Te praeclare gestis laetamur, fieri tamen non potest quin ex tribulationibus tuis et angustiis quarum certi ad nos quotidie nuntii perveniunt acerbum et continuum percipiamus dolorem.

Caeterum dum hac ratione inter spem et timorem jactamur, monitis quae Episcopis totius mundi in allocutione nuper habita dedisti, obtemperantes in unum convenimus ut non solum de rebus nostris ecclesiasticis verum etiam de malis gravissimis quibus nunc obruitur Ecclesia inter nos consilium caperemus. Verum ante omnia id a nobis temporum ratio exigere videbatur ut certiosem Te faceremus nos omnes vinculo fidei et amoris Tibi artissime conjunctos esse, ita ut in rebus tuis adversis doleamus Tecum, et tristitiae tuae partem ferre optemus.

Itaque Tecum non possumus non dolere de animarum ruina et funesto eorum casu qui cum antea domestici fidei essent signo rebellionis adversus sedem Apostolicam elato Concilii Vaticani auctoritatem aggressi decretum quo infallibilitas Christi Vicario et Petri successoribus divinitus data vindicabatur argumentis undique depromptis impugnant, et haec dum faciunt, e mentito turpiter nomine, veteres catholicos se vocant. Faxit Deus ut aliquando convertantur et voci Beati Petri qui per te loquitur aurem facilem praebentes animo tuo paterno levamen et consolationem adferant.

Neque sine magna tristitia loqui possumus Beatissime Pater, de filiis perduellibus qui intra Italiae fines et in ipsa tua alma urbe juribus omnibus divinis et humanis conculcatis et pro nihilo habitis cor tuum paternum maximo dolore affecerunt et sedem apostolicam inauditis injuriis impetierunt, quique scelestis consiliis agitati ditionem tuam temporalem sacrilege

usurpaverunt, Romam toti terrarum orbi venerandam vi et armis expugnaverunt, quinimo et per maximum scelus Vaticanum palatium, domicilium tuum explosis bellicis tormentis, nulla habita sacrae tuae personae ratione, imminenti ruinae et excidio exposuerunt: quorum nefanda facinora et praeterita et quae nunc fiunt cum omni Christiano populo damnamus et reprobamus.

Ut vero sceleribus cumulus imponeretur in urbe vestigiis et laboribus, et sudore et ipso sanguine innumerabilium martyrum et confessorum imo et apostolorum principum glorioso cruore consecrata, templa Deo dicata sanctorum reliquiis insignia, coenobia virorum religiosorum et sanctarum virginum coelesti vita illustrata impii catholicae veritatis hostes et effraenata licentia usurparunt et summa injustitia tenent, et impune a malo in pejus progredientes in perpetuum alienare et in usus profanos vertere conantur. Praeterea et ipsi clerici in sortem Domini vocati, ab altaribus sunt divulsi et ad danda militiae nomina coacti, et seminaria ecclesiastica ex Episcoporum manibus arrepta, et ipsi Episcopi proprio quod a Deo ipso habent munere juventutis in fide et bonis moribus instituendae privantur, quae iniquitatis opera magna ex parte consummata jam esse dolemus.

Voces itaque nostras una Tecum, Beatissime Pater attolimus et Deum nostrum opt. max. invocamus, quatenus *recor- detur Ipse quid acciderit nobis: et intueatur et respiciat opprobrium nostrum: nec diutius sinat haereditatem nostram verti ad alienos domos nostras ad extraneos.* Namque Ditio Tua Temporalis, Beatissime Pater, Patrimonium Sti. Petri, communis est haereditas omnium Christifidelium, quorum omnes et singuli jus habent, ut Ecclesia plena perfruatur libertate, ad quam exercendam Principatus Tuus civilis in praesenti rerum ordine est omnino necessarius. Eheu haec haereditas nostra versa est ad alienos; templum Dei vivens impetitur: et omnes sacrorum ministri quique legatione pro Deo fungi solent improbe anguntur, atque vexantur.

Caeterum non in Italia tantum mala haec conspiciuntur: verum dolendum est Tecum, Beatissime Pater, eo quod et in Imperio Germanico novis et hactenus fere inauditis persecutionum generibus Ecclesia Dei ejusque episcopi aetate doctrina et virtutibus venerabiles nec non et sacerdotes qui assidue Domini colebant vineam, subjiciuntur. Religiosi praeterea et viri et mulieres a munere instituendae juventutis exturban- tur et impiis Jesu Christi nominis osoribus, imo et Judaeis, locum cedere coguntur; quinimo et sanctimoniales foeminae quae in orphanatrophis et in xenodochiis et vel in bello recentissimo militibus vulneratis inserviebant, et maximis

laudibus vel ab ipsis acatholicis fuerant affecti, e domibus propriis et a communi patria exulare coguntur. Cor tuum paternum, Beatissime Pater, acerrimo perstringitur dolore, haec volvens: sinat Beatitudo Tua, ut nos Tecum et gemitus et lacrymas et preces coram Deo effundamus, ut *exurgat Ipse et adjuvet nos; et dissipentur inimici ejus, et fugiant qui oderunt Eum a facie Ejus.*

Quid dicemus de iniqua illa fratris nostri Episcopi Hebronensis vexatione et de sanctissimis Ecclesiae juribus impetitis a Gubernio Genevensi et ab aliis quibusdam Helvetiorum pagis? Faxit S. Gallus noster, faxint S. Columbanus et alii ex nostratibus qui olim Helvetios evangelizarunt, ut adesse festinent tempora pacis et ut finem accipiat iniquitas, et ut catholici, quibus jure meritoque Respublica illa acceptam fert libertatem illam politicam qua gaudet in plenam et expeditam jurium suorum omnium possessionem restituantur.

Sed et dolemus, Beatissime Pater, de angustiis quibus cor Tuum Apostolicum premitur ob fraudes et audaciam illorum hominum qui in Urbe praesertim Constantinopolitana, auctoritati Tuae et Sanctae Sedis resistunt et inconsutilem Christi vestem discerpunt. Utinam Schismaticorum istorum conatus et Turcarum quorum invocarunt opem, "reprimere et ad nihilum redigere" Dominus dignetur, ut sciant omnes homines B. Petri auctoritatem in Te, Beatissime Pater, vivere, et ut conclament omnes cum S. Optato Milevit. "In Urbe Roma Petro primo Cathedram Episcopalem esse collocatam in qua una Cathedra unitas ab omnibus servaretur, ut jam schismaticus et peccator esset, qui contra singularem cathedram alteram collocaret."

Caeterum inter istas maximas aerumnas quibus afficitur Beatitudo Tua et Sancta Sedes Apostolica, in eo magnum invenitur solatium; quod scilicet magis magisque ad Petri cathedram omnes Christifideles, pastores et populi appropinquent, eique Sedi firmissime adhaereant, *unde unitas sacerdotalis orta est, et ad quam perfidia non potest habere accessum.* Ex quo factum est ut et pastores ecclesiae et eorum greges libenter et devoto animo hortationes tuas suscipiant, nihilque verbis tuis et epistolis gratius aut salubrius esse existiment. Dum autem ita sentiunt, a caelestis institutione magistri non recedunt: nam Tibi in Beato Petro mandavit Dominus ut non modo fidem sed et nutantia fratrum corda confirmares, quod equidem praestas non solum verbis fidei et veritatis quae profers, sed etiam et norma vitae virtutibus omnibus praeclarae, in quam tanquam exemplar dum omnes intuemur mirifice ad sacra omnia munera peragenda accendimur.

Caeterum et hortationibus tuis excitati et invictum tuum

animum quo solus omnium Ecclesiae hostium impetus sustines et repellis, admirantes, jura et libertatem Ecclesiae ejusque supremi capitis, quemadmodum hactenus fecimus, pro viribus tuebimur, religiosam puerorum et puellarum institutionem promovebimus, contra injurias et excidium quibus religiosi ordines exponuntur protestabimur, ac praeterea Deum precibus implorabimus ut tandem placatus pacem et felicitatem populis catholicis donet, ac Tibi, Beatissime Pater, plenitudinem dierum et gloriosum in omnes perversos Ecclesiae hostes tribuat triumphum.

Interea ad pedes Beatitudinis Tuae provoluti, Benedictionem Apostolicam pro nobis et clero et fidei populo nostris curis commissis enixe efflagitamus.

BEATITUDINIS TUAE,

Humillimi ac devotissimi filii et famuli.

Dublina, 22 Jan., 1873.

- | | |
|--|---|
| ✠ PAULUS CARD. CULLEN, Archiepus. Dubl. Hiberniae Primas. | ✠ JOANNES MACEVILLY, Epus. Galviensis. |
| ✠ DANIEL M'GETTIGAN, Archiep. Armac., Universalisque Hiberniae Primas. | ✠ MICHAEL O'HEA, Epus. Rossen. |
| ✠ JOANNES, Archiepus. Tuamensis. | ✠ PATRITIUS DORRIAN, Epus. Dunen. et Connorien. |
| ✠ PATRITIUS LEAHY, Archiepus. Caseliensis, &c. | ✠ GEORGIUS BUTLER, Epus. Limericensis. |
| ✠ THOMAS FEENY, Epus. Alladensis. | ✠ NICOLAUS CONATY, Epus. Kilmorensis. |
| ✠ GULIELMUS DELANY, Epus. Corcagiensis. | ✠ THOMAS NULTY, Epus. Midensis. |
| ✠ FRANCISCUS KELLY, Epus. Derriensis. | ✠ JACOBUS DONNELLY, Ep. Clogheren. |
| ✠ GULIELMUS KEANĒ, Epus. Cloynen. | ✠ JACOBUS LYNCH, Ep. Arcadiapolis. |
| ✠ PATRITIUS DURCAN, Epus. Achadensis. | ✠ GEORGIUS CONROY, Ep. Ardacadensis. |
| ✠ J. P. LEAHY, Epus. Dromorensis. | ✠ JACOBUS MACDEVITT, Ep. Rapoten. |
| ✠ DOMINICUS O'BRIEN, Epus. Waterfordien. et Lismoren. | ✠ PATRITIUS DUGGAN, Ep. Clonfer-tensis. |
| ✠ JACOBUS WALSHE, Epus. Kildarien. et Leighlien. | ✠ HUGO CONWAY, Coad. Ep. Alladensis. |
| ✠ LAURENTIUS GILLOOLY, Epus. Elphinensis. | ✠ E. J. McCORMACK, Coad. Ep. Achadensis. |
| ✠ THOMAS FURLONG, Epus. Fernensis. | ✠ JACOBUS RYAN, Coad. Ep. Laonensis. |
| | ✠ PATRITIUS FRANCISCUS MORAN Ep. Ossoriensis. |

II.—*Dilecto Filio Nostro Paulo Tituli S. Petri in Monte Aureo S.R.E. Cardinali Cullen, Archiepiscopo Dublinensi ac ceteris Venerabilibus Fratribus Archiepiscopis et Episcopis Hiberniae.*

PIUS PP. IX.

Dilecte Fili Noster et Venerabiles Fratres salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem. Dum in osores Ecclesiae vocem nostram nuper extollimus, Dilecte Fili Noster et Venerabiles Fratres, desideravimus quidem, ipsos commoveri a teterrima expositione malorum quae fecerunt in Jerusalem et a consideratione poenae quam idcirco daturi sunt Deo, ac revocari per haec a viis suis pessimis; verum eo quoque praecipue spectavimus, ut in tanto belli apparatu et impetu Venerabiles omnes Fratres Nostros excitaremus ad impensiolem vigilantiam et ad arctiorem cum nobis conjunctionem adversus impietatis conatus et molimina. Id porro nos assecutos esse laetamur a vobis, qui, litteris nostris Apostolicis acceptis, illico convenistis omnes, non modo novum ac luculentius exhibituri nobis testimonium devotionis vestrae ac deploraturi nobiscum singulas quas doleamus, Ecclesiae calamitates et injurias; verum, etiam collaturi consilia vestra, suffragaturi Venerabilibus Fratribus alibi pugnantibus et juncturi vires ad sistenda et mitiganda praesentia damna ac graviora avertenda. Aspera sane et perdifficili versamur in lucta, sed quae non obscura praebeat superni favoris indicia. Videmus enim Deum, qui Sanctae hujus sedis firmamentum est, eo ferventiore obsequio ipsi obstringere sacrorum Antistites omnes et fideles, et eo magis erigere auctoritatem ejus et gloriam, quo dolosius ipsa circumvenitur ab hostibus, quo studiosius adlaboratur unitati Catholicae discernendae, quo infensius ipsa deprimitur; ita ut dum ab humana malitia imminens ei parari videtur exitium, ipsa Divina sustentata virtute, eum praeferat vigorem et robur, quod commoveat ac terreat hostes et non dissitam portendere videatur victoriam. Atqui si Deus sit pro nobis quis contra nos erit? Fidenter itaque decertare pergamus pro gloria nominis ejus pro sacris Ecclesiae juribus, pro animabus et legibus nostris; pugnantibus enim sic nobis Ipse conteret inimicos suos ante faciem nostram. Efficax interim caeleste auxilium, et cumulata caelestia munera vobis omnibus adprecamur; eorumque auspiciem et praecipuae nostrae benevolentiae pignus unicuique vestrum, Dilecte Fili Noster et Venerabiles Fratres, ac universae cujusque Dioecesi Benedictionem Apostolicam peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die 6 Februarii anno 1873.
Pontificatus Nostri anno Vigesimo septimo.

PIUS PP. IX.

III.—*Letter of the Irish Bishops assembled in Dublin on the 22nd January, 1873, to the Bishops of the German Empire.*

ILLUSTRISSIMI ET REVERENDISSIMI DOMINI, ET
VENERABILES FRATRES IN CHRISTO.

Cum proxime elapsis mensibus ad nos saepe nuntii pervenerint de vexationibus quibus apud vos Christi sponsa, catholica ecclesia subjicitur non parum dolore affecti fuimus. Neque aliter fieri poterat: omnes enim membra sumus ejusdem corporis, cujus caput est Christus: omnes eodem Episcopali munere fungentes vineam Domini excolimus, cunctique ut decet Apostolorum in Episcopatu successores arctissimis fidei et charitatis vinculis inter nos et Ecclesiae Supremo Capiti in terris Christi Vicario conjungimur. Quare in rebus angustis et afflictis vobiscum merito dolemus quemadmodum in rebus prosperis vestris et florenti ecclesiarum vestrarum statu, Apostoli verborum memores, saepe gloriati et gavisus sumus. Huc accedit quod cum nostra Hibernica Ecclesia saepe et diu saevissime fuerit oppressa, et atrox in ejus sacerdotes et episcopos temporibus jam feliciter transactis bellum gestum fuerit, haereditario quodam jure cum omnibus qui tribulationes, justitiae causa, sustinent, dolores communicamus et haud ignari malorum eis solamen et auxilium praestare gestimus.

Neque illud omittendum quod cum haud pauci ex sanctissimis illis viris qui illustrem vestram fundaverunt et dilatarunt ecclesiam quos inter Kilianus, Virgilius, Colmannus, Willibrordus et ipse etiam Bonifacius memorandi sunt, vel nostrates fuerint vel saltem sacris scientiis in Hibernia eruditi, antiqua quadam vobis necessitudine religiosa devinciri videamur. Quare facile intelligi potest cur angamur et doleamus cum fama ad nos de malis ingruentibus pervenerit quibus in latis Germaniae regionibus Christi ecclesia ejusque sacri ministri premuntur et vexantur.

Quid enim tristius aut ab omni religionis et humanitatis sensu esse potest remotius quam ea quae nobis relata sunt? Nam episcopi aetate, doctrina, virtutibus omnibus praestantes, praeclareque de ecclesia et societate civili meritis gravissime vexantur, eorumque sacratissimis juribus conculcatis, legum poenaliu[m] et confiscationis bonorum vel exilii minis terrentur, ea tantum de causa quod potestate sibi divinitus data ligandi et solvendi usi fuerint ut sacerdotes quosdam ob ecclesiae et conciliorum spretam auctoritatem, nisi ad saniora consilia reverterent a corpore ecclesiae absunderent, vel quod templa quaedam interdicenda existimaverint ne pseudo-Catholici in iis sacros religionis ritus sacrilege peragentes

scandalum fidelibus praeberent, et impune Dei et ecclesiae leges contemnerent; vel denique quod professores quosdam et magistros male de rebus divinis sentientes, juventutem studiosam a semita veritatis abducere, discipulorumque mentes errorum veneno impune inficere minime sinerent. Hac vero agendi ratione religionis nostrae fundamenta impeti, libertatem cultus catholici suppressi et sacrorum antistitum potestatem quae divinitus data est ad docendam et regendam ecclesiam atque errores coercendos, penitus deleri et ad nihilum redigi quis est qui non videat.

Verum ut tot mala religioni illata augeantur, et firmiores radices mittere valeant, aliud consilium, exemplo a Juliano Apostata desumpto, initum fuisse a rerum politicarum moderatoribus dolemus, quo religio ab educatione sejungeretur, et Ecclesiae Catholicae antistites quibus a Christo potestas docendi populos est commissa, a scholis exulare cogerentur: quo consilio nihil animabus sanguine Christi Domini redemptis magis exitiale excogitari unquam poterit. Nam cum ita instituuntur juvenes ut Dei praecepta ejusque timor in eorum cordibus alte non imprimantur facile in infidelitatis barathrum ruunt, Dei cultum spernunt, vitiis omnibus se tradunt cumque adeo intra limites motus animorum pravos cohibere non possint, plerumque omnis humanae et divinae auctoritatis impatientes evadunt et utriusque civitatis civilis et religiosae fundamenta labefactare, rerum novarum cupiditate abrepti, conantur.

Cum gravia quidem haec sint et periculi plena non minus lugenda et reprobanda ea sunt quae Ecclesiae Catholicae hostes adversus eos aggrediuntur qui voto devincti Christi sanctissima consilia observare nituntur, spretisque divitiis fastuque mundano, vitae castimoniam, humilitatem et obedientiam colunt, opera charitatis in alios exercent, iram Dei sceleribus humani generis provocatam precibus avertunt, atque nihil eorum omittunt quibus promoveatur vera felicitas populorum quae a religione separari non potest. Neque tacendum est eos de litteris humanioribus et scientiis egregie esse meritos, juventutis educationem plurimum promoveri, cives ad pacem et concordiam servandam legibusque obsequium praestandum verbo et exemplo impellere. Quid quod omnibus notum et compertum est mulieres et viros religiosarum familiarum in nupero bello omnia vitae commoda sprevisse et maximis se periculis exponentes gravissimos exantlasse labores ut opem et solatium militibus aegrotis et vulneratis adferrent, qua de causa miranda eorum pietas et patiens laboris fortitudo per totum orbem ore omnium celebrantur. Quae cum tota Europa spectante peragantur mirum non est paterna

corda vestra acerbo dolore opprimi, et in nobismet ipsis qui una cum vobis legatione pro Deo fungimur tristitiae et indignationis sensus excitari.

Plura alia ejusdem generis decreta de clericorum educatione de seminariis regendis, de jurisdictione ecclesiastica impedita, de praedicatione verbi Dei et litteris pastoralibus episcoporum laicae potestatis censura subjiciendis silentio brevitatis causa praeterimus quae omnino humanitati hujus aevi, et juribus et libertati ministrorum verae Christi ecclesiae repugnant, et ad ejus fundamenta labefactanda apta et excogitata esse videntur. Unum tamen maxime improbandum omittere non possumus, scilicet in quadam provincia plurima sacra templa a civili auctoritate fuisse clausa et obserata et divinum in iis cultum prohibitum eo quod Sacrosancto Cordi Domini nostri Jesu fuerint dicata. Hoc facinus, et sacrilegium aliqua ratione expiare optantes, et eodem tempore symboli divini et infiniti amoris quo Filius Dei unigenitus factus homo nos dilexit, cultum promovere, statuimus singulas nostras dioeceses et totam nostram ecclesiam Sacratissimo Cordi Jesu solemniter consecrari. Qua de re litteras pastorales fidelibus nostris gregibus inscriptas concinnavimus quarum exemplaria ad vos mitemus, ut quae pro religionis bono agenda existimavimus, ex eis intelligatis, et eodem tempore perspiciatis quanto obsequio et veneratione praestantissimos antistites prosequamur qui nunc Domini praelia tam fortiter in Germania praeliantur, quique pro Christi ecclesia tot mala, et tot acerbissimas tribulationes patiuntur.

Ne vero de afflictionibus agentes videamur caetera omnia oblivisci, antequam finem huic epistolae ponamus vobis ex corde gratulamur eo quod digni inventi qui contumelias pro nomine Christi paterentur tam praeclarae fortitudinis mansuetudinis et charitatis episcopalis exempla omnibus fidelibus exhibeatis, quod viribus unitis et concordii animo omnes idem sentiatis, unum quaerentes, ut ecclesia Dei sarta tectaque servetur, quodque inconcussae petrae supra quam Christus aedificavit ecclesiam, cathedrae scilicet Petri firmissime adhaereatis. Hac ratione cum inter vos conjuncti, et fidelium populorum obsequio et precibus adjuti sitis et infallibiii illius voci obsequentes cujus munus est confirmare fratres, Deus vobis propitius erit, hostes ecclesiae ad meliora reducet consilia, vel ad nihil eorum conatus redigens vel laetissimos vobis tribuens triumphos.

Haec ut cito eveniant, utque exurgat Deus et dissipentur inimici ejus et fugiant a facie ejus omnes qui oderunt eum, effusis precibus datorem bonorum omnium enixe rogamus, petimusque ut concordia et pax ecclesiis vestris reddatur, ut schismatis ultima vestigia deleantur, utque omnes virtutes in

vinea quam colitis floreat, atque bona omnia opera abundant et caetera omnia vobis tribuantur quae bonis pastoribus inter mala hujus mundi solamini et firmamento esse solent.

Caeterum felicem calamitatum quae vos nunc obruunt exitum adprecati, pacem Dei quae superat omnem intellectum, et fausta omnia tum spiritualia tum temporalia ex corde optantes singulari obsequio et veneratione subscribimur.

VESTRARUM DOMINATIONUM,

Humillimi et devotissimi famuli et fratres in Christo Archiepiscopi et Episcopi Hiberniae.

Dublino, 22 Jan., 1873.

- | | |
|--|---|
| ✠ PAULUS CARD. CULLEN, Archiepus. Dubl. Hiberniae Primas. | ✠ JOANNES MACEVILLY, Epus. Galviensis. |
| ✠ DANIEL M'GETTIGAN, Archiep. Armac., Universalisque Hiberniae Primas. | ✠ MICHAEL O'HEA, Epus. Rossen. |
| ✠ JOANNES, Archiepus. Tuamensis. | ✠ PATRITIUS DORRIAN, Epus. Dunen. et Connorien. |
| ✠ PATRICIUS LEAHY, Archiepus. Caseliensis, &c. | ✠ GEORGIUS BUTLER, Epus. Limericensis. |
| ✠ THOMAS FEENY, Epus. Alladensis. | ✠ NICOLAUS CONATY, Epus. Kilmorensis. |
| ✠ GULIELMUS DELANY, Epus. Corcagiensis. | ✠ THOMAS NULTY, Epus. Midensis. |
| ✠ FRANCISCUS KELLY, Epus. Derriensis. | ✠ JACOBUS DONNELLY, Epus. Clogheren. |
| ✠ GULIELMUS KEANE, Epus. Cloynen. | ✠ JACOBUS LYNCH, Ep. Arcadiapolis. |
| ✠ PATRITIUS DURCAN, Epus. Achadensis. | ✠ GEORGIUS CONROY, Ep. Ardacandensis. |
| ✠ J. P. LEAHY, Epus. Dromorensis. | ✠ JACOBUS MACDEVITT, Ep. Rapoten. |
| ✠ DOMINICUS O'BRIEN, Epus., Waterfordien. et Lismoren. | ✠ PATRITIUS DUGGAN, Ep. Clonferentensis. |
| ✠ JACOBUS WALSHE, Epus., Kildarien. et Leighlien. | ✠ HUGO CONWAY, Coad. Ep. Alladensis. |
| ✠ LAURENTIUS GILLOOLY, Epus. Elphinensis. | ✠ E. J. McCORMACK, Coad. Ep. Achadensis. |
| ✠ THOMAS FURLONG, Epus. Fernensis. | ✠ JACOBUS RYAN, Coad. Ep. Laonensis. |
| | ✠ PATRITIUS FRANCISCUS MORAN, Ep. Ossoriensis. |

IV.—ILLUSTRISSIME ET REVERENDISSIME DOMINE.

Mitto ad Amplitudinem Tuam litteras quas prestantissimis Archiepiscopis et Episcopis imperii Germanici scribendas esse existimarunt Hiberniae Episcopi in conventu quem die 22 Januarii Dublini habuerunt, cui praesse mihi contigit.

Ex hisce litteris intelliges quam vehementer de vexationibus quibus nunc Germanica vexatur Ecclesia nos omnes Antisites hujus regni angimur, et quantum Tecum et cum omnibus collegis Tuis ex imo corde condoleamus et compatiamur.

Verum id non omittendum omnes fortem et invictum animum mirari quo fratres nostri in episcopatu Germaniae praeliantur praelia Domini, atque jura et libertatem sponsae Christi defendunt.

Laetamur porro et gloriamur in praeclaris eorum virtutibus quibus decus et ornamentum sanctae nostrae religioni imperiuntur et exemplum tam clarum et illustre toti orbi praebent ut caeteris omnibus pastoribus populorum quasi stimulos quosdam ad fortiter agendum addant. Id porro silendum non est catholicos hujus regni scripta quae ab Episcopis Germaniae ad religionem defendendam edita sunt magni habere atque ex eorum lectione haud parvos fructus percipere.

Una cum hac epistola ad Amplitudinem Tuam pervenient litterae pastorales quibus Episcopi Hiberniae certiores faciunt greges sibi commissos de afflicto Ecclesiae statu, eosque hortantur, ut Dei iram tot mundi sceleribus provocatam placare conentur, eodemque tempore fuis precibus Datorem bonorum omnium implorent ut undas et tempestates quibus jactatur Ecclesia coerceat et placet, et pacem et tranquillitatem misericorditer omnibus Christianis populis tandem aliquando imperiatur.

Denique hanc nactus occasionem non possum quin Amplitudini Tuae eos obsequii et venerationis sensus aperiā, quibus erga Te et alios Germaniae Episcopos sum affectus.

Amplitudinis Tuae humillimus et devotissimus servus et frater in Christo.

✠ PAULUS CARDINALIS CULLEN.

Dublinae 24 Jan., 1873.

Illustrissimo et Reverendissimo Domino
Paulo Archiepiscopo Coloniensi.

V.—EMINENTISSIME AC REVERENDISSIME DOMINE.

Eminentiae Tuae Reverendissimae litteras colendas 24^o Januarii cr. ad me datas simul cum egregia epistola collectiva, quam Hiberniae Antistites Illustrissimi ac Reverendissimi in conventu, Te praeside, 22^{do} ejusdem Dublini habito ad imperii Germanici Antistites direxerant, recepi, ac sine mora istam epistolam necnon litterarum pastoralium adjunctarum epitomen cum singulis confratribus meis communicavi. Permagnam inde et jucundam in praesenti, qua versamur, tribulatione et pressura percepimus consolationem et recreationem, eo majorem quia ad nos venit ex ore et corde confratrum, qui colunt gregem Domini praeclarum per saecula jam durissima persecutione et oppressionem exercitum et probatum, ex quo tot viri sanctissimi quondam provenerunt, qui animarum zelo ferventes in patriam nostram migraverunt atque laboribus ac sudoribus

indefessis Ecclesia in Germania fundata sive dilatata, patres nostri spirituales facti sunt. Pro magnifico isto documento charitatis fraternae, quain non solum verbis et literis, sed factis quoque ac publicis suffragiis nobis exhibere voluistis, ex omnium confratrum meorum animo et commisso expresso Eminentiae Tuae Reverendissimae necnon omnibus et singulis Hiberniae Antistitibus veneratissimis qui epistolae ad nos transmissae nomen dederunt, gratias ago humillimas plurimasque, enixe rogans, ut suffragia quae pro Germaniae Ecclesia fundere jam coepistis dein prosegui et in cultu Sanctissimi Cordis Domini Nostri Jesu Christi, quod nos quoque in tribulatione nostra tanquam certissimum auxilii divini pignus et refugium opportunissimum una cum gregibus nobis conceditis colimus atque imploramus, nobiscum uniti perseverare dignemini, donec Deus Opt. Max. Ecclesiae suae persecutionibus finem imponat optatum.

Grato animo vobiscum quoque colimus sanctissimos illos viros apostolicos quibus Germania cum Hibernia supernaturalis necessitudinis vinculis conjunctam se esse gloriatur speramusque fore ut per eorum intercessionem preces nostrae apud gratiae divinae thronum valide juventur. Quod spectat in specie ad S. Bonifacium martyrem et pontificem, quem universa Germania catholica tanquam Apostolum suum peculiariter veneratur quemque et Vos Vestratem appellare et colere non dubitatis, liceat mihi hac occasione data significare, quod Germaniae necnon Angliae Episcopi jam pridem Sanctissimum Patrem Pium IX. adierint supplicantes, ut festum hujus martyris et Pontificis gloriosi, qui de sancta Sede Apostolica et Ecclesia catholica optime meruit, tanquam festum duplex in universa Ecclesia celebrandum praescriberetur. Eminentiam Tuam Reverendissimam omnes Germaniae Antistites per me humillime rogant, ut simul cum caeteris ac singulis Hiberniae Episcopis in honorem Sancti Bonifacii eandem supplicationem ad sacram sedem deferre digneris, quatenus dilatata per universum orbem catholicum veneratione sancti Apostoli Germaniae citius ipsius intercessione potenti nostrae cum vestris unitae preces exaudiantur et Germaniae catholicae auxilium divinum impetretur in tribulatione praesenti.

Maximae ac sincerissimae venerationis sensibus persisto.

Eminentiae Tuae Reverendissimae
humillimus ac devotissimus famulus.

✠ PAULUS ARCHIEPISCOPUS COLONIENSIS.

Coloniae, 21 Febr., 1873.

Eminentissimo ac Reverendissimo Domino
S. R. E. Cardinali Paulo Cullen, Archiepiscopo
Dubliniensi, Hiberniae Primati.

THE IRISH
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

=====
APRIL, 1873.
=====

THE IRISH MASSACRE OF 1641.

HISTORY does not present a parallel to the sufferings of the Irish nation during the brief period of Puritan rule from 1641 to 1660. The chief source of that ferocity which overspread our island with ruin, and deluged it with blood, was a rabid hatred of our faith, dearer than life itself to our people. Never were brute force and the perverted talents of man more persistently and more unscrupulously employed to attain the double end of rooting out the Irish, and extirpating the religion which they professed. However, the Celtic race, like the Jews of old, was found to be indestructible. The heroism of our nation under these unparalleled sufferings forms one of the brightest pages in our history, and has merited for "the Island of Saints" a new aureola as "the martyr island of the Church."

Not satisfied with the wholesale butcheries of olden times, the Puritans and their modern friends have sought to blacken the fame of the heroic sufferers, and by a strange perversion of historical truth, posterity has been made to believe that the Irish Catholics of 1641 were the guilty agents and perpetrators of a general massacre, whilst in reality they were the victims. So often, and with such minute details, has this tale of a general massacre by the Irish Catholics been repeated in works professedly historical, as well as in essays from the pulpit and the press, that it may now be said to have taken its place as an integral part of the Protestant tradition of the empire. It is not in the vain hope of checking the onward course of such tradition that these pages have been written. The enemies of the Irish Catholics will listen to no reasoning of ours, and they take care to read nothing but what is coloured for their sight. This paper is intended solely for the students

of Irish history, who love to trace the origin and the course of the many calumnies which the malice of our enemies has poured out upon our people.

Sir John Temple was the first who sought to give historical consistency to the lying stories of the supposed massacre. In 1646 he published in London a 4to volume with the title "The Irish Rebellion: or, An History of the Beginnings and First Progress of the General Rebellion raised within the Kingdom of Ireland on the 23rd of October, 1641," and he there laid down that, "since the Rebellion first broke out, unto the time of the cessation, made September 15, 1643, which was not full two years after, above 300,000 British and Protestants were cruelly murdered in cold blood, destroyed some other way, or expelled out of their habitations, according to the strictest conjecture and computation of those who seemed best to understand the numbers of English planted in Ireland, besides those few which fell in the heat of fight during the war," (page 6). The position of Sir John Temple as Master of the Rolls in Ireland and Privy Councillor, at the time the Revolution began, lent credit to his statements. There was also another feature of his work which seemed to give it the stamp of genuine history. A Commission had been issued in December, 1641, to seven Protestant ministers, authorizing them to take evidence upon oath "to keep up the memory of the outrages committed by the Irish." Sir John Temple had full access to the Depositions received by these Commissioners, and his work was little more than a series of extracts from them. Who, therefore, could question the accuracy of his narrative? We will, however, have many things to say hereafter regarding these Depositions. Their original text is still preserved, in thirty-two volumes in folio, in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin.

Dr. Edmund Borlase, a physician at Chester, and a host of other interested writers, soon joined in the accusations against the Irish Catholics. Even those who were honoured by the British public as impartial historians, lent their names to these calumnies, and appealed to the authentic "Depositions" as indisputable proof of the general massacre. Thus, Lord Clarendon, in his history, vol. 2nd, writes that "A general insurrection of the Irish spread itself over the whole country, in such an inhuman and barbarous manner, that there were forty or fifty thousand of the English Protestants murdered before they suspected themselves to be in danger." Rapin also states: "The day appointed for executing the bloody design was the 23rd of October, on which day they were to rise all over the island. The design

was really executed, as projected, and it is said that on that and the following days above 40,000 English Protestants were massacred by the Irish. . . . Above 154,000 Protestants were massacred in that kingdom from the 23rd October to the 1st March following.”—(*History of England*, vol. ix., p. 340). May, in his “History of the Parliament of England,” declares that “The innocent Protestants were upon a sudden disseized of their estates ; and the persons of above 200,000 men, women, and children were murdered, many of them with exquisite and unheard of tortures, within the space of one month.” Sir Philip Warwick, in “Memoirs of King Charles I.,” is still more definite : “Though they were prevented,” he says, “of surprising Dublin by a mere accident, yet, through the country, it has been thought that in one week they massacred very near 100,000 persons, men, women, and children.”

The historians of the massacre sometimes display considerable ingenuity in varying its details. Thus, for instance, Whitelock states that the rebels “drown'd many hundreds, men, women, and innocent children, in the rivers. Some they sent to sea in a rotten vessel without any sails or rudder, to be cast away ; and great numbers of the English, after they had done all sorts of drudgeries for the rebels in hopes of mercy, had all their throats cut by them, and with some of them the execrable villains and monsters would make themselves pastime and sport before their death, trying who could hack deepest into the Englishmen's flesh.”—(*Memorials of English Affairs*, London, 1682, p. 49.). Hume, though somewhat cautious in assigning the numbers of the massacred, yet writes :—“An universal massacre commenced of the English, now defenceless, and passively resigned to their inhuman foes. No age, no sex, no condition, was spared. The wife, weeping for her butchered husband, and embracing her helpless children, was pierced with them, and perished by the same stroke. In vain did flight save from the first assault. Destruction was everywhere let loose, and met the hunted victims at every turn.” Leland adds, that “Irish ecclesiastics were seen encouraging the carnage. The women forgot the tenderness of their sex, pursued the English with execrations, and imbrued their hands in blood ; even children in their feeble malice lifted the dagger against the helpless prisoners.” Milton, so famed for his liberality, is still more extravagant in his statement, for he swells up the number of the Protestant victims to more than 600,000. In the second edition of his *Iconoclastes* (p. 49), he deliberately treats of “The rebellion and horrid massacre of English Protestants in Ireland, to the number of 154,000 in the province of Ulster only, by their own compu-

tation, which, added to the other three, makes up the total sum of that slaughter, in all likelihood, four times as great." Mrs. Macauley, however, surpasses all her compeers in the minuteness of the imaginary details of the massacre:—"Slaughtering the English," she says, "was represented by the priests as the most meritorious of religious acts. They exhorted the people, with tears in their eyes, to rid the world of these declared enemies to the Catholic faith and piety. Many of the rebels would say, after bragging of the number of barbarous murders they had committed, that they knew, if they should die, their souls would go immediately to heaven."—(*History of England*, London, 1766, vol. iii., p. 71). At next page, she adds:—"Children were forced to carry their sick and aged parents to the place of slaughter. There were of those barbarians some so ingenious in their cruelty as to tempt their prisoners, with the hopes of preserving their lives, to imbrue their hands in the blood of their relations. Children were in this manner impelled to be the executioners of their parents, wives of their husbands, mothers of their children; and then when they were thus rendered accomplices in guilt, they were deprived of that life they endeavoured to purchase at so horrid a price. Children were boiled to death in cauldrons. Some wretches were flayed alive, others had their eyes plucked out, their ears, nose, cheeks, and hands cut off, and thus rendered spectacles to satiate the malice of their enemies. Some were buried up to the chin, and there left to perish by degrees."

It might be supposed that at least the reverend Protestant and Presbyterian historians of this period would abstain from such calumnies, sufficiently refuted by their own extravagant details. Whosoever would imagine this, must be but little acquainted with the hatred of Ireland's people and Ireland's creed that too often has taken root in anti-Catholic clerical breasts. The Rev. Patrick Adair, writing about the year 1690, declares that the Papists, in 1641, "raged as bears bereaved of their whelps, and destroyed all before them, burning and consuming men, beasts, corn, and the British and Protestants were partly destroyed and put to death, partly left in a worse case than death itself, and others standing amazed. It is attested by some worthy persons, and well acquainted with the case of these times, that there were about 300,000 persons, men, women, and children, destroyed one way or another. . . . That which mainly instigated them to this wicked course was that they were Papists under the power and conduct of the Roman Antichrist, etc. Their education and principles did especially stir them up, being thereto animated by their priests and churchmen."—(*A True Narrative of the Rise and Progress of the*

Presbyterian Church in Ireland, by the Rev. Patrick Adair, Minister in Belfast, edited by Rev. Dr. Killen, Belfast, 1866, pp. 73-75). Forty years later the Rev. Daniel Neal, in his "History of the Puritans" (first published in 1731), writes:—"On the appointed day, between thirty and forty thousand of the native Irish appeared in arms in the northern counties, and having secured the principal gentlemen and seized their effects, they murdered the common people in cold blood, forcing many thousands to fly from their houses and settlements naked, into the bogs and woods, where they perished with hunger and cold. No ties of friendship, neighbourhood, or consanguinity, were capable of softening their obdurate hearts. . . . Forty or fifty thousand were massacred in a few days, without distinction of age, sex, or quality. In a few weeks the insurrection was so general that they took possession of whole counties, murdering the inhabitants."—(Edition of 1837, vol. ii., p. 95.) He subsequently adds, that "these bloody butchers overacted their parts to such a degree as to massacre near 200,000 Protestants in cold blood."

In our own days the Right Rev. Dr. Mant, Protestant Bishop of Down and Connor, ventured to repeat, as sober history, these "fifty times refuted lies," as Edmund Burke has styled them. The plot was laid, he tells us, "for a general rebellion and massacre, by Popish priests and Jesuits of the continent, in conjunction with those of Ireland. . . . And surely the incentive must have been powerful to prompt a whole nation, as it were, to do despite to our common nature, and to cast from them all the feelings of humanity, and to combine together for the purpose of involving all the English, man, woman, and child, old and young, in one sweeping destruction, and thus extirpate them utterly from the country."—(*History of the Church of Ireland*, i., p. 557). The Very Rev. Richard Murray, Dean of Ardagh, in "Ireland and Her Church," also writes that "on the 23rd of October, the carnage began; on the 30th the order for a general massacre was issued from the camp of Sir Phelim O'Neill. . . . After rapacity had fully exerted itself, cruelty, and that the most barbarous that ever was known or heard of in any nation, began its operations."—(p. 263).

In England the same tales are told with some slight variations, the better to adorn this cherished Protestant tradition. The Rev. Mr. Palmer, in Oxford, calculates that 160,000 was the number of the English Protestants thus massacred by the Irish, whilst the Rev. Mr. Kettlewell states that the priests, Jesuits, and friars "impressed upon the people that to kill a heretic was no more than to kill a dog, but that to relieve and

protect one was an unpardonable sin.”—(*A Short Account of the Reformation in Ireland*, by Rev. S. Kettlewell, M.A., London, 1869, p. 98).

The Rev. Mr. Froude has, last of all, devoted his talents to perpetuate and deepen this deadly calumny against our country. He regards the question as a most important one, for upon the truth of this massacre, he says “the justification of the subsequent policy of England towards Ireland depends.” He takes care to tell us that he derives his information from the volumes of sworn “Depositions,” the testimony, he emphatically adds, of “eye-witnesses who were examined in Dublin, fresh from the scenes which they had witnessed, before Commissioners of known integrity, men of all stations, and of both nations, whose evidence is the eternal witness of blood which the Irish Catholics have from that time to this been vainly trying to wash away.”—(*The English in Ireland*, vol. i., p. 100.) He then repeats the story of the massacre, yielding to Mrs. Macauley alone in the minuteness of its details, and adding sufficient colouring of his own to show the malignant spirit that guides his pen. “Of practical intolerance there was at this time none at all. The Catholics were indulged to the uttermost, and therefore rebelled. . . . Lord Maguire and Hugh MacMahon undertook the more difficult enterprize at Dublin, while in the whole north, on the same day, the Irish people were to rise and dispose of the English settlers and their families. No distinct directions were probably given about killing them. An Irish mob let loose upon defenceless enemies might be left to their own discretion in such a matter. . . . The Ulster farmers dispersed, surprized, and isolated, became the helpless victims of Irish ferocity on a scale on which it has rarely had an opportunity of displaying itself. . . . On the morning of that fatal Saturday (October 23rd), there appeared before the houses of the settlers and their tenants, in the six escheated counties, gangs of armed Irish, who demanded instant possession, and on being admitted, ejected the entire families, and stripped most of them to the skin. Many resisted and were killed; many, the young vigorous men especially, who could save their own lives by flight, sought shelter for their women and their little ones in the houses of their Irish neighbours, with whom they had lived in intimacy. The doors of their neighbours were opened in seeming hospitality, but within there were not human beings, not even human savages, but ferocious beasts. The priests had so charmed the Irish, and laid such bloody impressions on them, as it was held a mortal sin to give relief or protection to the English. These helpless ones were either betrayed to the ruffians out of doors, or murdered by their

hosts. . . . Savage creatures of both sexes, yelping in chorus and brandishing their skenes; boys practising their young hands in stabbing and torturing the English children; these were the scenes which were witnessed daily through all parts of Ulster. The fury extended even to the farm-stock, and sheep and oxen were slaughtered, not for food, but in the blindness of rage. . . . Many were buried alive. Those who died first were never buried, but were left to be devoured by dogs, and rats, and swine. The insurgents swore in their madness they would not leave English man, woman, or child alive in Ireland. They flung babies into boiling pots, or tossed them into the ditches to the pigs. They put out grown men's eyes, turned them adrift to wander, and starved them to death." As if all this did not suffice, he adds approvingly in a note, a passage from a Puritan pamphlet of the period: "The priests and Jesuits commonly anoint the rebels with their Sacrament of the Unction before they go to murder and rob, assuring them for their meritorious service, if they chance to be killed, they shall escape Purgatory and go to Heaven immediately."—(pp. 89 to 112).

We need not refer to the reception given by the Protestant literary world to this work of Mr. Froude. Many censured him for the want of philosophy so apparent in his pages: others found a thousand other various faults: but all awarded him the tribute of their applause for his narrative of the massacre of 1641. Take, for instance, the *Edinburgh Review*:—"We are greatly indebted," it thus writes, "to our author for his powerful and graphic description of the appalling massacre of 1641, which was a desperate effort on the part of the native race to root out the English name and the Protestant religion from Ireland. We are doubly grateful to Mr. Froude for referring us to the indisputable evidence on which the story rests, no less than forty volumes of sworn depositions lying in Trinity College, Dublin, not to speak of the contemporary narratives of credible and competent eye-witnesses."—(*Ed. Rev.*, January, 1873, page 136). One would suppose that these Depositions had never been known till this modern historian transferred them to his pages. And yet Mr. Froude has nothing new. He does nothing more than repeat the old stories, sometimes in the same words, sometimes with increased malignity, which Temple and a hundred others had already narrated for the purpose of embittering the feelings of the Protestants of this empire against their Catholic fellow-subjects.

A plain statement of facts will suffice to refute all these lying tales—I should rather say, all this reckless falsification of history, for which it would be difficult to find a counterpart

in the annals of any other nation. There was no general massacre of English Protestants in Ireland by the native Catholics in 1641. No such massacre was premeditated by the Irish leaders: on the contrary, it was wholly inconsistent with their plans. They resolved that the English settlers, of late imported into the country, should be removed from their ill-gotten possessions, and, in accordance with this resolution, we find that in every district where the Confederates were successful, the new colonists were at once expelled with as little violence as could be hoped for amid the excitement of such a general revolution. It could not be expected that the excited populace would commit no crimes, nor could it be hoped that no outrages would mar the triumph of a cause otherwise so just. On such occasions individual malice will have its victims, and past injuries will be sure to be avenged. Nevertheless, thanks to the patient spirit and calm resolve of the Irish people, I do not hesitate to say that there is no example of so great a revolution having been elsewhere achieved amid such provocation, with so little bloodshed and so few crimes.

Let us here pause for an instant to consider the position of the Catholics of Ireland on the eve of this revolution.

In six counties of Ulster the entire population had been, a few years before, dispossessed of their lands, which were handed over, by the caprice of the monarch, to English and Scotch settlers. To such lands neither these receivers nor the giver had the slightest shadow of a claim. Nevertheless, the old Irish proprietors were driven forth at the point of the bayonet to make way for the new claimants; those that resisted were hanged for the offence: the rest, to maintain themselves and their families, were obliged to till for their new masters, or to hold as tenants some obscure corner of their own hereditary estates. Surely these men and their children must not have forgotten the harsh treatment they had received, and the scanty measure of justice that had been meted out to them. In like manner, the plantations in Munster, and the inquisitions in Connaught, had robbed and ruined the Irish of these provinces, and, as a rule, throughout all Ireland an unwise policy had been pursued for years to extirpate the natives in order to make way for strangers, and to plunder the Irish Catholics in order to meet the expenses of the English court, or to enrich some lawless adventurers. The scene was now reversed. The new English settlers were driven from their comfortable holdings, and compelled to undergo some, at least, of the annoyances to which they themselves had heretofore subjected the Irish proprietors.

But what are we to say of the thirty-two volumes of Depositions, that "eternal witness of blood," to which Froude and the other traducers of our nation so confidently appeal? Are they not to be regarded as unquestionable evidence of the general massacre premeditated and carried into effect with unparalleled barbarity by the Irish insurgents of 1641? I contend that these Depositions are of no weight in this matter, and cannot be admitted as proof of the supposed massacre. They are, for the most part, mere hearsay reports detailed by the lowest dregs of the Puritan faction. The Depositions were taken in the absence of the party incriminated, and this by Commissioners who were known to be desirous of tales of blood and massacre. In very many cases the attestation that the witnesses *were duly sworn* is inserted by the Commissioners, but subsequently cancelled. This alone would suffice as proof of the careless and precipitate manner in which the Depositions were taken. The most silly hearsays are duly registered as authentic evidence, and frequently tales of massacre are admitted which had not been witnessed, but merely were known by the whispers of others to the deponents. And, hence, a modern writer, though himself at times credulous in regard to tales reflecting on his countrymen, yet does not hesitate to say of these depositions:—"From the care with which, in most of these foolish stories, the marvellous is always mixed with the murderous, it seems probable that the greater part of them are forgeries as well as fictions."—(*Moore, History of Ireland*, iv., 231). In many instances we have the wildest stories, which were told by the Irish plunderers to excite the fears of the English settlers, gravely accepted as genuine facts, and not unfrequently individual fugitives, who found themselves unaccompanied in their flight by Protestant neighbours, attested on oath, such was their frenzy, that all these neighbours had been massacred; and yet, years afterwards, those very neighbours were happily still living, and able to attest that the massacres, which had been sworn to, existed only in the imagination of the alarmed fugitives. We may take an instance of the sad consequences which too frequently resulted from these wicked reports and groundless alarms, from the interesting narrative entitled "The Irish Warr of 1641," written by a British officer who was on active service in Ulster at this very time. There was a troop of forty horsemen stationed with him in Antrim, in December, 1641. They had come from Tullaghoge, and had left their wives and children there when hastening to enrol themselves under the banner of the Parliament. Such rumours reached them, as those gravely registered in Froude's pages, that their wives and families were

massacred by their Irish neighbours. Excited by these tales, the soldiers rushed out one night, unknown to their officers, and murdered in cold blood "about eighty persons, men, women, and children, near Templepatrick." The following August the same officer was stationed at Mountjoy Castle, and many of the British settlers came in to seek an asylum there, and among these "were the wives and children of that troop we mentioned before, who gave them for lost, and drew much of innocent blood in revenge of them."—(*The Warr of Ireland*, published by McGlashan and Gill, 1873, pp. 8 and 11.)

The Earl of Castlehaven, who played such an important part in the Confederation of 1641, assures us, in the "Defence of his Memoirs," written in 1684, that in the sworn Depositions "hundreds are mentioned, as then murdered, that lived many years after: nay, some of them are even this day alive."—p. 28. Another contemporary writer attests, in the year 1662, that at the trial of Qualifications in the Court of Claims at Athlone, "these volumes of Depositions being produced, were so contradicted in most particulars, as well by the witnesses themselves who were pretended to have been duly sworn, as also by the persons said to have been murdered, who were then and are yet living, that the said Depositions were, for shame, laid aside as no evidence; and several persons, whose examinations are there registered touching these murders, have frequently since acknowledged the falsity of the matters published by them, as being had from the information of those who, by the hurry of the times, and their own frights, were so transported, that they swore all their neighbours, whom they left behind them, were murdered, whereas all, or most of them, were afterwards found living."—(*A Collection of some of the Murders committed on the Irish*, London, 1662, in pref.)

It would be easy to cite many other writers who confirm these statements. Thus, the famous Peter Walsh, in his "History of the Remonstrance," expressly writes that the Depositions, "by reason of their exaggerations and other faults," were discredited even in the Cromwellian Courts. The learned O'Flaherty, who was witness of the scenes which he describes, also attests that "they were so falsified in most particulars, as well by the witnesses who were said to have thereunto deposed, as also by some of the persons then living, who were sworn to have been murdered," that "for shame they were set aside as no evidence."—(*Publications of I.A.S.* for 1846, page 432). We will have occasion hereafter to refer again to this passage of O'Flaherty. For the present we need only add the testimony of Warner, who, though a Protestant, and most bitter in his condemnation of the "Irish

Rebels," yet is forced to admit that "there is no credit to be given to anything that was said by these Deponents, which had not others' evidence to confirm it." And again he writes: "The reason why so many idle silly tales were registered, of what this body heard another body say, as to swell the collection to two-and-thirty thick volumes in folio, closely written, it is easier to conjecture than it is to commend."—(*History of the Rebellion, &c.*, London, 1768, page 146).

But perhaps much better than any general statements, one particular well authenticated case will serve to illustrate the value of the "Depositions" on which the whole tale of this Irish massacre depends. Of the thousands of decrees which issued from the Cromwellian Court of Transplantation at Athlone,¹ which adjudicated on the Irish claims, only one complete decree has come down to us. It is preserved in the Bodleian Library among the *Carte Papers*, vol. lxiv., p. 464. In it, it is stated that Henry O'Neil of Glasdroman, in the county of Armagh, presented his claim before the Commissioners on the 13th of June, 1655, and proved his title to 10,000 acres of land which he had held in fee by letters patent made to his father, Sir Turlogh O'Neil, by King James I., on 16th September, 1603, and King Charles I., on 19th December, 1625. The Attorney-General opposed his demand, and declared him disqualified as having taken an active part in the deeds of massacre and plunder of 1641. To prove this the Books of Depositions were produced, and there were found duly registered the sworn testimony of the wife of Richard Chappel of Armagh, and also the evidence of George Littlefield of Loughgall, in the county of Armagh, both witnesses having sworn, early in 1642, just after the outbreak, to the effect that the said Henry O'Neil, and others, had, on the 23rd of October, 1641, "stripped Sir Henry Spottiswood of all that he possessed in the counties of Armagh and Monaghan, being over £4,000 in value, and that they had also robbed and despoiled the said Mrs. Chappel and her husband, deceased, and the said George Littlefield of all their goods."

This was a clear case against Henry O'Neil. The witnesses had been far more precise than the generality of those whose testimony is recorded in the bulky volumes of Depositions. They had not dwelt on mere idle rumours heard among the disordered insurgents, as so many others had done, but they attest, and that on oath, the deeds of violence which they had witnessed, and of which they themselves had been the victims.

Fortunately for Henry O'Neil, Mrs. Chappel and George

¹ For an account of this Court, see Prendergast, "Cromwellian Settlement," p. 155.

Littlefield were still living, and could be cross-examined as to their former Depositions. They were summoned before the Court, and their replies abundantly illustrate the true nature of the Depositions of which such use is made against the Irish Catholics. Mrs. Chappel was interrogated as to her "knowledge of what she had sworn in her Deposition in 1642, against said Henry O'Neil. She replied, she heard when she was in prison in Armagh in 1641, that he was in rebellion, and what induced her to believe it was, that all the country generally was in rebellion. And George Littlefield, being re-examined as to his former Deposition, said that he heard said Henry O'Neil was out in action, but not a plunderer. But neither of them knew any such matter to be true of their own knowledge." It further appeared that Henry O'Neil was quite the reverse of what he had been represented in the Depositions of 1642. Mrs. Chappel now gave evidence that "she knew him of her own knowledge to be a great friend of the English." Another respectable witness, Mr. Richard Lee, also swore that Henry O'Neill was not among those who robbed Sir Henry Spottiswood. Furthermore, the accused was able to produce several witnesses to prove his constant good affection for his English neighbours. They attested "that at the beginning of the rebellion he saved the lives of Mr. Thomas Taylor of the city of Armagh, his wife and family, and six other families of that town who fled to him for protection, and sent them away to the English quarters. He saved the lives of Mr. Fitzgerald, a minister, and Mr. Edward Trevor of Monaghan, and the wives and families of both of them. He had kept altogether 200 persons in his house, protecting them from the violence of the rebels, until he could send them to Dundalk and other English quarters."

O'Neil further proved to the satisfaction of the Cromwellian Court that he had been a determined opponent of the "Irish rebels." He had been robbed by them of his horses and cows; his house at Glasdroman had been burned by Sir Phelim O'Neil. He had even fired at one of his own sons, who persisted in joining the rebels; he had given intelligence to the Governors of Dundalk and Newry of the approach of the Irish troops, and, in consequence, he had been arrested by Owen Roe O'Neil, and kept a close prisoner in Kilkenny for three weeks till he happily effected his escape.

The Court of Transplantation pronounced Henry O'Neil *innocent*; and their sentence virtually condemns as valueless the Depositions made regarding the Irish massacre in 1641. It further proves that these Depositions, instead of being an eternal witness of blood against the Irish nation, are much rather

a Record of the Bloodthirstiness of the Deponents and their Puritan friends, who, not satisfied with the wholesale massacres of past times, and the confiscation of the estates of the Irish Catholics, still seek to blacken the memory of their victims, and to heap opprobrium on their name. The original text of the important Decree of the Athlone Court, which records these facts, and of which we have given a full analysis, may be seen in the invaluable Report on "the Carte Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library," presented to the Right Hon. the Master of the Rolls, in 1871, by the Rev. C. W. Russell, D.D., and J. P. Prendergast, Esq., p. 148, seqq.

The Mrs. Chappel, of whose evidence we have just heard so much, further attested in her "Deposition" in 1642, that "as she hath creditably heard, the rebels murdered great numbers of Protestants, and that many children were seen lying murdered in vaults and cellars, whither they fled to hide themselves." These words are cited as important evidence by Sir John Temple (page 90), but he omits all mention of the remainder of her "Deposition" regarding Henry O'Neil. Such are the proofs on which the accusations against the Irish Catholics depend.

We may now be allowed to investigate the accuracy of some of the details on which our opponents dwell so much when setting forth the horrors of the supposed massacre of 1641.

Even the scanty records of the period of the Confederation suffice to prove to demonstration that the number of English Protestants described as massacred in Ireland in 1641, is far greater than the total Protestant population of this kingdom at that period. Sir William Petty, who profited so largely by the Cromwellian confiscation of the Irish estates, tells us, in his "Political Anatomy" (p. 18), that the whole population of Ireland in 1641 was 1,466,000 inhabitants, and that the relative proportion of Protestants to Catholics was as *two to eleven*. This would give us about 1,240,500 Catholics, and 225,500 Protestants, and in the latter category are included all the Scotch settlers who were particularly numerous in Ulster. It is generally admitted that this estimate of the proportion of the Protestants to the Catholics is greatly exaggerated; but, accepting it as true, and still further supposing that every man, woman, and child, without exception, of the English and Scotch settlers were massacred, where, nevertheless, are we to look for the 600,000 of Milton's story, or the 300,000 of so many other tales, all of whom we should find massacred in the first few weeks of the Rebellion?

Yet this is not all. Sir W. Petty goes on to inform us that about 112,000 of the Protestant settlers survived the revolu-

tion ; whilst of the remainder, about two-thirds " were cut off by war, plague, and famine " during the eleven years of the Confederation ; which leaves us but a comparatively small fraction for the massacre at the first outbreak of the disturbances. Petty, however, forgets to add that the greater part even of this fraction can be accounted for by the multitudes who, as we will just now see, fled from Ulster during the first months of the disorders, many of whom, no doubt, settled in Scotland or England, and returned no more to the theatre of their former alarms. No wonder, then, that Carte, in his " History of the Life of the Duke of Ormonde " (vol. i., p. 177), should find himself compelled, by the plain evidence of the case, to avow that the extravagant numbers of the English asserted to have been massacred in 1641 were " more than there were of English, at that time, in all Ireland."

We must add to this, that even our adversaries do not find a trace of any massacre in Dublin, Cork, Limerick, and the other chief cities of our island, although large numbers of Protestants resided in them. In Down and Antrim the Scotch were so numerous, that they expelled all the Irish *Creaghts* out of these counties. A letter of Lord Ormonde to the Council, dated Siginstown, 11th October, 1646, informs us that " when the War of 1641 broke out, the Creaghts were at once expelled from the counties of Antrim and Down, as the old Scottish planters of those counties, and the invading army of new Scots, were unwilling to have any of their enemies' race amongst them."—(*Report on Carte Papers*, 1871, p. 76.) Indeed, by far the greater number of the Protestant settlers throughout Ulster were Scotch, and during the first weeks of the disturbances these remained wholly undisturbed. Clanrickard, in his "Memoirs," tells us that there were 20,000 of the Scotch settlers able to take up arms in Ulster during the first months of the insurrection, and letters from the Lords Deputies are still extant conveying instructions to them to form regiments for their own defence. Then, again, in the one county of Fermanagh six thousand women and children of the English settlers were saved by Captain Mervyn. Even the Depositions are full of details concerning the thousands who sought for safety in flight, betaking themselves to Derry, Coleraine, Carrickfergus, or Dublin. Thus, for instance, in one of Sir John Temple's "Depositions" we read that "in the town of Coleraine, since the rebellion began, there died of robbed and stripped people that fled thither for succour many hundreds, besides those of the town who had anciently dwelt there ; and that the mortality there was such and so great that many thousands died there in two

days, and that the living, though scarce able to do it, laid the carcasses of those dead persons in great ranks into vast and wide holes, laying them so close and thick as if they had packed up herrings.”—(*Deposition of James Redferne of Londonderry*). Above all, Dublin was crowded by the fugitives, and here, too, a terrible disease broke out amongst them, so that all the churchyards were filled with their remains. “The fugitives,” writes May, “appeared like walking ghosts in every street; and all the barns, stables, and outhouses were filled with them, where they soon died in so great numbers, that all the churchyards of Dublin could not contain them.”—(*History of the Parliament, &c.*, p. 86.) “The Dublin churchyards,” writes Mr. Froude, “could not hold the multitudes that were crowding into them, and two large fields were enclosed as cemeteries before the forlorn wretches could find rest even for their bones.”—(*English in Ireland*, p. 111).

On this subject of the number of British Protestants supposed to have been massacred in Ulster in 1641, Carte affords us some valuable details, the more valuable because he himself, full of the prejudices of his countrymen, clings to the English traditional tale that the Irish were really guilty of a horrid massacre. It is thus he writes: “It is certain that the great body of the English was settled in Munster and Leinster, where very few murders were committed; and that in Ulster, which was the dismal scene of the massacre, there were above 100,000 Scots, who, before the general plantation of it, had settled in the counties of Down and Antrim, and new shoals of them had come over upon the plantation of the six escheated counties; and they were so very powerful therein, that the Irish, either out of fear of their numbers or some other politic reason, spared those of that nation, making proclamation, on pain of death, that no Scotchman should be molested in body, goods, or lands. . . . It cannot, therefore, reasonably be presumed that there were at most above 20,000 English souls, of all ages and sexes, in Ulster at that time; and of these, as appears by the Lords Justices’ letter, there were several thousands got safe to Dublin, and were supported there for many months afterwards, besides 6,000 women and children which Captain Mervyn saved in Fermanagh; and others that got safe to Derry, Coleraine, and Carrickfergus, and went from those and other ports into England.”—(*History, &c.*, vol. i., p. 177.) In the face of all this evidence, how can anyone, pretending to a study of history, persist in asserting that hundreds of thousands of the helpless English settlers fell victims to Irish cruelty at the commencement of this revolution!

From the contemporary, Roderick O'Flaherty, the well-known author of the "Ogygia," and other valuable works relating to Ireland, we learn that there were some who, having closely investigated the authentic narratives of this period, affirmed that only *seventeen murders* could be imputed to the Irish; and in his "Observations on Dr. Borlase's Reduction of Ireland," drawn up in January, 1682, he thus writes: "The one hundred and forty thousand souls in a few weeks dislodged on the authority of Sir John Temple's 'Irish Rebellion,' is by many thousands further from truth than the relation of seventeen persons only massacred; as appears by the strict enquiries made in Cromwell's time, when but few of those many thousands could be found to have been really murdered. For there were not so many thousands of Protestants living then in all Ireland, much less in Ulster, where most of those murders were said to be committed. Wherefore the Black Book in Athlone (it is thus the volumes of Depositions were designated), upon which Sir John Temple's 'Rebellion' was grounded, was so falsified in most particulars thereof, as well by the witnesses who were said to have thereunto deposed, as also by some of the persons then living, who in that Book were sworn to have been murdered, that it was, for shame, set aside as no evidence. It is also avowed that the first massacres were committed against the Irish; and yet the several murders in cold blood committed against them did twenty times exceed what they acted. Besides the Irish nation in general were so unconcerned in those murders, that at their humble proposals all murders were excepted out of the Articles of Peace in the year 1648; and since His Majesty's Restoration it was their request, through their agents, that all murders should be excepted, on both sides, out of the Act of Indemnity."¹

Warner, of whom we have already spoken, has also very closely examined what should be the precise number of those massacred by the Irish, accepting as genuine the statements made by the Puritans themselves. The following is his conclusion:—"Setting aside all opinions and calculations in this affair, which, besides their uncertainty, are without any precision as to the space of time in which the murders were committed, the evidence from the Depositions stands thus:—The number of people killed, upon positive evidence, collected in two years after the insurrection broke out, adding them all together, amounts only to *two thousand one hundred and nine*: on the reports of other Protestants, *one*

¹ Printed in Appendix to O'Flaherty's "Iar-Connaught," in Publications of Irish Archæological Society, p. 431.

thousand six hundred and nineteen more: and on the report of some of the rebels themselves, a further number of *three hundred*: the whole making *four thousand and twenty-eight*. Besides these murders, there is, in the same collection, evidence, on the report of others, of eight thousand killed by ill usage, and if we should allow that the cruelties of the Irish out of war extended to these numbers, *which, considering the nature of several of the Depositions, I think, in my conscience, we cannot*, yet to be impartial we must allow that there is no *pretence* for laying a greater number to their charge. This account is also corroborated by a letter which I copied out of the council books at Dublin, written on the 5th of May, 1652, ten years after the beginning of the rebellion, from the Parliament Commissioners in Ireland to the English Parliament. After exciting them to further severity against the Irish, as being afraid 'their behaviour towards this people may never sufficiently avenge their murders and massacres, and lest the Parliament might shortly be in pursuance of a speedy settlement of this nation, and thereby some tender concessions might be concluded,' the Commissioners tell them that it appears, *besides eight hundred and forty-eight families, there were killed, hanged, buried, and drowned, six thousand and sixty-two*."—(*History, &c.*, p. 297.) Thus, then, accepting as authentic the statements of the Puritan enemy, and even the Depositions which were set aside by the Cromwellian courts, we must necessarily admit that the traducers of our country are guilty of unparalleled exaggeration in their account of the Irish massacre.

The reader will be fatigued with all these tedious extracts, and hence I will cite only a few other short records, which, though very concise, yet throw the clearest possible light on the subject of which we treat. The first is a letter from Lord Chichester, addressed from Belfast to the King, on 24th October, old style (*i.e.*, 3rd November), 1641. He announces that the Irish rebels had taken Charlemont, Dungannon, Tanderagee, and Newry, with all the military stores in them. The whole country had been plundered: fires were visible on every side; farms and villages were destroyed; but so far he had not received intelligence "that they had slain more than one man."—(*Record Office MSS. Ireland*). Thus, the first week at least was almost wholly free from massacre, being stained with the blood of only one victim; and yet it is of this very week that Sir Philip Warwick does not blush to write that 100,000 English Protestants were massacred by the Irish rebels. Another extract which I wish to present to the reader is from the "Aphorismical Discovery of

Treasonable Faction." This work is a complete history of the Confederation of 1641, written by a person who had taken an active part in the events of that period, and is still preserved in MS. in the Library of Trinity College. It gives the most minute details regarding the first beginnings of the disturbances, yet there is not a word as to any general massacre by the Irish. Having mentioned a variety of facts regarding the counties of Armagh, Tyrone, Derry, Louth, Fermanagh, Monaghan, and Cavan, it thus continues (chap. 3) : "All the English and Scots in these several counties residing, refusing to swear allegiance to his Majesty, which alone was desired of them, adhered unto their brethren the Roundheads, and went in troops disarmed to Dublin, others to England, others conveyed themselves to Scotland, desiring their countrymen and alliance to assist them against the Irish." Surely if there were no more than 20,000 English Protestants in Ulster, and if we deduct from that number the settlers in Down and Antrim who remained undisturbed, and those of Armagh, Tyrone, Derry, Louth, Fermanagh, Monaghan, and Cavan, who were all allowed to betake themselves to safe quarters, but very few will remain to be registered as victims in the supposed massacre.

Even some of the Depositions plainly imply that no massacre was meditated by the Irish. Thus, for instance, in the county of Leitrim : "Elizabeth Vawse, late of Craigstown, county Leitrim, widow, the relict of Robert Vawse, late Vicar of Cargallen, deposeth, on 9th February, 1641, that she was robbed by divers rebels who threatened deponent and her neighbours that if they would not depart away they would burn their houses. When this deponent asked them why the rebels so robbed them, they asked again who sent you over to this country? And being answered that God and the king did it, they said, let your king fetch you back again, and saith further that the said rebels burned divers houses."

Again: "Nicholas Ward, of Ballenemore, in the parish of Outrage, county Leitrim, yeoman, deposeth, the 6th January, 1642, that since the present rebellion began, viz.: the 25th day of October last, 1641, about 10 o'clock in the forenoon, he was robbed of all his goods and chattles by Charles M'Gowran and others, amongst whom was Ternan MacTroer, Irish priest, and divers others Irish rebels. And further, that Charles O'Rorke said that the Castle of Dublin was taken, and that they had the king's broad seal to take the Englishmen's goods and send them away, and that within eight days the English were to depart for England." Another witness from the same county, Thomas Lewis of Killanshele, made his depositions

on 7th January, 1642. He stated that he was robbed "of about £322 18s. 4d.," and also that "Turlough M'Phelim M'Geoffry O'Roane, of Liscolpcate, in the parish of Outrage, said to this deponent that the king had given unto one O'Rorke, a prisoner beyond sea, the whole county of Leitrim : and further, that about the time that this deponent was so robbed, there were 296 persons more, dwelling in the said parish and within a mile or thereabouts thereof, that were likewise robbed of all their goods"—(*MSS., T.C.D.*) In these, and a thousand other instances, it is manifest that there was no premeditated design of a general massacre on the part of the insurgents.

There is one head of accusation specially dear to the traducers of our country whilst they linger on the lying details of this Irish massacre. It is that the Catholic priests were leaders in such deeds of bloodshed, and hounded on their followers to the most horrid excesses. Froude is the last to join in that chorus of calumny : "The priests," he says, "told the people that the Protestants were worse than dogs, they were devils and served the devil, and the killing of them was a meritorious act."—(*The English in Ireland*, p. 108.) I need not repeat the words of the Rev. Patrick Adair, Presbyterian minister, and others already cited. All these charges rest on the mendacious stories contained in the volumes of Depositions, which we have proved to be wholly undeserving of credit in their accusations against the Irish Catholics. The reader may wish, perhaps, to see, on the present subject, a few of the tales there registered as sober truth. The following was sworn on 14th January, 1643, as preserved in "Depositions," vol. xxiii. :—"Thomas Johnson, Vicar of Turloghe and Killycomon, saith, that he was sheltered in the house of Walter Bourke, of Turloghe, Esq., county Mayo (a Catholic), who not only gave him clothes, but kept and defended him. And he further saith, that while there the younger priests and friars demanded of Stephen Lynch, Prior of Strade, if it were not lawful to kill the deponent, because he would not turn to Mass : which prior answered them that it was as lawful for them to kill this deponent as to kill a sheep or dog : and divers of the rebel soldiers there would tell the deponent to his face that if it were not for offending the said Mr. Bourke, they would make no more conscience nor care to kill him, than they would do of a pig or a sheep : that he heard divers of the soldiers, at Mr. Bourke's house, earnestly protest and say, that the titular Archbishop of Tuam, Malachy Keely, had assured them that they should not need to fear, for that the English should not have power to fight against

them, but should be delivered into their hands, so as they might cut their throats or kill them at their pleasure: and that they should hear the Holy Ghost say Mass for them thrice before they went to battle.”—(*MSS. T.C.D.*)

It is manifest that the parson who attests such things, though safe in Catholic hands, was over credulous as to the horrid deeds perpetrated by the Irish. Such silly stories as he records were clearly intended as a matter of sport with his credulity, and no unprejudiced writer would dare to rest on them so terrible an accusation against the Irish clergy as that which is advanced by our opponents.

Another parson attests, “that after the cessation divers of the rebels confessed, the priests had given them the Sacrament upon condition they should not spare man, woman, or child that were Protestants; and that he heard divers of them say in a bragging manner, that it did them a great deal of good to wash their hands in the blood of the Protestants whom they had slain.”—(*Depositions, 7th January, 1643*). Another gentleman, named Alexander Creighton, of Glaslough, in the county Monaghan, gave evidence “that he heard it credibly reported among the rebels at Glaslough, that Hugh O’Degan, a priest, had done a most meritorious act, in drawing betwixt forty and fifty English and Scottish in the parish of Ganally, in the county of Fermanagh, to reconciliation with the Church of Rome; and after giving them the Sacrament, demanded of them whether Christ’s body was really in the Sacrament or no; and they said, yea: and that he demanded further, whether they held the Pope to be supreme head of the Church; they likewise answered, he was: and that thereupon he presently told them, they were in good faith, and for fear they should fall from it and turn hereticks, he, and the rest that were with him, cut all their throats,”—(*Depositions, 1st March, 1642.*)

Such are the stories on which is grounded this dreadful accusation against the Catholic clergy. Suffice it to say, that never was there an accusation made more repugnant to the well-known facts. In proof of this, we need only refer to the very Depositions of which our adversaries are so proud, and which, though handed down by the sworn enemies of the Catholics of Ireland, bear ample testimony to the charity and clemency exercised at this trying period by the Irish priesthood. Let us take, for instance, the Catholic town of Galway: Lieutenant John Gell, in his Deposition, swears “that it was commonly spoken in Galway that the O’Flaherties of Iar-Connaught were brought into the town purposely to murder all the English: and he believeth they would have murdered them all

accordingly, had not some priests hindered them, by going out in their vestments, with tapers and a crucifix carried before them, commanding the said murderers to cease. And where some goods had been plundered, they commanded restitution to be made, as the examining, being then in the fort of Galway, was credibly informed."—(*Depositions*, 7th March, 1653). And again: "Mary Bowler, spinster, servant to Lieutenant John Gell, 7th March, 1653, saith, that she heard by several of the town-people that it was the Mayor and Council that had brought in the said Iar-Connaught people to kill and murder all the English Protestants, because their own hands should not be imbrued in their blood. That she herself saw the priests of the town, and other priests, being about eight in number, going about the town in their vestments, with tapers burning and the Sacrament borne before them, and earnestly exhorting Murrough *na mart*, and his company, for Christ's sake, and our Lady's, and St. Patrick's, that they would shed no more blood, and if they did they would never have mercy. That the said Murrough and one Edmond O'Flaherty were at the committing of the said murders, and aiding and abetting the same; and that she doth verily believe, that had it not been for the said priests, the said O'Flaherties and their company had killed all the English Protestants they had found in Galway."—(*Ibid.*)

Let us take another instance in which a parson, a pervert, too, and specially hated by the clergy, was yet saved by the interposition of a friar:—

"30th December, 1643.—John Gouldsmith, parson of Brashowle, deposeth—Betwixt three or four years before the Irish Rebellion began, Francis Gouldsmith, deponent's brother, who is a Romish priest of good account, living at, and being chaplain major at the Castle of Antwerp, writ a letter to deponent to Brashowle aforesaid, which was delivered to him by one Father Richard Barrett, a Jesuit and Spanish preacher, by which letter he required deponent to come away out of Ireland, and concluding 'I wonder, brother, you would live in so base a kingdom. You will say you have wife and children and cannot come. Sell the little goods you have and come away with your wife and children.' This letter was first delivered at Antwerp to Mr. Malone, an arch-Jesuit that dwelt in Dublin, who left the letter to Barrett to deliver it. Deponent is verily persuaded that Malone had formerly revealed the intended plot of Rebellion to deponent's brother, which induced him so earnestly to write, deponent having been a Romish Papist, and converted to the Protestant religion by the light of God's truth, and therefore more hated than any other by the

Papists. The rebels coming to his house at midnight, in November, 1641, presented their sharp skeines to his throat, robbed him then and other times of all his goods, worth about £500, and forcibly expelled him from his church living and lands, worth £100 per annum. Having heard, and being told by some of his neighbours, that he had no way to save his life but by going to Mass, he fled away and was pursued by Edmond O'Malley M'Laughlin, who beset the house, whither he was fled, with about twenty of his men, saying unto him : Mr. Gouldsmith, do you remember how your English have served us ; how they slit our noses, and scarred our faces ; come forth : and was so bitter against this deponent that had not a friar begged for him upon his knees, as the neighbours told him, he had cut out the deponent's tongue. At length, with much difficulty, deponent escaped to Lord Mayo's house, and was the second man that was robbed in the county of Mayo, as he supposeth."—(*MSS., T.C.D.*)

I must add that this Deposition of Gouldsmith is precisely one of those which Sir John Temple professes to cite as proof of Irish cruelty (pp. 105-107) : nevertheless he wholly omits the extract which I have given.

Carte, in his "Life of the Duke of Ormonde," (i. 267), affords us another instance, whilst he incidentally records the noble conduct of the clergy and Catholics of Cashel : "Doctor Samuel Pullen," he says, "Chancellor of Cashel and Dean of Clonfert, with his wife and children, was preserved by Father James Saul, a Jesuit. Several other Romish priests distinguished themselves on this occasion by their endeavours to save the English, particularly Father Joseph Everard, and Father Edmund English, both Franciscan Friars, who hid some of them in the chapel, and even under the altar : which was proved by some of those so preserved, at the trial of the latter at Clonmel assizes in 1652 ; upon which he was acquitted, and had a privilege granted him of living in the country ; the like offer being made to Father Joseph Everard. And soon after, the English, who had been thus preserved, were, according to their desire, safely conveyed into the County of Cork by a guard of the Irish inhabitants of Cashel ; who acted with so much good faith in the affair, that several of the convoy were wounded in defending them from the violence of a rabble, that waylaid and attacked them upon the mountains, in their passage."

Dr. Pullen was a native of Yorkshire. In 1634 he obtained a prebend in Ossory, and in 1636 was made Chancellor of Cashel. From a T.C.D. manuscript (f. ii. 14), we learn that on the occasion of the riot, to which Carte refers, his losses were estimated at £4,652, besides "a pair of wind instruments," which

were broken by the rebels. Ware further informs us that "he was received with great humanity, entertained and protected by James Saul, a Jesuit, for the space of three months." A curious incident is preserved in the Tract called "Foxes and Firebrands," relating to this Father Saul. Wherever the Puritans held sway the Catholic clergy were compelled to have recourse to every variety of stratagem in order to save themselves from death while visiting the sick, and breaking the bread of life to the faithful. Not far from the manor of the Countess of Oxford, in England, a shoemaker had attracted general attention by the fervor of his preaching, and the clearness of his exposition of the sacred text. Dr. Pullen, being on a visit to Lady Oxford, was asked to accompany her to hear this strange but remarkable man. They were both enraptured with his eloquence, and she invited the shoemaker to come to her house to confer with her guest. He did so, and their conversation, turning on the original texts of the Sacred Scripture, Dr. Pullen soon recognised the shoemaker as his old benefactor from Cashel. He at once "gave him thanks for preserving his life in Ireland; told him he was not a shoemaker, but Mr. Saul, and that he would take care to return the favor he had done him, and preserve his life. Accordingly, he engaged the Earl and Countess in his behalf, and all the punishment he received was to be obliged to quit those parts." This F. James Saul is not to be confounded with Andrew Saul, also a Jesuit, who apostatized about this time, and was made prebendary of St. Patrick's, Dublin.

We glean a few additional details connected with the Cashel, disturbances from a MS. account of "The Insurrection in the Counties of Kilkenny and Tipperary," by James Kearney, a contemporary and confidential correspondent of the Duke of Ormonde.—(*Carte Papers*, vol. ii., p. 39). He tells us that the first attack was made on 6th December, 1641, by a body of peasants who were exasperated by the cruelties of St. Leger, the Lord President of Munster. A few gentlemen, however, and the priests, went forth to meet them, and easily induced them to abandon their purpose. On the 30th of December another attack was organized, and the people of the county declared "they could not sleep safe while Cashel was a receptacle for the President's troopers, and that the killing of all the English and Scotch in Cashel would be but a poor satisfaction for St. Leger's cruelties." They burst like a torrent into the town, and in the tumult thirteen persons were killed. "But all the rest of the English," continues Mr. Kearney, "were saved by the inhabitants and by the Roman Catholic clergy of the town, who exposed themselves to rescue them."

Divers of the poor English were preserved by Joseph Everard and Redmond English, Franciscan friars, in their chapel; some under the altar, as was proved in Cromwell's time, 6th November, 1652, upon the trial of the said Father English, who was acquitted and privileged to live in the country; and the like privilege was offered to Father Joseph Everard, as Colonel Sankey well knows; and soon afterwards the said English inhabitants preserved, were, by a guard of the Irish inhabitants of Cashel, safely conveyed to the County of Cork as they desired."

We will only add one other example, and it will be from the province of Leinster. The parish of Naas had been for many years the scene of Father O'Higgins's evangelicallabours, and we are informed by Clarendon and Borlase that, on the first outburst of popular fury in 1641, he preserved the lives of many English Protestants who, being scattered through that district, were exposed to imminent danger: at his own risk he concealed them in his church, and subsequently had them conveyed in safety to Dublin. We shall allow Lord Clarendon to describe the treatment which he, in return, received at the hands of Sir Charles Coote, who, by authority from the Lords Justices, freely exercised all the powers of Martial Law:—"In the town of Naas," he writes, "some of the soldiers of the Marquis of Ormonde found Mr. Higgins, who might, 'tis true, have easily fled, if he had apprehended any danger in the stay. When he was brought before the Marquis, he voluntarily acknowledged that he was a papist, and that his residence was in the town, from which he refused to fly away with those that were guilty; because he not only knew himself very innocent, but believed that he could not be without ample evidence of it, having by his sole charity and power preserved very many of the English Protestants from the rage and fury of the Irish; and, therefore, he only besought the Marquis to preserve him from the violence of the soldiers, and put him securely into Dublin to be tried for any crime. Which the Marquis promised to do, and performed it, though with so much hazard, that when it was spread among the soldiers that he was a papist, the officer into whose custody he was entrusted was assaulted by them; and it was as much as the Marquis could do to relieve him and compose the mutiny.

"When he came to Dublin he informed the Lords Justices of the prisoner he had brought with him—of the good testimony he had received of his peaceable carriage, and of the pains he had taken to restrain those with whom he had credit from entering into rebellion; and of many charitable offices he had performed, of which there wanted not evidence enough,

there being many then in Dublin who owed their lives and whatever of their fortunes was left purely to him ; so that he doubted not he would be worthy of protection. Within a few days after, when the Marquis did not suspect the poor man's danger, he heard that Sir Charles Coote had taken him out of prison and caused him to be put to death in the morning before, or, as soon as it was light ; of whose barbarity the Marquis complained to the Lords Justices, but so far were they from bringing the other to be questioned, that he found himself to be under some disadvantage for thinking that proceeding to be other than it ought to have been."

Thus far Lord Clarendon in his "History of the Irish Rebellion." We learn from De Burgo, that the day of Father O'Higgins's death was the 23rd of March, 1642 : his constancy in suffering, and the heavenly joy depicted in his countenance, moved many of the puritans to tears ; others, however, redoubled their fury on witnessing his calm composure ; nor did they cease their insults even after his death, discharging their muskets at his dead body, and dragging it for sepulchre without the city walls.—(*De Burgo ex Actis Capit. Gen.* 1644, p. 561). Richard Beling, a friend of Ormond, and well acquainted with the early scenes of the Revolution, attests that Father O'Higgins not only sheltered the English Protestants who were exposed to danger, but, moreover, supplied them with food and clothing. When he was brought to Dublin "no fewer than twenty petitions were presented to the Lords Justices by Englishmen whom he had thus succoured, and who now attested in his favor, that at the risk of his own life he had rescued them from peril." A servant of Ormond's, named Edward Butler, happening to pass by early in the morning, saw Father O'Higgins led out to the gallows, and was the first to bring to his master the news of the execution. Beling adds, that Ormond deemed it his duty to lodge a formal complaint on this head before the Lords Justices, "for he judged that it was a crime against prudence as well as against justice ; and that whilst the English were still in such difficulties, and dispersed through the provinces, it would have been much more wise to heap rewards on one who had often defended them against the attacks of the infuriated populace."—(p. 159).

