

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE



3 1761 07096616 3

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





The Irish Ecclesiastical Record

A Monthly Journal under Episcopal Sanction

VOLUME XV

JANUARY TO JUNE, 1920

FIFTH SERIES

DUBLIN

BROWNE AND NOLAN, LIMITED, NASSAU STREET

1920

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

JUL 27 1957

Nihil Obstat :

TERENTIUS O'DONNELL, S.T.D.,
Censor Dep.

Imprimi potest :

✠ GULIELMUS,
Archiep. Dublinen.,
Hiberniae Primas.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XV

ARTICLES

	PAGE
Amusements Forbidden on Sundays	114
By Rev. David Barry	
Augustinians in New Ross, The	303
By John B. Cullen	
Chinese Missions, The Holy See and the Protectorate of the	468
By Rev. Myles V. Ronan	
Darkest Africa, A Bright Spot in	482
By Rev. T. A. Sullivan	
Descent and Selection: A Query	43
By Professor D. T. Barry, M.D., D.Sc.	
Dr. Murray of Maynooth	453
By Rev. E. J. Quigley	
Fermanagh, The Chieftains of	353
By Rev. Professor Paul Walsh, M.A.	
Free Church in a Free Europe, A	24
By Rev. Myles V. Ronan	
Happiness Considered as a Motive	1
By Right Rev. John S. Vaughan, D.D., Bishop of Sebastopolis	
'Hound of Heaven, The'	365
By Thomas P. Whelan	
Innishbofin and Innishark, History of	216
By Rev. John Neary	
Irish Missionaries, The Trials of Some (1600-1699)	122, 403
By Rev. James P. Rushe, O.D.C.	
'Living Remnant,' Cardinal Billot on the	9
By Rev. J. Donovan, S.J.	
Maynooth Mission to China, The	146
Modern Church Building and Furnishing	186, 282
By R. M. Butler, M.R.I.A., F.R.I.B.A.	
Nan-Hoai-Jen: Early Jesuit in China	197
By Rev. C. Aherne	
Our Silent Congregations	177
By Rev. J. J. M'Namee	
Philippine Catholics, The Sad Plight of the	89
By Rev. T. A. Murphy, C.S.S.R.	
Portugal, Some Recent Impressions of	265
By Rev. M. H. MacInerny, O.P.	
Post-Pentecostal Sunday Masses, The	396
By Rev. Edward Stephens	
Priory of St. John the Baptist, Newtown, Trim	105
By Very Rev. P. Callary, P.P., V.G.	

iv THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD

	PAGE
Rebellion of 1641, The Depositions about the	15
By J. B. Williams	
Relativity, The Principle of, and Einstein's Law of Gravitation	441
By Rev. Professor P. J. Browne, M.A., D.Sc.	
Resurrection of the Dead, Jewish Belief in the	380
By Rev. T. J. Agius, S.J.	
Roman Liturgy or Holy Mass, The	140
By Rev. Oswald Donnelly, C.P.	
Storm of Drogheda in 1649, Dr. Bernard's Narrative of the	370
By J. B. Williams	
Trim : A Site for a University in 1584	277
By Rev. Peter Byrne, C.M., LL.D.	

CONTRIBUTORS

AGIUS, REV. T. J., S.J.—Jewish Belief in the Resurrection of the Dead	380
AHERNE, REV. C.—Nan-Hoai-Jen : Early Jesuit in China	197
BARRY, REV. DAVID—Amusements Forbidden on Sundays	114
BARRY, D. T., M.D., D.Sc.—Descent and Selection : A Query	43
BROWNE, REV. P. J., M.A., D.Sc.—The Principle of Relativity and Einstein's Law of Gravitation	441
BYRNE, REV. PETER, C.M., LL.D.—Trim : A Site for a University in 1584	277
BUTLER, R. M., M.R.I.A., F.R.I.B.A.—Modern Church Building and Furnishing	186, 282
CALLARY, REV. P., P.P., V.G.—Priory of St. John the Baptist, Newtown, Trim	105
CULLEN, JOHN B.—The Augustinians in New Ross	303
DONNELLY, REV. OSWALD, C.P.—The Roman Liturgy or Holy Mass	140
DONOVAN, REV. J., S.J.—Cardinal Billot on the 'Living Remnant'	9
EATON, REV. M., B.D., B.C.L.—Liturgy	68, 245, 326, 502
KINANE, REV. J., D.C.L.—Canon Law	62, 238, 320, 495
MACINERNEY, REV. M. H., O.P.—Some Recent Impressions of Portugal	265
M'NAMEE, REV. J. J.—Our Silent Congregations	177
MURPHY, REV. T. A., C.S.S.R.—Sad Plight of the Philippine Catholics	89
NEARY, REV. JOHN—History of Innishbofin and Innishark	216
O'DONNELL, REV. M. J., D.D.—Theology	56, 229, 313, 489
QUIGLEY, REV. E. J.—Dr. Murray of Maynooth	453
RONAN, REV. MYLES V.—A Free Church in a Free Europe	24
— The Holy See and the Protectorate of the Chinese Missions	468
RUSHE, REV. JAMES P., O.D.C.—The Trials of some Irish Missionaries (1600-1699)	122, 403
STEPHENS, REV. EDWARD—The Post-Pentecostal Sunday Masses	396
SULLIVAN, REV. T. A.—A Bright Spot in Darkest Africa	482
VAUGHAN, RIGHT REV. JOHN S., D.D.—Happiness Considered as a Motive	1
WALSH, REV. PAUL, M.A.—The Chieftains of Fermanagh	353
WHELAN, THOMAS P.—'The Hound of Heaven'	365
WILLIAMS, J. B.—The Depositions about the Rebellion of 1641	15
— Dr. Bernard's Narrative of the Storm of Drogheda in 1649	370

NOTES AND QUERIES

Theology :

By Rev. Professor M. J. O'DONNELL, D.D.

Absolute or Conditional Forms ?	229
Banns	56
Bequest for Charitable Purpose	490
Dances	316
Domicile and Quasi-Domicile	317
Faculties, Interpretation of	313
Fasts	494
Funeral Offerings	317, 490
Honoraria and Depreciation of Currency	490
Penitential Jurisdiction in the Code	232
Recent Roman Replies	61, 229
Reservation, An American Discussion on	316
— Consequences of	313
Reserved Sins and Censures	494
Socialists and Excommunicates	235

Canon Law :

By Rev. Professor J. KINANE, D.C.L.

Abstinence, The Privilege regarding the use of Meat on one of two consecutive Days of	240
Attendance at Theatres	324
Can Illegitimates and Converts be admitted to a Religious Institute ?	66
Dispensing Power of Parish Priest	244
Ecclesiastical Property, Tenure and Alienation of	67, 238, 495
New Code of Canon Law, Some Decisions of the Pontifical Commission for the Interpretation of the	62
November Offerings, A Question in Connexion with	320
Professors in Seminaries and Masses for Deceased Benefactors	322
Religious Poverty, A Case of	241

Liturgy :

By Rev. M. EATON, B.D., B.C.L.

Arrangement of the Veil of the Chalice when Carrying to and from the Altar	326
Benediction of the Most Holy Sacrament, The Reverences to be made in giving	68
Church with Two Titulars, A	248
Colour of the Preacher's Stole on Special Occasions	326
Confraternity of the Children of Mary	502
— of the Holy Rosary	502
Crucifix during Benediction, The	326
Desecration of an Altar-stone, The	248
Double-faced Vestments, The Use of	248
Enthronement of the Sacred Heart, The Blessing of Pictures and Exsequial Service impeded by the Rubrics, Case of the	502
	505

NOTES AND QUERIES—*continued.*

Feast of a Titular in relation to the Reformed Rubrics of the Breviary	71
Hospital Ward, Liccity of Mass in a	505
Hour for Celebration of Mass, The	326
Linen and Lace Albs, The Use of	326
Litany of the Blessed Virgin Mary, The Invocation ' Regina Pacis ' of the	245, 331
Name of the Ordinary in the Canon of the Mass, The	69
Reconciliation of a Convert, The Use of the Stole in the	69, 250
Repainting of the Crosses in a consecrated Church	505
Should the Anticipated Sunday Mass have the ' Credo ' ?	69
Sub-Deacons at a High Mass, Professed Religious and the Privilege of Acting as	69
Veil for the Monstrance	250
— on Tabernacle of a Side-Altar	326
Votive Mass of the Sacred Heart, The	330
Way of the Cross, The Indulgences of the	505

CORRESPONDENCE

Ecclesiastical Sculpture	149
------------------------------------	-----

DOCUMENTS

Abba Ghebre Michael, Priest of the Congregation of the Mission of St. Vincent de Paul, Decree for the Beatification and Declaration of Martyrdom of the Servant of God	517
African Missions, Letter from the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith prescribing a Collection on behalf of the	345
Apostolic Letter to Cardinal La Fontaine, Patriarch of Venice	166
— — to Rev. Octavis Marchetti, S.J., of the School of Ascetic-Mystical Theology in the Gregorian University	257
— — to the Illustrious D. Herbert Hoover, appraising the Work initiated by him on behalf of the starving Children of Europe	258
Bishops, Doubts regarding certain Privileges, Insignia, and Functions of, solved by the Congregation of Rites	521
Blessed Gabriel of the Congregation of the Passion, Decree regarding the Solemn Canonization of	424
— Joan of Arc, Decree regarding the Solemn Canonization of	424
— Mary Alacoque, Decree regarding the Solemn Canonization of	424
Boundaries of certain Parishes, Decision of the Holy Roman Rota fixing the	157
Cardinal Mercier is nominated President of the ' Pia Unio Cleri ' for all Belgium	428
Choral Service in the Case of certain Members of the Cathedral Chapter, Doubt regarding the Interpretation of a Canon of the Code regulating the obligation of	425

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XV

vii

PAGE

Christmas Day and All Souls' Day, Doubts regarding the Masses to be Celebrated on, in certain contingencies	429
East Indies, A New Diocese is erected in the	79
Exsequial Rite as prescribed in the Roman Ritual in certain circumstances, Doubts regarding the Obligation of the	509
Florentine Temple ' S. Maria Novella ' is raised to the dignity of a Minor Basilica, The	165
Fortunatus Redolfi, Priest of the Congregation of Regular Clerics of St. Paul, Decree concerning the Beatification and Canonization of the Servant of God	154
Institute of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul and of the Ursuline Order, Decree for the Beatification and Declaration of Martyrdom of many Servants of God, Members of the	163
' Inter Reliquas ' (June 15, 1919), Doubt regarding the Interpretation of the Decree, in the case of certain Congregations and Religious Institutes	434
Ireland, Letter of His Eminence Cardinal Logue to the Archbishops and Bishops of	252
Irish Hierarchy, Pronouncement of the, at a General Meeting held at Maynooth, January 27	150
Japan, An Apostolic Delegation is established in, and to it is also committed the care of Corea and the Island of Formosa	430
Joachima de Vedruna de Mas, Foundress of the Institute of the Carmelite Sisters of Charity, Decree for the Beatification and Canonization of the Servant of God	431
Latin America and the Philippines, Indult regarding Fast and Abstinence in	75
' Les faits de Loublande,' The Holy Office decides that the work entitled, cannot be approved	509
Lists of Feasts suppressed in the Universal Church	340
Litany of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Doubt regarding the validity for Indulgences of certain Methods of Chanting the	153
Mass Honoraria, Decision of the Sacred Congregation of the Council in a case connected with	338
Missions of China and the neighbouring Kingdoms, Decree regarding the Nomination of an Apostolic Vicar for the	80
New Parisian Temple erected in Montmartre, and Dedicated to the Sacred Heart, receives the Title of a Minor Basilica and is granted Privileges	76
Pontifical Commission for the Interpretation of the Canons of the New Code, replies to a number of proposed Difficulties	72
Public Funds, Decision of the Holy Roman Rota in a case connected with the Administration of	511
Rome, A New Parish under the title of the Blessed Virgin Mary of Good Counsel is erected in	253
— Another Parish under the Title of All Saints is erected near the Appian Way, outside St. John's Gate	255
— Sermon of the Holy Father to the Parish Priests and Lenten Preachers of	332
Schismatical Union of certain Bohemian Priests is condemned, A	344
Trent, The Diocese of, is separated from the Ecclesiastical Province of Salsburg, and immediately subjected to the Holy See	510

	PAGE
Uganda, Decree for the Beatification or Declaration of Martyrdom of the Venerable Servants of God, Charles Lwanga, Mathias Morumba, and their Associates of	434
Vicar-Delegate, Power is given to Vicars and Prefects Apostolic to nominate a	427
Wearing of a Beard, Decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Council defining the Law for the Secular Clergy in regard to the	341

REVIEWS AND NOTES

- ‘Catholic Soldiers,’ 168 ; ‘Christian Social Crusade, A,’ 170 ; ‘Conferences for Men,’ 176 ; ‘Dona Christi,’ 263 ; ‘English Catholics in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth,’ 438 ; ‘Essays on Poetry,’ 83 ; ‘Father Maturin,’ 350 ; ‘Father William Doyle, S.J.,’ 437 ; ‘From Dust to Glory,’ 262 ; ‘Gray Nuns in the Far North, The (1867-1917),’ 527 ; ‘In an Indian Abbey—Some Straight Talks on Theology,’ 172 ; ‘Ireland in Fiction—A Guide to Irish Novels, Romances, and Folklore,’ 347 ; ‘Le Christ, Vie de l’Ame,’ 81 ; ‘Patriot Priest, A,’ 349 ; ‘Preaching,’ 261 ; ‘St. Bernard’s Sermons on the Canticle of Canticles,’ 525 ; ‘St. Joan of Arc,’ 173 ; ‘Science and Morals,’ 174 ; ‘Soldier’s Confidences with God, A,’ 171 ; ‘Story of Hildebrand, The,’ 260 ; ‘Wife’s Story, A—Journal of Elizabeth Lesure,’ 86 ; Books, etc., received, 88, 176, 264, 352, 440, 528.

HAPPINESS CONSIDERED AS A MOTIVE

BY THE BISHOP OF SEBASTOPOLIS

ALMIGHTY GOD has not only commanded us to obey His Law, and to be 'perfect, as also our Heavenly Father is perfect' (Matthew v. 48), but He has greatly assisted us in the fulfilment of this task, and made it comparatively easy, by threatening the most appalling punishments upon those who neglect their duty, and by promising inconceivably great rewards to those who love and obey Him faithfully. These two motives are, no doubt, of immense power in themselves, but the help which we actually derive from them will, of course, depend upon the amount of attention which we bestow upon them, and on the greater or less vividness with which we are able to keep them before our minds.

The thought of the dreadful punishment of sin, and of the eternity of atrocious agony awaiting the impenitent breakers of God's Law, does, most certainly, exercise a very strong and a very wide influence, and restrains millions and millions from evil, but the question, which we wish to ask, is : Does the ordinary and average Christian make sufficient use of the other motive, which, after all, is a much higher and a much worthier one ? Does he bear in mind and ponder over as he should the marvellously generous manner, in which God rewards His 'good and faithful servants' ?

So far as our observation extends, we should say that this most powerful motive is very much neglected, and that its influence on men's lives and conduct is nothing like what it might be, and ought to be.

Anyone, even with but a slight acquaintance with the world, will realize that nothing so attracts a man as pleasure and the prospect of happiness. In fact, man is made for happiness, and what is more, he seeks it unintermittently and most assiduously to the very end of his life ; although it must be admitted he generally seeks it where it is by no means to be found. For the sake of a little worldly pleasure or

satisfaction man will exert himself to the utmost. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that this indiscriminate thirst for pleasure and self-gratification is the source of the greatest number and of the most deadly sins and crimes that are committed in the world. To take a single instance. It is the deliberate opinion of both Saints and theologians, that sensuality, or sins of the flesh, are the most prevalent of all deadly sins; in fact, some (as St. Alphonsus, for example) are fully persuaded that more souls are lost through sins of impurity—not merely than through any other class of sins, but than through all other classes of sins united. And this, of course, means that vast numbers of reasonable men (or at all events, men *endowed with reason*) are so strongly attracted by even these low and unclean pleasures that, in order to gratify their lusts, they are ready to face not only disgrace, remorse, and the anger of God, but even hell itself.

It is the same, in a lesser degree, of other earthly pleasures. Consider, for instance, what power the mere prospect of pleasure exercises over men, when it presents itself in the form of wealth, honours, dignities, position, influence, and the rest. How it attracts, allures, fascinates and seduces, and takes possession of their whole being; how it influences and sways and controls them, and sets their very hearts on fire. Now, let us ask, if the weak, sordid and wholly inadequate pleasures that this world contains can wield such influence and exercise such a thralldom, and arouse such fierce passions, what *an immeasurably greater influence* would be produced by the infallible promise of those infinitely superior delights which God has in store for those who do His will, if only men would consider them and call them to mind.

If there be infidels who do not believe in any future life, and who imagine that all ends with this, well, we are not addressing such. No; we are thinking of Catholics, who most firmly believe and openly confess their unwavering faith in the truths of revelation, and who therefore should be extremely sensitive to their influence.

If man is prepared to do and to suffer so much for purely earthly happiness, what should he not be ready to do and to suffer for a happiness which is incomparably greater? There are three considerations, in particular, which seem to prove to us how extraordinarily and exceptionately great this happiness must be.

The first consideration is that God, whose very nature

is LOVE (*Deus Caritas est*), is far more eager to reward the good than to punish the wicked. If, then, as we are assured, the punishments of sin are immeasurably above and beyond anything of which we have any experience or conception in this world, still more must the rewards of virtue in the next world exceed all our experience and conception in this.

The second consideration is that all happiness must be greater or less according to the nature and character of the source from which it springs. Now, all earthly happiness arises from some *finite and created* object, such as wealth, beauty of form, health, bodily vigour, mental endowments, troops of friends, the admiration and esteem of men and so forth, whereas the essential happiness of Heaven springs, not from anything created or finite, however admirable and magnificent, but from the secure possession and enjoyment of the *Infinite and Uncreated* God. Therefore, etc.

The third consideration is based upon what theologians teach us as regards the Pain of Loss. After describing, in the strongest terms, the unparalleled fierceness of the ravening flames, the stench, the darkness, the narrow confinement, the abominable company, the ghastly sights, the remorse and despair, and a multitude of other horrors suffered by the damned, they conclude by remarking that all this, multiplied a hundred times over, is as nothing compared to the torment that arises from the loss of God. Compared with this infinite loss, hell itself is but a trifle. Nay, cries out the eloquent St. Chrysostom, 'compared with this loss, *a thousand hells would be as nothing*' ('Si mille, quis ponat gehennas, nihil tale dicturus est, quale est a beatae illius gloriæ honore repelli').

Then we may well ask ourselves, if *the mere absence*, the mere privation of God can cause a greater agony than all hell's other torments united, what must be the delirium of joy arising from the full possession and fruition of Him, securely ensured for ever and for ever? No man in this life has seen God at any time. No man *can* see God and live. Even the most favoured of the Saints must be content to wait until they reach Heaven to contemplate the divine essence, in all its unveiled splendour and beauty.¹ For now, they could not endure so immense a joy. Some of the more favoured amongst the Saints, however, have been given at times some dim and faint reflection of His divine presence

¹ 'Si desideras scire quis est Deus, desideras ut sis Deus, quod non decet. Solus Deus seipsum scit vel scire potest'—(*Incendium Amoris*, pp. 161-2, by R. Rolle).

in their soul, even while on earth ; but even this, they tell us, has filled them with a wholly indescribable happiness far beyond what the world can give, yet infinitely short, of course, of that which awaits them hereafter. Thus St. Teresa, after describing certain wonderful favours which she received from our Divine Lord, and which threw her into a sort of ecstasy, goes on to say :—

Hither let worldings come with their riches and Lords with their pleasures, honours and trinkets ; for even though they could enjoy all these without the troubles that inevitably follow them (which is impossible), yet *they could not in a thousand years enjoy the pleasure which, in one moment, a soul possesses* which Our Lord has brought to this state.¹

If such a mere passing whiff of the heavenly banquet enjoyed by the Blessed in the Home of the Father be so satisfying and so exhilarating, what must be the joy of sitting down at that banquet where ‘they shall be inebriated with the plenty of God’s house, and shall drink of the torrent of His pleasure’ ? (Psalm xxxv. 9). God is a veritable ocean of delights, fathomless and inexhaustible. If, then, one single tiny drop from that boundless ocean can so charm and entrance the heart, that it almost breaks from the excess of its joy, what must it be to plunge entirely and, as it were, to lose oneself in its infinite depths !

There can be no doubt but that God, Who has created the human soul for Himself, and Who knows exactly the marvellous capacities with which He has endowed it, has fashioned a Home for His beloved so absolutely perfect, so exquisitely suitable, and so inconceivably beautiful and glorious, that the mere thought of ever entering into it almost takes away one’s breath.

Just call to mind all the sources of mere human happiness. Draw the most glowing picture possible of every form of earthly delight. Exhaust your powers of intellect and give your imagination unlimited room to roam over the length and the breadth of the earth, in search of fresh springs of pleasure, and then meditate on the verdict of the Saints, who have known God as we can never know Him in this life. For instance, attend to and carefully weigh the solemn declaration of the great St. John of the Cross. In Volume II, page 57, of his complete works, we read : ‘ If the soul had *but one single glimpse* of the grandeur and beauty of God, it would not only desire to die once in order to behold Him,

¹ *The Way of Perfection*, p. 255.

but would endure *joyfully a thousand most bitter deaths* to behold Him even *for a moment*, and, having seen Him, would suffer as many deaths over again in order to see Him for another moment.'

If the promise of such happiness cannot check man's tendency to commit sin; if the fear of forfeiting, and for ever, such an eternity of bliss be insufficient to restrain his evil desires, then what manner of man must he be! Either he must have no faith, or else no realization of the most fundamental truths of his religion.

Even in this world the greatest human happiness is to be found in friendship and mutual love. As the poet says: 'There is nothing half so sweet in life as love's young dream.' Love makes all things easy, and sweetens even the bitterest toil. Thus we read in the Bible that 'Jacob served seven years for Rachel; and they seemed but a few days because of the greatness of his love' (Genesis xxix. 20).

When a young man, of noble character, pure, generous and in perfect bodily and mental health and vigour, becomes engaged to one in all respects equal to him, and gifted with every attribute which should adorn a bride, he has probably reached the highwater mark of purely human happiness. And this is because the sexes are made for one another and because God has so disposed things that the male is drawn towards the female, and the female towards the male, and each finds his complement in the other.

But after all this natural union, so redolent of happiness, is but the faintest and most inadequate reflection or shadow of an infinitely higher, holier, more sublime, and *wholly spiritual* union, resulting likewise in an infinitely more intense love and happiness, namely, the union between the purified soul of man and its God. It may seem a very bold comparison, but it is the very comparison selected by the Holy Spirit, so there is not the slightest reason for not employing it.

In that wonderful Canticle of Solomon, inspired throughout by the Holy Ghost, God is represented as the Spouse of the faithful soul. So soon as ever she has shuffled off this mortal coil, and is fitted and made ready for her sublime reward, God invites her to the nuptials: 'Arise, make haste, my love, my dove, my beautiful one, and come. For winter [the winter of this cold life] is now past, the rain [the rain of trial and temptation] is over and gone. The flowers [flowers of heavenly joys and delights] have appeared

in our land' (Canticle of Canticles ii. 10-12). All commentators admit that the Bridegroom here referred to is no other than God Himself. So again, in the New Testament (Matthew xxv. 1), the Kingdom of Heaven is compared to ten virgins, who go forth to meet the Bridegroom. 'At midnight there was a cry: Behold, the Bridegroom cometh, go ye forth to meet Him. And they that were ready, went in with Him to the marriage and the door was shut.'

Here then, again, God comes before us as the divine Bridegroom. It is, of course, true that our conceptions of the next world are strongly coloured by our experiences of this, and they often set us entirely wrong. Thus, we are apt to picture God to ourselves, as we might picture an earthly sovereign, who is hardly approachable, who stands aloof from his subjects, and who is never seen but at a respectful distance. His courtiers may, indeed, gather around him, but it is in awe and trembling, while they never expect to be treated familiarly or with close personal affection and intimacy. The truth is, that *no earthly king can* so multiply his presence as to devote much of his time and attention to each and every one of his subjects.

But God's position is wholly different. He can and does give Himself unreservedly to each of the Blessed, just as though no other creature existed. So that even the very last and least in the Kingdom of Heaven may exclaim with absolute confidence and truth: 'My Beloved to me, and I to Him' (Canticle of Canticles ii. 16). Nor will this surprise us so very much when we consider how His Divine Majesty treats us, *even in this, the land of our exile*. We have but to consider what takes place in Holy Communion, and how He associates Himself and unites Himself with the soul of every devout communicant. Père Grou, S.J., first quotes the verse: 'He that eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him.' He then goes on to say: 'This indwelling is the closest and most intimate that can be conceived; it is a union of Jesus Christ with us and of us with Him, which is such that nothing in nature can approach it. His body is united to our body. His Soul to our soul; His faculties and all His operations to our faculties, in such a supernatural and transcendent manner that Jesus Christ lives in us and we in Him; our thoughts, our feelings, and our actions become identified with His thoughts, His feelings, and His actions.'¹

¹ *Manual for Interior Souls*, p. 359.