The contemporary Bishop of Ferns, Dr. French, also mentions this execution of Father O'Higgins, and he further informs us, that after execution the body was dragged through the public streets, and subjected to every indignity. Such was the gratitude shown by the Puritans to this worthy priest, their benefactor !

We have already seen the general statement that the county

Cavan was free from massacres, although the English settlers were despoiled of their newly gotten possessions there. Among those who suffered most in this spoliation were Dr. Bedell, Protestant Bishop of Kilmore, and his family. He had for twelve years held that See when the storm of 23rd October, 1641, burst upon his head. He had laboured strenuously to promote the interests of the Anglican community, and on that account his memory was cherished by his Protestant contemporaries, whilst his amiable character had endeared him still more to his immediate friends. Hence it is, that several authentic records have come down to us connected with his episcopate, and we are thus enabled to test at the same time the accuracy of the above general statement regarding Cavan, and the truthfulness of those writers who, whilst they accuse the native Irish of a general and premeditated massacre, impute a special malice to the Catholic priesthood. Cavan was one of the most populous of the northern counties, and the newly-imported English settlers, even at Kilmore, its Protestant head quarters, were scarcely one-fifth of the population. In a few days after the 23rd October, the whole county and all its strongholds, with the exception of the two small castles of Keilagh and Crohan, passed into the hands of the Irish, and if there had been any preconcerted scheme of massacre, surely we should here find at least some traces of bloodshed.

The "Life of Bedell," by Clogy, his son-in-law, is already well known to those interested in Irish history. It attests that the greatest forbearance was shown to the Protestant Bishop and his friends: that Doctor Swiney, the Catholic Bishop, even wrote to him that if he so desired, he himself would take up his residence with his family in order to protect them from violence or insult; and it further attests that any of the English settlers who so wished were safely conducted by the Irish to Dublin or other stations of their choice. I will take a few extracts from another "Life of Bishop Bedell," written by Mr. Bedell, his son, who shared his shelter as well as his imprisonment and other perils at this trying period. This work, long known to exist in MS., was only published at the close of 1871, at the Cambridge University Press, from the Tanner MSS., by Rev. John E. B. Mayor.

Among the causes which gave rise to the disturbances of 1641, and brought down such a calamity on the English settlers, Mr. Bedell mentions "the manifest height and fulness of pride in all ranks and sorts of men; pride, gluttony, uncleanness, deceit, oppression, extortion, and a supine neglect of religion and the worship of God."¹ He gives the following description

¹ "Life of Bishop Bedell," by his Son, Cambridge, 1871, p. 98.

of the Bishop's place of residence: "His house was situate in the county of Cavan, in a country consisting altogether of hills very steep and high, the valleys between being most commonly bogs and loughs: the country was then meetly well planted with English, but scatteringly here and there, which facilitated their ruin. . . . Kilmore itself was but a mere country village, of good large bounds, but so thinly inhabited that nowhere in the whole parish any street or part of a street was to be found. There was a competent number of English, but the Irishmen more than five times their number; and all these obstinate Papists. The Bishop's house joined close to the church, being built upon one of the highest hills in the country, not near any neighbour of any quality by a mile. In this posture, altogether unfit both for offence and defence, in a manner solitary and naked, and exposed to any insolencies, our Bishop being then at home, was on a sudden environed and involved with that horrible and ever lamentable rebellion. . . . Yet the Bishop had very strange respect in such a time as that was. For all the country round about, and in a manner the whole country, was dispeopled of the English before any violence was used either to his house or his person."

Mr. Bedell then enters into minute details regarding the revolution and the hardships to which the Bishop was subjected. "In the county of Cavan the rebels carried their business at first with a kind of hesitation; here and there some particular houses of the English were spoiled, and that was all. The chief of the Irish gentlemen there, being of the name of the O'Reillys, rather sought to persuade the English by fair words and promises to depart the country, than to fall upon them by main force. . . . But before the first fortnight was expired there began to come a great confluence of poor stripped English people to the Bishop's house for some shelter; like Job's messengers, bringing one sad report after another without intermission. They heard that the Bishop was yet permitted the enjoyment of his house and goods, and the place was near to fly unto, and thither they were glad to retire. The Bishop most freely entertained all that came, and filled all his out-houses with these guests. . . . But Edmund O'Reilly would no longer bear this expense of provision, which he said must be for the maintenance of the soldiers. And, therefore, in short space a course was taken that the Bishop's cattle, some by night and some by day, were driven all off his ground. They began with the oxen and cows; next they seized upon the horses both abroad and in the stable; and, lastly, they took away the sheep out of the courtyard. . . . The Bishop, for all this,

still relieved many poor stripped people in his outhouses. . . . From henceforth the Bishop was more closely besieged, or rather taken in his own house : nothing without doors being now left, nor any freedom or safety to him, or any with him within, but at the courtesy of the Irish, which, in comparison to what others met withal, was very much. For they suffered the Bishop thus to continue, and, in some measure, to enjoy himself from the first beginning of the Rebellion, October 23rd, till near upon Christmas following. And though he was prohibited from protecting or relieving any without the doors of his dwelling-house, yet those that were within the ark with him were all this while free from violence.”—(p. 106).

All this time, we are then told, the Irish “offered the Bishop, if he pleased, to see him and his company safely guarded and conveyed to Dublin, or what other place he should choose” (p. 108). His English friends also urged him to adopt this course, but finding that he persisted in residing in Kilmore, “they that were sheltered with him took their opportunities, the best they could, some at one time and some at another, and departed to Dublin.”—(p. 110).

We have next an account of the formal imprisonment of the Bishop. The Scottish garrisons of the two small garrisons which still held out, in one of their raids made prisoners of some of the Irish leaders. O'Reilly resolved, in return, to hold the Bishop prisoner, but first “called for an account of what was in the house, especially the plate, which was presently brought forth. It was not much : the chief was plate belonging to the Church. This, the Bishop told O'Reilly, was the Church's and not his ; and therefore desired it might not be converted to any other use, but be committed to his brother, as he called him, meaning the Popish Bishop.” To this O'Reilly readily assented. Then came the question of his library : “The greatest thing that stuck with our good Bishop was his library, yet some little satisfaction he had by thinking it should come into the hands of scholars, for O'Reilly told him, such things should be left to the Bishop.” Doctor Bedell, however, was allowed to retain all “his monies,” and at his request, his two sons and their wives were permitted to accompany him to Loughouter castle, which was the place marked out for his imprisonment. “O'Reilly was so civil as to furnish them all with horses, and with a small guard conveyed them to the water side, and so, by boat, wafted them over to the castle, standing in the midst of a great lough or lake. Being come into the castle, they were accommodated well. The governor, Mr. Owen O'Reilly, a very civil and honest gentleman, used the Bishop with all possible cour-

tesy. The place itself was very commodious for room and lodging, and there was also good company. Neither wanted there any provision, for by the care of the governor they were furnished with sufficient for their money. They had free liberty to exercise their religion together in a chamber for themselves, with very strict charge from the governor that none should interrupt them.”—(p. 116).

Soon after Christmas, on the occasion of an exchange of prisoners with the Scotch garrisons, Doctor Bedell and his friends were set at liberty, and he chose for his residence the house of Denis Sheridan, of whom, as a singularly rare occurrence, it is remarked that though an Irishman, he was “a Protestant and a minister.” This Sheridan lived about one mile from Kilmore, and his house “was a common asylum or sanctuary to as many distressed English as it could contain. While the Bishop lived here, he had a desire to hearken after his library, and if it might be to have the use of some books and papers of his own. Wherein, by Mr. Sheridan’s means, he had his desire. For he, having some familiar acquaintance with the Popish Bishop, had liberty to go where the books were, and so procured for our Bishop his desk and some other books and papers at several times.”—(p. 121).

The incidents of Doctor Bedell’s illness are foreign to our purpose. In the beginning of February, 1642, he was seized with the ague. Many of the Irish came to visit him, but especially Philip MacMoelmore O’Reilly, one of the leaders of the Irish in that county. He had from the commencement been opposed to the disturbances, and “he besought the Bishop if he wanted money or any other necessaries, to make use of anything that he was able to furnish him with.”—(p. 125.) Even after Doctor Bedell’s death, the Irish continued to display the same kindness and courtesy. He had desired to be interred without any funeral pomp: “only in one thing his will was not fulfilled, because the Irish would have their wills; and out of their affection to him would needs accompany him to his grave, not without some kind of pomp. The manner was thus. When the day appointed for his burial was come, the Irish, in a considerable number, resorted to the house, and some of the principal of them would needs be the bearers. When the company had passed something above half-way to the church, Edmund O’Reilly, that had imprisoned him and dispossessed him of all, being then resident in the Bishop’s house, close to the church, came forth to meet the corpse, being accompanied with Moelmore O’Reilly, his son, then sheriff of the county, and some other gentlemen, and attended with a party of musketeers and a drum. The coming of this

company, in this warlike manner, was thought at first to be intended to hinder and oppose the burial of the Bishop's corpse. But when they met the bier, it proved no such thing. For O'Reilly and those with him applied themselves in most courteous and condoling language to the Bishop's sons, speaking respectfully and honourably of the dead, and comfortably to the living; and so commanding their drum to beat, as the manner is when a soldier is buried, and placing the musketeers before the corpse, they thus conveyed the Bishop to his grave. And being come thither, the sheriff told the Bishop's sons that they might use what prayers, or what form of burial, they pleased; none should interrupt them. And when all was done, he commanded the musketeers to give a volley of shot, and so the company departed."—(p. 128).

Such a narrative from the Bishop's own son, and extending over four months, the precise period of the supposed universal massacre, should of itself suffice to silence the traducers of our country. Mr. Bedell's narrative ends with the demise of the Bishop. We will add one passage from the "Life of Doctor Bedell," by his son-in-law, which is a fitting sequel to the above:—"You may, perhaps, desire to know what became of Bedell's children after his death. They continued at Mr. Sheridan's house until the 15th June, 1642, on which day we marched away, above 1,200 men, women, and children, about 2,000 rebels accompanying us for our life-guard. The Scots, who had been compelled to surrender to the Irish, had about 300 horse under the command of Sir Francis Hamilton and Sir Arthur Jules. The country had orders to bring us provisions for money, which they did in great plenty. On the 22nd day of June Sir H. Tichborne, the Governor of Drogheda, met us with a party of horse and foot within ten miles of that town. The rebels that conducted us took solemn leave of us they offered us no violence, but were very civil to us all the way, and many of them wept at their parting from those that had lived so long peaceably among them."

Surely a nobler instance could not be desired of the inviolable fidelity of Irish Catholics to plighted faith in the face of the most inhuman cruelties perpetrated on their countrymen at this very time. It alone would suffice to prove that the statements of the modern maligners of our nation are groundless, and that the supposed premeditated scheme of massacre had no other foundation than the malignant hatred of the Puritans, who thus sought to screen the deeds of wickedness of their own countrymen, and to heap odium on the memory of their victims. I will, for the present, conclude with the words of a pamphlet published in London in 1642, which

makes some sound reflections on this head:—"The report," it says, "of the Irish killing women or men desiring quarter, and such like inhumanities, were inventions to draw contributions and make the enemy odious. But sure I am that there was no such thing done while I was in Ireland, about six months after these commotions began. And though unarmed men, women, and children were killed in thousands by command of the Lords Justices, the Irish sent multitudes of our people, both before and since these cruelties were done, as well officers and soldiers as women and children, and carefully conveyed them to the seaports and other places of safety: so let us call them what we will—bloody inhuman traitors, or barbarous rebels—we have suffered ourselves to be much exceeded by them in charity, humanity, and honour."¹

✠ P. F. M.

(To be continued.)

HARMONY OF THE PASSION.

INTRODUCTION.

THOUGH all Christians are familiar with the events of our Lord's Passion, there are few, perhaps, who would not find themselves embarrassed, if they undertook to arrange these events according to the exact order of historical sequence, and to fit together, into one consecutive narrative, the various incidents recorded by the several Evangelists. We purpose, therefore, to offer, in a convenient form, to the readers of the RECORD, the materials for constructing a narrative of this kind, and to give such aid, towards the accomplishment of the task, as our feeble powers and slender stores of learning will allow.

To this end we shall set forth all the leading events of the Passion in distinct sections, arranging them, as far as may be, according to the order of time. Each section will exhibit, in the first place, the *Gospel Text*; so that the reader may see, at a glance, how many Evangelists have recorded the event under consideration, and what each one has said. Next will follow the *Harmony*, in which we endeavour to combine the

¹ From Carte Papers, vol. iv., n. 154, Prendergast, "Cromwellian Settlement," p. 71.

several narratives into one; omitting no incident, and adhering closely, but not scrupulously, to the exact words of the text. Then come the *Notes*, which are intended (1) to explain briefly any difficulties that may exist about the order of events; (2) to reconcile with one another those passages in the different Gospels which seem, at first sight, to involve some contradiction or inconsistency; and (3) to give such information about the places and persons referred to, the laws and usages of the time, the meaning of obscure words and phrases, as may seem necessary for a clear and full perception of the sense of the Inspired narrative.

In carrying out this plan, we shall have to face many questions which, for ages, have been the subject of animated controversy, and on which much learning and ingenuity have been expended. Such questions we must dispatch, in our *Notes*, with almost discourteous brevity: for it is our desire, not to raise up a barrier of learning between the reader and the Sacred Text; but rather to let the touching narrative of the Gospel stand forth, in all its simplicity, and speak for itself. Some of them, however, which have more than ordinary interest and importance, we hope to deal with, from time to time, in the form of Dissertations, which may be read apart, and will not disturb the general character of our work. If, as we trust, we should be favoured, now and again, with suggestions and corrections, by the readers of the RECORD, it is hardly necessary to say they will be always gladly welcomed and carefully considered.

Before proceeding to consider in detail the various events of the Passion, it may be useful to sketch out roughly, as it were in outline, the last week of our Lord's life upon earth. When the festival of the Pasch was drawing near, He came up to Jerusalem with his Apostles, and, on the way, announced to them his approaching Passion, Death and Resurrection. "Behold we go up to Jerusalem, and the Son of Man shall be betrayed to the chief priests and the Scribes, and they shall condemn Him to death. And they shall deliver Him to the Gentiles, to be mocked, and scourged, and crucified, and the third day He shall rise again."¹

Towards evening, on the Friday before He was crucified, He arrived at the village of Bethania,² where Lazarus dwelt, with Mary and Martha his sisters. Here He rested the Sabbath day, and supped, in the evening, at the house of Simon the

¹ Matt. xx. 18, 19; Mark, x. 33, 34; Luke, xviii. 31-34.

² John, xii. 1.

Leper.¹ Lazarus sat at table with the guests ; while Martha served ; and Mary, taking a pound of precious ointment, made of costly spikenard, poured it on the head of Jesus, and then annointed also his feet and wiped them with her hair.

On the morrow, the first day of the Jewish week, He went towards the city, riding on an ass ; and the people came out in crowds to meet Him ; some carrying branches of palm in their hands, which they strewed in his path, whilst others spread out their garments beneath his feet ; and all cried aloud, Hosannah to the Son of David ! Blessed is He who cometh in the name of the Lord ! And when He came near to the city, and looked down upon it from the last crest of the mount of Olives, He wept over it, and foretold, in touching words, its approaching desolation. Then going into the temple, He healed the blind and the lame. And the Pharisees, hearing the acclamations of the people, and seeing the wonders that He wrought, were filled with envy. But Jesus, when evening was come, left them, and went back to Bethania, where He abode.²

The following days were spent by our Lord, teaching in the temple, but He returned each evening to Bethania,³ which was distant about two English miles, on the slopes of the Mount of Olives.⁴ And all the people used to come to the temple early in the morning to hear Him.⁵ As He came towards the city on Monday He cursed the barren fig tree, which withered away upon the spot.⁶ Then entering into the temple, He cast out those who were buying and selling therein, and overturned the tables of the money changers.⁷ When evening was come, He went forth again from the city.⁸

The incidents of Tuesday are related with great minuteness. On their way to the city, Jesus and his Apostles pass by the barren fig tree, which they see withered away to the roots :⁹ then coming to the temple, Jesus teaches there according to his wont. The Pharisees, and the Sadducees, and the Doctors of the law, seek to lay snares for Him and to catch Him in his discourse. But He defeats their crafty designs, and then assuming a tone of authority, He rebukes their pride and arrogance, their avarice, their hypocrisy. Seeing that they could not entrap Him by their subtilities, they would gladly seize

¹ Matt. xxvi. 6 ; Mark, xiv. 3 ; John, xii. 2.

² Matt. xxi. 1-11, 14-17 ; Mark, xi. 1-11 ; Luke, xix. 28-44 ; John, xii. 12-50 ; see also Milman, *Hist. of Christianity*, vol. i. pp. 280-284 ; Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, pp. 186-190.

³ Luke, xix. 47 ; xxi. 37, 38 ; Matt. xxi. 17 ; Mark, xi. 11, 19.

⁴ John, xi. 18.

⁵ Luke, xxi. 38.

⁶ Matt. xxi. 19 ; Mark, xi. 13, 14.

⁷ Matt. xxi. 12, 13 ; Mark, xi. 15-17 ; Luke, xix. 45, 46.

⁸ Mark, xi. 19.

⁹ Matt. xxi. 18-20 ; Mark, xi. 20, 21.

Him by force : but they fear the people, who look on Him as a prophet.¹ Jesus afterwards, going out from the temple foretells its approaching ruin : and coming with his Apostles to the Mount of Olives, enters into a long and weighty discourse, on the destruction of Jerusalem, and the end of the world. He admonishes his followers to watch and pray, that when He comes in judgment, they may be found prepared. This admonition He enforces in various parables, and ends with a vivid picture of the day of general judgment.² When his discourse was over, He turned suddenly, as it would seem, to the momentous events that were immediately impending, and reminded his Apostles that, after two days would be the Pasch, and the Son of Man would be delivered up to be crucified.³

On Wednesday the enemies of Jesus Christ took counsel together how they might get hold of Him by craft, and kill Him. Judas came to their aid, and agreed to deliver Him up for thirty pieces of silver.

Our Lord does not appear to have come to Jerusalem on Thursday morning, as had been his custom on the previous days.⁴ But in the afternoon He sent Peter and John into the city, to prepare the Paschal supper. Towards evening He arrived Himself with the rest of his Apostles, and they ate the Pasch together. Then He washed their feet, and instituted the sacrament of the Eucharist. Afterwards rising from table, He went forth from the supper hall and the city, to the garden of Gethsemani, entertaining his Apostles, on the way, with a long and beautiful discourse. Here He was betrayed with a kiss, and taken prisoner by the Jews. On the same night He was brought before Annas, and then before Caiphas, the High priest.

Early on the morning of Friday, He is condemned by the supreme council of the Jews, and delivered up to Pilate, the Roman Governor. From Pilate He is sent away to Herod ; and back again from Herod to Pilate. Then He is scourged, crowned with thorns, clothed in a purple garment, and exhibited before the populace as a mock King. At last, condemned to death, He goes forth from the city, carrying his cross, and ascends the hill of Calvary. At noon, He is crucified, and about three o'clock, He expires. Towards evening his sacred body is taken down from the cross, and laid in a sepulchre.

¹ Matt. xxi. 23-46 ; xxii ; xxiii ; Mark, xi. 27-33 ; xii. 1-44 ; Luke, xx. ; xxi.

² Matt. xxiv ; xxv ; Mark, xiii ; see also Milman, *History of Christianity*, vol. i. pp. 293-300.

³ Matt. xxvi. 1, 2.

⁴ See Luke, xix. 47 ; xxi. 37, 38.

§ I.

CONSPIRACY OF THE CHIEF PRIESTS.

TEXT.

Vulgate Version.

- MATT. xxvi. 1-5.—Et factum est, cum consummasset Jesus sermones hos omnes, dixit discipulis suis : (2). Scitis quia post biduum Pascha fiet, et Filius hominis tradetur ut crucifigatur. (3). Tunc congregati sunt principes sacerdotum, et seniores populi, in atrium principis sacerdotum, qui dicebatur Caiphas : (4). et consilium fecerunt ut Jesum dolo tenerent, et occiderent. (5). Dicebant autem: Non in die festo ; ne forte tumultus fieret in populo.
- MARK, xiv. 1, 2.—Erat autem Pascha et Azyma post biduum : et quærebant summi sacerdotes et scribæ quomodo eum dolo tenerent, et occiderent. (2). Dicebant autem : Non in die festo ; ne forte tumultus fieret in populo.
- LUKE, xxii. 1-2.—Appropinquabat autem dies festus Azymorum, qui dicitur Pascha. (2). Et quærebant principes sacerdotum et scribæ, quomodo Jesum interficerent ; timebant vero plebem.

Rheims Version.

- MATT., xxvi. 1-5.—And it came to pass, when Jesus had ended all these words, he said to his disciples : (2). You know that after two days shall be the Pasch, and the Son of man shall be delivered up to be crucified. (3). Then were gathered together the chief priests and ancients of the people, into the court of the High priest, who was called Caiphas : (4). and they consulted together, that by subtilty they might apprehend Jesus, and put him to death. (5). But they said : Not on the festival day ; lest perhaps there should be a tumult among the people.
- MARK, xiv. 1, 2.—Now the feast of the Pasch, and of the Azymes, was after two days : and the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might by some wile lay hold on him, and kill him. (2). But they said : Not on the festival day ; lest there should be a tumult among the people.
- LUKE, xxii. 1, 2.—Now the feast of unleavened bread, which is called the Pasch, was at hand. (2). And the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might put Jesus to death ; but they feared the people.

H A R M O N Y.

Now the feast of unleavened bread, which is called the Pasch, was at hand. And Jesus said to his disciples: You know that after two days will be the Pasch, and the Son of man will be delivered up to be crucified. Then were gathered together the chief priests, and the Scribes, and the elders of the people, into the palace of the High priest, who was called Caiphas: and they consulted together, how they might, by craft, lay hold on Jesus and put him to death. But they feared the multitude; and they said: Not on the festival day, lest perhaps there should be a tumult among the people.

NOTES.

After two days. These words were spoken on the evening of Tuesday, and the Pasch, as will appear in the sequel, was kept on the evening of Thursday, two days later.

The feast of the Pasch. Pascha, which in Greek is written $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\alpha$, in Latin, sometimes Pascha, sometimes Phase, is the

Chaldaic form of the Hebrew *Pesach*, and means literally a *passing over*: hence in English it is not inaptly translated, *the passover*. The origin of this feast is fully explained in the twelfth chapter of Exodus. On the day before the deliverance of the Hebrew people from the bondage of Egypt, they were commanded, in every household, to kill a lamb, at evening; and to sprinkle with its blood the door posts of the house. The lamb was then to be roasted upon the fire, and eaten with unleavened bread. Afterwards when the Lord went through the land, at midnight, and slew the first born of the Egyptians, from the first born of Pharaoh, who sat upon the throne, to the first born of the captive woman that was in prison, He *passed over* every house that was sprinkled with blood. Thus, whilst His enemies were smitten, His chosen people were saved by the blood of the lamb. In memory of this event, He ordained that the day should be kept as a feast for ever: and it was called the feast of the Pasch, that is to say, of the *passing over*.¹ The word Pasch, however, is not confined to the *feast*: it is often used of the *lamb* that was slain. Thus Moses, in this very chapter, tells the people to “kill the Pasch”;² and in Deuteronomy he says, “Thou shalt sacrifice the Pasch to the Lord thy God.”³ Christ, too, in the New Testament, speaks of *eating* the Pasch;⁴ and Saint Paul uses the word in this sense when he says that “Christ, our Pasch, has been sacrificed.”⁵

The Azymes. Closely connected with the Pasch was the feast of the Azymes; that is to say, of unleavened bread. It began on the evening that the Paschal lamb was eaten, and lasted seven days. During this period the Jews were forbidden, under pain of death, to eat leavened bread: nor was it even allowed to keep leaven in their houses.⁶ As the feast of the Pasch coincided with the first day of the Azymes, this day was the most important of the whole solemnity. Hence it is sometimes called, by excellence, *the festival of the Azymes*: and so it is here styled by Saint Luke. On this day, and also on the seventh day of the feast, no manner of servile work was allowed to be done, save only what was necessary for the preparation of food.⁷

The chief priests, οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς, were, most probably, the heads of the sacerdotal families; and must be carefully distinguished from the High priest, often called, by excellence, as in the present passage, *the chief priest,* ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς, who was the head of the whole sacerdotal order.⁸

¹ Exod. xii. 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 29, 30. ² Exod. xii. 21. ³ Deut. xvi. 2.

⁴ Mark, xiv. 14. et passim. ⁵ 1 Cor. v. 7. ⁶ Exod. xii. 15-20. ⁷ Exod. xii. 16.

⁸ See Patrizzi, De Évang. Diss. xxviii; Maldonatus, in Matt. ii. 4.

The Scribes, οἱ γραμματεῖς, were doctors of the law, and filled, as it were the office of public notaries. It was their duty to preserve the sacred Books and other public documents, to study them, and to explain them to the people.¹ They are mentioned here by Saint Mark and Saint Luke, but not by Saint Matthew, except in some Greek texts of doubtful authority.

The ancients of the people, οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ, are introduced here by Saint Matthew, but not by Saint Mark or Saint Luke. They were probably the heads of the Jewish families, and are called elsewhere simply *the elders*, sometimes also *the chiefs* of the people.² Combining the three narratives of this event, we find that the chief priests, the Scribes, and the elders of the people, were gathered together under the headship of the High priest. This was the supreme council of the Jews, called the Sanhedrim, to which belonged the highest judicial and administrative powers in things that concerned the Jewish religion and the Jewish law.³ Under the false pretence of religion, they were now assembled to conspire against the life of Jesus Christ, whose popularity with the people had excited their envy and hatred.

The court of the High priest. The Greek word is *αὐλή*, which sometimes meant the house or palace of a man of rank, sometimes a hall or court of the palace. It occurs frequently in the narrative of the Passion, and is used in both senses.⁴ Here it seems to mean the palace of the High priest.

Consulted together. They had long ago resolved upon his death: and when He was teaching openly in the Temple, a day or two before, they had wished to seize Him, but durst not on account of the people.⁵ Now therefore, probably on the morning of Wednesday,⁶ they took counsel together, how they might get Him into their hands by subtilty and craft.

They feared the people. For Jesus had many followers and friends among the people, who had been attracted to Him by his miracles, who had flocked round Him with acclamations on his entry into Jerusalem, spreading their garments in his way, and who had listened with admiration to his discourses in the Temple.⁷

¹ Patrizzi, De Evang. Diss. xxix; Maldonatus, in Matt. ii. 4; Jans. Ypr. in Matt. ii. 4. ² Patrizzi, De Evang. Diss. xxviii. n. 35.

³ See Smith, Dict. of the Bible; Kitto, Cyclop. of Bib. Lit., *Sanhedrim*; compare also Matt. xxvii. 1, Mark, xv. 1, Luke, xxii. 66.

⁴ See Kitto, Cyclop. of Bib. Lit.; Smith, Dict. of the Bible, *palace, hall*.

⁵ John, xi. 53; Luke, xix. 47, 48. ⁶ Patrizzi, De Evang. Adnot. clv.; Diss., xlix.

⁷ Matt. xxi. 8-11, 46; xxii. 46; Mark, xi. 8-11, 18; xii. 12; Luke, xix. 35-38, 47, 48; xx. 26, 39, 40; xxi. 37, 38; John, xi. 45; xii. 9-13.

Not on the festival day. They were influenced by no religious motive, but feared a tumult amongst the people. As it was only in Jerusalem that the Pasch could be kept, the crowds that flocked into the city on the occasion of that feast must have been enormous. In the reign of Nero, according to Josephus, the number of people that kept the Pasch was upwards of 2,700,000. Those who could not find accommodation within the city encamped in tents without the walls.¹ It is not strange that, in the presence of such a multitude, the enemies of our Lord should fear that His arrest might lead to a disturbance. Nevertheless, in the sequel it will appear that our Lord was, in fact, seized and put to death on the festival of the Pasch: and thus the event fell out rather in accordance with his prophecy than with the machinations of his enemies. They changed their plans, it would seem, when by the treachery of Judas, they were able secretly to arrest Him, on the evening of Thursday, in the garden of Gethsemani.

(*To be continued.*)

DOCUMENT.

SANCTISSIMI IN CHRISTO PATRIS ET DOMINI NOSTRI
DOMINI PII DIVINA PROVIDENTIA PAPAE IX., CON-
STITUTIO SUPER PRIVILEGIIS PROTONOTARIORUM
APOSTOLICORUM AD INSTAR NUNCUPATORUM.

*Pius Episcopus Servus Servorum Dei ad Perpetuam rei
Memoriam.*

APOSTOLICAE Sedis officium, quod licet imparibus meritis, tenuitati Nostrae inscrutabili divinae providentiae Consilio demandatum est, inter multimodas curas, quibus hisce maxime temporibus premimur, hanc etiam Nobis imponit ut eas concessionem per Romanos Pontifices Praedecessores Nostros factas, quae temporis lapsu vel nimis ampla et prava interpretatione, magnum ecclesiasticae disciplinae detrimentum attulerunt, eas prout exigit necessitas, ad rectum mentis ipsorum Praedecessorum Nostrorum et Nostrae tramitem reducere,

¹ Smith, Dict. of the Bible, *passover*.

studeamus : idque potissimum et ipsa rei gravitas et augusta Ecclesiae liturgia nec non et varia Praedecessorum Nostrorum temperamenta, alias ad eundem finem adhibita, visa sunt Apostolicae decisionis oraculum postulare. Sane, ut patet, Protonotarios Apostolicos *ad instar Participantium* nuncupatos, insignibus privilegiis Romanorum Pontificum benignitate auctos fuisse. Verum, ut est humanae naturae infirmitas, sive ex prava eorundem privilegiorum interpretatione sive etiam ex immoderato honorum desiderio, non raro extra Urbem contigisse compertum est, ut plures ex memoratis Protonotariis non sine gravi Episcopalis dignitatis injuria indebitas sibi praerogativas, praesertim in Pontificalibus exercendis usurpare praesumpserint. De huiusmodi abusibus quum frequentissimae expostulationes a non paucis Episcopis ad Nos delatae fuerint et porro deferantur, Nos ad praedictos eliminandos abusus certasque edendas regulas, quibus privilegia declarentur Protonotariis Apostolicis *ad instar*, vere proprieque spectantia, modusque praefiniatur in usu eorundem privilegiorum omnino servandus, peculiarem nonnullorum Venerabilium Fratrum Nostrorum Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae Cardinalium sacris tuendis Ritibus praepositorum cum aliquibus Romanae Curiae Praelatis, Congregationem deputandam duximus, cui rem universam discutiendam commisimus. Quae quidem Congregatio, cunctis accurate diligenterque perpensis, in Conventu sub die XVIII. Mensis Aprilis proxime praeteriti habito, negotium sibi demandatum ad exitum perduxit atque haec quae sequuntur decernenda censuit.

I. Protonotarii Apostolici *ad instar Participantium* a Summo Pontifice ad hunc honorem eVecti, inter Praelatos Domesticos eo ipso accensentur.

II. Licet illis habitu Praelatitio uti, nimirum : veste talari caudata, fascia et palliolo seu mantelletto violacei coloris cum collari et caligis item violaceis ac birreto, quod tamen omnino nigrum esse debet.

III. Hunc habitum Praelatitium cum Rochetto subtus palliolum adhibere poterunt in publicis supplicationibus aliisque sacris functionibus ; in reliquis vero Rochettum dimittant ; simulque sciant numquam sibi licere, praeterquam in celebratione Missae Pontificalis Crucem pectoralem et Annulum deferre.

IV. Habitu privato incedentibus, fas erit iisdem Protonotariis, retento usu collaris et caligarum violacei coloris, induere vestem talarem nigram fimbriis globulisque rosaceis ornatam, circumcingere illam ad lumbos parva fascia violacea, pallium item violaceum superimponere ac pileo nigro vittam seu cor-

dulam sericam rubri coloris, auro tamen non intertextam, adjungere.

V. Habitu Praelatio induti, quoscumque Clericos Presbyteros, Canonicos singillatim sumptos nec non Praelatos superiores Ordinum Regularium, quibus Pontificalium privilegium non competat, praecedunt: minime vero Vicarios Generales vel Capitulares, Canonicos collegialiter unitos et Abbates.

VI. Si in habitu Praelatio sacris functionibus assistant, non genuflectant sed caput Cruci inclinent, uti fieri solet a Canonicis Ecclesiarum Cathedralium, duplici ductu thurificentur et consideant juxta ordinem nuper indicatum.

VII. Si forte Canonicatu aut Dignitate in aliqua Ecclesia potiantur, habitum ibi gestent sui ordinis proprium, non Praelatitium: excepta tantum veste talari, quae violacea esse poterit, eoque consideant et incedant loco, qui ipsis ratione beneficii competit. Quod si habitu Praelatio uti nihilominus velint, sedem occupent ipsis superius assignatam et pro ea vice distributiones quotidianas amittant, quae Sodalibus accrescant.

VIII. Indulto gaudeant privati Oratorii ab Ordinario visitandi atque approbandi, in quo, diebus etiam solemnioribus, in consanguineorum et affinium secum cohabitantium nec non famulorum suorum praesentia, Missam vel per se celebrare, vel per quemcumque Sacerdotem saecularem vel cujusvis Ordinis regularem rite probatum celebrare facere, libere possint et valeant. Privilegio autem Altaris portatilis omnino carere se sciant.

IX. Ius habent assistendi Capellis Pontificiis ibique sedendi post Protonotarios Participantes.

X. Conficere possunt Acta de causis Beatificationis et Canonizationis Servorum Dei, quo tamen privilegio uti nequeant, si eo loci alter sit e Collegio Protonotariorum Participantium.

XI. Rite eliguntur in Conservatores Ordinum Regularium, in Iudices Synodales, in Commissarios Apostolicos et Iudices a Summo Pontifice adsciscendos pro causis Ecclesiasticis et Beneficiariis. Item apud ipsos Professionem Fidei recte emittunt, qui ex officio ad eandem adstringuntur. Item coram ipsis pensiones transferri possunt ab iis, qui eo gaudent privilegio.

XII. Meminerint tamen Protonotarii Apostolici *ad instar Participantium*, minime obstantibus privilegiis superius recensitis, ipsos a locorum Ordinariis eorumque jurisdictione minime esse exemptos, sed iisdem Ordinariis juxta communis juris

regulas, omnino subjectos, nec proinde sine expresso illorum assensu, numquam posse Pontificalia exercere.

XIII. Impetrata autem Ordinarii venia, qui eam tribuere poterit quoties et pro quibus Solemnitatibus voluerit, etsi Missa sollemnis celebranda sit in Ecclesia exémp̄ta, obtentu insuper assensu Praelati cui haec ipsa Ecclesia subest, non idcirco memorati Protonotarii fas sibi esse putent solemne Sacrum iisdem prorsus ritibus et pompa peragere, qui Episcopali tantum dignitati conveniunt. Plura siquidem sunt quae illis omnimode, prout sequitur, interdicuntur.

XIV. Itaque ad Ecclesiam ubi rem divinam sint solemniter celebraturi privatim accedant. Non Cappam magnam nec Pileum pontificale audeant assumere, ne unum quidem Presbyterum vel Clericum superpelliceo indutum sibi comitem adsciscant: non in templi vestibulo ab Ecclesiae Clero associari se sinant; non denique populum lustrali aqua ibidem aspergere, nec ipsi intra Ecclesiam benedicere manu praesumant.

XV. Item abstineant ab usu septimi candelabri super Altari, sacras vestes non ex eo, sed in sacrario assumant et deponant, non in faldistorio eove minus in throno sedeant; sed una cum Ministris in Scamno cooperto tapeto vel panno coloris officio diei respondentis, non Baculo pastorali non Canone; non Palmatoria non Presbytero assistente utantur; manus non nisi semel post Offertorium ad Altare lavent. Denique nec dicant PAX VOBIS loco DOMINUS VOBISCUM dum populum salutant, nec in fine Missae trinam benedictionem impertiantur.

XVI. Quoad ornamenta Pontificalia hisce tantum uti poterunt, scilicet: Caligis et Sandaliis sericis nec auro nec argento ornatis, sericis item Chirothecis sine opere frygio aureo vel argenteo, Dalmatica, Tunicella, Annulo cum unica gemma, Cruce pectorali sine ullis gemmis cum cordula serica violacei coloris, Mitra simplici ex tela alba cum sericis laciniis rubri coloris, ac pileolo nigri coloris, attamen non nisi sub Mitra adhibendo.

XVII. Haec ipsa vero Pontificalia ornamenta assumere nequibunt in Missis pro Defunctis in Processionibus et in quibuscumque aliis ecclesiasticis Functionibus, nisi forte Missam solemnem immediate praecedant vel subsequantur, at semper depositis in eiusmodi functionibus a Missa distinctis, Chirothecis cum Dalmatica et Tunicella.

XVIII. In Missis privatis quoad indumenta, caeremonias, ministros, Altaris ornatum cereorum lucentium numerum a simplici Sacerdote non differant, adeoque nullum prorsus ex ornamentis Pontificalibus pro Missa sollemni tantum sibi

indultis adhibeant, atque ab omnibus et singulis ritibus in ipsa Missa solemnibus sibi vetitis penitus abstineant.

XIX. Verum cum Protonotarii *ad instar Participantium* nequeant in Urbe, ob Summi Pontificis praesentiam, Pontificalium privilegium exercere, hinc illis Romae permittitur ut juxta vigentem ibi usum possint in Missis privatis, dummodo habitu Praelatitio sint induti, sese ad Missam praeparare eaque absoluta gratiarum actiones persolvere coram Altari in parvo genuflexorio sine strato cum duobus pulvinaribus tantum, altero sub genibus et altero sub brachiis; sacras vestes ex eodem Altari sumere, palmatoria uti ac Presbyterum superpelliceo indutum adhibere, qui Missalis folia illis evolvat: salvis tamen quoad Patriarchales Basilicas peculiaribus statutis et consuetudinibus ibidem laudabiliter observatis, et cauto semper ut abstinere omnino debeant ab Annulo et Cruce pectorali; ab usu pileoli, a salutatione populi per verba "*Pax Vobis*" a trina benedictione in fine Missae et ab aliis quibuscumque ritibus et caeremoniis, non nisi S. R. E. Cardinalium et Episcoporum propriis.

XX. Recensita hactenus privilegia illa sunt, quibus dumtaxat Protonotarii *ad instar* ab Apostolica Sede donantur. Verum non aliter illa exercere licebit iis qui huiusmodi honorem rite fuerint consecuti, nisi antea Apostolicas Litteras vel legitimum Diploma suae nominationis in officio Secretarii Collegii Protonotariorum Participantium exhibuerint, cuius erit in codicem referre nomen cognomen aetatem patriam et qualitates novi Protonotarii *ad instar*, nec non diem expeditionis praedictarum Litterarum Apostolicarum seu Diplomatis; nisi insuper coram Decano Protonotariorum Participantium vel per se, si Romae versentur, vel etiam per legitimum Procuratorem si alibi commorentur, Fidei professionem et Fidelitatis iuramentum praestiterint, et nisi denique, de sua legitima nominatione nec non de Fidei professione et Fidelitatis iuramento a se ut supra praestitis authenticum documentum nomine totius Collegii Protonotariorum Participantium ab huius Decano et Secretario subscribendum et Collegii ipsius Sigillo muniendum, Ordinario praesentaverint, una cum notula typis impressa honorum privilegiorum et praerogativarum Protonotariatus *ad instar* inhaerentium ad formam praesentis Decreti, iisdem prorsus quibus supra subscriptionibus et Sigillo munita.

XXI. Qui secus facere aliisve, praeter memorata, privilegiis et juribus uti praesumpserint, si ab Ordinario semel et bis admoniti non paruerint, eo ipso Protonotariatus honore privatos se sciant.

XXII. Quae supra de usu Pontificalium et de modo Missam privatam celebrandi quoad Protonotarios *ad instar Participantium* decreta sunt, a caeteris etiam Romanae Curiae Praelatis, quibus ex Constitutionibus aliisque specialibus Indultis Apostolicis privilegium Pontificalium competat, erunt adamussim servanda. Si qui vero Praelati et Praelatorum Collegia amplioribus hac in re praerogativis se aucta fuisse arbitrentur, peculiaria sua jura in Sacrorum Rituum Congregationem deducant, ut quod e canonicarum sanctionum praescripto visum fuerit, opportune decernatur.

XXIII. Cum autem intra privilegia a Romanis Pontificibus nonnulla Cathedralium aliarumve Insignium Ecclesiarum extra Urbem Capitula decorata fuerunt, illud quoque fuerit identidem concessum, ut praedictarum Ecclesiarum Canonici titulo gaudeant Protonotariorum *ad instar Participantium*; attente perpendant istiusmodi Capitula ex nudo hoc titulo singulis Canonicis Pontificia benignitate tributo, minime deduci posse privilegia quoque ipsis indulta fuisse eorundem Protonotariorum propria, sed juxta regulam a Sacra Rituum Congregatione in generali Decreto diei 27 Aprilis 1818, traditam et a Sa. mem. Pio VII. Idibus Decembris ejusdem anni in Constitutione "*Cum innumeri*" confirmatam, meminerint "Leges et conditiones in Apostolicis Indultis praefinitas, accurate diligenterque servandas, neque ulli fas esse concessionis limites pro suo arbitrio praetergredi, vel in Romana Curia id genus Insignia deferre, vel sibi singulatim et extra Collegii functiones attributa existimare, quae corpori tantummodo sunt collata."

XXIV. Caeterum, praedicta Congregatio particularis, hoc Decreto nihil detractum voluit de juribus privilegiis et exemptionibus Collegio Protonotariorum Participantium juxta Constitutiones Apostolicas, ac praesertim juxta Litteras in forma Brevis "*Quamvis peculiares facultates*" die 9 Februarii 1853, datas quomodo spectantibus.

Nos igitur qui certum ordinem in omnibus servari sinceris desideramus affectibus praemissa omnia et singula a praefata Congregatione digesta atque statuta, Apostolica Auctoritate, tenore praesentium, confirmamus et approbamus, eaque veluti Motu proprio certa scientia ac de Apostolicae Potestatis plenitudine constituimus, ordinamus atque sancimus.

Decernentes praesentes Litteras, etiam ex eo quod in praemissis et circa praemissa, jus vel interesse habentes seu habere quomodolibet praetendentes, vocati et auditi non fuerint, nec eis consenserint, ab omnibus ad quos nunc spectat et in futurum spectabit, perpetuo et inviolabiliter observari debere: easdemque nullo umquam tempore, ex quavis causa quan-

tumvis juridica privilegiata ac ex quovis capite colore et praetextu de Subreptionis vel Obreptionis ac nullitatis vitio seu intentionis Nostrae aliove quolibet etiam substantiali defectu, notari, impugnari, aut adversus illas oris aperitionem vel aliud juris facti vel gratiae remedium intentari posse ; sed eas semper et perpetuo validas et efficaces existere suosque plenarios et integros effectus sortiri et obtinere.

Sicque et non aliter per quoscumque Iudices Ordinarios vel Delegatos quavis auctoritate et potestate fungentes, seu honore praeminentia ac dignitate fulgentes, etiam causarum curae Camerae Apostolicae Auditores ac Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae Cardinales, etiam de latere Legatos Vice-Legatos atque Apostolicae Sedis Nuncios, sublata eis et eorum cuilibet, quavis aliter judicandi et interpretandi facultate, judicari et definiri etiam debere, ac irritum quoque et inane si secus super his a quoquam quavis auctoritate scienter vel ignoranter contigerit attentari.

Non obstantibus, quatenus opus sit, Nostra et Cancellariae Apostolicae regula "*De jure quaesito non tollendo*" ac quibusvis specialibus vel generalibus Apostolicis Constitutionibus atque privilegiis gratis et indultis, etiam confirmatione Apostolica vel quavis alia firmitate roboratis atque litteris Apostolicis sub quibuscumque tenoribus et formis ac cum quibusvis clausulis et decretis quibusvis Capitulis Collegiis ac etiam peculiaribus personis, quacumque ecclesiastica aut mundana Dignitate fulgentibus, quantumvis specifica et individua mentione dignis, quocumque tempore concessis, nec non quibusvis consuetudinibus etiam immemorabilibus: quibus omnibus et singulis, etiamsi de illis eorumque totis tenoribus specialis specifica et individua mentio, seu quaevis alia expressio habenda, aut aliqua alia exquisita forma ad hoc servanda foret; illorum tenores ac si de verbo ad verbum, nihil penitus omisso, et forma in illis tradita observata praesentibus inserti forent, pro expressis habentes, ad praemissorum omnium et singulorum effectum consequendum, latissime et plenissime ac specialiter et expresse de Apostolicae potestatis plenitudine Motu pari derogamus ac derogatum esse volumus, caeterisque in contrarium quomodolibet facientibus quibuscumque.

Volumus autem quod praesentium Litterarum transumptis etiam impressis, manu tamen alicujus Notarii publici subscriptis et Sigillo alicujus personae in Dignitate Ecclesiastica constitutae munitis, eadem prorsus fides in judicio et extra illud, adhibeatur, quae eisdem praesentibus adhiberetur si forent exhibitae vel ostensae.

Nulli ergo omnino hominum liceat hanc paginam Nostrae

confirmationis, approbationis, constitutionis, ordinationis, sanctionis, decreti, derogationis et voluntatis infringere, vel ei ausu temerario contradicere. Si quis, autem, hoc attentare prae-sumpserit indignationem Omnipotentis Dei ac Beatorum Petri et Pauli Apostolorum Ejus, se noverit incursum.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum IV. Kalendas Septembris Anno Incarnationis Dominicae Millesimo Octingentesimo Septuagesimo Secundo.

Pontificatus Nostri Anno Vigesimo Septimo.

F. CARD. ASQUINIUS.

C. Gori subdatarius

Visa—De Curia J. De Aquila E. Vicecomitibus.

Loco ✕ Plumbi.

I. Cugnonius.

Reg. in Secretaria Brevium.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

The Dove of the Tabernacle; or, The Love of Jesus in the Most Holy Eucharist, by the Rev. T. H. KINANE, C.C., Templemore. With a Preface by His Grace the Most Rev. Dr. LEAHY, Archbishop of Cashel. Dublin: J. F. Fowler.

A WORK of piety produced by a hard-working Irish curate in a country parish might claim a cordial reception even if its merits were much less solid than *The Dove of the Tabernacle* possesses. The circumstance that the author lives and works amongst the simple faithful, and in writing on the Holy Eucharist, has thought chiefly of them, gives to all that he says a reality, a practical earnestness, not always to be found in spiritual books. Every page is full of unction; and at the same time thought and study are abundantly evidenced in the compilation of the book, unpretentious as it is. As a guarantee for solidity and accuracy of doctrine, it is enough to state that the book appears under the censorship of Father O'Reilly, S.J., and bears the *imprimatur* of the Cardinal Archbishop of Dublin.

True patriotism and true piety can never be foes but friends. The patriotism, as well as the piety of Father Kinane's readers will be gratified by that section in which he adds to the argument from tradition testimonies which prove the faith of our earliest Christian forefathers, and of all the

Irish Saints, in the real presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist.

Everywhere through this book the devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus is inculcated directly or indirectly. A more opportune moment could not have been chosen for its publication than this happy epoch of the solemn consecration of all Catholic Ireland to that ever adorable Heart. It begins with dedicating itself "to the Most Sacred and Most Adorable Heart of Jesus in praise, homage, and adoration; in thanksgiving for all blessings granted; in reparation for all insults; in supplication for all needful graces." And it ends with the simple words: "We beg the blessing of the Sacred Heart of Jesus upon our poor offering of love."

Our brief notice might have been briefer, and yet a sufficient commendation of the work before us, if we had contented ourselves with citing the concluding words of the long and beautiful preface with which the Archbishop of Cashel introduces the volume:—"To spread the reverential love of our Lord in the Blessed Eucharist, especially in the hearts of the simple faithful, has been the object of the pious author in writing this unpretending little book, which we strongly recommend to our faithful people. If it is little, and if it is unpretending, it is not but that it will be of use in the hands of every class and description of persons. Gentle and simple will learn from it to love our Lord more ardently in the Blessed Eucharist, to receive Him more frequently, to approach Him with better dispositions, to visit Him oftener in the churches, to assist at Mass more frequently and more devoutly. This little book is well calculated to diffuse such a spirit of piety among the people, and will, with God's blessing, effect an amount of good far exceeding its bulk or pretensions. Therefore, we wish God-speed to *The Dove of the Tabernacle*."

Vindiciae Alphonsiane, seu Doctoris Ecclesiae S. Alphonsi M. de Ligorio Episcopi et Fundatoris Congregationis SS. Redemptoris Doctrina Moralis Vindicata a pluribus oppugnationibus Cl. P. Antonii Ballernii, S. F., in Collegio Romano Professoris, cura et studio quorundam theologorum e congregatione SS. Redemptoris. Romae, ex Typ. Polyg. S. C. de Prop. Fide, 1873.

THIS welcome volume, just issued from the Propaganda Press, having been placed in our hands too late this month for thorough examination, and indeed its important contents

being such as to demand more than a passing notice, we shall confine ourselves for the present to the Introduction.—“Benevolo ac Studioso Lectori”—in which the motives and intentions of the Publication are clearly set forth.

Our readers are well aware that St. Alphonsus Mary of Liguori, Founder of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer, was, less than two years ago, solemnly declared by His Holiness Pope Pius IX. to be a *Doctor of the Universal Church*—this title being one of very great distinction, in nineteen centuries conferred on not more than as many saints. True it is, that St. Alphonsus was long *de facto* what he was thus declared to be *de jure*. Before his mortal course was run, he was a Teacher of the Church, of ever increasing influence and authority. His “Moral Theology” was no sooner published than welcomed; and gradually, as its editions were multiplied and spread throughout the Church, it was approved of and adopted by constantly-increasing numbers of theologians and schools, until it had become what it now undoubtedly is, the Text Book of Catholic morality. Moreover, the canonization of the Saint had highly commended all his works, and the particular Apostolic authorization of his “Moral Theology” had given it a certain *de jure* title to its pre-eminence, which many thought sufficient approbation and honour great enough for any canonized Theologian. Yet something still was wanting that Alphonsus might rank with Augustine, Jerome, Chrysostom, Athanasius, and the other Doctors of the Universal Church, and this is now wanting no longer, thanks to the immortal Pontiff reserved by Providence for the accomplishment of this and so many other great works for the glory of God and the salvation of souls. That the glorious title thus conferred on the Saint is of the greatest importance and consequence, is fully shown in the “Acts of the Doctorate,” published at Rome, wherein are registered examinations of his doctrine, exact and lengthened as those known to accompany the Beatification and Canonization of Saints.

To these examinations the “*Vindiciae Alphonsianae*” owe their origin. The Promoter of the Faith, conscientiously fulfilling his important duty, laid before the Sacred Congregation of Rites all imaginable objections to the “Doctorate,” of which by far the strongest were taken from the “Adnotations of Father Ballerini,” published in F. Gury’s *Compendium of Moral Theology*. Answers to these objections were given by the defender of the cause and some Redemptorist theologians victoriously, as shown by the result, and now amplified and

perfected, these answers are republished as the "Vindiciae Alphonsianae" before us.

That gladly is this volume to be welcomed by theologians, requires no demonstration; that it is taken up with no merely theoretical disquisitions, but "especially with the practice of the Confessor," the Index itself will tell; that well have the editors accomplished their work, the happy termination of the great cause for which it was undertaken, places beyond all doubt.

An objection there was, they tell us, not easily nor quickly overcome: the fear that their refutation of Professor Ballerini would be taken as in any sense an attack on the Society of Jesus, of which he is a member. How groundless such a fancy they thus declare: "This thought will rest in none but a prejudiced mind: for not only as Religious to all such are we united in special charity, but as Redemptorists we cannot but imitate our great founder, who most particularly revered and loved as an impregnable bulwark of the Church the Society of Jesus, defending it courageously and perseveringly in its dire afflictions. We know, moreover, how much the holy Doctor esteemed the illustrious theologians of the same Society; whom after his example we shall quote against the teaching of the illustrious Professor, and at times from his unjust attacks must willingly defend."

How foolish it would be, as unfortunately it has too often been, to make of a scientific investigation a party question, need not be remarked. Father Ballerini, we are sure, in his attacks, which are sufficiently wide-spread, aims at individuals, and will courageously receive their repelling strokes unprotected in any way by the Society to which he has the honour to belong.

THE IRISH
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

MAY, 1873.

DARWINISM.¹

THE first appearance of Life on this globe, and the entrance of Man on the stage of organized beings, are subjects that in all ages, as well as in ours, have tempted the vain or vicious curiosity of men. "The proper study," says the poet, "of mankind is man." Doubtless he means the Moral man—the Intellectual man—him whom Plato and St. Thomas have analyzed and dissected, and presented to us, not in colourless diagrams nor in fleshless skeletons, but in the rich warm hues of nature, and in the vesture of sublime and immortal truth. But it is the physical man—the "animal" that has learned to walk erect on his two hinder limbs, to dispense with his forelimbs for purposes of progression, and, instead of using them for climbing trees to escape his enemies, to use them for throwing missiles or wielding weapons; the wonderful creature that has acquired the use of speech, the use of tools, and the use of fire; the glorious being that employs his teeth for eating and no longer for fighting, that can sit on a chair without inconvenience, that has survived the need of a nasal organ—it is, in short, man, "the dominant animal," "the wonder and glory of the universe," as Mr. Darwin admirably styles him; man, the hairless, the large-brained, and the beautiful, that in our day forms the proper study of philosophic mankind. His pedigree is the question of the hour. If on this question we consult the Naturalist's College of Heraldry, we shall be puzzled to determine—so much do pursuivants differ—whether we descend from a chimpanzee or a gorilla, from a jelly or from a seaweed, or derive

¹ This paper we print from the MS. of a "popular" lecture recently delivered by one of our contributors to a mixed audience in America.

from a collection of gases electro-chemically combined. For my part I am content to accept my pedigree under the hand and seal of the oldest king-at-arms that we know. He had his tabard from God. He wrote about thirty-four centuries ago; the duty having been placed on his shoulders, and the authority furnished by the Creator himself, he has recorded our pedigree in the Book of Genesis. If any one is not content with a genealogy that runs back six thousand years, let him take Darwin for his guide, and let him be assured that under such guidance he may "travel further and speed worse."

No long time after the human tree was planted by the Creator's hand, branches were cut off, or fell off, from the parent stock. These withered in their separation, and dim tradition of their origin soon succeeded to full knowledge, and in its turn gave place to utter forgetfulness, or dwindled into ignorant conjecture.

In one branch of the human family we know that the truth concerning man's descent has been preserved and handed down to us. A few struggling rays lingered to enlighten the nations that came into any kind of contact, however loose, with the people who were chosen to be the depository of the truth. Such nations were, in consequence, civilized and progressive, and though they lost the master-key to the mystery of man's birth, they never lost interest in that question of supreme import to the human mind—Whence has man come? Though we shall not cumber our brief hour's converse with the theories—often grotesque and incongruous compounds of the true and the false—with which old nations, whose civilization, like the Egyptian, goes back into the twilight of time, have attempted to resolve the absorbing problem; yet we will not be so ungrateful to the heroes of our schooldays as to pass by one of the grandest of the old myths of the Greek poets. The legend alluded to tells how Prometheus, having moulded a clay model of the "human form divine," animated it with a particle of celestial fire which he brought from heaven; how the gods, indignant with Prometheus for having shared the boon of life with a new being, for having robbed heaven to enrich earth, hurled him to Tartarus to feed the ever-gnawing vulture, and visited man, the unoffending creature of his hands, with what the bitter sarcasm of the poet calls the punishment of a wife. The myth, indeed, does not forget to record with due gallantry how all the gods and goddesses contributed their share to embellish "earth's noblest thing, woman perfected," and how she was therefore called Pandora, "the all-dowered." Curiosity being a virtue that highly adorns a woman, was not neglected in the catalogue of her accomplishments; accordingly, she was not

far on her earthward flight when, in spite of express injunctions, she opened the box that contained her dowry to man. The dowry consisted of all the blessings that can impart happiness to the species, along with "all the ills that flesh is heir to." The former had wings, and, escaping, have never since revisited earth; the latter—not being winged, remained—not alone, for Hope was left too in the bottom of the box. To this Campbell alludes when he says—

"When peace and mercy, banished from the plain,
Sprung on the viewless winds of Heaven again,
All, all forsook the friendless guilty mind,
But Hope, the charmer, lingered still behind."

We may claim for this poetic fiction of the pagan mind—if not a very clear perception of the noble origin of our species—at least some scattered fragments of that truth of which not the faintest gleam irradiates modern scientific opinion on the subject of man's descent.

What answers have the questions—Whence life?—Whence man?—received in this our era of stubborn adherence to the logic of facts—the boasted age of the Positive philosophy? To the first we have the answer of Sir William Thompson: That when the geological convulsions of our globe had fitted her for the theatre of life, the first germs thereof reached her in the mossy crannies of a boulder shot on her broad bosom from some other planet—some world that had been dissolved or unsphered, and whose orbit knows her no more. Though the hero of the Atlantic telegraph supplies us with some of the best weapons for an assault on Mr. Darwin's position, I cannot but adduce this novel opinion of his as a specimen of that glamour of speculation which fascinates certain scientific minds into hazarding any conjecture, however baseless, that has the attraction of novelty, originality, and boldness. An opinion such as this, which can never be brought to the test, never be verified, never rise into the dignity of a sound scientific hypothesis, never even leave the region of conjecture—what is it worth? Is it not—apart from revelation altogether—quite as rational to believe—seeing that creative action must begin somewhere—in some world or other—that God made our globe the scene of the stupendous miracle of Life, as to suppose that a living thing first invaded universal solitude on the breast of any other world that wheels its course in space? Before we pass to the system of Mr. Darwin, who deals with the question only tentatively and by piecemeal, allow me to place by the side of Sir William Thompson's answer to the first of our interroga-

tories, the reply of the great "Father of Morphology" to the second. The theory of this hierarch, who is the Archimandrite of all Darwinists, I shall have to compress into a brief, but honest and faithful record, in my own words.

Man has come from the ocean. In its vast expanse are born in countless myriads the germs of life, the embryonic cells from which all animated nature has had its beginning. These do not all come to maturity. Of those that do, some develop into fishes, others are the prey of the latter; some perish on the rocks, and another portion are landed safely on the shore. The latter lucky individuals are our ancestors. No longer compressed by the embrace of that heavy element which had encompassed them in their ocean home, their sac or envelope bursts and liberates the vital particles imprisoned within. They tear up the ground, we know not how—extract food, we know not what; they survive, which shows that the food agrees with them, and are transmuted into animals, with special organs perceptibly defined. By dint of exerting each newly acquired "autoplastic" member, these organisms go on progressing till the microscopic rudiment of a fish rises into a reptile. From reptiles—for some "reptiles" or lizards were winged—the transition into birds was comparatively rapid. When birds became fat and lazy, and too heavy for flight, their wings became useless and were gradually absorbed, and thus, by a process of slow promotion occupying cycles of cycles of time, they were developed into marsupials. The ostrich, in our day, is visibly *en route* for a similar goal, and after the lapse of a couple of hundred centuries, has a fair chance of becoming a kangaroo. Having arrived at the border land of the mammals we must pause, for it would be anticipating the Darwinian theory to pursue the kangaroo through the grades of his promotion in the animal kingdom until he emerges from the vulgar crowd of brutes, a perfect ape, the apex of the animal series, in a word—a Man.

If any one should hesitate to accept Oken's theory, that man comes from the sea, and is of the fish fishy, let him reflect that even to-day—though millions of years have chronicled their passage on the face of the globe since we were shapeless cells in the ocean—we cannot, with all our advancement, exist without continual contact with a liquid medium. In our amorphous condition the native element bathed our external coats—in our present state we prefer the native taken internally: the exterior has adapted itself to the subtler medium of air, but the interior has yet to be much further modified ere it can be brought to subsist on such ethereal aliment. It is a slight defect in this theory of Oken (and, indeed, of most other systems

that pretend to give us a scientific genesis of life), that we are left in the dark as to the origin of the primal germ itself. As a consequence, the solution of the mystery of existence is about as incomplete as the Indian's theory of the earth, according to which it is supported in space by an elephant which stands on the back of a tortoise, but it omits to tell us on what the tortoise stands, whether he has anything at all to stand upon, or has been out all this time in space standing on nothing, with an elephant and a good-sized planet on his back.

A similar incompleteness infects the doctrines of Darwin; for, while holding the general principles of Oken's theory, and recognising that "in the dim obscurity of the past we can see that the early progenitor of all the vertibrata must have been an aquatic animal," he distinctly declines to touch upon the question of the first appearance of life on our globe—holding it to be a "hopeless enquiry," and a "problem for the distant future." Beyond assuring us positively that we are only highly improved apes, he leaves us in bewildering perplexity as to our pedigree and our destiny, on both of which subjects he sheds redundant darkness. However, be the defects of his system in respect of thoroughness what they may, naturalists accept his name as the technical term for man's bestial origin. Greater men are content to be the caliphs of such a prophet. They take the liberty of private judgment in matters of detail, but on the central position of the new revelation—on the keystone of the arch of the new faith—they are too reverent to lay a sacrilegious hand.

Darwinism—the name of this latter-day revelation—is popularly associated with the doctrine of man's descent from the ape; but the word means much more, covers a wider area of scientific significance, embracing a complex of opinions involved and unfixed, undergoing modification, and losing coherence to that degree that Darwin is no longer the best exponent of Darwinism or its most formidable champion. From these opinions it is necessary to disentangle one or two of the most prominent.

The first work that launched Mr. Darwin's name on the nomenclature of science was his famous "Origin of Species," published in 1859. For one or two decades previous, the question that had agitated the scientific world had been, whether the races of men are one species or several, whether the white man and the black are descended from the same pair, or the several races have originated from as many distinct centres, and still preserve the primordial types. In that

controversy the advocates of the truth had the victory, and, strangely enough, have a supporter in Mr. Darwin. The appearance of this book diverted idle speculation and vicious curiosity into a new channel. The scope of the book was two-fold.

First, to overthrow the common belief that the several species of animals and plants—those now existing, and those that ceased to exist geological ages ago—were formed and placed on this globe at different times by separate fiat of the Creative Will—maintaining instead, as others had done before him, that all the forms of life that ever have existed at any time, have proceeded from pre-existing forms—in short, that the oak and man are the respective terms of the two great lines of life, the vegetable and the animal, and that a little spore of seaweed is the other end of these lines, the lowest term and the common ancestor of both. His second and paramount object was to start a new theory by which the pretended evolution of one species from another might be explained.

To secure his first object—to establish firmly that species are not radically distinct, and therefore requiring separate creation—to convince the world that the division into species is not a permanent, fixed, and immutable separation—he wrote his great book, the *magnum opus* of his life, “The Variation of Animals and Plants under Domestication,” in which he instances examples of varieties in a single species differing as widely from each other in visible characters as those kinds to which we give the name of species. The all-sufficient answer to all his instances is:—that the varieties, however aberrant from the normal type, are fertile *inter se*, while the primal curse of unfruitfulness lies on the hybrid offspring of different species. Moreover, those wonderful examples of abnormal varieties which he adduces, and for which he insinuates a claim to be ranked as species, will, like the pendulum that you draw from the verticle, revert, if left to themselves, to the central line with the unerring precision of a law of nature.

The corollary to the two principles maintained in these books is, that there is no immovable barrier between man and the lower animals. And this deduction foreshadowed in those books he distinctly and avowedly lays down in his more recent work the “Descent of Man.” Man’s identity with the ape-kind is the citadel of his position—the variability of species is the great outwork. In the conclusion of the last mentioned work he treats us to the following consoling assurance—“Man may be excused for feeling some pride at having risen, though not through his own exertions, to the very summit of the organic scale; and the fact of his having thus risen, instead of having

been aboriginally placed there, *may give him hopes of a still higher destiny in the distant future.* . . . We must acknowledge, as it seems to me, that man, with all his noble qualities, with sympathy which feels for the most debased, with benevolence which extends not only to other men but to the humblest living creature, with his god-like intellect, which has penetrated into the movements and constitution of the solar system, with all these exalted powers man still bears in his bodily frame the indelible stamp of his lowly origin."

From what we have said it appears that Darwinism embraces two things—a doctrine and a theory—the latter alone being new and distinctively Darwinian.

The doctrine is briefly and roughly this:—All the animal organisms (putting plants entirely out of sight), that have ever lived on the surface of our globe, form a single genealogical tree. The great provinces of the animal kingdom—the starfish, the snail, the insect, the elephant—are the great ascending branches from which diverge, in their appropriate places, those ramifications that are termed orders, genera, &c. Where any given branch springs from the parent trunk, Mr. Darwin does not undertake to determine. The whole tree is too vast for the comprehensive survey, the exhaustive study of any one age. Sufficient for our day is the examination of one branch, and that the highest. The members of this branch, in the ascending scale of organic perfection, are the fish, the reptile, the bird, the mammal.

Their relationship reveals itself to the anatomist's knife in the similar framework of bones which it lays bare in the hand of the man, the foreleg of the horse, the paddle of the whale, the flipper of the seal, the wing of the bird, and the fin of the fish, which are one and the same limb built on the same type, but modified a little to suit the owner's circumstances! If between the fish and the frog, and the bird and the mammal, there is no structural break, but the closest resemblance in the pattern, how much stronger the correspondence in structure that prevails between the various orders of mammals, and amongst these, especially between the Simian and human branches, since for every bone, muscle, tooth, and pattern of a tooth in man, we find a corresponding bone, muscle, tooth, and pattern of a tooth in the ape? The doctrine, therefore, may be summed up in the formula—There is no such thing as species, no impassable mering between the most heterogeneous animals; or, to put it in other words, the interval between the simple cell so indeterminate in structure that no one can decide whether it is an animal or a plant, and nature's paragon—Man—wide as that interval is, requires only time and favorable

circumstances to be spanned ; perhaps even the distance is not greater between these two beings than that which divides what man is from what man will be, provided only that he goes on improving for the next million of centuries as fast as he has improved for the past million. Such is the doctrine in the gross. The details may be reserved till after the statement of the theory. It is not, however, too soon to make one or two observations on this argument from structural correspondence which is continually flaunted in our faces by the Darwinists. In the first place we admit with them that all the animals that have ever been on this earth have been constructed on a plan or type, the unity of which is marvellous and worthy of Him in whom all live and move and have their being. We are agreed on the premises, but we utterly reject the inference from uniformity of design to community of descent. For the wonderful correspondence between the functional parts of all animal organisms we see ample reason in the sameness of their earthly visible destiny, which is to live and perpetuate life ; and, similarly, for the divergencies of detail in the structural plan of these organisms, we have just as abundant reason in the diverse conditions and various circumstances under which the common end has to be worked out. Secondly, we maintain that if they were to succeed in pulling down the barriers which nature has placed between different species as completely and as signally as they have failed, and were to establish that one species had descended from a lower species, yet the inference to man's evolution from the most perfect known brute would be "a most lame and impotent conclusion." Granting that the bear has been metamorphosed into a whale, or that the wolf has been improved by hunger into a dog, yet it does not follow that the shapliest orang or the handsomest gorilla could be developed into a man. Because, though the bear and the whale have less physical resemblance (less *obvious* resemblance) than the man and the orang-outang, yet in mental condition the difference between the former—if any—is one of degree, while in the latter it is one of kind. A man's head and a head of cabbage are not more unlike than his mind and the ape's. The physical metamorphosis would be a wonder, the mental transition a miracle ; and I need hardly say Mr. Darwin does not care for miracles. In all his works there is nothing so feeble as his attempt to bridge the chasm that yawns between the human and the animal mind, and divides the moral man from the irresponsible brute. He may be a triton among the minnows when a naturalist, he is only a minnow among tritons when he becomes a metaphysician.

We shall now briefly consider the theory propounded by Mr. Darwin in explanation of the process by which the higher are developed from the lower species of animal. By carefully selecting (I lay particular stress on the word *selecting*) by carefully selecting individuals, cattle-raisers, bird-fanciers, and such like are enabled to improve the breed of the objects of their care. In this way those remarkably dissimilar varieties of the pigeon—the tumbler, the pouter, and the fantail—if these eccentricities can be called improvements, are produced under man's supervision. Mr. Darwin would have us believe that varieties so extraordinary have as good a right to be called species as many which we are in the habit of dignifying with that title; and, instead of years or centuries, give him geological aeons of time, and his pigeons will turn into eagles, elephants, or men. We say of these varieties that they are only aberrations, more or less wide, from the central type, the common pigeon, and that the tendency of these varieties is to rid themselves of everything foreign to the natural organism; and we point to the significant fact, that the higher we ascend in the scale, the shorter we find the possible oscillations from the normal condition, and the less the excrescence which the organism is capable of taking on. There are two criteria by which people satisfy themselves whether two given races ought to be held as species or not. External resemblance is the most obvious and vulgar test, and, at the same time, the most misleading. It would certainly class the pouter and the fantail in two species; but it would also lead us either to regard the varieties of the dog as separate species, or to regard the horse and the ass as one and the same. The second criterion is fertility or infertility of the crosses between two races. This is the crucial test. Mr. Darwin tells us it is arbitrary; and, possibly, that it is no better than a "mockery, a delusion, and a snare." But he is careful to offer no substitute. When he supplies a better test, we shall accept his and surrender our own.

Now, these varieties, great or small, being produced in *domesticated* animals—that is to say, in animals under man's care, control, supervision, and selection—how are we to explain the rise of varieties, or, let us call them species, on a wholesale scale in the uncontrolled world of nature? Mr. Darwin does not desert us here. For man's selection he offers us "Natural Selection"—the supervision of "Nature;" and let us not suppose that "Nature" is a reverent synonym for the Author of Nature. Not at all. Nature means "the grand sequence of events," and what more can we want to know. Of the theory of Natural Selection, the fundamental axiom is that all

organized beings increase in a geometrical ratio. Of this rate of increase the unmathematical mind may require an illustration. Suppose a country, a virgin island for example, adapted for the habitat of birds. Place a pair there. Take four as the average of a brood, and four broods as the average of the life of a pair, and it is calculated that in fifteen years that island will be peopled with two thousand million birds. Such a rapid increase can have but one result—a competition for the necessaries, a “struggle for life.” Let the country be stocked after the fifteen years to its full capacity, and in the next fifteen the feathered population will not increase by a unit. In consequence of the pressure on the means of subsistence, myriads perish, even though there be no foreign foe to molest them. Now, supposing no alteration in the conditions of life—as, for example, in the supply of food—the smallest variation in his structure that gives one bird an advantage in the hot struggle for life, gives him an additional chance of survival, and a better chance of transmitting his advantage to the next generation. The advantages slowly accumulated in this way by numerous successive improved generations culminate in a new species of bird every way unlike the primitive pair. Such is Darwin’s famous theory of Natural Selection, and of this theory the struggle for life is the keystone. In illustration of the *modus operandi* of this mysterious power, natural selection, the oft cited example of the long neck of the giraffe will bear quotation.

This animal was herbivorous. But a drought came and multitudes perished. Among the few survivors was one who enjoyed the accident of a neck a little longer than the ordinary. His cervical superiority had enabled him to feed upon the leaves of trees when grass failed. He was the parent of a long-necked variety. After the lapse of ages came another drought, and with it another neck-or-nothing struggle for existence with the same results. The longest necked lived royally on high feeding, while his fellows were literally biting the dust. The Moloch of natural selection was appeased only by the ruthless extermination of the unsuccessful competitors. Other droughts came, and the same bloody drama was re-enacted, till, after several hundreds of generations, the giraffe emerged from the supreme struggle with his head eighteen feet above the ground. And, indeed, after such an ordeal it is no great wonder that he should carry his head so high. 'Tis a pity for the sake of this plausible story, that side by side with the giraffe, on his own ground, there are several species of hoofed animals, herbivorous too, that have survived these supposititious droughts, and whose necks have not lengthened by the thou-

sandth part of an inch. The zebra is a familiar example. Dogs have come by evolution from wolves. In times of great dearth of the ordinary prey of the animal, one lucky individual secured his life by the accident of an innate instinct for hunting hares. Luckily nature further endowed him with an appropriate slimness of body, and practice gave him fleetness of foot. He lived while hosts of his brethren fell victims to the ravages of hunger. Of course he transmitted his instincts, his appetite, his meagre proportions, and his taste for fast life to his progeny. The struggle for life, embittered by periodic famines, and presided over by natural selection, brought forth, after a travail of ages, the greyhound, most symmetrical of his species. It is easy to knock this wolf on the head. His small peculiarities would, according to the laws of probabilities, be swallowed up and absorbed for ever in a few generations; and, instead of a greyhound, his great-grandson would be as thoroughbred a wolf as his great-grandfather had been before him.

The tail (for Mr. Darwin proceeds to extremities) of the cow and of other animals is useful as a fly-flapper. The possession of such an instrument would be a grand advantage in the competition with the race for food and life in a hot or fly-infested country.

Now the genesis of any organ is thus accounted for in the Darwinian hypothesis. A slight accidental modification takes place in the structure of an animal, and happens to be useful to the possessor in the inevitable struggle for life. Such a change must be minute, for the system utterly rejects the idea of a great change suddenly occurring in the structure of any organ. This minute modification proving useful, is preserved by the possessor's survival, is transmitted, gradually improved, and ultimately developed into a complex organ. The system stands or falls by the minute changes. "If," says Mr. Darwin, "it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed, which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down." To this it may be replied—first, that it is proverbially difficult to prove a negative; secondly, that an advocate of what Mr. Darwin terms the "Creation Theory" might justly decline the *onus probandi*; and thirdly, that natural selection could not have preserved and matured the caudal member at all if it were the growth of numerous, successive, slight modifications, since though a tail of normal length may be a very useful structure, and very ornamental too no doubt, yet it could be of no possible use when a mere rudiment. A yard of tail might be serviceable, but of what use would an inch be?

And yet the first caudal appendage must have been only microscopic. While on the subject, it may be observed that this member had its origin in the sea. The primitive cells of the dawn of life on this globe were in their primordial condition shapeless. Even between them there was a struggle for life. It was an immense advantage to one of them that an infinitesimally minute portion of his extremely minute organism became accidentally flattened out. The accident helped locomotion, and thus gave him a better chance of survival and of offspring; these flattened out another iota; and so, by degrees, time made the deep familiar with a tailed animal. Progress did not stop here. By-and-by limbs were developed in this fashion. Certain accidental wrinkles appeared on the body, and, after the usual cycles of ages, grew either into fins, and the animal was a fish, or into pedals, and it took to *terra firma*. In this transmutation of a marine cell into a terrestrial animal there are wonders that would startle anyone but a Darwinist, to whom they are trifles. In the first place, why should the wrinkles be preserved by natural selection, seeing that while rudimentary they were not only useless, but even, as impeding progression, prejudicial? And again, what a marvellous coincidence it was that these rugosities happened accidentally to arrange themselves—not in one lump, nor in random agglomerations—but with admirable symmetry in the only parts where they might be exactly fitted to turn out propellers, whether fins or legs. To return to the tail, which is Mr. Darwin's most troublesome member, it is hard to understand how that article having once come into fashion ever went out. Yet the *immediate* ancestor of man and the ape had no tail. Now it is certainly difficult to conceive what advantage the loss of the tail would be to an animal who owed his preservation in the struggle for life to its acquisition. Why, such an animal must have been ruthlessly destroyed when he lost his tail. Mr. Darwin thus expresses himself on this subject:—

“It may be as well to own that no explanation, as far as I am aware, has ever been given of the loss of the tail by certain apes and *men*.” He goes on, however, to take the ground from under his own theory respecting the growth of every organ, by maintaining that the variety in the length and thickness of the tail of animals shows it to be a structure of *doubtful utility*. Why, Mr. Darwin must be very hard pleased when he rejects all the explanations that have “ever been given of the loss of the tail by men.” Exactly a century ago the author of the “Origin and Progress of Language” gave one which might have satisfied the fastidious taste of our modern philosopher. It is that we had the member at one time, but that we have

worn it away by constant sitting. This author even appeals to cotemporary history in support of his theory. He asserts that in his own time there was a nation of men in the Bay of Bengal who still retained the feature; from which it may at least be inferred that this interesting people were not of a sedentary habit. I am not aware that subsequent research has discovered the caudated nation of Lord Monboddo. I remember reading, about fifteen years ago, in some of the Paris journals of the period, the discovery of a tribe in Central Africa that still retain a portion of the caudal vertebræ, so short, and thick, and stumpy, that they are obliged to carry a stick with them, in order, when they wish to sit, that they may make a hole in the sand for the reception of the inflexible member. This discovery, like his Scotch lordship's, I believe still awaits confirmation. It is some consolation for our loss—inexplicable as that loss may be to Mr. Darwin—that we still retain, as he is careful to assure us, the rudiments of the article, though I confess it is hard to say whether we should be proud that we have so much, or thankful that we have no more.

By such agents as I have enumerated—namely, the fatal rapidity of the rate at which animals multiply, the consequent pressure on the resources of subsistence, the ensuing struggle for life, and the resulting survival of the fittest through the means of natural selection—do the Darwinists seek to obliterate the distinction of species, to make it appear possible and probable that all the animals in the scale of being ascend by evolution one from another, and thus to bridge over the gulf that interposes between the lowest and the highest forms of life. All the animals of that scale form a chain of which the existing links are knitted together with inconceivable closeness. Here and there in the chain gaps occur, small or large, according as few or many links are wanting. For a simple example take the breach between birds and quadrupeds. The latter were developed from the former. Between the bird and the quadruped what countless myriads of links must have intervened!—intermediate forms nicely graduated by minute shades of divergency, each less like a bird and more like a quadruped than its predecessor. All these links are irrecoverably lost. So between the Catarrhine monkey, the progenitor of man, and the first ape that walked erect, there must have been interposed uncounted millions of transitional forms, man-like monkeys and monkey-like men. Where are they? Where are all the half birds, half quadrupeds—the half monkeys, half men? Lost! all lost! ruthlessly eliminated, clean annihilated, in the terrible struggle for life! They have gone and made no sign. Strange,

if true. Have they left no "footprints on the sands of time"—written no record on the imperishable page of geological story? Is there no fossil to tell what crust of the globe was their cradle, their theatre, and their grave? There are no footprints, no marks, no fossils—nothing but "silence deep as death." But Mr. Darwin is not dismayed. He tells us with calm composure that the Geological Record is a "History of the World imperfectly kept and written, in a changing dialect; that of this history we possess the last volume alone, relating only to two or three countries; of this volume only, here and there a short chapter has been preserved, and of each page only here and there a few lines." But what pretention should a mere science of facts have to compete with the imaginative theories of a philosopher? If the facts do not accord with the theory, "so much the worse for the facts."

This fragmentary record tells us, if we believe geologists, the story of a time when life stirred not at all on the face of the earth—when our globe rolled its sullen course in space, a seething mass of fire—of a time ere the highest mountain had upheaved above the dull level of earth's surface, or raised its summit from the hissing lifeless waters—a time when "darkness was on the face of the deep"—a time when the broadest continents that clasp the globe were the ocean's bed, and the hardest rocks were mud, enveloping the earliest forms of life that ever intruded on nature's silent solitudes—of a time at whose remoteness we cannot even guess, when the waters subsided, and dry land emerged and was clothed with the gigantic fern (that forms the coal we burn to-day), and land and water and air were peopled with gigantic lizards—uncounted ages before Man, now "the dominant animal," appeared on the scene.¹

But the bird that hatched the opossum or the kangaroo, or the first quadruped, whatever it was, has never yet been discovered. Mr. Darwin's countless millions of transitional forms are unnoticed in the broad volume of Nature's annals.

The mention of our Catarrhine progenitor recalls me to the question of our pedigree. What manner of individuals were our ancestors? Mr. Darwin tells us, that "the early progenitors of man were once covered with hair, both sexes having beards. Their ears were pointed and capable of movement; and their bodies were provided with a tail having the proper muscles. The foot was prehensile, and our progenitors, no doubt, were arboreal in their habits, frequenting some warm forest-clad land. The males were provided with great canine teeth, which served them as formidable weapons." We no

¹ *Vide* Dr. Molloy's "Geology and Revelation." Second Edition.

longer use our teeth as weapons. Indeed, in another place he assures us, that "the reduction of the teeth and jaws in the early male progenitor led to a most striking and *favourable change in his appearance*"—as I should think it would; for the gorilla who has tusks as large as a boar's, and who can break a nut with them that we should require a heavy hammer to open, is, though a blood relation of ours, by no means a handsome or even a prepossessing animal. The description of our ancestor above cited is the most comprehensive and positive that we find in Mr. Darwin's books. His strength generally lies in negatives: he never ventures, as a rule, as to say that this animal was evolved from that. Thus he tells us elsewhere that "we must not fall into the error of supposing that the early progenitor of the whole Simian stock, including man, was identical with or closely resembled any existing ape or monkey," which error is about the last we should ever dream, if left to ourselves, of falling into.

He hangs a dark curtain before the stage on which is enacted the bloody drama of the "Struggle for Life," lifting just as much of it as suits, and only on scenes of the tragedy on which it serves his purpose to let in the light.

It is time to permit him to produce his proofs of the kinship between us and the apes. The first is taken from the result of Professor Huxley's investigations which have led that eminent anatomist to the conclusion announced in these words:—"In every visible character man differs less from the highest apes, than they do from the lowest order of primates." This is a fundamental proposition, a cardinal principle, and requires a word or two of comment. In the first place it may be noticed that the great anatomist says "visible" characters, for in mental characters there are few mammals so remote from man as his hideous caricature, the ape. In the next place, the statement contains a lurking sophism. The characters visible to a hasty cursory glance may bear a very close resemblance, but in the size of the brain, if not in the shape of the head, the discrepancy is greater than the skeletal similarities of the other parts. It may, perhaps, be urged that in the bulk of the brain there is a greater disparity between the lowest and highest ape, than between the latter and the lowest man; and it is elsewhere asserted by Professor Huxley that between the highest ape and the lowest man there is less difference in the size of the brain than between the lowest man and the highest; yet it appears to me that as long as the disparity in the volume of the brain between the highest man and the highest ape is as great as between the lowest man and the lowest ape, the genetic separation is preserved at all points; and as long as

there is a minimum of brain in man which is at a uniform distance from the maximum brain of the ape, associated with which minimum we invariably find; even in the very lowest savages, the exhibition of certain human instincts, the employment of certain peculiar powers and arts however rude, it will be difficult to persuade us that the physiological and anatomical differences (and their correlated outcome) between the two species are not vastly greater than their resemblances.