Now, it stands to reason that if Our Lord does so much for us, even here, there can be no doubt whatsoever but that He will do, not only as much, but immeasurably more for us, when we have proved our worth, and won our spurs, and have received the Crown of eternal glory in Heaven. Although even here, in the Blessed Sacrament, the union between the soul and God in Holy Communion is extraordinarily close, in fact, as Père Grou says, ‘*the closest and most intimate that can be conceived,*’ yet it is absolutely hidden, and known to faith alone; whereas in the next world we shall actually see and feel, and know and fully realize, with the utmost vividness, the (at present unimagined) delights of that mysterious union. And that fact will just make all the difference. The more fully we are able to realize the infinite majesty of God, the grander and therefore the truer will be our conception of the ineffable happiness of Heaven. And as our knowledge grows so will grow our love, *pari passu*. For God being the infinitely perfect and the infinitely beautiful, it follows that to know Him is to love Him, and to know Him more perfectly is to love Him yet more intensely, and so on and on and on *ad indefinitum*.

Furthermore, as this love of God increases the fear of Him diminishes, and finally disappears altogether, as the shadows of night flit away before the rising sun. For ‘perfect charity casteth out fear,’ as St. John reminds us (1 John iv. 18). Then even death will be shorn of its terrors, and will assume an attractive mien. It will always, no doubt, seem a dark passage, but it will be longed for as a passage that leads into a Paradise of perfect joy, where the heavenly Bridegroom is awaiting His chosen bride.

Thus, then, there is no bitterness in death to the soul that loves [writes St. John of the Cross], when it brings with it all the sweetness and delights of love. There is no sadness in the remembrance of it, when it opens the door to all joy. The thought of it is not painful and oppressive, when it is the end of all unhappiness and sorrow and the beginning of all good. Yea, the soul looks upon it as a friend and as its bride, and exults in the recollection of it as the day of espousals. It yearns for the day and the hour of death, more than the kings of the earth for principalities and kingdoms. . . . It is not without cause that the soul is bold to say: ‘Let the vision of Thy beauty kill me’; for it knows well that in the instant of that vision it will be itself absorbed and transformed into that beauty, and be made beautiful like it, enriched, and abounding in beauty as that beauty itself. ‘Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His Saints’ (Ps. cxv. 15). But that could not be so, if they did not become

partakers of His greatness, for there is nothing precious in the eyes of God except that which He is Himself, and therefore the soul, when it loves, fears not death, but rather desires it.¹

Père Grou, S.J., expresses the same idea, though in somewhat different words, when he writes :—

As the love of God is their principal and indeed their only employment here, they see in the passage from this life only a happy change, which will assure to them the possession of God and the ineffable bliss of loving Him for all eternity. It is not that they have a positive assurance of their salvation, but they have a firm faith and trust in God, and their conscience bears witness to their constant fidelity to Him.²

Our conclusion, then, is, that if we wish to be really happy in life, and still more happy in death, and supremely happy for all eternity in Heaven, we must do our best to increase more and more in the love of God. 'We should strive continually to increase our love. All our intentions, all our actions, must tend to this end, and we should make it the object of all our prayers and practices of piety. To pray ; to frequent the Sacraments ; to exercise works of charity ; to suffer all the pains and sorrows of this life, solely with the view of increasing in us this holy love ! That, indeed, is to love God with all our strength.' To gain that love is to gain all that is worth having both for time and for eternity.

✠ JOHN S. VAUGHAN.

¹ Vol. ii, pp. 59, 60.

² Op. cit. p. 246.

CARDINAL BILLOT ON THE 'LIVING REMNANT'

BY REV. J. DONOVAN, S.J.

CARDINAL BILLOT, in one of his masterly series of studies which have been appearing these last two years in the *Études*, contributes an argument on the 'Living Remnant' of 1 Thessalonians iv. 15, which well deserves consideration. The argument is that of an acute theological thinker, an expert in the subtlest processes of eliciting evidence from our sacred books, accustomed to appeal from text to context and to utilize every available clue in the search after meaning.

His Eminence's first care is to define clearly St. Paul's purpose in composing the famous pericope on the parousia. St. Paul's thesis may be gathered from his own words; and we get our orientation from the somewhat abrupt introduction: 'We would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning them that are asleep.'

Be it observed, in passing, how vivid must have been faith in the resurrection in the minds of those who apparently spoke habitually of their deceased brethren, not as dead but as 'sleeping.' This use of the word became so general that the last resting-place was subsequently called a 'dormitory' or *κοιμητήριον*, with which nowadays we are familiar under the name of cemetery.

The precise nature of the ignorance, to which reference is made above, is not directly stated; but, as Cardinal Billot points out, it may be gathered from the remark immediately following, and from the general trend of the theme discussed. It would seem that some at least of the Thessalonian neophytes fancied their dead would somehow miss the pageant of the parousia; that, being in their tombs, the dead could have no part in the triumph of the second advent. They were, most probably, acquainted with what we read in St. Matthew's Gospel (xxiv. 30, 31): 'The Son of man coming on the clouds of heaven shall send forth His angels

. . . and they shall gather together the elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.' This picture would be before their minds, but they seem to have understood it as being applicable only to the living. And thus they were grief stricken over the fate of the departed.

Such erroneous views, doubts, misgivings, it is manifestly the Apostle's intention to dispel: 'that you may not sorrow like the rest who have no hope.' The vast masses of the pagan world, seated in darkness, who turn deaf ears to the Gospel message—they may be suffered to grieve over their dead, because to them death is the end of all things. Their horizon is bounded by the shadows of death. Not so the Christian, who inherits from Christ the privilege of a glorious resurrection; the horizon of his hope extends indefinitely beyond the confines of death. 'If we believe,' the Apostle continues, 'that Jesus died and rose again, so,' most assuredly, 'will He bring with Him those who went to sleep in the Lord.'

Participation in the glory of the Lord's triumphant return is assured to all *κοιμηθέντες διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*—to such as went to their rest, by the assistance, i.e., through the instrumentality of Christ. Thus St. Paul takes a first step towards dissipating doubt and consequent sadness, by recalling to his converts the resurrection to glory of the elect—a resurrection which is at once their special prerogative and also their sure pledge of a share in the splendour of the parousia.

Here we have a first measure of solace presented to the weeping neophytes.

With this preamble, the Apostle next proceeds to advance a second statement which seems to constitute the special thesis, and is by some regarded as the principal message of the whole Epistle. It is to the effect that the living remnant at the great day of Assize will not have precedence over the dead. As Prat puts it: 'St. Paul's real purpose in writing is, to correct the false idea which these Thessalonians entertained concerning the (supposed) inferiority of deceased Christians in comparison with the living.' This is the theme St. Paul now sets himself to develop; this is the lesson, the special message, to be driven home and impressed on the mind of his readers, as an antidote to 'the sadness of them that have no hope.' His main contention does not touch, neither is it concerned with, the date of the parousia. Indeed, the question of date or time is explicitly repudiated

later on as wholly foreign to his present purpose. All he is here contending for is the negation of precedence on the part of the living over the dead, amid the grandeur and solemn pomp of the parousia.

The thesis of this Pauline passage is clearly set forth by Cardinal Billot as follows :—

The glorious resurrection of those who died in the faith and charity of Christ is the necessary consequence of Christ's own resurrection. Hence there are no grounds for bewailing their lot, as though, from the dust of the tomb, they were not to be restored to a happy immortality. That is his [Paul's] first point. His second follows, to wit, that the living residuum, at the last day, will have no advantage over the dead, as regards participation in the glory of the parousia. For the 'sleepers' shall awaken from their sleep unto immortal life; whereas the living remnant shall enter by rapid change, admitting of no lasting pause, into life eternal; and then all together, all at the same time—living remnant and 'sleepers' innumerable—shall be borne away to meet their Lord, from whom henceforth they shall never be separated. Such is the teaching of St. Paul, who combated and eliminated the false idea held by his neophytes on the subject of the dead.

Proof of the thesis propounded is a brief and simple statement of the course events will follow on the great day of the Lord. Are they to be interpreted literally or as symbols? The answer is God's secret, as Father Prat wisely observes. At any rate two tableaux are presented: first, that of the dead rising again and being restored to life; and secondly, that of the living remnant rapidly hurried away, and both together ushered into the glorious presence of their King.

'At the word of command, at the sound of the Archangel's voice, at the trumpet call of God, the Lord shall descend from heaven.' This solemn descent in power and majesty is the prelude to awe-inspiring manifestation of might. 'And the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we that shall be alive, that shall be left, shall together with them be caught up in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord.'—*Καὶ οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστήσονται πρῶτον· ἔπειτα ἡμεῖς—οἱ ζῶντες—οἱ περιλειπόμενοι . . . ἁρπαγησόμεθα.*

Two parallel statements introduce on the scene two classes of persons having an equal share in the parousia. These two statements are rendered by means of a special literary device of balance and parallelism, particularly affected by Greek littérateurs. Blass has remarked that St. Paul was a master of Greek prose; the balance,

harmonious structure, and sonorous endings of his periods, did not escape the notice of this Demosthenic critic.

The sentence quoted furnishes a good instance of chiasmus, and thus provides us with absolutely safe means of picking out the contrasted or paralleled words. It is seen at once that *ἔπειτα* corresponds to *πρῶτον*; *οἱ ζῶντες, οἱ περιλειπόμενοι* balance against *οἱ νεκροί*; and the word which precisely corresponds to *ἐν Χριστῷ* is *ἡμεῖς*.

The chiasmic schema makes the above parallelism absolutely certain. Let us now scrutinize each statement and each class of persons separately. As Cardinal Billot has already performed this task, his words may be quoted here.

First as regards the dead (*οἱ νεκροί*), who are they? Evidently not absolutely all indiscriminately, not all lying in the earth at the second coming. Among these are many destined to the resurrection of damnation; whereas Paul has in mind those who rise again unto life and unto eternal glory. Hence St. Paul is not speaking of the dead universally—the countless millions who will then have gone before to join the great majority. He is speaking only of *οἱ νεκροί ἐν Χριστῷ* or of *οἱ κοιμηθέντες διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*—those who went to their repose *in Christ*. In this way does he designate the elect, the predestined. These alone, in the words of the Apostle, are spoken of as ‘rising first.’ These then are the first category mentioned as sharing in the glories of the *parousia*.

And the living remnant left on earth at the great day, and mentioned as also sharing in the triumph—who are they? At any rate they are represented as a remainder, shall we say, an insignificant number in comparison with the numberless multitudes who once peopled this earth and passed away. Should this ‘living remnant’ be regarded as the *total* population of the globe still left at the time when the first premonitory symptoms herald the great day of Assize? Assuredly not; for among them are to be found impenitent sinners, unbelievers, reprobate, who, far from being borne heavenwards will be left behind at the universal cataclysm.

‘As were the days of Noah,’ so spoke the Lord (Matt. xxiv. 37-41), ‘so shall be the coming of the Son of man. For as in those days, which were before the flood, they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered the ark, and they knew not until the flood came and took them all away; so shall be the coming of the Son of man.‡ Then shall *two men be in the field; one is taken and one is left: two women shall be grinding at the mill, one is taken and one is left.*’

Such is the separation of living from living at the world’s last hour. No more than there was question of the universality of the dead in the previous clause, is there here question of the universality of the living in the exactly parallel words *οἱ ζῶντες, οἱ περιλειπόμενοι*. Hence the clamant need for some qualifying determinative which shall supplement the sense parallelism, as it will complete the

parallelism of structure. Thus one desiderates the necessary parallel to *ἐν Χριστῷ*, that shall convey the notion of elect and predestined. The necessary condition of election, implied in the words *ἐν Χριστῷ*, is just as requisite in the case of the living remnant who are to be admitted to the glorified presence of the Redeemer. In other words, both structural similarity and verbal correspondence demand a qualifying determinative to *οἱ ζῶντες* of meaning analogous to *ἐν Χριστῷ*. Where is this determinative to be found? Precisely in the word *ἡμεῖς*, which must bear the required meaning. Thus in the incriminated pronoun of the first person—the great prop of Rationalist pretensions—we find the exact analogue to *ἐν Χριστῷ*. And both structure and sense evince this meaning. Just as *ἐν Χριστῷ νεκροί* designates the Christian dead who died in the grace and charity of Christ, so must *ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες* mark the Christian living entitled to union with Christ in eternity, because they were united to Him in time.

And thus, by another road, we get back to the corporate or generic *ἡμεῖς*, which Cardinal Billot illustrates as follows:—

If I, who am a Frenchman [his Eminence wrote before the armistice], were to say that *we* have just won a second battle of the Marne, nobody would dream that I represent myself as being of the number of those who actually won the victory. And if addressing a more numerous audience I were to add that in all probability *we* shall shortly be in Berlin, none of my audience would consider himself included in the collective pronoun used by me.

An apposite remark of Father Prat on the same point will not be out of place. 'As the Christian Church never dies, not only St. Paul but Christians generally may well identify themselves with it, as though they were to assist in the far distant future in its triumphs or in its trials.'

It may be objected that in the foregoing solution no proof has been tendered to demonstrate the assertion that 'living remnant' rather than 'living survivors' is the correct rendering of the debated text.

Without insisting on the glaring tautology involved if the latter rendering were accepted, it may be briefly stated that Greek usage, as revealed by all available lexicographical evidence, is preponderatingly in favour of 'living remnant.' Substantival derivatives from the verb in question, such as *ὑπόλειμμα* and *λείμμα* occurring in St. Paul (Rom. ix. 27; xi. 5) are used only in the sense of 'remainder,' 'residuum,'

'remnant.' The verb itself occurs only once in the New Testament, in this very text which is the subject of discussion. Hence illustrations of its use must be sought elsewhere.

If we turn to the Classics it will be found that *περίλειμμα* is used by Plato as the equivalent of our word 'remnant.' Further, all instances of the verbal use cited by Liddell and Scott, Thayer and Bretschneider, go to show that *περιλείπεσθαι* is invariably translatable by 'to be left behind, to remain over.' A passage is quoted from Herodotus, where in English we might speak of 'the only one left,' or 'the sole remaining hero,' as 'the sole survivor.'

Incidentally one may be pardoned for calling the attention of our worshippers of non-Catholic erudition to the fact that all these Lexicographers—in high repute for learning—simply copy one from the other. Liddell and Scott copied from a German author. Thayer copied from Liddell and Scott to parade his erudition; and he further incorporates all the additional examples supplied by Bretschneider. None of these compilers most probably did any original research work if the paragraphs on *περιλείπεσθαι* be taken as the measure of their methods. We Catholics are sometimes only too prone to bend the knee to the supposed overwhelming erudition of Rationalist scholarship. The more one gets behind that scholarship, the more one learns to distrust it.

J. DONOVAN, S.J.

THE DEPOSITIONS ABOUT THE REBELLION OF 1641

BY J. B. WILLIAMS

THE actual facts of the Irish Rebellion of 1641 have long been in dispute. Whether the rebellion itself was really commenced by the Irish at all is one subject of controversy. Whether there were so many English in Ireland as the depositions about the rebellion apparently proved to have been killed is another, and so on with minor points.

But the principal subject of controversy—the one point which is of cardinal importance is, admitting, as every sensible man must admit, that *some* murders were committed, were they either in number or in their accompanying cruelty such as are depicted in the depositions of 1641? The main point is whether the depositions about the rebellion are, as a whole, true or false. Are they to be accepted in their entirety or rejected as worthless? It does not seem that a middle course is possible.

Some writers there have been who have whole-heartedly accepted the evidence of these depositions; but these writers have invariably been of the extreme Protestant type, and the general verdict of more scholarly historians seems to amount to the opinion that atrocities there must have been, for what rebellion is ever free from them, but not upon the scale exhibited in the documents now preserved in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin.

The latest Irish historian, Mr. Dunlop,¹ remarks that the question of the degree of credibility to be assigned to these depositions can 'never be satisfactorily settled until they are published in their entirety'; and tells us that, in considering the attitude of the seventeenth-century Englishman towards the Irish on this subject the question of the truth or falsehood of the depositions ought not to be considered, that 'the belief in the massacre, not the so-called

¹ *Ireland under the Commonwealth*, i. Historical Introduction, p. cxviii.

massacre itself,' is 'the point upon which we should concentrate our attention.'

In an age when 'Papists' were considered capable of any villainy, and when the whole English nation literally lost its reason over Titus Oates's trumped up (and by no means new) tale, the depositions, of course, found acceptance by seventeenth-century Englishmen in the mass. And from this standpoint the so-called massacres of 1641 have always been put forward as both a cause and a palliative of the deeds of the pseudo-Commonwealth in Ireland. Cromwell himself, in his Wexford dispatch, makes mention of atrocities supposed to have been perpetrated by the Irish in that town as an excuse for his own brutality, and it would not be difficult to multiply citations of the like nature from the public utterances of the rulers of the time.

But the real point is not what seventeenth-century Englishmen *in the mass* believed, but what *the rulers of the times* believed. It is to Cromwell and to his associates that the ten years' cruelties of the so-called Commonwealth were due. Did Cromwell, for instance, believe in these atrocities when he slaughtered the women at the market cross of Wexford¹ in 1649? Or, if Cromwell believed in the atrocities, had his nominal masters, the self-styled 'Council of State,' any real trust in the depositions?

The facts I am about to relate will supply the answer—possibly to the first, and certainly to the second, question.

When Bishop Henry Jones presented to Parliament the first batch of depositions, taken by himself as a Commissioner, in 1642, the House of Commons was decidedly of the opinion that they should be printed, and, accordingly, on 21st March, 1642, an order of the House of Commons was passed for this to be done.

Under the title of 'A Remonstrance of divers remarkable passages concerning the Church and Kingdom of Ireland,' these first depositions were published in due course in 1642.² Eighty-seven dispositions appeared in this volume, as well as the text of the Commissions from Charles I, and other matter.

¹ S. R. Gerdiner's objection to this story—that it was first told in 1763, by the Abbé Maceoghan, in his *Histoire d'Irlande*—has more than once been refuted by the present writer. The story is contemporary, and was first told by James Heath in 1663, in his 'Flagellum,' a life of Cromwell. Sooner or later, contemporary Irish corroboration will follow.

² Thomason tract (at the British Museum), E. 141. (30).

After this, the depositions seem to have been forgotten until the time when Cromwell's expedition to Ireland was planned, in 1649. The Order Books of the 'Council of State' narrate that on May 9, 1649, the Council having been

informed that Thomas Waring, formerly clerk of a commission under the Great Seal of Ireland for taking examinations concerning the losses and sufferings of the Protestants, has such examinations and that they would much tend to the vindication of the Protestant cause and perpetuating infamy upon the Irish Papists; and good testimony being given by Sir William Parsons, Sir Gerard Lowther and others, of Waring's labours and pains, refer the preparing and publishing of such examinations to Sir William Parsons and Sir Gerard Lowther, who are to speed the perfecting thereof; the rather as many here, by their cavils and queries, not knowing the true state of affairs of that other nation, turn obstructors of their intended relief, weaken the hands of the well affected in both nations, and, in effect, secure the designs of the rebels there.

That these instructions were carried out, there can be no doubt, for on the 8th of January, 1650, £100 was ordered to be paid to Thomas Waring 'for his book containing examinations of the bloody massacre in Ireland.' He received this sum (the equivalent of £400 of our money) the same day.¹ Two months later on Waring himself stated that the book of depositions was in the press and issued a preliminary pamphlet about it, published (according to the old collector Thomason) on 19th of March, 1650. It follows, therefore, that up to the month of March, 1650, there was every intention to print the depositions. They had been transcribed and their editor had been paid for his work.

Waring's tract was entitled:—

A Brief Narration of the Plotting, Beginning and Carrying on of that Execrable Rebellion and Butcherie in Ireland. With the unheard of, Devilish Cruelties and Massacres, by the Irish rebels exercised upon the Protestants and English there. Faithfully collected out of Depositions taken by Commissioners under the great seal of Ireland. Hereunto are added observations, discussing the actions of the late King and manifesting the concernment of the Protestant army now employed in Ireland. Published by special authority. London, Printed by B. Alsop and T. Dunster. And are to be delivered at Bernard Alsop's house in Grub Street, M.D.C.L.

The Preface states:—

There is publishing a large volume of Depositions (though far short of what might have been produced, a great part of that Island being ever since in the hands of the rebels) where the Reader may at large satisfie

¹ *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, 1649-1650*, pp. 131-2, 474 and 597.

himself of all the circumstances which may stile the massacre Horrid and Diabolical. But because that volume is swoln to a great largeness, and therefore cannot readily expect to pass the press, it hath been thought fit in the meantime, to publish this small tract, as an Introduction or fore-runner (or call it what you please) of the other.

In the last paragraph it is added : ' I doubt not but this small piece will heighten the expectation of the greater volume, which with all diligence shall be hastened to thee.'

The pamphlet then contains 64 pages, in two parts : ' The History of the Irish Rebellion ' (pp. 1-30), signed ' T. W.,' and ' Observations ' (pp. 41 to 64).

On page 27, Waring says of the ' Articles of peace made at several times by the Marquesse of Ormond with these cannibals,' that :—

One of which articles was that all inquiries, indictments, outlawryes and other proceedings against these rebels (whereof those examinations were part) should be vacated and extinguished ; which I am sure had been done accordingly to these examinations especially, had they not secretly and on a sudden been conveyed away hither, which could not possibly have been done had not an honest and worthy English Marchant (at my request) closely and exactly passed them away as marchandize amongst other of his goods, at that time so full of danger, when neither such things nor so much as a man must pass over but upon pain of death, without special license. (Which all men might rest confident would not have been granted in that behalf by the then Lieutenant, the Earl of Ormond.) But it pleased God they should be transported *to be published to the world.*¹

Whereby the justnesse of the War now undertaken may be maintained, the deep sufferings of the English and the execrable designs, plots and actions of the most inhuman and cruell Irish Rebels may be manifested and left to posterity. And the Commonwealth of England have on this so pregnant provocation and universall conspiracy resolved, by God's blessing, to settle a firm assurance to all these English that shall hereafter adventure to improve the English interest in Ireland and at last put it in a case plentifully to retribute to England for their moneys, deep expenses of blood and treasure.

In the body of this book Waring described the murders and other outrages in general terms only, giving no particulars either of names, places or dates. His description of the depositions, therefore, is of no historical value.

All this would lead us to expect that the depositions were soon published and that, therefore, Mr. Dunlop's suggestion has been made in ignorance of this publication. As a matter of fact (in spite of all their trouble and expense) the Council of State found that its wisest course was not to publish them. Whether printed or not, they were never

¹ Italics mine.

issued to the public. For the moment I will draw no inferences from this fact; but, before proceeding with my narrative, will pause to point out that the above facts seem to be a sufficient reason why certain passages in the originals at Trinity College had been crossed out. The abbreviations were probably made for the purpose of compression,¹ not necessarily because they were untrue.

After 1650 Calendars of State Papers, newsbooks and other tracts of the times are curiously silent about the depositions. They were never mentioned again.

In April, 1652, Bishop Henry Jones, then filling the office of Scout-Master General, hardly a creditable post for a prelate, presented 'an abstract of some particular murders' to the Commissioners in Ireland, who informed the Council of State that Jones had 'the original examinations of them now at large.'²

But the 'High Court of Justice'—appointed to try those implicated in the rebellion of 1641—did not commence its sittings until the 14th of October, 1652, at Kilkenny.³ Dr. Jones, therefore, had been suffered to take away with him the depositions, no longer needed in England, as his own personal property.

Another year passed, and then Waring petitioned the Council of State. It is unfortunate that his petition has not survived (or was destroyed), for we should like to know what was stated in it. However, on 1st of April, 1653, the Council ordered a further sum of £120 to be paid to Waring 'for services in taking the examinations concerning the murders in Ireland during the rebellion and printing and publishing somewhat on that subject' (evidently the pamphlet published in 1650), 'and to enable him to return to Ireland;

¹ See Miss Hickson's *Ireland in the Seventeenth Century*, ii. 199. The missing word in Waring's evidence, cited by her, should be 'printed.' Waring's evidence at the trial of Lord Muskerry should run as follows:—

'Also concerning the said examinations (i.e., the depositions) Mr. Thomas Waring was examined in Court on oath, of his receiving them by order from the Council of State to be (printed), he saith further that by order he did abbreviate the said examinations as to losses, but not murders.'

In the Eighth Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, pp. 572-6, Mr. Gilbert comments at length upon the words and passages struck out. It would seem that he and the authorities he cites have been mistaken in the inferences they drew from these alterations.

² R. Dunlop, *Ireland under the Commonwealth*, i. 179.

³ For the proceedings of this Court, as reported in *Mercurius Politicus*, see the present writer's article in this review for February, 1914 (Fifth Series, vol. iii. pp. 180-194).

£80 to be paid him here, and £40, on his arrival in Chester.'¹ It was surely an extraordinary course to take, to send part of his money on ahead of him. Was there any reason why the Council wished to ensure his going to Ireland? Did they want to silence him?

At Lord Muskerry's trial before the 'High Court of Justice,' on 1st of December, 1653, Waring gave evidence. Lord Muskerry was acquitted.