The second proof of kindred I am glad to be able to submit without the incubus of any commentary of mine.

Our descent from an arboreal ancestor is established by the delight which little boys exhibit in climbing trees. This is a lamentable instance of "reversion" to the habits of our progenitors. The propensity for scansorial gymnastics we have inherited from an ancestral monkey who enjoyed high life in the tree-tops of the primeval forest. It is not to be supposed that little boys are led into this degenerate behaviour through exuberance of animal spirits, love of adventure, or of mischief, or through the natural exhilaration of overcoming obstacles. Not at all; such vulgar hypotheses are below the dignity of scientific solutions, and are quite unworthy of this grand and hitherto refractory problem. Why are little boys fond of climbing? The true philosopher appeals to the analogy of other animals, and observe how the truth at once flashes on the mind. Let us watch the kids and the lambs, how they, when they find a mound or hillock, at once begin to skip and bound. Now they are descended from an ancestor that inhabited the Alpine heights, and when they find themselves on an elevation, they cannot help feeling, like their countryman Tell, that their "foot is on their native heath." After this who can doubt that the juvenile gymnastics are an instinct—an inherited propensity? I am not aware that Mr. Darwin, or any of his disciples, has founded an argument on another degenerate passion that sways the boyish mind: I allude to the unhappy propensity for surreptitious visits to the larder, in itself an obvious and irrefragable proof that we derive from some marauding vagabond of monkey extraction.

The next argument of Mr. Darwin which I shall adduce relies more on the cumulative force of a series of small details than on the strength of any single fact. I shall try to put it in the form in which he might put it himself if he were as limited in time as I.

Man and the ape have every bone and muscle in common, every fold and fissure of the brain homologous; they have the same external ear, the same rudiment to show that the common ear was once pointed. Both have lost the power of

erecting it. "I have known," says he, "a man who could move his ear forward, and another who could move it back; but I never heard of a man who had the power of erecting it." Now this looks like a fact, though perhaps not a very surprising one. Some monkeys have naked foreheads, some have eyebrows, some have whiskers, some moustaches, some beards, and the beard is usually of a lighter colour than the hair. Some apes, as the chimpanzee, will crack a nut with a stone; some, as the orang, which Mr. Darwin himself saw, will use a stick for a lever. (He does not say that either ever actually *fashions* a stick or stone for these purposes). Both the ape and man have lost the tail (though he cannot satisfy himself why they should); both are liable to the same diseases, and are cured by the same remedies; both are plagued and infested with the same parasites internally as well as externally; in both the embryos are covered with lanugo (the phenomenon of reversion to the hairy progenitor); both have the same strong liking for tea and coffee, spirits and tobacco; and when they exceed, both pay the penalty in the same consequences, as appears from the following anecdotes quoted by Mr. Darwin:

"Brehm asserts that the natives of North-Eastern Africa catch the wild baboons by exposing vessels of strong beer by which they are made drunk. He has seen some of these animals which he kept in confinement, and he gives a laughable account of their behaviour and strange grimaces. On the following morning they were very cross and dismal; they held their aching heads with both hands, and wore a most pitiable expression; when beer and wine were offered them, they turned away with disgust. It does not appear they were tried with brandy and soda; but they relished the juice of lemons. An American monkey, an Ateles, after getting drunk on brandy, would never touch it again, and thus was wiser than many men. These trifling facts prove how similar the nerves of taste must be in monkeys and men, and how similarly their whole nervous system is affected."

We have inherited these tastes from some common ancestor who has much to answer for. 'Tis to him we owe not only the useful parts of our framework, but also the rudimentary parts and the useless parts. Thus the sense of smell is of no use to man. "No doubt he inherits the power in an enfeebled and so far rudimentary condition from some early progenitor to whom it was highly serviceable, and by whom it was continually used." Be that as it may, it is no longer serviceable, for of course if it were, the savage who most needs it would most use it and be most benefited by it. Now it does not warn him of the approach of his enemies, as it does ruminant

animals ; it does not guide him to food, as it does the carnivorous animals ; it does not prevent him from eating half-putrid meat, nor does it prevent the Eskimo from sleeping in the fetid atmosphere of his offal-stored den. Even unphilosophical people, considering the multiplicity of smells with which this world abounds, are tempted to doubt the utility of this sense. But among the ingredients of the humble pleasures that may be derived from the simple enjoyments of eating, *flavour* is worth reckoning, and how much of this flavour is due to the much abused sense of smell may be left to the decision of any one (not a philosopher) that has ever had a cold in the head.

Mr. Darwin does not stop at arguments from physical resemblances. Unless he could account for the growth of our mental and moral faculties, which, with inimitable composure, he terms "instincts," that is, "inherited habits," his mission would be only half accomplished. Of course he traces them to our brute ancestors, though he declines to pursue their history to the fountain head, telling us that the inquiry how the mental powers were first developed in the lowest organisms is just as "hopeless" as that other—how life itself first originated. He defends his investigation of the "moral sense" on the twofold and highly satisfactory ground that the subject had not been previously approached from the side of natural history, and that "an attempt to see how far the study of the lower animals can throw light on one of the highest psychical faculties of man," must prove highly interesting to the philosophical student. He feels bound to reject the opinion of Bain and Mill, that conscience is acquired by each individual during his lifetime. He even acknowledges conscience to be innate ! Of course it is ; for what is it but an instinct, the developed growth of a whole series of useful habits inherited through the ancient line which began with an alga and terminated with a man ? The grandest, most vivid, and, above all, most abiding instinct which we have inherited is the social—"the prime principle of man's moral constitution." It is the law of our moral being, the centre of gravity in our moral world. Other instincts may deflect us, hunger, for example, or vengeance ; but, the temporary impulse ceasing, the persistent force of the social instinct resumes its sway. 'Tis a long time since the animals from which we claim descent began to be gregarious ; and he would be a very stupid brute indeed who should not appreciate the advantages of union and combination. It is, accordingly, well known that no animals that have ever learned to live in society have abandoned the social life. But it was not till "the power of

language was acquired, and the wishes of the members of the same community could be expressed," that the social instinct became the rule of life. Not to gratify an instinct is to occasion an uneasy feeling, "the dissatisfaction of unsatisfied instinct;" but not to gratify the social instinct is to produce remorse; therefore, in the conflict of instincts, the social should predominate, or we shall be troubled with remorse instead of a mere uneasiness, which latter, upon reflection, is sure to be transmuted into an unalloyed pleasure. After the gratification of the less-abiding instincts, "when past and weaker impressions are contrasted with the ever-enduring social instincts, retribution will surely come. Man will then feel dissatisfied with himself, and will resolve with more or less force to act differently for the future. This is conscience: for conscience looks backward, and judges past actions, inducing that kind of dissatisfaction which, if weak, we call regret, and if severe, remorse." Nor is conscience, "summed up in that imperious word *ought*," confined to man. The dog that fails to obey his persistent instincts, "fails in his duty and *acts wrongly*."

It is, indeed, when the virtues and intelligence of our four-footed and four-handed relations are his theme, that the usual tepidity of Mr. Darwin's style warms into enthusiasm. He calls a baboon, that rescued a young one of the herd from the attack of a party of dogs that surrounded it, "a true hero." And such is his admiration of his hero that, at the end of his book, he reverts with pride to him, saying that—"I would rather be descended from that hero than from a savage." Before yielding to his raptures, he ought to have made quite sure that the young baboon was not the hero's offspring. He tells us that the dogs were "astonished," but forgets to explain how the dogs' attitude of mind was diagnosed. In another place he becomes quite pathetic over the affectionate attentions of a dog that never could pass by a basket in which lay a sick cat, a great friend of his, without licking her—a proof of sympathy that the most refined of our own species is hardly prepared to exhibit.

The instances of animal virtues, above cited, are examples of "unselfish devotion," and of "sympathy." We behold "magnanimity" in the scorn of the big dog for the insolence of the small dog; and "modesty" in the shame which the same animal evinces when he asks too often for food. We can observe also among our humble relations the rudiments of those characters which fitted our early progenitors for social life.

The faculty for "combination and concerted action" is seen in the conduct of a herd of baboons known to defend a pass

into their territory against armed men; the notion of "property" is recognised (though not always respected) in the case of a dog who has got a bone and means to keep it; the rude beginnings of architecture and of dress may be traced to the habit of the orang-outang, who covers himself with the leaves of trees as a protection against the night air; an elementary notion of the mechanical arts is possessed by the chimpanzee who breaks his nut with a stone; personal cleanliness, rather a luxury than a necessity of social life, is already possessed by the hylobates who washes the faces of her young monkeys in a stream. The use of fire had to be procured before the talents of our brethren could be conveniently equipped for social life. Mr. Darwin is equal to the emergency. His *Deus ex machina* is the volcano. The nature of that useful element may have been learned, to his cost, by our ancestor, when one fine day a wave of the lava tide that had overflowed its crater, poured its fiery flood into the secret recesses of his lair! Who knows but that is how he lost his tail; and, being a cunning fellow, he may have persuaded all his associates to amputate theirs. Having thus practically learned the nature of fire, he acquired the art of using it by having accidentally "fractured a flint," with which it may be conjectured he was cracking a cocoa-nut for Mrs. Chimpanzee and the young Chimpanzees. Speech being almost as indispensable as fire, is not neglected by Mr. Darwin: nay, he boldly avows his belief—and we are far from disagreeing with him—that, but for the possession of some rude kind of articulate language, our ancestor would never be the dominant animal. Concerning its origin, this is what he has to say:—"It does not appear incredible that some unusually apelike animal should have thought of imitating the growl of a beast of prey, so as to indicate the nature of the expected danger. And this would have been a first step to the formation of a language." If he were asked why apes do not speak now, he insinuates that he would retort *more Hibernico* with another question—Why do not crows sing—if the ape has the vocal organs of a man, the crow has the vocal organs of a nightingale? We confess the force of this withering retort, but we are not exasperated; we leave it to the Darwinists to answer.

Now comes the question—Which of all the apes are we to call our cousin? If blood be thicker than water, here is a question that must probe our tenderest sympathies to the quick. Yet, even on this question that interests us so nearly, it will presently appear that Mr. Darwin is not prepared to give peace to our minds. The remarks about to be

quoted are intended to meet an objection to Natural Selection, which may be thus stated.

If man has been evolved from a four-handed arboreal ancestor, furnished with a tail and covered with hair, he must, while in the transition to a hairless biped, have been in an awkward predicament for competition with the other arboreals. The loss of the pilose covering would be a small advantage—if we look to personal appearance—but a terrible disadvantage in the struggle for life under the stern conditions environing our hairy progenitors. Even Mr. Darwin allows that “no one supposes the nakedness of the skin to be any direct advantage,” though he quotes with approbation the opinion that it conduces to beauty and cleanliness; and he even goes so far as to acknowledge that this hairlessness “is probably an injury to man, even in a hot climate, for he is thus exposed to sudden chills, especially after wet weather.” The loss of the tail (‘inexplicable’ to the great naturalist), would not be as much in our progenitor’s favour in walking, as it would be against him in climbing. Hence, by the loss of his hair and the loss of his tail, the balance of fitness for survival would be inclined against him. It is to be borne constantly in mind, that our ancestor had all the time to maintain a life and death fight for existence and survival: if the means of subsistence were to be unlimited, a monkey would still be a monkey, and man would never have appeared on the scene, never have been squeezed through the sponge of that wondrous sifting machine which does the work of natural selection: if our race has survived, it has been through the agency of some superiority small in the beginning, but a superiority which could not be the product of factors, such as the losses of useful parts.

Again, our ancestor had four hands for grasping the branches of the trees, on the fruits of which he subsisted, and among the tops of which he passed his life. The hinder two are now feet, and their thumbs go under another name. Now, even if in one night these hinder hands were to be converted into feet, the metamorphosis would not have benefited him much. To be sure, after exhausting the fruits of one tree, he might reach another, not accessible by the way of the branches of the first, in a more graceful mode of progression than his rival who should have to travel on all fours; but it is a question if he would run quicker; and certainly if both started simultaneously, he would be the last up the tree. How much greater would be the awkwardness and the disadvantage of the monkey whose hinder limbs were, like our ancestor’s, in the state of transition, neither hands nor feet—bad hands and not good feet!

To some such argument as this, Mr. Darwin thus replies:—"In regard to bodily size or strength, we don't know whether man is descended from some comparatively small species like the chimpanzee, or from one as powerful as the gorilla: and therefore we cannot say whether man has become stronger or smaller and weaker in comparison with his progenitors. We should, however, bear in mind that an animal possessing great size, strength and ferocity, and which, like the gorilla, could defend itself from all enemies, would probably though not necessarily have failed to become social; and this would most effectually have checked the acquirement by man of his higher mental qualities, such as sympathy and the love of his fellow-creatures. Hence it might have been an advantage to man to have sprung from some comparatively weak creature."

From the drift of these observations, it is plain that we must give up our claim to the gorilla; but let us bear the loss with fortitude, for we have still the chimpanzee left. Moreover, the gorilla is not social; neither is he sympathetic; he does not care for us perhaps, not being carnivorous.

Mr. Darwin, however, himself, seems loath to surrender the gorilla—for elsewhere, in allusion to the difficulty of an animal surviving that can neither climb well nor walk well, he observes: "We know several kinds of apes are in the intermediate condition. Thus the gorilla runs with a sidelong shambling gait, but more commonly progresses on his bent hands." It is some consolation to know that this animal is endowed with four hands as perfect as any other ape can boast of, for if we were to take Mr. Darwin's hint, and admit the possibility of the gorilla's being *en route* to be a man, we should tremble for posterity, because there is not an animal in the African forests for which the gorilla is not a match. He'd expunge the human race.

Let us, by way of bringing Darwinism to the test, examine what are the chances of the gorilla, under the influence of natural selection, emerging from his bestial condition. The following is his pen-and-ink portrait by a master hand:—"The gorilla has a black skin covered with short dark-gray hair, which is reddish brown on the head. The face is covered with hair, but the chest is bare. There is scarcely any appearance of neck. The mouth is wide, and no red appears on the lips. The eyes are deeply sunk beneath the projecting ridge of the skull, giving to the countenance a savage scowl, the aspect of ferocity being aggravated by the frequent exhibition of the teeth. The brain is small. The stomach is very large and prominent, in accordance with which character the gorilla is represented as a most voracious feeder. The great toe or

thumb stands out from the member to which it belongs at an angle of sixty degrees, and is so remarkably large, strong, and supple, that it is said to enable him, while hid in the branches of a tree, to catch up, collar, and strangle any unfortunate man who may be passing under the tree."

We may safely presume that this voracious feeder leads no idle luxurious life. He has to work hard for his subsistence. If he were not under the stern necessity of unremitting exertion, the avenues to promotion, which all lie through the inevitable struggle for life, would be closed against him. Let his characteristic structure diverge a hair's breadth in any direction, and he will be placed either at an advantage or at a disadvantage, as the case may be, in the competition with his kindred for existence. If his forearms become shorter or less adapted for locomotion, his hinder arms part a portion of their prehensile power—if his tusks diminish in size, if his fingers (the middle finger measures six inches round the first joint) lose in compressing force or in strength of grasp, or if his body be stripped of its pilose integument, he will diverge in the direction of the physical characteristics of man. But if any of these changes of bodily structure occur without sufficient compensation, which can only be a commensurate mental advantage, such change involving loss of strength, or of agility, or of comfort and protection, will place him at a disadvantage more or less embarrassing in the contest with individuals of the same and allied species. In order, therefore, that he should not be beaten, that is, in other words, that he should survive, an intellectual amelioration must accompany and counterbalance his physical deterioration. Considerable mental power will be requisite to govern and guide his new organization so as adequately to compensate its mechanical disadvantages. Is this increased mental force to be the *consequence* of the decreased physical force? This would be the sublime of the *non causa pro causa*.

Is the necessary mental development, which is to enable the gorilla to bear up against structural disadvantages, and which must surpass in fertility of resource, and versatility, the intelligence of many savages, to *precede* the process of physical decay? The mythical reaches the climax of audacity in the conception of an intelligent soul thus imprisoned in the carcass of a beast. Could any intelligent gorilla support existence, if he were mocked with a bodily structure no organ of which should be correlated with the functions, the instincts, and the capacities of his mind? Why life, under circumstances in which his mental and corporeal faculties would be so hopelessly out of gear, would be a burden to him, his mind a torture, society intolerable, the world a delusion; and even if he had the virtue to resist the inevitable temptations to voluntary death,

he would at all events be sure to be the last as well as the first of his unhappy race. Lastly, is the psychical improvement to start on its career *simultaneously* with the physical modification? We shall, in that event, have the birth of a *new* gorilla, *a new species*, with an altered (and deteriorated) body, and an altered (and improved) mind; and what is this but a new creation, the very mystery which Darwinism proposes to get rid of. Darwinism says in effect: Individuals are created by birth from individuals, that is the only creation we ever *see*; whatever mystery there may have been in the phenomenon, familiarity has blunted us to its perception; in order to preserve nature's uniformity—which is the grand problem of all science—we must presume that one species is born from another. But would not the birth of our supposititious gorilla from a common gorilla be a departure from the uniformity of nature, which, if it means anything, means "like father like son." The birth of this gorilla any way we account for it, would be fully as marvellous or mysterious as the sudden appearance of a new creature in the animal world, or, more accurately, it would be exactly the same thing. It may be legitimately concluded that the antecedent probability of Darwinism does not stand the gorilla test. Now, divested of its antecedent probability, the system becomes a provisional assumption, and is left to confront the facts of history, of paleontology, geographical distribution, and of every-day experience, to all of which it is opposed.

It is opposed to the facts of history, which tell us that the animals of to-day are, in unchanged characteristics, those of the pyramids, those known to the most ancient peoples who have left monuments; to those of paleontology, which assure us that no "transitional" form has ever been found, which prove that while one ocean, the Silurian, teeming with well preserved remains, knew not the shape of a vertebrate creature, the Devonian Sea, which followed immediately and tranquilly, swarmed with highly organized fishes; to the facts of both history and paleontology, which demonstrate not only that the human remains found in the caves of France and England, associated with flint implements, and with the bones of the elephant and the hyena, present no characteristics whatever indicative of an inferior or transitional state of the human species, but also that the oldest discovered human skeletons exhibit skulls as large and well formed as those of any existing race; to the facts brought to light by geographical research, which show that there are various species of animals peculiar to the various divisions of the earth, and that the diversity of these several species is in no way related to the distance which separates their habitats: and, finally, to the facts of every day experience which force the greatest naturalists to reject the notion that

any individual differs so much from its parents as to be adapted to be itself the parent of a specifically distinct race.

In our desultory and at the same time necessarily brief review of Darwinism, some of the statements have been allowed to pass unchallenged, for the very good reason that they may be very safely trusted to confute themselves. But we may ask, what is the aim of all this speculation which the naturalists have kept and are perseveringly keeping before the world in these latter years? Let us give Mr. Darwin the credit he claims, that his sole object is to get at the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Yet will it remain to be said, that the obvious tendency of his doctrines is—if not to eliminate creative action altogether out of the universe of mind and matter, and to reduce the order of harmony of Nature to the results of blind fortuitous forces, which would be to obliterate God altogether—at least to place the Creator at such a distance from His works that His supervision, providence, and justice may be safely ignored. Mr. Darwin may claim to be a Theist; but when we find him, in his explanation of the "*genesis*" of religion, laying down that religious devotion consists of love, complete submission to an exalted and mysterious superior, a strong sense of dependence, fear, gratitude, and hope for the future, and then maintaining that all this in the germ may be witnessed in "the deep love of a dog for his master," we feel compelled to say, that if his notion of truth at all resembles his notion of Theism, we ought to require some independent testimony in confirmation of his original statements before we believe them. For the moral tendencies of Darwinism let the following quotation—which shall be the last—be the witness:—"It is obvious that every one may, with an easy conscience, gratify his own desires, if they do not interfere with his social instincts, that is, with the good of others; but in order to be quite free from self reproach, or at least from anxiety, it is almost necessary for him to avoid the disapprobation, whether reasonable or not, of his fellowmen. Nor must he break through the fixed habits of his life, especially if these are supported by reason; for if he does, he will assuredly feel dissatisfaction. He must likewise avoid the reprobation of the one God or gods, in whom, according to his knowledge or superstition, he may believe; but in this case the additional fear of divine punishment often supervenes." The plain meaning of this ethical jargon is that man is responsible to—himself and himself only; which is a very comfortable doctrine for him who reposes in it. We cannot do better than conclude with the verdict of the great Agassiz: "The Transmutation theory is a scientific mistake, untrue in its facts, unscientific in its methods, and mischievous in its tendency."

DR. DÖLLINGER AND THE DOGMA OF INFALLIBILITY.¹

BY DR. HERGENRÖTHER, PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY AND CANON
LAW IN THE UNIVERSITY OF WÜRZBURG.

(*Translated from the German.*)²

VI.—CONCLUSION.

WHAT, then, is the drift of this agitation? Are we to have a system of national Churches set up within the Catholic Church of Christ? A German-Catholic Church subject only to the authority of a national Patriarch? In no other sense can we interpret the demand made by the meeting at Nürnberg for a Council to be assembled "at this side of the Alps," excluding of course the authority and even the participation of Rome; no other meaning can be attached to the claim so boldly and so clearly put forward, that the "national thought" must be recognised in matters of religion; nor is it possible to assign any other interpretation to the petitions already referred to, which call upon the State to withdraw the privileges enjoyed by what Dr. Döllinger and his party are pleased to term the "New Catholic" Church, and to transfer them to the "Old Catholics," that is to say, to themselves—petitions which are strangely at variance with the constitution and fundamental laws both of Prussia and Bavaria, according to which those States can recognise only one, and that the Roman Catholic religion and Church, from which the petitioners, by their action in this matter, plainly show that they have seceded.³

Some years ago, Dr. Aloisius Pichler, whose recent conduct in St. Petersburg has compromised in no small degree, his patron "the great ecclesiastical Professor of Munich," formed the project of a "German union to promote the recognition of true Christianity, and thus to lay the foundation of one great National Church of Germany."⁴

This suggestion he submitted to a scholar of established fame, placed in a position of commanding influence, and possessed of every qualification necessary for playing the part of a Luther or a Photius. As Photius gave to his resistance against the Holy See the character of a struggle between Greeks and

¹ Continued from our March number.

² The notes which are enclosed in brackets [thus], have been added by the translator.

³ Prussian Constitution of 1850, Art. 15: Bavarian Concordat of 1817, Art. 1.

⁴ *Die wahren Hindernisse und die Grundbedingungen einer durchgreifenden Reform der Kath. Kirche zunächst in Deutschland.* Leipzig, 1870, p. 489.

Latins—as Luther, adopting the same policy, invested his revolt with the character of a struggle between Germany and Rome—so the Munich Professor aims at bringing this new conflict into the same category, as a contest between Germans and Italians. And as Photius turned his scholarship and the traditions of his country to account in his conflict with the West, Dr. Döllinger employs the same weapons in his conflict with the Catholicity of Southern Europe. The constant changes of doctrine, the introduction of the civil power on the plea of protecting its own interests, the reliance on the co-operation of the professors of profane sciences, the boastful assertions of national superiority,¹ all these are common to the present conflict and its unhallowed prototypes. A Catholic who has swerved so far from the path of Catholic unity, can feel little difficulty in making common cause with Protestants, and is not unlikely to succeed in making some compromise with at least a small section of them, thus laying the foundation of what its unhappy members may chose to regard as a new German Church.

But it would be, indeed, a deplorable calamity for the people of Germany, if the era of the establishment of their national unity were marked also by the opening of a new schism, and this, especially, in the religious body which has hitherto presented the most signal example of compact unity. It can hardly be supposed that our Protestant fellow-countrymen could derive any advantage from so deplorable a catastrophe, and they are far too clear-sighted to form any such anticipation. They are well aware that the union resulting from such a movement would be a mere amalgamation of heterogeneous elements, that its sole profession of faith would be a negation,—emancipation from the yoke of Rome—and that it would include no Catholics but those whose religious opinions rest on the most unstable foundation, and whose apostacy would bring no discredit to the Catholic Church.

¹ [“It may be truly said that theology is now rare, very rare in Rome. There is, of course, no lack of theologians . . . but if they were all pounded together in a mortar into one theologian, *even this one would find some difficulty in getting his claims recognised in Germany.*” QUIRINUS. *Letters from the Council.* Authorized Translation. London, 1870, p. 95.

Elsewhere the same writer speaks of “the decline of study in Rome, and the want, not merely of learned men, but even, and most especially of well grounded theologians.” . . . “De Rossi,” he says, “the most acute and learned among the genuine Romans, . . . *has educated himself by the study of German works.*” *Ibid.* p. 233.

And Dr. Döllinger, in his *Lectures on the Reunion of the Churches*, proclaims that he has “found it the almost universal conviction in foreign countries that it is the special mission of Germany to take the lead in this world-wide question, and give to the movement its form, measure, and direction. *We are,*” he adds, “*the heart of Europe, richer in theologians than all other lands,*” &c. *Lectures.* Authorized Translation. London, 1872, p. 162.]

In the early ages of Christianity the Donatists used to assert that the true Church existed only in Africa : the members of the new sect will be obliged to proclaim in like manner that the true Church exists only in Germany. And for the defence of their position they must place their sole reliance on that which has indeed, for many a year, been the pride and boast of Germany—scholarship ; but scholarship which, in this case, though they may regard as “irrefragable,” is, after all, but the scholarship of a single man. For what claim can they have to the “old Catholicity,” to which they profess to adhere, while, in reality, their creed is the conception of one individual, and cannot fail, if its principles are carried to their ultimate consequence, to lead to the denial of every element of Catholicity? From the days of the Apostles to our own time, the title Catholic has been accorded to those alone who held fast to the unity of faith with the Chair of Peter, subject to the authority of the pastors in communion with the Roman See, and prepared to yield submission to every decision emanating from the teaching authority of the Church.

The present revolt against the authority of the Council has been long since threatened. Every close observer of the course of events, down to the 18th of July, 1870,¹ must have perceived that the leaders of the present movement in opposition to the Decrees of the Council, regarded its proceedings from the very first with jealous hostility, and were prepared to submit to its teaching only in case their own favourite ideas were endorsed by it, or at least allowed to pass without censure.² What would be thought of a suitor in a court of justice who would declare that unless the decision of the court were in his favour, he would forthwith undertake to organise a revolution? Yet this is precisely what is occurring now. Statesmen and jurists, if they would avoid a fatal blunder, of which they may one day have bitterly to repent, had better look to it in time.

¹ [The date of the Fourth Public Session of the Vatican Council, when the Definition of Papal Infallibility was solemnly ratified].

² We cannot regard as applicable to the persons of whom we speak, the following extract from a work written in opposition to the proposed Definition of Papal Infallibility (*Observationes quaedam de Infallibilitatis Ecclesiae Subjecto*: Vindob. 1870, cap. xv., p. 82), and ascribed to an eminent Austrian Prelate:—“The recognition of the authority of an Œcumenical Council is as universal as the Catholic faith. Even when the Pope alone instructs the Church, all Catholics declare with confidence that his teaching is free from error. When the Pope, in union with the Bishops, publishes a decree of faith, all most acknowledge that error is impossible.” Another work (*De Summi Pontificis Infallibilitatis Personali*) by S. Mayer, adopting a standpoint still farther removed from that of the extra-conciliar opposition, fully acknowledges the Infallibility of the Roman Church, the supreme authority of the Pope as teacher, and the inadmissibility of appeals from his decisions. Nothing was further from the mind of those writers than the idea of a merely conditional obedience to the Decrees of the Council.

Some opponents of the Dogma have gone so far as to call upon the State to adopt a policy of persecution against all who regarding the Definitions of the Vatican Council as binding in conscience, are determined, come what may, to remain faithful to the Church.¹ The Catholic Church has already had to sustain many persecutions from heretics and schismatics: but their only result has been to increase the glory of her triumph. Nor will any persecution which may now be raised against her, have a different issue. Not satisfied that the Bishops who, in the discharge of their duty, and in strict conformity with the principles of Canon Law, have undertaken proceedings, not, indeed, against any refractory layman, but against contumacious ecclesiastics, are receiving no aid from the State, these new advocates of religious intolerance, while complaining loudly that they are the victims of ecclesiastical oppression, demand nothing short of the actual suppression of the dogma defined by the Church, which they do not hesitate to stigmatize as a "heretical innovation." They urge that for eighteen centuries this Definition was not considered necessary; but this reasoning, on which almost every heretic has relied, when his error was condemned by the Church, needs no other reply than that by which such allegations have invariably been met by the defenders of the Catholic faith: the Definition is the natural result of several concurring causes—the truth of the doctrine which has been defined, the teaching authority of the Catholic Church, and the danger in which many consciences were placed of being led into error by the denial of this truth of faith.²

Since the fifteenth century, no anti-Pope has disputed the claim of the legitimate successor of Saint Peter to supreme ecclesiastical authority. But the place of those assailants of Catholic unity has been abundantly filled, to some extent, by the reformers of the sixteenth century, prominent among whom, Calvin exercised a religious dictatorship over a large portion of Europe, but in a much larger degree by the revolutionary spirit which, with ever increasing boldness, has continued to assert its independence of all authority, setting up the chair of its own dogmatism in opposition to the Chair of Peter, the overthrow of which is its incessant aim, and endeavouring by every art to spread far and wide the elements of disunion, turmoil, and distrust. But although we may now witness in the Church the result of its operations, it is vain for its

¹ See, for instance, the *Rhenish Mercury* of Dec. 3rd, 1870, and the *Allgemeine Zeitung* of Dec. the 26th.

² "Ex fidei veritate, ex Ecclesiae auctoritate, ex periculi necessitate." S. BONAVENT. *In Lib. I. Sent. D. xi. a. 4.*

apostles to imagine that she will ever succumb to their attacks. We may to-day repeat those words of the great Pontiff, Alexander III., against whom four anti-Popes, each of them sustained by the civil power, arose one after another, in the beginning of his stormy Pontificate—words which the Pope himself lived to see verified:—"He who said to his Apostles, 'Behold I am with you all days even unto the consummation of the world' (Matt. xxviii. 20), will not be unmindful of His promise, nor will He fail to secure the triumph of His Church, though for a time she may seem, like Peter's bark, about to sink amid the waves which surround her. False brethren, 'who have gone out from us but who were not of us,' (I. John ii. 19), may endeavour to rend the indivisible garment, but Christ, the Founder and Head of His Church, will protect His Bride, nor will He allow the bark of the faithful fisherman to suffer shipwreck, long and angrily as it may be tossed by the waves."¹

At the worst, the present rupture may be developed into open schism, but deplorable as that result would be for the many souls who might be led astray, it could not fail to have a useful and purifying influence: nor would the evil be of long continuance. A calmer appreciation of the true condition of affairs will produce its effect, the bugbear of Ultramontanism will cease to be an object of terror, and all feeling of apprehension will gradually be dispelled. As Catholics, we must hope for this blessed result, and pray for it to our merciful God. Those whose instincts are sound and true, will soon come to perceive that if they persist in rejecting the authority of the Vatican Council, they must set aside the authority of former Councils as well; they must call in question the course which has been pursued for centuries by the Holy See and by the entire Church; they must ignore the significance and deny the fulfilment of the promises made to the Church by her Divine founder; and, in fact, they must deny the perpetuity of the true Church. Nor can they fail to see the frightful abyss, on the brink of which they have been standing since the 18th July, 1870, falsely imagining that they are obeying a voice from heaven, while in reality their inspiration is of the earth, and forgetting that even if an angel from heaven were to preach another doctrine, it would be their duty to adhere to the apostolic teaching which is preserved by the unfailling authority of the Church. Meanwhile, the prayer of our Lord in the hour of his agony, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," (Luke xxiii. 34), must plead in their behalf.

Nor should we abandon all hope, that with the lights of his

¹ ALEX. III., Epist. I, (Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* Tom, cc., p. 69.)

own intelligence and the assistance of God's grace, the scholar, once so famous, who is now at the head of this movement, will abandon, before the end, the course on which he has entered—that he will come to see all that he has lost, and how little he has found in place of it, how strangely incompatible with his early career are the associates with whom he is now allied, what damage he is inflicting on his own dearest interests, and on the interests of those who rely so implicitly on his guidance, what, in fine, he has to expect on the one side and on the other. The most glorious of all victories is the victory of him who conquers himself, esteeming, above all human praise, and all worldly honour, the glory of humble submission to the teaching of the Church, his mother, and submitting his own judgment unreservedly to that authority, but for which an Augustine himself would have been unable to accept the Gospels, and without which, according to the teaching of the Fathers, it is vain to look for anything firm or enduring in the sphere of religion. And how glorious would not such a victory be for him—the priest, the teacher of so many theologians, the scholar on whom so many dignities and marks of honour have been conferred—who now possibly regards himself as guiding a movement which in reality is hurrying him along, and forcing him to serve in the ranks of a party hostile to him as to the Church which they are oppressing. How much preferable to the bitter reflection that, in his present position, it would have been better for him to have found less honour in the Catholic Church than to have forfeited it thus ;¹ that in the Church to which he had rendered such sterling service during the greater part of his life, he must henceforth be regarded only as another Tertullian,² and that it must be said of him that he was unmindful of what he commended in the case of certain eminent German theologians as an example worthy of imitation :—“ They all accepted it as a fundamental principle, that if in the course of their scientific investigations, they arrived at a result incompatible with the teaching of the universal Church, they should look for the error, not on the Church's side, but on their own.”³

¹ “ Minus est enim dedecoris, numquam ad praeconium laudis accessisse, quam de fastigio laudis ruisse : minus est criminis, honoratum bono testimonio non fuisse, quam bonorum testimoniorum perdidisse ; minus est sine praedicatione virtutum ignobilem sine laude jacuisse, quam exhaeredit fidei factum laudes proprias perdidisse. Ea enim quae in alicujus gloriam referuntur, nisi anxio et sollicito labore serventur, in invidiam maximi criminis intumescunt.”—CLERUS ROM. *Ep. ad Cypr.* cap. 2 (Ep. 31, Ed. Baluz).

² “ Post haec omnia Tertullianus, Catholici dogmatis ac vetustae fidei parum tenax, ac disertior quam fidelior, mutata deinceps sententia, fecit ad extremum quod de eo beatus confessor Hilarius quodam loco scribit ‘ sequenti ’ inquit ‘ errore, detraxit scriptis probabilibus auctoritatem, ’ et fuit quoque ipse in Ecclesia magna tentatio.”—VINCENT. LERIN. *Commonit.* cap. 18.

³ “ *Proceedings of the Meeting of Professors in 1863.*”—p. 56.

He has but to act up to these words, and with the assistance of God's grace, a calm re-examination of the question at issue cannot fail to restore to him his faith in those truths of which he was once so earnest a defender, but of which he has now so completely lost sight. For in the present stage of this controversy, it is not merely the dogma defined by the Vatican Council that is challenged, but also the principles which form the basis of all Catholic belief. Only one short step separates the ideas developed in Dr. Döllinger's Protest, from the Frohschammer theory of intuitions in religious questions, which possesses, at all events, the merit of greater consistency.

Feeling deeply the importance of the present crisis, I have interrupted, though not without reluctance, the performance of more onerous duties, and have endeavoured in these lines to obey the impulse of my heart, and to fulfil my sense of duty towards the authority of the Church, now so violently assailed. May they contribute in some degree to strengthen the wavering, and to instruct those faithful souls who have been led astray, and may they be the occasion, too, of leading others to consider carefully and conscientiously the step they have taken. If they tend in some slight degree towards these blessed results, their object will have been fully attained.

W. J. W.

HARMONY OF THE PASSION.—II.

§ 2.

THE SUPPER IN BETHANIA.

TEXT.

Vulgate Version.

MATT. xxvi. 6-13.—Quum autem Jesus esset in Bethania in domo Simonis leprosi, (7). accessit ad eum mulier habens alabastrum unguenti pretiosi, et effudit super caput ipsius recumbentis. (8). Videntes autem discipuli indignati sunt, dicentes: Ut quid perditio hæc? (9). Potuit enim istud venundari multo, et dari pauperibus. (10). Sciens autem Jesus, ait illis: Quid molesti estis huic mulieri? opus enim bonum operata est in me; (11). Nam semper pauperes habetis vobiscum: me autem non semper habetis. (12). Mittens enim hæc unguentum hoc in corpus meum, ad sepeliendum me fecit. (13). Amen dico vobis: ubicumque prædicatum fuerit hoc evangelium in toto mundo, dicetur et quod hæc fecit in memoriam ejus.

MARK, xiv. 3-9.—Et quum esset Bethaniæ in domo Simonis leprosi, et recumberet, venit mulier habens alabastrum unguenti nardi spicati pretiosi, et fracto alabastro, effudit super caput ejus. (4). Erant autem quidam indignè ferentes intra semetipsos, et dicentes : Ut quid perditio ista unguenti facta est? (5). Poterat enim unguentum istud venundari plus quam trecentis denariis, et dari pauperibus. Et fremebant in eam. (6). Jesus autem dixit : Sinite eam : quid illi molesti estis? Bonum opus operata est in me. (7). Semper enim pauperes habetis vobiscum ; et, quum volueritis, potestis illis benefacere : me autem non semper habetis. (8). Quod habuit hæc, fecit : prævenit ungere corpus meum in sepulturam. (9). Amen dico vobis : Ubicumque prædicatum fuerit Evangelium istud in universo mundo, et quod fecit hæc narrabitur in memoriam ejus.

JOHN, xii. 1-8.—Jesus ergo, ante sex dies Paschæ, venit Bethaniam, ubi Lazarus fuerat mortuus, quem suscitavit Jesus. (2). Fecerunt autem ei cœnam ibi ; et Martha ministrabat ; Lazarus vero unus erat ex discumbentibus cum eo. (3). Maria ergo accepit libram unguenti nardi pistici, pretiosi, et unxit pedes Jesu, et extersit pedes ejus capillis suis ; et domus impleta est ex odore unguenti. (4). Dixit ergo unus ex discipulis ejus, Judas Iscariotes, qui erat eum traditurus : (5). Quare hoc unguentum non venit trecentis denariis, et datum est egenis? (6). Dixit autem hoc, non quia de egenis pertinebat ad eum, sed quia fur erat, et, loculos habens, ea quæ mittebantur portabat. (7). Dixit ergo Jesus : Sinite illam, ut in diem sepulturæ meæ servet illud. (8). Pauperes enim semper habetis vobiscum ; me autem non semper habetis.

Rheims Version.

MATT. xxvi. 6-13.—And when Jesus was in Bethania, in the house of Simon the leper, (7). there came to him a woman having an alabaster box of precious ointment, and poured it on his head, as he was at table. (8). And the disciples seeing it, had indignation, saying : To what purpose is this waste? (9). For this might have been sold for much, and given to the poor. (10). And Jesus knowing it, said to them : Why do you trouble this woman? for she hath wrought a good work upon me. (11). For the poor you have always with you : but me you have not always. (12). For she in pouring this ointment upon my body, hath done it for my burial. (13). Amen I say to you, wheresoever this gospel shall be preached in the whole world, that also which she hath done, shall be told for a memory of her.

MARK, xiv. 3-9.—And when he was in Bethania, in the house of Simon the leper, and was at meat, there came a woman having an alabaster box of ointment of precious spikenard ; and breaking the alabaster box, she poured it out upon his head. (4). Now there were some that had indignation within themselves, and said : Why was this waste of the ointment made? (5). For this ointment might have been sold for more than three hundred pence, and given to the poor.

And they murmured against her. (6). But Jesus said: Let her alone; why do you molest her? She hath wrought a good work upon me. (7). For the poor you have always with you; and whensoever you will, you may do them good: but me you have not always. (8). What she had, she hath done: she is come beforehand to anoint my body for the burial. (9). Amen, I say to you, wheresoever this gospel shall be preached in the whole world, that also which she hath done, shall be told for a memorial of her.

JOHN, xii. 1-8.—Jesus therefore, six days before the pasch, came to Bethania, where Lazarus had been dead, whom Jesus raised to life. (2). And they made him a supper there: and Martha served; but Lazarus was one of them that were at table with him. (3). Mary therefore took a pound of ointment of right spikenard, of great price; and anointed the feet of Jesus, and wiped his feet with her hair; and the house was filled with the odour of the ointment. (4). Then one of his disciples, Judas Iscariot, he that was about to betray him, said: (5). Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence, and given to the poor? (6). Now he said this, not because he cared for the poor; but because he was a thief, and having the purse, carried the things that were put therein. (7). Jesus therefore said: Let her alone, that she may keep it against the day of my burial. (8). For the poor you have always with you; but me you have not always.

H A R M O N Y .

Now six days before the Pasch, Jesus came to Bethania, where Lazarus was, who had been dead, and whom He had raised to life. And they made Him a supper there, in the house of Simon the leper: and Martha served; but Lazarus was one of them that were at table with Him. Then Mary took an alabaster box containing a pound of precious ointment, made of costly spikenard: and breaking the box, she poured the ointment on the head of Jesus as He sat at table. She anointed also his feet, and wiped them with her hair. And the house was filled with the fragrance of the ointment. Then one of his disciples, Judas Iscariot, he that was about to betray Him, said: Why was this waste of the ointment made? For this ointment might have been sold for more than three hundred pence, and given to the poor. Now he said this, not because he cared for the poor; but because he was a thief, and having the purse, used to take away what was put therein. But some of the other disciples, too, seeing the conduct of the woman, were displeased, and said likewise: To what purpose is this waste? For this ointment might have been sold for much and given to the poor. And they murmured against her. Jesus, therefore, knowing it, said to them: Let her alone;

why do you molest her? She hath wrought a good work upon me. For the poor you have always with you, and whosoever you will, you may do them good: but me you have not always. What she could do she hath done. She has come beforehand to anoint me: for in pouring this ointment on my body, she hath done it for my burial. Amen, I say to you, wheresoever this Gospel shall be preached in the whole world, that also which she hath done shall be told, for a memorial of her.

NOTES.

Six days before the Pasch. The Pasch, as will appear in the sequel, was kept on Thursday evening, the day before our Lord was put to death. If we count back six days from Thursday, we come to Friday of the week before; on which day, therefore, it would seem that Jesus came to Bethania. Some eminent commentators, as for instance Patrizzi,¹ maintain that He did not reach this village until Saturday evening: for Saint John says that, "on the next day", He went up to Jerusalem;² and it is generally agreed that the entry into Jerusalem took place on Sunday. But when we look closely into the sequence of events, in Saint John's narrative, it seems plain that these words, "on the next day", may just as well be taken in connection with the supper, as with the arrival in Bethania. And therefore we may suppose, as far as the text is concerned, that our Lord came to Bethania on Friday, that He remained there all day on Saturday, was present at the supper on Saturday evening, and went up to Jerusalem on Sunday. In favour of this explanation, it may be observed that it gets rid of any difficulty as to our Lord making a journey on the Sabbath, which would have been against the law: it also allows time for an event of some moment, here introduced by Saint John, namely, that a great crowd of Jews hearing that He was in Bethania came thither to see Him, and also to see Lazarus whom He had raised to life.³

Bethania, is one of the most interesting spots connected with Scripture history: for, besides being the scene of the resurrection of Lazarus, and of the supper mentioned in the text, it was the nightly resting place of our Lord, for the six days that preceded his Passion and death. At the present day, it is a decayed village of about twenty families, and is known by the Arabic name of Lazarieh, a word seemingly derived from Lazarus. It lies about two English miles to the

¹ Patrizzi, De Evang. Diss. xlix. nn. 2, 5. ² John, xii. 12.

³ John, xii. 9, 11; see Jans. Gand. Concord Evang. cap. cix. p. 754; A Lap. John, xii. 1.

east of Jerusalem, in a secluded hollow on the slopes of the Mount of Olives; and is pleasantly planted round with oaks and olives, almonds and pomegranates.¹ Jesus had many friends in this village, on account of the resurrection of Lazarus: so He stayed among them for the Sabbath day; and in the evening,

They made Him a supper. It is argued by Lightfoot² that the supper here described by Saint John, is not the same as that described by Saint Matthew and Saint Mark: for the former is referred by the Evangelist,³ to the eve of Palm Sunday; whereas the latter is introduced in connection with what occurred *two days* before the Pasch.⁴ But we must remember, that Saint Matthew and Saint Mark do not always follow, in their narrative, the exact order of events: and if we consider carefully the variety of incidents which are related by all three Evangelists, we can hardly doubt that they are describing one and the same event. There is (1) a supper in Bethania; (2) a woman enters unbidden; (3) she anoints our Lord with costly ointment; (4) murmurs are heard against her; (5) a suggestion is made that the ointment might have been sold for the benefit of the poor; (6) the murmurers are rebuked by our Lord; who (7) finally remarks that she has anointed his body for burial. It is unlikely that so many different circumstances should have concurred together twice in one week: it is also unlikely that the disciples would have repeated on Tuesday those murmurings for which Judas had been rebuked on the Saturday before.

Nor is it difficult to find a reason for the position which the supper in Bethania occupies in the Gospels of Saint Matthew and Saint Mark. At this supper the avarice of Judas seems to have been made manifest to the other Apostles; and it was avarice that prompted him to betray his Divine Master. Hence it was a natural and significant arrangement, to bring in the account of this supper between the conspiracy of the priests, who wanted to take Jesus by craft, and the compact of Judas, who agreed, for thirty pieces of silver, to deliver Him into their hands.

At the house of Simon the leper. He was not actually suffering from leprosy: for a leper was, by the law, unclean, and could not associate with the people nor the people with him: but he was known by that title. Possibly he had once been afflicted with leprosy, and had been cleansed by our Lord. His

¹ Smith, Dict. of the Bible; Kitto, Cyclop. Bib. Lit. sub voce; Stanley, Sinai and Palestine, pp. 186, 187.

² Hor. Heb. Matth. xxvi. 6, John. xii. 1; see also Patrizzi, Diss. I, nn. 5 et, seqq.

³ John, xii. 12. ⁴ Matth. xxvi. 2-6; Mark, xiv. 1-3.

history is unknown. It is probable, however, that he was the same person as Simon "the Pharisee", at whose house our Lord had been once before anointed, when seated at supper.¹

There came to Him a woman. She is called Mary by Saint John, who mentions her in connection with Martha and Lazarus:—Martha served; Lazarus sat at table with the guests; and Mary anointed the feet of our Lord. From this close association it may be fairly inferred that Mary, here mentioned, was the sister of Lazarus, the same who, on a former occasion,² when Martha was troubled about many things, chose the better part, and sat at the feet of Jesus, listening in silence to his words. It is highly probable, too, that this Mary is the woman of whom Saint Luke tells us,³—once a sinner in the city—who when Jesus was at supper in the house of Simon the Pharisee, came and washed his feet with her tears, and wiped them with her hair, and anointed them with ointment from an alabaster box. That she is the same woman is suggested at once by the great resemblance between the circumstances of the anointing on the two occasions: it would seem as if she now repeats, in gratitude and thanksgiving, those same offices by which she had before expressed her love, and gained forgiveness. A more weighty reason is found in the words of Saint John, who speaking of Mary, the sister of Lazarus, says that she was the woman "that anointed the Lord with ointment and wiped his feet with her hair." Now he would hardly have spoken in this way, if there were *two* women who had done this, and whose action had been recorded, with marked emphasis, in the Gospel history. Lastly it is commonly held, and seems to have been handed down by a steady tradition, that this Mary, the sister of Lazarus—once a sinner, now an ardent lover of Jesus—is no other than Mary Magdalen, from whom our Lord cast out seven devils,⁴ who followed Him to Calvary,⁵ and who came to seek Him at the sepulchre, early on the morning of the Resurrection.⁶

Having an alabaster box. Alabastron was a town in Egypt, where small vases, intended for holding perfumes, were made from a stone found in the neighbouring mountains. The name of the town was naturally given to these vases, and also to the stone of which they were made. Afterwards, it was extended to all vases used for perfumes, of whatever materials they might be composed. Hence the word in the text, *ἀλάβαστρον*, means simply a *perfume vase*: though, as the oint-

¹ Luke, vii. 36-40. ² Luke, x. 38-42. ³ Luke, vii. 36-50. ⁴ Luke, viii. 2.
⁵ Matthew, xxvii. 56; John, xix. 25. ⁶ Mark, xvi. 1, 9.

ment was "of great price", it is not unlikely that this vase was made of the alabaster stone, which, according to Pliny, was deemed peculiarly suitable for the most precious unguents.

It is worthy of notice that the stone to which the name Alabaster was generally given by the ancients, is a crystalline limestone, approaching the nature of marble, and formed by the deposition of carbonate of lime from a state of solution. This stone, from the mode of its formation, often exhibits distinct layers of different shades of colour; and thus somewhat resembles the onyx in appearance, though altogether different in composition. Accordingly we sometimes find a perfume vase, or Alabaster, called by classical writers an onyx; as in the well known line, "Nardi parvus *onyx* eliciet cadum".¹ The mineral commonly called Alabaster, in modern times, is not the alabaster stone of the ancients; but a white semi-transparent variety of gypsum, or sulphate of lime. It is found in the neighbourhood of Volterra in Tuscany, at Montmartre near Paris, also in some parts of England; and is manufactured into vases, statuettes and other domestic ornaments.²

Precious ointment. It is interesting to compare the accounts of this ointment, given by the three Evangelists. Saint Matthew writes, ἔχουσα ἀλάβαστρον μύρον βαρντίμου, which may be rendered, "having an alabaster vase of very precious ointment"; Saint Mark, ἔχουσα ἀλάβαστρον μύρον νάρδον πιστικῆς πολυτελοῦς, "having an alabaster vase of ointment of pistic nard, of great price"; and Saint John, λαβοῦσα λίτραν μύρον νάρδου πιστικῆς πολυτίμου, "taking a pound of ointment of pistic nard, highly esteemed."³ All three, therefore, expressly record, though by different words, that the ointment was of great value: and so it must indeed have been, when a pound weight of it could have been sold for more than three hundred pence, or rather *denarii*. The denarius was the chief silver coin of the Romans; and at the time of our Lord, it was commonly current in Palestine. Those coined in the reign of Augustus were equivalent to about eight pence halfpenny, those in the reign of Nero to about seven pence halfpenny, of our money.⁴ It would seem from the parable of the labourers in the vineyard,⁵ that a denarius was looked upon as a fair day's wages, and we know from Tacitus⁶ that it was more than the daily

¹ Hor. IV. Carm. xii. 17.

² See Kitto, Cyclop. Bib. Lit.; Smith, Dict. of the Bible; English Cyclop., sub voce; Page, Advanced Text Book of Geology, p. 436.

³ See Liddell and Scott, in voc.

⁴ See Kitto, Cyclop. Bib. Lit.; Smith, Dict. of the Bible, *denarius*.

⁵ Matth. xx. i. 14. ⁶ Tacit. Ann. i. 17.

pay of the Roman soldier. The price of the ointment, therefore, would have been about ten pounds sterling, and would represent the wages of a labouring man for a whole year.

Of right spikenard. From these words it appears that the ointment used by Mary, was composed, in great part, of the farfamed aromatic substance called Nard, or Spikenard, which is obtained from the Eastern plant of the same name, well known to the ancients.¹ Its costliness may be illustrated from Horace, who writing to his friend Virgil, seems to say that a *cask of choicest wine* would be only a fitting return for a little box of nard.

“ Nardo vina merebere.

Nardi parvus onyx eliciet cadum,
Qui nunc Sulpiciis accubat horreis.”²

—————“bring thou the nard
And with it earn my wine
One tiny box of spikenard will draw forth
The cask now ripening in Sulpician vaults.”³

The meaning of the epithet *πιστικῆς* which, in the Greek text accompanies the word Nard, is uncertain. But there are many conjectures. It may be formed from *πίστις*, faith, and mean genuine, unadulterated : it may be used for *πιστός*, from *πίνω*, to drink, and mean drinkable, or liquid : lastly, there is the suggestion of Saint Augustine that the nard may have received this epithet from the district where it was obtained.⁴ In Pliny⁵ we find *pistic* nard contrasted with *spurious* nard ; which fact is strongly in favour of the first interpretation. The author of the Vulgate version, in Saint John's Gospel, preserves the Greek word, but gives it a Latin form, *nardi pistici*. In Saint Mark's Gospel, he renders the phrase, *nardi spicati*, which would seem to denote the ointment that was made from the *spikes* of the plant, as distinguished from that which was made from the ears. Our English translators, adopting apparently this view of the question, use the compound word *spike-nard* in both Gospels.

Breaking the alabaster box, that is to say, breaking the seal, by which the vase was carefully closed to prevent the fragrance from escaping. Or, it may be that the vase was formed with a long narrow neck, and that Mary broke off the upper part of the neck, in her eagerness to get at the ointment.

Poured it on his head. It was usual to anoint the head before banquets, on festive occasions. Thus Horace, bring-

¹ Kitto, Cyclop. Bib. Lit. *nerd* ; Smith, Dict. of the Bible, *spikenard*.

² Hor. IV. Carm. xii. 16-18. ³ Lord Lytton.

⁴ See Alford, Greek Test. Mark, xiv. 3 ; Liddell and Scott, in voc.

⁵ Nat. Hist. xii. 26.

ing back pleasant memories to an old friend and fellow soldier, writes :

“ Cum quo morantem sæpe diem mero
Fregi coronatus intentes
Malabathro Syrio capillos.”¹

“ With whom full oft I’ve sped the lingering day,
Quaffing bright wine as in our tents we lay,
With Syrian spikenard on our glistening hair.”²

And our Lord seems to allude to this practice, when He says, “ But thou, when thou fastest, anoint thy head, and wash thy face,”³ as if to say, Appear amongst men as one taking part in a festive banquet. It should be observed, however, that this practice was not borrowed by the Jews, as some have supposed, from the Romans ; but was of much older date, as appears from allusions to it in the Old Testament. For example, we read in the Psalms : “ Thou hast prepared a table before me ; thou hast anointed my head with oil.”⁴ But Mary, as we learn from Saint John, anointed also the feet of our Lord, which were probably wearied and sore from long walking. When it is said that she wiped them with her hair, we are to understand, that she washed them first, and dried them with her hair ; for after anointing, they would not need to be wiped.⁵ Saint John, it may be observed, does not mention the anointing of the head, which was not an unusual mark of civility and attention : but he dwells rather on the anointing of the feet, which was a very special token of love and veneration. Thus, when our Lord, once before, was anointed by Mary, He said to the master of the house : “ Dost thou see this woman ? I entered into thy house, and thou gavest me no water for my feet ; but she with tears hath washed my feet, and with her hair hath wiped them. Thou gavest me no kiss ; but she, since she came in, hath not ceased to kiss my feet. My head with oil thou didst not anoint ; but she with ointment hath anointed my feet. Wherefore I say to thee, Many sins are forgiven her because she hath loved much.”⁶

The disciples, seeing it, had indignation. The word in the Greek text, ἠγανάκτησαν, is not quite so strong : it means rather, *were displeased*. Some think that the plural verb is here used for the singular, as sometimes occurs in Scripture, and that none of the disciples was displeased but Judas, of whom alone this story is told by Saint John. But there seems no sufficient reason why the words of Saint Matthew and Saint Mark should not be taken in their obvious sense. It

¹ II Carm. vii. 6-8 ; see also, II Carm. xi. 15-17. ² Theodore Martin.

³ Matth. vi. 17. ⁴ Ps. xxii. 5 ; see also, Prov. xxi. 17 ; Wisd. ii. 7.

⁵ Jans. Gand. Concord. Evang. cap. cix. p. 755. ⁶ Luke, vii. 44-47.

may well have been that some of the other disciples, not knowing yet the secret wickedness of Judas, and deceived by his plausible reasoning, caught up the sentiment he expressed, and even repeated his words. Moreover, the rebuke of our Lord, which followed these murmurings, is addressed not to one only, but to many. This is strikingly apparent in the Greek and Latin versions, which may be rendered thus: Jesus said to *them*, Why trouble *ye* this woman?"

Having the purse. From these words it appears that Jesus and his Apostles had a common purse, carried by Judas, in which were deposited the contributions of pious followers, to be used, as occasion might require, for their own wants, and for the wants of the poor. The possession of property in common is, therefore, not inconsistent with the full observance of the Gospel counsel contained in the words of our Lord: "If thou wilt be perfect, go, sell what thou hast, and give to the poor, and come, follow me."¹

Carried what was put therein; rather *carried away, purloined.* The Greek word, ἐβάρταξεν, is the same that Saint John uses, in telling how Mary Magdalen asked the gardener (as she supposed) if he had *carried off* the body of Jesus from the Sepulchre.²

Jesus knowing it said. Jesus heard the complaints and the murmurs, and He *knew* the guilty thoughts that were passing in the mind of Judas.

Me you have not always. Jesus is still present amongst men, in more ways than one. First, He is everywhere and always present, in his divine nature: secondly, He is present on our altars, even in his human nature. But He is no longer present in human *form*; He is no longer capable of suffering fatigue and pain, or of receiving bodily comfort; and therefore He is not present with us in the same sense as He was present at the supper in Bethania. We cannot now show our affection, as Mary did, by anointing his body.

She is come beforehand to anoint my body for the burial. Not that this was her intention: she seems rather to have been moved by an impulse of love, without having any further end in view: but what she did answered for the day of burial. Some commentators, however, think that in thus anointing our Lord, she was guided by a special inspiration of the Holy Spirit. In Saint John, according to the Vulgate, we read: "Let her alone that she may keep it for the day of my burial"; that is, Let her do this act for the day of my burial. The phrase is variously given in the Greek manuscripts: but those of highest authority agree with the Vulgate.³ But whatever

¹ Matth. xix. 21. ² John, xx. 15. See Alford, in loc.; Liddell and Scott, in voce.

³ See Jans. Gand. Concord. Evang. cap. cix. pp. 756, 757; Alford, Greek Test. John, xii. 7.

may be the grammatical explanation of the words in Saint John, it is plain that the substantial sense is the same as that conveyed by the other Evangelists ; that our Lord wishes to keep the fact of his approaching death before the minds of his Apostles, and tells them that the anointing of his body has a prophetic significance in reference to his burial. He alludes to the practice of the Jews, who were accustomed, in preparing a body for burial, to insert perfumed spices in the folds of the grave-clothes, or perhaps apply them to the body in the form of an ointment.¹

§ 3.

COMPACT OF JUDAS.

T E X T .

Vulgate Version.

- MATT. xxvi. 14-16.—Tunc abiit unus de duodecim, qui dicebatur Judas Iscariotes, ad principes sacerdotum ; (15). Et ait illis : Quid vultis mihi dare, et ego vobis eum tradam ? At illi constituerunt ei triginta argenteos. (16). Et exinde quærebat opportunitatem ut eum traderet.
- MARK, xiv. 10, 11.—Et Judas Iscariotes, unus de duodecim, abiit ad summos sacerdotes, ut proderet eum illis. (11). Qui audientes gavisii sunt ; et promiserunt ei pecuniam se daturos. Et quærebat quomodo illum oportune traderet.
- LUKE, xxii. 3-6.—Intravit autem Satanas in Judam, qui cognominabatur Iscariotes, unum de duodecim. (4). Et abiit, et locutus est cum principibus sacerdotum et magistratibus, quemadmodum illum traderet eis. (5). Et gavisii sunt, et pacti sunt pecuniam illi dare. (6). Et spondit. Et quærebat opportunitatem, ut traderet illum sine turbis.

Rheims Version.

- MATT. xxvi. 14-16.—Then went one of the twelve, who was called Judas Iscariot, to the chief priests, (15). and said to them : What will you give me, and I will deliver him unto you ? But they appointed him thirty pieces of silver. (16). And from thenceforth he sought opportunity to betray him.
- MARK, xiv. 10, 11.—And Judas Iscariot, one of the twelve, went to the chief priests, to betray him to them. (11). Who hearing it were glad ; and they promised him they would give him money. And he sought how he might conveniently betray him.
- LUKE, xxii. 3-6.—And Satan entered into Judas, who was surnamed Iscariot, one of the twelve. (4). And he went and discoursed with the chief priests and the magistrates, how he might betray him to them. (5). And they were glad, and covenanted to give him money. (6). And he promised. And he sought opportunity to betray him, in the absence of the multitude.

H A R M O N Y .

Now Satan entered in Judas, surnamed Iscariot, one of the twelve ; and he went and discoursed with the chief priests

¹ John, xix. 39, 40 ; Mark, xi. 1 ; Luke, xxiii. 56, xxiv. 1 ; Kitto, Cyclop. Bib. Lit. ; Smith, Dict of the Bible, *burial*.

and magistrates, how he might deliver up Jesus to them. He said to them : What will you give me and I will deliver Him unto you? And they were glad, and covenanted to give him thirty pieces of silver. And he promised. And from thenceforth he sought an opportunity to deliver up Jesus, in the absence of the multitude.

NOTES.

Satan entered in Judas. Judas had allowed the lust of money to get possession of his heart ; and the devil suggested to his imagination a dreadful thought. The price of the ointment was lost, and could not be recovered ; but he might sell his Master to those who were thirsting for his blood. Judas gave consent to this evil inspiration : and so the devil entered into his soul. "The love of money," says Saint Paul, "is the root of all evils."¹

One of the twelve. It is remarkable that all three Evangelists, as if with one accord, note this circumstance. It was a very grievous crime to deliver up Jesus Christ into the hands of his enemies : but there was a special enormity in the fact that this crime was committed by "one of the twelve," whom He had chosen for his favoured friends and intimate associates. "If my enemy," said the Psalmist, "had reviled me, I would verily have borne with it : but thou a man of one mind, my guide and my familiar, who didst take sweet meats together with me!"²

Went to the chief priests. Probably upon Wednesday morning, when the chief priests, the scribes, and the elders of the people, were taking counsel together how they might get Jesus into their hands.

And the magistrates, τοῖς στρατηγοῖς. A little further on they are distinguished by Saint Luke from the elders, and are called magistrates of the temple, *στρατηγοὺς τοῦ ἱεροῦ*.³ It appears, therefore, that they had charge of the temple, and were probably provided with soldiers to keep order there.⁴

Thirty pieces of silver, τριάκοντα ἀργύρια. This circumstance was foretold by the prophet Zachary : "They weighed, for my price, thirty pieces of silver."⁵ Now as the *shekel* was the common unit of weight for money, among the Jews, there can be little doubt that the prophet meant by these words, thirty *shekels* of silver : and consequently we should understand the words of Saint Matthew in the same sense. It may be observed, too, that, under the Old Law, if a slave were gored by an ox, through the fault of its owner, thirty shekels of silver were to be paid for his life.⁶ And the chief priests

¹ Tim. vi. 10. ² Ps. liv. 13, 14. ³ Luke, xxii. 52. ⁴ See Maldonatus, Matth. xxvi. 14 ; Lamy, Harm. Evang. in loco. ⁵ Zach. xi. 12. ⁶ Exod. xxi. 32.

it would seem, with this law before their eyes, put the same price on the head of Jesus Christ. The shekel of silver was equal to four denarii, and was therefore about half a crown or three shillings of our money. Accordingly, the price paid to Judas for his treachery, was a little more or less than four pounds sterling.¹

In the absence of the crowd. As Jesus was daily teaching in the temple, there could have been no difficulty in finding Him: but his enemies dared not lay hands upon Him, through fear of the people. What Judas, then, agreed to do was, to deliver Him up when He should be away from the crowds that followed Him during the day. This he was able to promise, and afterwards to effect, by reason of his intimate familiarity with his Divine Master.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Vindiciae Alphonsianae, seu Doctoris Ecclesiae S. Alphonsi M. de Ligorio Episcopi et Fundatoris Congregationis SS. Redemptoris Doctrina Moralis Vindicata a pluribus impugnationibus Cl. P. Antonii Ballerini, S. Jesu, in Collegio Romano Professoris, cura et studio quorundam Theologorum e Congregatione SS. Redemptoris. Romae, ex Typ. Polyg. S. C. de Prop. Fide, 1873.

II.

THIS voluminous Defence or Vindication of the Moral Doctrine of St. Alphonsus, published by his Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer, was noticed by us last month, and then we promised our readers a fuller account of the work for some future occasion, which we are happy to make the present—at least in part, reserving further considerations for next, and perhaps other issues.

An "Introductory Dissertation" opens the volume, which is at the same time an amplification of the Preface we last month spoke of, and an epitome of the whole work, laying down the Thesis to be proved, and, in a general and *a priori* manner, establishing and maintaining the same. To this Dissertation we now confine ourselves, having found therein abundant matter for consideration and for the practical information of the readers of this ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD. Should we not esteem it profitable to enter hereafter into the particular disputations of the "Vindiciae," we shall, nevertheless, have thus communicated a general knowledge of them, and, perhaps, adopted the conclusions they endeavour to maintain.

¹ See Smith, Dict. of the Bible; Kitto Cyclop. Bib. Lit. *piece of silver*.

The "Vindiciae" are—as is clearly set forth in the title page—a defence of the Moral Theology of St. Alphonsus against the objections of Father Ballerini; that is to say, they are a refutation of these objections; which being many, the labour is long; which all, however, the "Introductory Dissertation" classifies and refutes in common, comprising thus *in parvo* the *multum* of 950 pages. Now the style of Father Ballerini is in truth a dagger: it need not be told the readers of his notes. This is in reality the greatest of his objections, or, we should perhaps say the most *objectionable* of them. We would venture to say that but for this form the matter of his observations would have evoked little comment, and never, certainly, the unenviable notoriety of the Doctorate and these "Vindiciae." This very notoriety, however, may be for him simply delicious: he is, no doubt, even while we write, assaulting, as best he can, the "Vindiciae" and all opponents courageous enough to face him. Can it be that he contradicts and disputes for the very pleasure of discussion? Such a Theologian is known to us; yet we do not say that such is Father Ballerini, even though we have been told by one who *heard* his adnotations that they *sounded* not half so hard as they *look*, and that his manner at times would rob them of all sting. We would not say that he was not in earnest, precisely because his notes are printed. *Verba volant*, it is true, no matter how pungent; but the *littera scripta manet*, in its sober simple meaning, unqualified and unmollified by tone or gesture; and this no one knew better than the learned Professor. This cutting style of his attacking, insulting *persons* for their opinions, is justly dwelt on by the Redemptorist Theologians and exemplified. They point out where, in his notes, Pontius is accused of ostentation, Collet of prejudice, Cardenas of stupidity, Comitulus of disorder, Croix of absurdity, Henriquez of mis-quotation, Lugo of anachronism, Suarez of singularity, Lambertinus of irreverence, and every adversary of something personally disgraceful. This reflection is merciful, for it removes the impression of single combat, and softens, with a certain compassion, that which is unavoidably hard in refutation. Earnestly, nevertheless, is the particular opposition of the adnotator to the celebrated Salmanticenses pointed out, and the particular esteem of St. Alphonsus for the same great Theologians.

Then come the Ballerinian censures in long lists, ranged side by side with the doctrine of the Saint. We give a number of these censures for the reader's consideration, that he may remark with us how each appears to scoff at the Theological knowledge and ability of the Saint, without openly, or indeed intentionally attacking his sanctity, which, as we have just

seen, was little if at all cared for or spared in others. Father Ballerini, therefore, attaches the following objections or censures to the many propositions or points of doctrine or assertions of St. Alphonsus which he refuses to agree with:—"Groundless inventions"—"Unreasonable citations"—"Worth nothing"—"A deception"—"No solid reason"—"No authority"—"A contemptible argument"—"Not even the slightest probability"—"A false supposition"—"Something absurd"—"An argument rejected by all"—"Altogether singular"—"Most absurdly and against first principles"—"A vain, absurd, ridiculous, chimerical hypothesis," &c., &c. In these censures, and the like, with which the Ballerinian notes abound, we have the principal objections against the Doctorate of St. Alphonsus, and the subject matter of the "Vindiciae" before us. Assuredly the objections are strong individually, and stronger still collectively. Well might the Promoter of the Faith maintain, as he did, that one thus justly censured could never be declared a Doctor of the Church; and, therefore, was each censure examined, and censured in its turn, before the petition of the world was granted, and St Alphonsus ranked with the Fathers.

These celebrated objections are gathered into five classes in the Dissertation, according to which classification the Ballerinian Thesis, which the "Vindiciae" undertakes to refute, is the following:—"The Moral Doctrine of St. Alphonsus is in many points singular, borrowed, groundless, gratuitous, and absurd." It may not be strictly fair to compress an author's teaching into a Thesis, to be attacked as his without his knowledge and approbation; yet have we no choice in his absence and our desire to make clear the issue between him and the "Vindiciae." The above proposition was never indeed penned by him, but it is all the same the epitome of his censures, and what the "Introductory Dissertation" undertakes to refute. The Redemptorist Theologians therefore pronounce the Thesis in question to be "opposed to sound and temperate criticism," and forthwith pour in copious arguments from Reason and Authority, superabundantly proving it untenable and intolerable. Three are the great engines they uplift against the enemy, from each of which such shafts are thrown, that he must indeed be mad for war who is not thus driven from it. The first argument is the learning of St. Alphonsus irreconcilable with the Ballerinian Thesis? This learning the Vindicators have not to prove, for it is not called in question by the Objector; they have, however, to *remind* him of it as of their other arguments, all of which, for his own sake, 'tis well to believe or suppose forgotten by him. He is, then, in the first place, *reminded* of the very great learning of St. Alphonsus,

admitted, respected, and celebrated by the whole Catholic Church, and most especially by the Sovereign Pontiffs Benedict XIV., Clement XIII., Pius VII., Leo XII., Pius VIII., Gregory XVI., and Pius IX. The Objector would entrench himself in the fortress of Reason Individual, and hold it impregnable by his sole judgment. For him words are nothing: he must have arguments. Yet, on reflection, he must admit that great men's words are reasons in themselves—far stronger than all the reasoning of their admitted inferiors. This, indeed, he would seem himself to require, for his own censures are mere words—hard words, reckless words—poured out without proof, and supposed to be accepted on the sole ground of their speaker's authority or learning. Reasons, however, are not wanting for great men's words, and St. Alphonsus is ever reasoning and reasonable to such a degree that, foreseeing in his consummate wisdom the objections of his modern critics, he has removed all worth removing beforehand.

If the teaching of the Saint be thought *singular*, when not followed by a multitude of authors, the critic is thus instructed by the Saint himself:—"It must be ever remembered that the authority of writers is constituted, not by their number, but by their weight. Azor, Castropal, Vasquez, &c., &c., say with Saint Thomas, that sometimes the authority of one Doctor may establish the probability of an opinion, and even render it more probable than the common teaching of many; and St. Augustin taught the same. Moreover, Viva, Croix, &c., assert with St. Antonine, that if any great Theologian declare any opinion to be probable; this is quite enough to make us morally certain of its probability. If I, less learned than St. Thomas, follow his teaching against another which appears more probable to me, who will deny the prudence of my conduct, who prefer so great an authority to mine own?" How well, say the Vindicators, may not the modern Theologian speak of the transcendent authority of St. Alphonsus as he did of St. Thomas, and *weighing*—not numbering—his adversaries, desert their less for his greater authority. But where are these authors so numerous? Is not, in these times, St. Alphonsus everywhere? and his, if any, the common opinion?

If the doctrine of St. Alphonsus be slighted as *borrowed*, or blindly taken from others, the Saint has again made answer:—"I call God to witness, whose honour I have sought to promote as well as the salvation of souls, that whatever I have written I resolved to write uninfluenced by any passion, unshackled by any slavery, ungiven to laxity or severity. In every question I have endeavoured to discover the truth in long-protracted study, particularly in things of practice, and, therefore, not only have I diligently considered the arguments

of ancient Doctors, but also those of moderns, so that sometimes I have spent many days in deciding one question. I have endeavoured to prefer reason to authority, and convinced by reason, have not hesitated to oppose the teaching of many." The very authority enjoyed by Alphonsus in his own life-time and ever since, sufficiently repels the censure of Plagiarism, had we not Papal, Episcopal, and Professorial attestations of his originality and peculiar wisdom. With these documents the Acts of the Doctorate are replete, the most glorious being the Petition signed by more than six hundred Bishops. If *misquotations* be spoken of, the critic is told in the "Vindiciae" how there are upwards of thirty thousand quotations in the Moral Theology, taken during the laborious study of fifteen years, from eight hundred different authors, and that it was simply impossible that some mistakes of writer and printer should not occur. The numbering and correction of such mistakes belong, of course, more properly to the editor than to the professor, of which truth the misquotations of Father Ballerini himself are an unanswerable proof.

If the teaching of Alphonsus be *groundless*, then where shall sound teaching be sought? What ground more solid than the learning and experience of a great mind? *Groundless?* Then the objectors must be *reminded* of the grounds of morality in the exact disputations of the "Vindiciae."

If, finally, we are obliged to hear the reasoning of the Prince of Moral Theology laughed at as *absurd*, then, considering the refutation of such an outrage *absurd*, we may reflect that the teaching of Jesus Christ was censured as harshly, and more so, and that surely this word and such like fell from the pen unpondered and unconfirmed.

This is the substance of the first general reply to the Ballerinian censures. We cannot but accept it with approval, ever mindful that the sublimest intellect, best stored with learning and guarded by experience, can err, but convinced that such a mind cannot habitually err in things best known, and be withal applauded and agreed with by noblest thinkers, and reign unrivalled in his sphere: no, this is quite impossible.

The second argument of the Dissertation is the Sanctity of Alphonsus, likewise irreconcilable with the Ballerinian Thesis. So far, then, the Disputation has been conducted on the level, but here we see the defendants rise above the Objector, and strike more heavily. They *remind* him that Alphonsus is a canonized Saint, and as such should be safe from *such* attacks. And as their adversary would, no doubt, object that a teacher's sanctity does not defend his doctrine, and again, that scientific censuring does not assail the sanctity of anyone, both assertions they at once deny, maintaining

that an author's sanctity is a very great defence and guarantee of his teaching, and that consequently, as well as absolutely, the Objector's Thesis does strike at the sanctity of the great Doctor. Again we must agree with the Vindicators. The sanctity of a writer assures us of his prudence, diligence, impartiality, and veracity. If his talents be great, and his learning beyond question, his canonization raises his doctrine to the highest degree of moral certainty. True it is, that holiness does not render him intellectually infallible, but this, we may say, is all it does not do in the case of an Alphonsus. "No one will deny," says Scavini, "the sanctity of a writer to be in itself a strong proof of the truth of his teaching, especially in Christian ethics. Excited and disorderly passions, whence errors generally arise, are all but extinguished in the saints." What, then, of the Ballerinian censures? Are such blemishes at all reconcilable with sanctity? By attributing them to ignorance invincible—yes, but not otherwise; and the existence of this ignorance in Alphonsus would be a far greater wonder than the inanity of the objections themselves. The sanctity of the Saint is indeed really though unintentionally assailed, in being utterly disregarded, and replaced by degrading qualities scarcely, if at all, compatible with ordinary piety. The Commentator was free, and still is so, to differ from the Saint in matters undefined, but to insult him and outrage him, crowned as he is with glory above, and honoured by the Universal Church on earth, this was, and ever will be, rash and condemnable.

The third argument of the Dissertation is the Papal approbation of the doctrine of St. Alphonsus. This—the principal of the three great arguments—is fully developed in the first part of the Dissertation on account, no doubt, of its preponderance. We, for the same reason, would place it last, and with it crown and finish the temple raised by learning and sanctity to the fame of Alphonsus. From the multitude of documents that enrich the Dissertation, we gather that three solemn Papal approbations have been given to the moral teaching of the Saint. The Vindicators, as already said, set up no claim for infallibility; but rather proclaim the greatest tolerance for scientific opposition, and admit that the infallible Church may yet declare untenable some opinions of the Saint. Yet such are the approbations of which the Objector is *reminded*, that we fancy him already thinking of apologies and retractions.

These approbations are the Negative or Permissive, and the Positive or Laudatory. The Negative or Permissive approbation of all the works of St. Alphonsus was thus decreed, in 1803, by Pius VII: "Facta plena relatione prae-fatorum operum tam impressorum quam aliorum MSS. omnium, nihil in iis censura dignum repertum." Here we are

told that a particular and full examination having been made of all the works of St. Alphonsus, they were found to contain nothing censurable. What more sweeping answer to the Balerinian censures! *Nihil censura dignum*. Has the Professor discovered blemishes invisible to the eye of Peter? Yes, he may reply, what *was not* found may *yet* be found; but no, for well he knows how Gregory XVI. explains those words to mean: "Ejus opera inoffenso pede percurri a fidelibus posse;" viz., that the faithful may read with perfect safety his works from end to end. Therefore, we may conclude, according to the doctrine of Benedict XIV., that in the Saint's works there is nothing false, nothing erroneous, nothing rash, nothing dangerous. What, then, the Vindicators may demand, will the Objector reply? If his censures are just, what does he think of the decrees of Pius and Gregory? May we not here once more suppose the Objections harder in print than ever in the mind or on the lips of the Objector?

The Positive or Laudatory approbations is contained in the celebrated reply of the Holy Penitentiary given in 1831. The copy of this document inserted in the "Vindiciae" is declared to be authentic, and for its theoretical and practical importance we give it here in full to our readers:—

Responsum S. Poenitentiariae de die 5 Jul., 1831. Consultatio. Eminentissime. Ludovicus Franciscus Augustus Cardinalis de Rohan-Chabot Archiepiscopus Vesontionensis, doctrinae sapientiam et unitatem fovere nititur apud omnes dioecesis suae qui curam gerunt animarum; quorum nonnullis impugnantibus Theologiam Moralem Beati Alphonsi Mariae a Ligorio tamquam laxam nimis, periculosam saluti et sanae morali contrariam, Sacrae Poenitentiariae oraculum requirit, ac ipsi unius Theologiae professoris sequentia dubia proponit solvenda:

1^o Utrum Sacrae Theologiae Professor opiniones quas in sua Theologia morali profitetur Beatus Alphonsus a Ligorio sequi tuto possit ac profiteri?

2^o An sit inquietandus Confessarius, qui omnes Beati Alphonsi a Ligorio sequitur opiniones in praxi sacri Poenitentiae tribunalis hac sola ratione quod a Sancta Sede Apostolica nihil in operibus censura dignum repertum fuerit? Confessarius, de quo in dubio agitur non legit Opera Beati Doctoris, nisi ad cognoscendum accurate ejus doctrinam, non perpendens momenta rationesve quibus variae nituntur opiniones; sed existimat se tuto agere eo ipso quod doctrinam quae nihil censura dignum continet prudenter judicare queat sanam, tutam, nec ullatenus sanctitati evangelicae contrariam.

Decisio. Sacra Poenitentiaria perpensis expositis Reverendissimo in Christo Patri S. R. E. Cardinali, Archiepiscopo Vesontionensi respondendum censuit:

Ad 1^{um} quaesitum : Affirmative, quin tamen inde reprehendendi censeantur qui opiniones ab aliis probatis auctoribus traditas sequuntur.

Ad 2^{um} quaesitum : Negative, habita ratione mentis Sanctae Sedis circa approbationem scriptorum Servorum Dei ad effectum Canonizationis.

Datum Romae in S. Poenitentiaria die 5 Jul., 1831.

A. F. DE RETZ, S.P., Regens.

F. TRICCA, Secretarius.

The Redemptorist Theologians see in this reply something much greater than permission, viz., positive commendation ; and we once more agree with them, not unaware of the difficulty we shall have to solve. The Positive or Laudatory approbation is deduced from the objects of the consultation. These objects were : 1st, the promotion of wisdom in teaching ; 2nd, the assurance of safe guidance for souls ; 3rd, the establishment of a rule for professorial criticism ; 4th, the constitution of a confessional oracle. Now, the decision declares St. Alphonsus' "Moral Theology" the wisdom, the rule, the guide, and the oracle. It tells the world that this doctrine can be taught and practised by learned and ignorant, pastor and people. "Who does not see," says the vote for the Doctorate, "that by this reply Alphonsus has been constituted, so to speak, the Oracle of Confessors in the Tribunal of Penance, and, consequently, his moral teaching declared above that of all others." The Oracle, indeed, reasons not but rules ; and such, we are told, is Alphonsus for the theorizing as well as for the practical Theologian. Whose authority shall then compare with this ? Whose censures aim so high ? But there is a difficulty to be considered, and it is this : both in the Consultation and in the Decision reference is made to the Decree of Pius VII., as if nothing more were sought for and given than an explanation thereof ; whence it would follow, that as the approbation given in that Decree was only negative, nothing more is given in the Reply. We solve this difficulty by observing, that inversely proceeding, we might prove thus from the Reply—that the Decree of Pius was a Positive approbation ; and, nevertheless, until the Reply came the proof could not be given. Whether the Reply then be considered in an absolute or explanatory sense, the conclusions drawn from it are equally tenable, and conclusions they are of such satisfactory import for the pastors and people of God, that it can be the interest of none to impugn them.

A third and last great approbation follows : the Decisive or Imperative ; and of this the Objector is not *reminded*, because his objections preceded it, and consequently retarded it, resisted it, and were by it finally crushed—it is *The Doctorate*.

The following words from the Brief of July 7th, 1871, may well conclude the Disputation, and fill with joyous exultation the children and disciples of Alphonsus:—"In Universali Ecclesia Catholica semper Is Doctor habeatur. Hujus Doctoris opera omnia ut aliorum Ecclesiae Doctorum non modo privatim sed publice omnibus scholasticis studiis Christianisque exercitationibus citari, proferri, atque cum res postulaverit adhiberi volumus et decernimus": that is to say, "Let him be ever held a Doctor in the Universal Catholic Church. We desire and command all the works of this Doctor to be cited, quoted, and, when necessary, adopted like the works of the other Doctors of the Church, not only privately, but also publicly, in all scholastic studies and Christian exercises." These are, indeed, words of approbation to satisfy the most scrupulous, and silence the least scrupulous amongst us.—"Volumus et decernimus."