I wish to point out that, to a very great extent, it is possible to check the depositions by comparing them with the lists of *acquittals* set out in *Mercurius Politicus*, the official journal, published weekly in London. This periodical was a pamphlet of 16 pages, and with No. 125 for 21-28 October, 1652, it commenced to give ample accounts of the proceedings at the 'High Court of Justice.' After a week or two these reports dwindle, diminish and almost vanish, and I think the reason for this, probably, is to be found in the number of acquittals the newsbook was compelled to record. Thus, according to *Mercurius Politicus*, the first three places visited by the 'Court' were Kilkenny, Clonmell and Cork. At the first place 19 persons were condemned to die according to this journal, their names and those of the persons they were supposed to have murdered being stated; while nine were acquitted, the same details being given. But at Clonmell six were condemned and seven acquitted; while at Cork 32 were condemned and 23 acquitted.² If a modern Court had a percentage of acquittals like this to record, it would be unusual, to say the least; but if we bear in mind the rigour of criminal courts in those days, and the fact that this so-called 'High Court of Justice' existed for no other purpose than to sentence all those whose crimes were detailed in the depositions, then these statistics are noteworthy and in themselves impeach the depositions. Moreover, in searching through the file of *Mercurius Politicus* I have failed to find a single mention of the depositions. Indeed, from 1652 until the Restoration there is nothing more to record about the depositions from the pamphlets or State Papers of the time.

With the Restoration, in 1660, this silence was broken and the depositions were discussed once again. The Clarendonian settlement of Ireland was in contemplation,

¹ *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, 1652-1653*, pp. 157 and 597.

² See the present writer's article in this review for February, 1914, for the names in full.

and in order to prejudice the cases of the Irish a tract entitled an 'Abstract' of the murders committed by the Irish since 23rd October, 1641, was published in 1662. The facts given in this tract were summarized from the depositions, and at once elicited a reply from an author whose initials were 'R. S.' but who is otherwise unknown. 'R. S.'s' reply was a tract of twenty-seven pages, entitled,¹ 'A Collection of some of the murthers and massacres committed upon the Irish in Ireland since the 23rd of October, 1641. With some observations and falsifications of a late printed abstract of murthers, said to be committed by the Irish. Now published by R. S. London, printed for the author, 1662.' The body of this tract, together with the tract it answered, was added to one of the early editions of Lord Clarendon's *History of the Irish Rebellion (1720)*, but the title-page and the preliminary observations, twelve pages in length, were omitted. From these observations I take the following information:—

'R. S.' was an English Royalist who had been born in Ireland and was a Roman Catholic. He states of the 'High Court of Justice,' sent over to Ireland to try the perpetrators of the murders described in the depositions of 1642, that

It is publicly known that Cromwell's pretended High Court of Justice past through all the parts of Ireland and pickt' out of the people all such as could be in any manner tainted with the spilling of English blood, with that rigour as may be esteemed rather 'summum jus' than moderate Justice, that upon tryalls in the said Court and examinations taken in order to those tryals there were but a few of the many thousands said to be murdered in printed pamphlets found to be real. And it is well known that there were not so many Protestants of the English nation living in Ireland in the beginning of that rebellion as have been printed to be murdered. Also it is undeniable that the first massacres committed at the time of the said rebellion (which occasioned all the mischiefs thereafter happening) was all done upon the Irish and the severall murthers perpetrated in cold blood upon them did twentyfold exceed those which were committed upon the English, and that they who took in hand the publishing of the murthers done upon the English did raise the same to an immense number and painted the hardness thereof with such barbarous circumstances thereby to win compassion and succour from England and to stain the unblemished honour of his Sacred Majesty with some reflections from that rebellion, as hath been manifested upon the

¹ The British Museum press mark is not a fixed one. I cannot find that any modern writer has noticed this tract. Nor is it catalogued, except under the initials 'R. S.'

Compare with this pages 154-160 of *The Politicians Cathecism*, by N. N., published in 1658 (by Richard Talbot, Archbishop of Dublin).

tryals of several persons in the said High Court and at the Tryal of Qualifications in Ashloane (Athlone) where the book called the black book, being a collection of the examinations taken in the year 1641 of murthers said to be then committed, being produced, the same was so falsified in most particulars thereof as well by the witnesses pretended to be fondly sworn, as also by none of the persons then and now living, who were in the said book sworn to be murdered, that the said book was for shame laid aside as no evidence, and several other persons who have taken examinations touching murthers have several times since acknowledged the falsity of the matters published by them as being the false information of others, who in the hurry of those times and their own frights were so transported as they swore all their neighbours whom they left behind were all murdered, when all or most of them were afterwards found to be living. And yet all these mistakes, though well known, remain yet unrectified.

On page 12 a serious allegation was made against Axtell, the regicide, with reference to the case of Mrs. FitzPatrick; burnt alive in 1652.¹

As for such who, in the usurper's time, have been unjustly executed by the pretended High Courts of Justice, are omitted here for brevity's sake (*sic*) only a few instances (*viz.*) The Lord Viscount of Mayo, under colour of being guilty of the murthers committed at Shruell, was put to death by a court consisting of eleaven officers, amongst whom there was not one lawyer, whereof five did acquit him when (*sic*) the said murders were committed. The said Lord was a Protestant, had no command amongst the Irish and urged at his trial by good proofs that he escaped the murthers with his life by great providence. Col. Bagenall, in 1652, a very loyal gentleman, executed at Kilkenny for signing a warrant to hang one John (*sic* William) Stone, a known spie, the said Col. being then left for a publicke hostage for performance of articles concluded there and not discharged before his execution. Mr. Edward Butler, son to the Lord of Mount-Garret, having notice sent him that some Protestants were ahang- ing at Ballaragad, came with all hast to preserve their lives. Which he did of such as he overtook alive. Yet was condemned and executed because he came not time enough to save all of them that were hanged, upon a suspicion he might save them as well as the rest. How unjustly the Lady Roch was put to death for murdering an unknown person is notoriously known. And Mrs. Fitz-Patrick was executed on the testimony of one woman, who afterwards did acknowledge that she was set on by Col. Axtel, and had a sum of money from him for such prosecution.

Some evidence about these cases mentioned by 'R. S.' has been elicited in modern times. Mr. Gilbert, in the Eighth Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission (p. 576), draws attention to the fact that at 'Court of Transplantation' at Athlone, in 1655,

the Attorney General produced depositions taken in 1642 in which Charity Chappell and George Littlefield, of Armagh, declared, with much

¹ See more about the case in the article in this review for February, 1914.

circumstantiality, that Harry O'Neill, son of Sir Torlogh O'Neill, had been in rebellion in 1641 and had plundered to a large amount. O'Neill, however, obtained permission to have Chappell and Littlefield examined in Court. There both of them admitted that they were not acquainted with the facts from their own knowledge, but, on the contrary, knew O'Neill to have always assisted the English. The Court consequently set aside the depositions and decided in favour of O'Neill.

Of Mrs. FitzPatrick—of whom Ludlow, in his Memoirs, asserts that, 'the mother of Col. Fitz-Patrick was found guilty of the murder of the English, with this aggravation, that she said she would make candles of their fat'—the tract answered by 'R. S.' states that John Nicholson and his wife were murdered by Florence FitzPatrick, and that 'Elizabeth Baskerville says that Mrs. FitzPatrick blam'd the murderers because they brought not Mrs. Nicholson's fat or grease, wherewith she might have made candles.'

It is evident that Elizabeth Baskerville's evidence alone sent Mrs. FitzPatrick to her awful death. Yet it was a rule of ordinary criminal courts in those days to require two witnesses in matters of this kind. One was not enough.

In all probability the great bulk of the depositions will prevent Mr. Dunlop's suggestion, that they should be printed in their entirety, from being realized. There is no reason, however, why the depositions as far as regards certain test cases should not be given to the world, particularly the depositions against those persons stated by *Mercurius Politicus* to have been acquitted. Selections are useless unless they have a definite object in view; and I venture to suggest that a selection made in order to check the acquittals would be a sufficient test, and it would also seem that 'R. S.'s' remarks deserve investigation.

In any case, the steps taken to print the depositions in 1650, coupled with the abandonment of this project and the sending of Waring to Ireland, warrant us in concluding that the 'Council of State' knew that the depositions would not stand the test of their own illegal 'High Court of Justice.' The rulers of the time did *not* believe in the massacres.

J. B. WILLIAMS.

A FREE CHURCH IN A FREE EUROPE

By REV. MYLES V. RONAN

II

FUTURE PROSPECTS

ON November 8, 1918, three days before the armistice, Benedict XV wrote to Cardinal Gasparri:—

We have recently instructed our Nuncio in Vienna to put himself into friendly relations with the different nationalities of the Austro-Hungarian State which have just been constituted into independent States. The Church, the perfect society, which has for its one end the sanctification of men of all times and of all countries, just as she adapts herself to different forms of government, accepts also, without any difficulty, the legitimate territorial and political changes of nations.

This language is in agreement with the traditions of the Roman past; and looks joyfully at the prospects of the European future. In fact, the Roman Church, face to face with Germany, Austria-Hungary and Russia, can look confidently on the new scene presented to her. She sought the Slav world, she sought the East; Germanism encumbered both routes. She can smile on the new world which, now and then, without knowing it, thinks as she does, and, without even wishing it, speaks as she does.

I—THE FALLEN EMPIRES AND THE LIBERTY OF THE CHURCH

Cardinal Manning, who had borrowed from the strictest Roman theology his idea of authority, and from Anglo-Saxon customs his idea of liberty, considered the spiritual dictatorship of the State, in whatever form it was clothed, as the adversary, par excellence, of Christianity. God did not become man so that a Cæsar might be pontiff.

The last war has put an end to Cæsar-papism [says M. Goyau]. Religiously speaking that has been *le grand vaincu*. It flourished in Austria in what remained of the old Josephist apparatus; it set itself

up in Prussia in the person of William II, the sovereign bishop of national evangelism; it possessed in the Empire of the Czars a finished organization. In Austria we have seen the Church had, by herself, struggled slowly to free herself; in Germany and Russia she must be more patient in order to avoid greater misfortunes.

From the Vistula to the Pacific Czarism laid claim to the hegemony over souls. 'Fidelity to the Czar,' wrote Michelet, 'is in Russia the whole of religious education.' But it seems that the great novelists of the nineteenth century attribute to the spirit of the Gospel in the formation of the Russian soul a larger part than historic truth has given it. The official Church of the Czars ignored in fact, by its very essence, the distinction between the two powers, religious and civil, which was the message of Christ, and which changed the face of the world and the interior of souls. Christianity was thus beggared of a great part of its virtue; and in order to restore it, the Roman Church could do nothing, or almost nothing, whilst this formidable political edifice was poised on its tottering and fraudulent foundations. In Germany she had seen, during the time of Pius IX, the State armed against her in the name of *Kultur*. In Jerusalem, in Aix-la-Chapelle, William of Hohenzollern endeavoured to obtain for his own adornment the stately ornaments of the sanctuaries. He cherished the dream of exercising a power in this Church of which he was not a member. Under Pius the dream became an obsession. His diplomats were at their post. Germany did not practise in regard to the Vatican the absentee policy pursued by other States.

When, in 1904, Father Denifle, the custodian of the Apostolic archives, became famous by his first researches on Luther, German diplomacy made the Holy See understand that William II protected with his sceptre this great historic reputation. Father Frühworth (afterwards Cardinal), then General of the Dominicans, smiled at these manœuvres of Berlin against the freedom of history. The Vatican let the sceptre grow restless, and Father Denifle continued his learned inquiries, despite his German leanings. But soon, afresh, the protecting sceptre was raised aloft to defend Luther against Pius X. The centenary of St. Charles Borromeo had induced the Pope to publish an encyclical in which the Reformation and the first reformers were freely criticized. William II made it known that he guarded them religiously, and that this

encyclical offended him. Pius X then had the Prussian minister informed that, of his own accord, for motives of prudence, he had given the necessary instructions that the incriminated encyclical should not be published from the pulpits or in the diocesan journals of Germany.

Sometime afterwards the Government of William II had Germany excepted from a universal law of the Church, namely, that regarding the anti-modernist oath. Those who were freed from this requirement were the professors of theology of the German universities. Pius X then, lowering his reputation even of inflexibility, gave way before the dictation of Berlin sovereignty. It was a cruel blow to him. Had he been less proud for the interests of his God, less humble for his own, he would, perhaps, have concealed these half-capitulations under the disguise of strategy, and passed off this defeat as a stroke of cleverness. But he preferred to confess that Germany made him suffer in spite of himself. 'The nation that causes me most trouble,' he said in the beginning of 1914, 'is Germany.' The dissolving influence of Berlin Cæsar-papism insinuated itself slowly into certain deep strata of German Catholicism. Publicists and the faithful became easily accustomed to see Berlin determine what Rome had a right to say in Germany, and about what she had a duty to remain silent. To-day, however, there is no longer any great Power in which is incarnated, even in a small degree, the medieval idea of the temporal vicariate of God. In spite of the ideal of justice and harmony to which this idea endeavoured to respond, it has ended by endangering itself, badly treated, from century to century, by abuses, often hateful and always childish, which the temporal vicars practised against the autonomy of the spiritual vicar.

This autonomy desired by Christ [says M. Goyau], and without which there would be no Christianity, has nothing to fear from these other Powers to which the war has given the victory. Between the authority of the religious power and the docile liberty of individual consciences these Powers did not interfere. The sending by the British Government in 1914 of an ambassador to the Vatican, and the cordial participation that the civil authorities of the United States took in such functions as the jubilee of Cardinal Gibbons, show that, even under a theoretical regime of separation, the State can recognize the Church and hold communion with her. Mgr. Julien, Bishop of Arras, representative of the French nation at this jubilee, pointed out on his return the warm atmosphere of freedom, of respect, and even of sympathy, which in

the United States surrounds the men and affairs of the Church, no matter what Church it may be. The Churches and the State are separated, but that does not prevent them from knowing, from speaking to, from helping, one another, and does not prevent American Catholicism from considering itself to be reckoned among the principal sources of the ideal with which the soul of a great people is imbued. Already [continues M. Goyau] we have heard the Church, in Latin nations, ask for liberty 'as among the Anglo-Saxons,' and that a new era may be inaugurated, in which the Holy See, more thoroughly free than when certain Powers were an obstacle to her, will be able to prepare, by means of the same liberty, a religious and social future, more strictly in accord with the requirements of her mission, and with the aspirations of souls towards unity.

II—THE CHURCH AND THE RIGHTS OF POLAND

Out of the heaped-up ruins another liberty begins to shine, a liberty specially dear to the Church, that of Poland. The great crime committed by the eighteenth century is repaired: Poland lives again.

Since the middle of the seventeenth century three Powers—the Emperor, the Elector of Brandenburg, and the Czar—looked together at Poland with the spirit of concupiscence, which made the Poles very uneasy. The first step was made in 1769 by the ministers of Marie-Thérèse, who took over one district. She knew what interest the Popes took in the 'maintenance of the political state of Poland.' Clement XIII had expressly written that 'The security and the integrity of the Catholic religion were joined together there.' He hoped that the Government of Vienna would be touched by this statement. To be touched! That hardly cost Marie-Thérèse anything. 'She seems to have tears at her command,' wrote Cardinal de Rohan of it. 'In one hand she has a handkerchief to dry her tears, and in the other a sword, to be the third sharer.' She wept then; but was it always over Poland that she wept? Sometimes it was over the wrong done to Poland by the other two robbers who wished to take possession of the best portions. 'Long after my death,' she said, 'one will see what results from having thus trampled under foot all that, up to the present, has been held as just and sacred.' But she herself got rid of her sin joyfully. 'So many great and learned people wished that it might be thus!' Their advice counterbalanced the objections of the Church. Marie-Thérèse signed the *Placet*. Her ink dried, so did her eyes. The first partition was accomplished which put the Church into mourning and

made Voltaire rejoice. The unanimous hosannas with which to-day the human conscience greets Poland were then to be found only on the lips of the Popes, and very weak was their echo.

In three stages the crime was accomplished beneath the powerless observation of the Church. Against Poland and against the Church two of the robbers got on marvellously together. Berlin provided schismatic Czarism with splendid organizers of spiritual dictatorship. Under Catherine one of them was a foreign philosopher by the name of Bulgari, a former courtier of Frederic II. Under Alexander I it was a Stanislas Siestrenczewicz, a former student of Calvinist theology, then a Prussian officer, then a churchman, of whom Joseph de Maistre said: 'If I had absolutely to touch the hand of this man I should first put on a buff leather glove.' In the last quarter of the nineteenth century it was Constantin Petrovitch von Kauffmann, who had passed over from German Protestantism to Russian orthodoxy to become the barefaced agent of the 'forced conversions.' The spirit of persecution against Rome, in order to be let loose in Russia, gathered together in Prussia its most trustworthy arms and its cleverest agents. Austria, calm and correct, and publicly indifferent, let things take their course.

'Europe,' exclaimed Gratry, 'is in a state of mortal sin.' The sinner was ill at ease, felt herself troubled. It was an uncomfortable balance that relied on a crime for its preservation. Crushed under the weight of Russia, of Prussia, and of Austria the Polish people reminded Montalembert of 'the giant of the fable whom one had thought annihilated in being crushed under Etna. Far from being annihilated every movement of his made the earth tremble and eruptions break out. There is the perfect symbol of Poland; every movement of her heroic heart shakes Europe.' This Polish soul, so long faithful to her own sufferings, without the power or the will to die, was esteemed and admired. In critical moments of European conflicts the alliance of this august impotence was sought. The honour of treating her as a Power was done to her. The Europe of 1812 saw Napoleon and Alexander dispute with each other over the adhesion of Poland, so anxious were they 'to enlist a great moral force.' The Europe of 1914 heard Prussia, Austria, and Czarism make advances to Poland which had not always

the value of promises, but which recognized implicitly her right to a new life, to something more than a mere survival.

'The question of Poland,' said Talleyrand to Metternich at the time of the Congress of Vienna, 'is the first, the most eminently European.' But woe to the Polish soul if she sought to raise this question. Prophets, who were consolers, then arose. Intoxicated by the national martyrdom they announced that the rebirth of Poland would mark a rebirth of entire humanity. 'As at the resurrection of Christ,' prophesied Mickiewicz, 'human sacrifices ceased over the whole earth, so, at the resurrection of Poland, wars will end in Christianity.' This was Polish Messianism. In making the very destinies of humanity centre round the destinies of Poland the imaginations of these prophets seemed to defy history. And diplomats said: that is all a dream. But some dreams are idea-forces that call forth the reality of to-day only in order to quell that of the morrow.

The Catholic Church always looked with gratitude and pride on Poland's past, her long struggle for the Christian name, against Islam, against the Tartars, against the pagans. Pope Paul V spoke of Poland as a sanctuary of heroism, the very soil of which was sanctified. The Church did not believe that this sanctuary could be for ever profaned, and the rôle that Poland had played in the history of the Catholic past made her not less worthy of being resurrected than did the mission to which she believed herself called in the future European evolutions. Happy and unfortunate Poland! She had the happiness, in the name even of her misfortunes, to raise up during the whole of the nineteenth century a kind of sacred union between Roman Catholicism and European liberalism. She was their common dependant. They disputed over their client only in order to seek the means to help her most effectively. 'You, priests, are too lukewarm for her,' said Edgar Quinet one day. And Mgr. Dupanloup replied to him: 'You are always herding the clergy behind the altar, and you call them out when it suits you; you load them with impediments, then you reproach them for not acting.' The Church, through this eloquent voice, that was frightened neither by the idea nor the word of liberty, asked her enemies to liberate herself so that she might be better able to free Poland and to struggle, there as elsewhere, against

the work of Voltaire. That was the great humiliation of the nineteenth century, to be so unanimous in its *forum internum* in favour of Poland, and so useless in bringing her relief.

There was, however, one Power that clung with a cruel feeling of powerlessness to the Polish sorrows, and that sometimes herself felt this sorrow. This Power was the Holy See. Let us listen to Gregory XVI at the Consistory of 1842. For ten years he had suffered from the fact that in threatening him with the deportation into Siberia of all the Bishops, Russia had driven him into a corner to send to them, in a famous brief, counsels of obedience. No doubt, shortly afterwards, in two notes he made known his grievance to the Czar's Government with regard to the attacks made on their liberty. The world knew about his brief, but did not know about his notes. For several years no Pole could cross the Pontifical frontier without a Russian passport. Some thought that the Pope had closed the door on the Poles, who were weeping. But the aged Pontiff, gathering together his Cardinals, confided to them his paternal sorrows. He said to them:—

Nobody knows what we have done incessantly to protect and defend the inviolable rights of the Catholic Church in all the territories subject to the Russian nation. The enemies of the Holy See, by a hereditary fraud that is characteristic of them, have spread the report in these territories where the faithful are gathered in large numbers that, forgetful of our sacred ministry, we have covered by our silence the great ills with which they are overwhelmed, and that thus we had almost abandoned the cause of the Catholic religion. . . . We have almost become a stumbling-block, the stone of scandal, for a great portion of the Lord's flock.

It was a man grieving over his weakness and grieving that weaknesses were imputed to him who spoke, desirous to vindicate the Papacy, to vindicate God, from having for one moment failed Poland. The promises that in a memorable audience he snatched from Nicholas I, those that later the Government of Alexander II gave to Pius IX, remained a dead letter, and Pius IX, in 1864, in another consistory, made in turn, in the name even of his responsibilities, the range of his protests be heard. Poland then was abominably tortured. In Europe the press was uneasy, brochures were multiplied, but the sovereigns were silent. Pius IX broke the silence:—

I do not wish to have to cry out one day in presence of the Eternal Judge: *Vae mihi quia tacui*. A ruler, who calls himself an Eastern

Catholic, oppresses and kills his Catholic subjects, driven by his persecutions to insurrection. Under pretext of suppressing this insurrection he extirpates Catholicism, he deports entire populations into the most northern parts where they are deprived of all religious help, and replaces them by adventurers of other religions. He persecutes and massacres priests, he banishes Bishops, and heterodox though he is, yet he deprives of his jurisdiction a Bishop lawfully installed. . . . And let nobody say that in rising up against the ruler of the north I foment European revolution; I know well how to distinguish from revolution reasonable right and liberty, and if I protest against him it is to satisfy my conscience.

Thus did Pius IX protest; and before the Parliament of Turin a deputy named Brofferio, who was by no means a lover of priests, confessed quite simply:—

When I see an old man, worn-out, an invalid, without resources, without an army, on the brink of the grave, cursing a ruler because he has throttled his people, I feel myself moved in my whole being, I think myself carried back to the time of Gregory VII, I bow and I applaud.

III—THE CHURCH AND THE POLISH SOUL—THE RESURRECTION

Sustained by the words of the Popes Poland did not despair. She learned to suffer as long as it was necessary. She considered herself a martyr, but not a dead one. She introduced into the bearing of her troubles the Catholic philosophy of suffering; she changed her disasters into a vocation. And the more the Church saw this people suffer the more she felt the suffering her own. Garibaldi would not forgive the Poles for their Catholicism. 'Cease,' he wrote to them, 'to give your heroic struggle a religious character, which alienates sympathy from you and provokes bloody reactions against you.' Poland despised these bloody reactions and preserved her soul.

Montalembert in 1830, at the time that he thought of setting out for Warsaw as a volunteer of the Church and of the nations, had congratulated the Poles for showing to the world what this Catholic faith was which was being relegated to the tomb, and what the world could expect from it for its liberty. Even when 'the horse of the Cossack bathed its feet in the blood of the sons of Sobieski,' these remained witnesses of what the Catholic conscience was worth and of what it could do for the freedom of nations. Come what might, they had done all that they could. It was certainly an austere rôle, but Poland accepted it and knew, thanks to Montalembert, how to charge herself

with it. 'The tribune, when you ascend it,' wrote the Anonymous Poet of Poland later to him, 'is changed into a kind of spiritual pulpit, and I know not what memory of the Church of the Middle Ages, thundering against tyrants and freeing the nations, is called up suddenly in the enthusiastic soul.' And the Anonymous Poet, commenting on the predestination of his people, made it consist in 'introducing by the strength of its sorrows the spirit of the Gospel into the affairs of this world, in showing to political unbelievers and Pharisees, who for centuries have not ceased to crucify Christ again on all the crosses of history, that nationality is an imperishable thing on earth.' Poland furnished a proof of this, and was contented with these words as with a title of nobility. The Anonymous Poet again meditated:—

In order that the kingdom that every day we ask our Heavenly Father may come in this world, all men, even the ministers of religion, must become real Christians. That can take place only when the principle of national existence has been recognized as inviolable—inviolable because it comes from God. Thus Poland, whilst accomplishing her Slav mission, accomplishes another that is universal. It brings a new political and social truth to the conscience of the human race.

It is [says M. Goyau] to her very sufferings that she owes this eloquence and this fertility; she spoke aloud such profound things, because she was provisionally erased from the number of the States. A people is successfully invincible when each and everyone of its successive defeats brands it with the sign of election, of which it can be proud as others would be of victory; the Church knew how to advise Poland to remain a force, and Poland accepted it with all her temperament, with all her faith.

'The blood that we shed,' she sang, 'will raise up our country and unite it to that of Jesus Christ.' And Mickiewicz, unbeliever as he was, speaking to a Polish mother, said: 'Run and throw yourself on your knees before the statue of Our Lady of Dolours; think of amusing your child only with the instruments of its future pains.' The little Polish child, the pupil of such a discipline, of the desires of Christ, of the deeds of Christ, was often more ready to suffer than to struggle. And Adam Czartoryski, on the eve of his death, implored his country: 'Do not come down from this height on which the nations and the rulers of the earth are forced to respect thee. Reject temptations to anger. Remember that it requires more heroism to go towards death in baring one's breast than to defend one's life, sword in hand.'

Oriental fatalism, Slav indolence! These words readily come to one's lips, but we must guard ourselves against abusing them. Something more than indolence or fatalism, something more even than the purely passive virtues was needed in order that, under the assault of the Russian fusilade, the Polish people, occupied with praying to God, should throw itself on its knees and that, inoffensively, calmly challenging, she should continue to sing: 'Give us back, O Lord, our country and our freedom.'