We heartily congratulate the writers of the "Vindiciae" on the great learning and moderation displayed in this Dissertation, and we commend their great work to all earnest Theologians. We shall gladly welcome the edition they promise of the "Moral Theology" of their glorious Founder, and meanwhile, with the Cardinal Archbishop of Besançon, we would exhort all to hear respectfully, and confidently obey that teaching declared so often by Peter, ever living in the Church, to be uncensurable and safe, "that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no schisms among you, but that you be perfect in the same mind and in the same judgment."—I Cor., i.

Devotion to the Sacred Heart, by ROBERT J. CARBERY, Priest of the Society of Jesus. Dublin: Elwood and Son, 9, Capel Street.

IN this excellent little volume the Rector of Clongowes Wood College furnishes, in six short chapters, a clear, attractive, and sufficiently full account of the history, nature, and practice of the Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus. It has manifestly been inspired by the great event of last Passion Sunday, of which the concluding chapter treats. Our religious literature, scanty as it is, has already several treatises on the Devotion to the Heart of Jesus, but generally they form part of larger volumes of Meditations, &c. We know of no one filling the position which Father Carbery's book fills so well. Apart from the opportuneness of its publication, it is sure of a rapid and wide diffusion. It will do its part in kindling and maintaining a solid and enlightened devotion to that Adorable Heart to which our beloved country has been consecrated so happily.

THE IRISH
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

=====

JUNE, 1873.

=====

EPICTETUS.¹

IT may be presumed that it is to the hard, dry, unadorned style of the Stoic Philosopher, and not to any defect of interest inherent in the subject-matter of the treatise which bears his name, that we should attribute the silent deposition of the first and best of 'Handbooks' from the honored place which once it occupied on the Maynooth roll of matriculation classics.

Time was when the ambitious candidate, aspiring to the honors of a pass in Rhetoric, might reckon himself pretty secure, *ceteris paribus*, if he had been at the pains of establishing an intimacy with the Phrygian Slave-Philosopher. But *Ilium fuit*. That good old time is gone. It expired with the era of those private academies which, familiar to the first half of the present century by the name of classical schools, were the humble but useful precursors of the existing diocesan seminaries. In the Maynooth programme of to-day the Porch is superseded by the Academy; Plato usurps the chair of Epictetus. Of the relative merits of these two sages in respect of doctrine it might be perilous to adventure a comparison; but it seems safe enough to assign the palm of literary merit to Plato, "the majesty of whose style," says Sydney Smith, "would have made a great orator of a bad philosopher." From the point of view therefore, of those "most potent, grave, and reverend signors" who, in regulating programmes of examination, adopt the qualities of style for standard to measure the fitness of text-books by, the substitution of a treatise of Plato for a treatise of Epictetus was

¹ Ancient Philosophy; or the Enchiridion of Epictetus, and the Chrusa Epe of Pythagoras: translated into English prose and verse, by Hon. Thomas Talbot. Lovel: Montreal, 1873.

a commendable reform. But suppose we were to take, upon the subject of the alteration, the suffrages of the candidates—a body of gentlemen whose wishes College Dons are so careless to ascertain, and so slow to recognise—how should we find them to incline? Of this much we are certain. In the days of his ascendancy in the schools Epictetus was by no means unpopular. He may not be very profound, or imaginative, or brilliant; but he is very clear, vigorous, and homely—and, chiefest of charms, he is short. There is not much of the *Enchiridion*, and what there is of it is not too ‘hard.’ Upon these grounds the *Enchiridion* was a favourite with the young student of a race who now write P.P. after their name and forget Epictetus. The facility with which it is grasped flows from its character, as a well-assorted collection of plain, intelligible, practical lessons of moral conduct—instructions and admonitions “that come home to men’s business and bosoms”—conveyed in a style at once clear, terse, and full of energy. Though the maxims of Epictetus are not disjointed fragments of ‘hob-nailed philosophy’ presented in the form of proverbs, yet such is the pithy way in which they are stated, that the Epictetea are as readily seized, as quickly understood, and almost as easily remembered, as any proverbs outside the Old Testament. So simple are the precepts of this most benevolent of ancients, so faithful to nature is his picture of the human heart; so Christian are his sentiments in their lofty morality, and so universal in their application are his rules of life, that construing and comprehending the *Enchiridion*, go abreast with more ease and freedom than these operations are commonly attended with in the study of the ancient authors. As our Stoic was studied only by those who had views of entering Maynooth, or by those who prosecuted their studies in a school, the majority of the pupils of which entertained such expectations, he has fallen into complete oblivion here in Ireland, since the countenance of the Imperial College on the Rye was withdrawn. Now it is not too much to say that if the book which has occasioned the present notice, had seen the light a quarter of a century ago, Epictetus, instead of lying in the cold shade of neglect, would now be basking in the warm sunshine of scholastic favour and popularity.

It is gratifying to the admirers of the old Stoic Professor to behold even one Irishman mindful of obligations to him, and bringing from the treasures of a ripe and cultured intellect tribute to lay at the feet of his early preceptor. The Hon. T. Talbot; who has just recently evoked Epictetus from the limbo of the neglected ancients, and clothed him in a

rich and rare vesture of English poetry, may be presumed to have made his acquaintance with his author in an Irish school. For Mr. Talbot is an Irishman. He is one of that number whose name is legion, who in foreign lands have carved their way to eminence, and won for themselves power and position, a distinction from which faith, or blood, or both, had cut them off at home. From the yoke of office, and from the duties of Government in his adopted country (Newfoundland), this gentleman contrives to escape occasionally, and snatch some time in order to devote it to literary relaxation, and the only department of literary labour that can in strictness be called "a labour of love," namely, the courtship of the Muses. And his success and popularity in the commonwealth of letters are on a par with his political prosperity, if we may judge from the favourable criticisms that swell the welcome accorded to his latest work on the other side of the Atlantic. The press of Canada is loud in praise of the book, and, to our minds, rightly and justly. This book aims at more than does any volume of the ancient classics for English readers now issuing from the English press. Instead of an outline of the author, Mr. Talbot's book is a translation more or less strict; in place of compressing the *Epictetea*, it inclines rather to expand them, and instead of a dry summary or a marrowless abstract, it places before us a flowing poetical version of these beautiful maxims. Mr. Talbot was wise in selecting the poetic medium. We have the authority of Pope that verse is the easiest fitting garb in which to array moral truths. Truth in verse is truth transfigured and glorified. The *Epictetea* in heroic verse are neither more pagan nor less Christian than the "Essay on Man," to which poem the work under review bears a very marked resemblance. Indeed the new *Enchiridion*, as we are justified in styling this spirited reproduction by Mr. Talbot's muse, is the better book of the two. It contains numerous excellent practical rules of life, while the *Essay* is no more than a tissue of highly wrought sentiment, and of very beautiful and very fantastic conceits, shot with a very rare thread of Christian truth, but taking its prevailing colour from the cold uncertain light of Deistic philosophy. Where either poem diverges from the practical it will appear, as might be expected beforehand, as if the *Enchiridion* rises above the plain of the attainable, and the *Essay* sinks below the level of the merely sufferable. The superiority of the *Enchiridion* would be more conspicuous if anyone were to attempt to do that for the *Essay* which Mr. Talbot has not only attempted, but successfully accomplished, for the *Enchiridion*. He has tested and verified, and, as it were, checked

off the Epictetea almost one by one by appeals to parallel texts of Scripture. Almost every page of his book has its complement of foot notes referring to passages of the Old and New Testaments, confirming the pure and elevated lessons of the earnest, sincere, and benevolent Stoic. And yet the author, while giving us this choice bouquet of illustrations from revealed truth, assures us that he is far from designing to exhaust the mass of parallels which will inevitably suggest themselves to the attentive student of Epictetus. Anticipating the possible charge of irreverence in thus elucidating a system of what is accepted as heathen philosophy by comparison with the dogmas of Holy Writ, and in seeming to enforce the moral doctrines of the latter by the sanction and authority of the former, he proceeds to justify himself in these terms:—"I cannot see why the translator of an old book, or the commentator upon an ancient author, should not apply the doctrines and precepts of his ancient heathens to the touchstone of the Divine Word, and thus measure the merit or demerit, the price or worthlessness in a moral point of view, of these ancient volumes. Surely the nearer approach any one of these authors makes to the purity of moral, social, and natural doctrine, which is set forth in God's own Inspired volume, the closer must be the approximation he must necessarily make to excellence and perfection, and the more fit must he be to be placed in the hands of inquiring youth, to be by them read and studied. I have appended these references from two motives: the first was the personal satisfaction which I felt in showing forth the moral beauty of my author, and the second the sincere desire I entertain to see classical students employ this test in rating the relative merits of the authors they read in the course of their studies, thus rendering their study of the ancients and of their language auxiliary to a knowledge of, and intimate acquaintance with, Inspired writings. . . . Although every book and every system of morals must ever fall infinitely short of the Book of Life, and of the system of ethics therein contained, yet (as we find it in the Book of Ecclesiasticus) 'the wise man will seek out the wisdom of all the ancients' and 'he will keep the sayings of renowned men.'"

The question is debated—Was Epictetus a Christian; or, taking a lower ground, was he acquainted at all with the teachings of Christianity? We, for our part, fail to see the evidences for the very emphatic reply in the negative which the question has encountered in modern times.

Any one who reads Epictetus in the light of his age and surroundings, and with such insight into the spirit of the

Portico as he may catch from the scattered notices to be met in Cicero, or may reach by the study of Seneca, will hesitate to assent to so peremptory a denial. In the *Epictetea* we seem to discern unmistakably the light of the Gospel irradiating the darkness, and its mild spirit softening and engentling the ruggedness of stoicism. It may be that we dare not claim the author of the sentiments collected in the *Enchiridion* for a Christian; but we may venture to doubt if the bold assumption that he was utterly ignorant—as Brandis does not hesitate to maintain—of the doctrines of Christianity, reposes on sufficiently solid grounds. It must be premised that the *Enchiridion* is held to be the work, not of Epictetus—who is said to have committed nothing to writing—but of his friend and pupil Arrianus, whose life and literary labours reached well into the latter half of the second century. It professes to give a resumé of Epictetus's ethical doctrines, of which the great body are collected in the less known commentaries of the same writer. The book was published under the auspices of Antoninus. Now this circumstance would sufficiently explain the absence of explicit reference to Christianity. This emperor was an implacable persecutor of the Christians. He hated them on principle. He loved the state, and he was firmly convinced that the Christians were a danger to his empire. He regarded them as a political sect, a secret society. He never thought of inquiring into their tenets. He did not dream that they had any religious tenets. If they had, he could not be persuaded that these could be nobler or purer than his own. As little could he be persuaded that his own mind was thoroughly imbued with the morality of the Gospel. And yet we believe such was the case. He was the pupil of Epictetus, and we are convinced that the "philosophy" which he imbibed from his master was merely the vehicle which the latter employed to convey the higher morality of revelation. Was the world any better in the days of Marcus Aurelius than his *Meditations* should be expected to reflect more of the light of God's spirit and truth than had ever before, at any stage of the world, illumined heathen philosophy? We think not. The truth is, Epictetus had inculcated Gospel ethics into the minds of his pupils. He may have done this unconsciously, from the fulness of a heart impressed, though not convinced, by the doctrines of revelation now resounding throughout the world, and against which only kings and princes had shut their ears. Or he may have acted with design in thus leavening his philosophic discourses with Christian truth. In supposing the latter alternative, we suppose Epictetus to have been a Christian, but not a very courageous one. He may even have

been a theoretic, and yet not a practical Christian ; but we fancy that in those days the genus was rare. Nay, though he were both in intellect, and will, and act a devout believer, he may not have felt called upon, in his peculiar circumstances as a public lecturer, to parade that fact. He may have hoped to insinuate truth rather than force it. Before condemning his moral cowardice we should reflect that the martyrs themselves did not blindly rush upon their fate. They thought it time enough to avow their faith when their belief was called to the question. Origen, who in his early days invited martyrdom, has not been held up as an example for general imitation : nor, indeed, does he seem to have got much credit for his ardour, or to have deserved it, for the temper and quality of his peculiar enthusiasm. Cassianus's faith was unknown to the noble mother of Pancratius when she placed her precious orphan under his care. It was an accident that revealed to the quick sympathetic eye of the pupil, that the master of the very "mixed" school which contained a Pancratius and a Corvinus was a fellow-Christian. Epictetus was as little called upon as Cassianus to make the gratuitous avowal of the faith that was in him. The auditors of the former were politicians, sucking statesmen, bred up in the fear and hatred of the Christians. He may be pardoned if he suppressed the mention of the source from which he drew the pure morality of his lectures ; and all the more readily because he addressed himself, with better hopes of success, to introducing the precepts of the Gospel into his hearers' minds by the avenues open to the approach of philosophy. To avow the sources and sanctions of his doctrines would be to alarm the prejudices of his auditors, and to harden and close their hearts. So far, then, is the absence of allusion to revelation from affording a proof that Epictetus was unacquainted with Divine truth, we see that it supplies no tangible ground for assuming that he was not a Christian.

However, we do not go so far as to contend that he was ; but we are firmly convinced that he was deeply indebted to the truths of Revelation. Let us enter on the path of facts.

When Epictetus was delivering his lectures in Rome, he had for auditors and pupils Emperors and Princes : and, if for no other reason than the dictation of fashion, he must have gathered round his *cathedra* an auditory of all the learning and refinement that the imperial capital could boast. Now, at that period, the attitude of mind of the higher classes towards what paganism had to offer them by way of religious teaching was notoriously one of suspicion, silent defection, or open revolt. All the educated minds of the time that were not

plunged in atheism were only hesitating on the brink, and needed little to send them over the edge into the fatal abyss. All the upper classes were thoroughly depraved. Licentiousness had corrupted them to the marrow. The dry rot which had eaten into the foundations of their faith had started from their gross and brutal sensuality. To hold up to such men, in such times, such a noble ideal of virtue, its duties and practices, as we behold in the *Enchiridion*, required the courage of one who had imbibed some portion of the spirit of the Martyrs.¹ But it is the intrinsic evidences visible in his book that afford the strongest presumption in favour of the great influence of the Gospel on the mind of Epictetus. On every page of the *Enchiridion* the spirit of the new revelation—the spirit of mercy and compassion and love of kind—has inscribed itself. Genuine stoicism presents too hard a surface for Christianity to impress its divine image upon. The stern and unsympathetic system of the Stoa is never penetrated by a single ray of that compassionate tenderness for weak and erring human nature, which, like an emanation from a heart touched by the spirit of love and mercy, illumines the beautiful lessons of this old moralist—this Christianized, if not Christian teacher. At the time of which we are speaking, the voice of the Gospel had penetrated the nations, and was being reflected in men's commonest conversations. It would be a miracle of miracles if the schools alone were impervious to this all-pervading and resounding voice, if their discussions did not echo its tones. *A priori* then, we should expect to find in any work of the day, pretending to be a manual of Moral, an occasional gleam of truth penetrating the errors and shining across the darkness of its heathen disquisitions. The most cursory glance at the *Enchiridion* reveals the light of this divine truth clear and unmistakable, while the closest study of the book, an operation, thanks to the splendid services of Mr. Talbot, at once easy and delightful, will fail to discover the shadow of philosophic error on its pages. The darkness of Epictetus is not of the 'visible' kind. If there is paganism in the *Enchiridion*, it is transparent—an invisible essence of philosophy which acts as a solvent to convey and make palatable the lessons of the Gospel to an auditory prejudiced and reluctant. If there is an element of paganism in Epictetus, it is less obtrusive, and far less, infinitely less, pernicious than the insolent deism of Pope. In truth, many chapters of the *Enchiridion* read like so many taken from the "Imitation of Christ." No one would seriously argue, because of the absence of all mention of the Blessed Virgin's name from the "Imitation," that Thomas à Kempis was

¹ Domitian banished him from Rome : Adrian recalled him.

ignorant of the Christian doctrine respecting the devotion due to her. The author never intended his book to be a complete manual of devotional practices. It is just as rational to infer, from the absence of explicit reference to the Christians and their faith in the *Enchiridion*, that the author of that work never heard of the one, and was utterly ignorant of the nature of the other.

A comparison of the stoicism of Epictetus with the stoicism pictured in the pages of Cicero, and hardly, if at all, caricatured in Horace, will establish all that we contend for—the obligations of the *Enchiridion* to the Bible. We are ready to admit that the Porch, from Zeus to Marcus Aurelius, always came nearest to the standard of morality which Revelation has set up for the observance of mankind. Yet it must be said of the stoics, before Epictetus, that, with all their merits and their exceptional lights, they were, as far as we have the means of judging from second-hand or from casual notices, a harsh, narrow, and ungenial sect. They aimed at perfection, but it was an ideal perfection absurdly unattainable and equally undesirable and delusive, the apathetic complacent equanimity of the wise man "*totus, teres atque rotundus.*" With many noble ideas of duty, and many sublime truths concerning man's relations to his Creator, they mingled several tenets tending to encourage the grossest selfishness, and a tangle of errors touching the nature of the Deity, in which we can discover one akin to any and every form of intellectual delusion that has ever subjected and misled the mind of man. They seem not only to have jumbled the antagonistic systems of the Pantheists, the Manichœans and the Calvinists—or at least their essential errors, the akosmism of the first, the dualism of the second and the fatalism of the third—but to have surpassed the Manichœans, in absurdity and fanaticism, the Pantheists in extravagance and grossness, and the Calvinists in arrogance and intolerance. Widely different from the imperial power claimed for the cold abstraction called 'Wisdom,' and from the proud pretensions of the self-centred, self-sustained model of philosophic excellence, the

Vir bonus omne forum quem spectat et omne tribunal,

is the spirit of gentle patience, of mild endurance, of trust in Providence, of forbearance and forgiveness of injuries, of benevolence and love of our neighbour, the inculcation of which is the keynote of the Epictetea. This is the spirit of the Gospel and not the spirit of the Porch. The Stoic's patience was sullen indifference to, or insolent contempt for,

the opinions of men or the tricks of fortune. But Epictetus teaches patience with the spirit of Him who tells us, "Blessed is he who suffers afflictions in the spirit of patience." It is this benign spirit which, imbuing his mind, pervading his thoughts, and kindling his whole soul, forces one into the conviction that Epictetus was indebted to Christianity for his inspirations. He must have yielded at least an intellectual adhesion to the Gospel. Of him doubtless, as of many others, it has to be recorded that "the spirit was willing but the flesh was weak." The atmosphere of a court is not the best to develop the bud of belief into the fruit of works.

It is much to be regretted that Mr. Talbot, perhaps of all the moderns most qualified to determine it, has left the question of Epictetus' relations to Christianity as unsettled as he found it. Doubtless he did not care to embark on the troubled waters of controversy. He may be content to have successfully resuscitated an author who had died to most even of the students of the classics. We have no doubt but a second edition of this novel and valuable contribution to our classical literature will be speedily called for, and we may be permitted to hope that such an opportunity of taking this vexed question out of the region of speculation will not be lost. Of the structure of Mr. Talbot's book, which is peculiar and remarkable, we shall now briefly speak.

The chapters of the original, according to their purport, are grouped into sections, the metrical versions of the several chapters constituting as many stanzas of the section. Each section embracing its chapters or stanzas is prefaced by what the author terms "an Analytical illustration." This latter, while it serves for the argument or summary of the section, is to all intents and purposes a free and flowing translation in nervous and flexible prose. In this part of the design there is a temptation to sacrifice to the sin of word painting the native force of the vigorous language of the original, and we are glad to observe that Mr. Talbot has been proof against the vanity which besets and often misleads poets when handling the vulgar instrument of prose. A poet's prose, as a rule, is a very washy dilution in which the spirit evaporates most frequently. The specimen we subjoin is the argument to section 30, which embraces the sixtieth and two following chapters of the *Enchiridion*.

"In every department of life we should keep a strict watch over our spiritual interests, even as we would do with respect to our temporal concerns. Whatever we meditate, whatever we design, whatever we set about to accomplish, we should always keep a watchful eye on the nature, circumstances, con-

nections, and attributes of the thing thus designed and undertaken, in order that our movements may not be attended with fear or danger, and that the peace and harmony of our souls be not broken or disturbed.

“We should never be extravagant in our desires : even as the shoe is limited to the size of the foot, so should our desires be circumscribed by the extent of our wants. If our wishes once exceed our existing necessities, the mind loses its balance and becomes wrapt in uncertainty and confusion ; our desires grow apace, and become boundless in their aim ; and peace and happiness depart from our breasts for ever. Young females, instead of adorning their faces to attract the admiration of men, should cultivate the virtues of prudence, discretion, and modesty ; for, by these qualities *alone* they may be valued and respected, and not by the vanity of dress or the worse than idle indulgence of budding passion. The exercise of the virtues above named cannot fail to secure the general and lasting esteem of the good and wise, while fantastic dress and sensual coquetry can attract the gaze only of the insipid coxcomb or senseless buffoon.”

In the voluminous notes at the end of the book the author redeems to the full the ample promise of the title in the brief vigorous sketches which he supplies of the leading philosophic systems among the ancient Greeks.

We have space only for a short extract which we shall take from the graceful version of the ‘Golden Song’ ascribed to Pythagoras :—

“To honest aims let all thy actions tend,
 Truth, justice, peace, their purpose and their end.
 Let not thine eyes to balmy sleep be woo’d
 Ere thou hast thrice thy daily acts reviewed.
 Thus search thy heart,—how have I spent this sun ?
 What rules transgressed ? What duties left undone ?
 Each weak bad act reprove with fearless mind,
 And in the good enjoy a bliss refined.
 Such be thy practice, such thy labour here,
 In virtue’s path with soul resolved sincere ;
 And grace divine within thy soul shall grow,
 Wrought by the hand of him who bids to flow
 A fount perennial of essential joy,
 Of four-fold bliss unmingled with alloy.”

TWO CONFERENCES IN THE PRISON AT YORK
WITH FATHER WALPOLE, S.J., AN. DOM. 1594.
RELATED BY HIMSELF.¹

FATHER HENRY WALPOLE, S.J., the martyr, landed at Flamborough Head, in Yorkshire, Dec. 4, 1593, and within twenty-four hours was apprehended by Topcliffe the priest-catcher, and carried prisoner to York, where he remained till the 25th of February following, when he was sent to the Tower. In a letter written, while a prisoner at York, he says, "I have had various conferences and disputations with many of the heretics. And whereas I believed I should have been tried at the last assizes in this city, I sent in writing to the Lord President [the Earl of Huntingdon] all those conferences and disputations; who ordered me pen, ink, and paper for that purpose. To which I joined a large discourse on that treatise; in which I exhorted all to beware of false prophets, and to give ear to the voice of the holy Church, the spouse of the King, the house, the vineyard, and the city of Christ. One of the ministers complained of me much to the President for being so bold as to put down such things in writing, but he could not refute what was written; and, indeed, they seem to me to be much confounded. Blessed be Jesus, *Qui dat os insipienti, cui non possunt resistere sapientes.*"²

The following paper is either that which Father Walpole sent to the Lord President, or it consists of the notes from which he wrote it. The "Mr. Outlaw, who came up with their drinking," is mentioned elsewhere as one of the pursuivants. The names of Dr. Bennet and Mr. Goodwin appear amongst those of the York ministers, to whose sermons the Catholics imprisoned in York Castle were dragged in 1599, of which a curious account has come down to us from the pen of Mr. Richmond, a priest.³

The most interesting portion of these conferences is that in which Father Walpole speaks of Anglican Orders. He asserts their nullity plainly. "You have neither Orders nor sending;" and again he hits the blot exactly when he says, "Perhaps you have not yet learned the essence of your new Order. The essence of ours containeth power to offer the Body and Blood of our Saviour, and to remit sins." But when the minister Bell asserted that the Anglicans had Orders also, Father

¹ Public Record Office. State Papers; Domestic, Elizabeth, 1594. Vol. 248. No 51.

² Challoner's *Missionary Priests*, i., p. 344.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 423. The full manuscript is at Stonyhurst.

Walpole was naturally led to ask how his life could be in danger for having received the very Orders that they claimed to possess, and on being told that the difference consisted in the ceremonies of anointing and tonsuring, to exclaim, "Alas! Is that treason?"

For that treason Father Henry Walpole suffered at York, April 7, 1595.

JHESUS.

THE somme of all the conferences I have had with the ministers since my restraint.

Ffirst Mr. D. favour and Mr. Hardistie visited me. And Mr. hardistie acknowledged I had relieved him beyond the seas, &c., he proposed that we made the church the finall resolution of our faith.—whereas god should be.

W. It is a scole poynt which as yt semeth you do not well understand, ffor the learned Catholic teache God to be primam veritatem the first truthe whereunto we resolve. And so the question is of the proposition of our faithe and the infallible way to come to the truthe which we teache not to be each mannes fantasy or spirit but the church and pastors appoynted by god. To which he laboured to repley from the purpose and so D. favour acknowledged he missed the poynt and toke the speache out of his mouthe.

D. f. It is true the question is which is the true church and lawful pastors to teache us and deliver unto us the faithe.

W. That I can plainlie prove to be ours and not yours.

D. f. I knowe some of your profession, but you stand all upon the church, and have no respecte to scriptures teaching prayers to saints and such like withoutt warraunt of the Word of god.

W. The church is warrant owt of the Word of god, not to mislead us, but to be the pillar of truth, and she teacheth that doctrine. Besides we are bownden to kepe traditions by word of mowthe deliuered: and this hath all times bene a tradition. And besides it is evidently deduced out of the scripture, yea plainelye taught.

D. f. Ffor the church you do take parte with the wife and we with the husband. Traditions be not warranted out of god his word unlesse they be written.

H. And nowe or after hardistie said that place 2 Thess, as yf St. Pawle God said the same the same which I have spoken, I have written.

W. Our Saviour is not like a man that maie fall out with his wife. God forbid. He hath promised the contrarie. And

yt were a faatheles thought to think so, and then for it is not well said. And as for traditions they be evidently proved out of the 2 Thes 2: for it is siue a disiunctive coniunction, which must be true in every parte as yf a man should saie: you shall paie all you owe hyther either in monye or corne. It was not sufficient to paye hym his mony without corne. And yf he ought hym no corne that speach was frivolous which can not be imagined in the Apostle. And that there be traditions to be observed is manifest by scripture, reason, and all antiquitie.

D. f. That is a generall ground I will come to particulars. You praie to Saints which is against the word of god.

W. It is not.

D. f. It is against the mediation of Christ.

W. No more, naie lesse, then to desier them that lyves to praie for us.

D. f. They can not hear us.

W. Prove yt out of scripture.

D. f. Naie prove you they can.

W. It is your parte to prove yt. Having undertaken to shoue it is no tradition and that the churche teacheth amisse. But you can not. I then will prove they do heare us. The proves I thinck you haue seene in a littell treatise hereof which I will not repeate. And he wold not answer. But mentioning the honour of our Blessed Lady he said

D. f. God is no more to be honored by hir nor she is no more to be used to that end than this stoole.

W. Oh Mr. favour. What meane you to saie so of the mother of god. Doth not the honor of the sonne redound to his father and of the mother in respecte of the sonne redounde unto him, was not the hemme of Christ his garment touched with reverence by the faithfull and they were healed. And thinck you the mother of god in whose wombe and armes, and which was with him in his life, at the Cross, and nowe in heaven, is no more to be honored then this stoole. Salomon a figure of Christ set a throne to his mother and badd hir aske and haue which was a commendable and dutifull parte. And thinck you our Saviour dothe not according to the lawe honor his mother in heaven to whom he was servant on yearthe. We are bidden adore the fotestole of God which is the earth that is saithe St. Augustine earthe for of the flesh of the blessed Virgine beyng earthe he took earthe. And is the fotestole of god and of Christ no better then a stoole mad for you and suche to sytt on. And here Mr. hardistie (I thinck ashamed) tok the stoole awaie and set yt out of syght and put of his gowne and prayed.

D. f. It semeth a hard speache, but yet it is true. As yt is true that you are no more a kinge then this table.

W. The speaches is not like, ffor the blessed Virgine is blessed, and to be honored aboue all women and angelles. But neyther yete wold I be king nor like to be allthough much more capable therof then this table beyng men reasonable &c. And thus from the stole to the table we ended our talk at this tyme.

Mr. hardestie alone.

On fridaie at night he came and said he had preached. And that no man could remitt synnes.

W. What not Christ Jesus ?

H. No not he, as man.

W. Oh take heed of blasphemie. The Jewes indeede saide non but god could but our Saviour cured miraculouslye the sick of the palsy in profe that he could as the sonne of man, uppon earthe remitt synnes. And the faithfull glorified god that had given suche authoritie unto men. Loo to men. And therfor our Saviour sent his Apostelles as he was sente and gave them power that whose synes they forgave uppon earthe &c.

H. That power was God.

W. God gave them power and in his name they remitte.

H. Well this doctrine have I preached today. And that remission is meant of one neighbour that receyveth iniurie of an other.

W. Whi, thinck you, we may in charitie not forgeve our neighbours, as you see the Apostelles have authoritie to retayne.

H. Ther is but one prest one god and one iustifier.

W. Christ is said to baptize in St. John when his disciples baptize. And so he exerteth, saith St. Augustin, 1 7 de conditione mundj, his presthood when we offer and he geveth faithe and charitie and grace whereby we be iustified.

H. He lefte presthood he hathe forsaken, and tok hold o iustification and made a discourse affirming that a man is iustified before faithe, and after all.

W. That is the Justification a Turk or a Jewe hathe or one that hathe forsaken his father but a true member of Christ is farre otherwise iustified.

And here cometh upp Mr. Owtlawe with our drinkinge.

H. Well quod Mr. Hardistie I have preached of these matters this daie. And for that cause and to shewe the libertie of the gossell I would eate some fleshe. Have you not a pidgeon pye ?

W. I am sure though you will not obey the churchs lawe yet the Q. you will who forbiddeth pyes nowe; And St. Pawle saithe we must obey our princes lawes for conscience sake.

H. As far as is expressed in the word of god. But this is not.

W. Nor anie other lawe commonlye, but contened in the generall obligation to obey when they commaund net contrarie to the word of god. As Will Owlawe is bound to shutt the dore when his mother biddethe hym: and yf he did not he were a shrewd ladd. And yet this is not in the text, but honour your parents, in which this is conteyned. And so not to eat flesh, in the commaundment of obeying the quene and the church our mother. And Mrs. Owlawe she would allowe no pigeon pye that nighte.

D. Benet, Mr. Kinge, and Mr. Goodwyne came an other tyme.

K. We come to conferr. And first I would have you showe me by what authoritie you are a preste, and do offer upp sacrifice.

W. Before conference we must agree upp on some principles which you and I beleve, or elles our take will be in vaine. I addmitt all the written word of god, and in dowbtfull senses, the first ther of the consent of the church, the traditions therof, the consent of the fathers. And yf you stand only upp on your own fansye, as some do, how can I convince you?

K. We allowe this too.

W. I would you did, then we showld agree.

K. Well, to conferre upp on these generall grownds were too longe. Only to prove, and showe your presthode by any grownds how prove you yt.

W. Ffirst I prove yt by any grownd that you can prove your ministry. Naye more. And as you can prove the blessed Trinitie or equalitie of Christ against the Arrians.

K. You answeere me as Christ did answer the pharesies by an other question.

W. I am gladd I answer you like our Saviour. I know not how you should reioyse to be like the pharesies.

K. Well you can not prove out of the word of god your presthood.

W. Yes, as I have said: and yet to come to your request, I prove yt: Our Saviour in his last supper offered upp a sacrifice, after the order of Melchisedech, and gave his disciples power to do the same, and consequentye the prests of the church, therfor we have a presthood.

K. Consider first, you stand upp on Hoc facite two words,

and those reported onely by one of the Evangelists, which is a weik hold.

W. Whie the world was created with few words and receyved power to encrease in *Crescite et multiplicaminj.* And I hope you dowbt not but that which one evangelist writeth is true. And indeed yt seemeth not to want mysterie that St. Luke resembled by the Calf in Ezechiall, because as St. Hierome saithe he handleth the most our Saviours presthood of the new law.

K. Those words also can not conteyne power of offeringe because they be generall ffor I do not thincke they do signifie (sanctifye this), as some saie. But (do this) which is a generall speache, and not to sacrifice.

W. Though prophane Authors as Virgill et cet. and the scripture verie often take *facere* for *sacrificare* yet I will not stand with you. But take them as you will they prove my purpose.

K. That is straunge. I take them to signifie do this, which is a generall speach and signifieth not to sacrifice, no more then any other thinge.

W. I will shoue you the contrarie and so I toke a bok of the Cuppbord and laid yt upon the bord, and said to hym, do thus: Loo nowe in saienge this, I bidd you laye the boke upon the table because I did so before. So our Saviour offeringe his bodye, and saienge do this, badd them offer, and withall (as he is wont) gave them power and grace thereto.

K. These words pertaine to the people as to the prest: So saint pawle writeth them to the Corinthians, and saithe that they showld remember the passion of Christ which perteynethe unto all.

W. St. Pawle writeth institution wherin ech one hathe his parte, the people to receyve the prest to administer and offer. And it is evident that these words perteyne not so well, and fully to the people, as to the Apostelles and prests: ffirst because then you ministers shewe no warrant more to make and administer this sacrament then any man or woman, which were absurde. Next they be spoken to the xij aparte as our Saviour is wonte and is noted by the Evangelist when they be speches, and precepts belonging unto them. Thirdlye to blesse bread and geve, which is in the text, can not perteyne to the people and therefor not the words *Hoc facite* do this. And this is the interpretation of god his church and the practise therof.

K. Where then in the scripture have the people commaundment to receyve.

W. That they maie have in places that do not occurre to

my mynd. And yet out of this place they have too: for as when Christ badd his Apostelles baptize yt is understood and implied that the people shold be and suffer themselves to be baptized. So when the Apostelles gave the body they must receyve yt.

K. Well yet you have not proved that our Saviour did offer sacrifice.

W. I can not yet, hitherto being hindered by the dowbts in the waie. But that I might prove out of the text of St. Luke (Corpus quod datur) out of Malachias cleane oblation, Daniell his dailie sacrifice, the paschall lambe: the dyvrs sacrifices in leviticus figuringe this that you saie not I stand upon one prooffe, but I must bring but one proof at ones and therfor I saie he then did offer, after the order of Melchisedech, under the formes of bread and wyne, fullfilling that figure as David saithe. God hathe sworne, he is a prest for ever after that order.

K. Melchisedech did not offer, but bring forth and blessed Abraham.

W. The text is erat enim sacerdos, which beyng a coniunction causative, geveth a reason of the bringinge forth, because he was a prest, and therfor therein he exercised his presthood.

K. Enim is many tymes no Causative, but as muche as autem, and yt geveth a reason of the sentence followinge, as whie Abraham blessed, but this is a grammer question and the hebrew coniunction is et or autem.

W. Owt of grammer we learne the proprieties of words which is nowe the question, and when you can bring enim to geve a reason of the sentence followinge ones, yf you can bring yt ones I will bring xx places where yt geveth a reason of the sentence going before. And like your chief Grammarian, do describe this coniunction Causative, to geve a reason of the sentence going before, and not, not describinge any other as yf he had written his grammer purposelye against you, in this poynt. And for the hebrew which is *scilicet* as I take yt is after a causative. And Beza upon these words of the Ave Maria, Et Benedictus fructus ventris tuj, saithe Et here after the hebrew phrase is enim geving a cause whie the virgine was blessed. How muche more ought he and you to acknowledg yt to signifie enim when the translation receyved in god his churche these thousand yeres expresslye hathe (enim). And all the ancient fathers redd so, who understood hebrew: And besides the hebrew word for sacerdos signifieth sacrificium which is more playn yf you go to the hebrew.

K. I knowe not whither yt be sacrificium in hebrewe that I will learne: but the fathers do not read obtulit but protulit.

W. I prove yt out of sacerdos and enim and yet even that word to in the scripture is perteyninge to sacrifice in leviticus, &c. And St. Cyprian saithe Melchisedech obtulit panem &c. And St. Augustin Cap i 7. de civitate dej ca. ij^o &c. When then we see the sacrifice of Aaron to have ceased, and that to be offered every where nowe, which Melchisedech brought forthe when he blessed Abraham, who can dowbt of whom yt was said, Thou art a prest for ever after the order of Melchisedech.

Goodw. St. Augustin saithe that he brought forthe and that yt was bread and wyne. And you offer the bodye and bloud.

W. St. Augustin plainlie affirmeth that which is principally denied (that is) that we offeringe every wher bread and wyne, do ye rate the presthood of Christ, after the order of Melchisedech: And who dowbts, but our saviour beyng god, did offer nowe in truthé, that which Melchisedech did in figure. But the order and figure is nowe observed, and fulfilled manifestlye, whiles under the formes of bread and wyne, he offerethe his bodye and bloud.

Goodmā. Alleadged Byshop fisher, Thomas aquinas, and Bellarminus and others, that differed from me in matters of the sacrament, and in opposition of the text alledged.

W. Shewe me the places, and I will answer them. In the meane while yt maie suffice that I am assured that they agre with me in this poynte, and all others, that be matters of faithe or warr in thes dayes.

Good. You hould a plaine contradiction in the sacrament: saience that Christ his bodye is in many places, which is impossible and above nature.

W. It is no contradiction, but above the power of nature in dede. And yet not impossible to god, which in the fyve loaves, wrought a mirackell, so like unto this yf you compare them, and nothinge more. And in his owne bodye he did many things above nature as walkinge on the waters, risinge out of the sepulcher the stone not removed, ascendinge in to heaven, and penetrating them beyng hard, and comming unto his disciples the doores beyng shut.

D. Ben. The tyme is past, yt is now xij. Remember, what hathe bene obiected and consider in what state you stand. And as for the text of the doores beyng shut, that is in the preter tens that is Clausis (i.) when thei had bene shut and nowe were opened.

Goodmā. So you read that St. Peter had the gate of the prison opened by an Angell. And so might Christ have.

W. The miracle of St. Peter was, that the gats were opened by an Angell. The miracle reported by our saviour was that he cam in the dores beyng shutt, and therfor thei thought he had bene a spirite. And clausis, which had bene shut, signifieth that so thei remained still. As occiso homine dothe not signifie a man dead and alyve againe, but slaine, and dead still: ffar otherwise yf clausis beyng shut, and then were open, and be shutt, and so our saviour came in, clausis ianuis, the dores beyng open, and you do go herein apertis ianuis, that is when they be shutt. And so not our saviour but you do the miracle. Whiles I was thus speakinge of these things thei departed.

Some other things thei maie have said, but surelye I do not remember any word more of moment or substance.

The last conference with Mr. Bell, Mr. Remington, Kynge, Doctor favour and D. Benet, present the attorneie and others.

Thei tould me thei were come to conferre with me. I answered that thei were manie and reported learned and I one of the most unlearned prest of our societie, and in what uncertaintie of lif thei knewe. And then for sithence ther be manie sorts of Lutheranisme, Calvinisme, Brownisme, Arrianisme, Anabaptisme and others nowe in the world, I standinge in the possession of the Catholic faithe thought yt my best waie to take my blessed saviour his counsaile, who biddeth me beware of false prophets, as I had said the other daie unto D. favour (who even then came into the chamber) and because that hearing them I could not so well beware, unlesse thei could shewe me the warrant, and commission from god, wherby I might be ascertained that thei were no false prophets, I could not safelie heare them.

Heare thei all paused a good space, everie man doubtfull to speake, because he knewe he had no commission to shewe. At lengthe, Mr. Remington said, thei came to make a frendlie conference, and that this was to exclude conference. Thei added that he had bene my tutor in Cambridge, and wished me well. I said he had bene, and perhappes in some thing might be yet, but rather in logique then in divinitie wherin I have had most learned tutors in the Catholic church enstructed by the holie ghost. And how frendlie so ever it were yet importinge my salvation and others, my saviours counsaile seemed best unto me which I meant to followe, and to stand in possession of the truthe, and catholic church, and to beware of them.

Here again all paused a good while. And at length Mr. Bell who latelie out from us at the dore did now endevoire to get in to deceive me, by the windowe thus.

Bell. I will take your owne wordes (quoth he) you saie you stand in possession of the truth. I prove no. Your possession must either be materiall, formall, or mixed. But yt is neither, ergo &c.

W. You have not yet showed your commission to prove or preach, not beinge sent by god. And though I nede not answer you, but beware, for yf every man should make himself subiect to defend all obiections, a more learned false prophet might deceive hym. But Christ biddethe me beware, and indeed had I not had confidence more to discover them, and desire to satisfie as ffarr as I might, I would have stood ther uppon yet quod I to see what you can saie. We have bothe the materiall, and formall possession too, though the materiall suffice to exclude you which have neither.

The materiall is the pastor, and the sacraments which in deed you had when Luther and Calvin beganne and so have still. But the formall, which is the true doctrine: you have not, which I prove thus.

I nede not admitte your further proof, the materiall possession dothe suffice to exclude you which have neither. And this was my saviour his meaninge saienge thei should come saienge loo here is Christ that is the formall. But go not out from the materiall: And indeed yt is most absurd to saie, theie maie be severed, ffor in materiall things, matter is not without forme, and the alteration of the materiall in to an other formall distroiethe the subiecte, so the soule which is the formall departinge from the bodye the materiall is deathe and dissolution. But the churche is the bodie of Christ. Tak then from the pastores the truth, sever from the bodie the head, Christ, and the holie ghost the soule, and what do you but dissolve Christ his mysticall body, which in St. John his epistle is the verie mark of Antichrist, Qm. solvit illum, but yet I saie too that we have the formall.

Bell. In the matter of matrimonie, you have changed the matter of the sacrament, which your selfe teache non can do but Xpt., ffor matrimonie, which was lawful mariag before the counsaile of Trent, and is yet in England, is not in Rome. And so that which is in one place a sacrament and which any wher was: Now at Rome is not. Therfor you have not nowe the true Apostolike doctrine and so not the formall possession.

W. I denie all your profs: for though yt be true that Clandestine mariage is nowe no sacrament at Rome and other places which have receyved the holie counsaile and yet is in

England and was before the Counsaile, yet yt followeth not that the matter of the sacrament is altered: ffor the matter of the sacrament is a lawfull contracte which is so here, though yt be¹ but is not so when the law of the church is receyved which hath the power to add that qualification to the contracte, without which against the lawes yt can not be lawfull.

B. Certaine yt is you have changed the matter for the same which is a sacrament in England is none in Rome, which was one there before the counsaile.

W. This is not so, ffor that which is a sacrament here is so reputed at Rome. And those Clandestine mariags which were befor the Counsaile, be still reputed to continue a sacrament. But yf they were nowe contracted in Rome, thei should not be the same, because the unlawfulness of the Contract repugnant to the churches lawe maketh a difference: for though yt be not necessarie the self same bread be to make the sacrament of the alter, yet yt must be bread, and so this must be a lawfull contracte. So he let this argument fall.

B. Well certaine yt is you ones departed from the Apostolicall doctrine for the pope dispenseth in matrimonio rato and other matters de iure diuino, which all the Canonists saie is about his power. And to this end he cited dyvrs authours and last Thomas Aquinas.

W. When you cite Authors, that be not verie well knownen, you must shewe the boks and places to have answer. Also to make your profs good, you must prove the pope to decre that as an article of faith which is false, which you can not do. And as for St. Thomas, I am assured these be not his words. And therfor for triall I praie you set downe the place, and words, and so I toke my penne, and ynck.

B. Thei be in a parte.

W. What be the words.

B. Surelie the words I have forgotten.

W. Oh then. Whie did you cite them even nowe. You se that it is good to have the author to loke uppon ere we answer. Whie cite you not the word of god, which you pretend that I have, but we heare not a word of that. Thinck you thus to make me yeld the possession of the truthe. Well now will I, yf you please, prove that you entrude, or have nothing to prove or preache or obiecte as you have done.

B. I will answer you.

The other made difficultie, yet at lengthe thei bad me to obiecte, and thei would answer. Ffirst then I am to prove that I am to beware of you, because you have no warrant to preache for you have no lawful orders nor sendinge.

¹ Blank in original.

B. We have both.

W. You derive all from Cranmire here and from Luther and Calvin who had both their orders from us Catholics. Ergo.

B. I grant, and so do all learned men, that we take them of you.

Then they be either the same that ours be or different: Whatsoever ever you say you condemn your own orders.

B. They be the same that yours be.

W. First this is otherwise than doctor favour did, who claimed by an extraordinary sending from God, as St. John Baptiste.

Secondly it is against Calvin your Christ and first Author, who saith that our orders be not good or lawful.

B. Calvin was a learned man, but in this I follow him not.

W. Whom do you agree withal. Thirdly it maketh for me, for how can't be treason, or trespass in me to take the same orders that you have.

B. Though you take the same, yet you add other things, as Ointing, shaving, and such.

W. Alas is that treason: Might you not as well condemn the Christendom you received of us for treason, saying therein was Ointing, and other Ceremonies which now you do leave out in Baptism. But either yours or ours do differ in essence or substance. Yea or no.

B. They do not.

W. Then you see we may take ours without offence, for things not essentially may be wanting. But this I speak and shew even by your selves that our orders be good, and yours bad, for they differ in essence. What is the essence of yours.

B. That I need not assigne. You must prove and not aske.

W. Perhaps you yet have not learned the essence of your new orders. But I prove the essence of ours containeth power to offer the body and blood of our saviour and to remitt synnes. Ours be a sacrament. The matter of ours is the giving or receiving of a yoke &c. Have you this power, sacrament, and matter.

B. You say you have this power and sacrament, but you have yet not. And here he made a discourse at large, how all was depraved, so that you have depraved your orders, and took them to be otherwise than they were.

W. In which speeches, being many absurdities, and contradictions, as that ours should be depraved, and theirs not, which flow from ours: That they should be so essentially different and yet the same: That they would claim to preach by that commission which they break, and make void and

which sheweth all the works of Antichrist in false prophets upon ther foreheads. As to be gone out, unconstant, bringe in newe sects and doctrine, to be proved, disobedience, disagreeings, out of unities with the hole church, not consenting with the humble. All which, and many other works in the scripture being manifestly set upon Luther and Cranmeres foreheads, by the verie orders, and Commission to preache which thei claime from the church that they impugne, and so were not only taken and had of us doubtfull but to be esthmed as heretiks condemned by ther owne mouthes and iugments yet I replied upon his words and said Then should yt follow that the pastors and hole church of god did abuse the verie sacraments which is against the promise of Christ, and assistance of the holie ghost.

B. Yt doth not followe for though all the priests and pastors did deceyve you, ther might be many of the church which beleve aright.

W. The people are to be taught by the pastors allwais. And therfor yf the pastors erred the people must consequently erre also.

B. That order is not alwais necessarie.

W. It is the express commandment of god, who in the 7th to Ephesians is said to have put pastors and teachers to the ende of the world lest we be carried about with everie winde of vaine doctrine.

B. That is the best place you haue, and indeed yt troubled me longe.

W. I hope yt will trouble you againe—but we have manie to the same end.

B. Well, yet it is not ment ordinarilie but some tymes, other meanes maie be used, as when they did err Luther might departe.

W. It is the meanes which god appointed to that end lest we be carried upp and downe with diurse blasts. God his meanes be sufficient and be allwais to be used, and especially when these blasts do arise, as nowe in this tyme. We must heare our pastours, and leane to the pillar of truthe, the church. Neither must we departe from our pastours, and materiall possession, for them which departe and pretend the formall (that is true doctrine), but we must tarye with our pastours, and these shall kepe us from suche blasts of vaine doctrine. And hell gats shall not prevaile against the church.

B. Here Mr. Remington seinge Mr. Bell somewhat troubled with these places, tok the matter and said, that all those promises were conditionall, ffor the like wer made to the Jewes, who yet notwithstandinge have erred, and left ther temple

and lawe. And so thei be meante so longe as the church dothe obeye Christe, for the hearers maie have sometymes chaster eares then the prayers.

W. So maie be in some place, where false prophets preache, but in the hole church yt is impossible: ffor nowe we be not under Moises but Christ our head, and the holie ghoste leadeth into all truth. And all the promises in Christ is Est, saithe St. Pawle, that is fulfilled. Nowe then all nations be blessed in Abraham's seede and he put as Esaie saithe his spirit in the mouthe of the church, and in the mouthe of his seed, and pastours, for ever. And the prophete noteth this difference, betwene the Synagoge, and the church, spouse, kingdome, and bodye of Christ, ffor saithe Ezechiell gentem

¹ nō amittet Daniel Regnū eius nō dissipabitur.
² as in the daies of Noie. I swear I would bringe no more the deluge, so he will nowe no more rebuke his spouse or diemisse hir, with an other alteration. But multi filij desertæ magis &c. hir children be farre manie moe then those of the Synagoge, wherby you teache the Ceremonies of the Synagog be more glorious then the church of Christ, ffor the Jewes have ever had som openlye professinge Jūdaisme even nowe in the dispersion, since Christ. And you make the church invisible manie hundred years, making the blessing of Christ more base then the curse of the lawe, coveringe the cite uppon an hill and puttinge the Candell under a bushell invisible.

K. Then next Mr. Kynge at a pynche, and said that in Antichrist his tyme, the church should be invisible, and therefor those promises were not absolute.

W. Naye not even in Antichrist his tyme shall yt be invisible, much lesse so longe befor.

K. Your own Remists in their nots uppon the testament do say that yt shall.

W. They do not.

K. It is certaine they do, and so said Dr. Benet and others.

W. I assure myself yf they did (but indeed loking sence uppon the boke I fynd yt cleane contrarie, and that the church shall then be knowen both to hir friends and enemyes: They speake in suche sense as St. Hyppolitus describeth that masse shall not be openlie said, as nowe in England many do saie masse privatlye, and I would gladlie in this chamber, wherto I do professe my faithe before you.

K. Well the Remists be against you in this.

W. That must be tryed by the boke (which is flatte against them), but how so ere it wer, yt is nothings for you, which

absurdly make the state of the church for a small space in Antichrists raigne, the same for a thousand years in the raigne of Christ.

K. Whi Antichrist his raigne was even in St. John his tyme, as it is cleare in his epistell the words be *Audistis quia Antichristus veniet. Nunc Antichristi multi facti sunt.*

W. Those words be against your fantasy, for you se putts a difference betwix multi and Antichristū. And proveth the great one is comminge because his littell fore runners be come. As yf a man should saie my Lord Archbeshop is comminge, for behold here is one of his chaplings. And you knowe that in Daniell and the Apocalips Antichrist his raigne is described to be thre yeres and a half, by yeres dayes and monethes, and they shall be shortened saith our saviour. And the Jewes shall receyve him, St. Pawle calleth hym the man of perdition. And howe can you drawe this short tyme, and one man, to all the tyme sithence Christ, and to so many men.

K. We saie, he is one bodye, and many members, and this text is, that he is come, and therfor against you.

W. This proposition is your fantasie, and against all interpreters that be ancient, and against the place I have alleadged: But Mr. Kinge do you remember the Greek whither it be presentence or preterperfectence.

K. I thinck yt be the present tense.

W. Whi then you saie he is not come but comminge, as I said of my Lord Archbishopp.

Kyng. It is the preter tense (which is false) I am sure, for in the english translations which I redd, so yt is, he shall come (which is all together against him).

W. Well the text must be sene, and beyng even what you will yt is against you for the meaninge must be he is come, not in person but in his forerunners as Elias in St. John Baptist, or Christ in the prophet. And besids you be noted to be those Antichrists, and so the great one too, in the verie words following. *Ex nobis exierunt sed non erant ex nobis, nam si fuissent ex nobis mansissent utiq. nobiscum.* Loo goinge out is the very proper mark of Antichrist, as yt is confessed, you went out from us. And here Mr. Belle tok his leave of the companye, and left us, and went his waie out the dore.

D f. Then D favour tok the matter and said that in the 4th chapter it was cleare that Antichrist was in St. John his tyme. *Hic est Antichristus de quo audistis quoniam venit, Etiam nunc in mundo est.*

W. It is cleare to the contrarie, for *venit*, he is comminge hym self in mnndo yf in his forerunners, so Christ was seene

from the beginninge in signe and vertue, but afterwards in deed. So St. John is Elias, 2 7. and yet Elias venturus est, et restituet omnia, saithe our saviour. And in deed I fear, nowe by hakket, and such like, that Antichrist is nere at hand.

D. f. It is a monstrous error of Elias, that he should come, for our saviour saithe he was come and St. John was he.

W. It is but your fancie to saie so, for all the fathers expound yt otherwis. And the text is plaine. St. John is come in spu. Elias but venturus est in persona for St. John shall not come againe. And so the prophet Malachie describeth Elyas comminge before the terrible daie of Judgment, not the meeke daie of redemption. And the Apocalips saithe, the two witnesses shall come, and make it shall not raigne alluding to Elyas praier, in the tyme of Achab and Jesabell.

f. And here D favour brought furthe a bull which was sent to the Irish men by the pope.

W. Toplif have showed me that allridie, it is directed to Irishe men. And so they went away.

Benedictus deus in secula.

*Dom. Eliz. State Papers, Vol. 247, No. 21—1594 :
Public Record Office.*

Right Hon: I know not, my good Lord, whether my Lord President of the North have signified unto your LL^{ps}. and the rest of her Ma^{ty}s. Privie Counsell our proceedings with those 3 p'sons taken at their arrivale at Flambroaghe or not: Father Wallpoole y^e Preest Jhezewt [Jesuit—H. F.] A younge man his brother, a soldyer under Stanley, & Lyngen a soldyer vnder him also. Bvtt for many convenient regards I thought my dewty that her M^{ty}. may by your L^{ps}. have some inking, by yo^r. Lo. (to whome her High^{ns}. chiefly referred me in this my travell) to signify how farre wee have digged into the hartts of too of these vnnaturall trato^{rs}—the Jhezewt Preest, and Lyngen. By the incredible toyle day and night of y^e Lord President himselfe: for his Lordshipp in wisdome fyndinge the 3rd persone a young man of amyble disposytion & not so farr gyven over in y^e poyntz of cyvell honestye as the other too, y^e Jhezewt & Lyngen, his Lordshipp applyed him himselfe with Godly p'suasions, himselfe and y^t. day and night, and then applyed him with the labour of his Chaplain Mr. Doct^r. Favour, a very milde devyne, well known to my Lord of Buckhurst. That after the younge man Wallpoole once hadd grace to knowe that offence he had comytted to God in his disobedience & cunnige to her [*fol. MS. obliterated*] to serve them, to

serve his idolatrous hewmour. Then all trewth, secretts and matter even against himselfe, and the other two, the Jhezwt & Lyngen, flowed from him as fast as his Lo^p. culde or can imadgen qwstyons. Lyke & more yn lyke to proove very geratly [greatly] to do her M^{ty}. highe service, thus much beinge falllen ovt from hym alreddye.

First the Jhezwt & Lyngen bee so farre gyven over in poperye & so thereby bownde to disloyaltye, that they wold nether of them utter or confesse any one letter eather delyvered them, or browght over by eather of them, or by younge Wallpoole, or one cipher, mark, noate, toaken, dyrection, or message, for any purpose But salutations by worde of mouthe from one friende to another the Jhezwt avowed so, & Lingen upon y^e [MS. illegible one word—H. F.] But after my Lo. had so paynfully laboured younge Wallpoole. But younge Wallpoole the fyrst tyme he was examined before mee with a good consyence (as one might well judge) confessed that his brother the Jhezwt did delyver to him to keepe vj small peeces of p'chment wrytten uppon lyke to these fyxt in the margin . . . And a packett of letters & dirèctions seeminge to bee about

The very orygenals, his Lop. will send by mee, they be not fitt to be hazarded nor the Lres.

xii and iij p'chments to Lyngen. The p'chments bee cutt in halfe, That whoever hereafter sholde fly over with these noates to Dunkyrke havinge ij of them, or to Newport havinge j of the greatest he should be receaved, and any thinge that he sholde bringe with him to eyther of these places, or any person that should cum with him without damadge, stopp, or loss.

The finder confessed that besides these xij Lres. delyvered to him by his brother y^e Jhezwt, the Jhezwt did at Dunkirk in his chamber before him reade to himselfe (y^e Jhezwt) iij or v. other letters & burned them, and one letter the Jhezwt polled in peeces, but still disperantly lyke Devills of nether faythe, loyaltye, & honesty the Jhezwt & Lyngen denied any suche, thoughe broade spetche were revealed to them to trye their desperate spyretts.

Wallpool & Lingen & Mr Topliffe Wallpoole over-toke Cahill at Callais. [A short sentence follows in French, almost impossible to make out—H. F.]

Hereupon the Lord President sent younge Lingen & y^e Jhezwt seweyd [? seaward] to rest. And young Wallpoole to proove his honesty, his Lo^p. putt well guarded to the sea syde, if he colde fynde y^e place wher hee hadd with his dagger cutt vp a sodd verry neare a fyrr boshe [fir bush—H. F.] & buried his xij L^{res}. as the Jhezwt had directed him And by y^e younge Wallpoole a trusty servant of my Lords, was browt to y^e sodd, & y^e servant tooke upp the bundell all wyett [wett—H. F.] wth rayne, & brought them home to Yorke to his Lop.; whych mayde him leape for joye.

Presentlye his Lord^p. delyv^d. them to mee, and before a fyer, my Lo^p. & I so tenderly handled y^e same, that wee unfowlded xxij letters & directions w^{ch} were every one : and in all those xxij no one tyttill blemysht.

And before younge Wallpoole did goe to the conney [rabbit warren—H. F.] for y^e Lres, hee hymselfe for y^e first prooffe delyvered to my Lorde ye vi labels or prevate marks above fyxed.

By this your Lops. may shew vnto her sacred M^{tye} how God blesseth her highness with the utteringe of that w^{ch} I see will torne to her Highnesses service for discovery of disloyal men & women bothe abowt London, in sondrie countree in England, & deeply in Ireland, and her Ma^{tye} shall see what a Toyllinge [toiling—H. F.] Lord President can do by day & night labor in this, wherof I am an eye witness, & not one of his Councell.

After his Lordship hadd gotten this laght [light—H. F.] he glanced at this Jhezewt, so that he confessed to ix of those labels or p'chment marks, wherof vi delivered to his brother y^e younger man, & iij delivered to Lingen, w^{ch} Lyngen yet shamefull and trator lyke deniethe, lyke an Athest.

Now hathe his Lordship digged out of that hollow harted Jhezewt, that y^e intent of the use of those p'chments was (as his brother confessed honestlye vpon his goinge & findinge them), for any to passe that hadd them.

Then also is founde about the Jhezewt, a bracelett of gwolde flagon fashyon, & vpon the lape a cypher or mark of armes that will bewray the sender in Spayne or in the Low Countrys, and to whome itt was sent, in dis-
 pight of the Jhezewt.

A ring with a seale of armes thereon engraved fayre ancyeat coatts (if not disperdged¹ [dispersed] wth treachery to the soveryne of the owner) that cannot bee hidden for I wold prove a Harrold. A wedding ring the Jhezewt is trusted with for another, & Jhezewts be farr and deeply trusted by Catholick popish women.

Much more lyethe hydden in theis too lewde p'sons, the Jhezewt & Lyngen which wytt of man geveth occasion to bee suspected that labour of man without funder athorytye and conference than his Lordsp. hath here, can never be digged out.

And therefore as it is most honorable for her Ma^{tye}s fayme yt this thinge which hath been gotten out by his Lo^p. with fayre Counsell and labour & conversyon of the sowle & body of younge Wallpole, so the Jhezewt & Lyngen must be dealt

¹ Sic in original.—H. F.

with in some sharper sort above, and more will burst owt than yett, or otherwise can be knowen, yett doe I more in this servyce than ever I did in any before, to her Ma^{ty}s benefit both of stayt & pursse. And so I beseech your Lop^s to shew to her M^{ty} [a word torn out—? “ & Council”] that the woorst affected subjects in the north gaze & [word torn out] after the justice & doings of her Ma^{ty}, and the Lord President sittinge in her seat as her Justice. The countenancing of whome in this & lyke services in these partts, will make Trators appalled. And so must I saye with all trewth & humylitie to her Ma^{ty} at my returne, when she shall vouchsafe to hear me; or els I shall not dischargd the oathe I have avowed to her Ma^{ty}, nor ye dewty of a trewe Englyshman; And so wearyinge yo^r Lo^{ps} with my tedjousnes; but so muche the playner, which you may abridge at y^r pleasure, I ende with all dewty. At Yorke where I will be a lytell further—the 25 of January, 1593.

Your Lo^{ps} ever at commdenent

RYC : FOX LYFFE :

Postscript.—His L^p is not privie hereunto. My Lord President still laboreth younge Wallpole and getteth contynually, as y^e younge man can remember. About the ende of this tearm I shall wayt uppon y^r Lo^{ps}; before which tyme I hope her Ma^{ty} will comande for y^e. Jhezewt and Lyngen, to bee sent for vpp. for to utter that woorte knowinge, for great is the opynyon among all Papists here of Wallpool the Jhezewt.

To the Right Hon. Sir Jhon Puckeringe,
Knight, London, Keeper of the Greate
Seale of Englande.”

N.B.—Three little slips of parchment are affixed to the letter. It may be remarked that the writing and spelling of the original are very bad. The wretched Topcliffe was an ignorant man, as well as a bad writer. Some words puzzled even the experts at the State Paper Office.

H. FOLY.

28 May, 1873.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Vindiciae Alphonsianae, seu Doctoris Ecclesiae S. Alphonsi M. de Liguorio, Episcopi et Fundatoris Congregationis SS. Redemptoris Doctrina Moralis Vindicata a pluribus oppugnationibus Cl. P. Antonii Ballerini, S. Jesu, in Collegio Romano Professoris, cura et studio quorundam Theologorum e Congregatione SS. Redemptoris. Romae, ex Typ. Polyg. S. C. de Prop. Fide, 1873.

III.

THIS Defence of the Moral Theology of St. Alphonsus, the preface and introduction of which have been already noticed, is divided into eight parts, and terminated by four appendices. The first part discusses with Father Ballerini the General Moral System of the Holy Doctor, and the other seven parts the whole course of objections grouped into their respective sections. Thus, Part II. treats of Human Acts, in eight questions; Part III. of the Commandments, in sixteen questions; Part IV. of the Mass, in three questions; Part V. of Penance, in twenty-four questions; Part VI. of Relapses, in two chapters; Part VII. of Matrimony, in eight questions; Part VIII. of Censures, in nine questions. As to the appendices, the first is an Index or Conspectus of the whole work; the second is a Reference to the Acts of the Doctorate; the third is a Key to the Terminology of the Saint; and the fourth is a Catalogue of the many points of doctrine in which Father Gury himself recedes from his master's teaching. Into the particular disputations of the "Vindiciae" we shall not enter, but simply commend them to the consideration of the studious reader. The first more general and more important part will, therefore, engage our attention in this our third and last notice of the "Vindiciae Alphonsianae."

The subject matter of the disputation is the Moral System of St. Alphonsus, so far as it relates to that fertile source of systems—Probability. The Vindicators declare their Founder's system misunderstood and misrepresented by the Objector, although in this case from no unfriendly motive, but rather from love of fellowship unwelcome to them, he being himself what he would have the Saint—a pure and simple Probabilist, they upholding him as the very author of their own system, Equi-Probabilism. The Vindicators thus show themselves determined or obliged to give their adversary no quarter, since his very agreement they find objectionable, and demonstrate untenable, clearly considering it at the outset an open contor-

tion of the Saint's teaching, and by no means a concession of the Professor's. It is evident, moreover, that they consider this objection particularly intolerable as injurious to their own teaching, and universally to the entire Moral Doctrine of St. Alphonsus.

Five may be said to be the principal and general systems of Probability: *i.e.*, Rigorism, Greater-Probabilism, Equi-Probabilism, Less-Probabilism, and Laxism. The Vindicators maintain that the third of these systems—the central, and, in their opinion, the perfect—is the system of St. Alphonsus, and the Objector against them holds that the Alphonsian system is his own—the fourth, namely, generally known as Probabilism. The controverted point is clear, and clearly a question of fact, to be decided by documentary evidence in great part; and, consequently, this first part of the “*Vindiciae*” might be said to have been written by St. Alphonsus himself, so many and copious are the quotations from his works which it contains.

The system of Equi-Probabilism is thus briefly, in the first place, summarised by the Vindicators:—I. When the existence or extension of a law or right is doubtful, we may adopt the negative opinion then only when it is equally, or almost equally as probable as the positive; because, in a real doubt concerning the existence of a law, liberty of action is in possession. II. When the abrogation of a once certain law or right is doubtful, we may adopt the positive opinion then only when equally, or almost equally as probable as the negative; because in a real doubt concerning the cessation of the law, the law is in possession. III. In doubts of fact, when there is danger of harm being done which we have no right to allow—as, for example, in matters of Faith and the Sacraments—the safer opinion must always be followed, for then the use of Probabilism is forbidden by certain law. In fewer words: to be excused from the observance of a doubtful law, its non-existence must be equally, or almost equally as probable to us as its existence. This is Equi-Probabilism. The first chapter undertakes to prove the Thesis in a general way, and gives us, amongst many others, the following quotations from the writings of St. Alphonsus: “That our actions may be prudent, it is absolutely necessary that our opinions should be solidly probable—that is to say, grounded on a good foundation.” This he explains: “A truly probable opinion is only that one which rests on internal and external grounds, secure or almost as secure as those which sustain the contrary, so that the law may appear certainly and strictly doubtful.” And further: “When the opinion for the non-existence of the law is equally, or almost equally as probable as the contrary, then the exis-

tence of the law is strictly doubtful, and, consequently, the observance of that law is not of obligation." So much for Equi-Probabilism. Now let us hear what St. Alphonsus thought of Probabilism. In 1769 he wrote as follows: "As to whether it be lawful to act on a probable opinion there are three teachings, the first of which is that any one may lawfully follow the less probable of two opinions, the clearly more probable of which is for the law. This doctrine was almost commonly taught by the writers of the last century; but we say that it is lax, and may not lawfully be embraced." And again: "Whenever it is evident to the understanding that truth is far more for than against the existence of the law, the will cannot prudently and justly embrace what is less safe: for, in this case, a man would not act trusting to his own judgment and belief; but rather, by his will, he would do violence to his understanding to force it away from what appears to it very likely, and oblige it to accept what does not seem true—nay, what it judges destitute of all certain grounds of truth. Here we may apply the Apostle's words: 'All that is not of Faith is sin.'" (Rom. xiv.). From like objections he defends Equi-Probabilism: "When there is an equally probable opinion for the non-existence of the law, then there remains no probability at all, or reason capable of captivating the consent of any prudent man, either for or against the law; for, from those equal probabilities, nothing but a mere doubt results whether the law exists or not. St. Thomas clearly teaches this: 'Our understanding is differently affected by the two points of a contradiction: sometimes it is not drawn more towards one than towards another, either from a want of motives, as in those problems in which reasons are not to be discovered, or on account of a seeming equality of opposite motives, and such is the condition of one in doubt, fluctuating between the two points of a contradiction.' And the same Saint teaches elsewhere more briefly: In an equality of reasons and arguments there is only room for a doubt. . . . Hence, as regards our controversy, in which two equally probable opinions are discussed, it cannot be said that a probable knowledge of the law is a sufficient promulgation thereof, for it is but the promulgation of the doubt, or mere hesitation, whether the law exist or not. It happens thus that when two opinions of equal authority are opposed, neither of them is weighty in the case." The same doctrine is further thus inculcated by the Saint: "When the opinion for the existence of the law is certainly the more probable of the two, then although the law is not quite certain, nevertheless, on account of that greater probability, the opinion favoring it appears morally

truer; and, consequently also, the law itself would seem morally or sufficiently promulgated; therefore the law cannot then be held entirely and strictly doubtful, some vague doubt only remaining insufficient for a departure from the safer opinion. But if the opinion against the law's existence be equally probable, then there is a real strict doubt concerning the existence of the law, and, consequently, as we have shown, it cannot be binding."

The second chapter is an historical demonstration of the Equi-Probabilism of Saint Alphonsus, maintaining against Father Ballerini that this system was *always* that of the holy Founder from the time he first embraced it, instead of the Rigorism with which his education had imbued him. Here, then, we are supplied with quotations from the Saint's writings from 1749 to 1785, interesting not only for their direct bearing on the question of Probabilism, but also as indicative of the immense labours of the Saint for Christian faith and morality, and demonstrative of his claims to that sacred Doctorate which now is his.

In 1749 Saint Alphonsus wrote—opposing Rigorism, be it well remarked, and favoring Probabilism in a general sense:—"Our Theologians deny that the greater probability extinguishes the less, if the excess be not remarkable."

In 1755, engaged in a like cause: "We say that our doctrine, namely, that it is lawful to adopt a probable opinion against a more probable one, is morally certain."

In 1762: "We say that it is not lawful to adopt the less probable opinion when the contrary, for the law is certainly and notably more probable It appeared to me the doctrine upholding the opinion equally probable was morally certain, influenced by the principle here demonstrated, that a doubtful law cannot impose a certain obligation."

In 1764: "We say that it is not lawful to act in accordance with an opinion certainly and greatly less probable than the contrary for the law We say that it is most lawful to follow an opinion equally, or almost equally, probable for the non-existence of the law; because then the law is truly and strictly doubtful, and it is a certain principle that a doubtful law cannot impose a certain obligation."

In 1765: "The opinion against the law cannot be followed, when the preponderance for the law is much and certain (and I explain myself: as long as the opinion is doubtfully less probable, it is always equally, or almost equally probable; on the contrary, when the opinion is certainly less probable, I

conceive it then to be notably less probable); because then the less safe opinion cannot be judged certainly probable, nor can the law in such a case be said to be strictly doubtful; but when the preponderance is slight and doubtful for the opinion favorable to the law, then the contrary opinion may truly be judged probable by the axiom: *Parum pro nihilo reputatur*, and the opinion for the law is then strictly doubtful."

In 1767: "I say that it is not lawful to follow a less probable opinion, when the contrary opinion for the law is notably or certainly more probable: I say *or certainly*, for when the opinion for the existence of the law is certainly, and, without any hesitation, more probable, then of necessity that opinion is *notably* more probable. And in that case the safer opinion will be no longer doubtful—meaning strictly so—but will be morally certain or almost so; at all events it can no longer be judged strictly doubtful having, in its favor certain grounds of truth. Whence it then follows that the less safe opinion which is wanting in those grounds, remains scarcely or only doubtfully probable as compared with the safer, and consequently, it were not prudence, but the contrary, to embrace it."

In 1770: "The first teaching says that a person may lawfully follow the less probable opinion for the non-existence of the law, although the contrary opinion be certainly more probable. This teaching we say is lax, and cannot lawfully be embraced. . . . Our doctrine says, that when the opinion for the non-existence of the law is equally as probable as the contrary, it can confidently and lawfully be followed. The reason is, that of two equally probable opinions we are not bound to adopt the safer; because a doubtful law cannot impose a certain obligation, inasmuch as a doubtful law is not sufficiently promulgated."

In 1772: "When the opinion for liberty of action is as probable as the contrary, it can be adopted, not because it is probable, but because then the opinion for the law is not binding, because the law is not promulgated; the doubt is promulgated, or, if you will, the question if there is or not such a law, but the law itself is not promulgated, and therefore cannot bind."

In 1773: "If the opinion for the existence of the law appear to be certainly the more probable, we are absolutely bound to follow it. . . . If two equally probable opinions be opposed, the law is uncertain, and cannot be binding."

In 1774: "When the opinion favoring liberty is of equal weight with the contrary opinion, then the latter is no longer probable, but only doubtful, because the two opinions do not produce a probability for the case, but deprive themselves of probability reciprocally."

In 1779: "A doubtful law in the opposition of two equiprobable opinions does not bind."

In 1785: "An uncertain law cannot impose a certain obligation, because the obligation comes later than the free will which is in possession and must be proved."

These detached sentences, snatched from the quotations of the "Vindiciae," put clearly forward, we think, the arguments made use of by the 'Vindicators to prove that Equi-Probabilism was ever the system of their Father.

The third chapter declares that Saint Alphonsus was not only an Equi-Probabilist, and ever such, but *the very author* of this celebrated system; and this assertion, the strongest of the three, they establish by further quotations from the Saint's writing, and by the unanimous testimony of many Cardinals, Bishops, and Theologians of all schools and nations, and again by the acts of Beatification. Confining our observations to these acts, we learn from them that although in 1803 the Sacred Congregation of Rites declared the works of Saint Alphonsus uncensurable, yet was his moral system again examined in 1806 in the cause of his Beatification, and objected to by the Promoter of the Faith as opposed to perfect prudence, inasmuch as too favorable to human liberty. The Vindicator of the cause replying to this and all other charges, clearly refutes them all; else, would not the Beatification have been decreed. Concerning the impugned moral system, amongst other things, he says: "It is certain that he taught that in the case of two equally probable opinions being opposed, the opinion denying the law creates a serious doubt whether the law exists or not; which law cannot therefore, be judged to be sufficiently promulgated, and cannot, therefore be binding. . . . Is it to be feared that by this system too much indulgence is given to liberty of action? . . . Too much indulgence is granted by that opinion which unreasonably constitutes probability in every isolated argument, making light of all opposite, and undoubtedly strong reasons. . . . Each of the two opinions in the opposition of which the Liguorian system consists being equally probable is equally safe. If, however, that certain rule be followed that a doubtful law does not bind, or that a doubtful law does not impose a certain obligation,

without which there is no sin, then the probable opinion for the law is no longer safe but doubtful; and thus the contrary opinion for the non-existence of the law becomes the safer of the two."

The Vindicators having thus established their *Thesis*, viz.: that the moral system of Saint Alphonsus was Equi-Probabilism, they proceed, in the fourth chapter, to consider and refute the arguments advanced by Father Ballerini to show against them that the Saint was a Probabilist.

The first objection is that explanations of his doctrine, clearly proving him a Probabilist, were fraudulently omitted in the edition of the Moral Theology approved by the Holy See; to which omission it is due that the Objector's assertion is not quite clear.

The Vindicators reply: 1st. That Father Ballerini, being the first discoverer of this fraud, is very probably mistaken; 2nd. That the omissions spoken of took place in the 7th edition, and, consequently, by the directions of the Saint himself, else he would have had the omission supplied in the 8th and 9th editions; 3rd. That the passages omitted are elsewhere inserted, and hence the omission; 4th. That in later editions the passages are restored, and yet are by no means favourable to the Objector, &c.

The second objection grounded on this omitted passage is that St. Alphonsus, by "a certainly more probable opinion," meant a moral certainty. The words of the Saint are these: "I say, in the first place, that if the opinion for the existence of the law appears certainly more probable than the contrary, we are truly bound to follow it. I said *certainly* more probable, for such an opinion must be *notably* more probable. For (this is the omission) then the opinion in question is no longer strictly doubtful, but is morally, or almost morally, certain."

The Vindicators deny this interpretation to be correct—1st. Because it would make the Saint illogical, confounding opinion with certainty; 2nd. Because it would prove him lax, allowing the weakest probability to be followed; 3rd. Because it would show him to be a fool, contending against imaginary adversaries that improbable opinions must give way to moral certainty; 4th. Because the known distinction of absolute and relative remove the difficulty; 5th. Because the words "strictly" and "almost" must be taken into account, &c.

The third objection is that those who are opposed to Father Ballerini are deceived in supposing that St. Alphonsus holds of any degree of probability what he only teaches of the highest.

The Vindicators reply that the deception must be on the Objector's side, pointing out how Scavini, Neyraguet, Gousset, and the rest have faithfully quoted the words of St. Alphonsus, and then once more bringing him forward to speak for himself. As to degrees of probability the Saint thus writes: "When the opinion for the existence of the law is certainly more probable, *be it only by one degree*, then is it notably more probable; because that certainty of the greater probability proves that it is so weighty that it suffices to move the scales. All ambiguity is removed when I say that the certainly more probable of two opinions asserting the law must be embraced, be it only, if certainly, more probable, by one degree."

The fourth objection is that the Saint declared, in 1757 and 1763, that he intended to abstain from disputes on Probabilism.

The Vindicators reply—1st. That like protestations are found in earlier works, which can therefore be taken as transient intentions. 2nd. That several such casual remarks have passed on from early to late editions of many works. 3rd. That the Saint's first undertakings were against Rigorism, and, consequently, favouring general Probabilism. 4th. That the words spoken by the Saint for Probabilism can well be applied to his own system of Equi-Probabilism. 5th. That he did not all at once, but gradually, perfect his system, having been himself educated by Rigorists, &c.

The fifth objection is, that the Equi-Probabilism of the Saint was insincere, and superfluously defended against silent adversaries; that it was put forth to establish his orthodoxy, and disarm opposition.

The Vindicators reply—1st. That such hypocrisy and deceit would have been sinful. 2nd. That St. Alphonsus frequently asserts his earnestness. 3rd. That in his private letters and conversations he confirmed his public teaching. 4th. That again and again he denies the charge or praise of Probabilism: "I am no Probabilist, nor do I follow Probabilism; on the contrary, I condemn it," &c.

The sixth objection is that St. Alphonsus, defending Equi-Probabilism, establishes Probabilism pure and simple, the same being the principle of both systems—viz., a doubtful law cannot be binding.

The Vindicators reply that the Saint denies and rejects this consequence over and over again: "I make answer that when the opinion for the law is certainly more probable, although it is not quite certain, nevertheless on account of that greater probability it appears to be morally truer, and the law in con-

sequence morally or sufficiently promulgated, and no longer strictly doubtful." And again: "We, as we have frequently said before, do not defend the probable in opposition to the more probable."

The discussion thus closes, and we must applaud the victors, who are, undoubtedly, the Vindicators, as we think is sufficiently clear from this cursory review of their work, but as will be most conclusively demonstrated to all impartial readers of it. We agree with Father Ballerini that the question discussed "is of the greatest importance, since by the judgment of the Apostolic See the sole authority of Alphonsus is enough, that not only without censure, but also without any danger or suspicion of laxity—or *rigorism*—his opinions may be adopted and reduced to practice, and this without any consideration of their intrinsic reasons." The application of this doctrine is not precisely what Father Ballerini accepts; but it is, nevertheless, thus shown that the system of St. Alphonsus has been declared safe by the Church, and that system is *Equi-Probabilism*. It is true that other systems are tolerated, and may, perhaps, yet be declared safe, so certain is it that the approval of the Alphonsian system is no condemnation of all others. Yet it is practically hard to read the Holy Doctor's open and strongly inculcated condemnation of anything, knowing such condemnation safe, and not subscribe to it. "I have not," he writes, "been wanting in diligence while endeavouring to reach the truth with certainty in this controversy, having, during the studies of many years, read all modern authors of the rigid teaching as they came to hand, examining all their reasons and objections. Moreover, I have not, I think, failed to commend myself to the Lord and the Divine Mother on this point, praying earnestly to be enlightened should I go astray." We hold it certain that he was enlightened, and that he did not go astray in that very matter for which he was given to the Church of God.

What this matter was we cannot, in conclusion, better state than in the words of Father Ballerini—words, we may say, more earnest and meaning than any of his objections: "No one will deny that it was an ineffable proof of God's provident love that in the pitiable confusion of antagonistic teachings which for two centuries had reigned in the schools of Christian morals, torturing with unceasing anxieties all needing rule and guidance, the writings of Alphonsus should appear so highly commended, not only for their author's exalted qualities, but also (what is of far greater importance) by the judgment of the Apostolic See. That in such dread circumstances a

heaven-sent friend should be given us as remarkable for learning as for sanctity, who, casting off, in the first place, the prejudice of the school in which he had been educated, and daring, then, the clamours of a powerful adverse faction, courageously shook off and shattered the yoke of error, and undertook to reform doctrines traditionally revered, and to restore their honours to maligned sages; that the judgment of the Apostolic See should approve his work, and solemnly declare his followers safe from all censure of laxity—or *rigorism*—that so great, I say, and unexpected a change of things should have been so speedily accomplished, was, we must all say, most fortunate for us—was, we must all feel, a blessing ineffable and divine.”

LITURGICAL QUESTIONS.

I.—QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE MISSA PRO POPULO.

The following questions were proposed to the S. Congregation of the Council :—

“ I. An parochus die festo a sua parœcia absens satisfaciat suæ obligationi missam celebrando pro populo in loco ubi degit, seu potius teneatur substituere alium qui missam pro populo dicat in propria ecclesia ?

“ Et quatenus negative ad secundam partem.

“ II. An teneatur missam applicare pro populo in loco ubi degit, seu potius ad parochiam rediens teneatur applicare in propria ecclesia ?

“ III. An parochus morbi causa legitime impeditus ne missam celebret, teneatur post recuperatam sanitatem tot missas applicare pro populo, quot durante morbo omisit, sive in casu quo nec per se nec per alium celebrare poterat sine gravi incommodo, sive in casu quo poterat per alium, sed ex aliquo vano timore vel negligentia non curavit vel non obtinuit ut alius pro se celebraret.”

To these questions the S. Congregation replied, 14th December, 1872 :—

Parochum die festo a sua parœcia legitime absentem satisfacere suæ obligationi missam applicando pro populo suo, in loco ubi degit, dummodo ad necessariam populi commodi-

tatem alius sacerdos in ecclesia parochiali celebret et verbum Dei explicet.

Parochum vero utcumque legitime impeditum ne missam celebret, teneri eam die festo per alium celebrari et applicari facere pro populo in ecclesia parochiali: quod si ita factum non fuerit, quamprimum poterit, missam pro populo applicare debere.

II.—*De Confessariis Monialium extra claustra Dubium.*

Aliquando moniales aut sanitatis causa, aut ob aliud motivum ad bene tempus facultatem e Monasterio exeundi obtinent, retento habitu. Quæritur an tunc possint confessionem instituere apud Confessarium ab Episcopo approbatum *pro utroque sexu*, quamvis approbatus non sit *pro monialibus?*

Sanctissimus in audientia habita die vigesima séptima Augusti, 1852, Mandavit rescribi:—

Affirmative, durante mora extra Monasterium.

[The above document will be found at page 141 of Bizzarri's *Collectanea in usum Secretariæ S. Congregationis Episcoporum et Regularium.*]

DOCUMENTS.

I.—INDULGENCES GRANTED TO THE APOSTLESHIP OF PRAYER.

BEATISSIME PATER,

Henricus Ramiere, apostolatus orationis generalis moderator, ad Vestræ Sanctitatis pedes provolutus, modicam ei partem offert innumerabilium precum, sacrificiorum et piarum actionum quas ob Sanctæ Sedis catholicæque Ecclesiæ triumphum obtinendum dictæ societatis membra, sed maxime pueri et puellæ ad pontificalem militiam pertinentes, ultimis mensibus peregerunt.

Hæc nempe pontificalis militia peculiaris quædam praxis est qua apostolatus orationis puerorum ætati et indoli adaptatur, quaque juniores christiani ad Sanctam Sedem armis sibi propriis defendendam excitantur, speciatim vero frequenti communione, et quampluribus horis in strenuo labore perfecta-que regulæ custodia impensis.

Jam centena millia numerantur qui in variis orbis partibus et in utriusque sexus educationis domibus huic militiæ nomina

dederunt, et ubique hæc pia praxis uberrimos edidit fructus. Dum scilicet renovatur in his domibus sacramentorum frequentatio et scholasticæ disciplinæ observantia, augetur sive inter alumnos, sive etiam inter magistros alumnorumque parentes amor Ecclesiæ et devotio erga Sanctam Sedem; hujusque spiritualis militiæ exercitio ad prælia Domini efficacioribus armis aliquando prælianda juvenes disponuntur.

Ut vero hi fructus in dies crescant, utque nostrum hoc defensorum Sanctæ Sedis seminarium nova ubertate donetur, a Vestra Sanctitate humilis orator suppliciter postulat:

Primo, ut Vestra Sanctitas sua benedictione sancire dignetur *decorationes*, seu insignia quæ ad militum conatus remunerandos eorumque generositatem excitandam, juxta meritorum gradus, ipsis a magistris tradentur, eo tamen pacto ut qui his insignibus decorabuntur toties promissum renovent societatibus ab Ecclesia damnatis numquam sua dandi nomina, et Sanctæ Sedis jura semper tuendi.

Secundo, ut qui his decorationibus fuerint insigniti, tum ipsa die qua eas accipient, tum in mortis articulo, pontificali benedictione cum plenaria indulgentia frui possint, sive a militiæ moderatore, sive a proprio confessario ipsis impartienda; utque præterea ii qui ad finem usque studiorum militiæ officia constanter impleverint, et ideo supremam decorationem accipient, duplex supradictum privilegium parentibus in primo gradu communicare possint.

Tertio, ut omnes qui pias praxes pontificalis militiæ peragunt, plenariam indulgentiam lucrari possint, primo quidem in die quo associatio instaurabitur circa initium anni scholastici; deinceps vero in festis Cathedræ Romanæ sancti Petri (die 18 januarii), sancti Leonis (die 11 aprilis), B. V. Mariæ Auxiliatricis (die 24 maii), et sanctorum Petri et Pauli (die 29 junii).

Quarto, demum, ut ad prædictas gratias lucrandas nulla alia aggregatione aut inscriptione opus sit nisi ea quæ requiritur ad ingrediendam societatem apostolatus orationis, cujus militia pontificalis specialis est praxis, ita ut in omnibus domibus apostolatus orationis aggregatis militiam pontificalem instituere liceat.

Ex audientia SSmi diei 21 Aprilis 1870.

SSmus Dominus Noster Pius Divina Providentia PP. IX, referente me infrascripto S. Congregationis de Propaganda fide card. præfecto, perpensis expositis, benigne rescribi jussit prout sequitur: Ad I. *juxta petita*; ad II. *affirmative servatis de jure servandis, et quoad indulgentiam in articulo mortis lucrandam,*

dummodo rite dispositi SSimum Jesu nomen saltem corde, si ore nequiverint, devote invocaverint; ad III, affirmative, servatis ut supra de jure servandis; ad IV, affirmative, contrariis quibuscumque minime obstantibus.

Datum Romæ, ex ædibus d. S. Congregationis, die et anno supradictis."

Al, Card. BARNABO, præfectus.

Præsens rescriptum exhibitum fuit in secretaria S. Congregationis Indulgentiarum hac die 15 februarii 1873, ad formam decreti ejusdem S. Congregationis die 14 aprilis 1856. In quorum fidem etc.

Dominicus SARRA, substitutus.

II.—MAGNA SUPPLICIA A PERSECUTORIBUS ALIQUOT CATHOLICORUM IN HIBERNIA SUMPTA.

Anno 1577, Guilielmus Drurius Anglus Hiberniæ Prorex citatus à Rdissimo. Patricio Heli, Franciscano Episcopo [quem ob religionis solius causam una cum religioso fratre morti addixerat] ad Xti. tribunal rationem facti redditurus, repente gravissimo morbo correptus, furens et blasphemans, paulo post interiit. Ejus certè funebri die, tales tenebrae, tonitrua, fulgura fuerunt cujusmodi prius et posterius Hibernia non noverat.

Quo tempore Baro Graius proregebat in Hibernia, totusque erat in insectandis Catholicis, insimulans eos falso, quod Jacobo Mauritiadi et Sandero [qui a Gregorio XIII. suppetiolas Catholicis duxerant] faverent: quodque Hurlaeum, Tannerum, aliosque Epos. et Sacerdotes, qui praedictorum complices erant, impensius foverent, inventus est Robertus Dillonus, cocles equestris, et supremi Senatorii ordinis, ambitiosissimi et perfidissimi ingenii vir, qui plurimos nobilissimos Episcoporum et Sacerdotum patronos prodebat, reosque lesae majestatis peragebat. Vah! Quot ille nobiles familias, quot perillustres Heroes evertit, quantumque patrii sanguinis per summum nefas exsuxit! Cum igitur undique Sacerdotes disquirerentur, et vix uspiam tuti esse possent, Immaculata Deipara Virgo, devotissimo famulo suo Patricio Nigramo, Sacerdoti, opportunè voluit subvenire. Nocte igitur in multo splendore apparuit Alisonae Fitsimon, conjugi Richardi Bellingi inclyti juris consulti, tum Donamori prope Dublinium degenti,

edocens illum Patricium confestim quaerendum ad mortem, ideoque statim esse occultandum. Surgeret igitur ut eum accersiret et occultaret in crypta, quam infra lapidem in penuario reperiret.

Obsequitur tandem, non tamen sine tergiversatione, Alisona ducitque Patricium ad latibulum, quod non absque difficultate offendit. Gradus erant ad descendendum, lectus, mensa et caetera necessarijs usibus commoda, visusque locus non minus amoenus quam securus. Tantisper illic delituit Patricius, donec abeuntibus satellitibus, Alisona, à clementissima Dei Matre monita, illum evocavit. Quo egresso, et lapide ut prius reposito, cum postea curiose perlustrare locum percuperent, nullum ejus vestigium, fodiendo et laborando, percipere unquam potuerunt. Ego certe hoc affirmare nolui priusquam non modo optima illa Matrona, verum plures alii omni exceptione majores sanctum jusjurandum de rei veritate interposuissent.

Ceterum Graius, ille Prorex, a Regina ipsa multifariam obferitatem et impietatem objurgatus, Provinciam abdicare, et despectus ab aula exulare coactus est. Robertus vero Dillonus, Deo et hominibus exosus, tandem perduellionis accusatus omnique dignitate spoliatus difficulter furcam evasurus dicebatur nisi, ex maerore, praematura morte fuisset extinctus.

Anno 1581, in civitate Yokilla (Youghal) decurio ex cohorte centurionis Piersei, cum duobus militibus centurionis * * deturbavit, blasphemavit, rambisset crucem repertam inter ruderera coenobii Dominicanorum. Ille phrenesi et caecitate correptus, a cruce etiam ut aiebat oppressus, reptans per plateas exspiravit intra biduum. Isti pediculari morbo enecti, ex * * intollerabili, non elati sed extracti, sub dio jacuerunt, volucrum et ferarum pabulum.

Anno 1594, in eadem civitate Puritanus Anglus, Pseudo-ecclesiastes Joannis Doudali, equitis et centurionis, in Deum divosq. saepe blasphemus, tandem in Deiparam, et salutationem angelicam acerbius invectus est. Illam non esse in mulieribus benedictam; sed et Angelum Gabrielem [nescio ob quam causam] fuisse veneficum impurissime asseruit.

Is vero nocte sequenti decumbens expetiit socii pugionem ut mandato Cacodaemonis, quemadmodum aperte profitebatur, sese confoderet. Denegante et flagitium deprecante socio, sequenti die ad mare innixus baculo, quod senex esset, progressus est, cumque exarasset majusculis literis "Thomas Lythse se submergit," togatus processit pectore tenus in aequor. Accurrentibus qui retraherent militibus caput suum ipse involvit continuitque donec vivere desiit. Centurio ille

eques, ex dedecore et ignominia professioni suae aspersa, maxime commotus, cadaver altissima pertica transfossum in ipsa arena sepeliri fecit. Attamen vel a lupis vel a daemonibus abreptum disparuit.

Anno 1599, praesidiariis in castro Cahirensi non sufficiebat sylva vicina ad focum, sed tectum sacelli et crucem libuit comburere. Communicata igitur ope, ex tecto et cruce quantum jumentum perferre potuit ad stationem transtulerunt; verum consedente mortuo jumento, horror et poenitentia facti caeteros occupavit.

At vero Centurio animosior crucem cum parte tecti in ignem projecit. Subito ferventissime flagrans et miserrime vociferans ad paradromidem castris conscendit, ibique excubitori sciscitanti quorsum evaderet, respondit "ad praecipituum imperio Domini sui," et uno cum verbo sese praecipitans in praeterlabentem fluvium non amplius comparuit.

Anno eodem in Lagenia in Castro Elicio, Jacobus Devereux, Apostata Sacerdos, se gerebat officialem haeretici Superintendentis. In Sacello loci S. Joannis Baptistae imaginem conspiciens, in vilem obscurumque angulum, sordibus obsitum, jussit projici. Eodem momento paralisi affectus, impotens a suis in cœmeterium elatus est, statimque in summo foetore impiam animam efflavit. Cadavere vero ejus in loco quem imagini deputavit humato, ipsa imago priori loco restituta est.

Anno item eodem Gualterus Ballus, vere vir Belial, Senator Dubliniensis [tam impius filius in Matrem, quam decrepitae aetatis invitam traxit in Concilium impiorum et in viam peccatorum, quam sacrilegus investigator Christorum Domini seu Sacerdotum] magno comitatu Patrem quemdam Franciscanum, Patremque Societatis Jesu rimebatur; eosque tantum non intercipiebat. Tandem spe delusus domum remeans, rabidus spiransque blasphemias caeteris Sacerdotum persecutoribus in inferno se subito aggregavit.

Anno 1600, Henricus Wallopus Anglus ex secretiori senatu et Regni proquaestor, qui Catholicorum cruentus et implacabilis semper fuit persecutor. Is cum conjugē ejusdem furfuris et Domina Sentledgera aliisque primariis Puritanis ritus et exequias ecclesiasticas, tanquam Papisticae superstitionis reliquias, consuevit inter reliquias blasphemias irridere, et exsibilare.

Tandem vita excessit sed adeo tum intollerabili foetore ut nulli fautorum quantumvis libentes ejus cadaveri accedere nedum parentare possent. Igitur non aliud ei templum fuit vel cloaca vel infernus, non alia vero justa quam nefandaeitae execratio ac divinorum judiciorum in hos cedros Libani grata

commemoratio. Idem prorsus et eodem modo accidit praecipuis exequiarum contemptoribus, ut conjugii praedicti Wallopi, necnon Antonii Sentlegeri, plurimisque aliis Puritanis, ut jam vulgare sit dubium an Puritani, quo magis primarii sint, eo certius, corpore simul et anima ad inferos deportentur.

Anno eodem Radulphus Lanaeus eques, regii exercitus censor, Senatus supremi consultor sagaciter indagabat Sacerdotes. Ejus statim tota domus, totaque suppellex tam repente noctu deflagravit, ut cum in frequenti habitaret platea, et aedium turris ex solidis esset lapidibus; ipsos tamem excubitores, nedum caeteros latuit incendium, et omnibus stupentibus vix cineres, vix ulla vestigia superfuerunt.

Mirum quam anxio hoc sectarii silentio contegere voluerunt. Idem cum supremum clausisset diem ubi sepultus fuit, incertum; certum autem est, urna absque cadavere fuisse parentatum.

Anno 1602, Jacobus Latnaerus Anglus Puritanus, et, si Deo placet, Doctor Theologus, magnusque Proregis Sacellanus obiit. Is ut quemdam Patrem Societatis ex diuturno carcere liberaret, egeregium equum sponcione accepit, fefellit pignoratam fidem. Accidit ut eidem equo insidens, cum ex abortu aliquo strepitu ferociens equus paulatim submovissit illum è turba, ab aliquo nomini pravis, glande pone auriculam, salvo toto reliquo exercitu, trajiceretur. Auribus multorum, multum imposuerat, auribusque ipsius impositum fuit, quo intra biduum audire et vivere destitit.

Anno 1603, ex nobili Donagalensi Monasterio deturbantur decrepiti quidam Monachi, qui ab obtutu hereticorum dissiti suo utcunque fruebantur cœnobio, viceque eorum praepostere substituebantur Præsidiarii.

Cum, ut fit, sacratum isti locum nefario polluerent, nec aliquid quod possent non prophanarent et diruerent, factum est, ut cum in portu, et certe non proximè adesset navis in qua maxima copia erat tormentarii pulveris, ex coelo misso fulmine incensus est latens ille pulvis, simulque ac fuit inflammatus, magno venti flatu deferebatur in tectum coenobii, dictoq. citius integrum cohortem absumpsit. Non absimilis longe ante fuit Dirrensis Monasterii violatorum interitus anno 1570, itidem a fulmine [quod raro accidit in Hibernia] et tormentario pulvere, quingentis simul militibus in cineres redactis.

Anno 1603, Adamus Loftus, Anglus Apostata Sacerdos, et totius Regni Cancellarius saepius credebatur ex remorsa conscientiae ad resipiscentiam propendere: Longe lateque serpebat illa suspicio, et ad ipsos Regni Moderatores pertingebat,

timens sibi Adamus, ne ex ea minueretur ipsi dignitas, occurrere voluit infamiae, ut interpretabatur, disserendo contra Catholicam de Purgatorio doctrinam, Dies concioni habendae condicebatur ipsum Festum Animarum. Ob rei novitatem, quia ut emeritus [non enim multum octogenario aberat] ab illo officio diu vacabat, ingens erat confluxus, et, ut propius adessent, ad melius audiendum concertatio; vix exorsus, torminibus ventris acerrime urgeri coepit, primo expalescere, vocem remittere, silere, vultum humerosque contrahere, gravissime laborare percipiebatur. Tandem exonerato ventre, non tantum strepitu sed foetore, toti multitudini apprimè intentæ patellam concioni habendae magis idoneam proposuit, nec ulterius progredi potuit. Qui purgationem animarum improbare voluit, purgatione corporis, causa cedere coactus est.

Anno 1603, Longa Regni Elizabethae epistasis, tragica catastrophe tanquam suorum facinorum idonea coronide debebat absolvi. Totis 44 annis, nec per favores allicere, nec per furores impellere ducentos ex universo Ibernico populo in suam haeresim potuerat. Saepe enim, ne illam Patriam, ut Angliam, sanguine ad luendum religionis candorem purpuraret, obstitit vel procerum aliquorum vel totius populi ad propugnandam suam avitam fidem explorata propensio. Nunc autem pulsus erant ex Ibernica Hispani, depauperata tota regio, Comes Tironensis valde debilitatus, omnes a resistendo impotentes, et nullum subesse videbatur obstaculum quo minus vel inviti fierent sectarii. Instigabant Puritani, pestes et eversores Regnorum. A Dublinia, primaria civitate, ad quam credebant reliquam Iberniam se facile composituram, exordiri placuit, conscriptis quadraginta consessoribus, plurimisque quadruplatoribus, apparitoribus, et carcerum praefectis disseminatisque undequaque terrorum et periculorum rumoribus. Tandem condicto die, Tribunali ad Majestatem et severitatem valde composito, sistitur Senatus Populusque Dubliniensis. Reginae immensa clementia, et plurima in illam civitatem benemerita, nec non antiqua et intemerata in suos Reges Dubliniensium fides gravi et accurata oratione laudantur. Solummodo superesse dicebatur, ut qua observantia in reliquis semper fuissent, pari etiam in amplectenda Evangelica luce, quam Regina semper voluit, nunc autem morti proxima debuit propagare, uterentur. Obsequentes omni honore, detractantes omni supplicio protinus esse afficiendos. Brevi responsione opus esse, et in alterutram partem definita. Responsum est igitur una omnium (dempta unius et alterius) consensione: Potestati Caesaris suas fortunas

omnes, vitasque ipsas permitti: Deo autem fidem religionemque deberi et servari: illam fixam et immutabilem suam esse sententiam. Vultibus igitur verbisque atrocibus jubentur senatores civesque selecti in perpetuum carcerem abripi. Reliqui etiam ordine omnes suo non majorem praestolari gratiam admonentur. Sed gnari ejus quod dixit Abner, periculosam esse desperationem; ac prospicientes obfirmatos esse in avita religione universos, frementes frendentesque coguntur ab incoepto disistere, illosque celeberrimos Xti. fieri confessores (qui praeclara constantia impetum omnium quae contra Iberniam fiebant, periculosissimum eluserunt) post quinque septimanarum carceres emancipare; quique eis animam addidit ad resistendum Deus, idem qui neminem patitur tentari supra id quod potest, de coelo prospexit ut audiret gemitus compeditorum, et sustulit illis e vivis Elizabetham, praefecitque Regem qui ex morte utriusque Parentis suaque ipsius captivitate expertus indolem Puritanorum immanem eorum insolentiam comperisset. De utrisque Elizabetha et Puritanis paucis diebus postquam Catholicos Dublinenses exercuerunt, exigit divina aequitas justissimum hoc supplicium. Audita vero Reginae morte, Deus immortalis! Quis Catholicorum Ibernorum in profitenda Religione evincit ardor, quae ad Tempia repurganda et restauranda alacritas! Qualis ad supplicationes, sacramenta, conciones fuit confluxus! Certe non modo dicendi facundiam, et facultatem humanam, sed etiam fidem superat. Elizabetha jam extincta morbo modo, ac morte inglorius (usque adeo ut de illis ipsimet sileant sectarii) succedente Jacobo Rege, delegati sunt ex Ibernia nobilissimi ac prudentissimi viri, qui obsequentissimo quod reliqua omnia regna demississimis precibus ante omnia Religionis Catholicae libertatem efflagitarent; sed in Angliam venientes clam moniti sunt a praecipuis, amicitiae ergo, religione praetermissa caetera proponerent. Illi vero omnia alia posthabentes, spretis insuper carceribus quibus ab incoepto deterrendi credebantur, unius religionis indemnitate deposcebant. Rex in praesentia praecipuorum procerum, ac sollicitos tantum officii fideique erga ipsum. Laetissimum id ad nuntium Ibernia. Sed inde frendentes, frementesque Puritani, prodi fidem evangelicam exclamarunt: permissa immunitate religionis Catholicae, omnium mortalium Papistissimis, certissimum praeludium ac praejudicium ruentis Evangelii nec ob aliam causam a Rege in Puritanos animadverti, quam ut sublatis Evangelii defensoribus, Papismo fenestra vel potius janua aperiatur. Importunitate ac impudentia tandem extorserunt nova edicta Catholicis in Ibernia opprimendis, quibus illorum nequitiae

laxatis habenis, quidquid impietas, crudelitas, immanitas voluit in eosdem exercuerunt. Et quod tempora priora nesciverunt, lex quam vocant martialis (ut scilicet indicta causa innocentissimus quisque e vestigio in ipsis triviis ad libidinem non Judicis publici sed nebulonis plerumque in eo officio constituti suspenderetur) introducta est. Quis strages, exilia, depopulationes, carceres, oppressiones illorum dierum dinumeret? Sed Deo suis athleticis propitio, nihil perfidiae hereticae profuit, mulieres crinibus per vicos raptasse, pueros virgis flagellasse, viros pugnis caesos, uxoribus, prolibus, fortunis spoliatos in humeris ad impia templa deportasse, minis ac terroribus in totam gentem fulminasse, unico tantum coriario ex universa Ibernia omnibus his laboribus gregi suo acquisito. Incomparabiles forsitan in fide constantia, tanto sudore in duorum annorum Neroniana persecutione non nisi unicum potuisset, eundemque corpore magis quam anima sectario caetui consociasse. Interim boni isti Puritani qui spe certissima devoraverant sanguinem fortunasque Catholicorum qua fiducia freti animos ingentiores assumpserant, luxuriantes ipsi, conjuges ac proles insolenti suppellectili, ornatu, comitatu, tandem aere alieno abrutis, sibi inter se, ut Cadmi fratres, dissentientes, Regi magis magisque invisus, Deo et hominibus exosi, Catholicorum intemeratam fidem sua iniquitate, propriam vero erga Deum, Regem hominesque perfidiam sua explorata fraude liquido demonstrarunt. Indeque jam eorum Ministri nepotum ac nebulonum; eorum nobiles, decoctorum; eorum caterva, seditiosorum nomine, ac loco recensentur.

Scripta sunt ad me a R. Patre Christophoro Holivodio
(Holywood) Superiore Societatis Jesu in Ibernia, et
vera esse testor.

Henr: FitzSimon.

THE IRISH
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

=====
JULY, 1873.
=====

MY CLERICAL FRIENDS.

EVERY book is made up of two things—matter and manner ; and though the first is, in itself, by far the more important, yet it is mainly on the latter that the success of a book ordinarily depends. If it be true that “the style is the man,” it is still more emphatically true that for nine readers out of ten “the style is the book.” Of the volume named at the head of this paper, the matter is valuable and the style brilliant. We have, consequently, in “My Clerical Friends,” a book that combines excellence in both elements, and forms that desirable but rare product, a book that is at once useful and entertaining.

It is unfortunately true that the useful books are not always interesting, and it is perhaps truer still that many of the interesting books published now-a-days are anything at all but useful. Persons whose care it is, will admit that there is scarcely anything so difficult as to provide suitable general reading for young Catholics, or indeed for Catholics of any age. Spiritual books we have, admirably suited to their purpose; students of special subjects will not fail to find orthodox authorities of high standing, especially if they be acquainted with other languages besides their own; but when we turn from such students to the “general reader,” to whom a book must needs speak in the homely mother tongue if it would secure his attention, and from those works more or less scientific in their character, to that ever-growing department of literature that classifies itself in catalogues under the heading of “fiction” or “amusement,” we find few books, indeed, which we can safely put into the hands of those whose reading is, and is meant to be, only a recreation. Nor is it surprising that it should be so. To produce a literature indigenous to a country and racy of a soil, requires a combina-

tion of favorable circumstances that have not, for the last three hundred years, grouped themselves around any period of English or Irish Catholic history. The appearance of a book like this is one of the surest signs of the return of better times—and for that reason, as well as for its own unquestionable merit, we gladly welcome “My Clerical Friends,” and earnestly recommend it to the attention of our readers.

The book has what always makes a book lifelike—a strong flavor of the writer’s personal experience. It is written by one—in fact it is to some extent his autobiography—who worked his way from Anglican Protestantism to the light and freedom of the Catholic Church. No man who had not lived long and intimately with English Protestant clergymen could possibly have given such graphic pictures of the Anglican Church and its official exponents. The author has lived amongst them—has, as he remarks, learned many things from them—but, to our mind, the most valuable things he so learned, were those which he himself characterizes as “things which it was not their intention to teach.” The fact is, that amongst the natural means that smoothed the author’s passage to the True Church, a keen sense of the ridiculous holds a prominent place ; and, beyond all question, it had abundant material to work upon in that nondescript conglomerate of contradictory opinion which, with an irony of which it is all unconscious, calls itself *the Church* of England. That the *Church* that, not with irony but impudence, arrogates to itself the title of “the Church of Ireland,” is in no better plight, recent synodical proceedings have made abundantly evident.

In the eyes of some readers the very brilliancy of “My Clerical Friends” will, we have no doubt, be considered its greatest fault. There are people—and very worthy people—who can neither appreciate wit nor relish humor—who can neither make a joke nor take one—to whom the “ridiculous” is rather repulsive than laughable. Such persons will, we imagine, entertain a suspicion that the book is *too* sparkling ; that it is not so much a good solid discharge of artillery against prevailing errors, as a display of intellectual fireworks that lights them up without doing them any damage. The truth is, there yet linger amongst us a few people who can scarcely bring themselves to think that any book can possibly be sound and solid that is at the same time readable and amusing. However “My Clerical Friends” will make its readers laugh in spite of themselves ; but underneath the satire and the sparkle, those who do not run while they read will easily discern the earnestness that in many cases finds no more

appropriate expression than the language of caustic humor and pungent satire.

And the humor here *is* caustic—the satire unsparing. Both are directed against the Anglican Church and its well paid parsons, and surely never had humorist a more promising subject or satirist a more fertile theme. There may be, in the chapter on “The Clergy at Home,” a few passages in which the author’s sense of the ridiculous may seem to have outrun his good taste. He may have been too personal in some of his descriptions of certain Anglican dignitaries; but we may remark, that the satire will be felt only in proportion to its truth; and *if* these pictures be true pictures—and certainly they are lifelike in the reading—we are decidedly of opinion that the only reparation such men can make to the human nature they caricature, is to sit for their portraits to an artist with a hand so ready and an eye so keen. We append one of these passages—not so much for its fun, though it is full of fun—as because it strikes us as eminently characteristic of a peculiar power of the author—and a very rare power it is—the power of poking fun and argument at an adversary in one and the same breath. It is found at page 54.

“Another of our episcopal guests who came only on rare occasions, and at a later period, when I had seen too much of the world to be easily moved to awe, was of a totally different character,” [from one previously described]. Harsh in feature and uncouth in form, he had much difficulty in assuming a dignified aspect, and seemed to be conscious of the probable failure of any efforts in that direction. . . . He had made himself conspicuous by vehement remonstrance against the appointment of a brother dignitary, which was not effectual, and it was said that the Government gave him a bishopric in order to stop his mouth—which it did. He had only two ideas: the first that the Pope is ‘*hostis generis humani*’—and the second that the Church of England is now, always has been, and always will be, the most absolutely perfect and faultless institution both in its origin and its history, its constitution in particular, and its results in general, ever presented to the admiration of the human race since Adam was ejected from Paradise. . . . He was incapable of doubt on any subject whatever, never seeing more than one side of a question, and only part of that; and inflexibly certain of his own fitness to teach, reprove, and confute the rest of the human family. If he could have realised his most ardent wish he would have liked to gather the Pope and all his Cardinals around him—not perhaps in his episcopal palace, but on some convenient neutral ground—and to point out to them, with the more than

human wisdom at his command, the error of their ways. He would have told them, with not more severity than the occasion required, exactly where St. Athanasius fell short of the true Anglican measure, and where St. Chrysostom went beyond it. He would have explained to them, with stern precision, the mistakes of St. Cyprian, particularly about the mystery of unity which that African absurdly exaggerated; the treachery of St. Ambrose who foolishly identified the Church with St. Peter, and invented the ridiculous formula '*Ubi Petrus ibi Ecclesia, &c.*' . . . He would admonish them to join themselves without loss of time to the Anglican communion. It might perhaps have occurred, as a preliminary difficulty, to one or two of the more crafty among them, to inquire *which* of the innumerable religions taught in the Church of Barlow the bishop advised them to adopt. Would he counsel them to exalt the Christian Priesthood with the Professor of Hebrew, or to deride it with the Professor of Greek—to affirm the Real Presence with the Archdeacon of Bovington, or to laugh at it with the Archdeacon of Covington—to teach the doctrine of Baptism with the Master of St. Luke's, or to ridicule it with the Master of St. Jude's—to applaud the 'Catholic movement' with the Bishop of Oxford, or brand it as 'more disastrous than Puritanism' with the Bishop of London? But these were only trivial details which could be easily settled afterwards. The really urgent duty in their case, as indeed in that of mankind in general, was to become Anglicans, and to do it at once." Only thus "could they hope to compensate the penury of their own by the opulence of Anglican theology—to substitute for the crude novelties of Romanism the venerable antiquity of the Book of Common Prayer . . . to replace such questionable saints as Bernard and Francis, Alphonsus and Philip Neri, by such virile and colossal sanctities as Andrewes and Jeremy Taylor, Reginald Heber and Henry Martyn—to abandon the vague, capricious, and fluctuating opinions of the Roman sect for the clearly defined and immutable dogmas of the Anglican Church; and, finally, to exchange the obscure and narrow home of Paul III. and Pius IX. for the majestic and universal communion of Dr. Tait and Dr. Jackson."

The book is divided into four chapters. The first of these treats of "The Vocation of the Clergy"—and being written from the standpoint of a vivid recollection of personal experience among the Anglican clergy, it is chiefly taken up with painting a picture, the materials for which exist abundantly in the Anglican Church—a picture of a select body of men set apart (in theory) for the express purpose of (in fact) doing nothing at all that would seem to require any special segregation—

an eminently respectable body of men, it may be, as the world goes, but men who not only have no divine vocation, but in whose case, considering their mutual contradictions of each other, the mere pretence of a divine vocation would be, according to the temper of an impartial spectator, either an utter absurdity or a practical blasphemy. But here we let the writer speak for himself.

“The church of England appears to consider the example of Aaron obsolete, and sees nothing in his history worthy of her own imitation. ‘You wish to be one of my clergy?’—she seems to say, in a tone of faint surprise, and with the voice of a sleeper who begs not to be needlessly disturbed—to the youths who select that career. ‘Nothing is easier. I will ask no question about your past life, because the inquiry might be indiscreet. I take it for granted that you are baptized, and if not, it is too late now to ascertain the fact. You are, no doubt, totally ignorant of theology, which is not a popular subject in my universities—but that is of no consequence. If you are not acquainted, however, with the Thirty-nine Articles, I advise you to amend the defect, because my bishop, who will examine you, is sure to question you about that useful summary of my doctrine. He will also expect you to translate a verse or two of the Greek Testament, though it is not a good specimen of the Hellenic style; but he will probably be more lenient in that department of your Christian attainments, especially if you aspire to a family benefice, a laudable ambition which he will be careful not to thwart. I have no farther advice to give you. It is not likely you will ever want to consult me again—(here she closes her eyes)—and if you do, I shall refer you to the Privy Council, a very gentlemanly tribunal whose decrees my clergy do not always applaud, but always have the good sense to accept. It is true they sometimes ruin themselves in costs, an expensive recreation which seems to afford them singular pleasure. But why should I interfere with their innocent amusements? As my excellent archbishop has said—I do not wish to restrain or curb the liberty of the clergy—*Vale ad multos annos.*’—(Here she falls asleep.)”—page 45.

The author having received Anglican ordination,—of which he caustically remarks that “as nothing had led up to this event, so nothing grew out of it”—began to exercise his ministerial functions with so little knowledge of their character, that the parish clerk had to give him a lecture in the vestry on the ritual of baptism. But he was of a religious turn, and soon commenced to examine the grounds of his profession of Protestantism. He began with the personal history of the so-

called reformers, and found, as every candid inquirer must find, that personally they were disreputable. He next proceeded to the study of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. The eighteen propositions on the primacy and prerogatives of St. Peter, in which he states clearly the Catholic argument and the Protestant attempt at an answer, are amongst the best specimens we have ever seen of popular controversy. He had, as he pursued his course of investigation, consulted his clerical friends of the Anglican communion on his various difficulties, and had received from them answers which force from him the emphatic assertion, that "if their opinions were true, it seemed transparently evident that Christianity was false." God was gradually leading him to the Church. One by one the defences of Protestantism had to be abandoned, and he soon found himself in a state of mind to which many, as well as he, have arrived, who unfortunately never went any further—a state of intellectual conviction that Protestantism as a system was baseless, and that if Christianity were true at all, it was true only as expounded by the Catholic Church.

At this juncture it was providential that an opportunity presented itself to him of visiting the Continent. His father perceiving his tendency towards Romanism, was, no doubt, honestly of opinion that the most effectual cure for such a state of mind would be, to expose his son to the shock of witnessing, in its own special homes, the working of that corruption of Christianity which the untravelled English Protestant imagines Popery to be. Accordingly he sent him on a continental tour in company, indeed, under the guardianship of a parson "of sound church principles." The experiment of travel turned out disastrously for the father's purpose, but most happily for the spiritual interests of the son. Brought face to face with the Church whose historical and scriptural basis had commended it so warmly to his judgment as a student, he began to recognise the lineaments of the spouse of Christ. He found, in full operation within its fold, the very things the absence of which in the Anglican Church had sorely troubled his awakened conscience. He found a priesthood—set apart—claiming to have a vocation for no less a purpose than the teaching of divine truth, and proving to unprejudiced observers their claim to such a vocation by the earnestness and unanimity with which they pursued it. He found an altar, and a sacrifice—and sacraments that were no mere ceremonial rights—but that were visibly influencing the lives of multitudes of men. In a very short time he became a Catholic, and found the peace which intellect and heart had so long sought for in vain in the Anglican communion.

At the close of the chapter on "The Clergy Abroad," there is just one thing to which we wish to advert. The author, having won his way to Catholicity, very naturally and very ably sets himself to review certain "assumptions on which heretical obstinacy and self confidence are founded." Coming to the last of these, he remarks that Protestants try to satisfy their conscience by contemplating the virtues practised in Protestant societies. Now, of course, such virtues are not a note of the truth of Protestant doctrines. It is obvious that "virtue," in its theological sense, cannot be a sufficient note of the truth of doctrine; and for the simple reason that it is not within the competence of man to decide with certainty whether, in any particular case, the real virtue is there at all or not. In so far as "virtue" *could* be a note of the truth of doctrine, it should be taken in its exercise as a virtuous action—or, to speak with all strictness—an action that bears the appearance of virtue. Now of any human action it is true that the circumstances modify it considerably, and that the motive enters essentially into any correct estimate of its morality, and, as a matter of fact, the circumstances *may* be unknown, while the motive is certainly beyond the sphere of human judgment. For these reasons, if for these alone, it would be hazardous in the extreme to stake the truth of a doctrine on the virtue of its professor. Nevertheless, the paragraph to which we allude is liable to misinterpretation. It would seem to convey *either* that virtue was impossible except in the visible communion of the church, *or* that if virtue exist outside that visible communion, it is rather to the discredit and disadvantage of those who practice it. Now with regard to the first part of the disjunctive proposition, a person may belong to the *soul* of the Church, even though, through invincible ignorance, he is not attached to its visible body and in such case he is capable of performing actions supernaturally virtuous. For the rest these virtuous actions will of course profit them nothing if by wilful transgression of any commandment of God they die in the state of mortal sin; but this is true of all virtuous actions by whomsoever performed. Equally, of course, mere natural virtues, whether in a Catholic or a non-Catholic, will not be meritorious of a supernatural reward; but it would not, we submit, be true to say that persons who practice them, are precisely on that account "*magis vituperandi*;" nor do we conceive St. Augustine, in the passage quoted, to have meant any such thing. The truth seems to be that two things, not perhaps in practice easily separable, became confounded together in the mind of the writer. He may have confounded "virtue" with the *grace* given to an in-

dividual for the purpose of leading him to the true Church. If he abuse that grace, he certainly is "*magis vituperandus*," precisely on account of having got it and profited so little by it. But if any one—whether a Catholic, or a merely material heretic—perform an action naturally or supernaturally virtuous, we may lay it down as a safe and certain conclusion, that the performance of it will never turn to his discredit or disadvantage either in this world or the next.

The fourth chapter "On the Clergy and Modern Thought," is in itself by far the most important, and opens so wide a field, that we do not purpose to give any detailed notice of it in the present paper, reserving certain remarks on modern thought for a future number. We shall only say, just now, that this chapter strikes us as peculiarly valuable for that large class of persons, amongst whom missionary priests are conspicuous, who are constantly liable to have "modern thought" thrown in their face, and who, at the same time, have neither leisure nor inclination to study it thoroughly. In this chapter they will find many pungent remarks on modern thought and its disciples that will suggest lines of popular argument even to those uninstructed in the details of special scientific controversies. It may strike one reading this chapter, that "modern thought" is, perhaps, a shade *too* easily disposed of, and that its chief ornaments—men whom all the world knows to be of conspicuous ability—are made to exhibit themselves in *too* ridiculous a light. But in this chapter, and, indeed, throughout the entire volume, the author exhibits himself as one who can see no valid reason why it should be forbidden him—" *ridentem dicere verum*"—and though the book abounds both in solid information and sound argument, we should fail to appreciate it in the reading, and to judge it justly when read, if we did not constantly keep in mind that it partakes largely of the character of a "*jeu d'esprit*."

HARMONY OF THE PASSION.—III.

DISSERTATION I.

ON THE DAY OF THE LAST SUPPER.

THERE is no doubt that our Lord celebrated his Last Supper on the evening of Thursday, in the week of his sacred Passion. This fact is sufficiently apparent from the inspired narrative itself. For we read that, after the Crucifixion, the Jews were solicitous to have the bodies taken down at once, that they "might not remain upon the cross on the Sabbath day".¹ The Crucifixion then must have been on Friday. But it is plain, from the sequence of the Gospel narrative, that the Crucifixion took place on the morrow of the Last Supper. All are agreed, therefore, in referring the Last Supper to the evening of Thursday.

But whether this was the evening of the Jewish Passover; is a question which has given rise to much controversy. Before we proceed to consider the various opinions which have been advanced on the subject, it will be useful to have clearly before us the leading features of the Paschal rite, as prescribed in the law of Moses.

(1) The lamb was to be slain on the fourteenth day of the month Nisan, in the afternoon, when the sun was declining. It was to be roasted with fire, and eaten that evening with unleavened bread. No part of it was to be kept over until morning: whatever remained, after the meal, was to be burned.²

(2) On the same evening began the festival of unleavened bread. It was to be observed for seven days, from the evening of the fourteenth to the evening of the twenty-first. During that period no leavened bread was to be used, nor was any leaven to be kept in the houses. The first day of the period, and also the seventh, were to be made holy in a special manner; and no servile work was to be done on them, except what was necessary for the preparation of food.³ This exception, it may be remarked, was not admitted in the observance of the ordinary Sabbath.

(3) The festival of unleavened bread was, therefore, introduced by the observance of the Paschal rite; and so it

¹ John, xix. 31.

² Exod. xii. 3-20; xxxiv. 25; Levit. xxiii. 4-8; Numb. ix. 1-14; xxviii. 16, 17; Deut. xvi. 1-8; see also Smith, Dict. of the Bible, *passover*; Kitto, Cyclop. of Bib. Lit. *passover*, p. 423, note.

³ Exod. xii. 14-20; xiii. 5-7; xxiii. 14, 15, 18; xxxiv. 18, 25; Levit. xxiii. 6-8; Numb. xxviii. 16-25; Deut. xvi. 3, 4, 8.

came to be spoken of, not unfrequently, as *the festival of the Pasch*.¹ (4) It is plain from the terms of the law,² and it is quite certain from many sources, that, in connection with this as with other festivals, the Jews reckoned the day from sunset to sunset: and therefore, according to the Mosaic law, the great festival day of the Pasch began at sunset on the fourteenth day of the month Nisan, and ended at sunset on the fifteenth.

Now it may be taken as certain that our Lord, at his Last Supper, kept the Pasch with his Apostles. No doubt, some eminent scholars have sought to escape from the difficulties in which this question is involved, by maintaining that our Lord did not keep the Pasch at all, on the occasion of his Last Supper.³ But this opinion has been justly characterised by Benedict the Fourteenth as too daring—*nimis audax*; for it is entirely at variance, as well with the constant tradition of the Church, as with the plain sense of the Gospel narrative.

We are told that, the day having arrived when *the Pasch should be killed*, the disciples said to Jesus, "Whither wilt thou that we go, and *prepare for thee to eat the Pasch*?" Then Jesus sent Peter and John into the city, directing them where to go, and telling them to say to the goodman of the house, "The Master saith, My time is near at hand, *I will keep the Pasch* at thy house with my disciples". They went accordingly into the city, and they found as he had told them, and they *prepared the Pasch*. Jesus followed with the rest; and when the hour was come, He sat down, and the twelve Apostles with Him. And He said to them, "With desire I have desired to eat this Pasch with you before I suffer."⁴ Surely this is to say, as plainly as language can say it, that our Lord, on that evening, kept the Pasch with his Apostles.

So much then is certain: that our Lord observed the Paschal rite on the occasion of his Last Supper; and that this took place on the evening of Thursday in the week of his Passion. But the question yet remains, was this the evening of the Jewish Passover?—a question which, as we have

¹ Exod. xxxiv. 25; IV. Kings, xxiii 21-23; II. Par. xxxv. 17, 18; Luke, ii. 41; xxii. 1; Act. xii. 3, 4. See also Smith, Dict. of the Bible; Kitto, Cyclop. of Bib. Lit. *passover*.

² See, for instance, Lev. xxiii. 32, "from evening to evening shall you keep your Sabbath."

³ Lamy, Harm. Evang. lib. v. cap. 17; Calmet, Dissert. de Pasch.; Tourne- mine, Theses; See Bened. XIV. De Fest. lib. i. cap. vi. n. 8; Petrone, Prælect. Theol. de Materia Euch. prop. 1.

⁴ Matt. xxvi. 17-20; Mark, xiv. 12-17; Luke, xxii. 7-18.

said, has been much disputed and variously answered. The chief source of difficulty is that the Evangelists, particularly Saint John, afford grounds for supposing that the general body of the Jews kept the Pasch, that year, not on Thursday evening, but on Friday. We read, for example, that the Jews, on the day of the Crucifixion, abstained from going into the Prætorium of Pilate, "that they might not be defiled but *that they might eat the Pasch*".¹ Therefore, it would seem, they had not eaten it the evening before. Again, speaking of the Last Supper, Saint John represents it as taking place "*before the feast of the Pasch*".² And Friday he calls the Parasceve, or *day of preparation*;³ therefore it was not itself the festival day, but rather *the day before the festival*.

For these reasons, and some others of less weight, many of our most distinguished Commentators hold that, whereas our Lord kept the Pasch on Thursday evening, the Jews kept it on Friday evening. But they do not all explain this opinion in the same way. Some consider that the Jews kept the Pasch on the day prescribed, and that our Lord kept it on the day before, that is, on the thirteenth day of the month, at evening.⁴ Others, on the contrary, maintain that our Lord observed the Paschal rite on the fourteenth day, as prescribed by law, and that the Jews transferred it to the day following.⁶ The writers of each class, again, are not unanimous among themselves, but may be subdivided into numerous sections, according to the diverse ways in which they attempt to explain how it happened that our Lord kept the feast a day too soon, or the Jews a day too late.

We will not weary our readers with the details of this complicated controversy: for it seems to us that neither of the leading views above set forth is quite consistent with the Sacred Text. In common with many of the highest authorities, both ancient and modern, we hold, First, that our Lord kept the Pasch on the day prescribed in the law, and Secondly, that the Jews did so too; that, consequently, Thursday was the fourteenth day of the month Nisan, and our Lord was put to death on the great festival day of the Jewish Passover.⁶ The grounds on which these conclusions rest we shall first briefly

¹ John, xviii. 28.

² John, xiii. 1.

³ John, xix. 14, 31.

⁴ Origen. tract. 35 in Matt.; Chrysost. and Theophyl. in Joan. xviii. 28; Greswell, Ha. mony of the Gospels, Diss. 41, vol. iii. p. 143.

⁵ Maldonatus, in Matt. xxvi. 2; Jans. Gand. Concord. Evang. cap. 128, pp. 873, 874. See also, Langen, Die Letzten Lebenstage Jesu, p. 95; Bened. XIV. De Festis, cap. vi. n. 15.

⁶ A Lapide in Matt. xxvi. 17; Jansenius Yprensis, in Matt. xxvi. 17; Patrizzi, De Evang. Diss. 1; Bened. XIV, De Festis, lib. i. cap. vi. n. 15; Langen, Die Letzten Lebenstage Jesu, pp. 95, 128; also Schoetgen, Lightfoot, Olshausen, Hengstenberg, Robinson; see Smith, Dict. of the Bible, *passover*, p. 720, note p.

point out, and then we shall consider in detail the various objections which have been advanced against them.

I. We maintain, then, as in the highest degree probable, that our Lord and his Apostles kept the Pasch on the day prescribed by the Mosaic law. (1) The language of the Evangelists clearly implies that the Pasch of our Lord was not a special and extraordinary Pasch, but the usual Pasch, an ordinance of the law, well known to everybody. This is apparent from such phrases as the following:—"Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee *to eat the Pasch?*"¹ "*I will keep the Pasch* at thy house with my disciples".² "And they *made ready the Pasch*".³ Now to keep the Pasch, in the ordinary and true sense of the word, meant not merely to eat certain kinds of food, but to do so *at the time*, and in the manner prescribed by law: and if our Lord did not eat the Paschal meal on the day enjoined, He could not be said truly to keep the Pasch.

(2) Again, we must suppose that the Pasch, kept by our Lord, was the same as that of which He had spoken Himself, a little before, when He said, "You know that after two days will be the Pasch".⁴ But who will say that He meant to speak here of a special Pasch, kept only by Himself and his Apostles, and not rather of the common Pasch enjoined upon all by the Mosaic law? The Greek text shows this argument in a still stronger light: *οἶδατε ὅτι μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας τὸ πάσχα γίνεται*, "You know that after two days *is the Pasch*"; as if to say, that fixed and well known festival day.

(3) Once more: our Lord kept the Pasch on the evening of the day on which He sent his two Apostles to prepare it. But that day is expressly described by Saint Luke as the day "on which *it was necessary*—*ἐν ᾧ ἔδει*—that the Pasch should be killed";⁵ that is to say, the fourteenth day of the month Nisan.

(4) Lastly, it must have been known to the Jews that Jesus Christ kept the Pasch on Thursday evening: and if this were not the day fixed by law, they would surely have alleged that fact, as a crime, when they brought him the same night, before the High priest.

It is worthy of note that, in support of these arguments, we are able to adduce the authority even of those eminent writers who reject the opinion we are defending. With one voice they all confess that the first three Gospels, according to the obvious sense of the narrative, would appear to represent

¹ Matt. xxvi. 17.

² Matt. xxvi. 18.

³ Luke, xxii. 13.

⁴ Matt. xxvi. 2.

⁵ Luke, xxii. 7.

our Lord as observing the ordinary Jewish Passover; and that they never would have thought of putting any other meaning on the Sacred Text, if it were not that the difficulties against this opinion seemed to be insurmountable. Now we hope, in the sequel, to show that these difficulties all admit of a perfectly satisfactory solution: and if we succeed in doing so, it will follow that there is no sufficient reason for giving up the plain and obvious sense of the Gospel narrative.

II. In the next place, it seems to us much the more probable opinion that the Jews, too, kept the Pasch on the day prescribed by Moses; and, therefore, on the same day as our Lord. (1) For notwithstanding the malice and corruption of their hearts, which so often drew down upon them the severe reprehension of Jesus Christ, the leaders of the people seem to have adhered strictly to the exact letter of the law; at least, in all cases where the law was clear and explicit. Therefore we have a strong presumption that they observed the law in keeping the Pasch, a solemnity in which the whole nation was deeply concerned, and on which the law spoke in terms the most distinct and emphatic.

(2) If the Jews did not keep the Pasch on the day prescribed, there must have been two Paschs kept that year; one by our Lord on Thursday evening, and one by the general body of the Jews on Friday. But it seems hard to reconcile this supposition with the words of our Lord already quoted, "After two days is the Pasch"—*τὸ πάσχα*; which obviously imply that there was but *one Pasch*, and *that* the well defined and well known festival prescribed by the law.

(3) Furthermore, Saint Mark seems to say distinctly that the Jews killed their Pasch on the same day that our Lord sent his disciples forward to prepare the Pasch for Him: for he describes it as "the first day of unleavened bread, *when they killed the Pasch*".¹

There is one significant circumstance which lends no small support, at once, to both the opinions we are maintaining. It is the release of Barabbas, the malefactor. Pilate was accustomed to release unto the Jews one prisoner, whomsoever they desired, *on the feast day*—*κατὰ ἑορτήν*;² or, as Saint John has it, *on the Pasch*—*ἐν τῷ πάσχα*.³ Now, on the day of the Crucifixion, according to Saint Mark, the Jews came to Pilate, in the forenoon, and asked him to do according to his custom.⁴ He urged them, at first, to ask for the release of Jesus Christ; but failing in this, he at length consented, in obedience to their demand, to set Barabbas free, and he delivered up

¹ Mark, xiv. 12.

² Matt., xxvii. 15; Mark, xv. 6; Luke, xxiii. 17.

³ John, xviii. 39.

⁴ Mark, xv. 8.

Jesus Christ to be crucified. The tenor of this narrative clearly conveys that Barabbas was set free on the festival day of the Pasch. But if this was the festival day with the Jews, they must have observed the Paschal rite the evening before. It follows, then, that the Jews kept the Pasch on the same evening as our Lord.

Some writers of great ability have attempted to solve the difficulties of this controversy by a somewhat singular theory, which is plausible enough to claim at least a passing notice. They maintain that our Lord kept his Pasch on Thursday, and the Jews kept theirs on Friday, yet that both, in a certain sense, observed the law: our Lord, according to the strict letter of the Inspired Books; the Jews, according to a certain modification sanctioned by the tradition of their fathers. It is alleged by these writers that when the day fixed in the law for the Paschal solemnity, fell on a Friday, the Jews were accustomed to transfer the festival to the following Saturday; and thus avoid the inconvenience of having two days of rest in immediate succession. Now this, it is said, was just what occurred in the year of our Lord's Crucifixion. The festival of the Pasch, as fixed by the law, happened to fall on a Friday: our Lord kept the feast on that day, and accordingly ate his Paschal meal the evening before. The Jews, on the other hand, according to established custom, transferred the festival to Saturday, and ate the Paschal meal on Friday evening.¹

If the learned advocates of this opinion could establish that the custom on which they rely did really exist, at the time of our Lord, then indeed they might claim to have solved the Gordian knot. But so far as we know, they have failed to do so: nay, they do not appear to have seriously made the attempt. Others however have investigated the matter; and have shown, from the highest Jewish authorities, that the custom in question was not introduced until after the final destruction of Jerusalem.² It is obvious to infer, if the custom did not exist, that the explanation before us, which supposes the custom, cannot be admitted.

It now remains to defend our views from the objections which have been urged against them, and which are taken, for the most part, from the Gospel of Saint John. They all tend to this one point, that the Jews did not keep the Pasch on the same day as our Lord, but on the following day;

¹ Maldon. in Matt. xxvi. 2, p. 531; Jans. Gand. Conc. Evang. cap. cxxviii. p. 874; Calv. Harm. in Matt. xxvi. 17.

² Lamy, Harm. Evang. lib. v. Dissert. § ix; A Lap. in Matt. xxvi. 17 Secundo; see also Smith, Dict. of the Bible, *passover*, p. 720 (c).

and that, consequently, our Lord must have kept the Pasch a day too soon, or the Jews must have kept it a day too late. In support of this argument several distinct texts are brought forward, which we propose to consider in order, and to each of which we hope to offer a fair and reasonable solution.

First, then, Saint John, speaking of the Last Supper, distinctly says that it took place "*before the festival day of the Pasch.*"¹ Therefore that festival had not yet commenced, when Jesus Christ celebrated the Paschal rite, on Thursday evening: and consequently, it was not kept, that year, by the Jews, from Thursday to Friday evening, but rather from Friday to Saturday evening. This difficulty, which, to some Commentators has seemed very formidable, may well be answered by supposing that Saint John wishes here to be understood, not according to the Jewish mode of reckoning festival days, from evening to evening, but according to the common mode of speaking among the Greeks and Romans. They counted their day as we do from midnight to midnight: and, therefore, if the festival extended over the whole of Friday down to sunset, they would naturally refer the events of the preceding evening to *the day before the festival*. This kind of phraseology prevails, in fact, among the Jews of the present day. Thus, for example, a Hebrew letter written after sunset on Saturday evening, is not dated *the first day of the week*, as we might have expected, but *the eve of the first day*.² And it seems natural that Saint John should have allowed himself a similar latitude of expression, when we remember that he wrote his Gospel full sixty years after our Lord's death, at a time when Jewish law had long ceased to be in force, and Jewish usages had long been forgotten.

But it is not a mere conjecture that Saint John was accustomed to adopt this mode of speaking. We have clear and distinct traces of it in other parts of his Gospel. Thus, after describing the supper in Bethania, he says that our Lord went up, *the next day*, to Jerusalem;³ though it would have been, in fact, *the same day*, if the day were reckoned from evening to evening. Again, speaking of the apparition of Christ to his Apostles, late on the evening of the Resurrection, he refers it to *the first day of the week*.⁴ whereas, if he counted his days from sunset to sunset, it is obvious that the evening of Sunday would have belonged to the *second* day of the week, and not to the *first*.

This explanation, which is set forth, with much learning,

¹ John, xiii. 1.

² See Kitto, Cyclop. of Bib. Lit. *day*.

³ John, xii. 12.

⁴ John, xx. 19. See Patrizzi, De Evang. Diss. l. n. 23.

by some of our ablest Biblical scholars, is certainly quite sufficient to solve the difficulty under consideration. Nevertheless it seems to us unnecessary to rest the explanation on the use of language among the Greeks and Romans. For we believe that the sense we have ascribed to the words of Saint John, is conformable to the common use of language, even among the Jews. The festival days, no doubt, were reckoned, according to law, from sunset to sunset: but this mode of reckoning does not appear to have found expression in the common language of the people. Let us examine, for a moment, the practice of Moses himself, in the Pentateuch. When explaining the law, he makes it clear that the feast of the Pasch began with the observance of the Paschal rite, on the evening of the fourteenth. Strictly speaking, therefore, the Paschal meal was eaten on the festival day.¹ Yet, over and over again, we find the Paschal rite referred to one day, and the festival to the next. "The fourteenth day of the month, at evening, is the Pasch of the Lord. And the fifteenth day of the same month is the feast of unleavened bread."² Again: "On the fourteenth day of the month is the Pasch of the Lord. And on the fifteenth day, the solemn feast."³ It appears, then, that Moses speaks of the Paschal rite as falling on the *fourteenth*, and the festival on the *fifteenth*. Does Saint John go farther than this, when he represents the evening of the Paschal meal as "before the festival day"?

There is another illustration of the subject, perhaps even more strictly to the point. The Hebrew people, having kept their first Pasch on the evening of the fourteenth day of the month Nisan, set out on their journey into the desert, early on the morning of the fifteenth. This fact is thus related in the Book of Numbers:—"The children of Israel departed from Rameses, on the fifteenth day of the first month, *the day after the Pasch.*"⁴ Now it was surely open to Saint John to represent the evening of the Pasch as "before the festival day", when Moses represents the festival day as "the day after the Pasch."

Finally, we have distinct evidence, in Josephus, that the same mode of speaking still prevailed among the Jews in the time of the Apostles. For he says, "On the fifteenth day the solemnity of the Azymes *succeeds* the solemnity of the Pasch."⁵ From this we may infer that he would not hesitate to speak of the Paschal rite as taking place *before* the festival of the Azymes.⁶

¹ See Exod. xii. 17-19.

² Levit. xxiii. 5, 6.

³ Numb. xxviii. 16, 17.

⁴ Numb. xxxiii. 3.

⁵ Joseph, Antiq. lib. iii. cap. x. § 5.

⁶ See this question ably treated by Langen, *Die Letzten Lebenstage Jesu*, pp. 98-110.

The next difficulty we have to meet is founded on the statement of Saint John, that when the Jews brought Jesus before Pilate, on the morning of the Crucifixion, they would not themselves go into the Prætorium, "that they might not be defiled, but *that they might eat the Pasch*."¹ These words, it is argued, plainly convey that the Jews had yet to eat the Paschal meal; and therefore, that they had not eaten it the evening before. This argument, we freely confess, would be unanswerable, if it were shown that by the Pasch is here meant the Paschal lamb. But it must be remembered that other victims, offered during the Paschal solemnity, were likewise called by the name of the Pasch. This is sufficiently evident from the well known passage in Deuteronomy: "Thou shalt *sacrifice the Pasch* to the Lord thy God *of sheep and of oxen*; . . . thou shalt eat no leavened bread with it."² And that the word continued to be used in this sense, at the time of our Lord, is abundantly proved from the Rabbinical writings.³

Now we know that it was usual, on the first day of the Paschal solemnity, to offer a very special sacrifice, known as the *Chagigah*, or festive thank-offering. The victim might be taken from the flock or the herd: it was slain at the door of the sanctuary: certain portions were then burned, and other portions were given to the priest: what remained might be eaten by the person who had made the offering; and he generally invited his friends to join him. Thus the *Chagigah* became the occasion of a social and festive meal.⁴

Those who were legally unclean were forbidden to partake of the *Chagigah*: and nothing could have been more natural than that the Jews, on the morning of the festival day, should have been careful to keep themselves free from legal defilement, that they might not be excluded from it. Now there can be little doubt that the *Chagigah* was one of those offerings commonly known under the name of the Pasch. And, therefore, we may fairly suppose that Saint John, in the passage before us, refers to the eating of the *Chagigah*, and not to the eating of the Paschal lamb.⁵

Nay more: there is intrinsic evidence that our interpretation is the more probable of the two. The Jews would not go into the Court of Pilate, lest they should be defiled and prevented from eating the Pasch. Now, in fact, this uncleanness

¹ John, xviii. 28.

² Deut. xvi. 2, 3. See also II Paral. xxxv. 8, 9.

³ See Patrizzi, De Evang. Diss. l. n. 28; Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. in Mark, xv. 25, and John, xviii. 28.

⁴ See Smith. Dict. of the Bible, *passover*, p. 717; Robinson's Harmony, p. 156.

⁵ See Langen, Die Letzten Lebenstage Jesu, pp. 111-117.

would not have been a practical hindrance to their eating the Paschal lamb, but it would have been a practical hindrance to their eating the Chagigah. The act in question, of going into a heathen's house, induced but a slight uncleanness, which could be removed by a simple evening ablution. Therefore if the Paschal lamb were to be eaten that evening, the uncleanness might have been easily got rid of before the time for the meal had arrived. But the victim of the Chagigah was slain early in the day, and eaten before the hour of the evening ablutions. Consequently any uncleanness incurred in the morning would have effectually excluded the Jews from all share in this social festivity.¹

The third difficulty is likewise taken from Saint John, who calls the day of Crucifixion "the Parasceve of the Pasch."² Now, the word Parasceve, in Greek *παρασκευή*, signifies literally a *preparation*. Hence the *Parasceve of the Pasch* would seem to mean the *preparation*, or *day of preparation*, for the Pasch; that is, the day before the Pasch, on which it was necessary to prepare those things that were required for the festival. Consequently, the day of the Crucifixion was not the festival day, as we have supposed, but the day before it.

It is quite true that the word Parasceve, if we looked only to its etymology, might fairly be understood to mean, simply, the day of preparation; and the Parasceve of the Pasch would then certainly be the day of preparation for the Pasch. But the precise meaning of words is to be learned rather from common usage than from considerations of etymology. And we hope to show, from the use of this word Parasceve in the Gospel, that it meant, not a day of preparation in general, but the day of preparation for the Sabbath; in other words, the sixth day of the week, or Friday. If this be so, then the *Parasceve of the Pasch* would mean the *Friday of the Pasch*, that is, the Friday that fell within the seven days of the Paschal solemnity.

Saint Mark tells us very clearly what is the meaning of Parasceve. He says that, when evening was come, Joseph of Arimathea went boldly to Pilate, and begged the body of Jesus, "because it was the Parasceve, *which is the day before the Sabbath*"—*ἐπεὶ ἦν παρασκευή, ὃ ἐστὶν προσάββατον.*³ Words could hardly be found to express more clearly what the Jews understood by the Parasceve. It was *the*

¹ See Patrizzi, *De Evang. Diss.* l. n. 29; Langen, 115-7; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* in John xviii. 28; Robinson's *Harmony*, p. 158.

² John, xix. 14.

³ Mark, xv. 42.

day before the Sabbath, that is, the sixth day of the week, or Friday.

No such distinct definition of the word *Parasceve* is given by the other Evangelists,—who, indeed, could not be expected to define a word that must have been generally understood at the time in which they wrote,—but they pretty clearly convey the same meaning, at least implicitly. Saint John writes: “The Jews, therefore, because it was the *Parasceve*, that the bodies might not remain upon the cross on the Sabbath day, besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away.”¹ The reasoning of this passage is very evident: *Because* it was the *Parasceve*, it was necessary to take away the bodies at once; otherwise they would remain upon the cross on the Sabbath day. It is assumed, then, that *because* this day was the *Parasceve*, the next day was the Sabbath; an assumption which would not be lawful unless *Parasceve* meant Friday.

We find the word next introduced in the account of our Lord’s burial. After describing the sepulchre in the garden, near the place of Crucifixion, Saint John says: “There, therefore, on account of the *Parasceve* of the Jews, they laid Jesus, because the sepulchre was nigh at hand.”² As if to say: On account of the *Parasceve*, they did not carry the body to a distance, but laid it in the sepulchre close by. But why this haste *on account of* the *Parasceve*? Was it because the *Parasceve* was followed by the Sabbath? or was it because the *Parasceve* was followed by the Pasch? The text before us does not say: but the question seems to be answered by Saint Luke, who concludes his account of the interment with the words: “And that day was the *Parasceve*, and the Sabbath drew on.”³ The close connection of these two clauses would seem to convey, that *because* it was the *Parasceve*, the Sabbath was approaching: and we are no longer left in doubt *why* there was need of a hasty interment, *on account of* the *Parasceve* of the Jews.

Again, Saint Matthew, recording how the Jewish authorities, on the Saturday after the Crucifixion, demanded a guard from Pilate for the sepulchre of our Lord, writes thus:—“And on the next day, *which is after the Parasceve*, the chief priests and the Pharisees came together to Pilate.”⁴ About the substantial sense of these words there is no dispute. Saint Matthew wants to fix attention on the circumstance that this was the day on which the body of our Lord was lying in the

¹ John, xix. 31.² John, xix. 42.³ Luke, xxiii. 54.⁴ Matt. xxvii. 62.

tomb ; and since it was well known that the Crucifixion took place on the Parasceve, he marks this day as the one that followed the Parasceve. The clause, then, has just the same force as if it ran thus : “ On the next day, that is, the day after the Crucifixion.” But while we fully accept this explanation, it seems to us that the mode of expression chosen by Saint Matthew fits in much better with the meaning we attach to the word Parasceve than it does with the meaning against which we are contending. We can understand how this Saturday might naturally have been referred to as *the day after the Friday*, that is, the well known Friday of the Crucifixion. But if it were itself the festival day of the Pasch, would it not be strange to describe it as *the day after the day of preparation for the festival*? This latter mode of speaking would be pretty much the same as if one were now, in relating an occurrence of Christmas Day, to say that it took place on *the day after Christmas Eve*.

We have now brought under notice every text of Scripture in which the word Parasceve occurs, and we may briefly sum up the results at which we have arrived. Passing over the text which is the subject of discussion, we have first, the definition of Saint Mark, who explains what is meant by the Parasceve, and says it is “ the day before the Sabbath.” This is exactly our definition, too. Next, we have the argument of Saint John, that *because* the day of Crucifixion was the Parasceve the next day was the Sabbath. From this we infer that the Parasceve was, *of necessity*, followed by the Sabbath ; and, therefore, that the Parasceve was the eve of the Sabbath, and not the eve of a festival in general. Thirdly, we have two parallel passages, one from Saint Luke, the other from Saint John, which, taken together, strongly suggest, though perhaps they do not quite demonstrate, that the close of the Parasceve implied the approach of the Sabbath. Lastly, we have the text of Saint Matthew, in which, to say the least, the sense would be perfectly well preserved if the word Friday were simply put in the place of the word Parasceve.

Besides these positive arguments, there are some considerations of a negative character not undeserving of notice. First, there is absolutely no example of the word Parasceve being applied to any day except Friday. It is used six times in Scripture ; and, in every instance, the day referred to is, in point of fact, a Friday. On this point all are agreed. Secondly, there is no evidence whatever to prove that the day before a festival was called a Parasceve, by the Jews. No doubt, certain preparations were required for a festival, as

well as for a Sabbath : and since the Parasceve meant literally a *preparation*, it *might* have been fitly used to designate the day before a festival, no less than to designate the day before the Sabbath. But that it *was* so used is an assertion that we cannot admit without evidence of the fact : for conjectures founded on etymology alone, are a very delusive guide as to the actual meaning of words. Thus, amongst ourselves, the word *Lady Day* would be an appropriate title for *all* the festivals of the Blessed Virgin : but, as a matter of fact, only two of them, as we know, are so called, the twenty-fifth of March and the fifteenth of August. In like manner, the word Parasceve might perhaps have been a suitable name for the vigils of festivals as well as for the vigils of Sabbaths ; but we are not therefore justified in inferring that it was so used in point of fact.

If it were necessary, we might confirm our argument by a long list of early Fathers, who were accustomed to speak of Friday as the Parasceve, and who, so far, bear witness to the received meaning of the word in their own time.¹ But we have trespassed, perhaps, too much already on the patience of our readers : and we shall bring this branch of the discussion to an end, by referring to the authority of the Syriac version, which translates the Greek word Parasceve into the Syriac word for Friday. There is only one exception to this rule, and even the exception itself fully supports our argument. In the passage where the friends of our Lord are said to have laid his body in the tomb that was close by, "on account of the Parasceve of the Jews", we read in the Syriac version, "on account of *the Sabbath coming on*". The authors, therefore, must have understood that the Parasceve here meant the day before the Sabbath.

Once it is admitted that the word Parasceve had come to be used among the Jews as the proper name of Friday, no difficulty remains about the phrase, *the Parasceve of the Pasch*. Since the feast of the Pasch extended over a period of seven days, all the days of the week must have occurred within its limits : and nothing could have been more natural than to distinguish them by their respective names, as the Monday of the Pasch, the Tuesday of the Pasch, the Friday of the Pasch ; just as now we speak of Easter Monday and Easter Tuesday. Nor are we left without ancient authority, even on this point. Socrates, the ecclesiastical historian, speaks about *the Sabbath of the festival*, *σάββατον τῆς ἑορτῆς* ;² and

¹ See Langen, Die Letzten Lebenstage Jesu, pp. 123, 124. ² Hist. Eccl. v. 22.

in the epistles ascribed to Saint Ignatius of Antioch, we find the phrase, *the Sabbath of the Pasch*, σαββατον τοῦ πάσχα.¹ It is therefore not uncomformable with ancient usage that Saint John should speak of *the Friday of the Pasch*.²

A fourth passage of Saint John, often quoted against our view, is the one where, speaking of the solicitude of the Jews that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the Sabbath day, he throws in by way of parenthesis, "for that was a great Sabbath day".³ It is argued, that if the Saturday following the Crucifixion were the festival day of the Pasch, it would very properly be called "a great Sabbath". For, to the ordinary sanctity of the Sabbath would be added the special solemnity of a high festival. Whereas there would be no sufficient reason for making it out as "a great Sabbath" if it were only, as we have supposed, the day after the feast.

This argument fails in two points: the foundation of fact is uncertain; the reasoning is inconclusive. First, as regards the foundation of fact. It is assumed that Saint John, speaking of the day that followed the Crucifixion, says that it was *a great Sabbath*. Now according to the more common Greek reading which is supported, too, by the Vulgate version, he does not say, "That was a great Sabbath day", but rather, "Great was that day of the Sabbath";— ἦν γὰρ μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη τοῦ σαββάτου, erat enim magnus dies ille Sabbati. The difference of meaning is obvious. One expression signifies that this was *a great Sabbath*, as compared with *other Sabbaths*: while the other signifies that the Sabbath was a great day as compared with *other days*. Now this latter version is quite in harmony with the context of the whole passage. It furnishes an appropriate reason why the Jews were unwilling that the bodies should remain upon the cross on the Sabbath day; for, great was that day of the Sabbath among the Jews. This, no doubt, would be superfluous information if it were addressed to those who had been familiar all their lives with Jewish laws and customs. But it was not superfluous when addressed to the general body of Christians, sixty years after the Jewish religion had been abrogated, and the Christian religion set up in its stead.

¹ Ep. ad Phil. 13.

² See on this subject, Langen, loc. cit. pp. 117-128; Patrizzi, de Evang. Diss. l. nn. 37-43; Smith, Dict. of the Bible, *passover*, pp. 721, 722; Robinson's Harmony, pp. 158, 159.

³ John, xix. 31.

It is only fair, however, to admit that some Greek versions of high authority, give the passage thus: ἦν γὰρ μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνου τοῦ σαββάτου, "great was the day of *that Sabbath*." This reading certainly implies that some special solemnity belonged to the day in question, over and above the ordinary solemnity of the Sabbath. But we cannot admit that it must, therefore, have been the *first day* of the Paschal festival. For there are good reasons why the Sabbath which fell on the *second day* of the festival, might well be called a great Sabbath. First, because it fell within the seven days of a great solemnity. Secondly, because on that day, the sheaf of corn representing the first fruits of the earth, was offered to God in the temple.¹ Thirdly, because that day was sanctified by more numerous sacrifices than the other days of the Paschal feast.² We say then, that there are two readings of this passage: according to one reading, there is no difficulty at all; according to the other, the difficulty exists, but it admits of a satisfactory explanation.³

Another difficulty, which has been strongly urged, is founded on the strict observance of festival days among the Jews. Many of the acts, which accompanied the Passion and Death of our Lord, were such as could not be done, according to the Mosaic law, on a festival day:—his arrest in the Garden of Olives, his examination before the High Priest and before the Sanhedrim, his trial before Pilate, the scourging, the carrying of the cross, the Crucifixion. Now it can hardly be supposed that the Jewish leaders would have openly transgressed the law, in many ways, at the very time that they were clamouring for the death of Jesus Christ, on account of an alleged violation of the law. We may infer, therefore, that the day on which all these things were done, that is, the day of the Crucifixion, was not a festival day.⁴

This argument, though plausible at first sight, derives in reality its chief strength from boldness of assertion. In the first place, it is to be noticed, that most of the acts referred to were done, not by the Jews, but by the Romans. The scourging was inflicted by Roman soldiers; the sentence of death was passed by the Roman Governor; by Roman soldiers Jesus Christ was forced to carry the cross; and by Roman soldiers He was put to death. Nothing remains, therefore,

¹ Levit. xxiii. 10, 11.

² Levit. xxiii. 12-14.

³ See Patrizzi, *De Evang.* Diss. l. nn. 44-49.

⁴ Greswell, *Diss. on Harm.* iii. pp. 155-9; Jans. *Gand. Concord.* cap. cxviii. p. 874; Maldon. in *Matt.* xxvi. 2, p. 528, c.

but the arrest in the Garden, the examination before the Jewish authorities, and the accusation before Pilate. And the question we have to consider is simply this, whether the above mentioned acts were against the letter of the Mosaic law: for the enemies of our Lord paid little heed, as every one knows, to the spirit of the law, while they piqued themselves upon observing it according to the letter.

First, as regards the judicial investigation, whether before the High Court of the Jews, or before the Roman Governor, there is no satisfactory evidence that a trial of this kind was forbidden either on the Sabbath or on festival days. No such prohibition is to be found in the Books of Moses. And the Talmud, though it professes to enumerate all the actions that were regarded as unlawful on a day of rest, makes no mention of a judicial inquiry.¹

Passing next to the arrest of our Lord in the Garden of Olives, we do not think it has been shown, either from the Sacred Books or from the Rabbinical authorities, that such a proceeding on a festival day was held to be against the law. But whether it was against the law or not, there is clear proof that the Jewish leaders had no scruple about it. When taking counsel together, how they might lay hold on Jesus, they said, "Not on the festival day, *lest perhaps there should be a tumult among the people.*"² They did not consider, therefore, that the law stood in their way; but they feared a public disturbance. On another occasion, they actually did send out their officers, although it was a great feast day, to arrest Jesus Christ; and afterwards rebuked them severely for not doing it.³

But it is further argued that many things are recorded of our Lord's own friends and followers, which could not have been lawfully done on a festival day. The taking down of the body from the cross, the preparations for the burial, and the burial itself, are among the most striking examples. Further, it was against the law to buy and sell on a feast day: yet we find that Joseph of Arimathea *bought* fine linen to wrap round the body of our Lord before it was laid in the tomb.⁴ It is said, too, that some of the Apostles, when Judas went forth from the supper room, late on Thursday evening, thought that perhaps he was sent to *buy* what things they had need of for the feast.⁵ Now the Apostles could not think that their Master would send one of them to do what was forbidden

¹ See Patrizzi, De Evang. Diss. l. n. 53; Langen, Die Letzten Lebenstage Jesu, pp. 132-4; Smith, Dict. of the Bible, *passover*, f. p. 722.

² Matt. xxvi. 5.

³ John, vii. 32-45.

⁴ Mark, xv. 46.

⁵ John, xiii. 29.

by the law. It follows, that the festival day had not yet arrived.

These arguments it will be time enough to answer when they are shown to have any solid foundation in the Mosaic law, either as it exists in the Pentateuch, or as it was commonly understood by the Jews at the time of our Lord. As they come before us, at present, they are based only on conjectures. It is forbidden, no doubt, in the Talmud, to bury the dead on the *Sabbath*, but this prohibition does not extend to *festival days*. Nay, even on the Sabbath, it was expressly commanded to bury the bodies of those who had suffered the punishment of death.¹ And, of course, in those cases where it was not unlawful to bury the dead, it was not unlawful to make the necessary preparations.

The same distinction between the law of the Sabbath and of festival days, may be applied to the questions of buying and selling. It has not been proved that the practice of buying and selling, within certain limits, was regarded as unlawful on a festival. We find it laid down by Moses himself, that such work might be done on the feast of the Pasch as was connected with the preparation of food:² and this privilege would seem naturally to include the buying of all things needful. Hence the Apostles may have conjectured, not unreasonably, that Judas was sent out to buy what was required for the sacrifice and feast of the Chagigah, which generally took place on the first day of unleavened bread.³

But the passage of Saint John to which we have just alluded, though quoted so often against our opinion, tells, in fact, strongly in its favour. We are maintaining, be it remembered, that the feast of the Pasch was kept from Thursday to Friday evening, not from Friday to Saturday evening. If we are right, there is no difficulty in understanding how the Apostles may have supposed that Judas was sent out from the supper table, to buy at once whatever was needful for the feast, which was then actually impending. But if the feast day were Saturday, how could they suppose that Judas was sent out late on Thursday night, with the instructions, What thou dost do quickly, to buy, at that unseasonable hour, what could just as well have been provided at any time on Friday?

It may seem strange that the Jews, who had no scruple in clamouring for the *crucifixion* of our Lord on the *festival day*, were nevertheless very solicitous that his body should not

¹ Patrizzi, De Evang. Diss. l. n. 56; Langen, 135, 136.

² Exod. xii. 16. ³ See Patrizzi, De Evang. Diss. l. nn. 7, 26; Langen, 136.

*remain upon the cross on the Sabbath.*¹ But this was just one more illustration of their singular perversity of character : they strained at a gnat and swallowed a camel. We are not trying to show that they acted, in this matter, consistently or reasonably ; but that, according to our view about the day of Crucifixion, they did not act against the letter of the law. We have established, from the words of Moses himself, that the law of rest was more strict on the Sabbath day than on the festival day : and there is nothing to prevent us from supposing, that the Jews may have thought it lawful to attend an execution on the Paschal feast, but not lawful to leave the bodies on the cross for the Sabbath.

A curious illustration of the distinction they made, in respect to the law of rest, between the festival day and the Sabbath, is found in the Talmud, and helps to throw some light on the question before us. It was prescribed to kill the Paschal lamb towards evening, between three and five O'Clock, on the fourteenth day of the month Nisan. But when the fourteenth of Nisan fell on the Sabbath, then it was ordered not to kill the lamb till after sunset. Thus it appears that such an act was considered inconsistent with the observance of the Sabbath, but not inconsistent with the observance of a festival : and this notwithstanding the express instructions of Moses as to the time when the lamb was to be slain.²

Two objections yet remain of trifling importance. First, the words of the chief priests and elders are sometimes quoted : "Not on the festival day, lest perhaps there should be a tumult among the people."³ The enemies of our Lord had, therefore, made up their minds beforehand *not* to arrest Jesus Christ on the festival day : whereas, according to our view, they actually *did* arrest Him, and even had Him tried, condemned, and executed, on the festival day.

This objection, if it had any force, would tell equally against all opinions. The day of the Crucifixion was, certainly, either the festival day, or the day before the festival. But the danger of a tumult would have been just the same in either case. For the danger arose from the great crowd of strangers which the festival brought together into the city : and these strangers would have already arrived in Jerusalem the day before the festival. Nay, in the supposition against which we are contending, they would most probably have been thronging the public way, and making their preparations for

¹ See John, xix. 31. ² Langen, Die Letzten Lebenstage Jesu, p. 136.

³ Matt. xxvi. 5 ; Mark, xiv. 2.

the Paschal solemnity, at the very time when Jesus was led forth as a malefactor, from the court of Pilate, and conducted, in solemn procession, to Mount Calvary. From this consideration it appears, that the motive which influenced the Jewish leaders, would have prevented the arrest and crucifixion of Jesus Christ, on the day before the festival, just as much as on the festival day itself. Consequently, their first intention must have been, to postpone these proceedings until after the festival. But they were probably induced to change their plans, partly because, through the treachery of Judas, they were enabled to arrest our Lord secretly in the Garden, and partly, because they succeeded beyond their hopes in exciting the passions of the populace against Him.

The other difficulty is founded on the text of Exodus: "Let none of you go out at the door of his house until the morning."¹ According to the Mosaic law, no one might leave the house where he had eaten the Paschal meal, until morning had come. But our Lord and his Apostles went out, during the night, to the Garden of Olives. Therefore this was not the night of the Paschal solemnity. This argument, it is plain, would lead to the conclusion, that our Lord did not keep the Pasch at all, on the occasion of his Last Supper. Such a conclusion, however, as we have already shown, would be opposed to the express testimony of the first three Gospels. The argument, therefore, cannot be valid. And it only devolves on us to inquire, how the fact is to be explained, that our Lord went out, when supper was over, although Moses commanded that none should go out until morning.

Nor have we far to seek. On referring to the passage in Exodus, we find that Moses is not laying down the law for the future observance of the Paschal rite, but is giving instructions to be followed on the occasion when the Hebrew people ate the Paschal meal in Egypt. It is well known that some of the observances of that night were peculiar to itself, and formed no part of the permanent Paschal ceremony.² Thus, for example, the Pasch, in Egypt, was eaten standing; subsequently it was eaten sitting or reclining.³ The chief differences between the permanent rite and the Pasch observed in Egypt, are carefully set forth in the Talmud: and, amongst them, we find it recorded that whereas, in Egypt, every one should pass the night where he kept the Pasch, no such obligation existed in subsequent times.⁴

¹ Exod. xii. 22.

² Smith. Dict. of the Bible, *passover* II. p. 713.

³ Id. ib. p. 716, 717.

⁴ Langen, *Die Letzten Lebenstage Jesu*, pp. 129, 130.

This difference might be fairly inferred even from the words of Moses himself. After the injunction in Exodus, that none should go out of his house until morning, he immediately adds the reason of it:—"For the Lord will pass through, smiting the Egyptians: and when He shall see the blood on the lintel, and on the two side posts, He will pass over the door of the house, and will not suffer the destroyer to come into your houses to smite you."¹ The Hebrews, in Egypt, were instructed to remain within doors after the Paschal meal, that they might escape the hand of the destroying Angel. This reason, it is evident, was peculiar to that occasion: and, therefore, we might fairly suppose, even in the absence of authority, that the injunction founded upon it was not intended for subsequent times.

The views we have endeavoured to establish and to defend in this long and, we fear, wearisome paper, are briefly these: First, that our Lord kept the Pasch on the day prescribed by the Mosaic law; and Secondly, that the Jews did so too. It follows, that the Crucifixion took place on the great festival day of the Jewish Passover; and that the evening chosen by our Lord for the institution of the sublime mystery of the Eucharist, was the same which was set apart, in the Old Law, for the celebration of the Paschal rite, the figure and the shadow of that mystery:

" In hac mensa novi Regis,
 " Novum Pascha novæ legis,
 " Phase vetus terminat.

" Vetustatem novitas,
 " Umbram fugat veritas,
 " Noctem lux eliminat."

¹ Exod. xii. 23.

THE PREROGATIVES OF THE ROMAN PONTIFF.

From the Pastoral Letter of His Eminence Cardinal Cullen.

EACH succeeding year at this period, the virtues, the labours, and the sufferings of those heralds of the gospel who laid down their lives and shed their blood for Christ naturally recur to our minds ; but we should make it a special duty to meditate on the dignity, the powers, and the privileges conferred by the Redeemer on St. Peter.

To this great Prince of the Apostles all Catholics, by the sweetest ties of gratitude, owe the profoundest respect and veneration. To his guidance and protection we have been committed in the all-important matter of our eternal salvation ; on him Christ built His Church as on a solid foundation, against which the gates of hell shall never prevail ; to him he gave the divine commission to feed his lambs and sheep, and the important charge to watch over, to correct, and to bring back his brethren should they wander away from the paths of truth.

St. Peter still discharges these duties, acting and living in the persons of his venerable successors, the inheritors of his dignity and authority ; through them he still continues to confirm or correct the brethren ; and he is still at the helm of the mystical boat of the Church, steering it safely through every storm.

When, carried away by the pride of his heart, Nestorius, patriarch of the imperial city of Constantinople, assailed the dignity of the Mother of God, pretending that there were two persons, a divine and a human one, in our Lord—thus showing, as St. John says, by “dissolving Jesus that he was not of God”¹—St. Celestine raised his voice against such fatal errors, and condemned them ; and his censures and anathemas were received by the Fathers of the Council of Ephesus with as much respect as if they had been uttered by the Prince of the Apostles himself in person.

The condemnation of Eutyches was received with similar feelings by the great Synod of Chalcedon ; and when the letter of the then reigning Pontiff, passing sentence on that obstinate heretic, had been read, all the Fathers cried out that Peter had spoken through St. Leo—*Petrus per Leonem locutus est*—thus giving us a convincing proof of the universal belief of the primacy of St. Peter in those remote ages of the Church.

¹ 1 Ep. St. John.

In more recent times the Council of Florence defined that the Roman Pontiff is "the true Vicar of Christ and the Head of the whole Church, and the Father and Teacher of all Christians ; that to him, *in Blessed Peter, was given, by Jesus Christ our Lord, full power to feed, rule, and govern the Universal Church.*"

Finally, not three years ago, nearly all the bishops of the Church, assembled around the Pontifical throne in the Vatican Basilica, near the tombs of the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, published the following solemn decision :—"Further, we teach and declare that, by the appointment of our Lord, the Roman Church possesses the supreme authority of ordinary jurisdiction over all other churches, and that this power of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, which is truly episcopal, is immediate ; to which all, both pastors and faithful of whatsoever rite and dignity, both individually and collectively, are bound to submit, by the duty of hierarchical subordination and true obedience, not only in matters belonging to faith and morals, but also in those that appertain to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world ; so that by the preservation of unity both of communion and of the profession of the same faith with the Roman Pontiff, the Church of Christ may be one flock under one supreme pastor. This is the teaching of the Catholic Church, from which no one can deviate without detriment to faith and salvation."