Bismarck [says M. Goyau], shallow psychologist, like all men who rejoice at feeling themselves strong, wished that by force of fighting the Poles the taste even of living would be taken away from them; the question of Poland would thus be solved by their suicide. He did not perceive that at the very bottom of their chalice of sufferings, mystically interpreted, mystically turned to account, these essentially Catholic souls found with a bitter sweetness some kind of immortal residue of joy—joy of living, of acting, and of suffering. Polish optimism resisted the cruelty of vexations; it rewarded the fidelity of Poland with the Catholic idea of suffering and of life.

In Austria Polish optimism survived the heavy burdens that the Hapsburg Government laid on its new subjects, 'despotism, defiance, intolerance' as the Anonymous Poet enumerated them. It survived the 'official *jacquerie*'¹ that in 1846, under the administration of Metternich, delivered lands, people, and wealth to the bloody lusts of a certain mob for the consolidation of the Austrian dictatorship.

In this Russia, whose people, according to Guizot, were 'still more desirous than the Emperor not to allow Poland escape from the empire,' Polish optimism survived the confiscation of the Uniate churches, then the official usurpation of millions of Uniate souls, the deportations of Bishops, monks and priests, the trials that raised up confessors, the torments that consecrated martyrs, the skilful organization of forced conversions, the 'martial law against prayer,' the academic dictatorship of the Russian language as the enclosure of schism; it survived even the flagrant violation by the subordinate bureaucracy of certain belated commands of tolerance. It was in the philosophy of the Polish soul to borrow from so much persecution and fraud this lesson—that the interests of Polish Catholicism were intimately bound up with those

¹ *Jacquerie* was the name given to the rising of the French peasants against the nobility in 1358.

of national autonomy, and to submit with a bitter predilection to the providential marks of this glorious solidarity.

In this Prussia, finally, where Pan-Germanism wished to abolish the Polish race and language, Polish optimism survived the rigours of the *Kulturkampf*, the incarceration of prelates and priests, the barbarous struggles of the school against the language of the little children, the introduction into Polish territory of a stream of German colonists, of which eighty-five per cent. were Protestants, the cunning policy that, in order to plant Teutonism better, installed Lutheranism. It was in the philosophy of the Polish soul to infer from these facts, with a sorrowful serenity, that Prussia struck Catholicism in order to attack Polonism better, and to find in this surfeit of sorrows the new and cruelly interesting proof of a flattering identity.

'Thus was prolonged the immortality of Polish hopes,' says M. Goyau. 'It seemed as if she was supported on the very eternity of the Church, and that she entwined them with the certitudes that come from the beyond.' And Henri Lasserre, the historian of Lourdes, said of her, that for half a century she could not speak of religion without demanding at the same time her political life. And as she wished to continue speaking religion she aspired more and more tenaciously to be free.

It was not confined to the Germanic Powers alone to render once more, in 1918, these aspirations abortive. Austria, in the short-lived treaty of Brest, threw complacently to Ukraine the old province of Cholm, which in 1875 had heroically suffered for its Polish and Catholic faith. In the Reichsrat of Vienna the president of the Polish party stigmatized this treaty that was inspired, he said, with 'the spirit of Prussian militarism and with the impotent knavery of the Austrian diplomacy of the old school'; and before the Landtag of Prussia the Polish member, Korfanty, affirmed ironically: 'It was reserved for the Government of his Apostolic Majesty to traffic in this Catholic country, to deliver it to Russian orthodoxy for a morsel of bread.' The commissary of the Ukrainian hetman, Skoropatsky, a good ally of Prussia, made known to the Polish soul its destinies: 'The end of Poland is beyond all question inevitable; at my order all Polish schools have been closed, and an end will also come for the priests. Might is with us, for the Germans are with us.'

... The religion of the State in Ukraine will be our old Orthodox faith.'

'The free and orthodox republic of Poland,' as the Popes long ago called it, has made its entry into life. As was only right the Church was there. Benedict XV sending to the Bishops of Poland in April, 1918, the Prefect of the Vatican, Mgr. Ratti, had informed him that he would find there 'a people remarkable for its devotion to the Roman Church.' And Mgr. Ratti declared after some weeks: 'I have seen with my own eyes what the Pope had told me, and more than that.' 'A Power is resurrected which the Papacy can consider as a friend,' says M. Goyau. 'On the very soil where the Church was a suspect, a captive, or a slave, the Church breathes freely to-day.' The first Diet of the new regime has been inaugurated, the 9th February, 1919, with a ceremony in the Cathedral of Warsaw, and by the religious consecration of the houses of parliament; the Protestant element of the Diet was present. Catholic culture in Warsaw means to fit itself up magnificently in a university for which already twenty-three millions are collected. The purple is promised to the Archbishop in a solemn letter from Benedict XV; and Mgr. Ratti, in June, 1919, was raised to the office of Nuncio. After one hundred and fifty years of mournful watching the Church rejoices.

IV—TRIBUNES OF THE CHURCH IN THE LIBERATED NATIONS

For the first three years of the war national opinions were forced to remain silent in the Dual Monarchy. It was only in the summer of 1917 that the reopening of Parliament furnished an opportunity for their being heard. Some priests arose who pleaded for their oppressed nations, which had been dragged into the war and which, by the Hapsburg command, should seal their own slavery with their own blood. Bohemian souls felt their sentiments expressed, and at the same time felt comforted when they heard Abbé Isidore Jahradnik proclaim to the Reichsrat: 'This God that I serve will punish the guilty; He will defend and protect my people, and will give them victory and liberty.' Another clerical deputy, M. Valouesk, developed these hopes in presence of twenty thousand Moravian Catholics, and called upon them to be the architects of a sovereign and independent Czecho-Slovak State.

A Yugo-Slav parliamentary assembly was formed, and Mgr. Korosec, a Slovene prelate, presided over it. He corresponded to the confidence placed in him by reading to the Parliament on the 30th May, 1917, an imperishable declaration that demanded that all the Serb, Croatian and Slovene countries into which the double-headed eagle had dug its claws should from henceforth be an independent, united democracy. Mgr. Krek, defender of the Slovene people, and Mgr. Spincie, a Croatian deputy, followed on the same lines. The latter declared :—

The Dual Monarchy, as it is, is only a misfortune for the Yugo-Slavs ; it means for them the death and destruction of their nation. In consequence of dualism the Yugo-Slavs are on one side at the mercy of the Germans and on the other at the mercy of the Magyars, and in some places at the mercy of both Germans and Magyars united. During this war the Yugo-Slavs have been more than ever oppressed as so-called traitors to the country. They prefer, however, to be called traitors to the State by those who wish to annihilate the Yugo-Slav nation than to become themselves traitors to their nation.

The words of these clerical deputies were echoed in an immense referendum organized by the clergy throughout a great part of Yugo-Slavia—referendum of Bishops and parish priests, referendum of the country people, referendum of women. Mgr. Jeglic, Prince-Bishop of Laybach, protested vehemently against the violence of the Pan-Germans and Magyars towards the Slovenes. The Government of Vienna wished Rome to try the Bishop for a breach of discipline. It was the wish of Austria in her agony to make use of the spiritual force against the liberty of nations. It did not succeed. But Austria made use of her magistrates and police to throw the priests into prison on the flimsiest excuse, where she was more concerned in tormenting them than in bringing them to trial. Mgr. Korosec, reciting the Slovene martyrology at a parliamentary session, spoke of the ‘monstrous excesses that recalled those of the Chinese bands at the time of the Boxer revolution.’

These persecutions did not even deter the women from coming, to the number of two hundred thousand, and at the voice of their clergy, to sign their names in seven large volumes in favour of the claims of the Yugo-Slav assembly. At the town hall Mgr. Korosec solemnly presided. ‘We shall not yield,’ he exclaimed, ‘as long as we have not attained our object.’ The Catholic Slovenes loved to hear the lips that spoke to them of their God speak also to them of their country. The words of their

pastors were inspiring messages of the coming regeneration, and were already preparing the way for it.

Even though held down under the rigorous regime of Budapest, numerous Croatian priests dared to send to Vienna their signatures of adhesion to the Yugo-Slav parliamentary assembly. Bosnia and Herzegovina, but recently enslaved, rose up in turn. The clergy, regular and secular, acclaimed the future Yugo-Slavia. A Franciscan, Marco Barbaric, proclaimed that 'By order and with the approval of the three religions of the territory, Catholic, Orthodox and Mussulman,' he gave the notice to quit to their Vienna oppressors. 'Whatever,' said the Catholic journal of Zagreb, 'may be the religious and denominational points of view, we are obliged to recognize that the clergy represent the kernel of intellectual national circles.' In 1897 the Austrian dictatorship had intervened between the work of the priests and their popular feelings. But the years 1917 and 1918 swept away this dictatorship; the union of people and priests from that time developed unopposed.

Shortly after the short-lived treaty of Brest in January, 1918, Mgr. Koresec proclaimed that 'the Yugo-Slavs' demanded a complete guarantee for the peoples of Austria-Hungary of the full right of self-determination, and that they ridiculed the right bestowed by the constitutions of Austria-Hungary as a promise of free development.' General Herzmansky, military governor of Gratz, wrote an official report in May, 1918, in a melancholy strain: 'The disturbance comes partly from the Slovene clergy, who receive instructions and support from the Bishop'; and the military governor of Zagreb noted on the 4th September: 'The Yugo-Slav tendencies have their origin amongst the junior clergy; the Archbishop is considered a confirmed Yugo-Slav.'

By degrees Austria changed her tactics. She began to make other promises, and whispered such words as autonomy and federalism into Slav ears.

The Yugo-Slavs [replied Mgr. Korosec in the Reichsrat] very politely thank you; but Baron Hussarek has come too late. . . . The subject peoples of Austria demand that no further discussion—especially at the time of peace negotiations—be held as to the fate of the Yugo-Slav people without the co-operation of entire Yugo-Slavia; they demand, besides, that this co-operation be personally secured at the Peace Congress by the representatives of the people elected for the purpose as an application of the self-determination of nations.

Mgr. Korosec was chosen as the representative of the eight million Yugo-Slavs at their conference with Serbia and with the Entente in the autumn of 1918. He was then appointed Vice-President of the first ministry of the new State. Yugo-Slav gratitude was not confined to the Bishop. Many priests were appointed on the local governments in the work of organization for the purpose of establishing public liberties.

The voice of the Yugo-Slav episcopacy was also raised in solemn meeting in Zagreb in November, 1918, in recognition of the new State, and expressed its desire to live 'in the best relations of Christian charity' with the orthodox and other denominations. Immediately, also, the Bishops wrote to Rome about the urgency of agrarian reform, and expressed their readiness to give up, with suitable compensation, a portion of the Church lands, for which they asked the consent of the Holy See. Then, for the united peoples, from end to end of Yugo-Slavia, the Bishops desired the right of speaking to God in the old Slav liturgy, and uniting thus their prayers as a kind of treaty of union, not only with God, but with the old Slav past, of which this liturgy was the survival, and with the immense crowd of all their Slav brethren, even those separated from them. 'The steps of the altar,' says M. Goyau, 'where they wished to begin again to pray in Slav, thus became a kind of observatory whence a broad view was obtained of the entire destinies of the Slav race in presence of the very God whom they implored.'

It was in vain then that Austria, through Baron Hussarek, the minister of public instruction, had during the war, in an authentically Josephist style, defined the duty imposed on the members of the episcopate of conducting themselves as real Austrian Bishops. Mgr. Endrici, Prince-Bishop of Trent, suspected of sharing the Italian patriotism of his dioceses, was specially favoured by these Government remonstrances which ended in his arrest.

For a Bishop [they wrote to him from Vienna] to confine himself to his ecclesiastical functions and to a mere existence that allows of the development of a programme of extreme nationality without opposing to this programme with the greatest firmness the Austrian point of view, this could be considered only as an attitude incompatible with the exalted position of a prince of the Austrian Church.

Mgr. Endrici repudiated this Germanic phraseology and the demand made of him. He spurned the honours and

titles offered to him by Vienna in exchange for his mitre. Under the last stampedes from Vienna the Italian Church of Austria as well as the Czecho-Slovak and the Yugo-Slav Church, disappeared like shifting sand; she would not allow a State to be her master which was no longer master of itself. In Transylvania, on the very eve of their political emancipation, Count Tisza was able by clever manœuvres to win over the Roumanians of the Orthodox Church and to place a Magyarizing prelate at their head, but the Roumanians of the Catholic Church adopted an attitude against which Magyarism could not prevail.