The same Fathers also published the following decree regarding the Pope's Infallibility :—

"Faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith, for the glory of God our Saviour, the exaltation of the Catholic religion, and the salvation of Christian people, with the approbation of the sacred Council, we teach and define it to be a dogma divinely revealed : That when the Roman Pontiff speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when in the office of pastor and teacher of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines that a doctrine regarding faith or morals is to be held by the universal Church, he enjoys by the Divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed His Church to be endowed in defining doctrine regarding faith or morals, and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church. But if any one, which may God avert, presume to contradict this our definition, let him be anathema."

Thus the primacy of the Pope, and his infallibility in

deciding matters of faith and morals have been solemnly proclaimed by the last General Council ; and all the Catholics of the world, from the rising to the setting sun, have rejoiced in a decision which has not only condemned heretical doctrines, but has put an end to Gallicanism, and to the pretensions of other parties that tended to weaken the authority of the Church, by keeping up dissensions within her own bosom.

The Holy Fathers who illustrated the Church and edified the world by their virtues and their writings, were no less explicit in maintaining the prerogatives of the Holy See. Thus St. Jerome, the great commentator and translator of the Scriptures, writes to Pope Damasus :—

“ I hold fast to the Chair of Peter; upon whom the Church is built. . . . I shall declare to the whole world, if any person is firm in his allegiance to the Chair of Peter, he is of my mind. I hold with the successor of the fisherman. He that does not gather with you, scatters—that is, he that is not of Christ is of Antichrist.”

St. Peter Chrysologus, the eloquent Bishop of Ravenna, thus writes to the heresiarch Eutyches :—

“ We entreat you to hearken especially to the decision of the Pope at Rome, and to abide with all readiness by his final decision, because Peter, who lives and rules in his own See, returns to those who consult him the answer of truth.”

Passing over innumerable other authorities, we shall merely quote the following words, in which the great St. Bernard, a special friend and admirer of our own St. Malachy, in his work, *De Consideratione*, addresses the Pope :—

“ Thou art the Sovereign Pontiff, the head of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, the Prince of Bishops, the heir of the Apostles. Thou art like Abel in thy primacy, like Noah in thy government, like Abraham in thy patriarchate, like Melchisedeck in thy priestly character, like Aaron in thy dignity, like Peter in thy power, like Christ in thy unction. The other bishops are indeed shepherds, each having charge of a particular portion of the fold ; but thou art the only one who feedest the entire fold of Christ. For thou art the Shepherd of the shepherds. . . . Others possess a partial jurisdiction, thou the plentitude of power. The jurisdiction of others is confined within definite limits, thy jurisdiction extends over all. Thine is the indefeasable title acquired by Peter when Christ delivered to him the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and entrusted him with the care of his flock.”

The doctrines thus proclaimed by the holy Fathers and

defined by General Councils were always held in Ireland, from the days of St. Patrick, the great apostle who was commissioned by the Holy See to preach the gospel of salvation to our forefathers, down to the present time.

Indeed, an ancient canon enacted by St. Patrick himself provides—"That should any grave controversies arise in this island, they shall be referred to the Apostolic See.

This canon was always acted on in Ireland, and the famous controversy regarding the time of celebrating Easter was decided in conformity with it, by an appeal to Rome.

Letters of the learned St. Cummián upon the paschal question are still extant, written about the year 634, in which he founds his arguments upon the authority of the Pope. When his opponents objected to him the teaching of some holy Irishman, who had defended a discipline contrary to that of the Universal Church, St. Cummián, adopting the words of St. Jerome, says:—"An old authority rises up against me. In the meantime I shout out with Jerome, whoever is joined to the chair of St. Peter, with him shall I be."—(Apud Usher, Syl. Epist. p. 20).

The ancient liturgy of Ireland teaches in a similar way the great power of St. Peter. In the celebrated Missal of St. Columbanus, in the Mass of the chair of St. Peter, that Apostle is said to have received all "authority over both Jews and Gentiles," and his are declared to be "the keys of heaven, the dignity of the pontifical chair; so great a power that what he binds none can loosen, and what he looses shall be loosed also in heaven; a throne of exalted dignity, where he shall sit in judgment on all the nations of the earth."

The Collect of the Mass is still more explicit. "O God! who, on this day (it says) didst give to St. Peter, after Thyself, the lordship of the whole Church, we humbly pray Thee, that as Thou didst constitute him pastor for the safety of the flock, and that Thy sheep might be preserved from error, so now Thou mayest save us through his intercession."¹

From these few quotations, it is evident that our ancient and venerable Church never raised the standard of rebellion against the Holy See, and had nothing in common with modern Protestantism; though some recent writers and lecturers, shutting their eyes against the known truth, have had the hardihood to pretend that the heresies of Luther and Calvin were preached by St. Patrick and his disciples in this Island of Saints. Not a shadow of foundation is

¹ See Dr. Moran's Essay on the Ancient Irish Church, p. 96.

there for such assertions ; on the contrary, all the canons of our Church, its liturgy, its discipline, the lives of our saints, the continual pilgrimages to Rome, and other practices of our forefathers, the labours and preaching of our missionaries in pagan lands, which they placed in communion with Rome, all afford the strongest proof that Ireland, from the earliest ages, was most closely connected with the Apostolic See, and was ever guided by its authority in all questions of doctrine and ecclesiastical discipline.

Our great countryman, St. Columbanus, writing about the year 600 of our era, was able to state that there was no Jew, no schismatic, and no heretic in Ireland. Unhappily, we cannot make a similar assertion in our days, but we may boast that our poor country, more fortunate in preserving the faith, has been less ravaged by heresy and infidelity than most other kingdoms. Undoubtedly, this privilege is to be attributed to our continued obedience and attachment to the great centre of unity. In their difficulties, and doubts, and troubles, the Catholics of Ireland have always turned to St. Peter, and the influence of the words of the Fisherman of Galilee has ever brought peace and consolation to their hearts, banishing heresy, putting an end to schism, dissipating every fear, calming every anxiety, and filling faithful hearts with the peace and joy of the Holy Spirit.

How different, alas ! is the condition of those amongst us who have separated themselves from the true Church ; how sad is their unhappy state. Poor wanderers ! they are tossed to and fro on the dark abyss of doubt and speculation, by every wind of doctrine, with no guide but an erring judgment, no directing light but meteors that seduce them to destruction, no principle of union, except an inveterate hatred of the one true Church, the spouse of Jesus Christ. Oh ! that they may see the errors of their ways, that they may retrace their steps ; taking refuge in the ark of salvation, may they place themselves under the guidance of the successors of the Prince of the Apostles, so that there may be but one fold and one shepherd.

The authority of St. Peter was never more necessary than at present to preserve us from the contagion of error, and from corrupting and dangerous opinions. Undoubtedly, the time appears to have come, described by that Apostle, where he says : " There shall be among you lying teachers, who shall bring in sects of perdition, and deny the Lord who bought them ; bringing upon themselves swift destruction : and many shall follow their riotousness, through whom the

way of truth shall be evil spoken of, and through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you. Whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their perdition slumbereth not."—(2 Pet. ii. 1.)

How many instances, indeed, could we not quote of lying teachers, who deny our divine Lord, and bring in sects of perdition. What efforts are made to promote Atheism, Pantheism, Socialism, Communism, and every opinion hostile to religion, and destructive of human society? A Protestant missionary bishop assails the inspiration and veracity of the Scriptures, whilst professors and writers, even in our own Catholic city, reject the doctrine clearly laid down in the gospel, that the wicked will be punished with eternal torments, because, in their view—which forsooth is to be preferred to the gospel—that doctrine jars with the civilization of the nineteenth century! It is not necessary to refer to other pestiferous opinions, and especially to the wild, revolutionary, and communistic theories which are now so widely spread, and which are directed to the destruction of the foundations of society, and of all authority, human and divine. Whilst errors of every kind are thus defended by public writers and lecturers, and propagated by the press, we ought all to endeavour to protect ourselves against them by solid study, by cultivating a profound respect for the decisions of the Church, and placing ourselves under the guidance of the infallible authority of the See of Peter, to whom Christ has given the power of feeding his lambs and sheep, driving them away from the noxious pastures of error and heresy and leading them to the springs of everlasting truth.

I shall now conclude this letter by recommending to your generosity the collection to be made on the Sunday within the Octave of SS. Peter and Paul, 6th July, in aid of the Association of St. Peter's Pence. You are all aware that His Holiness has been stripped of the inheritance with which the piety of past ages had enriched his predecessors, in order to enable them to maintain the independence of the Church, and to provide for its administration, and that he is now a prisoner in the hands of his wicked enemies. In the midst of his trials and persecutions the Pope has never ceased to defend our holy religion, and to uphold all its rights, and at the same time he has displayed the greatest patience, humility, constancy, firmness, courage, and charity; so that all Catholics have reason to thank God for having given them such a Pontiff in those difficult times, whilst his enemies have been obliged to admire and extol his noble virtues and the sanctity of his life.

As long as the Pope is in so sad a condition, it is the inte-

rest and the duty of all his children to assist their pastor and spiritual father. In this spirit, within the last few years, the Catholics of almost every country have made great exertions to provide for the wants of His Holiness ; thus giving a proof of their faith in the supreme and infallible authority of St. Peter, and of their love for the spiritual guide of their souls.

The Catholics of this diocese, in their poverty, have not yielded even to those who were richer and more powerful, in their sacrifices and generosity. I trust that this year they will manifest the same spirit as for the past, and that they will show their love and their reverence for the Vicar of Christ, the successor of St. Peter, their divinely-appointed guide and father, by administering to his wants, and supplying him with the means of discharging the onerous duties committed to him by Christ for the welfare of our souls, and of preserving and defending the rights and the liberty of the Catholic Church.

May the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul intercede for and protect all those who stretch out their hands to relieve the Vicar of Christ ; may they watch over and preserve the faith of Ireland, which has been always, in weal and woe, so sincerely attached to the successors of St. Peter, and so obedient to their words.

NOTES FROM CHURCH HISTORY.

No. II.—WHAT PROTESTANTISM HAS DONE FOR REASON.

PROTESTANTISM claims for all men immunity from external authority in interpreting the words of Holy Scripture. This is its vital and fundamental principle. Hence the difference between faith and simple opinion gradually disappears. Faith is reduced to the level of mere human conviction, for every man's weak judgment is made the *measure* and *exponent* of Revelation. Nay more, the authority of human reason thus considered, is raised above that of the Gospel ; for those who profess to commit themselves to the guidance of the Gospel, arrogate to themselves the right of rejecting what portions of it they please. Thus abandoned to the guidance of reason in matters beyond the sphere of reason, men fall into quagmires of doubt, and doubt ends in unbelief. The rays which reach the wanderer from the distant light of truth become fainter and more faint. Yet they struggle onward through prejudice and error until at length the starless night of infidelity

envelops them in utter darkness. For the old Christian creed the world is invited to adopt a principle equivalent to Bayles' famous axiom: "Understanding is the measure of belief."

Yet there are some who will see in this principle only a indication of the grand prerogatives of reason. Such men see in Protestantism the mighty power which unbarred the doors of the prison-house in which reason pined. They maintain that the honor of striking off her fetters, and setting her free, belongs to the great Reformer.

My possible prejudices as a Catholic may render my opinion unworthy the attention of our adversaries. Hence I shall refer to the opinions of Protestants who are entirely beyond the suspicion of Catholic prejudices.

We search in vain the works of the fiery Reformer for eulogies of reason? In his last sermon at Wittemberg he refers to reason in the following terms:—"Reason is the bride of the Devil, a prostitute, an abomination, which with its wisdom we ought to tread under foot." The words sound very like the ravings of a lunatic. Is it not a libel on truth to speak of him by whom those words were uttered as the emancipator of reason? By all reflecting minds he must be considered the enemy of reason and its development. Again, in his book "*De Servo Arbitro*" Luther writes—"If the Christian revelation evidently rejects flesh and blood that is human reason, and all that comes from man, it follows, without doubt, that all this can only be darkness and lies." "Yet the great schools do not make the less noise about them as natural lights, and cry them up to us as if they were not only useful but indispensable to the manifestation of Christian truth. So that we may be perfectly satisfied that those schools are an invention of the Devil, destined to obscure Christianity, if not to ruin it utterly." Luther's fanatical invectives against human reason and its development were such that they led to the suppression of schools and academies. The same feelings were shared by many of his followers.

Döllinger writes: "At Wittemberg the preachers George Mohr and Gabriel Didymus, both zealous Lutherans, proclaimed from the pulpit that the study of the sciences was not only useless but pernicious, and that the people could not do better than destroy academies and schools. The result of this preaching was to convert the school-house at Wittemberg into a baker's shop; the same thing occurred throughout the Duchy of Anspach." Hence, as a natural consequence, ignorance followed close in the footsteps of the reformers. A sense of these sad consequences caused the

magistrates to write thus to the Margrave of Brandenburg: "If this state of things continue, we shall soon fall into such gross ignorance that nothing will be more difficult than to find a good preacher or a skilful lawyer." So fast did ignorance continue to spread under the fostering care of Luther's heresy that the King of Denmark addressed two letters to his subjects on the matter, 1533 and 1540:—"We are convinced, and we make known to you, that the schools in all towns in our kingdom are in a deplorable state of decay, to such a point that in those schools where there were three hundred students scarcely fifty can now be reckoned. In many parishes they are completely deserted, which must be highly prejudicial to the kingdom. The title of student or minister is now held in disesteem, and few parents will consent to devote their children to learning, so that shortly the country will be but indifferently provided with learned or capable men."

Thus did Gustavus Vasa deplore the evils which he himself was instrumental in bringing about. Erasmus, too, assures us that the acceptance of Lutheranism was a sure sign of the ruin of letters: "*Ubi cumque vigeat Lutheranismus ibi litterarum est interitus.*" Again he writes in his letter (*ad Fratres Germaniae*, p. 4): "When a man professes, as Luther did, that the Aristotelian philosophy, that is to say, all philosophical science based upon the principles of Aristotle, is but the work of Satan; when he looks upon all speculative science in general as sin and error; when with Farrell he treats openly, and on all occasions, every kind of human knowledge as the conception of Hell and the Devil—how can any one suppose that such principles can produce ought but a contempt for study? Has it not been openly taught at Strasburg and elsewhere, that it is contrary to the spirit of the Gospel that people should lose their time whether in studying ancient languages (Hebrew excepted), or in instructing themselves in any other branch of human learning?" The testimonies which I have cited from such men as Luther, Gustavus Vasa, and Erasmus, only show the spirit of the Reformation was one of bitter hostility to reason and human science, and seem to afford a triumphant proof that the charge against the Catholic religion of holding reason captive, of obscuring her light, and of placing obstacles for centuries to her progress, is a base calumny.

We have said that the fundamental principle of Protestantism leads to infidelity—to a rejection of revelation and the supernatural. Protestantism is now little more than a name. As a fixed religious profession, it has no existence even in the nation which watched over its infancy. The imbecility of old age has long since fallen upon it. And infidelity, its first born,

remains to represent it, instinct with the same deep spirit of hostility to the Catholic Church. And if its development was slow for a time, it was because false teaching could not for a generation or two entirely efface from the bosom of Protestant European society the holy and salutary impressions which the Catholic Church had made upon them. With infidelity an epoch opens upon us entirely new in the history of error; an epoch which has no parallel in the Christian era; an epoch in which all moral restraints are scornfully rejected, and which threatens to bury our religion and civilization in one common ruin.

Arius, Macedonius, Luther, all leaders of sects or schisms, laboured to satisfy their followers that their teachings had the high sanction of revelation. They professed to recognise revelation as the supreme authority by which the truth of religious teachings should be tested. Seventeen centuries lent their sanction to this belief. Men of profound and varied erudition, the most illustrious names which adorn literature and the arts, accepted it as an axiom. The tongue of infidelity at length proclaims that the Bible is but a fine allegory; that religious convictions and the solemn Christian teachings regarding the Deity, and a future state of reward or punishment, are but a mere chimera. Here, in truth, understanding is made the measure of belief. The boasted principle of Protestantism regarding the entire and perfect independence of human reason in matters of faith, has put forth its leaves, and blossomed, and bears attractive but bitter and deadly fruit. Though it was in France the volcanic action of infidelity publicly manifested itself, and struck the nations dumb in the eighteenth century, it would be a mistake to assume that the infidelity of the eighteenth century was of French *origin*. The infidelity of Voltaire was not French infidelity. It was an importation from Protestant countries. It was the infidelity of England, around which the wit, and rhetoric, and withering sarcasm of Voltaire cast a fatal charm—it was the infidelity of Bolingbroke, of Hobbes, of Tindall, and others. Dr. Newman writes in confirmation of this opinion: “About 150 years ago, a school of infidelity arose in Protestant England. The infamous Voltaire came over here from France, and on his return took back with him its arguments, and propagated them amongst his countrymen.”—(*See Lecture on Catholicism in England.*) In Dr. Murray’s admirable and exhaustive work, “*De Ecclesia*,” we find the following valuable note:—“In the latter half of the eighteenth century, the Deism which had been troubling England had passed through the French alembic of scepticism, and now settles down in a shower of rationalism in Germany.”

It may be interesting to hear what the professors of this so called philosophy thought of it, and how far they consider it advanced the interests of reason and society. Instead of promoting we shall find it injuring the best interests of reason and society. We shall find it destroying every sense of moral and social duty; trampling reason under foot, and making it the slave of passion. If philosophy should mean a close approximation to the fullest development of reason, alas! what disappointment awaits those who seek it among the disciples of Voltaire or Rousseau. It is thus the Baron De Holbach, himself an infidel, writes of contemporary infidelity:—"We must allow that corruption of manners, debauchery, licence, and even frivolity of mind, may often lead to irreligion or infidelity. Many people give up prejudices they have adopted through variety and hearsay. These pretended Free-thinkers have examined nothing for themselves. How can men, given up to voluptuousness and debauchery, plunged in excesses, ambitious in intriguing--frivolous, dissipated, or depraved women of wit and fashion—how can such as these be capable of forming an opinion on a religion they have never thoroughly examined, of feeling the force of an argument, or of embracing a system in all its parts?" Another infidel of the same period writes: "Can philosophy boast of having for adherents, in a dissolute nation, a multitude of dissipated and licentious libertines who despise a false religion on hearsay, without knowledge of the duties they ought to substitute for it? Will philosophy be flattered by the interested homage and stupid applause of a troop of voluptuaries—of public robbers—of intemperate and licentious men—who conclude that because they forgot their God, and despise his worship, therefore they owe nothing to themselves or society." Frederick the Great, who is not remembered in history as a model of pure morality, writes thus of Voltaire: "Voltaire behaved himself here like a consummate scoundrel and cheat. He is a wretch, and, for the honor of genius, I am sorry that a man who has so much, should be so full of mischief. Voltaire is the most wicked fool I have ever known. You cannot imagine what duplicity, cheating, and villainy he practised here." Such are the flattering terms in which infidels are compelled to tell the tale of their own degradation. Their boasts prove vain and empty. Their knowledge is but ignorance. They would look abroad upon the world with eagle eye, and with keen scrutiny examine its manifold secrets, strong in the belief that the impressions of past ages were but prejudice, and their faith superstition. The wonderful laws of the universe, ever constant in producing their

harmonious and various results, the causes of the phenomena among which they lived, the deeper mysteries of their own being, they would investigate and solve by the poor rushlight of reason. Regardless of social duties, insensible to moral obligations, unconscious of any higher destiny than that which the dumb brute shares, they place themselves on the high places of life to speak in unintelligible jargon as the prophets of their age. Their lips distilled honeyed sympathy for their suffering brothers. Philanthropy was to occupy the place of religion, humanity that of God. A universal brotherhood was to be established upon which a millennium of happiness was to dawn, in which equal rights, equal burdens, and social equality would for ever set aside the grievances of the old regime! But *the Materialists* of the eighteenth century passed away. The charm of their writings and teachings which, for a time, like the voices of the sirens of mythology, degraded men into beasts, lost its power; and Infidelity assumed another form to which men began to pay homage. Perhaps, indeed, the minds of men began to revolt against the awful excesses committed in the name, and with the sanction of, *Materialism* at the close of the eighteenth century. Perhaps men blushed at their own degradation when they remembered having knelt before a naked prostitute, placed to receive their homage on the desecrated altar of the living God. Perhaps they grew tired of the red carnage, and bloodshed, and lawlessness and anarchy to which it led. Certain it is, that at the end of the eighteenth century the infidels of France and of Europe adopted German Pantheism, as about a century before they embraced the materialism of England.

Baruch Spinoza and Emanuel Kant seem to have been the earliest and most remarkable apostles of Pantheism. Living in the seventeenth century, they preached their errors to a generation that heard not, or listened only to contradict. But in those ages of unbelief it would seem that men often make themselves the victims of doctrines equally repugnant to reason and revelation. The great minds of his own age condemned the teachings of the Jew of Amsterdam. He was pronounced a *wretch* by the great Malebranche. But, alas! their false and fatal teachings remained to be revived by Shelling and Hegel, and received in this nineteenth century of vaunted erudition by many in France and other European states. We see the unhappy De Laménais labouring to support the system by the strength of his giant intellect. His was then but the mind of an "archangel fallen."

I shall allow the learned Rector of the University of Louvain, N. J. Lafont, to describe, in his own eloquent and graphic

words, what Materialism is, and what Pantheism : “Materialism is reason abdicating her throne, which she abandons to the flesh ; it is the mind compassing its own ruin, and delivering itself up as a vile slave to the caprices of the body, which was made to serve it ; it is the soul losing the very consciousness of its own reality, or believing itself to be the property, or dependent of the organs of sense ; it is man assimilated to the brutes and glorying in this assimilation. And what is Pantheism ? Pantheism is reason abdicating its throne, and abandoning it to *sophistry* ; it is the radical change of all principles which form the moral and intellectual life of humanity ; it is the negation of good sense and reason.” According to Pantheism there is no real distinction between the universe and the Deity. In the wonderful harmony of creation—in the infinite variety we observe in the heavens, in the earth, and sea—in the striking beauty and order which reigns through every portion of the great universe—the Christian sees a reflection of the omnipotence and infinite wisdom of the great Creator, while the Pantheist regards it as the Deity itself. In the dust beneath our feet—in the rich vesture woven in nature’s own loom with which early summer arrays herself, and on which we see plants and shrubs and flowers in every variety of form and tint—in the heaving bosom of the mighty ocean—in the cliffs beetling over the booming sea, in which the student can read the history of ages lost in the womb of time—in the mystic speaking brilliancy of the fiery orbs that light up the glorious vault of heaven—in the whispering breeze and roaring tempest—in the dead leaves which whirl to earth in autumn, as well as in every living form—the Pantheist only sees one great Being who pervades all, absorbs all, and is identified with all, outside whom there is nothing. Behold, then, in the Pantheist’s mind there is no distinction between spirit and matter ! The broad and familiar distinction between good and evil, vice and virtue, is recognised no longer ; for when all is the result of fatal necessity there can be no moral obligations—no social duties. How correctly are the blinded advocates of those errors designated by our illustrious Pontiff Pius IX., in his Allocution dated June 9th, 1862 :—“*Insigni improbitate et pari stultitia haud timent asserrere, nullum suprēmum sapientissimum providentissimumque, numen divinum existere ab hac rerum universitate distinctum ac Deum idem esse ac rerum naturam. Quo certe nihil dementius nihil majis imprimo contra ipsam rationem majis repugnans fingi nequam potest.*” These—Materialism, Pantheism, General Infidelity—are some of the doctrines received by those who, advocating the right of private judgment, do not hesitate to

adopt its necessary and logical consequences. Do not such doctrines herald the ruin of society? They seem to threaten to reduce Europe to a more deplorable state than when it lay beneath the moral incubus of Heathenism; for even Paganism pointed to a future state of rewards and punishments, branded crime with its condemnation, and held out incentives to virtue.

Upon Europe of to-day reasoning men must look as on a very plague-spot of sophistry and moral degradation. How Materialism can, even in name, be linked with Philosophy, I confess I am unable to see. Surely the reason which fails to discover in the world around it evidence of a supreme ruler, and can see no evidence of its own spiritual nature and destiny, must have emptied to the dregs the poisonous cup of error! But the independence of human reason, vindicated by the Reformers, meant the removal of restraint on pride and passion, and a total rejection of the Divine guidance of the Church. These were the results for which the early Reformers and their adherents struggled. The excesses at which society stood aghast, the history of the struggle written in blood, the destruction of the union in which European states were bound together, are the indirect but natural results of the vindication of this principle. A vessel without rudder or ballast, exposed on the storm-tossed ocean to the mercy of every wave and every gale, is but a weak illustration of the unhappy condition of those who, adopting the principles of the Reformation, rejected the authority of the Divinely appointed guide in matters of faith.

The rejection of Christianity was the next natural and necessary result of the influence of this fatal principle. The chilling repulsive belief, which shuts out all hope of a future state, is formed under the free and unrestrained exercise of reason. It matters little what form infidelity may adopt—in what plausible sophistry it may endeavour to conceal its hideousness—its spirit is the same. It is the spirit of hostility to the Catholic Church inherited from the Reformation. The humiliation or total extinction of the Church of Christ is the object on which it concentrates all its energies, towards which it directs all its deadly efforts. The destruction of a Church which breathes a supernatural life seems to be the great and primary object attempted by Materialists, Pantheists, and Socialists in the exercise of revolutions, in the horrors and crimes of communism, in the lawless plunder sanctioned by modern warfare. By the influence of the Catholic Church, with the idea of God and a reverence for His supreme dominion, the civilization of Europe was built up from the ruins of a mighty empire and the wreck of a pagan world. Under its holy influence, what was rude and fierce and lawless in the nature of the

savage—Frank and Hun, and Goth and Norseman—disappeared. It united hostile nations in social ties, and educated them in the duties of citizenship and the useful arts. To abolish the idea of God, and destroy the Catholic Church, by which it is principally maintained, is now declared to be the grand mission of the Freethinkers of Europe. “Whereas the idea of God,” say they, “is the source and support of every despotism and of every iniquity; and whereas the Catholic religion is the most complete and terrible personification of this idea, the Freethinkers of Pan assume, as an obligation, to abolish Catholicity promptly and radically.” Such the decree promulgated at Naples on the 8th of December, 1869. A similar declaration was published at Marseilles in the same year in the following words:—“Our programme has for its basis the denial of God, the suppression of all authority, and every religious idea.” Thus it is that infidelity proclaims its fatal errors from the hilltops, and the fundamental principles of the Reformation justifies the melancholy and blasphemous teaching.

J. A. F.

THE SWISS CHURCH.

I.

*Episcopis et Sacerdotibus Ecclesiae Catholicae Intra Limites
Statuum Helvetiae Foederatorum Militantibus Archiepis-
copus et Episcopi Angliae Salutem et Fraternali Caritatem.*

NIHIL sane novum Vobis, Fratres dilectissimi, infidelium odia pati, et a sectariorum conspirationibus vexari: a tribus enim saeculis Ecclesia in Helvetia Vestra constituta acatholicorum impetus et insidias iterum iterumque invicte passa est. Porro hisce etiam diebus omnium ferme aliarum regionum exules et transfugae ejurati et veteratores intra valles vestras hospitales inviosque montes refugium sibi et latibulum constituerunt. Cur igitur mirandum si in Vos, vigilantes Ecclesiae Dei Pastores, fidelesque Vestros greges, veritatis et obedientiae inimici insurgant et debacchentur? Ex nobis ipsis sunt qui jampridem Confratrem Vestrum praeclarum Lausannensem Antistitem, pro Ecclesia auctoritate Confessorem, exulem Romae vidimus et veneranter allocuti sumus. Hodie, tamquam filium per patris vestigia incedentem, eximium Hebronensem Episcopum pro eadem sacrosancta causa conspiciamus exulantem. Immo Basilea Vestra, quae perversorum contra

Sanctae Sedis auctoritatem molimina olim ploravit et detestata est, hodie Praesulem suum invictum, Clero et Fidelibus animose stipatum, in prima acie pro Ecclesiae libertate praeliantem, spoliatum, divexatum, gestiens veneratur. Ignobiles istae Pastorum Jesu Christi persecutiones, Helvetiae dedecus, Ecclesiae Vestrae gloria: Episcopatus enim egregiam constantiam, Cleri fidelissimi unitatem, gregis inseparabilem cum Pastoribus cohaerentiam, luculentissime prae nationum praevaricantium oculis demonstrat haeticorum, incredulorum, eversorum, odiosa ista et impotens in veritatem Jesu conjuratio. Omnes, Venerabiles Fratres, per Catholicam unitatem Sacerdotes et Christifideles Vobiscum gratulantur, exemplumque Vestrum tanquam Cleri Gregisque formam imitandum sibi proponunt. Pro nobili Vestra constantia gratias agimus, omnemque Boni Pastoris consolationem, vigilantiam et custodiam, Vobis populoque a Sacrosancto Corde Jesu peramanter adprecamur.

- ✠ HENRICUS EDUARDUS, Archiepiscopus Westmonasteriensis.
- ✠ THOMAS JOSEPHUS, O.S.B., Episcopus Neoportensis et Meneviensis.
- ✠ GULIELMUS BERNARDUS, O.S.B., Episcopus Birminghamiensis.
- ✠ JACOBUS, Episcopus Salopiensis.
- ✠ RICARDUS, Episcopus Nottinghamiensis.
- ✠ GULIELMUS, Episcopus Plymuthensis.
- ✠ GULIELMUS, Episcopus Cliftoniensis.
- ✠ FRANCISCUS, Episcopus Northantoniensis.
- ✠ ROBERTUS, Episcopus Beverlacensis.
- ✠ JACOBUS, Episcopus Hagulstadensis Novicastrensis.
- ✠ JACOBUS, Episcopus Suthwarcensis.
- ✠ HERBERTUS, Episcopus Salfordiensis.
- ✠ BERNARDUS, Episcopus Liverpoolitanus.

In Festo S. Georgii Martyris, 1873.

II.

Rmis. ac Illmis. Archiepiscopo Westmonasteriensi Caeterisque Omnibus Catholicis Angliae Episcopis Episcopi Helvetiae Fraternali in Domino Salutem.

Nobis nuperrime Friburgi Helvetiorum in unum collectis, ut afflictis apud nos Ecclesiae Catholicae rebus pro viribus consuleremus, redditae ac perlectae sunt Litterae quas ad nos difficillimo hoc tempore dirigere dignati estis. Quantopere illae nobis gratae jucundaeque acciderint vix dici potest. Quod, accepta persecutionum recentissimarum Ecclesiae in nostris regionibus notitia, nec mora, Vos omnes, Rmi. Collegae, magnopere nobis compassuri essetis, id pro certo habebamus, ob fraternam illam totius Episcopatus Catholici unionem quae,

vix unquam ac hodiedum arctior, existit; verum anne praetolari poteramus ut universus Episcoporum Angliae coetus in unum congregatus profundae suae compassionis sensus scripto testari properaret? Numquid non longo ab invicem distamus intervallo? Numquid non ipse quoque Angliae Episcopatus, noviter reconstitutus, circa renascentem et reflorescentem inibi Ecclesiam gravissimis occupatur curis, luctisque continuis fidei causa distinetur, variisque adversitatibus exagitur, in regno quod per saecula se Ecclesiae Catholicae et hostem juratum et persecutorem acerrimum exhibuit? Et ecce Vos Vestri ipsorum oblivisci videmini, ut de nobis longe dissitis cogitatis, nostrosque dolores Vestros faciatis; ut diutine exagitatis varieque divexatis, praesertim e suis demum sedibus ejectis collegis nostris, necnon et clero mirabili constantia eis adhaerenti, peculiarem prorsus sympathiam commonstretis: atque, uti e Vestrarum Litterarum tenore facile colligere est, non hodiernus nec hesternus est, sed jam ab annis hic Vester fraternis in nos existit affectus.

Quantum est lenimen tales habere Confratres, quos nec locorum distantia nec propriae divexationes et angores nostris calamitatibus extraneos reddere queunt, quique e longinquo nobis suas cordiales consolationes transmittere maturant! Dum pro his debitas Vobis gratias agimus, eas ut continuetis enixe rogamus; tantò quippe illis amplioribus egebimus, quanto majora quantoque plura nobis adhuc mala imminere videntur. In persecutionem etenim adhucdum initio consistimus; quod si hoc tam asperum existit, qualis earum prosecutio, earum demum finis erit? Certum est, id agi, ut primo nomen Romano-Catholicum tum etiam christianum ex Helvetiae solo extirpetur; unde nulli parceret operae ut persecutio magis magisque sese extendat ac caeteros quoque pagos invadat. Omnia ista tanto nobis graviora ac magis dolorosa eveniunt, quod sacris foederibus juramento sancitis, pactis, ac solemniter acceptatis, constitutionibus adversentur quae nos contra hujusmodi divexationes prorsus securos esse jubebant; quoque nos, qui in libertatis patria, quo nomine tantopere nostra gloriabatur Helvetia, vivere nos habebamus, modo nos in religiosae servitutis atque oppressionis patria deprehendimur. Verumtamen speramus, et quidem undequaque a nostris in fide fratribus magnopere confortati, potenter adjuti, eorum precibus suffulti firmiter speramus nunquam eo usque a modernis persecutoribus ipsorum consilia perduci posse. Quapropter Vestris Vestrorumque dioecesanorum ferventibus orationibus fraternaue charitate nos prosequi dignemini.

Pro qualicumque debitae gratitudinis persolutione, Vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, Vestrisque gregibus, ac Ecclesiae Catho-

licae Anglicanae, benedictionem ac gratiarum abundantiam apprecamur, quibus foecundati labores Vestri in dies magis fructificent, ipsa Ecclesiae in dies firmiora fundamenta ac majora incrementa accipiat, in pristinum perfectionis et prosperitatis gradum assurgat, ac eum gloriae splendorem recuperet quo olim in orbe catholico refulsit.

In nomine omnium Episcoporum Helvetiae—Stephani, Episcopi Lausannensis; Nicolai Francisci, Episc. Coire; Caroli Joannis, Episc. St. Gall; Stephani, Episc. Bethlemen, *in partibus*, Abbatis St. Maurice; Gaspari, Episc. Hebronensis *i. p.*, Vicarii Apostolici Genevae; Gaspari, Episc. Antipatren. *i. p.*, Auxiliarii Curiensis.

✠ PETRUS JOSEPHUS, Episcopus Sion, Senior.

Sion, in Valais, die 4 Junii, 1873.

DOCUMENTS.

THE following documents refer to a triduum of public prayers which is to be performed throughout the Church on the 12th, 13th, and 14th August next. The Pope has granted seven years indulgence for each time any one attends the triduum, and a plenary indulgence to all who attend three times, and go to confession and communion during the triduum on the festival, or during the octave.

LETTER OF THE PIOUS UNION OF ROME, ADDRESSED TO THE BISHOPS OF THE CHURCH.

Illme. et Rme. Domine.

Pergratum Tibi fore confido, si nomine Societatum Foederis Piani supplicem nostrum libellum ad SS. D. N. Pium IX. P. M., Ejusque responsa Tibi exhibeam.

Pietati Tuae et singulari, quo Catholicam Religionem foves, studio rem totam committens, manum Tuam humillime deosculor.

Romae die festo Pentecostes, 1 Junii, 1873.

Ex Aedibus Comitatus Foederis Piani ad Carcerem Mamertinum.

PAULUS EQVES MENCACCI,
Foederis Piani Praeses.

PETITION OF THE PIOUS UNION OF ROME TO THE POPE.

I.—SUPPLEX LIBELLUS.

Beatissime Pater.

In coetu Foederis Piani Societatum Catholicarum Romae nonis maii initum fuit communi consensione consilium, omnium Christifidelium, si fieri posset, pietatem fraterna charitate excitandi, ut in triduum catholici omnes, in singulis orbis terrae partibus, eodem tempore, poenitentia et precibus vim, ut ita loquamur, Deo inferant, ut incolumitatem et triumphum Sanctitatis Tuae, et Ecclesiae in his temporum difficultatibus impetrent. Quam nostri Foederis mentem maxime probarunt Moderatores, qui modo Romae versantur, Sacrarum Peregrinationum Gallicarum.

Itaque omnes concordi animo hoc a nobis initum consilium Sapientiae Tuae subiicimus, ut illud auctoritate Tua sancias, et confirmes.

Cum vero tres solemnes dies, quibus haec praemitti queant, propositi fuerint, festa scilicet aut Apostolorum Petri et Pauli, aut Transfigurationis Christi Dei, aut Matris Dei Mariae in coelum assumptae, socii nostri ita censuerunt :

Festum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli, utpote quod brevi immineret, reiciendum indicavimus. Alterum impiis in Christum Deum verbis, et probris redimendis apprime aptum nobis videbatur. At vero socii Galli Matris Dei Mariae in coelum assumptae festum ceteris diebus anteferendum forte ducebant ob singularém aetatis nostrae pietatem in Virginem Immaculatam.

Erit autem Sapientiae Tuae, Pater Sanctissime, et dies praefinire, et obsequia, quibus Dei opem expetamus, statuere.

Ad Tuos autem pedes proni a Te petimus, ut Ecclesiae thesauris haec obsequia ditare digneris.

Romae die XVIII Maii.

F. PICARD Dr. du Comité des Pélerinages français.
VICOMTE DE DAMAS, Président du Comité des Pélerinages.
KOURNISIEN, Vice-Président du Comité des Pélerinages
GERMER-DURAND, Secrétaire.
DUC DE CHAULNES, Trésorier.

Cav. PAOLO MENCACCI, Presidente di Turno della Federazione Piana, Presidente del Circolo S. Pietro della Gioventù cattolica.

Monsig. LUIGI MACCHI, Presidente della Società Preservatrice.

PIETRO ALDOBRANDINI, Principe di Sarsina Presidente della Società degl'Interessi Cattolici.

Msa CHIARA ANTICI-MATTEI, Direttrice generale della Unione delle Donne Cattoliche.

Pel Mse PATRIZI-MONTORO, Presidente dei Reduci Pontifici, Comm. GIOACCHINO MONARI, Vice-Presidente.

Mse GIROLAMO CAVALLETTI, Presidente della Società Promotrice delle buone Opere.

Prof. TITO Cav. ARMELLINI, Vice-Presidente della Società Artistica Operaia.

Prof. VINCENZO Cav. DIORIO, Presidente dell'Associazione di S. Carlo per la diffusione della buona stampa.

Msa MARIA CAVALLETTI, Presidente delle Dame Protettrici delle Serve.

Mse ANDREA LEZZANI, Presidente del Circolo dell'Immacolata.

Mse GIUSEPPE DONATI, Segretario Generale della Federazione Piana.

RESCRIPT OF HIS HOLINESS.

II.—SS. D. N. PII PP. IX. RESPONSA.

Die 24 Maii Anno 1873.

Voluntas orandi non solum est laude digna, sed est etiam necessaria his praesertim temporibus. Nam Ecclesia Catholica undique turbatur, divexatur infernali conatu. Rogemus ergo, ut liberet Deus Ecclesiam Suam de laqueo venantium, et de gladio persecutoris. Benedicat Deus Fideles suos, et det eis semper spiritum gratiae et precum, ut tandem audire possint vocem Ejus, quae imperat ventis et mari, et post turbines facit tranquillitatem.

PIUS PP. IX.

EX AUDIENTIA SSMI.

Die 30 Maii Anno 1873.

Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Pius PP. IX. quoad tempus universalis supplicationis peragenda, dies 12, 13, et 14 mensis Augusti huius anni praefinivit, et quoad preces, Litanias Sanctorum assignavit. Praeterea omnibus Christifidelibus qui illas devote recitaverint, indulgentiam septem annorum pro unoquoque die; qui vero singulis diebus praedictis easdem preces fuderint ac vel uno ex praedictis diebus vel die festo Assumptionis vel infra Octavam vere poenitentes confessi ac sacra Communione refecti fuerint, plenariam Indulgentiam benigne concessit.

CONSTANTINUS CARDINALIS VICARIUS.

THE IRISH
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

AUGUST, 1873.

THE QUESTION OF HIGHER, OR UNIVERSITY
EDUCATION IN IRELAND.

THE following article has just been published in the learned Jesuit periodical "La Civiltà Cattolica."

Last March there was great commotion, even in the Liberal newspapers of Italy, with respect to the ministerial crisis of the English Cabinet, brought on by the opposition of the Catholics of Ireland to Mr. Gladstone's Bill on Higher, or University Education in that country; but they discussed the crisis rather in the political sense than in respect to the question which had occasioned it; and hence, the ministerial crisis having passed, there has been scarcely any further mention of the Bill. Another Bill, more simple and limited in its scope, having been proposed by Mr. Fawcett, and since then discussed in the British Parliament, new interest in the question of Irish University Education has been awakened even in foreign countries, and the Liberal journals have spoken of this second Bill, although of less importance than the first. The question of Higher Education in Ireland cannot but possess great interest for us Catholics, not only in general, because there is at issue the great question of the chief part which Religion must have in Education, but also, in particular, because there is question of that heroic Irish nation, which never ceases to awaken the sympathies of all Catholic peoples by the battles she has maintained for ages for the Catholic Faith. And this interest must be greatly increased when we come to hear in detail how great has been the struggle which Catholic Ireland has had to maintain, and still maintains, in defence of her right to Catholic Education. Wherefore, we think that we are undertaking a task which will be most agreeable to our Catholic readers, in sketching as it were, in an historical picture, the past and present position of Irish Catholics with

regard to Higher Education ; for we wish to treat almost exclusively of this portion of the question of Education to which Gladstone's Bill, which was lately rejected by the British Parliament, and Fawcett's, which has been recently discussed in the same assembly, both referred. From this simple exposition of facts, more than from any arguments of ours, it will appear manifest what good reason Catholic Ireland, so long oppressed by anti-Catholic educational laws, has now at last, after Catholic Emancipation and the disestablishment of the Law-Church in Ireland, reason to expect from the justice of Parliament a law which will meet the wants and concede the rights of Catholics in the matter of Higher Education ; and that the Government, which up to this time has not even recognised the University erected and maintained at their own expense by the Catholics of Ireland, will at last confer upon it some portion at any rate of the favors hitherto bestowed and even lavished upon Protestants.

The Catholic University of Ireland, although brought into existence by the circumstances of the day, really owes its foundation to the reasonableness, or even necessity, of the principles that a people possessed of intellectual, moral, and religious characteristics peculiar to itself, should not be without some great central School for the development of the national genius, and the expression of the national mind. Every nation has her own University ; and it is but natural that Catholic Ireland, as soon as by the abolition of the odious Penal Laws she could take a place among the nations, should have her own University, which would at once be Catholic and Irish. The abrogation of the Penal Laws against the Catholic Religion, or, as it is called, Catholic Emancipation, was achieved under the leadership of our great O'Connell in 1829 ; and almost immediately steps were begun to be taken to secure for Catholics that Higher Education on sound principles, from which, with the exception of Ecclesiastical students, they had hitherto been excluded by law. I say, with the exception of Ecclesiastical students, for in 1793 the College of Maynooth had been founded and endowed by Government for the education of aspirants to the Priesthood, and several other Ecclesiastical Colleges had been founded by the Bishops. From that date also Catholic laymen had been admitted to study and take Degrees in the Protestant University of Dublin ; but the Government teaching and whole spirit of that Institution have always been most anti-Catholic, as I shall hereafter explain more fully.

As to the position of Irish Catholics with respect to Education previous to 1793, you may form an idea of it from the following facts :—

In 1641, the Catholics of one of our provinces, Ulster, in an "humble Remonstrance," presented to King Charles I., stated that one of the reasons which had forced them to take up arms was, that the "youth of this kingdom (Ireland), especially, of us Catholics, is debarred from education and learning, in that no schoolmaster of our religion is admitted to be bred beyond the seas, and the one only University of Ireland doth exclude all Catholics, thereby to make us utterly ignorant of literature and civil breeding, which always followeth learning and arts, insomuch that we boldly affirm we are the most miserable and most unhappy nation of the Christian world."

As time went on, the circumstances of the Catholics of Ireland with respect to education became even worse. Thus, in 1695, an Act of Parliament was passed "to restrain Foreign Education." By this Act they were found to be guilty of two *crimes*! One was to send their children to be educated as Catholics on the Continent; the other was, to educate them as Catholics at home! The persons guilty of the first of these two offences are divided into three classes: 1st, those who shall send any child or other person into any foreign country, "to the intent and purpose to enter into, or be resident, or trained up, in any priory, abbey, nunnery, Popish University, college or school, or house of Jesuits or priests." 2ndly, those who shall go "into any parts beyond the seas . . . to be resident or trained up in any Popish family, and shall be, in such parts beyond the seas, by any Jesuite, seminary, priest, fryar, monk, or other Popish person, instructed, persuaded, or strengthened in the Popish religion, in any sort to profess the same." 3rdly, those who send money for the maintenance of any child who is being educated abroad. Any person guilty of any of these grave offences was deprived of every civil right, and forfeited all his property.

The Act says:—"It is found by experience that tolerating or conniving at papists keeping schools or instructing youth in literature, is one great reason of many of the natives of this kingdom (Ireland) continuing ignorant of the principles of true religion" (Protestantism), "and strangers to the Scriptures" (as was falsely asserted of the Catholics); "and of their neglecting to conform themselves to the laws and statutes of this realm; and of their not using the English habit and language, to the great prejudice of the public weal thereof." In order to prevent this *grievous crime*, it is enacted: "That no person whatsoever of the Popish religion shall publicly teach school or instruct youth in learning, or, in private houses, teach or instruct youth in learning, except only the children or others under the guardianship of the

master or mistress of such private house or family." Any one guilty of such an offence was to be punished with fine and imprisonment for three months for every transgression of the law.

Another stringent Act was passed in 1709, as follows:—"Whatsoever person of the Popish religion shall publicly teach school, or shall instruct youth in learning in any private house within this realm, or shall be entertained to instruct youth in learning as usher, under-master or assistant, by any Protestant schoolmaster, he shall be esteemed and taken to be a Popish regular clergyman, and be prosecuted as such, and incur such pains, penalties, and forfeitures as any Popish regular convict is liable to by the laws and statutes of this realm." These penalties were—*exile*, and, in case of return to this country, *death*, as for the crime of *high treason*!

These laws continued in force till 1782, when an Act was passed, which, after admitting that the enactments "relative to the Education of Papists are considered too severe," permits Catholics to teach a school, but subject to three conditions:—First, they should be licensed by the Protestant Bishop; secondly, they should not teach Protestants; thirdly, this Act was not to "be construed to allow the erection or endowment of any Popish university, college, or endowed school in this realm."

Whilst the majority of the Irish people were thus suffering, great educational privileges were conferred by the State on the Protestant minority. King Henry VIII. seized the great abbeyes and monastic foundations, and alienated the Church lands and all the other ecclesiastical property of the kingdom, thus disendowing, by one fell blow, the educational establishments, as well as the religious foundations, which our Catholic forefathers had created in the greatest number. In 1537 the same monarch, who was the enemy at once of Catholicity and of Ireland, ordered the establishment of a school in every parish; and in 1570 his daughter, Queen Elizabeth, in order to alienate our people from the Faith and from their country, directed that a Grammar School should be erected and maintained in every diocese in Ireland—thirty-four in number. Her successor, King James I., founded five great Royal Schools, and richly endowed them with the property taken from the Irish chieftains who had remained faithful to the Church. And in order that nothing might be wanting to the educational system, by which it was hoped to secure the conversion of the Irish nation to Protestantism, Queen Elizabeth founded in Dublin, in the year 1591, the University of Trinity College, which, until the year

1845, was the only one in Ireland, and the avowed object of the foundation of which was—to promote education based on the principles of the Protestant religion. We have the opinion of its chief authorities and friends; and, indeed, it seems admitted on all hands, that “for three centuries Trinity College has faithfully fulfilled the trust imposed on it by its founder (Queen Elizabeth) and benefactors, and has, in consequence, enjoyed the confidence of the Protestants.” Its government is altogether in the hands of Protestants; nearly all the authorities and teachers are Protestant clergymen; although there is one Mahommedan (the Professor of Arabic), there is not even one Catholic; and this in the capital of Ireland, where 77 per cent. of the population is Catholic! The Protestant University of Dublin, thus constituted, has been most richly endowed by Queen Elizabeth and successive sovereigns and parliaments. Besides large grants for building purposes, it received immense estates in land, which in great part had been taken from the Catholics. The extent of these lands is over 200,000 acres, or more than a hundredth part of the whole of Ireland. The annual income of the Protestant University of Trinity College, at a low calculation, amounts to between £60,000 and £70,000—\$1,500,000, or 1,750,000 *lire Italiane* per annum.

The advantages enjoyed by it do not stop here. But the Public Schools which I have mentioned above, and others which have been founded by the State, or endowed out of property taken from Catholics, are in close communication with it, serve as feeders for it, and are under the management of Protestant ministers, nearly all of whom are members of the Protestant University. To these schools are attached 153 burses for the pupils, who pass from their halls to the University. Schools are scattered throughout Ireland that also enjoy large landed estates, and their income from public sources is calculated at over £40,000 a-year—1,000,000 Italian lire and more.

This is the financial position of the Protestant University of Ireland, although the Protestant Church has ceased to be the Church “established by law” as dominant over others in this country.

As to its position with respect to Religion, three of its medical Professorships and some of its subordinate Chairs are open to Catholics—that is to say, Catholics are eligible to them; but, as a matter of fact, there is, as I have already said, no Catholic professor in the whole University. And the Bishops of Ireland, writing to the Home Secretary in 1866, thus briefly epitomize the character of the institution:—“Trinity College” (this is another name for the University of

Dublin) "was founded by Queen Elizabeth as a bulwark of the Protestant religion in Ireland against Catholicity. Until the year 1793 all its students, as well as all others belonging to it, were obliged to subscribe the *Thirty-nine Articles*" (the authorized formulary of the Anglican Church). "About thirty-three per cent. of its students, even now, are Divinity students of the (then) Established Church; its whole teaching is based on the Protestant religion; the works it publishes are imbued with an anti-Catholic spirit; and several who entered its halls as Catholics have, during their University course, or afterwards, forsaken the religion of their parents."

To this accurate description of the spirit of the Protestant University I shall only add, that some of its distinguished Fellows and teachers have publicly called into doubt some of the truths which are the foundation of Christianity, as, for instance, the eternity of Hell; and that there is a large, and, I fear, an increasing school there of followers of the Positive Philosophy, and of other modern forms of error and infidelity.

Trinity is the chief University in Ireland. It was the only one till 1845. In that year an Act of Parliament was passed establishing three "Queen's Colleges," as they are called, in three different counties, for the purpose of meeting, it was said, the educational requirements of Irish Catholics. These Colleges were united into a University, which is called "The Queen's University." They were set up on the *mixed principle*, that is to say, that in them Higher Education was to be given by Professors of any or of no Religion to students of every religious denomination, care being taken, as it was alleged, to exclude from the common teaching every allusion to Religion which could in any way be offensive to any of the auditors. It had been found by experience that Catholics would not accept avowedly Protestant teaching. It was hoped that they would avail themselves of non-Catholic Education; but the men who conceived such hopes did not know the spirit of Catholic Ireland. Whatever the intentions of the originators of the Queen's Colleges, it is now notorious that one of the chief, if not the chief, of the promoters of the Mixed System in Ireland, the late Dr. Whately, Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, devoted all his great talents to the advancement of that system, with the view of "*gradually undermining* (they are his own words) *the vast fabric of the Irish Roman Catholic Church.*" In his Life, written by his daughter, we read these words; and, again, the following: "I believe . . . that *mixed Education* is gradually enlightening the mass of the people, and that if we give it up, we give up the only hope of *weaning the Irish from the abuses of Popery.*"

But from the very beginning, the proposal of establishing Mixed Colleges for the education of Catholics was met with condemnation. Even a Protestant Member of Parliament designated the project as a "*gigantic scheme of godless education.*" Our great O'Connell, both at public meetings and in his place in the House of Commons, condemned the Bill. He condemned it, he said, both because the Bishops of Ireland condemned it, and because it pretended to give Education without Religion. On the latter point we find the following words in an eloquent speech he delivered in the House of Commons, in June, 1845: "The people of England will not sanction this scheme of godless education, and you must introduce religion into your system or it will not be received by the people of Ireland. The Irish are essentially a religious people. Infidelity is unknown in Ireland. Act manfully, therefore, and make religion the basis of your proceedings, and fear not. By so doing you will have a better prospect before you—you will have the protection of a Higher Power if you adopt proper principles as the foundation of your scheme; but do not flatter yourselves with the idea, that you are doing anything conciliating to Ireland, if, in a matter of this kind, you exclude Religion from your considerations." The Bishops of Ireland condemned the project; but, subsequently, the Government promising to make some concessions favorable to Catholics, a certain number thought the new Colleges might be accepted, or at least tolerated. A difference of opinion having thus arisen as to the most prudent course to be adopted, the Prelates referred the question, as was their duty, to the supreme judgment of the Holy See; and in October, 1847, and again in October, 1848, our Holy Father Pope Pius IX., through the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda, declared the new Colleges *grievously and intrinsically dangerous to the faith and morals of Catholic youth.* This decision of the Sovereign Pontiff was unanimously accepted and promulgated by our Bishops assembled in the National Synod of Thurles in August, 1850. Since their first foundation, the Queen's University and its mixed Colleges have had expended on them out of the public revenues over £800,000=20 millions of Italian lire. But, although professedly established for the education, chiefly, of Irish Catholics, they have failed to attract to their halls more than a very small number of our youth, and they have been induced to go even to the necessity of obtaining Degrees, which can be had only there or in the Protestant University, or by the large pecuniary advantages these Colleges offer. Thus, in the academical year 1870-71, there were in the three Mixed Colleges, in all their departments—Arts, Medicine, Engineering, and Law—only 164 Catholics, the Catholic population of

Ireland being about four and a-half millions!! In one of these Colleges, that of Belfast, which is situated in the province of Ulster, where there are over a million of Catholics, there were only *fourteen* Catholic students!! You see, then, that as far as Catholics are concerned, the curse of barrenness has been upon those Mixed Colleges. O'Connell's words have been verified in their regard. They have "not been received by the people of Ireland."

The Sovereign Pontiff, while condemning those Godless Colleges, counselled our Bishops to establish in Ireland a Catholic University like that of Louvain. The Prelates assembled in National Synod at Thurles in August, 1850, determined to give effect to this advice of the Apostolic See, and appealed to our generous people for the pecuniary means to carry out the great work. The first collection was made in Ireland on St. Patrick's Day, 17th March, 1851. The Bishops also asked the help of the Prelates of England, America, Australia, France, &c. Since that time over £170,000 = 4,250,000 Italian lire, have been contributed, chiefly by Irish Catholics at home and abroad, for the foundation and maintenance of their Catholic University.

In May, 1854, the Bishops assembled in Synodal meeting canonically erected the University; and in August of the same year the Supreme Pontiff graciously approved that erection, and granted to the Rector the power of conferring the usual academical Degrees. The first Rector, Very Rev. Dr. Newman, was installed on Whit-Sunday, and Professors were appointed, and the schools opened in the autumn of the same year, 1854. Since that time the Catholics of Ireland have shown the greatest enthusiasm and perseverance in seeking to obtain from the Government the legal recognition of the University and of Catholic Education, but hitherto without success. On several occasions promises have been given, and even attempts have been made by successive administrations, to grant our demands. But these promises have not been fulfilled, or these attempts have proved nugatory, either through the violence of our opponents, or because it was sought to introduce conditions subversive to the principles of Catholic Education.

The last of these attempts has been the Bill introduced into Parliament by the Prime Minister, Mr. Gladstone, in February last, and rejected by the House of Commons on the 12th of March ult. I enclose a copy of the petition of our Bishops against the Bill. Its chief provisions may, I think, be reduced to three heads, all most objectionable to Catholics. One was: to create a Council, which was to have the supreme control of University Education, and which was to have been

almost entirely nominated by Government. The effect of this provision would have been to hand over to the State, which in our case is the English and Protestant Government, the control of the education of the Catholics of Ireland. The second was : to create here in Dublin, alongside and in addition to the Protestant University, which was to be left for Protestants, and for such as they might wish to admit, a mixed University or College, with an endowment of about £40,000 = 1,000,000 Italian lire a-year. The intention was—to fill it with the ablest professors, selected solely on account of their learning, and without any regard for their Religious opinions ; and it was hoped that Catholic students would avail themselves of the teaching of that most learned body, at least in supplement of the short-comings of the Catholic University, which, it was believed, would result from its poverty. For the third head, to which the provisions of the Bill may be reduced, was : to leave to the Protestant College, and to the old and new Mixed Colleges, an enormous annual revenue, while no help whatsoever was to be given for Catholic Education. Thus, while the property taken from our forefathers in former times, and large annual sums out of the taxes, to which all contribute equally, were left for the maintenance and consolidation of Protestant and Godless Education, it was expected that Catholics would tax themselves to maintain their Catholic University ; and all this in the name of Liberty and Equality !! The petition of our Bishops briefly touches on those points.

Besides the Petition of the Prelates, I enclose a copy of the Resolutions which they adopted on the same occasion, and which explain more fully their views respecting the Bill brought forward by Mr. Gladstone.

I have now brought down the history of Higher Education in Ireland to the present time. The rejection of the Bill leaves us without a likelihood of our grievances being redressed for the present. The educational ascendancy of Protestants is still maintained in Catholic Ireland. A system continues which the Prime Minister himself has declared to be "*miserably bad,*" "*scandalously bad.*" The only remedy offered us is one which would aggravate the evil ; for instead of Protestant Education, it would consolidate, extend, and perpetuate the Mixed System, that is, false Liberalism, which is nothing else but Infidelity in Education. The Catholics of Ireland, led on by their Bishops, have refused the proffered boon. We will, with God's help, maintain the battle for Catholic Education which our fathers have fought before us at more desperate odds for the last 300 years. We remember the old glories of Ireland, and we will never relinquish that which alone can make our dear native land what she was of old : the *Insula Sanctorum et Doctorum.*

THE CHURCH AND MODERN THOUGHT.—I.

IN the last number of the RECORD, on presenting to the notice of our readers that singularly able and interesting book, "My Clerical Friends," we entered into an engagement to deal at some length with the fruitful subject of "Modern Thought." Nor are we deterred from the fulfilment of that engagement by the consciousness we have that we shall say very little that is either very new or very striking. But, better than a new thing is a true thing—better what is useful than what is merely striking; and it shall be our aim to say what we believe to be true, and to pursue the lines which we have found to be useful in those speculations about "Modern Thought," on which we, in common with every one who has made the slightest acquaintance with modern literature or modern science, have been compelled to enter. Our remarks shall, in the main, be rather suggestive on the several topics they touch than exhaustive in the treatment of any of them; and it is our ambition not so much to direct as to stimulate speculation on this important matter. The title of these papers—"The Church and Modern Thought"—has been selected, because we are ourselves convinced of the fact, which, indeed, the ablest and most consistent of our opponents admit, that it is only from the Catholic Church that the infidel element of "Modern Thought" can meet with any forcible answer, or any effectual opposition. Having said so much by way of preface, we proceed at once to the subject of our paper.

Human thought is the lineal ancestor of human action, and no power, whether human or divine, that claims to exercise any influence upon the actions of men, will ever have its claim recognised in its fulness, if it have not first enthroned itself in all the majesty of acknowledged sovereignty over the silent empire of human thought. Brute force may, for a time, seem to triumph over thought—may proscribe its expression and ignore its existence—but thought will keep working all the time, in silence, preparing the way for revolutions that are not silent, and when compressed beyond the appointed limit, thought, like steam, will burst through all material barriers, and manifest itself in action.

Hence, too, at any given time, the action of an age—the action that gets itself written down in history—is but the harvest of a long past sowing, and, in the silent thoughts of its living actors, may be seen another seed-time of which the sheaves shall all be garnered in coming years. This truth it is,

we may incidentally remark, that gives its unspeakable importance to the work of education, and places in the teacher's hand a sceptre that wields an empire over times to be. If any one wish to read aright the history of his own time, he must stand face to face with "modern thought;" and if he wish to fulfil the duty which has been imposed upon him by the fact that God has caused him to live *now*, and not in any *then*—the duty of doing his part, that the world he shall leave after him will be, on his account, at any rate no worse than the world of which he made a part—he must make such a survey of "modern thought" as will enable him to take his stand upon the side of whatsoever in it is true and good, and to wage unceasing war upon the false and the evil.

Nor would it ever be true to imagine that "modern thought," however deplorable in its tendency, is all a mass of sophistry and error. The human intellect was made, and made by God, to see truth; and, however it may have abused its function, it has never been able to see as a reality a pure unmixed falsehood. Any error that lives, if only for a day, has in it some grain of truth to which it owes its vitality. There is no one from whom we dissent, however just the grounds of our dissent may be, from whom we may not learn something, and the best service we can do, both to our own good cause and to the real interest of our opponent, is, as far as we are able, to disentangle his truth from his falsehood—show him that the truth makes not for his side but for ours, and that his falsehood is not only an injustice to us, but a very real hindrance to himself even in the attainment of his laudable ambitions.

The first condition of speaking to any good purpose about anything whatever, is to know precisely what that thing is, and whence it came. As in dealing with an individual in the way of argument, we address ourselves not precisely to his abstract reason but to his concrete individuality, adapting our arguments to the known conditions of his existence, suppressing, consequently, some whose cogency he is not qualified to appreciate, and urging others to which his special circumstances give special weight; so, in dealing with "modern thought," and its most eminent exponents, it will be to our advantage, and to that of truth, to ascertain, as accurately as may be, its parentage and character.

And in this matter, as in most others, the first step seems to present the greatest difficulty. To hear what men say, and read what they write, one would imagine that if anything had a definite meaning it is—"modern thought." The phrase is in everybody's mouth. One man condemns it unsparingly;

another as unsparingly applauds. Is a thing to be praised?—"It is quite in accordance with 'modern thought.'" Is a thing to be condemned?—"Has not modern thought already banned it." But when one comes to ask what precisely *is* this "modern thought" about which so much is said and written, then it is no such simple matter to get or give a simple answer.

The truth is, like all generalities, it leads to the vague; and another thing that is true of it is, that to Catholic ears it is a phrase of evil omen. So much injustice has been perpetrated under the sanction of "modern thought"—so many a fraud has sought its protection—so many a pill, bitter to the natural palate of the unsophisticated human conscience, has been gilt by this glittering phrase, that Catholics have some reason to shrink from it as if it were the necessary prelude to inevitable evil. Nevertheless, we are of those who think that the phrase itself—"modern thought"—need not be vague to any one who cares to ascertain its precise meaning; and of those, too, who think that far too much would be given up to our opponents if we recognised in their speculations exclusively a complete expression of "modern thought."

If there be now, as in most ages there has been, a "modern thought" that has wandered from the path of truth, there is also a "modern thought" that has never left that path; and both may be found, stripped of all vagueness, in the syllabus issued by our Holy Father Pius the Ninth, the propositions of which, in their direct meaning, photograph with unerring accuracy "modern thought" in its evil sense; while their contradictories, proposed by infallible authority, give an equally faithful picture of that "modern thought" that is "ever ancient and ever new," that has been preserved in the past and shall be preserved in the future by the only authority capable of such a function—the authority of the Holy Catholic Church.

† Taking "modern thought" in its worst sense, as opposed to the teaching of the Church, it will be to our purpose to examine its origin and its tendency, and to determine, as accurately as may be, some of the principles which, in the main, form its distinctive character. For the sake of clearness, it will be well to lay down at the very outset our own theory of the matter. Accordingly we do so here. The origin of this "modern thought" is to be found in Protestantism as a system—and its tendency is a tendency which, indeed, is no longer a mere tendency, but a full development into pure naturalism. Some of its leading assumptions are—and they are assumptions which, beyond all others, should be branded as "unscientific"—that there is no such thing as "the supernatural"—

or, at least, that if there be, it cannot be brought within the scope of human knowledge ; that physical experiment is the sole test of scientific truth, and that, consequently, any proposition not capable of submitting itself to that test, thereby forfeits any claim to the attention, not to say the adherence, of the human mind ; that there is, in the domain of matter, such a "reign of law," that God Himself cannot interfere in its working, and in the domain of morals such a "law of evolution," that the human will counts for nothing in the production of history ; that, consequently, miracles are myths, the sediment, as it were, of unscientific ages past, and that responsibility is a bugbear, which, having served its purpose with the intellectual children of a pre-scientific period, may now be relegated to the domain of exploded superstitions, and be substituted by the infallible dogma, that even if a man does wrong, he is only fulfilling a certain law that works in spite of him to the progress of the species. But in the enumeration of these so-called principles of "modern thought," we are compelled to pause for the present. The number of them, and the extent of ground they cover, and their unbounded impudence, and their arrogant intolerance so grow upon our imagination, that we feel it best to commence our attack at once, lest, appalled by these "shadows of the night," we might be tempted to give up as hopeless a contest that seems to have so many issues and so many fields of combat.

We have said, first, that we find the origin of this "modern thought" in Protestantism as a system.

The intellectual basis of Protestantism is the denial of authority—external to the inquirer—to decide in matters of religion. Now "religion," as generally understood, includes two branches—first, things to be believed, or dogma ; second, things to be done, or morality ; in other words, in order to have a religion at all, it is necessary to have *some* authority proposing dogma, and *some* standard determining morality. From the very nature of the case this authority should be infallible—this standard absolutely unerring in its accuracy. We say "from the very nature of the case," for, if anything is certain, it is that God could not have contradictory wishes in these matters ; that, consequently, He must have wished one thing, or set of dogmas, to be believed, and not another—one thing, or set of precepts, to be obeyed, and not another ; and that if, besides being infinitely wise, He was also infinitely just and powerful, He would have appointed for the beings from whom He exacted faith and morality, a means of attaining to both with infallible certainty. Now, by *whatever* system interpreted, the only logical claim Christianity has ever made upon the

world is the claim to be, in some way or other, an infallible teacher of faith and morals. In any system of Christianity there must needs be some infallible authority in these matters. According to the Catholic system, that authority is an always living authority, speaking through the infallible *magisterium* of the Church; and it is a strong indirect proof of the logical cogency of the Catholic system, that from the moment any man, or any society, removed that key-stone of infallible *living* authority, Christianity, in the hands of that man or that society, became no longer a sacred temple or a secure habitation, but a ruin leading daily more and more to disintegration and decay.

This Catholic system, as a matter of fact, was, antecedent to the so-called "Reformation," co-extensive with Christianity itself. Not only was there no true logically coherent Christianity outside that system—*that* much is always true—but there was nothing that claimed even the name of Christianity. Such being the case, what did this "Reformation" at first do? It did not deny the necessity of dogma or morality, nor did it even deny the necessity of an authority (practically) infallible; but it changed the seat of that authority. It wrestled the dead letter of Scripture from the hand of its only lawful guardian, the Church; and it left to "private judgment," exercising its ingenuity on the text, to propose to itself dogma, and to the "individual conscience," either in its natural state, or, at best, illuminated by the *ignes fatui* of "private judgment," to make its own morality. And Protestantism, in its first founders, having done so much, sought to stop there. It would fain retain Christianity after having removed its foundation. It had created and let loose upon the world the "Frankenstein" of "private judgment," and sought to satiate its appetite by the sacrifice of some, not all, of the dogmas of the Christian religion. But the endeavour was futile. The human mind, even starting from a profoundly false principle, is too naturally logical not to push that principle to its remotest conclusions. Supply the human mind with premises, and sooner or later it will put the syllogism into form. Accordingly, the argument formed itself gradually into this—"If there be such a thing as dogma at all it must be true, and we must have certainty that it is true; but, if 'private judgment' be the measure of dogma, it is abundantly evident that either there is no true dogma, or, at any rate, none capable of proof; therefore there *is not* any dogma cognizable by the human intellect." This conclusion took time to formulate itself, but it is tolerably well formulized in Protestant societies at present. Of course there is another alternative possible in the above

conclusion. It may be, after all, that "private judgment" is *not* the proper measure of dogmatic truth. But "private judgment" was too great a bribe to the "natural man" that he should question his right to receive it; and so blind has Protestantism been to this alternative of the conclusion, that we venture to say that there is no human right, at the present moment, which one could with less impunity call into question in Protestant societies than the imaginary right of every man to think as he likes in matters of religion.

And what of the parallel branch of morality? Well, the human mind, reasoning logically, inevitably reasons in precisely the same way about morality that it reasons about dogma, and would enforce its conclusion with a rod of iron upon civil society were it not that, for a time, the policeman is an inevitable condition of the social problem—only for a time—for when faith shall have utterly died out of any society, and morality lost its sanction, revolution will be prompt to claim its logical right to take the place of the dethroned authorities that in times past presided over the consolidation of Christian society. Here, then, we have "modern thought" in its very essence. A man has a right to think as he likes in matters of dogma, and this right he may at once proceed to exercise, because its tendency to dissolve civil society, however inevitable, is more or less remote. Again, a man has a right to do as he likes, but with the full exercise of this right the policeman for the present unwarrantably interferes.

The necessity, however, of authority in human affairs, intellectual and other, is so obvious a condition of progress that when we find it called into question in matters of religion, we begin at once to suspect that, in the first instance, at any rate, this claim for what is in reality intellectual licence, was only an after-thought to excuse or palliate moral licentiousness. Any student of history can tell how the facts of the history of the Reformation bear out such suspicions.

Authority is so necessary to the progress of the human mind in any direction, that it cannot be dispensed with even in the pursuit of those branches of physical knowledge to which their professors, with an arrogance quite their own, restrict the title of "scientific" investigation. In every department of knowledge, human as well as divine, there must be teachers before there can be learners; and the learners must proceed on the practical maxim—" *cuique sua arte credendum* ;" that is, they must accept, provisionally at least, the authority of the teacher as a guarantee of the truth of certain statements which their condition as beginners renders it impossible to verify for themselves. Hence let us freely admit that scientific statements

made by scientific men, so that both the statements and the men *be* really scientific—are eminently worthy of credence—but, it has become more than ever necessary to distinguish between the statements of scientific men on the proper subject matter of their science, and the arbitrary assumptions and crude theories by which they make unwarrantable incursions into other sciences in which, from the necessities of the case, they are themselves mere beginners—more in need of teaching than competent to teach. Let us give a scientific illustration of what we have been saying. If a chemist, in pursuit of chemistry, arrives at some conclusion which at first sight appears to him to contradict some conclusion proclaimed by the science of physiology—should he at once take for granted, and proclaim that physiology teaches an error? Should he not, rather in common justice, make himself acquainted with the science of physiology, and with the demonstration which that science professes to give of the proposition in dispute? As a matter of fact, men of science are too shrewd to proceed in any other way. It is only in one matter that their native sagacity seems to desert them. It is only when it occurs to them that some of their scientific conclusions, or theories formed of these conclusions by copious use of gratuitous assumption, contradict some truth of revealed religion—it is only then that they hasten to give the lie to revelation without ever troubling themselves to ascertain what the Church has to say in favour of her authoritative assertion of revealed truth.

If it were, instead of being the merest assumption, an ascertained matter of simple fact—that there is no such thing as “the supernatural”—that man is merely a higher development of monkey, or the slowly evolved product of some original “protoplasm” which came no one knows whence, but which, once having come, developed itself by laws so necessary that not even its creator—if, indeed, it had a creator at all—can interfere with their operation—that it is one of these necessary laws that man so evolved should in his turn evolve some “baseless fabric of a vision,” and give it the name of “the supernatural”—if all this, and much more of the same character, were a proved matter of fact, then indeed might men of science, confronted with such a race and such a state of things, have some warrant for the contemptuous attitude they assume towards the millions who believe that the supernatural is not a dream, but the highest and sublimest of all realities. But for this—they come too late. The supernatural has preceded them in the world’s history by six thousand years. It is not unreasonable to suppose that it will outlive them in the minds of men by as many more, if the world itself shall last so long.

But for this attitude of men of science towards supernatural truth, we can find, not indeed a justification, for there is none, but at least some explanation and excuse in the Protestant system, which is the basis of "modern thought." The truth is, there is always a danger in a Protestant society, especially when it is approaching its ultimate development into pure naturalism; there is always a danger, indeed almost a certainty, that men of great intellectual power will begin their intellectual life with a strong bias against revealed religion—a bias which nothing but a special interposition of Divine grace is able to counteract. A young man of ability begins to find his mind awakening to the problems which the mere fact of living in the world must necessarily accumulate around an intelligent being—and amongst these, as a matter of fact, those problems which are called "religious" assume a paramount importance. He turns to the solution which the religious society in which it was his lot to be born professes to offer. Now, if that society be Protestant, he perceives at once, and all the more clearly in proportion to the acuteness of his intellect, that any solution that, in its ultimate analysis and last resort, rests upon a "private judgment" which he bitterly feels to be fallible, and which, even if he did not feel it, would prove itself fallible by the contradictions in which it resulted, must fail to be satisfactory to a logical inquirer after religious truth. He begins, then, very naturally, to be sceptical about everything that transcends the sphere of purely natural knowledge. Looking abroad upon a society in which the disintegrating influences of such a system have been at work in every field of thought, he is met with a vast chaos of uncertain utterances and conflicting opinions about the very things which the instinct of his soul proclaimed to be of primary importance; and it need surprise no one if he throw himself into physical science as believing it to be the only one capable of satisfying the restless craving of his intellectual nature. Accordingly he begins his intellectual career with the assumption, tacit or expressed, that there is nothing capable of being really known unless it can be submitted to the test of sensible experiment. He is compelled, to be sure, as an indispensable condition of any intellectual effort, to recognise and respect the laws of his own thought—he abstracts and generalizes, proceeds by induction and deduction—and hence his complete theory issues in this—that human reason proceeding upon the evidence supplied by tangible experiment, is the ultimate tribunal of appeal on every possible question. He feels, indeed, that men have, by almost universal consent, raised issues which human reason has no data to pronounce upon with any certainty, but he calmly

proceeds to assume that, even with regard to these, it is competent to pronounce that nothing certain *can* be known about them,

He has never seen the magnificent vision which God reveals to those who have the divine faith, without which it is impossible to please Him—the vision of a living Church moving majestic through all the ages—speaking with a voice that has not in its vast compass one quaver of uncertainty—a Church that has mingled in all the conflicts of human opinion, has stilled their tumult, confronted their hostility—and when her enemies mocked her and prophesied her fall, wrapped herself in the mantle of truth, passed on, and outlived them. This blessed vision the men of whom we speak have never known. Those who have known it, and felt how it can sweeten the lives of sorrowing men, must be filled with the pity that begets charity and patience for those to whom God hath not done likewise.

We have, in this paper, striven to ascertain the origin of “modern thought”—to show the direction in which it tends—to suggest the ultimate chaos in which it must necessarily result unless checked by something very different from itself. In condemning the contemptuous attitude of the disciples of “modern thought” towards the Church of God, we have suggested a palliation which makes us, not, indeed, absolve them of all blame, but makes us, even while we blame, pity far more than we blame them.

In our next paper it will fall in with the course of the remarks we have been making, to describe, in a general way, the position which the Catholic Church assumes towards the human mind, and the nature and extent of the claim she advances to the allegiance of man. Afterwards, we shall proceed to some of the detailed controversies which have arisen between the Church and “modern thought.”

ST. BLAITMAIC, OF IONA, MARTYR.

SOME individuals are heroic in action; others in patient suffering. This noble saint, whose memory is held in honour on the 19th day of January, justly deserves the meed of praise for his fortitude under both aspects. Blaitmaic's biography has been elegantly composed, in Latin hexameter verses, by Walafridus or Galafriidus Strabo,¹ a learned Benedictine monk,

¹ He was a monk of Fulda, afterwards a dean at St. Gall; then he became abbot at Richenaw or Ringau, near Lake Constance. All of the foregoing religious houses were founded by holy Irishmen, who were missionaries on the continent of Europe.

who died A.D. 847. This celebrated writer was an accomplished mediæval poet.¹ His greatly admired composition was written at the instigation of a venerable superior, Felix, and it appeared most probably some short time after the tragic but glorious death of the noble subject, suggesting Strabo's fine poem.²

We are unable to state on whose authority events associated with the life of Blaitmaic depend, as they are metrically narrated by Strabo; but it is probable, they had been taken from some relation given by monks connected with Iona monastery. These informants, too, might have had a personal knowledge concerning the martyred Christian hero, and even of the circumstances attending his death. His interesting Acts have been frequently written in various forms, as well in prose³ as in verse.⁴

St. Blaitmaic or Brah Mac, which name, according to Strabo and Bollandus, means "the beautiful son,"⁵ seems to have been gifted with singular graces even from his very infancy.⁶ This child, the delight of his parents, was of Royal extraction, and of noble birth.⁷ He was born in Ireland, most probably, about the middle of the eighth century.⁸ St. Blaitmaic was prospective heir to his father's possessions,⁹ the ornament and hope of his family and country.

¹ See Bishop Challoner's "Britannia Sancta," part i., p. 67.

² In the "Cursus Completus Patrologiæ," the works of Walafridus Strabo will be found printed. The second tome of these works contains the tract in question, pp. 1043 to 1046.—See Tomus cxiii. *Parisiis*, 1852.

³ In Butler's "Lives of the Saints," we find, at January the 19th, some notices of St. Blaitmaic, abbot. These are brief, and, notwithstanding, quite incorrect.

⁴ In the "Acta Sanctorum Ordinis S. Benedicti," occurs the life of St. Blaitmaic, martyr, with companions, in Latin hexameter verse—Tomus iv., pp. 439 to 442. Likewise in the great Bollandist collection "Acta Sanctorum," Januarii, Tomus ii., pp. 236 to 238.

⁵ "Cujus honorandum nomen sermone Latino,
Pulcher natus adest : meritoque probabilis illo
Nomine dignus erat, Patrem qui cunctipotentem
Elegit, pulchroque Deum quæsit amore."

Strabo, Vita S. Blaitmaici, § ii.

⁶ In the "Antiquæ Lectiones of Canisius," Tomus vi., and nova editio Tomus ii., parte ii., p. 201, as also in Messingham's "Florilegium Insulae Sanctorum," p. 399, such particulars are stated in the metrical acts of this Saint by Strabo.

⁷ Without giving the date of his festival, Convæus thus refers to this Saint :—"S. Blaithmac, princeps, haeres regni, et inclytus martyr, in insula Eo." See O'Sullivan Beare's "Historiæ Catholiciæ Iberniciæ Compendium."—Tomus i., Lib. iv., cap. x., p. 48.

⁸ Henry FitzSimon, citing "Antiquæ Lectiones, tom. vi., p. 575, states that S. Blaithmac lived about the year 912.—See *ibid.*, cap. xii., p. 52. This date is later, however, than has been allowed by other writers, and long after the period when Strabo, the biographer of St. Blaitmaic, died.

⁹ "In the Irish annals and calendars his father is called Flann; but it is not stated what principality he had. Colgan conjectures that he was one of the

At an early age he was distinguished for almost every virtue and merit. He is described as being of sound judgment, prudent, a great lover of holy purity, and humble, notwithstanding his exalted birth.¹ The innate nobility of his soul surpassed that of his race.² Accomplishments were not wanting to add a royal grace to his character; sober and circumspect, he was pleasing in mien, and agreeable in disposition. Although remaining in the world he was not one of this world's votaries.³ He had resolved upon devoting himself wholly to religious services, but kept this secret locked up within his own breast, until such time as he could most conveniently put his resolution into practice. Without his father's knowledge, Blaitmaic withdrew privately to a monastery, where he practised all exercises of a monastic life, until his retreat was discovered.

Hereupon, the fond parent, who loved his son according to the instinct of worldlings, repaired to this monastery; and he brought a band of friends and acquaintances, whose exertions and entreaties it had been supposed must have exercised great influence in changing Blaitmaic's purpose. Besides the chiefs and people, a bishop and several abbots united their persuasions with those of his father to induce the Saint to resume his former rank. But the pious prince resisted all these solicitations, and persevered in his happy course of life.⁴

He looked upon himself as a servant to all the religious in the monastery, although esteemed beyond expression by his fellow-cenobites. He was distinguished by religious silence, and the observance of monastic discipline: by attentive study of the sacred Scriptures and books of ecclesiastical science, he edified all through his conduct and conversation. In due time, he was made superior of the religious community;⁵ and this

southern Niells, princes of Meath, because the names Flann and Blaithmaic were rather common in that family."—Lanigan's *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland*, vol. iii., chap. xx., § xi., n. 121, p. 255.

¹ Hugh Menard calls him "Filius Regis Hiberniæ." The Annals of Clonmacnoise and of Senat Mac-Magnus, at A.D. 823, concur.

² The Martyrologies of Tallagh and of Marianus O'Gorman, as also St. Ængus' commentator on the Feilire, represent him as the son of Flann.—See Colgan's "Acta Sanctorum Hiberniæ," xix. Januarii, n. 2, p. 129.

³ The poem of Strabo states:

"Tractabat laicus, quod clericus efficiebat."—*Vita S. Blaitmaici*.

⁴ See Mabillon's *Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti*.—Tomus ii., lib. xxvi., § xxvii., pp. 309, 310:

⁵ This is stated by Strabo:

"Sicque vigens doctrinarum, morumque nitore,
Agmina multorum rexit veneranda Vivorum,"—*Vita S. Blaitmaici*.

Where this religious institute was has not been stated, but it seems to have been in some part of Ireland,

band of religious he governed more by example than by precept. Christ Jesus was the sole object of his praise and glory, as of his discourse and allusions. Peace was his shield, prayers were his coat of mail; patience was his field for victory, and the word of God his sword; mildness characterized his conduct towards the monks; he became all things to all of them, that he might gain all to Christ. He was ever hopeful and loving; practising every virtue and avoiding every imperfection; and ever referring his actions to the great Author of our being. Thus his example brightened as a beacon before the eyes of his disciples; and these latter progressed towards perfection under the directing zeal of their saintly superior.

Our Saint burned with a desire of martyrdom; and to attain this object, he had often attempted to visit strange lands, but had been prevented by his people. On a certain occasion, Blaitmaic thought to effect his retreat under cover of night, and through a secret path. He was accompanied by a small band of disciples; but the fugitives were arrested and brought back. However, his wishes were at length gratified; for he contrived to escape from his native country.¹ Blaitmaic directed his course to Iona, "the sacred isle" of Columba.² The Danish ravages had been frequently directed against the shrines and altars of unprotected religious that peopled this known island. But, in a knowledge of this fact, Blaitmaic grounded his hopes for securing to himself the palm of martyrdom.

He had been gifted from on high with a spirit of prophecy. Hence, before a hostile irruption, which took place after the commencement of the ninth century, Blaitmaic predicted to his companions, in Iona monastery, a storm which was about to burst upon them.³ This seems to have occurred during the

¹ The year in which he departed from Ireland does not appear to have been recorded,

² The poem states:

"Insula Pictorum quaedam monstratur in oris
Fluctivago suspensa salo cognominis Eo,
Qua Sanctus Domini requiescit carne Columba :
Hanc petit voto patiendi stygmata Christi."—

Vita S. Blaitmaici.

³ Applicable to such a prophecy are the following spirited lines from Motherwell, in his magnificent poem,

"THE BATTLE FLAG OF SIGURD.

"The eagle hearts of all the North have left their stormy strand;
The warriors of the world are forth to choose another land;
Again, their long keels sheer the wave, their broad sheets court the breeze;
Again, the reckless and the brave ride lords of weltering seas.
Nor swifter from the well-bent bow can feathered shaft be sped,
Than o'er the ocean's flood of snow their snoring galleys tread."

incumbency of Diarmait,¹ the twentieth abbot in succession² to the great St. Columkille.

Before the northern pirates, with their fleet, had reached the shores of Columba's sacred isle, Blaitmaic called the monks together, addressing them as follows:—"My friends, consider well the choice which is now left you. If you wish to endure martyrdom for the name of Christ, and fear it not, let such as will remain with me arm themselves with becoming courage. But those who are weak in resolution, let them fly, that they may avoid impending dangers, and nerve themselves for more fortunate issues. The near trial of certain death awaits us. Invincible faith, which looks to a future life, will shield the brave soldier of Christ, and the cautious security of flight will preserve the less courageous."³

These words were received by the religious with resolutions suited to the confidence or timidity of each individual. Some resolved to brave the invaders' fury, together with their holy companion; some betook themselves to places of concealment until this hostile storm had passed.⁴

On the morning of January the 19th, A.D. 823,⁵ 824,⁶ or 825, St. Blaitmaic, robed in vestments of his order, had been engaged in celebrating the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.⁷ Whilst he offered up the Immaculate Host, he stood as a self-immolated victim, prepared for sacrifice. The band of his faithful religious, anticipating a coronal of martyrdom, knelt around; with tears and prayers they besought mercy and grace before the throne of God. This, truly, must have been a sublime spectacle, and one never yet surpassed in the records of human heroism. Whilst engaged in these services, the loud shout of their destroyers was heard thundering without the church.⁸

¹ See Rev. Dr. Reeves' edition of Adamnan's "Life of St. Columba." Additional Notes, O, pp. 388 to 390.

² His rule at Iona commenced A.D. 815, and continued after A.D. 831.

³ See Bishop Challoner's "Britannia Sancta," part i., p. 68.

⁴ Mabillon, in his "Annales Ordinis, S. Benedicti," tomus ii. lib. xxvi., § xxvii., A.D. 793, mistakes when he assigns the martyrdom of our Saint to that year. See pp. 309, 310. Yet he is more generally followed as an authority by Continental historians than our own Colgan, who is a much safer guide in dates and particulars regarding Irish ecclesiastical history and biography.

⁵ According to Dr. O'Donovan's "Annals of the Four Masters," vol. i., p. 436.

⁶ In extracts from the "Annals of Ulster," given by the Rev. James Johnstone, the following entry occurs:—"824. Blachan M'Flan murdered, in I-Colm-kil, by the Gáls."—*Antiquitates Celto-Normannicae*, p. 63.

⁷ Dr. Reeves has this martyrdom recorded at A.D. 825. See his "Adamnan's Life of St. Columba." Additional notes, O, p. 389.

⁸ In "Whittier's Poetical Works" this situation is thus correctly, although fortuitously, described:—

"Iona's sable-stoled Culdee
Has heard it sounding o'er the sea,
And swept with hoary beard and hair,
His altar's foot in trembling prayer!"—

Legendary Poems.—The Norseman, p. 67.

The Pagan and pirate Danes¹ rushed in through its open doors, threatening death to the religious, and almost immediately afterwards these barbarous threats were put in execution. The monks, expecting this irruption, had the precaution to remove a rich shrine, containing St. Columba's relics, from its usual place. They buried it under ground, so that it might thus escape the profanation of those savage invaders. That rich prize was what the Danes chiefly sought. They urged Blaitmaic to show them the place of its concealment.² But our Saint, who knew not the particular place where it was buried, with unbending constancy of mind opposed himself to this armed band. Although unarmed himself, he put forth some futile efforts of strength to stay the ravages of his enemies. He cried out, at the same time, "I am entirely ignorant regarding those treasures you seek for, and where they are buried. But, even had I a knowledge of all this, my lips should yet be closed. Draw your swords, barbarians, take my chalice, and murder me. Gracious God, I humbly resign myself to Thee!" The barbarians immediately hewed him into pieces with their swords, and with more diabolical rage, because they were disappointed in their expectations for obtaining spoil. At this time the Abbot Diarmait was probably absent from Iona, and the holy martyred priest it would seem, worthily represented their Superior's authority among the religious. The body of St. Blaitmaic was buried in that place where his glorious crown of martyrdom had been obtained, according to his biographer Strabo; and many miracles were afterwards wrought in favour of several persons, through the merits and intercession of this great soldier of Christ.³

We have not been able to discover whether our Saint ever enjoyed any superior dignity at Iona; but it would seem, from the preceding narrative, that he exercised considerable influence over the minds of his brethren on that island. We are told that in the Irish language this Saint is called Blathmhac.⁴ The first syllable of this compound name has an equivocal signification. Blath, when pronounced long, has the literal meaning "a flower," and the metaphorical signification "beautiful;" when pronounced short, it is rendered into the English

¹ See Father Stephen White's "Apologia pro Hibernia," cap. iii., p. 23, and cap. v., p. 59.

² It seems so have eluded their search, for in A.D. 829, the Abbot Diarmait brought the relics of St. Columbkille to the mainland of Scotland, and A.D. 831, he removed them to Ireland.

³ This Saint is venerated abroad on the 19th of January, while in the Martyrology of Donegal his feast is set down on the 24th of July. This latter festival, perhaps, was some translation of his relics.

⁴ See Colgan's "Acta Sanctorum Hiberniæ," xix. Januarii, n. 3, p. 129.

words "honor" or "fame." The word Mhac is Anglicised "son."¹ Truly was this heroic man named. For not alone was he the son and heir apparent to his father's temporal possessions, but he became one of God's glorified children, secured in the enjoyment of a heavenly inheritance. He plucked the flower of martyrdom with unbending constancy, and he blooms with distinguished brilliancy, "as the apple-tree among the trees of the woods."² His memory deserves to be honoured in the Church, since he achieved a distinguished reputation. This is one, likewise, which no concurrence of events can ever tend to tarnish or destroy.

DECREES OF THE COUNCILS OF TRENT AND OF THE VATICAN ON THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

(From the Etudes Religieuses.)

THE Church has been commissioned to teach all mankind. It is by preaching she fulfils this great work. But to aid her in this Divine mission, her Founder has furnished her with books written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, which contain the very Word of God graven in ineffaceable characters. So precious a treasure has always been preserved by the Church with the respect it merits. Her doctors have carefully weighed every word of these holy books; they have taken pleasure in developing the different significations; and their commentaries form the finest monuments of Christian literature. There, as in a well-furnished arsenal, they have sought spiritual arms in their warfare against the enemies of the faith, and they have defended the Bible with unequalled zeal against all attacks and alterations by heretics. The Scriptures have been the object of the fury of persecutors, and more than one hero has shed his blood to defend them from the insults of the unbeliever, and thereby had his name inscribed on the glorious roll of the martyrology.

Protestantism, at its very birth, was desirous of profiting

¹ This name, which is a common one, derived from *βλακῆ*, *flos*, and *μακῆ*, *filius*, may be Latinized Florigenus or Florentius. The Index to the Calendar of Donegal represents it by Florigenius and Florus, as it does *βλακῆ* by Flora. See Rev. William Reeves' Adamnan's "Life of St. Columba," n. (y), p. 389.

² Canticle of Canticles," ii., 3.

by this respect of the Christian world. It affected an ardent zeal for the sacred books, and, carrying its veneration beyond reasonable limits, maintained that the Bible is the only rule of faith. But its very exaggerations, by a law of Providence, have led it to the opposite extreme. Three centuries have hardly elapsed, and the followers of those who acknowledged no other rule of faith than the Bible, gradually led to the verge of rationalism, accord a merely human authority to the sacred volume.

Even from the very dawn of the Reformation, the pernicious influence of free examination gave a deadly blow to the canon of Scripture. Luther was the foremost. Everything in Holy Writ that conflicted with his doctrines of wholly imputative justification, of free-will, and the sacraments, was boldly consigned among the apocryphal books. The canon of Scripture, thus at the option of individuals, no longer had any stability. Individual caprice led to the admission or rejection of books that had been regarded as inspired from all antiquity. The authenticity of the Scriptures was not only questioned, but also their legitimate meaning. Luther denied the doctrinal authority of the Church, and was obliged to make the Bible the ground of Faith; that is, the Bible interpreted according to the particular notions of each believer. In reality, Luther wished to subject his followers to his own interpretation. Like rebels of every age, he arrogated an authority he refused to legitimate power. But logic has its inevitable laws. The Lutheran theory claimed absolute independence. It made all Christians, even the most ignorant, even those the farthest from the knowledge of the truth, judges of the real signification of the Scriptures. It promised each believer the interior illumination of the Holy Spirit in ascertaining the true meaning of the sacred text beneath all its obscurities. But, as the Divine Spirit is not pledged to fulfil the promises of the Reformer, each Protestant interprets the Bible according to his own views, and the various sects sprung from the Reform have, in the name of the Scriptures, maintained the most contradictory opinions.

Besides the change in the canon, and the false interpretation of the holy books, there was another abuse—that of unfaithful translations. Protestantism rejected the authority of the Church, therefore it would not receive her version of the Scriptures. It had no regard for the Vulgate. The innovators, with Luther at their head, undertook new translations. In their boldness, they did not shrink from attempting to surpass the work of St. Jerome. They were not well versed in the knowledge of the original idioms; they had access to

but few manuscripts; the copies they had were not the choicest; and yet they imagined they could excel the great Doctor who spent so large a part of his life in Palestine, absorbed in the profound study of the ancient languages; who took pains to collate the best manuscripts, and was aided by the ancient rabbis—the most versed in the knowledge of Hebrew antiquities and in the languages of the East. Every day a new translation appeared, which, under the pretext of adapting God's own Word to the common mind, diffused heretical novelties by means of insidious falsifications.

The Reform was equally unscrupulous as to the correctness of the text. The Bible was left to the arbitrariness of its editors and the carelessness of printers. Through unscrupulousness or negligence, many incorrect expressions crept into the versions sold to the public. The new heresy was not wholly responsible for the numerous faults in the various editions of the Bible. The sacred book had for ages been subjected to all the hazards of individual transcription. The distractions of the copyist had, in many instances, caused the substitution of one word for another, the omission of a part of a verse, or the transferring of the marginal gloss to the text. Hence so many copies alike in the main, but full of discrepancies.

II.

Such was the state of the Bible question at the opening of the Council of Trent. Its importance could not escape the bishops who composed that assembly, and the theologians who assisted them with their acquirements, consequently it was the first proposed for consideration. On the 8th of February, 1546, the Fathers being assembled in general congregation, Cardinal del Monte, the chief legate of the Holy See, proposed the Council should first consider the subject of the Holy Scriptures, and make a recension of the canon, in order to determine the arms to be used in the struggle against heresy, and also to show Catholics on what their faith was grounded, many of whom lived in deplorable ignorance on this point, seeing the same book accepted by some as dictated by the Holy Spirit, and rejected by others as spurious.¹ The president of the Council afterwards determined the principal points to be submitted to the consideration of the Fathers.

But this is not the place to review the account of this interesting discussion. We will only state the results.

¹ Pallavicini, *History of the Council of Trent*, b. vi., ch. xi., No. 4.

In the fourth session, held April 8, 1546, the Council promulgated its celebrated decree respecting the Holy Scriptures, which comprehended two very distinct parts:—the first, dogmatic; the second, disciplinary.

The dogmatic part established the authority of the sacred books in matters of faith and morals, their divine origin, the canon, the authenticity of the Vulgate, and the rules for interpreting the inspired text.

The disciplinary prescriptions had reference to the use of the Vulgate in the lessons, sermons, controversies, and commentaries; the obligation of interpreting the Scriptures according to the unanimous teachings of the Fathers; the respect to be paid to the divine word, and, consequently, the crime of those who apply it to profane, light, or superstitious uses. The Council likewise enacted severe laws against publishers who issue the holy books, or commentaries on them, without a written authorization of the ordinary, and against the vendors or holders of prohibited editions; finally, it ordained that the Holy Scriptures, especially the Vulgate, be henceforth printed with all possible correctness.

To these prescriptions of the fourth session we will add the first chapter of the decree of reform, continued in the fifth session, ordering the institution of a course of Holy Scripture in certain churches, in order that the Christian community might not be ignorant of the salutary truths contained in the sacred volume. Such was the reply to Protestant calumnies which accused the Church of withholding the sacred treasure of God's Word from the faithful.

Such, briefly, were the labors of the Council of Trent with regard to the Holy Scriptures. The importance of the decree of the fourth session must not be estimated according to the brief place it occupies in the canons, for, brief as it is, it has had an incalculable influence on sacred science. This decree, in fact, gave rise to those admirable works of criticism that have defended the authentic canon against the attacks of heresy, and reduced the pretended discoveries of Protestantism respecting the true canon of holy books to their proper value; thence the number of excellent commentaries that for three centuries have been enriching Catholic theology; and thence so many apologetic works which have defended the truth of the Biblical narrative against the false pretensions of rationalistic history. To this same decree we owe the many learned researches concerning the original text, the primitive versions regarded as genuine in the ancient churches, and, above all, the incomparable edition of the Vulgate—the result of thirty years' labor by those most versed in the study of sacred literature.

It would seem as if there were no necessity of reconsidering a question so fully weighed by the Council of Trent. And yet the Fathers of the Vatican also deemed it proper to take up the subject of the Holy Scriptures, in order to reaffirm what had been defined by the Council of Trent, to give greater prominence to points that the Council had left obscure, and to clear up some difficulties of interpretation that had arisen within three centuries even among Catholic schools. The dogmatic part of the decree of Trent alone was renewed and completed by the Fathers of the Vatican. The exclusively doctrinal character of the decree *Dei Filius* admitted no reconsideration of the disciplinary laws relating to the publishing of the holy books, or their commentaries, and the abuses that might be made of the sacred text. Besides, the penalties decreed by the Council of Trent were such as in our day could not be put in execution, as they consisted not only of spiritual censures, but pecuniary fines. The ecclesiastical authority, deprived of its ancient tribunals, and living in the midst of a society whose leading maxim is liberty of the press and liberty of conscience, could not revive the old penalties. The Fathers of the Vatican also omitted everything respecting the authenticity of the Vulgate. Many of them, however, requested the Council to ratify the decree of the fourth session of Trent on this point, but the greater part of the bishops did not deem it advisable to accede to the request. What, indeed, could they add to that which had been so wisely defined by the Fathers of Trent? Besides, is not the Vulgate received without protest by the whole Catholic world as the only version recognised by the Church as authentic? As to the rationalists, it is not the translation of the sacred books they attack, but the books themselves, their canonicity and supernatural origin.

Laying aside, therefore, all these questions so important in themselves, but which are not now points of controversy, the Council of the Vatican only dwelt on the authority of the Scriptures, their divine origin, the canon, and the rule of interpretation. On all these points it had to oppose modern rationalism, and banish false and dangerous theories from Catholic schools of theology.

III.

First, in opposition to rationalism, the Council teaches that divine revelation is comprised in the Scriptures and tradition. This was declared in the same terms by the Council of Trent, but it was by no means useless in these times to renew so fundamental a definition. Modern science rejects revelation :

to be consistent, it ought also to reject its monuments. It regards the Holy Scriptures as merely of human authority. It does not, it is true, imitate the cynicism of the philosophers of the eighteenth century: it does not make our holy books the butt of their foolish railleries. On the contrary, it affects a profound respect for them, though it refuses to accept them as the organ of divine communications. It regards them as it would the discourses of Socrates—as books full of admirable wisdom—which every philosopher ought to know and study, but which do not owe their origin to inspiration, properly so-called, or to revelation.

Discussion as to such an error was impossible. The Council had merely to pass its judgment, and repeat what the Church had taught its members for eighteen centuries, as a fresh proof that the Christian faith does not falter in encountering the many new forms of incredulity. Having affirmed the truth of revelation, it was necessary to point out what it was contained in, that the Christian might know where to study the science of salvation. It says: "This supernatural revelation, according to the belief of the Universal Church, as declared by the holy Council of Trent, is contained in the written books and in the unwritten traditions that have come down to us."

But what books contain this revelation? Pursuing the subject, the Council defined anew the canon of Scripture, which the state of the times made, if not necessary, at least very opportune. Protestant critics have not ceased since the Reformation to attack the canon sanctioned by the authority of the Church. Rationalism has come to the support of Protestant criticism, and sometimes flatters itself it has, by its historical discoveries, blotted out the entire list of the holy books. The unadulterated traditions preserved by the Church have no scientific value in the eyes of rationalism, which only admits the canonicity of those books that can trace the proofs of their origin back to the very time of the apostles. Tertullian took a wrong stand in asserting that the dogmas of faith should have prescriptive proof. In vain the Catholic points out the wholly exceptional circumstances that surround the Scriptural canon—the impossibility from the very first of admitting books of doubtful origin as coming from the apostles, or that these books could have been changed in any respect under the jealous guardianship of a Church and hierarchy spread over the face of the earth, and charged with the conservation of the sacred deposit. The incredulous critic refuses to receive proofs which the most common mind perceives the full value of as well as the good sense. What does

he substitute for them? Theories founded on mere conjecture, and constantly changing, but which are welcomed as the final conclusions of science. Have we not seen the school of Tübingen, founded on some obscure words of Papias, a whole system tending to establish the more recent composition of the Gospels? These new doctors regard the books of divine truth as some of those legends that are embellished as they pass from mouth to mouth, till they are collected in a definite form by some unknown writer. And has not this strange theory met with ardent panegyrists in France, as if it were the definite solution of the great controversy on the origin of the Gospels?¹

Whoever attentively examines these strange theories will soon perceive their weak point. But where are the men in the present generation who read with sufficient care to see the hollowness of such solutions? Their authors have seats in our academies; they occupy the most important professorships; there is not an honorary distinction that does not add its recommendation to their apparent knowledge. Skilled in praising one another, the journals and reviews regarded as authorities, even by certain Catholics, extol their labors. One would think they had a monopoly of science. Has not all this been a source of real danger to the faith of Christians?

The Church had to counteract the influence of a criticism as bold as it was easy, by her immutable decrees. It must once more affirm the ancient canon of Scripture. This catalogue of the sacred books had been solemnly approved, at the end of the fourth century, in a celebrated decree of the Councils of Hippo and Carthage, in which the Fathers declared they received this canon from their ancestors in the faith. A little later, Pope S. Innocent I. sent this same canon of Scripture to S. Exuperius, the illustrious Bishop of Toulouse. S. Gelasius, in 494, included it in his synodical decree. Finally, the Council of Florence, in its decree relating to the Jacobites, and, at a later period, the Council of Trent, sanctioned it by their supreme authority. Several of the Fathers of Trent proposed to subject it to a re-examination: not in order to retrench anything, but to satisfy the heretical, and convince them by such a discussion that the Church of Rome had not lightly decided on the list of the inspired books. But a large majority of the Fathers thought, and with reason, that such a discussion was appropriate to schools of Catholic theology, but to a Council it belonged to pronounce authoritatively. The canon of Scripture, being a dogma of faith, formally defined by Popes and Councils, and consequently unchangeable, could

¹ See Renan's *Vie de Jesus*, Introduction; also, Albert Réville, *Revue des Deux Mondes*, for May and June, 1866.

only be proclaimed anew and without discussion.¹ The Council of the Vatican came to a like decision, and, in declaring its acceptance of the canon of the Council of Trent, with each of its books, in all the parts, it strengthened the faith of Christians against the shameful pretensions of false science.

This course has shocked the Protestant historian of the Council. M. de Pressensé is indignant at so summary a procedure. "The Council," he says, "has fallen into a profound and dangerous error on two important points. In the first place, it proclaims the indisputable canonicity of all the books of the Vulgate, including the Apocrypha² of the Old Testament, thus showing it regards the immense labors of the critics of the nineteenth century as of no account, and acknowledging that it is not permitted, for example, to question the origin of the Gospel of Matthew, or the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, by referring to such and such an expression of a Father of the second and third centuries.³ The Catholic Church is thus prevented anew from taking any part in the great work of Christian science of our day, which consists in establishing a safeguard to the true canon of Holy Scripture by free and conscientious research. What confidence can we have in Catholic theology, on those points disputed by rationalism, like the authenticity of the fourth Gospel? Examination, even, is forbidden. Everything must be accepted in a lump. How much valuable co-operation is thus lost or made fruitless through the Council!"⁴

¹ Pallavicini, *History of the Council of Trent*, b. vi., ch. xi. Leplat, *Monum. Conc. Trid.*, vol. iii., p. 386, *et seq.*

² M. de Pressensé means the *deutero-canonical* books of the Old Testament. *Deutero-canonical* and *apocryphal* are by no means synonymous. The authenticity of the deutero-canonical books have been demonstrated sufficiently often within three centuries to prevent a writer, with any respect for himself, from alluding to them as apocryphal.

³ We wish M. de Pressensé would be kind enough to inform us what Fathers of the second and third centuries have questioned the origin of the Gospel according to S. Matthew. We are well aware that French rationalists have borrowed the German idea of a primitive Gospel, which, perhaps, served as a basis for the other abridgments. The promoters of this system are Eichorn, Eckermann, Gieseler, Credner, and Ewald, in Germany; in France, Messrs. Réville and Renan have lent to it the support of their names. They have endeavoured to support it by one or two words of Papias, which by no means prove so strange an assertion. Where are the Fathers of the second and third centuries who had any doubt as to the authenticity of the first Gospel? As to the Epistle to the Hebrews, we wish M. de Pressensé would read a few pages on this question by the Rev. Père Franzelin, in his able treatise, *De Traditione et Scriptura*. He would see how little doubt the Fathers of the first ages had respecting this epistle. Some, on account of the absence of S. Paul's name, and the difference of style, have doubted it was by the doctor of nations, but all the Fathers, unless we except two or three of the least known, invariably asserted its canonicity. For it is one thing to doubt whether S. Paul was the author of this epistle, and another that it is of the number of inspired books.

⁴ *Histoire du Concile du Vatican*, p. 283.

The Church, then, at the bidding of this Protestant theologian, should renounce her right to decide on the true Scriptures, and give up the canon to the researches of rationalistic science, and this in order to provide a safeguard for this same canon. An amusing idea, to give up the catalogue of holy books to the caprice of incredulous critics in order to preserve it intact! And besides, what new documents can rationalistic science bring to light not perfectly known and considered by the Catholic theologians of the last three centuries? Catholic doctors have seen and weighed these difficulties as fully, to say the least, as Protestant critics, but they have not thought a few obscurities ought, scientifically, to outweigh immemorial prescription, or, dogmatically, the perpetual usage of the Church and the decrees of Councils.

Rationalism, on the contrary, appeals to obscure passages, or hasty conclusions sometimes to be met with in the Fathers, in order to exclude books from the Scriptural canon that have been venerated from time immemorial as inspired. On which side is the real scientific method? If historical records merit any confidence in spite of difficulties of detail, no person of sincerity would hesitate to give the preference to the theological rather than the rationalistic method.

As to the reproach made against the Church for confining criticism within such narrow limits as to stifle it, nothing is more contrary to experience. The Council of Trent likewise decided on the canon of Scripture, and yet what extensive labors, how many learned works, have been published within three centuries in reply to the attacks of Protestantism, and in order to establish the authenticity of the books rejected by the Reformer! No, indeed; the Church, in defining the canon of Scripture, does not discourage the researches of the learned respecting the Bible. The love of sacred literature, in the first place, and also the necessity of defending Catholic belief against the constantly renewed attacks of heterodox criticism, will keep Catholic apologists constantly at work. The Church, in maintaining its canon, directs their labors, but without putting any restraint on their abilities.

IV.

Besides reaffirming the ancient decrees relating to the canon of Scripture, the Council of the Vatican has completed and explained more clearly what faith requires us to believe respecting the origin of the holy books. This point had not been fully decided. The wants of the times had not before required it. But the attacks of rationalism, and the misinter-

pretations of semi-rationalism, required a more definite decision in order to put an end to dangerous teachings even in Catholic schools.

Christians have from the beginning believed God to be the author of the Holy Scriptures. The Fathers of the fourth Council of Carthage, in the profession of faith required of the new bishops, expressly made mention of this truth. The same profession of faith is made in our day by those who are promoted to the episcopate. Pope S. Leo. IX., in the profession of faith to which he required Peter of Antioch to subscribe, declared God to be the author of the Old and New Testaments, including the law, the prophets, and the apostolic books. The Council of Florence inserted this same article in the decree about the Jacobites: The most Holy Roman Church "confesses that it is one and the same God who is the author of the Old and the New Testament; that is to say, the law, the prophets, and the Gospel; the saints of both Testaments having spoken under the inspiration of the same Holy Spirit." Finally, the Council of Trent, renewing the decree of Florence, accepted all the canonical books of the two Testaments, God being the author of them both: *Cum utriusque unus Deus sit auctor*. Besides, all these decrees were only an expansion of the words of the Nicene Creed: *Qui locutus est per prophetas*.

The Catholic dogma is explicit: "God is the author of the books of the Old and the New Testament." The definitions of the ancient Councils had for their direct object the condemnation of the errors of the Manichees, who made a distinction between the two Testaments, attributing the first to the evil principle, the second to the true God. But, secondarily, these definitions, referring to the actual origin of the Holy Scriptures, declare they have God for their author. The Council of Florence gave this explanation: "Because the saints of both Testaments wrote under the inspiration of the same Holy Spirit."

But what is meant by inspiration? An important question, on which not only Protestants differ from Catholics, but on which even orthodox writers are not agreed.

To say what Protestantism understands by the inspiration of the Scriptures would be difficult, or, to speak more correctly, impossible. In a system where all belief is founded on free examination, there must be an infinite variety of doctrinal opinions. The first Reformers understood the inspiration of the holy books in the strictest sense—every word of Scripture was sacred. Now, Protestantism, even the most orthodox, allows greater latitude. Constrained to make more or less concession to the encroaching spirit of rationalism, it

takes refuge in vague expressions that leave one in doubt as to the part God had in the composition of the sacred books. Here is a pastor who considers himself orthodox, and boasts of remaining faithful to the principles of Luther and Calvin; he enters upon the subject of the Scriptures, and speaks at length on the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. Nevertheless, in these holy books inspired by God, he admits the possibility of complete error when there is any question of history or science which does not touch directly on religious dogmas or precepts. Even in what relates to religious truth, inspiration, to him, is reduced to I know not what particular assistance granted those who had witnessed the life of Christ, in relating what they had seen and heard.¹

According to this theory, every way so vague, we ask ourselves, What was the nature of the inspiration imparted to the Evangelists SS. Mark and Luke, who were not witnesses of our Saviour's deeds, but merely related what they had heard from others; what was the nature of that imparted to S. Paul, who had never seen Christ, and took something very different for the subject of his epistles from the acts and discourses of the Redeemer?

The incertitudes of Protestantism had pervaded more than one Catholic school, especially in Germany. Jahn, in his introduction to the books of the Old Testament, confounds inspiration with assistance. A book composed by the mere light of reason and pure human industry might be placed on the catalogue of Holy Writ, if the Church declared God had preserved the writer from all error in the composition of the work. Who does not see the falseness of a system which would include all the dogmatic decrees of the Popes and Councils in the canon of Scripture? Others confound inspiration with revealed truth. Every book written according to the precise spirit of divine revelation could be placed in the canon. According to this, not only the definitions of Popes and Councils, but many ascetic works, sermons, and catechisms, might be reckoned among the Holy Scriptures.

Finally, others, desirous of explaining the difference to be seen in the various books of the Bible, think several kinds of inspiration are to be distinguished. Sometimes the truths the sacred writer had to record were above human comprehension, or at least unknown to him, and could only be learned by actual revelation. The inspiration God accords for this class of truths supersedes all effort on the part of the writer. It is a suggestive inspiration, or, as it is called, *antecedent*.

If the sacred writer was himself aware of the facts he related, and the philosophical maxims he proposed to insert in his

¹ Pressensé, *Histoire du Concile du Vatican*, ch. xi.

book, or if he had drawn from any other source the truths he undertook to record, he had no need of suggestive inspiration. His book, however, is to be regarded as the work of God if he received special assistance to guide him in the choice of the truths he recorded, and prevent him from making any mistake in expressing himself. This is what is called *concomitant* inspiration.

Finally, suppose a work composed by mere human wisdom, without any other participation on the part of God than general assistance, and it comes to pass that God, by the testimony of his prophets, or the voice of the Church, declares this book exempt from error, it is thereby endowed with infallible authority, and may be reckoned among the Scriptures. This kind of approval has been styled, though very improperly, *subsequent* inspiration.

These three distinct kinds of inspiration have been taught by eminent theologians, such as Sixtus of Sienna (*Biblioth. Sac.* l. viii. Hæres, 12 ad. obj. sept.), Bonfrère (*Prolog.* c. viii.), Lessius and Hamel (*Hist. Congreg. de Auxiliis*, a Livino de Meyere, l. i. c. ix.) But these doctors never actually applied this distinction to the books that compose the canon of Scripture. It was for them a mere question of possibility: could books thus authentically approved have a place in the Scriptural canon? They replied in the affirmative. But are there actually any of our holy books that are wholly due to human industry, and which God has declared sacred by subsequent approval? We give Lessius' opinion: "Though I do not believe this kind of inspiration produced any of our canonical books, I do not think it impossible" (*loc. cit.*)

But the wise reserve of these great theologians has not been imitated by all. A learned German professor, who is likewise a highly esteemed author, has not hesitated to apply the distinction of these three kinds of inspiration to the existing books:—"The kind of inspiration," he says, "that produced such and such a book, or such and such a passage, it is almost impossible to determine in particular. We can only say that the parts where we read, *Thus saith the Lord*, or a similar formula, probably belong to the first kind of inspiration; the historical narrations that came under the writer's observation belong to the third (subsequent inspiration); the poetical books seem to come under the second concomitant inspiration"¹

These systems, it is manifest, weaken one's idea of the inspiration of the sacred volume as always understood by the Church. We want an inspiration by virtue of which the book is really the work of God, and not of man—the truths it contains of divine, and not of human, origin: man is the instru-

¹ *Hist. Revelat. Bibl.*, Auct. D. Haneberg, p. 774.

ment, he who dictates is the Holy Ghost : man lends his hand and pen, the Spirit of truth puts them in action. But in the systems referred to, it is not really God who speaks : it is man. Supernatural testimony gives indeed a divine authority to a book, but it could not make God the author of what was really composed by man. And though these writings should contain the exact truths of revelation, they would be as much the result of human wisdom as sermons, catechisms, ascetic books, and even the creeds and decrees of councils which clearly state the doctrines of the Church.

It was the duty of the Council to put an end to interpretations which, depriving the sacred books of the prestige of divine origin, diminished their authority among the faithful. It has therefore defined what every Catholic must believe concerning the degree of inspiration accorded to the sacred writers. This definition is first stated in a negative form : “ The Church holds them (the Holy Scriptures) as sacred and canonical, not for the reason that they have been compiled by mere human industry, and afterwards approved by her authority ; nor only because they contain revelation without error.” To this definition in a negative form succeeds a positive one, in which the Council declares the essential condition of a book’s being placed in the canon of Scripture—“because, having been written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, they have God for their author :” *propterea quod Spiritu Sancto inspirante conscripti, Deum habent auctorem.*

The Council, therefore, by this dogmatic definition, has excluded any other meaning to the inspiration of the Scriptures that does not ascribe them to the special agency of God. The schools are still free to discuss what this divine operation consists in, and the conditions on which a book may be said to have God for its author. But they must first reject every explanation that reduces the agency of God to mere assistance, and, still more, to subsequent approbation. It is in this sense we must understand the fourth canon of the second series : “ If any one shall refuse to receive for sacred and canonical the books of the Holy Scriptures in their integrity, with all their parts, according as they were enumerated by the Holy Council of Trent, or shall deny that they are inspired by God, let him be anathema.” It is the same anathema pronounced by the Council of Trent, to which the Council of the Vatican has added the express mention of the inspiration of the Holy Ghost.

There are other important observations to be made concerning this definition. Though by no means favorable to the system of Sixtus of Sienna, Bonfrère, and Lessius, it does not, however, condemn them in formal terms. These theologians, as we have said, only considered the subject *in abstracto* :

Would subsequent inspiration or approbation give a book a right to be placed in the canon?—a verbal question rather than one of doctrine. It is certain that such a book would have a sacred authority, but it is also certain that it could not be called the work of God in the same sense as the holy books now in our possession. The Council, in its definition, only considered the actual point; it declared all the books of our canon have God for their author, because the Holy Ghost was the chief agent in their composition. But the opinion of the modern exegete who applies the doctrine of subsequent approbation to the books contained in our actual canon appears to us really condemned by the new definition.

Now, the decree of the Vatican does not forbid the division of the holy books into several classes according as the truths they contain are recorded by the writer as a special revelation, or from knowledge acquired by his natural faculties. But this distinction does not infringe on the overruling agency of God in the composition of the book.

Finally, the question of verbal inspiration, so often discussed by theologians, remains as free since the Council as before. It is not necessary for a ruler who issues a decree to dictate every expression, but merely the substance of the new law: the secretary clothes it in his own style. The latter is not a mere copyist: he, too, is the author of the decree, but in a secondary sense. It is the same with regard to the Holy Scriptures. The Holy Spirit suggests the truths to be recorded in the prophecy, and directs the writer, but David and Isaias clothe them in their own royal style, Amos in his rustic language.

(To be continued).

LETTER OF FATHER BALLERINI, S. J., TO THE EDITOR OF THE *UNIVERS*.

We have been requested to insert the following letter addressed by Father Ballerini, S. J., to the editor of the *Univers*:—

SIR,—I regret being compelled to discuss questions of theology in the columns of a public journal, however respectable that journal may be. But it is the field of battle you have chosen. You have summoned me to it, and I must follow; not so much, however, with a view to defend my own reputation, as to prevent misconception and scandal in the minds of those persons especially who, while they entrust the education of their youth to our hands, are entitled to know what is the precise character of the theology we teach in our schools.

The reproaches with which you visit me are no doubt

dictated by a sincere love of truth and zeal for a sound system of morals. Should I succeed in my attempt to remove some false impressions, I shall have the satisfaction of freeing you from apparent distress of mind, and of tearing from your heart the thorn which so pains you—that, to wit, of beholding in one of the great Schools of the Catholic world a Chair of Theology turned almost into a chair of pestilence, “to the great detriment of sacred science and of souls.”

Your charges against me may be reduced to three heads: My attacks upon S. Alphonsus, my own moral system, and, lastly, the absolving of *recidivi*, that is, of relapsing sinners.

1. Under the first head you find in me the leader of a party which opposes S. Alphonsus as a rigorist and an over-severe teacher of morals—“the champion,” you say, “of liberty and evangelical benignity, against what is styled the severity and exacting spirit of S. Alphonsus.” In a word, you conjure up in my person, although in a sense opposite to the original one, a very Patuzzi—the fierce opponent, as every one knows, of the holy Doctor Alphonsus.

As to the party pictured by you as hostile to S. Alphonsus, I declare, Sir, I know nothing of it; and were it not for your article, I should not have even suspected its existence. Assuredly no one here, as far as I know, has written in the sense you state, still less has, to my knowledge, “been cherishing such thoughts in secret.”

However, that you may be able to know whether I am a real Patuzzi declaring war anew against S. Alphonsus, I forward you, through the hands of the Editor, a copy of a brief dissertation, dedicated by his kind permission to the Superior-General of the Redemptorist Fathers, which has been often reprinted in the “Abridgment of Moral Philosophy” of the learned and holy pastor of Genoa, Joseph Frassinetti. In that brief document I think I have said, to the honour of S. Alphonsus, whatever could be said by the most affectionate son of the holy Founder himself. I have gone further than yourself in that way. While you write, “S. Alphonsus appears to have received from heaven the mission . . .” you will find in my dissertation the following words, rather fuller, and certainly not less expressive than your own . . . “*insignissimo Dei beneficio adscribendum esse, quod . . . datum sit ad manus habere Beatissimi Alphonsi scripta, quæ non modo ab eximiis auctoris dotibus, sed, quod longe majoris momenti est, ab apostolicæ sedis judicio tam singularem commendationem mutuata sunt:*” and this, be it observed, on the very second page of the little tract.

Permit me, Sir, on this point to disclose a secret for your edification. In the paper of which I speak, I made bold to

honour S. Alphonsus with the title of "The Holy Doctor." The title was cancelled by the Most Rev. Father Gigli, then Master of the Apostolic Palace, on the ground, as he observed, that the Holy See had not, up to that time, accorded that title to the Saint. This much premised, let us see how I deserve the reproach you direct against me of having taxed S. Alphonsus as "severe," and a "rigorist." The only proof you offer is the fact that I have sometimes stated that it is not necessary to follow the opinion of S. Alphonsus in favour of the law. But I have done quite the same when the opinion of the Saint favoured the liberty of the agent. If, then, I occasionally parted from the holy Doctor, it cannot have been solely to champion the side of benignity and liberty against the law. Is not this inference pretty clear?

Further, if I sometimes differed from the opinion of S. Alphonsus, I have done so from finding more cogent force in the arguments of other Doctors for the opposite view. In this choice, I confess, I may have been mistaken. But that is not the question. The question is, do I deserve censure? How! from the mere fact of detaching one's self from the opinion of another, must a man be reputed as charging that other (from whom he differs) with rigorism or with laxism? Page after page we see S. Alphonsus himself embracing opinions opposed to the opinions of other authors; and must we say that S. Alphonsus thereby accuses those honourable adversaries of his with laxity on one hand, or undue rigour on the other? I must add here, that no one can point out a single passage in which I have parted company with the holy Doctor in order to follow my own opinion. The chief merit I claim, on the contrary, is, that no man in perusing my writings can say that such or such doctrine, such or such opinion, is my doctrine, my particular opinion. What I have said or written is not of, or from myself, but of and from the Doctors of the Schools. What I have done as regards S. Alphonsus, I have done with regard to other writers, even those of our own Society; and I am at a loss to know how the authors of the *Vindiciae* can impute this to me as a crime. To be brief, whoever the writer be that comes into the hands of a Professor, if the latter meets in such writer an opinion not well supported, a proof rather weak and insufficient, a citation not to the purpose, is it the Professor's duty, in reverence for the author he treats, to cover up his flaws and bestow the bliss of ignorance upon his hearers?

2. Let us come to the chapter on the System or Scheme of Morals. You grieve to find me a probabilist, and a probabilist so advanced that, according to my system, one may follow a probable—even a less probable—opinion in favour of liberty, rejecting the opinion in favour of the law, even though

the latter opinion be certainly and notably the more probable. Whence, you say, I am charged in the *Vindiciae* with rushing into practical laxism, and professing a doctrine which amounts to nothing less than liberalism introduced into theology, and seated in the Chair of Penance to lead souls astray by a path strewn with flowers.

To a charge of this nature—grave, very grave, indeed—the following is my reply. You have my “Dissertatio” at hand. Take notice, I beg you, how, with many passages of S. Alphonsus (pp. 12-14), I have shown to evidence that “certo et notabiliter probabilior” stands for a proposition which can no longer be called doubtful, but is morally, or *quasi*-morally, certain; in such manner that the opposite opinion cannot be deemed truly probable, but only slenderly, or at most, doubtfully probable, “tenuiter aut dubie probabilis.” According, then, to your rendering of my views, my teaching would amount to this, that a person may add an opinion, though it be not of more than slender or doubtful probability, that is to say, though it be in a true sense not probable at all. Now, whether I hold that one can follow an opinion of this description, you will see decided beyond controversy in my “Dissertation” above alluded to (pages 17, 18). In that paper, applying to our present subject the words of Father Viva, I have said “that none but a fool could deem such a mode of action lawful. . . . Nemo profecto sanæ mentis, ut cum Dominico Viva loquar, docuit, aut docere potuit, homines prudenter ac licite operari, si opinione nullatenus probabilis nitantur.” The same teaching is manifestly conveyed in the “Abridgment” of Father Gury (vol. i., s. 58), where we find the following proposition:—

“Non licet sequi opinionem tenuiter probabilem relicta tutiore.” I myself, in a note appended to this passage, have stated that, considering the meaning attached by S. Alphonsus to the phrase “slenderly,” “probable,” it would be a gravely censurable proposition if one maintained that lawful action could be taken on probability of that kind.

Bearing this in mind, it is not easy to understand on what principle the writers of the *Vindiciae* have thought right to fasten upon me the offence complained of—an offence not certainly extenuated by the graceful epithets put upon it, as of “laxism” and “liberalism” brought by me into the Chair of Moral Theology, &c. The Jansenist Pascal could not have said much more; but of him who flings himself into the fire of controversy, no utterance can cause surprise. Having thus enabled you to detect the error that lies hidden in this charge made against me, I consider I should be travelling beyond my present purpose, were I to enter into the general question of

“probabilism” and “equi-probabilism.” That question I shall be able to treat more suitably, and with greater advantage, when it shall be my duty to reply to the other censures directed against me by the writers of the *Vindiciae*. At present, I shall limit myself to one thing merely.

In the “Dissertation” which I forward to you, you will notice without doubt a proposition of S. Liguori, couched in the following terms:—“Ultimam benigniorem et communissimam (sententiam) probandam aggredimur, nempe licitum esse uti opinione probabili, etiam in concurso probabilioris pro lege, semper ac illa certum et grave habeat fundamentum.” This teaching is put forward by the Saint as highly probable, or rather as morally certain. Here are the words: “Dicimus quod nostra sententia, nempe quod liceat sequi opinionem probabilem pro libertate, relicta probabilior est longe probabilior sive probabilissima immoraliter seu lato modo certa. Id patet ex argumentis supra expositis,”—arguments of which the holy Doctor fixes his estimate in the following words:—“Haec argumenta singula valent moralem certitudinem nostrae sententiae, ostendere tanto magis simul conjuncta . . . ita ut contrariae (sententiae) vix supersit apparentia veritatis.” Now, Sir, let me ask you one question on this point. Does this equi-probabilism, of which you style St. Alphonsus the true discoverer (*createur*), differ or not from the doctrine just set forth? If it differs from it, how can you object to our following St. Alphonsus in his adherence to a doctrine the most usual among Catholic teachers, and one declared by himself and established as morally certain, rather than siding with him while he professes an opinion in support of which (as far at least as it is in opposition to the foregoing one) he brings forward no really solid argument, nor one which he has not himself elsewhere triumphantly refuted? If his equi-probabilism does not differ from the teaching mentioned, there remains but a mere battle about words as the issue of a great controversy regarding the equi-probabilism—credited by you to the creative mind of St. Alphonsus—and probabilism as maintained by that same St. Alphonsus, and by him ascribed (and with justice) to Catholic teachers at large.

That such would be the outcome of your reasonings will appear still more clearly from one observation. Suppose in effect that our controversy were not a mere logomachy—a mere war of words—but that St. Alphonsus, as you claim, receiving a mission from on high to spread a new light around, became the true creator (*createur*) of a new moral system, should we not be forced to conclude that upon a leading point of Christian ethics, upon a principle of wide reach and continual application, the Catholic Church remained in darkness down to the

latter half of the eighteenth century, while the Schools of Christendom and Catholic Doctors in general only groped their way, as best they could, in the midst of such darkness? This were pretty hard and passing strange indeed; but enough at present on that point.

3. The last point—the absolution of relapsing sinners—deserves a word. On this subject of the *recidivi* you not only find me at utter variance with St. Alphonsus, but charge me with errors of the most grievous kind. Do not lose heart, however. You shall, if I am not greatly at fault, discover that there is no such ground as you think for complaint or incrimination. You contemplate two states of things. First, that the penitent's disposition is doubtful; second, that the penitent appears sufficiently disposed. With regard to the first of these suppositions, you make me say that the confessor ought always to absolve the penitent, even of doubtful disposition, provided such penitent declare himself desirous to amend, and this in pursuance of the maxim, "*Credendum est poenitenti tam pro se quam contra se.*" I must ask you, Sir, to look back to my note on paragraph 2, vol. ii. (of the work referred to), where I have stated just the contrary. My words are, "*Quod, excepto casu necessitatis, absolvi licite non possit poenitens dubie dispositus, quem scilicet sufficienter dispositum esse ad gratiam in sacramento recipiendam nulla prudens ratio suadet, extra controversiam esse debet.*" Is not this tolerably clear? Yet to make clear things more clear, I add that it is the duty of a confessor to endeavour to dispose those penitents who present themselves to him not duly disposed; and having cited to that purpose the words of a Bull of Leo XII., "*Multi accedunt imparati, sed persaepe hujusmodi ut ex imparatis parati fieri possint, si modo sacerdos . . . sciat studiose, patienter, mansuete cum ipsis agere.*"

I subjoin as a reason why we may become then enabled to give absolution, the fact that "*patientia, mansuetudo et industrii sacerdotis charitas consequi tunc ipsum potest, ut ex imparatis parati fiant, IDQUE PRUDENTER CONFESSARIUS JUDICARE QUEAT.*" Never have I upheld that to authorize this decision of the confessors the mere assurances or protestations of the penitent are enough. I acknowledge the force of the aphorism, "You are to believe the penitent for as well as against himself," whenever by means of the above-mentioned efforts and charitable care of the confessor "*fieri non potest quin signum aliquod sufficiens animi sui poenitens exhibeat se sincere agere;*" and besides that, "*neque ex ignorantia, neque ex dolo, repeti rationabiliter potest illud poenitentis testimonium.*" Is this being content with simple protestations? But with a view to

further declare my meaning, I there quote the words of S. Alphonsus, to the effect that "aliquando alia signa proesentis dispositionis multo melius manifestant mutationem voluntatis, quam experientia temporis;" and, in fact, I contemplated the case of which the Saint, whom I had been citing, speaks as follows:—"Sufficit, quod confessarius habeat prudentem probabilitatem de dispositione poenitentis, et non obstat ex alia parte prudens suspicio indispositionis." But in order that the confessor be furnished with this well-grounded probable belief of the penitent's disposedness, neither I nor anybody else (so far as I am aware) has ever said or thought that "simple declarations are sufficient." In the second case contemplated—that of a relapsing sinner who gives indications of being duly disposed to receive absolution, you set me in contradiction to S. Alphonsus, as though I had stated that in case of such a penitent, absolution ought never to be deferred, or, at least, never without a very grave reason; while S. Alphonsus maintains that the confessor can and ought to defer absolving so often as he judges such a step useful, and not forbidden by any accident and intrinsic circumstance. You remind me, moreover, that the "Vindiciae" sharply reproaches me with not reflecting that the relapsing sinner, having so often broken his word, is not entitled to have his protestations any longer believed. You wind up by saying that, according to my doctrine, the (part of) physician disappears altogether from the office of confessor. . . . Bear in mind, however, that the case here in question is that of a penitent reputed to be already duly disposed for absolution (the inquiry being only about deferring it), while the reproach you allude to regards a confessor contenting himself with simple protestations, and resting on them;—a discussion on the propriety or impropriety of which procedure would bring us back to the first supposition—that of a penitent of only doubtful disposition. With this I decline for the moment to deal.

As to the charge of eliminating the office of (spiritual) physician from that of confessor, please cast a glance at a note of mine, paragraph 621, vol. ii. (of Gury). You will there find me stating that to defer absolution is at times a salutary medicine, recommended by the gravest theologians whose texts I reproduce. You will find me maintaining the undoubted utility of such a practice in opposition to the somewhat odd opinion of John Sanchez. Further still, with a view to fix the time when, and the rule according to which, this medicinal act of deferring absolution should be adopted, I refer the reader to the teaching of S. Alphonsus, praising the discretion of the saintly Doctor, while I incorporated his decision in my

text. Such is the way in which I am all at variance with S. Alphonsus!

As to the Latin words, "Causam admodum gravem requiri," assuredly you have not found them in the note I speak of. I know not where you have found them. All that I have said on this part of the subject amounts to a statement of the question, "Quam gravis debeat esse causa propter quam confessarius hoc remedio cum poenitente disposito utatur . . ." under which inquiry I cite the words of Cardinal De Lugo, "Gravis res per triduum esse in statu peccati;" then the words of S. Alphonsus, "Videtur durum esse ei qui est in peccato mortali manere sine absolute etiam per diem;" whence I inferred "that the confessor was bound to use prudent caution and sobriety in the administration of such a remedy."

What I have hitherto said may suffice, Sir, to do away with some of your apprehensions, and to correct some not over-partial notions which you seem to have conceived in reference to me and my writings. I shall waive further inquiry, awaiting a more suitable occasion for an extended reply to the other complaints of the "Vindiciae"—complaints, or rather reproaches, which require for their refutation neither profound study nor great expense of time. The Redemptorist Fathers have informed me that they are engaged in preparing a new and accurate edition of the "Moral Theology" of S. Alphonsus. It will be my business, in connection with the forthcoming desirable work, to bring under notice several other points besides those here treated, to which the reverend fathers may usefully direct their attention. One favour I have, Sir, to entreat of you, and one question to ask before I close.

You profess, in your article, to be pained at seeing "theologians" and "priests of the Lord" set themselves to examine the doctrine of S. Alphonsus through the prism of commentators the least reliable that may be. You add that it is high time to study the author ourselves, and to read and meditate upon the "Vindiciae Alphonsianae." Whether you prefer to study S. Alphonsus in his own page or to behold him through the prism of the "Vindiciae," you are most competent to decide, nor shall I fetter your freedom in this point. But as to the notes appended by me to the abridgment by Father Gury, I beg you will have the goodness not to study them through the prism of the "Vindiciae." Gaze steadily upon them yourself: use no intermediary glass. Your experience in so doing has hitherto not been fortunate, as we have seen. Your reputation may be somewhat concerned in not repeating the experiment. Your conscience as well as your reputation has to do with what I am now about to remark.

S. Alphonsus will inform you, if necessary, how grave is the obligation not to injure knowingly another's reputation, and even not to expose yourself to the risk of injuring it wilfully—an obligation all the more serious as the matters it concerns are more delicate, the persons more reputable, and the maintenance of a good name the more necessary to such persons as a condition for the effectual discharge of the duties of their state. You will find an easy application of these principles, the individual concerned being a person whom you are pleased to style "a learned Religious" and "Professor of Moral Theology in one of the great Schools of the Catholic world," and as such (if such he be) having need of the confidence of a large number of the Episcopate, whose young ecclesiastics are confided to our care in that College.

You have taken the trouble to lay down certain *Canons*, or theological rules, to enable us to know to what point we are bound to follow the opinions of the Saint. Touching these Canons, I beg to ask what is the proper meaning to be put upon the two following answers of the Holy See (uttered through its organ, the Sacred Penitentiary), viz., "Sacrae Theologiae Professor, opiniones quas in Sua Theologia Morali profitetur B. Alphonsus sequi tuto potest ac profiteri;" and again, "Non est inquietandus Confessarius qui omnes B. Alphonsi sequitur opiniones in praxi Sacri poenitentiae tribunalis." You say in your article that, "in virtue of the approbation of the Holy See, all the opinions of S. Alphonsus in general, and each one in particular, are positively declared altogether probable (approvable?), quite prudent, quite salutary, and common and that we are obliged to regard them as such." Is this really your conviction? My question is suggested by a real, not a chimerical difficulty. Several opinions may be cited which are upheld by S. Alphonsus as probable, and even more probable, which opinions, however, had been previously repudiated by a decree of the supreme Roman Inquisition—a decree solemnly confirmed by Benedict XIV. in the well-known Bull *Sacramentum Poenitentiae*. Mark well, I pray, that we have no intention to find fault in this matter with the holy Doctor. It is beyond all doubt that the Saint knew not, could not easily have known, these Decrees of the Holy See, on which account it would be most unjust to, in the least degree, visit him with censure or lessen our respect for him. Our business here is with matters as they are in themselves—objectively considered. I take it for granted, too, that we must not question the compatibility of the two Decrees (I mean the response of the Holy See, and the Decree of the Holy Inquisition, confirmed by an Apostolic Bull of Benedict XIV.) with one another. You must be fully in ac-

cord with me on this point ; for, were it open with us to suspect the genuineness or validity of either or both of these oracles, what (to say nothing more) would become of the very ground on which your *Canons* or above-mentioned rules rest ? Admitting, then, the unquestioned force of those Decrees, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the fact that S. Alphonsus maintains as probable, and even most probable, certain opinions therein repudiated, how can you hold that such opinions can be put in practice and propounded from a Professor's chair ? Would it be altogether a sinless proceeding to put in practice in the confessional, or publicly to teach opinions by the Holy See censured and solemnly condemned ? And if not a sinless proceeding, how can it be adopted, as you say it may be, *tuta conscientia* ?

If such mode of acting would involve absurdity, as it must do, what then must be the true meaning and interpretation of the above-mentioned Answers of the Sacred Penitentiary, as also of all the Approbations given by the Holy See to S. Alphonsus' teachings ! The above, Sir, appears to me a fair question, and one not unworthy to engage your attention, and even become part of your programme of studies. It may be known to you, Sir, that even here, at Rome, a learned theologian and canonist, finding an opinion of S. Alphonsus (touching another point) opposed to a certain Decree, was forced to plead the Answers of the Sacred Penitentiary, and gave to the press a solution of the difficulty—a solution based upon a just and moderate interpretation of the said Answers. The publication of the writing was fortified, be it understood, by the usual approbation of the ecclesiastical authorities. The interpretation I speak of—just and moderate as it was—was, as I have reason to know, not altogether pleasing to the authors of the “*Vindiciae* ;” but it was pleasing, nevertheless, to many members and dignitaries of the Sacred Penitentiary, and had their full sanction, as I know. It is unnecessary to state here what the point was. You can discover it for yourself, and in the process of investigation you may find in what a peculiar way a fit solution of the difficulty above set forth, as well as a just interpretation of the Answers of the Sacred Penitentiary, may be harmonized with the *Canons*, which, discovered I dare say by means of the *prism* of the “*Vindiciae*,” you have thought right to impart to the public for their instruction and advantage. I close by a statement of my belief that public journals are scarcely a suitable medium for the discussion of questions of Theology.

I remain, Sir, &c.,

ANTHONY BALLERINI, Prof. Theol.

Roman College.

SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI PII DIVINA PRO-
VIDENTIA PAPAE IX.,

*Allocutio Habita die XXV Julii MDCCCLXXIII, AD S. R. E.
Cardinales in Aedibus Vaticanis.*

VENERABILES FRATRES.

Quod praenunciavimus, Venerabiles Fratres, dum Vos alloquebamur, exeunte praeterito anno, scilicet Nobis iterum fortasse dicendum esse de vexationibus Ecclesiae quotidie invalescentibus; id, consummato in praesentiarum iniquitatis opere tunc designato, munus Nostrum postulat a Nobis, quorum auribus insonare videtur *vox illa dicentis: Clama.*

Vix ac didicimus proponendam esse Legislativo Coetui legem quae in hac etiam alma Urbe, sicuti in reliqua Italia, suppressura foret Religiosas Familias et objectura publicae licitationi ecclesiastica bona; Nos, impium execrantes facinus, quodcumque nefariae hujusce legis schema proscripsimus, cassam declaravimus quamlibet direptorum honorum acquisitionem, censurasque commemoravimus ipso facto incurrendas ab auctoribus et fautoribus hujusmodi legum. Verum hodie lex ista, licet non ab Ecclesia tantum confixa, veluti divino suoque juri repugnans, sed ab ipsa legali scientia publice reprobata, utpote adversa naturali et humano cuivis juri, adeoque irrita suapte natura et nulla; recepta tamen fuit communi suffragio cum Legislativi Coetus, tum Senatus ac demum Regia auctoritate sancita.

Abstinentum censemus, Venerabiles Fratres, ab iis iterandis, quae toties ad deterrendos ab ausu scelestos publicarum rerum moderatores fuse jam exposuimus de legis impietate, malitia, fine, gravissimis detrimentis; sed omnino compellimur ab officio vindicandi Ecclesiae jura, a studio praemonendi incautos, ab ipsa caritate erga sontes, elata voce nunciare iis omnibus, qui praedictam iniquissimam legem proponere, probare, sancire non extimerunt, nec non mandantibus, fautoribus, consultoribus, adhaerentibus, executoribus, bonorumque ecclesiasticorum emptoribus, non solum irritum esse, cassum et nullum quidquid hac in re egerint aut sint, facturi, sed universos majori excommunicatione alisque censuris et poenis ecclesiasticis juxta sacros Canones, Apostolicas Constitutiones et Generalium Conciliorum, Tridentini praesertim, decreta inflictis obstringi, severissimam incurrere divinam ultionem et in aperto versari damnationis aeternae periculo.

Interea, Venerabiles Fratres, dum necessaria supremo ministerio Nostro auxilia magis in dies subducuntur, dum injuriae injuriis quotidie cumulantur in res et personas sacras, dum nostrates et exteri insectatores Ecclesiae studia conferre et

vires conjungere videntur ad comprimendum quodlibet omnino ecclesiasticae jurisdictionis exercitium et nominatim fortasse ad praevertendam liberam illius electionem, qui in hac Petri cathedra Christi Vicarius sedere debeat ; quid Nobis reliquum est, nisi ut impensius confugiamus ad Eum, qui dives est in misericordia ac servos suos non deserit in tempore tribulationis?

Et sane jam haud obscure virtus ostenditur Providentiae divinae in perfecta cum hac Sancta Sede conjunctione Episcoporum omnium, in nobilissima eorum firmitate adversus iniquas leges et usurpationem sacrorum jurium, in impensissimo studio totius catholicae familiae erga hoc unitatis centrum ; in vivificante illo spiritu, quo fides et caritas in christiano populo roboratae et auctae passim erumpunt in opera lectissimis digna temporibus Ecclesiae

Nitamur igitur optata maturare clementiae tempora : omnes simul, qua late patet orbis, piam vim Deo nostro inferre conemur. Universi sacrorum Antistites ad id excitent parochos, universi parochi propriam plebem ; omnesque ad aras provoluti ac cernui clamemus : *Veni, Domine, veni, noli tardare ; parce populo tuo, relaxa facinora plebi tuæ, vide desolationem nostram ; non in justificationibus nostris prosternimus preces ante faciem tuam, sed in miserationibus tuis multis : excita potentiam tuam et veni, ostende faciem tuam, et salvi erimus.*

Licet autem indignitatis nostrae conscii simus, non vereamur accedere fidenter ad thronum gratiae : hanc quaeramus per coelites omnes, hanc nominatim per sanctos Apostolos, hanc per purissimum Deiparae Sponsum, hanc per Immaculatam praesertim Virginem quaeramus, cujus preces apud Filium imperii cujusdam rationem habent. Sed antea mundare studiose conemur conscientiam nostram ab operibus mortuis ; quia *oculi Domini super justos, et aures ejus in preces eorum.* Quod ut accuratius etiam et plenius perficiatur, fidelibus omnibus, qui rite confessi, et sacra communionem refecti piam precibus hujusmodi pro Ecclesiae necessitatibus operam dederint, Indulgentiam plenariam semel lucrandam, et in fidelium quoque defunctorum suffragium convertendam pro eo die, quem in singulis dioecesibus Ordinarius designaverit, Apostolica auctoritate Nostra, concedimus.

Itaque, Venerabiles Fratres, quamquam innumerae et sane gravissimae ingruant persecutionem et tribulationem tempestates, non propterea concidamus animo, in eo confisi, qui sperantes in se confundi non patitur ; Dei enim promissio est, quae praeterire non potest : *Quoniam in me speravit, liberabo eum*

THE IRISH
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

SEPTEMBER, 1873.

THE CHURCH AND MODERN THOUGHT.—II.

IF the Catholic Church were judged merely by a principle by which modern thinkers set great store—the principle of “natural selection,” or “the survival of the fittest”—one would imagine that, considered as an institution actually in possession of a large field of its own, it would awaken the deepest interest of those who profess to concern themselves about everything that bears upon the history and the progress of humanity. Facts are, proverbially, stubborn things—not lightly to be overleaped by the briskest hobby ever ridden by a philosopher; and, whatever else the Catholic Church is, or is not, no one can deny that it is, at any rate, a great fact—a fact that dates from no mere yesterday, but one that, in addition to whatever claim it can make by reason of its own intrinsic merits, carries with it, besides, the prescription of eighteen hundred years. This Church must be a sore puzzle to those who know its history, and yet refuse to believe in its Divine authority. In vain they exhaust their philosophic ingenuity to account for an institution that has no place, and can have no place, in such philosophy as theirs. In vain they catch at superficial aspects of this world-wide society, and, fondly deeming them to be characteristic, evolve an explanation of their existence out of their own inner consciousness after a fashion very much in vogue with the choice spirits of modern thought. The Church is too wide and deep to be covered by any of their theories. Either it came from God, or it is the most perplexing mystery that ever invited, and yet baffled, the efforts of the human intellect. And if the baffled philosopher, still refusing to recognise its Divine authority, take refuge in the latter alternative, then he is confronted by another palpable fact—that increases by a thousandfold the perplexity of the mystery—that this inexplicable institution

has won and held a larger and more permanent place in human history, and in human hearts, than any institution that has ever been established in the world.

Not being able, however, to account for the existence, and the persistent existence, of the Catholic Church, on any grounds that would be satisfactory to themselves, the disciples of "modern thought" seem to have made up their minds that the next best thing to do is to ignore, as far as possible, her existence and her claims. To our mind, there is nothing so characteristic of "modern thought" in the various departments in which it loves to disport itself, as the cool assumption, unsustained in many cases by even an attempt at proof, that the satisfaction of its own claims is the one supreme test of the advantage, or the need, of any existing institution, whether political, or social, or religious. Nor do we think there is any duty more pressingly incumbent upon those who can hope in the slightest degree to influence public opinion, than the duty of dragging such assumptions from the obscure depths of the theories which they underlie, and separating them from the tissue of sophistry under cover of which they carry on their evil work. To put forward, as against such assumptions, the claims of the Church in the majestic simplicity of their truthfulness—to exhibit these claims as lying at the very entrance of any road to duty that is open to man—and to show that their prompt recognition and loyal adoption must be the foundation of any theory that can claim to direct individual conduct, or conduce to social progress—this must be, to a Catholic writer, a labor of love, and to the Catholic reader, a matter of the last importance.

Since, however, any exposition of the claims of the Church must address itself either to Catholics or to non-Catholics, it is manifest that there are two ways in which such an exposition may proceed. We may select either the mode of clear direct statement, or the mode of controversial argument. A writer may address himself primarily, and principally, to Catholics; in which case his main object will be to put clearly before them, in an explicit form, the things which they, as Catholics, already implicitly believe; or, he may concern himself chiefly about establishing Catholic principles by refuting the principles of opponents, and developing for their instruction those arguments by which the Church—though she does not rest on them her claim to the adherence of her own children to the doctrines which she teaches—yet condescends to appeal to the rational nature of those whose first basis of inquiry or of argument is a rejection of her Divine authority.

It is the former, rather than the latter, method which we

purpose to adopt in the present paper, both because such a course is more congenial to our own habits of mind, and because we feel that it will be more serviceable to Catholics to whom, principally, at any rate, it is our duty, as it is our pleasure, to address ourselves. We need not remind Catholics that this is the own way of the Church herself in her dealings with men. She does not set herself so much to prove her doctrine as to teach it; not so much to establish the thing taught, as her Divine mission to teach it; not so much to defend deductions from her claim to allegiance, as to set forth that claim itself, with all its majestic simplicity and all its solemn sanctions.

Nor do we think there ever was a time in which, more than now, it was necessary—as well for the advantage of Catholics as of those who are not such—to propound that claim with what of clearness and of force may be made available for the purpose. In the case of non-Catholics that necessity is always obvious; but for Catholics, it seems to us, if not so obvious, certainly more urgent. It is a melancholy thing that a large section of mankind refuses, point blank, to give in their adherence to the one true Church. But, to our thinking, it is even more melancholy that any person who has the inestimable privilege of belonging to the Church should, through want of explicit knowledge of what his being a Catholic involves, be led to adopt and advocate principles which are logically inconsistent with the principle of Catholicity. Now, this is precisely a danger that is too often, unhappily, illustrated in the sayings and doings of Catholics who have the unavoidable misfortune of living in the atmosphere of a public opinion that not only has not been formed under influences exclusively Catholic, but has even been tainted and corrupted by influences that are both anti-Catholic and anti-Christian. Anyone who has ever been pained, as we have been pained, by hearing Catholics utter magniloquent platitudes about “liberty of conscience,” or the “source of political power,” or some such delicate subject, will recognise at once the danger to which we allude.

It would be, then, our most earnest desire that every Catholic should have at his command those elementary principles that underlie his Catholicity; that he should have them at such command as to be able on occasion to use them as tests even of problems that are not exclusively religious; that he should hold them as Thuriel held his spear, ready to touch the most complex theories, strip them of the complexities in which human intellect can involve them, strike through the beautiful panoply which human genius can throw around them, divest

them of the fascination which an appeal to interest or passion can lend them, behold them in their essence, and decide whether in that form they are consistent or not with eternal truth.

To contribute, however slightly, to such a desirable result is the main object of the present paper. Accordingly, we purpose to lay down the general position of the Church towards man, and the rights and duties involved in that position—to draw attention to the problems that grow out of these mutual relations, and to the general principles that serve for their solution—to indicate the attitude of “modern thought” in its opposition to the Church, and the few elementary principles which, wielded even by a man uninstructed in the details of particular subjects of controversy, can yet thoroughly demonstrate the unreason of that opposition.

It will be found on examination that the logical and the historical position of the Church, in its relation to man, are coincident; and that, consequently, a summary of her historical position will be at once a clear statement of her claims, and an admirable proof of their force and justice. It is a remarkable and a fundamental fact in the history of the Church, that neither her Divine Founder Himself nor the Apostles whom He commissioned, ever worked their miracles for the purpose of proving *directly* the truth of any special doctrine of which there might have been question at the time in which the miracle was performed. They were wrought, primarily, at all events, to prove the Divine mission of those who wrought them. Hence, the Church, on the very threshold of her history, comes before men as a Divinely commissioned teacher and witness of revealed truth, with a right and an obligation to perform that function in every age; with an assurance, in its discharge, of that continuous infallibility without which any claim to such a function would be, simply, illusory; and with an irresistible claim to have her mission acknowledged, and her teaching accepted, by every individual of the entire human race.

The Church, endowed with such a mission, was placed in the midst of a world, with which she was warned she could make no terms of peace that would not be preceded by a complete submission to her Divine authority. The “world”—that is, that section of the human race, for any time being, that would reject this initial claim of Christianity—was to be, according to the express terms of a prophetic statement on the subject, not alone in the first or second century of the Christian era, but through all the ages of Christian time, a deadly and irreconcilable enemy, whose unabating hostility,

prophetically announced, ought to be, and is, the strongest *prima facie* proof of the fidelity of the Church which experiences it, to her Divine mission. This principle, so clearly laid down in scripture and so copiously illustrated in history, ought to afford grave matter for reflection to a Bible Protestant, and supplies, beyond all question, a solemn and sufficient warning to those Catholics amongst us, if such there unhappily be, who are tempted to take their views from the pages of publications, the conductors of which make it their proudest boast that they repudiate any allegiance to the one true Church of God.

The mission of the Church was "to every creature." She had a message, not in the first place to any nation as such, or to any people as such, but to each and every individual of the human race. Hers was no mere social or political theory—like some that had been framed before her time—that absolutely needed numbers for its application, and that, after the manner of such theories, could afford to sacrifice individuals to what it conceived to be the common good. The Church's theory could, and did, in time, develop itself for social purposes; but before this, and as a foundation for this, it was a theory that could find its fullest application in the case of each man in his individual capacity. She, first, then, proposed herself to the individual, and declared that she had a mission to him as exclusively as if he alone were its subject. Now, the first question such an individual would naturally ask, was—"A mission, for what end?"—and it is manifest that, in proportion to the greatness and importance of the end disclosed by the Church's answer, would be the greatness and importance of her mission, and the determination of the place her claim should occupy in any list of claims of which man could be made the subject. Hence, too, if this end was found to be of all ends the greatest, and if the Church could establish her power to aid in its attainment, it would be in strict accordance with the highest exercise of reason that the individual should submit himself to her teaching with a docility and completeness of submission incomparably greater than should have place in any other matter whatsoever. And here it was that, even philosophically speaking, the Church had a decided advantage over any teacher that had ever sought the suffrages of humanity—for, her answer cut down deep to the very roots of life—it was this: "My mission is to teach you the ultimate end for which you were created, and to supply you with the means necessary for its attainment. The end for which you were created is to save your immortal soul, and I am the Divinely appointed teacher under whose guidance

you can learn how to do so." Now, the individual to whom the Church is addressing herself is a being made up of a rational and an animal nature—a being who had hitherto been accustomed to look only to reason for guidance in the attainment of knowledge, and to perform his actions through the impulse of passion, more or less under the control of reason, working on certain principles of right and wrong which were engraven upon the soul and manifested through the conscience. It would, at the very outset, strike a being so constituted, that a submission to the Church might possibly lead to a radical change both in his moral and intellectual modes of procedure; and, probably, too, both reason and passion, alarmed by what would seem a direct attack on what they considered their imprescriptible rights, would express themselves in the form of certain objections which it would be the first business of the Church, once for all, to dispose of.

The first objection would be something of this sort—"Does the Church, then, purpose to supersede reason in its functions?" And the answer would be, in a general way, as follows—No—so far from doing anything of the kind, it is to Reason itself, in the highest exercise of its legitimate functions, that the Church appeals with a statement and a proof of her Divine mission. When that mission has been acknowledged, and acknowledged by the most rational act of which man is capable, the Church leaves reason to the free prosecution of its appointed purposes. But a Divine mission to teach God's truth, necessarily includes what the Church also claims, namely—infallibility in its exercise. A teacher of Divine truth, without infallibility, would be a living contradiction which not even unaided reason could for a moment tolerate. Hence, then, you have an infallible teacher brought face to face with a reason which has no pretensions to infallibility, which, on the contrary, cannot exercise itself for any length of time without painful proof of its liability to error. It is manifest that the most reasonable act of reason will be, once for all, to defer to the claims of this infallible teacher. If, afterwards, in exercising his reason in what he may deem its own peculiar sphere, the individual taking occasion to formulate the result, finds some conclusion at which he has arrived met by the contradiction of the Church—he will find himself before a pair of alternatives, between which, however, he need have little trouble to decide—either the infallible teacher whose mission I, in the highest exercise of my reason, accepted, has erred, *or*, this reason, which, indeed, I never for a moment dreamed to be infallible—has fallen under a mistake. Surely, in such a case humility and common sense point to the same conclusion.

Here, then, we have the one principle that contains, as it were in solution, all teaching on the relations of reason with revealed religion. Where the Church, in the exercise of her office as infallible teacher, teaches men, her teaching is infallibly true; and any conclusion (so called) of reason that contradicts this teaching is infallibly false—and such a conclusion, however it may be sustained by the subtlety of intellect, or embellished by the touch of genius, or supported by an appeal to passion, approves itself, at first sight, as infallibly false, not only to those who can trace the subtlety, perceive the misapplication of the genius, and disregard as irrelevant the appeal to passion, but approves itself as false, and with quite as strong certainty, to the most simple and uneducated man, provided only that he is a Catholic.

Again, another difficulty—Does the submission required by the Church nullify or supersede liberty? Again the answer must be in the negative. No man ever was, or ever can be, enslaved by the teaching of what is true. The submission made to the claim of the Church is in itself a most perfect act of liberty—and when it has been made, it still leaves legitimate liberty undisturbed. All rational liberty supposes a law under which it is exercised—a law supposes an intelligent law-giver—and an intelligent author of the law supposes an end for the attainment of which the law is imposed. A Divinely commissioned teacher—the scope of whose mission is to reveal the end and the law under which alone it can be attained, so far from curtailing legitimate liberty, gives to it its most extensive field of action. Hence, to a Catholic, from the very fact that, as a Catholic, he has apprehended and admitted the claim of the Church to be the interpreter of the Divine law in its application to man—it follows that the highest exercise of liberty, whether of conscience or of action, is that which is directed by the teaching of the Church. This is quite an exhaustive general answer to any charge brought against the Church of interfering unduly with human liberty. She interferes not with true liberty in its legitimate exercise, but with that spurious liberty which St. Augustine forcibly styles—“liberty of perdition.”

So much for the two problems that arise from the proposition of the Church to man as an individual—the problem of the relations of the Church with reason, and that of her relations with liberty whether of conscience or of action. We have not aimed at doing more, and even that only suggestively, than to indicate a few of the principles which underlie all controversies on these subjects, and which may guide to general conclusions which result from the positions towards each other of the World and the Church.

But man is not only an individual, he is also a member of civil society. God has instituted civil society as the mode under which man's faculties should find their proper development, and in which his own individual destiny may be accomplished with a large appliance of means, and a sure hope of success. Hence, the Church which could never dream of ignoring a position established by God Himself, after addressing her claim to man, primarily, as an individual, must needs also address that claim to him as a member of civil society. Society is an aggregation of individuals for the prosecution of certain definite ends which either could not be attained at all, or could only be attained imperfectly and with difficulty by isolated individuals. Now, considering what the Church is, it is obvious that whatever be her claim upon man as a member of civil society, it must harmonize perfectly with her previous claim upon man as an individual. Not only must one not clash with the other, but the former must proceed by logical development from the latter, which constitutes its foundation both logically and historically. Consequently the Church's teaching to man, as a member of civil society, will be, in its most general form, of this nature:—As an individual your ultimate end is, to save your soul under my guidance—and, even as a member of civil society, you must recognise and pursue the self-same end. Civil society can have no possible claim upon you that is incompatible with that end, nor, indeed, any claim that would impede its attainment. Broadly speaking then—whatever be the end of civil society, that end is strictly subordinate, and must be prosecuted in strict subordination to the ultimate end of the individuals who constitute it. Now, as that ultimate end is to be attained under the guidance of the Church, it will consequently, and must necessarily happen, that the functions of civil society will fall under the criticism of the Church, and must—even for the attainment of its own end—submit to that criticism.

The philosophy of Catholic teaching on social and political questions is referable to, and deducible from, the great principle of the necessity of subordinating man's lesser interests and more proximate ends to the great and ultimate end of his creation. The Church claims no *direct* power over civil society, *as such*. On the contrary, it is in the Church that civil society has always found the strongest champion of its independence, and in her teaching the greatest security for its maintenance. The Church does not pretend for a moment that the power of civil society comes, even immediately, from herself. Her teaching is, and has always been, that civil power, whether in its limited exercise in the family, or in its widest exercise in

the State, comes *immediately* from God Himself. But since it is so, and because it is so, she teaches that it should be exercised with due subordination to the higher end which God also has appointed. Since she knows that her own function with regard to man—that of saving his soul—is the highest conceivable—she knows, consequently, and teaches, as a matter of course, that no lower end, no lesser interest, however glorious or laudable *in the abstract*, can have the slightest claim to bar man's progress on the path to Heaven. To put the whole matter in a nutshell: when the individual whom we have been contemplating as submitted to the proposition of the Church, became a Christian convert, he was forthwith aggregated the corporate society of the visible Church. He remained, as before, a member of the civil society to which he belonged, but in such wise, that henceforth his duty as a citizen of the Church took rank before any possible duty that could devolve upon him as a citizen of the State; and that, precisely, because any possible end attainable through civil society must be subordinate to the great end attainable through the Church.

From this can easily be deduced both the authority of the Church in pronouncing on social and political questions, and also the extent to which she can undertake to make such pronouncement. As her authority is given for a certain end, so its extent is limited only by the requirements for its attainment; and, from the very nature of the case, hers, and hers only, is the right of deciding the limits of these requirements. If Catholics would only keep this explicitly before them, we should not be pained, as we are occasionally, by hearing from time to time—even from those who are in other respects good Catholics—expressions with regard to the interference of the Church in temporal affairs, which, in the mouths of heretics and infidels, however false, are at least consistent; but which, on the lips of a Catholic, are at once impious and illogical.

When the Church first proposed herself to the world, she found that world principally pagan. She recognised the Divine origin of the civil power, pagan though it was, but only in so far as it tended to ends compatible with her own, and with the great end for which man had been created. What the Church did then, that precisely she does now. She recognises the Divine origin of civil power so far, and so far only, as that power pursues ends not irreconcilable with the pursuit of the great end of her own individual members. The Church has been able, in consequence, to unite in herself two functions which, to superficial observers, might seem contradictory of each other, but which, rightly considered, are found

to partake of the unity of the one principle on which they are exercised. She is, on the one hand, the most uncompromising upholder of constituted authority against revolutionary violence; and, on the other, the most persistent defender of popular liberty against aggressive despotism.

When the Church met that pagan society of old, she found a "modern thought" that was bitterly hostile to her pretensions. She found all temporal power arrayed against her in the prosecution of her appointed work. The individual convert found that, as a member of civil society, he was beset on all sides by the gravest difficulties. These difficulties may be summed up in the fact, that by remaining a Christian he exposed himself to imminent peril of his very life. Did the Church, in the face of this peril—which she would be the last to underrate—did she abate one tittle of her high demand? Not so. She said to the convert:—"If it be so, let it be so. If peril be to limb or life, it is simply your duty to face it. Martyrdom is a high calling, and needs a special grace; but if martyrdom comes in your one path to Heaven, then you must be a martyr, not as doing something so heroic that you might shrink from it, but as doing your simple duty even at the cost of life—as in quieter times you would be called upon to do it at no greater cost than resisting an ordinary temptation."

And as the Church was then, so is she now; and as was then the great pagan world, so in our day, too, is the great world, even that section of it that calls itself Christian, but denies the Divine authority of the Church of God. They do not now—these worldlings—ask a Catholic to burn incense in a temple of Jupiter; but they do ask him to offer incense to a more satanic deity. They have made for themselves a great god, have breathed into it the foul breath of their own nostrils, and have set it up in Christian lands, and called it—Public Opinion, or "modern thought"—that is, a public opinion and a modern thought fashioned on the principles of all men of all countries whose first principle is to hate the Church and to resent her claims. The worship goes on in many a temple—the priests are arrayed, now in the livery of material wealth, now in the garb of science, now in the vestments of philosophy. The liturgy is furnished by a teeming press whose great principle is—the necessity of unbounded license for itself; its gospel is redacted in the treatises of political economy which proclaim, in explicit and shameless words, that the end of man and of society is to accumulate wealth. They ask a Catholic to bow down before this idol and acknowledge its god-head—to bring the Church that baptized him to be judged before its tribunal—to join in proclamation of that unbounded "liberty of con-

science" that more than one Pope has branded as "an insanity"—and to uphold that unlimited "liberty of the press" that makes it a propaganda of corruption. They ask him to truckle to religious indifference, and to stain his conscience and belie his intelligence by talking the nonsensical jargon of "universal toleration."

In those days, and in these countries, Catholics are surrounded by an atmosphere that holds, as it were in solution, the most deadly poisons; and they can hardly exaggerate the evil influence that an un-Catholic and an anti-Catholic press can gradually exercise on Catholic instincts. In such circumstances it is necessary to aim at being (if we may be allowed the exaggeration) more Catholic than the Church herself. It is needful that Catholic principles—especially those of them that are distinctively and aggressively Catholic—should be not merely apprehended by the intellect, but brought home in full force to the whole moral and intellectual nature, and made the motive powers of social and political action. We should have them on our lips and in our hearts, and bound on the determined foreheads which we raise to confront the infidel politics which strive, and not without a certain melancholy success, to rule this Europe that once was Christian and Catholic; and that may, in God's good time, if we, and such as we, do well our part, be Christian and Catholic again. It is needful that our watchwords be—No compromise of Catholic truth, but a full insistence on it down to its last detail, cost what it may; no paltering with conscience for temporal ends, however desirable; no seeking even for glorious issues by unholy means; no scant and grudging, but a full and heartfelt submission to that voice that goes out across the waste of waters, wherein powers and thrones have been engulfed, from the bark of Peter. There is no man, however humble, but can exert some influence on the society around him; and there is not—at any rate, there ought not to be—any Catholic indifferent to the duty of fostering and spreading sound Catholic principles. Turn which way we will, we find our most cherished convictions attacked either by open hostility or covert insinuation, and we should be prepared to detect sophistry and refute error. To do so effectually, we have but to look back upon "the line of light" that marks the path along which the Church has travelled through the centuries; and be guided by the voice of that infallible truth that has met old errors, and vanquished them and buried them in graves of ages past; and that is prompt to-day, as ever, to confront them when they rise, as old errors do rise, in new forms, disinterred by evil hands from the unholy graves that were sealed, in times gone by, with the dread anathema of the Church of God.

IRISH COLLEGES SINCE THE REFORMATION.

MADRID.

WE know very little of this house. As it never was incorporated with Salamanca like the other Spanish Colleges, the documents referring to it are not within our reach, but we will try to give to the readers of the IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD the little we have been able to glean about it.

It was founded in the year 1629, some say by the venerable Thobada Copleton, restorer of the College in Seville; but I conceive there must be some mistake in this, as I am convinced from what was said of the latter College, that Copleton went to Ireland long before this date. Don Dermisio O'Brien, chaplain to Philip IV., was its second rector, and he gave to the young establishment his own house in the Calle del Humilladero, where this pious foundation still exists. For the space of twenty years after its foundation it supported from ten to twenty students with the revenues allotted it by the corporation of the city and others. These resources failing, the Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo, Don Baltasar Moscoso Sandoval, turned it, in 1692, into a house of refuge for the Irish students coming to Madrid to seek the customary viaticum which the king of Spain was accustomed to give them on their return to Ireland: this viaticum amounted to £10. The patronage was vested in the Committee of Beneficed Priests till about 1759, when it passed to the Archbishop.

Some houses were purchased in 1669, and in 1690 a church and sacristy were made of them. This work was accomplished by means of alms, and the gratuitous labour of various persons in the neighbourhood on Sundays and festival days.

By royal order of 5th June, 1768, Charles III. took this establishment under his royal patronage, and appointed Don Andres Gonzalez de Barcia, Mayor of Madrid, its Judge Protector. On his death Don Gaspar Melchor succeeded him; and in 1792 all the affairs of this patronage was handed over to the Count de Isla.

On the 7th November, 1792, the Count appointed Don Pedro Perlins interim administrator, with a salary of £35 per annum; and on the death of the rector, Don Guillermo Navin, this office was also conferred on him.

It is known also that the Count framed new constitutions, which, however, it appears were never confirmed.

The Count of Isla died in 1807, and it is not known whether a new Judge Protector was appointed.

The Rector-Administrator, Perlins, left Madrid in 1819, to recruit his health, and authorized Don Simon Martinez Rubio to receive the rents and discharge the debts of the house. The net value of these rents has not been accurately ascertained, and they apparently consist of the rents of houses burthened with various charges, and of the interest accruing from the capital accumulated from property sold.

The result of these different changes within the last century has been to gradually obscure the primitive intention of this establishment, and turn its rents into channels never contemplated by its pious founders. At present, and for many years past, the Irish nation, for whose benefit it was intended, derives no advantage whatever from it. The Corporation of Madrid has pulled down two of the houses and erected new ones in their place, which renders any attempt to recover the property very difficult. Doctor Garltan laboured for years in the hope of succeeding, and employed all the influential interest he had in Madrid, but to no purpose. The present rector of Salamanca is again engaged in the same attempt, and has hopes of finally succeeding if the unfortunate times through which we are now passing, and which paralyze all action, would pass and open up an era of a more peaceful and propitious character.

ALCALA DE HENARES.

This College was founded in 1657 by Baron George de Paz y Silveira, who gave it the interest of £ 5,768, sunk in *juros* as rent. *Juros* are perpetual annuities imposed on lands or houses and paid in kind. It was incorporated with the famous University founded by the great Cardinal Ziminez, in which his grand Complutensian Polyglot was compiled and printed. This Irish College was never of any great importance. It was founded specially and exclusively for students from the north of Ireland. It was the constant scene of disorders from the beginning, and this could not well be otherwise, as the founder ordained that the students should elect their own rector every four years, the outgoing one to be ineligible: the rector should necessarily be one of the present students. Sometimes this rule was not strictly observed by the outgoing rector, and there is one instance on record where he contrived to have himself re-elected to the great indignation of some of his companions, who protested against the illegality of the election, but in vain. They wrote to Madrid complaining of this serious breach of their democratic constitution, but obtained no redress. They then determined on going in person to complain to the Camara; but the rector, foreseeing their determination, sent a message

round to all the coach owners, and the hirers out of horses and asses, that he would not be responsible if they entrusted their property to any student, and they should do so at their risk; he also refused travelling charges to the students. When they tried to get a horse or a vehicle they were met with an unqualified refusal; but so determined were they on asserting their rights that they went on foot. They got very little satisfaction in Madrid, and had to return and bear their grievances as best they could.

Even so early as 1729 the bishops of Ireland were anxious to cut at the root of these disorders by having the College incorporated with the Jesuit establishment, and a Jesuit rector at its head; but they were met with a thousand objections to the system of the Society, which it was said would not suit the Alcala house at all. The fact is, that it continued to the end as it was. Charles III., in his letter confirming the appointment of Dr. Birmingham as visitor in 1778, commanded that no more students should be received in it, and that it should be incorporated with Salamanca when cleared of its existing inmates. This incorporation was finally effected in 1785, when its last rector was Rev. Patrick Magennis. Father Magennis appears to have been of a different stamp from his predecessors, for he held office for several years, and was a zealous president and a good administrator; but the rebellious training he had received showed itself in his opposition to Dr. Curtis, the then rector of Salamanca, when he went, in 1785, to take possession. Father Magennis, and a student named M'Mahon, who had been received in spite of the order of Charles III. to the contrary, some year or two before barricaded the door, and refused to pay any attention to the bell when Dr. Curtis rang. The mayor of the town had to come with a posse of police and a notary to witness the proceedings, and after formally demanding unconditional surrender from the two valiant defenders of the fortress against all the power of the great king of all the Spains, had to break open the door and take the College by storm. This was the last of the restless and disturbed Irish house in Alcala de Henares. It was called the College of St. George.

The *juros* of the founder were extinguished by Ferdinand VI., and a pension of £284 per annum substituted. This pension has been paid to the College of Salamanca since the incorporation, except during the years of the War of Independence, up to 1st July, 1871, when it was eliminated from the Budget without examination or reason assigned, and although it had been declared by a Committee of the Cortes, which examined it thoroughly in 1822, to be a claim of *rigorous*

justice! Every effort has been made to have it restored to its former place on the Budget, but without success. The present rector petitioned the Chancellor of the Exchequer through Mr. Layard, the English Ambassador in Madrid, and afterwards both Houses of Parliament, setting forth the just claim of the Irish College, but all to no purpose. From Mr. Layard he received all the assistance he could possibly expect, not only when looking after this claim, but on several other occasions he had to trouble him.

W. M'D.

A WORD ON COMMUNISM.

THE upsetting of thrones and the abolition of titles seem to have been the highest object which the French Republicans of '90 had in view. No one was to be styled king, duke, count, or knight; king and subject, lord and tenant, knight and peasant, were all to be addressed as *citizens*. The Communists of to-day go a good long step beyond; equality of civil rights and sameness of address are for them insufficient; equality would be as yet imperfect; the idea of property as well must be taken away, and material goods equally distributed among, or held in common by all. The extravagance of such a principle would be ridiculed by many a Republican who approvingly witnessed the murder of Louis XVI. Yet the spirit which prompted the Dantons and Robespierres is the same as prompts our Mullers of to-day. It is no other than the spirit which wrought man's fall in the garden of Eden—the spirit of pride. In '90 the French Republican could not bear that any one should be called count; to-day our Communist thinks that he should be as wealthy as a wealthier neighbour; that the lands of one should be the lands of every other; that no one's share of earthly goods should be greater than that of his fellow-men. It is pride gathering strength with time. The seeds of evil which are sown one century grow up the next, and produce full fruits, if Providence stops not the growth. It is true that kings and noblemen have to bear their burden of blame for the terrible evils which the end of the last century brought upon Europe. It is true, likewise, that when men lose the idea of another and better world, they would wish, by the easiest means, to make the best of this. Yet, notwithstanding the faults of crowned heads and noblemen in the last century, and the enticements of riches in the present, the Revolutionists of both are mainly led by the spirit of envy and pride. How, otherwise, explain the prin-

ciple of equality which they are so eager to put into practice—a principle which, in the minds of those who uphold it, would, were it possible, embrace the soul as well as the body, mind as well as matter, would equalize the faculties and talents of all; and, more, would lower Heaven to earth—would make God man, and man God. Do not the cries heard on the streets of Paris in the last awful outbreak indicate what they think of their Creator?

A word now on the falseness of the Communistic idea. A writer of sense would almost beg pardon of his readers for speaking of such nonsense; but we must treat the times as we find them. It would be superfluous, in the seventeenth century, to raise a great cry in defence of the rights of kings, when not many denied them; yet it would not be so to do such the next; it would be ridiculous, last century, to speak strongly in favour of property, when few were foolish enough to impugn its claims, yet to-day it is a duty. It is heartrending to think upon the truths which are assailed in our day. The world has gone mad, and we must act with it as such. Communism is not a mere name; it is taking possession of the hearts of many, and it must be refuted and resisted. Here is its fundamental error contained in a nutshell.

All things good are from God. He might have created nothing; in His liberty He has created what He has created. Decreasing creation, He might have created few beings or many; beings of one kind or of many kinds. In His wisdom He has created grades of species, the gradation arising from a difference in perfection between them, and even individuals of the same species He has differently endowed. It is through God's great goodness each being has what it has, and over what it has not, it cannot complain; for if it has a right to nothing, how can it have a right to more than it has? Hence the lump of clay cannot complain, so to speak, that it is not a plant, a plant that it is not a bird, a bird that it is not a man, a man that he is not an angel. Placing man by man, talents, too, are unequally distributed among them. One has this talent, another is endowed with that; and in those who have the same talent, there is a difference in its strength. Yet each of us must be thankful for the powers of mind he has received, since it is God's kindness that we have a rational soul at all. Is the same to be said of the distribution of material goods? It depends upon the will of God, who is the giver of all. The question, then, comes to this: Does God, as men are now circumstanced, condemn Communism? Our reason, prescinding from revelation, shows us He does. Does not reason tell us that labour bears fruit for him who labours just because he

labours, and that the greater the labour the greater the fruit. Here, let it be remembered, by labour is meant every effort, whether of mind and body combined, or of mind only, to obtain material goods. My physical strength, my business tact, my professional skill are all my own, and belong to no other; the exercise of these, and their application to their object, are likewise only mine; what is made to be through the use of these powers—namely, earthly goods—surely, has more relation to me than to any other; are these not mine, being an effect of which I, and no one else, was chief cause? From a difference in individuals in the above qualities, and in the intensity of their application, would arise a greater or less acquirement of wealth. This difference actually exists; hence the right of one to possess more property than another; hence Communism is an error. The above reasoning is equally applicable to persons holding land in common, when one labours more than another. Again, God wills that there be order in society; Communism would bring into it confusion. How could harmony reign among men of divers and opposite inclinations who possess in common? It would cause more than confusion—it would create a chaos. Take away the individual's right to acquire property, enterprise then would cease, commerce would go with enterprise, trades would be given up, professions would not be practised, intellectual pursuits to a great extent would be left aside. The reign of beggars would begin, which would terminate in common plunder, carried on in barren fields, grassy ways, and dilapidated houses. It is by God's will, consequently, that man has a right to acquire riches, and to keep them.

According, then, to God—truth and the source of truth—we find the error of the equalizing *furor* which prevails to no small extent in these our times. There is no doubt that one man is substantially equal to another. All men have the same high origin, and the same noble end was fixed for them. Justice, too, must be equally measured out to all. Accidentally men differ, and it is precisely this accidental difference which the Radicals of to-day would wish to remove. We have seen how erroneous is the principle which animates them. The difference among men in the quantity of property held arises from the accidents of greater or less talent and industry, and of divers circumstances. The former God gave, the latter are in His providential hands. Why fight against God? I would here even say a word against the more moderate Republicans. Some men are in themselves greater than others. There are men who, above others, benefit their country, and bring upon it honor; there are those who are

remarkable in this or that creditable sphere. Is it not natural to call them by a name which would indicate their singular services and worth? Are not titles, then, natural? On the whole universe is stamped variety; why do men proclaim against it?

It would be far more advantageous to the Communist chiefs and to their followers to try to scrape up some money and make their way out to America—North or South—or to Australia, where they could obtain land cheaply, and without bloodshed or robbery;—where they might strive, through honesty and industry, to become as rich as those who are now richer than they. It should be their ambition to rise, not to pull down those who are higher than they. They should remember, too, that the immediate object of temporal riches is the body—just as herbs in regard to the beasts of the field—and that they are entirely secondary. Above all, they should bear in mind that man's real wealth, virtue, and grace, can be, through God's goodness, as easily acquired by the poor as by the rich, by the peasant as by the knight, by the beggar as by the prince.

HOLYCROSS ABBEY.¹

IN the following brief outline of the origin and early history of this Abbey I have purposely abstained from any reference to its charters, or the particular lands with which it was endowed, as of no interest to the general reader, and presenting little else than a mere list of townlands, which can be no longer identified under their modern designations. Nor is it my intention to attempt tracing the succession of its abbots down to the Reformation, as the materials extant for such a purpose are extremely few, and those I have collected had been mislaid, perhaps altogether lost, and the sources from which they were derived are no longer accessible. This, however, I trust to be in a position to accomplish hereafter, and to be able to present to the public in a fuller and more consecutive form, an historical memoir of the Abbey of Holycross and its dependencies.

For such portions of this notice as have reference to the origin of the Abbey, and for several of the facts regarding its abbots, I am indebted to a manuscript written in 1640, by John Hartry, of Waterford, a monk of the Cistercian Order, and entitled "*Triumphalia Chronologica Sanctæ Crucis*," &c.,

¹ This interesting history of Holycross Abbey was written by the late Rev. THOMAS O'CARROLL, P.P., Clonoulty, Cashel, and appeared some years ago in the *Tipperary Vindicator*.

which, though not strictly a history of that house, but simply a record of the miraculous cures, &c., effected through the agency of the Holy Rood, has preserved many interesting facts connected with its history.

Exception may be taken by some as to the preternatural circumstances that are stated to have led to its foundation ; but, as Hartry professes to have derived his account of it, and to have framed his narrative from an ancient Irish chronicle, preserved from an early period in the monastery, there can be no just grounds for doubting the substantial accuracy of the facts he has recorded. Besides, as Donald O'Brien came from Limerick to visit the place several years before it had been in possession of the Holy Rood, it must be inferred that he was attracted thither by some singular and extraordinary event that had previously given celebrity to it.

About three miles from Thurles, on the right bank of the Suir, and under the shadow of the parish church of Temple-naue, there existed, from a remote period of our history, a hermitage or cell, which was destined to become celebrated as the "Manister Ogther Lamhan," or *Monastery of the Eight Hands*, and, subsequently, more celebrated still as the *Abbey of Holycross*.

A short time before the Norman invasion, this small convent was occupied by two monks, one of whom was greatly venerated for the austerity and sanctity of his life. One day, in the absence of his confrère, the holy man was attacked by four robbers, who required him, under the threat of instant death, to surrender to them the hidden treasures of the house. The father assured them that they possessed none of this world's wealth, and that their means of subsistence were solely derived from the charity of the faithful. Foiled in their purpose of plunder, they began to mock and otherwise maltreat the holy man. "Let us then see," said they, "some proof of those miraculous powers which people say you possess." "Come," continued one of them, "make this huge tree bow down its top to the earth to do us homage, otherwise we swear we shall lay violent hands upon you." The monk remonstrated with them on their impiety, and besought them to refrain from tempting God lest some terrible visitation might befall them ; but they still persisting in their impious purpose, the tree suddenly bent down its branches to the earth, and in their effort to escape, crushed and mutilated the hands of the four robbers as a retribution from Heaven for their impiety.

The fame of this marvel induced several pious men to become members of the little community, and attracted pilgrims from many distant places to visit the house. Among them

was Donald O'Brien, King of Limerick, who, accompanied by a brilliant retinue of nobles, visited the place, A.D. 1169, enlarged the convent at his own expense, and afterwards enriched it with large endowments, which he confirmed by a formal act in 1182. The O'Fogartys¹ too, as immediate lords of the district, took the Monastery under their protection, and subsequently bestowed on it a considerable donation in lands.

In commemoration of the miracle, the house was thenceforward called the "Manister Ogther Lamhan," or the *Monastery of the Eight Hands*, a name which it was not long, however, destined to retain, as in the course of a few years another event, equally marvellous, imparted to it a new designation, with an additional degree of celebrity and lustre. This event is recorded to have occurred in this wise:—

A young prince of the royal blood of England, desirous to visit a country, and become acquainted with the manners and habits of a people lately subjected to the English crown,² came over to Ireland for that purpose. The king availed himself of the prince's visit as a favorable opportunity for introducing the impost of Peter's Pence, and accordingly gave him a commission to collect it throughout the island. What degree of success attended his pious efforts, history has left us no data to determine; it is, however, probable that his mission encountered much hostility from the native princes, as being an impost theretofore unheard of and introduced by foreign usurpers. It is certain that he was assailed by the O'Fogartys whilst journeying through the wood of Kilecloundowny, which lay about two miles west of the "Manister Ogther Lamhan," and was there brutally murdered by some members of that family.

Meanwhile, a blind and aged monk of the Abbey was admonished, in a series of visions, to proceed to the wood—that he would there meet some swine turning up the surface of the soil, and witness a spectacle that was to restore his sight and render his convent illustrious for ever.³ Having obtained the abbot's blessing and a brother monk for guide, he went forth joyfully on his errand under the full conviction of recovering his sight. On arriving at the spot indicated by the vision, the half-buried arm of the murdered prince appeared protruding from the grave, and upon his finger was found a gold ring in-

¹ Quorundam beneficiorum in usum abbatix concessorum ob nationes, cum antiquo eorum monumento exstructo a parte Evangelii magni altaris, familiam terrarum possessione et rerum temporalium dominio fuisse potentem, satis denotant. H.

² Ad videndos mores Hibernicos et formam vivendi.

³ Ibidem quoddam invenies quo perpetui nominis claritate conspicuum, hoc redderetur Monasterium H.

scribed with his name, which, on being presented to the blind monk, he was forthwith restored to the use of his sight. A report of the bloody deed had no sooner reached the brotherhood than they proceeded in funeral procession to the fatal spot. The Prince's remains were conveyed to the monastery for interment, and were deposited at the epistle side of the great altar with all the solemnity suited to his rank and the sacred cause in which he perished.

Immediately after the obsequies, the monk, who had been so singularly favored by Heaven, was delegated to convey to the Queen the ring of her martyred son. On seeing it she gave herself up to all the bitterness of a mother's grief, and, retiring to her closet, would not be comforted. Fearing that his mission would be unpopular, and consequently apprehending danger to her son, she had given him this ring, which, in case he had fallen into any difficulties in Ireland, was to be sent to her to apprise her of his being in need of succour. Her worst apprehensions were now realized, but if aught could impart to her consolation under such a bereavement, it was the assurance that her son had suffered in a holy work, and that Heaven had accepted the sacrifice. The calm which these pious reflections produced in her mind was followed by acts of thanksgiving to God for the great graces vouchsafed to her son, and of gratitude to the good brotherhood for the honorable interment they had accorded to his remains. As a test of these sentiments, she implored permission from her husband, the King, to present to the monastery a portion of the Holy Rood which had been presented to him by the King of France. The King, after much hesitation, yielded to her solicitations, and the monk was dismissed with the sacred relic and other valuable presents for his convent. Deeply conscious of the priceless treasure he bore, the good brother had it sewed up in cloth of gold and swathed round his heart. During the course of his journey homeward, it became so deeply imbedded in his flesh that no effort of his could possibly detach it therefrom. The moment, however, he reached the "Manister Ogther Lamhan," it fell to the earth, as if to embrace the spot it was destined by Heaven to occupy.

The name of the Royal donor has been lost, but tradition has transmitted it under the designation of the "Good Woman." The author of "*Les Montmorency's de la France et l'Irlande*" states that she was the daughter of a podestat of Lucca, while T. L. Cooke, Esq., of Birr, an antiquarian of deep research, in an able paper read before the Kilkenny Archæological Society, conjectures her to have been Eleanor, Queen of Henry II., and the murdered Prince her sixth and

youngest son Philip, "who is stated by historians to have died young, but without specifying the date or the manner of his death." Who was the personage known as the "Good Woman's Son" must ever remain a matter of mere conjecture, as the chronicler tells us that a folio of the ancient Irish manuscript, from which he compiled his narrative of these facts, in which the name and more copious details respecting the young Prince are supposed to have been recorded, was torn from the volume.

The *eclat* which the possession of this sacred relic communicated to the "Manister Ogther Lamhan" and the marvellous cures effected through its agency, imparted to it an unusual degree of celebrity, so that it gradually lost its primitive designation, and in the course of a few years was known solely by the name of the *Abbey of the Holycross*. Other causes also contributed to its splendor. The ample possession with which the O'Fogartys had endowed it, and by which they thereby hoped to avert from themselves the anger of Heaven for the bloody deed in which they were concerned, and the pious offerings of the faithful through a succession of ages, contributed to render it one of the richest ecclesiastical establishments in the island. Matthew O'Heney, Archbishop of Cashel and Papal Legate, became one of its earliest benefactors, and was buried there in 1206, whilst several of his successors appropriated to it in succession the Parish Churches of Templebeg, Templeoughtragh (Upper Church), Ballycahill, Rathcannon, and Glenkeen.

In proportion, too, as it increased in wealth, it grew in extent and magnificence. Every age added to its embellishment. It possessed seven altars, a peal of five bells, eight dormitories for the brotherhood, with numerous chambers for the entertainment of those strangers who were wont to visit for curiosity or devotion. Its Abbot was mitred—was a Lord of Parliament—was exempt from episcopal visitation, and exercised sole spiritual jurisdiction over the parish of Holycross and all the other annexes of the Abbey, whilst civil jurisdiction, as secular lord of the county of "The Cross of Tipperary," embraced not only the territory subject to him in his spiritual capacity, but also extended to the city of Cashel, which I find to have been cited in legal documents, as within that county, for more than a century after the dissolution of the Abbey. The county of the Holycross appears to have been merged in the county of Tipperary during the Protectorate.

Matthew O'Ryan succeeded as Abbot about the beginning of the sixteenth century. He conducted the government and maintained the discipline of the house in the primitive spirit

of the institute for nearly twenty years, when, becoming enfeebled by gout, he was no longer able to exercise that degree of supervision which a conscientious discharge of his office required, and a gradual relaxation of discipline was the unhappy result. Though frequently warned of his incapacity to perform the duties of his charge and of the grave responsibility he thereby incurred, the love of power had grown so strong upon him, that he could not, either by remonstrance or entreaty, be induced to resign. He was at last deprived of authority by the Holy See and was succeeded by William O'Dwyer.

It was, probably, in the early years of the incumbency of this Abbot, or, at least, some short time prior to his accession, that the Holy Rood was carried to Glankeen to ratify a treaty of peace and amity between the O'Dwyers of Kilnamanagh and the Burkes of Borris-(Ileigh).

The vicarage of the church of Glankeen was appropriated to the Abbot of Holycross, by Archbishop Creagh, during the last decade of the fifteenth century. That church owes its origin to St. Culane, one of the five saintly brothers of Cormac McCullenan, Bishop of Cashel and King of Munster, and dates from the middle of the ninth century. It was the parish church of "The Territory of Ileigh," which, having been created at such a remote period of our history, continued distinct from the surrounding baronies to the commencement of the present century. This territory, during the early part of the sixteenth century, was the theatre of a protracted and sanguinary struggle between Diarmid O'Dwyer, Lord of Kilnamanagh, and Ricard Burke of Borris, the descendant of an adventurous "Free Lance" from Galway, who finally succeeded in wresting the district from its rightful owner. After the effusion of much blood, the belligerents consented to a reconciliation, and to add more solemnity to the oath by which they bound themselves to preserve peace towards each other, they agreed to ratify their engagements on the Holy Rood. For this purpose two Monks were sent from the Abbey to Ileigh in charge of the holy relic; but, after having accomplished the object of their mission, whilst crossing a ford of the river Carhane on their return home, the relic was carried away by a flood, but providentially recovered a few hours after.

This feud was revived through successive generations, till, towards the close of the sixteenth century, it was finally set at rest by the victories achieved by Walter Burke, "the strenuous defender of his territory of Ileigh," over his hereditary enemies the O'Dwyers.

This Walter, after a stormy life, sleeps in peace in the old church of Glankeen. A handsome monument, with an epitaph in Latin, still in good preservation, marks the place of his rest. His representative was styled "The MacWalter," and the last who bore that name died about the middle of the last century.

During the latter years of the incumbency of Abbot O'Ryan, William O'Dwyer, at the instance of the community, made three journeys to Rome on the subject of his deprivation, and whilst there was appointed, by Apostolic brief, to the office of Abbot, the duties of which he discharged with exemplary zeal and satisfaction for a period of nearly six years. On his death, Philip Purcell, a friar of the order, was elected Abbot, who, shortly after his promotion, being carried away by the turbulence and irreligion of the time, surrendered the Abbey to Henry VIII., in the twenty-eighth year of that monarch's reign, A.D. 1536.

Philip Purcell was cousin-german to the then Baron of Loughmoe, who possessed several manors in the parish of Holycross, and in close proximity to the Abbey. The Purcells were of Norman origin, and like other families of the same race, assumed the family name from their armorial device—that of the Purcells was a boar's head, hence, Porcus, Porcellus, or Purcell. The first of the family who immigrated to Ireland was Hugo Purcell, who came in the train of Theobald Fitz-Walter, the first of the Butlers. His name appears as one of the witnesses to a deed executed in 1199, by which Richard de Burgo grants his manor of Ardmayle, on the river Suir, to Theobald Fitzwalter, as the dowry of his daughter, Margery de Burgo.

Very intimate relations subsisted ever after between the houses of Butler and Purcell, and as the former acquired vast possessions in Tipperary and Kilkenny, and grew into political power and pre-eminence in the country, the Purcells shared in their good fortune; they established themselves in Kilkenny contemporaneously with the house of Ormond, and a branch afterwards settled at Loughmoe, on the Suir, in O'Fogarty's country, which became very powerful, and took a prominent part in all the national and religious struggles in which the country was engaged. The representative of the house was usually styled the "Baron of Loughmoe"—a title conferred by the Earl of Ormond, in his capacity of Count Palatine of Tipperary.

The Baron of Loughmoe held large possessions at Holycross, and was favorably disposed towards the community. It was thought desirable to cultivate these favorable dis-

positions, and to secure friends among the great ones of this world at this critical juncture, when the very existence of their house and order in Ireland was menaced with destruction. Accordingly, on the death of Abbot O'Dwyer, the chapter elected Philip Purcell, the Baron's cousin, as his successor.

Meanwhile, the suppression of the great Abbeys had proceeded with wonderful rapidity in England, and their inmates thrown upon the world, many of them, in their old age, with only a miserable pittance for their subsistence. But Philip Purcell was not the man to make sacrifices to conscience; when his turn came he made his terms, and surrendered the Abbey to the Crown, on consideration of being left in the enjoyment of its revenues during his life. He afterwards married, begat children; but, towards the close of his life, endeavoured to make his peace with God and some reparation to religion for his scandal, by dying in the communion of the Church. He died A.D. 1563, seven-and-twenty years after his apostacy, and was buried in the Abbey.

At the dissolution, the Abbey, with its temporalities, as well as its spiritualities, was granted to James, Earl of Ormond and Ossory, who was a great favorite with Henry VIII. With this Abbey he got a grant of six others, three of which were of the Cistercian Order. On the death of Purcell this grant was confirmed by Elizabeth to Thomas, Earl of Ormond, who, though educated in the Anglican schism, embraced the Catholic faith several years before his death, and was succeeded by Earl Walter, a devout and steadfast son of the Church.

Though the monks were expelled from the Abbey, and driven to seek shelter and subsistence from the charity of the faithful, they still lingered in its neighbourhood, in the hope that the dawn of a more auspicious day would permit them to return to those cloisters, endeared to them by so many holy associations; and even at times they ventured to assemble stealthily within its sacred walls and chaunt the divine office. Purcell, who abandoned the place, as awakening unpleasant memories, and having, perhaps, "some dregs of conscience still within him," connived at these clandestine visits. During the reign of Mary they took possession of the Abbey once more, and, though deprived of the revenues, continued to celebrate the offices and discharge all the other functions of the institute, till the accession of Elizabeth, when they were finally dispersed, and not one of them survived to enter its hallowed precincts ever after.

About half a century after its suppression, the deserted Abbey gave obvious indications of decay. Its cells,

dormitories, and guests' chambers, long sacred to contemplation and prayer, had been converted into stables for housing the cattle of the ex-abbot, and were already reduced to a state of comparative ruin. The church alone, as containing the tombs of many distinguished families of the district, escaped desecration, but did not escape the ravages that the neglect of sixty years had wrought upon it. Even the choir, though the most firmly built portion of the edifice, seemed to be the first destined to destruction.

The mural monument on the south, or epistle side of the great altar, marks the grave of the "Good Woman's Son." This grave had been an object of deep veneration, and it was considered a crime little short of sacrilege to disturb the sainted remains inhumed within it. About the year 1584, Peter Purcell, son of the Abbot, was buried in this grave, and the bones of the martyred Prince were displaced to create sufficient space to admit the coffin. Four years after this interment, water began to flow down copiously, and without intermission, from the roof, so as to threaten the choir with total destruction. Efforts were made to arrest the destructive element; but as the water still continued to flow, and its cause was hidden in mystery, the work was abandoned in despair, and the destruction of the tomb was felt to be inevitable.

At last, in the year 1603, about the Feast of St. John the Evangelist, it pleased the Almighty to reveal, in a vision, to Sir Hugh Purcell, son-in-law to the deceased Peter, that the water would not cease to fall until the body of Peter was removed from the grave so unjustly usurped; and so vividly was Sir Hugh impressed with the vision, that he sent a letter to the Rev. David Henesy, the Parish Priest then residing in the Monastery, detailing the circumstances of his vision, and stating that, as he was unable, from infirmity, to go in person to superintend the exhumation of the body, he sent workmen for that purpose. The remains were removed after much difficulty, owing to the intolerable stench that proceeded from the grave. A fountain of pure water burst forth at the time just by the Monastery, at which many cures were subsequently effected; among others, John O'Cullinane, a person employed in the Abbey, was cured, on the 14th of May, 1628, of an excruciating pain in the side, on visiting the tomb of the "Good Woman's Son," and drinking three times of the water of this well.

In the year 1595, a very distinguished man was buried in the Abbey. This was Sir Oliver Oge Morres, Lord of Thorny, Lattera and Knockagh, who, having been involved in the civil wars of the period, and embarrassed by the munificent hos-

pitality, retired into France in 1588, where he died seven years after. At his desire, his body was transported, and was interred with great solemnity at Holy Cross.

This Sir Oliver was married to Hannah, one of the ten, or, as tradition says, the twenty beautiful daughters of John MacConnor O'Mulryan, of Beakstown, dynast of Owney O'Mulrian, popularly called Shane O'Trean agus Troghan na Trogh—that is, John the Brave, and the Raven with the numerous progeny, in allusion to his character, his dark complexion, and numerous family. His ancestral castle of Owney (Abington) having been demolished in 1452, during the lifetime of his father, Connor O'Mulryan, by James, 4th Earl of Ormond, whilst Lord Justice, he fixed his residence at Beakstown, a manor belonging to the then Baron of Loughmoe.

Beakstown derived its modern designation from Beck, or Rebecca O'Mulrian, his eldest daughter, and appears to have been one of the earlier endowments of the Abbey, but alienated from it in after years. It contained a chapel and cemetery, which, if we are to trust tradition, was connected with the Monastery by a subterraneous passage, running parallel with the river.

From the year 1580 to the close of that century, a rabid spirit of intolerance actuated the Government, and pervaded all classes of the Protestant community to such an extent that no priest dare appear in public throughout the entire province, and even the disguises they assumed, and the hiding places to which they resorted, did not always enable them to elude the vigilance of their persecutors.

But several defeats sustained by the Queen's forces in Munster, and the confederacy of the Catholic chiefs of that province, promoted by Hugh O'Neil, in 1598, gave heart to the Catholic body; and, accordingly, the clergy began to emerge from their places of concealment, and to perform in public all the ministrations of the Church. The Rev. David Henesy, having been appointed Parish Priest of Holycross, in 1599, fixed his residence among the ruins of the Abbey, and fitted up its choir as a Parish Church. Some monks of the order followed towards the close of that year, and organised a little community within its walls.

In the month of January of the next year, 1600, Hugh O'Neil mustered a force to march to the South of Ireland, to confirm his friendship with those who were in alliance with, and to wreak his vengeance on, his enemies. After wasting the country of Ely, O'Carroll, and those of other chiefs who were partizans of England, he proceeded by slow marches from Roscrea to Templemore and Thurles, and encamped his

army "at the gate of the Monastery of Holycross. They were not long there," say the Four Masters, "when the Holy Rood was brought to them, and the Irish gave large presents, alms, and offerings to its conservators and monks in honor of Almighty God; and they protected and respected the Monastery, with its buildings, the lands appropriated for its use, and its inhabitants in general."

O'Neil remained encamped for some part of the month of February in the vicinity of Holycross, and afterwards proceeded to Cashel, where he was met by James McThomas Fitzgerald, whom he created Earl of Desmond. In this expedition his movements were closely watched by the Earls of Ormond and Kildare, the Lord Delvin, and other partizans of the Queen, who hung upon his march, but never dared to provoke him to an engagement.

O'Neil's triumphant progress through the South crushed the spirit of persecution for a time, and the monks continued in undisturbed possession of the Abbey. Two years after we find them exhibiting the Holy Rood to the veneration of the people, on the Feast of St. Patrick, in the Parish Chapel of Clonmel, when a lame man "was made whole" by applying the relic to the injured member.

The accession of James I. to the Crown of England, in the early part of the next year, inspired the Catholics of Ireland with hopes of toleration for their religion, which, however, his subsequent policy soon dispelled. Accordingly, at this favorable juncture, parish priests were formally collated to parishes, whilst monastic orders resumed possession of, and appointed superiors to, all the religious houses from which they had been forcibly expelled about seventy years before. Father Richard Bernard Fulow was appointed abbot of Holycross, the first who was elevated to that dignity since the suppression of that monastery in 1536.

Richard Fulow was a native of the City of Cashel, where, having acquired his classical education, he repaired at an early age to Spain, and having there completed his ecclesiastical studies with much distinction, was appointed by his Catholic Majesty chaplain to the fleet. He continued in this charge for some years; but, touched with the desolate state of the Church in his native country, and inspired with a burning zeal for the salvation of souls, he returned to Ireland during the last decade of the sixteenth century, towards the close of Elizabeth's reign.

He began his ministry in his native city, where, by his zeal, his saintly life, and strenuous preaching, he successfully resisted the progress of the Anglican schism, and confirmed the

faithful in the faith. After laboring for several years as a secular priest in the active duties of the ministry, he retired into the cloister, and took the habit of the Cistercian Order, at the Convent of Newry, in 1602.

Abbot Fulow, at his religious profession, assumed the name of Bernard, and was no sooner put in possession of the Abbey than he resolved to celebrate the festival of his great patron with unusual *eclat*. For this purpose he invited the neighbouring clergy to the Abbey, to assist at the Divine office on the Feast of St. Bernard (20th August), 1603. But the rumour of this solemn assemblage of clergy and people having reached the Government, a troop of Dragoons was despatched by Sir George Carey, President of Munster, to seize the abbot, and other clergymen, as seditious and rebellious persons.

Fulow, having received intimation of their approach, made his escape to Wexford, and from thence, after many perils and hardships, reached the coast of France. He appears to have carried with him the Holy Rood, for, whilst passing through New Ross, about two months after (October 22nd), he exposed it in the Church of that town in the presence of a large concourse of people assembled for public worship, when Isabella McShane recovered the use of her speech. After reaching the coast of France, he directed his steps to the Abbey of Clairvoux, where he remained five months, and assisted at a general chapter of the order, and was elected Vicar-General of the Cistercian Institute in England, Ireland, and Scotland. He afterwards passed into Spain, where, in a secluded house in a wood, about two miles from Bilboa, he spent two years in contemplation and prayer. But the spiritual wants of his countrymen haunted him in his seclusion, and he could no longer resist the ardent desire he conceived of returning to his native land.

Cashel once more became the theatre of his apostolic labors, but it was only for a few months, as he spent the last year of his life in visiting the houses under his jurisdiction, and otherwise promoting the reform and extension of the order in his province. In one of these journeys he took suddenly ill near the village of Golden, and was carried into the Priory of Athassel, where he closed his eventful career in the year 1609, universally regretted for his zeal, his sanctity, and his sufferings. His remains were conveyed to Holycross for interment, and were there deposited with his predecessors in the monument of the Abbots.

It was during the administration of this abbot, and through his agency, that the acquisition of another valuable relic had been made for the Abbey.

In 1603, a ship laden with provisions and munitions of war, which was despatched by Philip II., of Spain, to Hugh O'Donnell, Prince of Tyrconnell, was wrecked on the coast of Clare. Among the valuable cargo lost in the wreck was a small image or statuette of the Blessed Virgin, made of odoriferous wood, of beautiful workmanship, which floated about on the surface of the ocean for three years, when it was observed by some fishermen, who endeavoured to possess themselves of it, but in vain, as it invariably eluded all their efforts to do so. It was observed to appear more conspicuously, and with great lustre, on every Saturday, and seldom on any other day; so that singular circumstance excited the curiosity of the fishermen, and caused them to redouble their exertions. Turlough Roe M'Mahon, Lord of Corkavaskin, in Thomond, interested himself in the matter, and having prepared a boat, sent a Franciscan Friar, who was attracted to that neighbourhood by the report of the wonderful image, accompanied by the fisherman who made the relation in quest of it; who, having found the sacred relic, returned with great joy. It was delivered at once to the safe keeping of Turlough.

Margaret O'Brien, Lady Dunboyne, and sister to the Earl of Thomond, no sooner heard of this statue than she despatched a messenger to Turlough, entreating him in the most earnest terms, and by the ties of blood and friendship that connected them, to bestow on her the holy image. She was gratified. Bernard Fulow, Abbot of Holycross, considering of what spiritual advantage the possession of so great a treasure would be to his abbey, directed his steps to the pious lady, and having represented to her that the legitimate depository for such a miraculous relic was the Abbey of the Holycross, where it could be publicly visited by, and receive the veneration of, the faithful—that many benefits would thereby accrue to religion—that it was but meet that so favored an effigy of the Virgin Mother should be preserved on the same altar, with a portion of the sacred cross on which her Divine Son had suffered, and, finally, that the monastery had special claims on her ladyship, as it had been originally founded, endowed, and protected by one of her royal ancestors. Influenced, no doubt, by these representations, the good lady presented the relic to the Abbot, who, having reverently wrapped it in fine linen, returned to his abbey. Fearing, however, to expose it publicly on the altar, lest the fame of it might attract a concourse of people to the church, and thereby expose the community to renewed vexations, he hid it in a heap of corn in a barn at Ballycormac (now Cormackstown). In this place of security it remained, until the storm of persecution somewhat

subsiding, it was conveyed to the Abbey, and there, in a private manner, exposed to the veneration of the people.

After the death of Abbot Fulow, his successor had it enclosed in a richly gilt tabernacle of carved wood, and placed on the high altar; where, in 1634, on the occasion of its being newly gilt, a minute fragment detached from it effected a cure on a patient residing near the Abbey.

This relic has been long since lost. There has been no recollection of it within the memory of man.

In the interval that elapsed between the death of Abbot Fulow and the appointment of his successor, several of the secular clergy strenuously exerted themselves to obtain the dignity of commendatory Abbot of Holycross; but all their efforts to attain their object were frustrated by the appointment of Luke Archer to the office of Abbot in 1611.

Luke Archer was born in 1570, at Kilkenny, of the ancient and respectable house of the Archers of that city. He repaired to Lisbon at an early age, where, having pursued his ecclesiastical studies with great success and received Holy Orders, he returned to his native city in 1594, and immediately after was appointed Archdeacon of Ossory, and a few years subsequently parish priest of St. Patrick's, by Dr. Thomas Strange, then Bishop of that See. On the recommendation of Dr. Dermid Creagh, Bishop of Cork, he was promoted to the dignity of Guardian, and subsequently to that of Vicar-Apostolic of the diocese of Loughlin, the Bishop of which had been in exile.

After ministering for sixteen years as a secular Priest in his native city, he resolved to retire from the world and devote the remaining years of his life in the seclusion of the cloister. Accordingly, in the year 1610, he embraced the Cistercian Institute, and on taking the habit of that order, on the 7th of October of the following year, was created Abbot of Holycross.

On his elevation to this dignity, he resigned all his preferments in the Church, but finding that the time had not yet arrived, when he could with safety take possession of his Abbey, he prudently determined to remain at Kilkenny till a more favorable opportunity presented itself.

Meanwhile, he was elected Provincial and Vicar-General of his order on the 18th September, 1618. This office imposed new responsibilities. He at once commenced the visitation of his province and exerted all his energies to re-establish the defunct houses of his order in Ireland. In furtherance of his object, he made long and painful journeys through the country, visiting the ruins, and appointing *ad interim* superiors to them

till the dawn of a more tolerant period admitted of their restoration. During this visitation he had to encounter much hostility and opposition from the commendatory Abbots and such other secular clergymen, as aspired to that distinction, or had been appointed by their ordinaries to the cure of souls, in parishes attached to the suppressed Abbeys. Among others, the Rev. David Henesy, whose appointment to the parish of Holycross in 1599, we have previously noticed, refused to receive jurisdiction from him, maintaining that he needed no other title than that derived from his ordinary, the Archbishop of Cashel. The Abbot insisted on the original and inherent right of the Abbots of Holycross to appoint to the parish and other dependencies of the Abbey. The Parish Priest persisted in his view, and was supported by the Vicar-General of the diocese. As a last resource, the Abbot had recourse to excommunication, and delegated the Very Rev. Matthew Roche, afterwards Vicar-Apostolic of Leighlin, to pronounce the sentence, which he did among the ruins of the monastery. This extreme measure was not for some time attended with the results anticipated. Notwithstanding the censure, Father Henesy continued to officiate in the Abbey, and the Vicar General of the diocese sustained him in his opposition, by publicly assisting at Mass and recommending the faithful to do so. During this unhappy controversy, the Abbot produced, in support of his right, a letter written to him on the part of Dr. O'Kearney, Archbishop of Cashel, intimating that he had given no jurisdiction to Mr. Henesy, *intra limites abbatiæ*, unless subject to the authority and approbation of the Abbot. The letter ran thus:—

“——— It had been a scandal to Sir David Henesy to be removed from his station, especially at this time when these false speeches are going forth. You will do verie well not to remove him till you know further. And trulie, in my opinion, none can stand in better steede than himself for your purpose in that place, as yet in the Abbey of Holiecrosse, and I know he will be directed by yourself, if Dr. Kearney or yourself may agree. I take leave with the heartiest commendations this 10th day of April, 1816.

“Your Worship's moste assured friend,

“JOHN HAARIES D. CASSELIEN.”

Mr. Henesy at length submitted, and from the instrument subjoined, it will be seen that he fully recognised the sole authority and pre-eminence of the Abbot within the Abbey and its dependencies, and disclaimed all pretension to spiritual jurisdiction derived from any other source:—

“I, Sir David Henesy, of the diocese of Cassel, prieste, do by these presents acknowledge and make known that I am

heartilie grieved and repentant for all and singular speches I have committed, either in word or deede against or to the prejudice of the honor, credit, and authoritie of the Right Rev. Dr. Luke Archer, right and lawfull Lord Abbot of the Hollycrosse in the diocese of Cassel, or any other depending of him ; especially Sir Matthew Roche, prieste, for which I have deserved to be censured by the said Dr. Luke, and do therefore moste humblie crave to be absolved of the excommunication ; and all other censures denounced against me for my disobedience and misbehaviour to the Lord Abbot, and his authoritie, promisinge, by God's grace, to make sufficient amends, both by recallinge what opprobrious speches my choller onlie suggested me against the aforementioned Lord Abbot and his adherents in such other places as they might have wrought anny sinister impression in the hearers, and especially in the verie Abbey of the Hollicrosse the next St. Bernard's day, and also by foregoinge hereafter, as I do by these presents forego, desist and resign any title, claime, or chardge I did or could claime in or belonginge to the lands or territories or jurisdiction of the said Abbey of Hollicrosse, meaninge and faithfullie promisinge not to intermeddle or undergoe hereafter any cure, chardge, or any other exercise or function within precinct or territories of the said monastery, or without the said Lo. Abbot's allowance, warrant, and direction. In witness whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name the first of June, 1621.

“ SIR DAVID HENESIE.

“ Being present—

“ Mortough O'Dowling, Sacerdos and Doctor Theologiæ,

“ Thomas Roth, sacerd. vic. Gerlis diæs. offer and pronot apostol.

“ Fr. Nicholas Shee, Postea Provin, Ord. Minorum.

“ Fr. Thomas, alias John Madan, Electus Abbas de Motalibus.

“ Fr. Stephen Shortall, Electus Abb. de Beatitudine.

“ Fr. Thomas Bernard O'Leamy, Electur Abb. de Kilcooly.”

Having thus made his submission, Mr. Henesy humbly petitioned the Abbot to be restored to the cure of souls within the Abbey, parish, and annexes of the Monastery. The Abbot restored him provisionally ; but before so doing, he exacted from him subscription to the subjoined instrument, in which a full recognition of the Abbot's exclusive jurisdiction is formally asserted :—

“ Ego, David Henesy, Presbyter, &c.” Thus in English—

“ I, David Henesy, Priest, admit before all present that I

have received, had, and held the cure of souls in the Monastery of the Holy Cross, in the parishes and territories belonging to the same, of the Rev. Lord Richard Fulow, deceased Abbot of said Monastery. I admit also that on his death I have received, had, and held the same cure for some years, of his successor, the Rev. Lord Luke Archer, present Abbot of said Monastery. I furthermore admit that I have received the same cure anew by the authority and free gift of the said Luke Archer; and I promise to give him submission and obedience to all and singular pertaining to that charge, so that I may be removed from said charge by him or his successors, or by any other deputed by him or them, at their mere pleasure, any appeal or resistance to the contrary notwithstanding, and that the said Abbot Luke, his successors, or any other deputed by him or them may substitute any other, at their pleasure, in my place. I promise, moreover, that I shall not minister or exhibit any relic or cross within or without the said Abbey without the special mandate or license of the said Lord Abbot Luke, his successor, or assign. In faith and testimony of all and singular I have put my hand and seal. Given the 12th day of February, 1621 (O.S.)

“SIR DAVID HENESIE.”

Mr. Henesy was restored to the cure of souls; but with this document on record, no future resistance was apprehended from him. He was deprived of his charge the year after (1623), and John O'Dea, a friar of the Abbey was appointed in his place.

John O'Dea studied at the Irish College of Salamanca, where he took orders, and on returning to Ireland was engaged in the sacred ministry for several years. In the year 1619, and 40th of his age, he took the habit of the Cistercian Order in the Abbey of Holycross from the hands of Abbot Archer, and, on the deprivation of David Henesy, was appointed to the pastoral care of the monastery and parishes appertaining to it. He retained this charge to 1628, when he was promoted by Apostolic brief to the Abbey of Curcumroe in Clare. He was distinguished for his learning and virtues. During his incumbency in 1626, the abbot, who was then temporarily residing in the monastery, had the bells of the Abbey pealed in thanksgiving for a miraculous cure effected by the application of the Holy Rood to a paralytic in the presence of a large assemblage of people.

Gerald (in religion Malachy) Forstall was a native of Kilkenny, where he received his education. He was the first priest ordained by the great Dr. Rothe, Bishop of Ossory. After ministering in that diocese for some years, he embraced

the Cistercian Order, and having made his noviciate at Kilkenny under Luke Archer, was professed at Holycross on the 16th November, 1620. He succeeded John O'Dea in 1628 as pastor of Holycross, and died in August, 1631.

The Abbot Archer, having thus satisfactorily set at rest the question of spiritual jurisdiction, next directed his attention to the temporalities of the Abbey, which had been already alienated for nearly a century. As he hoped, they were destined, before long, to be restored to their original purposes, he resolved to leave on record the source whence they were derived. With this view he summoned witnesses and took depositions, a few of which, however, only have been preserved.

“Copia vera.

“I, Owen Ryan, of Beakstown, fermour, aged of five scoare years or thereabouts, do depose uppon my salvation the tiethes of the Baronny of Ballycorniack to belong to the Abbey and house of Hollie Crosse; My reason of knowing is that I have seene the Abbot of the said Abbey, Phelip Purcell, gathering said teithes, his procurators being then James Roe O'Thrihey and James More, in Clarvine. And that by the licence of the Barron of Loghmoe, the said Abbot builded a barn upon the lands of Beakstowne, to gather his said tiethes. Written in the yeere of our Lord, 1623, and in the 12th day of August. Being present when the aforesaid deposition was taken by above named Owen Rian.

“Fr. Luke Archer, Abbot of Holy Cross.

“Fr. Thomas Leamy, Monk of said Abbey.

“Peter Forstall—Sir David Henesie, Prieste.”

“Copia vera.

“Witnesses produced and examined concerning the church of Templebegge, and the parish thereof.

“First—John MacWilliam, of Thadge, of four scoare yeeres or thereabout, beinge duliae examined and by vertue of his oath, swear that the Church of Templebegge was, during his remembrance, governed by the Lo: Abbot of Holie Crosse, from time to time without any disturbance of the Lo: Archbishop of Cashell, or any in his name, and for proffe thereof sayeth that Lughe MacDonoughe had thereof the profit for the term of five yeeres for the Lo: Abbot that was then: and was bounde to pay som butter and egges unto the Lo: Abbot. And further, the said John sayeth that the third part of the altar and profit of the church of Templewoutragh (Upperchurch), doth follow the Abbey of Holly Crosse, and the other two parts the Lord of Cashell from time to time doth holde. Mealleaghlin MacWilliam, of Thadge, of seventie

yeeres or thereabouts, agreed with the former matter and substance, and their knowledge is that they both were borne and brought up in the aforesaid parishes.

“Written in the yeer of our Lord, 1623, and in the 12th day of August.” The same witnesses.

The Abbey of Holycross did not, however, exclusively engage the solicitude of its Abbot. At this period the diocese of Ossory was reduced to a deplorable state of religious destitution—its bishop was in exile—its vicar-general dead, and there was not a priest in any of the rural parishes within twenty miles of the see. Dr. Richard Fitzgerald, who then administered the diocese, in quality of vicar apostolic, induced Dr. Archer to accept the vacant office of vicar-general. To secure a supply of priests for the diocese, and of religious for the different houses of his province, he established at Kilkenny a noviciate of his order, to which was attached a seminary for the education of secular ecclesiastics. These institutions prospered, and he had the happiness, during an administration of eleven years, to appoint a pastor to every vacant church and to see religion flourish in every parish of that diocese.

Dr. Rothe, the Bishop, took possession of his see in 1637. From that time Abbot Archer removed the noviciate of his order to Holycross, where he permanently resided to his death, 19th December, 1644. He was buried in the Abbey with great solemnity, in presence of a vast concourse of people, in the monument of the Abbots.

On the 15th July, 1636, the year prior to the removal of the Cistercian noviciate from Kilkenny to Holycross, Thomas Bernard O’Leary, a monk of that house, and subsequently Abbot of St. Mary’s, Kilcooley, died at the noviciate of the order, and was buried in his Abbey de Arvi Campo, or Kilcooley, with great solemnity.

About the same time died a munificent benefactor of the Abbey, the Lady Margaret O’Brien, daughter of Connor, Earl of Thomond, and wife of James Butler, Second Lord Dunboyne. By her will, dated 11th February, 1636, she bequeaths to “the Bernardians” of Holycross “£i. X ster., and the same to every one of the orders of the Jesuits, Franciscans and Dominicans, at Cashell, Fethard, and Clonmell: and for the same to enjoin them severally to such devotion as they shall think fit in their discretions: and £i. XX ster. to be divided between the clergie that shall be present at my buryall, and £i. X sterl. to my old priest John FitzDerby.” She moreover leaves “£100 to Mr. Dr. Morrish Roche to the equal use of John O’Dea.”

This bequest appears to have been virtually given to the Abbeyes of Holycross and Corcumroe, as John O'Dea was a monk of the former house, and subsequently Abbot of the latter, both of which were foundations of one of her royal ancestors, Donald, King of Thomond.

The inscription on the mural slab inserted in the parapet of the bridge over the Suir at Holycross, records that this lady and her husband repaired, at their joint expense, that bridge which was then in a ruinous condition. The inscription is as follows:—

“Jacobus Butler, Baro de Dunboyne et Margareta
Brien, ejus uxor, hunc pontem collapsum
erexerunt et Suis insignibus adornarunt,
A.D. 1626.

Dic precor ante obitum verbo non amplius uno,
Evadat Stygios uterque lacus.”

This inscription, as mentioned in it, is surmounted by two escutcheons, bearing respectively the arms of Dunboyne and of the Earls of Thomond.

(To be continued).

S T. M U N C H I N,
PATRON OF LIMERICK CITY AND DIOCESE.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.—INQUIRY CONCERNING THE IDENTIFICATION OF ST. MUNCHIN.—CALLED THE SON OF SEDNA.—SAID TO HAVE BUILT A CHURCH IN FIDH-INIS.—ST. PATRICK'S FIRST VISIT TO LIMERICK.—DIVERS SAINTS BEARING THE NAME OF MUNCHIN, OR MANCHEN.

NO man is perfect who desires not greater perfection; and in this especially does a man prove himself a proficient in the knowledge of God, when he ever tends to the highest degree of perfection. The holy bishops of our Irish Church studied well the course to be pursued for the exercise of their pastoral charge. In charity and humility they excelled, and, therefore, it does not appear strange that so many, with a great fervor of affection, aspired to an intimate union with the true pastor of souls. Adorned with all the graces of solid virtue, the great guilt of sin had no abiding place in souls devotedly attached to the duties of their sacred profession.

Not only are conflicting opinions held regarding St. Munchin's identity with various holy men similarly named, but great doubts prevail with respect to the exact period when he lived. The best authorities on Irish ecclesiastical history seem to agree pretty generally, in calling the patron saint of Limerick the son of Sedna. From what we can learn, this parentage connects him apparently by birth, or at least by extraction, with the district in which Luiminech, so called by the old chroniclers, was situated.

Some writers believe St. Munchin of Limerick may be identical with a Mancenus,¹ who is reputed to have been a very religious man, and a master well versed in a knowledge of the Holy Scripture.² When Christianity had been first introduced by St. Patrick among the subjects of Amalgaid, King of Connaught, about A.D. 434,³ this Mancenus was placed as bishop over the people in that part of the country. Yet it does not seem probable, that such an efficient and a distinguished pastor had been called away from his own field of missionary labor to assume the charge of a See established at Limerick, long subsequent to the date of his appointment.

St. Munchin, called the son of Sedna, was grandson to Cas,⁴ and great-grandson to Conell of the Dalgais.⁵ He was nephew to Bloid, king of Thomond. Nothing more have we been able to collect regarding his education, pursuits, and preparation for his call to Holy Orders. Neither documentary fragments nor popular tradition aid our endeavours to clear up his personal history. It has been asserted, that St. Munchin, bishop of Limerick, built a church in the island of Fidh-Inis, which lies within the large estuary where the river Fergus enters the river Shannon. Here he is said to have lived for a long time; and it is thought possible, a St. Brigid,⁶ who was his kinswoman,⁷ may have lived there after he left it.⁸

¹ Mentioned by Jocelyn, "Sexta Vita S. Patricii," cap. lix., p. 78.

² See Colgan's "Trias Thaumaturga. Septima Vita S. Patricii." Lib. ii., cap. lxxxvii., p. 141.

³ See Ussher's "Britannicarum Ecclesiarum Antiquitates." Index Chronologicus, p. 517.

⁴ He is called Cassius Tail, the Dalcassian, by Colgan, in "Acta Sanctorum Hiberniæ," n. 24, p. 540. Oliol Olum, King of Munster, A.D. 125, is said to have divided his principality between his two sons. North Munster, including Limerick, fell to the lot of Cormack Cas, the younger. See Gough's Camden's "Britannia," vol. iii., p. 516.

⁵ This is borne out by the Genealogies of the Irish Saints. He is also associated with Limerick. See Colgan's "Acta Sanctorum Hiberniæ," xiv. Februarii. "Vita S. Mancheni," n. 4, p. 332.

⁶ Same notices of her occur in our Calendars at the 30th of September, presumably the day of her feast.

⁷ Her descent is traced through the same Dalcassian line.

⁸ See Colgan's "Acta Sanctorum Hiberniæ," viii. Martii, "Vita S. Senani," n. 24, p. 240, recte 236.

By the erudite local and modern historian¹ of Limerick, we are informed, that St. Patrick crossed the Shannon, near this city, and at a place called Sois Angel, now Singland. Not long ago there was a tower at this place. The holy well, with the stoney bed and altar of the Irish Apostle, may yet be seen there.² He is said to have had a vision of angels at this spot, and to have preached. Then we are told, that St. Manchin, a religious man, who had a complete knowledge of the Sacred Scriptures, was appointed by St. Patrick first bishop over Limerick. He also ruled spiritually, it is said, over the subjects of Amailgaid, King of Connaught. This prince, at the time, had been a recent convert to Christianity.³ Notwithstanding what has been so frequently asserted in reference to this matter, if, as appears probable enough, St. Patrick founded the See of Limerick, as also the Abbey of Mungret, and if he appointed a bishop over the former, most likely he would have selected a Dalcassian to hold the office, especially were one to be found capable and worthy to assume this responsible charge. So conflicting are the statements, however, and so unsatisfactory the evidence yet brought to light, that on such a subject it would be useless to hazard a conjecture, and it seems still more difficult to form even an opinion.

St. Manchinus, the disciple of St. Patrick, and who, from his proficiency in sacred erudition, has been surnamed "The Master," is said to have flourished about the year 460. He is, therefore, to be clearly distinguished from St. Manchin of Dysert Gallen, from St. Manchin of Mena Droichit, from St. Manchin of Mohill, from St. Manchin of Leth, as also from other holy men bearing this name, since all these latter are known to have lived at a much later period.⁴ There was another St. Manchin, who was a disciple of St. Deelan,⁵ of Ardmore, and who was only a boy at the time St. Patrick is supposed to have been at Limerick.⁶ It seems not unlikely, he may have been consecrated for the work of the ministry, and he might have been the first to preside over that church.

It is barely possible, but hardly probable, that Mainchin, or Munchin, of Limerick, can be identified with the learned Mainchin who presided over the monastery of Rosnat in

¹ Maurice Lenihan, Esq., M.R.I.A.

² See likewise Ferrar's "History of Limerick," Part I., chap. i., p. 4.

³ "We thus catch a glimpse," adds the historian, "through the dimness and obscurity of distant time, of the halo that encircled the name and character of Limerick." Lenihan's "History of Limerick," chap. i., p. 4.

⁴ See Colgan's "Acta Sanctorum Hiberniæ," xiv. Februarii. "Vita S. Mancheni." n. 6, p. 333.

⁵ He is mentioned in "Vita S. Declani," cap. xix.

⁶ *Ibid.*, n. 3, p. 332.

Britain,¹ and who was the Master of so many renowned saints. Yet the circumstances of time, of station, and of erudition, would not render this an extravagant supposition. This holy man, with one hundred and fifty of his disciples, has been invoked in the Litany of St. Ængus.² Yet, it seems difficult to assign his exact festival, owing as well to the confused orthographies, Munchin, Manchen, Mainchein, and Manchan, not to speak of Mansen, Manicheus, and other varied Latinized forms, with which we meet, as also to the great number of saints thus called, but whose festival days are not sufficiently distinguished by predicates in our Martyrologies.³

Certain writers confound St. Munchin of Limerick with St. Manchan of Menadrochid.⁴ Not alone are these places far apart, but the periods when both holy men flourished seem to mark a wide difference. St. Manchan of Menadrochid⁵ died A.D. 648, according to the Annals of the Four Masters. The Annals of Clonmacnoise record his demise at A.D. 649. Dr. O'Donovan regards this latter date even as antecedant to his dormition.⁶

The Annals of Ulster assign the death of Maencha, Abbot of Menadrochit, to A.D. 651. This place is now known as Monadrochid, a townland situated in the south end of Magh-Thuat, plain or parish of Offerilan. It lies about one mile north-east from Borris-in-Ossory, Queen's County.⁷

If St. Munchin of Limerick flourished in the time of St. Patrick, we must then fairly conclude he cannot be confounded with St. Mainchein, the Wise, or Manchene, Abbot of Menedrochaidh, who died A.D. 651,⁸ or 652.⁹

However, it is thought that St. Manchin of Limerick lived, at least two centuries, before that period, assigned by our Martyrologies to St. Manchen, Abbot of Menedrochit.¹⁰

¹ He is specially mentioned in the Acts of St. David, of St. Tighernach, of St. Enda, and of St. Modwenna.

² Num. 60.

³ It has been remarked by Colgan, that the various forms of this name are derivable from the Irish Manath, which means "a monk." These appellations, in many cases were substituted, it is thought, for cognomens, and thus they are probably, sometimes, read as proper names of saints. and sometimes as a characteristic of their profession. See Trias Thaumaturga. "Sexta Vita S. Patricii," n. 67, p. 101.

⁴ See Harris' Ware, vol. i. Bishops of Limerick, p. 503.

⁵ See "Annals of the Four Masters," vol. i., pp. 262, 263, and n. (n.)

⁶ Colgan thinks him to be identical with St. Manchein, the sage, of Dysart Gallen, and whose festival is kept on the same day.

⁷ There are still some ruins here, and his feast day is held on the 10th of September.

⁸ According to the "Annals of Ulster."

⁹ According to the "Anna's of Tighernach."

¹⁰ See Lenihan's "History of Limerick," chap. i., p. 5.

CHAPTER II.

ST. MUNCHIN AND ST. MOLUA REGARDED AS PATRON SAINTS OF THE THOMOND O'BRIENS.—ST. MUNCHIN IS SAID TO HAVE BEEN ABBOT OVER MUNGRET.—DESCRIPTIVE PARTICULARS OF THIS PLACE.—SISTERS OF ST. MUNCHIN.—ORIGIN OF THE CITY AND SEE OF LIMERICK.—ST. MUNCHIN SUPPOSED TO HAVE BEEN ITS FIRST BISHOP.

NOW, St. Munchin thus belonged, as tradition holds, to the blood royal of North Munster. St. Molua and he were regarded as tutelary saints of the Thomond O'Briens.¹ St. Munchin, called the son of Sedna,² is said to have been the first founder of Mungret Monastery, regarding which a curious legend has come down in popular tradition. Some maintain, that the Priory of Mungret, within the liberties of Limerick, was first founded by St. Patrick, in the fifth century.³ Other writers state, that St. Nessian was the founder of this Monastery, or at least its first Abbot. Hence, probably, the place derived its name in ancient times; for we are told it was formerly called the city of Deochain-assain.⁴ Whether before or after his appointment, as bishop of Limerick, is not stated; but, it has been thought, St. Munchin in the due course of time succeeded St. Nessian, as Abbot, over Mungret or Muingharid.⁵ This house or colony contained 1,500 monks:⁶ 500 of whom were devoted to preaching; 500 others were so classed and divided, as to have a perpetual full choir day and night; while the remaining 500 were old men, of exemplary piety, who devoted themselves to charitable and religious works.⁷ This statement seems to have been founded on a local tradition.

Mungret parish is situated partly within the liberties of Limerick, and partly in the barony of Pubblebrien. The river Shannon forms a part of its northern boundary.⁸ Although it has been stated, on the authority of "The Psalter of Cashel," that Mungret had formerly within its walls six churches, and contained, exclusive of scholars, 1,600 religious,⁹ yet, the ecclesiastical remains now left are very inconsiderable. There

¹ See O'Halloran's "History of Ireland," vol. ii., chap. ii., p. 97.

² Rev. Dr. Reeves identifies him with the patron Saint of Limerick. See a Paper read before the Royal Irish Academy, June 10th, 1861, on Augustin, an Irish writer of the seventh century.

³ See Ferrar's "History of Limerick," part iii., chap. 3, pp. 136, 186, 187.

⁴ According to Cormac MacCuillenan, in The Psalter of Cashel, as quoted in Gough's "Camden's Britannia," vol. iii., p. 519.

⁵ See Lenihan's "Limerick, its History and Antiquities," chap. liv., pp. 539, 540.

⁶ See an illustration, and some account of Mungret Priory, in Mr. and Mrs. Hall's "Ireland, its Scenery, Character," &c., vol. i., p. 361. This, however, is not a very ancient building.

⁷ See Ferrar's "History of Limerick," part iii., chap. 3, p. 186.

⁸ In the "Annals of the Four Masters," the name of this parish is *Munzkirac*. Dr. O'Donovan confesses himself unable to resolve its etymology.

⁹ See Gough's "Camden's Britannia," vol. iii., p. 519.

is an old church in the Irish style of the tenth century.¹ This is situated immediately to the left of the road, as you approach it from Limerick. On the inside, this church measures 41 feet in length by 23 feet in breadth. Considering its age, the walls are in good preservation.² The side walls are 2 feet 10 inches in thickness and 14 feet in height; they are built with good stones, cemented with excellent lime and sand mortar. The west gable is remarkably high and sharp at the point, while the east one is rendered obtuse, after the storms of ages. As usually the case, in old Irish churches, the doorway opens in the west gable. It is 6 feet 8 inches in height, while it is 3 feet 7 inches wide at the bottom, and it diminishes to 3 feet 4 inches at the top.³ A large breach in the south wall extends from the ground to the top of a round-headed window, which, excepting its top, has altogether disappeared. The east gable contains a rude round-headed window, placed at some height from the ground. On the inside it measures about 5 feet 10 inches in height, and 2 feet 8 inches in width; on the outside, it is about 3 feet 10 inches in height, and 1 foot 6 inches in width.⁴ The north wall is in very good preservation, but featureless; the south wall is a good deal injured, and besides the window already alluded to, it contained another, now reduced to a formless breach.⁵

According to tradition, little Kilrush⁶ is said to have been built by Rose, a sister of St. Munchin. Again, the Church of Killeely, in a parish of the same name, was dedicated to Lelia, also thought to have been a sister to St. Munchin.⁷ It adjoins Mungret parish. When the death of St. Munchin happened has not been ascertained with any degree of correctness. We are carelessly told, indeed, that St. Munchin, the first bishop of Limerick died in the year 652.⁸ No authority whatever is cited for such a statement.

¹ So states Dr. O'Donovan, who describes this parish. See Letters containing Information relative to the Antiquities of the county of Limerick, collected during the progress of the Ordnance Survey in 1840. Vol. i., pp. 33-34.

² This ruin, however, is only one of an interesting group.

³ It is built of Cyclopean masonry, and Dr. O'Donovan supplies a rough drawing of it.

⁴ Dr. O'Donovan gives a sketch of this window.

⁵ An account of the more modern abbey church, and some other ecclesiastical ruins in this parish, follows the foregoing, with the history of Mungret. See *ibid.* pp. 35 to 57. Among the Ordnance Survey Sketches, preserved in the R.I.A., there is a pencil sketch of this Abbey by William F. Wakeman, and taken in 1840.

⁶ This ancient church is said to resemble, in various particulars, that of Mungret. The residence of the Hon. Robert O'Brien, brother of Lord Inchiquin, adjoins it.

⁷ Lenihan's "Limerick, its History and Antiquities," chap. liv., pp. 542-543.

⁸ See Ferrar's "History of Limerick," part i., chap. 1, p. 4.

It is not considered probable, by Dr. Lanigan, that the patron saint of Limerick, St. Munchen or Manchin, had been a bishop over that see.¹ It has been remarked,² likewise, that we now find nothing related, respecting the successors of St. Munchin in the See of Limerick, before the times of those Pagan Ostmen, who held Limerick by force of arms, as they did other cities.³ We labour under like defects and disadvantages in reference to the early origin of many among our most celebrated towns and cities.

CHAPTER III.

ANTIQUITY OF THE SEE AND CATHEDRAL OF LIMERICK.—THE OLD CHURCH OF ST. MUNCHIN CONVERTED INTO A PARISH CHURCH.—ST. MUNCHIN'S CATHOLIC CHAPEL ERECTED.—FESTIVALS AND OFFICES OF ST. MUNCHIN.—CONCLUSION.

AN impenetrable mystery seems to shroud the history of the establishment of a See at Limerick, while the acts of its patron Saint and first bishop are involved in a maze of obscurity. Various writers have endeavoured to solve the problem presented, but they have been obliged to leave much for conjecture, and this has only tended the more to perpetuate uncertainty. Some writers make this city identical with the Regia found on the map of Ptolemy, the geographer. St. Munchin is thought to have been earliest bishop over Limerick,⁴ and he is traditionally said to have founded this see and a Cathedral there, called after his name.⁵

The first historian of this city, Ferrar, could not discover anything authentic concerning it, until about the middle of the ninth century.⁶ A still later history of the county and city of Limerick has been written by Rev. P. Fitzgerald and J. J. M'Gregor. These writers have acknowledged the obscurity in which the city of Limerick's original foundation is involved. The same historians state, that a manuscript⁷ belonging to the friars of Multifernam, designates Limerick as Rosse-de-hail-leagh.⁸ Although little be known regarding Limerick before

¹ See "Ecclesiastical History of Ireland," vol. ii., chap. xi., § iv., 53, p. 63.

² In Harris' Ware, vol. i., Bishops of Limerick, p. 503.

³ But in the tenth century, they were converted to the Christian religion. However, we hardly find any bishop in this see before *Gille* or *Gillebert*, who commenced to govern it about the beginning of the 12th century. See *ibid.*

⁴ See Ferrar's "History of Limerick," part iii., ch. ii., p. 170; and ch. iii., p. 186.

⁵ See Harris' "Ware," vol. i., Bishops of Limerick, p. 503.

⁶ See Ferrar's "History of Limerick," p. 3.

⁷ This, however, would not seem to have been the *Annales de Monte Fernandi*.

⁸ The *Annales de Monte Fernandi*, or *Annals of Multifernam*, edited by Dr. Aquilla Smith, have been published by the Irish Archæological Society. In these Annals, I cannot discover any allusion to Limerick under the foregoing name, as given in the text.

the Danes landed there, yet, its having been reputed the see of a bishop so early as the 7th century, furnishes some proof that it was a place of consequence at a very remote period.¹

But there can hardly be any question that the Church of Limerick had a continued succession of bishops from a very early date.² To St. Munchin the foundation of Limerick Cathedral has been generally assigned.³ From about the middle of the sixth century, Limerick appears to have held rank among the cities of Ireland.⁴ In the second Life of St. Senan, one Denson, called bishop of Limerick, is said to have attended the funeral of Iniscathy's first abbot;⁵ yet, it has been asserted, that there was neither a city nor a bishop of Limerick at this early period.⁶

St. Munchin's church in this city, is said by one writer to have been founded by St. Munchin about the year 630.⁷ It is thought to have been rebuilt by the Danes after their conversion to Christianity. St. Munchin's church continued to be this city's cathedral, until after the erection of St. Mary's church.⁸ Then it would appear to have been converted to a parish church, as the new building had been considered more convenient and appropriate for cathedral purposes.

It is situated at the north end of the English town.⁹ Little is however known regarding its subsequent history, until the year 1711, a time of great excitement in Limerick. Then the church was diverted from its original purposes. It received some additions and repairs, under the superintendence of the Protestant Bishop Smyth.¹⁰ This old church was a plain building, 86 feet in length by 23 in breadth. It was destitute

¹ See Ferrar's "History of Limerick," part iii., chap. i., pp. 149, 150.

² See Lenihan's "Limerick: its History and Antiquities," chap. liv. p. 544.

³ This continued tradition has been followed by Sir James Ware and his authorities, as also by all our ancient and modern writers. This was the Cathedral of Limerick See, until about the time of the English invasion, when St. Mary's Cathedral was founded by Donald O'Brien, king of Limerick. The Ostmen are said to have restored St. Munchin's church. See Lenihan's "Limerick: its History and Antiquities," chap. liv., p. 542.

⁴ See Mr. and Mrs. Hall's "Ireland: its Scenery, Character, &c.," vol. i., p. 325.

⁵ Colgan's "Acta Sanctorum Hiberniae," viii. Martii. Vita S. Senani, cap. xliii., p. 537 (*recte*) 533.

⁶ See Dr. Lanigan's "Ecclesiastical History of Ireland," vol. ii. chap. xi. iv. 33, p. 92.

⁷ See Ferrar's "History of Limerick," part i., chap. i., p. 4. Yet, in another place, its erection is assigned to A.D. 651. See *ibid.*, part iii., chap. I, p. 149.

⁸ See *ibid* note, p. 4. For a further account in reference to the parochial history of this rectory, see "Carlisle's Topographical Dictionary of Ireland," under the heading, LIMERICK.

⁹ See Lenihan's "Limerick, its History and Antiquities," chap. liv., p. 149.

¹⁰ See Lenihan's "Limerick: its History and Antiquities," chap. liv., pp. 542-543.

of any interesting object, except a fine monument of black and white marble, placed over the restorer's family vault.

The church, converted to Protestant purposes, received further improvements through the family exertions of Bishop Smyth. He died in 1725, and was interred in St. Munchin's Church. A gallery was erected, at the west end, in 1752. The rebuilding of this church was commenced by the Board of First Fruits, before A.D. 1827.

The site of St. Munchin's Church at the northern extremity of Limerick, is extremely agreeable; the church-yard is 630 feet in circumference, overhangs the river Shannon, and having the old town wall for its northern boundary. A pleasant elevated terrace walk extends along it, from which a view of Thomond Bridge, the river, and the county Clare may be obtained. The parish of St. Munchin contained 2,250 acres of cultivated land, and upwards of 300 of mountain heath and bog, in A.D. 1827. Part of the parish was then situated in the King's Island, the remainder in the city's north liberties, and in the adjoining barony of Bunratty, county Clare. St. Munchin's was one of the Prebends, in the gift of the bishop. It was an entire rectory, partly within the city, and partly within the county of the city, being united to the rectory of Killconygoyn, and to the rectory and vicarage of Killonchan.¹ In the year 1744, the Catholics of Limerick built a chapel near Thomond Bridge, on the north strand. This plain building was dedicated to St. Munchin.² According to present arrangements, the parish of St. Munchin forms a cure of souls apart from the Cathedral lately built, and in a style of great architectural beauty.

The festival of the patron, St. Munchin, is celebrated as a double of the first class, in Limerick city and diocese. However, De Burgo's "*Officia Propria Sanctorum Hiberniae*" contains no proper office of this saint, nor indeed does any other ritualistic collection. The Office and Mass for his festival are taken from those common to a bishop and a confessor, as found in the Roman Breviary and Missal.

In the anonymous catalogue of Irish Saints, published by O'Sullivan Beare,³ this Saint is set down as Munchinus, at the 1st day of January.⁴ Nor can we doubt but he is commemo-

¹ This whole benefice was valued in the King's books at £2 13s. 4d. There is a glebe house and garden in the parish of St. Munchin. See Fitzgerald's and McGregor's "*History, Topography, and Antiquities of the County and City of Limerick*," pp. 4, 556 to 558, and Addenda.

² See Ferrar's "*History of Limerick*," part iv., chap. i., page 196.

³ See Harris' "*Ware*, vol. i., *Bishops of Limerick*," p. 503, where a similar statement is to be found.

⁴ See "*Historiae Catholicae Iberniae Compendium*," tomus I., lib. iv., cap. xi., p. 49.

rated in Henry FitzSimon's list, under the name Monuchinus, although the day of his feast is not entered.¹ However, the prevailing practice at Limerick celebrates the Patron Saint's festival on the 2nd day of January. This appears, likewise, to have been the usage from time immemorial.

Another feast has been assigned to a St. Mainchin, conjecturally supposed by O'Clery to have been identical with this holy bishop of Limerick. It was held on the 29th of November.²

It is only in the Church of Christ true merit is recognised and worthily honoured. The world may disregard holy men, as our Blessed Saviour was once discredited and rejected by his chosen people. In a wordly sense, the saints never enjoyed ease or comfort; and this truth must be admitted by all Christians in whatever degree or rank they live and move. Yet, the pious servants of God find it a great happiness to lay securely the foundation of a spiritual life in discharging the highly responsible duties entrusted to them during life. Beyond that goal, the good bishops and pastors of the Church point out a true inheritance to their flocks, as Moses from Mount Nebo did the promised land to the children of Israel. Like that great leader and prophet too, they may rest in unknown graves,³ but their memories shall live in the recollection of a grateful people, even though the traditions of their age and personal characteristics may have perished in those places, once sanctified by their living presence.

DOCUMENT.

ILLUSTRISSIMI AC REVERENDISSIMI ANTISTITES.

Quod olim Sanctissimi Ecclesiae Patres ac praesertim magnus Constantinopolitanus Antistes Ioannes Chrysostomus praestiterunt contra iniquos vituperatores vitae regularis et monasticae; id vos, Reverendissimi ac Illustrissimi Praesules, eorum successores, eorumque vestigiis inhaerentes, summo consensu et apostolica sollicitudine ac libertate modo praestitistis: et qua editis in lucem pastoralibus litteris, qua oblati ad gubernii Ministros supplicibus libellis, causae nostrae defensionem, quantum in vobis erat, suscepistis. Atrox enim ac maxime luctuosum a pluribus annis excitatum est bellum in Ecclesiam Christi: eoque infensissimi hostes contendere videmus, ut, per

¹ See "Historiae Catholicae Iberniae Compendium," tom. i., lib. i., cap. xii., p. 56.

² See Drs. Todd's and Reeve's edition of the Martyrology of Donegal, pp. 350, 351. See likewise, notices regarding him at the same date.

³ See Deuteronomy, xxxiv.

summam vim deleto civili Sedis Apostolicae sacro principatu, divinam ipsam Romani Pontificis auctoritatem, atque adeo Ecclesiae universae constitutionem, si fieri unquam posset, omni arte ac conatu impetant et labefactent. Ad hoc autem facilius, uti putant, consequendum, omnes Religiosos Ordines, qui suis viventes legibus et Sanctae Sedi subiecti pro viribus in vinea Domini laborant ad divinae gloriae et fidei christianae propagationem et ad animarum pietatem et salutem procurandam, e medio tollere statuerunt; eosque propositis iniquis legibus, e propriis domiciliis exturbare, rebus bonisque omnibus expoliare, et in sanctioris vitae proposito multimodis vexare vel penitus impedire praesumunt.

Gravissima utique haec sunt mala, quae partim nobis inflicta, partim infligenda videmus. Sed in primis nos erigit et recreat, quod in tanta calumniarum colluvie, nihil quod rationem vitae nostrae, nihil quod ministeriorum exercitationem dedeceat, a persecutoribus rite probatum sit: deinde, quod SS. D. N. Pius PP. IX, quod Ecclesiarum Praesules et Antistites operam nostram, labores, ministeria accepta habeant, et conditionem hanc nostram tanta aegritudine deplorent, ut eam non mediocri damno sibi, et gregibus suis, et universae Ecclesiae futuram arbitrentur.

Haec profecto, quae singularis beneficii loco a vestra benevolentia suscipimus, Veneratissimi Praesules, haud mediocriter leniunt animum nostrum; nec satis verbis a perire possumus, quanto grati devotique animi affectu erga vos feramur. In vos itaque, Patres vigilantissimi, convertimus oculos; in vestram fidem ac patrocinium tuto confidimus; et Deum assiduis oramus precibus, ut quorum sapientia ducimur et voce commonemur, eorum etiam incitamento et exemplo ad fortiter pro Dei gloria et animarum salute decertandum, et ad graviora etiam mala pro iustitia et fide ferenda, sustentemur.

Interim dum maxima cordis effusione divinam bonitatem invocamus, ut eximiam in nos benevolentiam vestram, Antistites Reverendissimi, abunde remuneret; humiliter petimus, ut quos palam coram hominibus defendere non dubitastis, sanctis quoque precibus apud Deum in tribulatione nostra adiuvetis, qui debita grati animi et profundae venerationis significatione subscribimus

Romae 5 Junii 1873.

P. D. Albertus Passeri, Vic. Gen. Canonic. Lateranensium.

P. D. Franciscus M.^A Cirino, Vic. Gen. Cleric. Regul. Teatinorum.

P. D. Bernardinus Sandrini, Praep. Gen. Cleric. Regul. a Somasca.

P. Petrus Beckx, Praep. Gen. Societatis Iesu.

P. Iosephus M.^A Novaro, Vic. Gen. Cleric. Regul. Minorum.

P. Camillus Guardi, Vic. Gen. Cleric. Regul. Infirmis Ministrantium.

- P. Quiricus Quirici, Rector Gen. Congr. Matris Dei.
 P. Iosephus Calasactius Casanovas, Praep. Gen. Schol. Piarum.
 P. Dominicus a Mariae Nomine, Praep. Gen. Passionistarum.
 P. Nicolaus Mauron, Sup. Gen. Congr. SSmi Redemptoris.
 P. D. Andreas Torrielli, Vic. Gen. Doctrinariorum.
 P. D. Ioannes De Franciscis, Praep. Gen. Piorum Operariorum.
 P. Enricus Rizzoli, Director Gen. Congr. Pretiosissimi Sanguinis.
 P. D. Emmanuel Speranza, Sup. Gen. Congr. SS. CC.
 P. Iosephus Faa di Bruno, Rector Gen. Piae Societatis Missionum.
 Fr. Crispinus, (pro) Vic. Gen. Scholar. Christianarum.
 P. D. Angelus Pescetelli, Abbas Gen. Cassinensium
 D. Gregorius Benassai, Abbas Gen. Monac. Camaldulensium.
 D. Onuphrius Lepri, (pro) D. Maiore Eremitarum a Monte Corona.
 D. Stanislaus Battistoni, (pro) Gen. Vallumbrosan.
 D. Theobaldus Ab. Cesari, Sup. Gen. Cisterciensium.
 D. Fr. Regis, Ab. (pro) Abb. Gen. Trappistarum.
 D. Placidus M.^a Schiffino, Abb. Vic. Gen. Olivetanorum.
 D. Vincentius Corneli, Abb. Gen. Silvestrinorum.
 P. D. Bruno Vercelli, (pro) Priore Gen. Certosinorum.
 P. D. Alexander Balgy, (pro) Abb. Gen. Mechitarist. Vienn.
 P. Fr. Iosephus M.^a Sanvito, Vic. Gen. Praedicatorum.
 P. Fr. Bernardinus a Porto Gruaro, Min. Gen. Franciscanorum.
 P. Fr. Antonius M.^a Adragna, Vic. Gen. Min. Conventualium.
 P. Fr. Egidius a Cortona, Gen. Cappucinatorum.
 P. Fr. Franciscus Salemi, Vic. Gen. Tertii Ord. S. Francisci.
 P. Ioannes Bellomini, Gen. Augustinianorum.
 Fr. Aloisius a S. Iosepho, (pro) Vic. Gen. Augustin. Discalceat.
 P. Angelus Savini, Vic. Gen. Carmelitarum Antiq. Observ.
 P. Lucas a S. Ioanne a Cruce, Gen. Carmelitarum Discalceat.
 P. Ioannes Angelus Mondani, Gen. Servorum Mariae
 P. Clemens Consolani, Vic. Gen. Minimorum.
 P. Iosephus M.^a Rodriguez, Vic. Gen. Mercedarior.
 P. Antonius Martin, Vic. Gen. Trinitarior
 P. Benedictus a Virgine, Gen. Trinitar. Discalceat.
 P. Carmelus Paterniani, Gener. Ierolaminor.
 P. Ioannes M.^a Alfieri, Gen. FF. (vulgo) Fate bene Fratelli.
 P. Victorius Menghini, Gen. Ord. Poenitentiae.





BX 801 .I68 1872 SMC
The Irish ecclesiastical
record 47085658

Does Not Circulate