Prelates [says M. Goyau] like Korosec, Jeglic, and Endrici were leaders of men. They knew how to do and to suffer, knew how to unite the Church in the reawakenings of national hope as manifested by their dioceses, and the triumph of which Europe was soon to witness. Side by side with these peoples who evolved a youth and a joyous freshness of life the old Church set itself as a teacher and a companion of their awakening. She had never ceased to be with them, to be of them. Three-quarters of a century before Leo XIII, she had made a Pope of the Bishop of Imola, who wrote to his diocesans: 'Democratic government is not at variance with the Gospel, and requires, on the contrary, those sublime virtues that are learned only in the school of Jesus Christ: be ye good Christians and you will be excellent democrats.

V—ROME AS THE GATES OF THE EAST

Henceforth all deceits are done away with. The Church is no longer tied to the corpse of Austria. Free and sovereign Poland has no longer to fear that in her country the other Slavs who practise the Slav rite should be, on that account, brutally separated from the Roman fold. Between the Polish, Lithuanian and Ruthenian clergy tyranny caused hatreds to be stirred up which their common attachment to Rome was not always sufficient to assuage. And when, in 1894, Leo XIII invited the Polish Bishops to consider and treat the Ruthenians united to Rome 'as brothers having only one heart and one soul,' he knew at the same time what were the disrupting forces that held in check these wise counsels. But freedom, henceforth, can and must bring along with it the harmony of mutual love. Nowhere, perhaps, more than in Poland is the human soul more submissive to this influence.

Profiting by the recent liberations, Rome aspires to make itself known in the European East. Benedict XV, on the 1st May, 1917, created a special Congregation for the Oriental Churches. The *Motu proprio* in which he

announced this creation guaranteed to the different Churches of the Slav world, not less than to those of Hellenism, a consideration more and more respectful of the integrity of their rites and their lawful traditions.

Besides [says M. Goyau], we can hope that the Latins will not be again represented to the Christians of the East as objects of suspicion, for the present act will show with abundant clearness that the Church of Jesus Christ, because it is neither Latin, nor Greek, nor Slav, but Catholic, makes no distinction between her children, and that all, be they Greeks, Latins, Slavs, or members of other national groups, occupy the same place in regard to the Apostolic See.

Some months afterwards, at the wish of the Pope, a Pontifical institute was established in Rome for the purpose of instructing western priests, who would afterwards be brought into contact with them, on many questions relating to Oriental Christians. Under Leo XIII an important paper had been established in Rome for the study of these questions. It was called *Bessarione*, in memory of Cardinal Bessarion, who, in the fifteenth century, bridged over in several ways the distance between Rome and the Orient. Under Cardinal Marini many experts in history, theology and liturgy collaborated together, and their skill and subtlety gave to the Church's ambitions a direction and a thrust. Benedict XV organized side by side with this periodical a teaching institute, and appealing even to dissentient Christians, he invited them to the new institute to become acquainted with Roman teaching. 'They will thus be able,' he wrote on the 15th October, 1917, 'to search truth closely whilst laying aside all preconceived ideas. We wish, in fact, that the teaching of Catholic doctrine and that of the *Orthodox* doctrine be openly conducted, so that each and everyone, master of his own judgment, may be able to see from the evidence from what source both proceed.'

There is no longer in Russia any spiritual bureaucracy to forbid clerics there to come, out of curiosity even, to this original institute; and the *separated* priests of the Christian Balkans who would yield, if only by its scientific attraction, to the same desire for information, would be no longer accused to-day of betraying their country for Austria. From the East towards Rome, and from Rome towards the East, the roads are open. The spiritual police have disappeared, and the spirit of universal paternity which inspired Leo XIII in his glorious letter *Praeclara*, 'to princes and peoples,' is beginning to hover over all.



VI—ROME AND THE NEW INTERNATIONALISMS

Thus Rome, without any impatience, but without procrastination, watches anxiously, actively, the religious echoes of human revolutions. It seems that, for the moment, these revolutions offer her no other field of activity. She is kept aside in the present reconstructions of the world. Although in the Middle Ages she was the mother of the rights of nations, yet the young League of Nations seems disposed to ignore her.

In these different States [says M. Goyau] which are about to unite together, the Holy See counts millions of faithful; her moral authority, freely accepted by them, could one day determine these millions of consciences to become, in their different countries, auxiliaries of good will for the decisions or for the aspirations that baffle the League of Nations. International councils, where a little justice is sought to be evolved, would find the co-operation of the Holy See an element of prestige which would prove efficacious. Former precedents could be appealed to of which long ago she was the instigator; the Truce of God, the Peace of God, pontifical measures of arbitration or mediation, the *architectural scaffolding* of that Christianity that Auguste Comte regarded as the 'political masterpiece of human wisdom.' The partial successes that these Pontiffs achieved would be for the young League of Nations a lesson of confidence and even of daring. But why should she not expect from the Popes other lessons besides those from beyond the grave? Why should their voice receive a hearing only when it raises itself up from the depths of the past?

The idea of an international legislation on labour has been consecrated by the Peace Conference. More than a quarter of a century ago Leo XIII, in a letter to the Swiss, Gaspard Decurtins, demanded this entente. His voice, although he was absent himself, was heard at the Hague in favour of the *International Association for the Protection of Workers*. To let the Holy See have a voice in international affairs, sociologists, like M. Millerand, and representatives of the working world, like M. Keufer, were less put about than were the diplomatists.

The Papacy [says M. Goyau], though denied admittance through the timidity of the chancelleries, nevertheless entered in, without forcing any doors, on its work of human mercy. It was brought back there through the very urgency of these social questions that the diplomatists of 1919 must in the end consider as factors of history.

Speaking of the temporal sovereignty of the Pope, M. Goyau finally says:—

It could be solved in several ways, either by guaranteeing internationally the liberty of the Pope or by drawing up a deed by

international procedure embodying the will of Italy to guarantee this liberty. On the day when Italian diplomacy, with the initial wish of the Holy See, would thus consider some suitable solution, the transalpine statesmen would doubtless rejoice at having done an artistic work, at having affirmed once more that certain voluntary restrictions of sovereignty sometimes mean a great relief. The need of maintaining in Rome a disturbed situation, a need that Bismarck cunningly knew how to exploit, had, forty years ago, paved the way of Italy towards the Triple Alliance, which since the first days of the great war appeared to her to be at variance with her spirit, her Latin brotherhood, her worship of right, the call of her blood. It would be for her a political good fortune to be able one day to state through the League of Nations that the Pope would enjoy in Rome all that would be necessary for his liberty. It would thus take the edge off what still remains thorny in the pontifical question ; and the feeling that a splendid work had been accomplished would immediately inspire a magnanimous desire to invite the Pope and Christianity to the foundation of a *Pax Romana*. This glorious title was blessed when it expressed the harmony that ancient Rome caused to reign among the nations obedient to her ; the third Rome would offer to the world another vision of harmony in calling it to co-operate with her in realizing the spectacle of a free Pope under the aegis of free nations.

M. V. RONAN.

DESCENT AND SELECTION : A QUERY

By D. T. BARRY, M.D. D.Sc.

THE psychic plan of the human race exhibits a lack of uniformity in adaptation to knowing, which is more remarkable for some branches of knowledge than others ; in few domains is this heteromorphic character so well revealed as in that of things spiritual and their relation to the realm of science. The varying significance of the phenomena observed or described, the different aspects of theories advanced or assertions made to account for them, the facile incidence of occasion for dissent, doubt, denial make it a domain of many views. Uniformity of outlook, however, in this as in other spheres, has always been a characteristic of the Catholic standpoint, but even for Catholics it is essential to examine the problems with punctilious care and a due sense of the proper significance of things before giving a definite ruling concerning this point or that. What is theory to day may not be theory to-morrow, and there is no valid reason for failing to pronounce a theological verdict on any form of scientific belief, whether it be in ascertained facts or not. For the Catholic teacher of science it is not always a salutary line to take up to shirk the question or refer seekers after light to exponents of philosophy or theology. It is more impressive, and perhaps more effective, when the scientist can himself turn philosopher or theologian for the nonce. The theologian proper may himself be a biologist of no mean order, and very naturally is entitled not only to entertain an opinion on the purely scientific aspects of a problem, but also to express it. In this restricted domain, however, he cannot expect all students to see eye to eye with him or to come to similar conclusions.

The writer of this article may seem to be unorthodox in some of his expressions, but he is not intentionally so ; he must at the outset disclaim all conflict with the principles of theological pronouncements ; where a semblance of this strikes the reader it is to be taken rather as indicating a want

of light in the interpretation of these pronouncements, chiefly those affecting the theory of evolution, the problems presented in its exposition, and especially the relationship to Catholic belief of the Darwinian basis of the explanation—Natural Selection. He is a scientific teacher seeking information on questions bearing on religion, which have either occurred to himself or have been propounded by Catholic students and others in the course of philosophical discussion. The truth is that a Catholic student frequently announces his inability to discriminate in scientific writings between what might be accepted as orthodox and what should be rejected as heterodox. The delver in science brings his delving propensity with him when he invades new fields, and the tendency in the theological field may seem to overstep the limits of reason by his desire for clear enunciation; he is not questioning the why and wherefore so much, however, as seeking how far and how much—how far certain views in the biological world are in or out of line with Catholic concepts.

In the *Catholic Encyclopaedia* the writers on evolution concede the acceptance of the theory of descent as compatible with Christian views of the Universe, and apparently the concession extends to the descent of man; but evolutionary theories, such as neo-Lamarckism and natural selection, are condemned. However, one of the writers of this, Wasmann, in a separate work,¹ is by no means so restricted. There, apparently, he grants the acceptance of the evolutionary theory in full and at least a part of the natural selection theory as in harmony with the Catholic outlook. He does not always announce his own views of the theory as a biologist—its scientific value—and to that we raise no objection, but clear as he is in many respects as a theologian, even Wasmann does not satisfy in explicitness.

To take another example of the theological position and the difficulties of the lay mind in interpretation, we may cite a recent article in the *I. E. RECORD*² by Father Agius, S.J., who states: 'To the theory of descent, then, apart from the question of man, there appears to be no insuperable theological difficulty.' This plainly implies that for belief in the *theory* of the descent of man there is an insuperable theological difficulty. Now to put a simple

¹ *Modern Biology and the Theory of Evolution*, p. 439.

² June, 1919, Fifth Series, vol. xiii. p. 445.

question : Is there an insuperable difficulty from the theologian's point of view to this belief ? It is a question solely concerned with somatic or bodily evolution and is distinct and separate from wild theories of psychic evolution. In the same article we find the following : ' That the human soul is created directly by God is a demonstrated conclusion of sane philosophy, and from a theological standpoint *it appears* [no italics in the original] to be heretical to deny it, mainly because . . . , though there is much in Genesis . . . to favour it.'

To favour what ? Ambiguity in the sentence may only seem to exist to an obtuse reader, and the present one must confess to the affliction if it be so. A discriminating student, a neophyte in theology, however, when asked to expound it, said he could not determine whether it meant that Genesis favoured the direct creation or the denial, with its apparent heresy. Of course the learned writer's views are easily intelligible to those whom no doubt he considered likely to be his sole readers, adepts like himself in the seizure of theological sense ; but, would it be asking too much to cater even in an ecclesiastical journal for the needs of the embryo in exegetics when the biological relationship is touched ? There can scarcely be a single Catholic scientist who would not consider denial of direct creation of the human soul as positive heresy. Can one still be Catholic and doubt that act of creation ? What is the alternative belief which enables one to escape a suspicion of heresy ? The questions are put in genuine ignorance, though at one time the questioner thought he knew the answers. The alleged evolution of the human rational soul from the sensitive animal soul is as widely separated from the problem of somatic evolution as is the problem of psycho-physical parallelism in the higher spheres of mentation from the simple processes underlying osmosis and secretion in the vegetative sphere of the body glands.

That there could be continuity of somatic development as between lower animal forms and man is a simple proposition ; the physiological processes are the same ; the belief, according to the *Catholic Encyclopaedia*, is not heretical. It is an essential belief for many students of science, though the proposition is still in the realm of theory ; they cannot envisage vital processes in human physiology as being fenced off in an unknowable compartment, distinct in origin as in function from all animal physiology. Vivisection and

comparative physiology would have little significance or value were the view of morphological and functional continuity not tenable. Once the Church grants that it is tenable it would be better to demonstrate to students the proper standpoint from which to envisage that possibility of continuity than to assume a fainéant attitude and declare : ' It is only a theory.'

Darwin's theory of natural selection has a fascination for many students, but there is a general belief that it is condemned by the Church as godless and untenable. Is it ? Is it not rather certain attributes of the theory, methods of expounding it, interpretation of accessory phenomena, and unwarrantable appropriation of it by causo-mechanical pilferers that are condemned as atheistic or agnostic. To expose in full detail these attributes and methods would be out of place here ; it would be necessary to go too profoundly into the scientific data to appreciate their character as truths or half truths ; it is a wide region in science, from which facts and theories reacting on faith may emanate ; but, without desiring to introduce scientific discussion into these pages, it will be permitted perhaps to set forth a few points, culled from limited regions but salient, to amplify those referred to by Father Agius. Our *besogne* is that of establishing the necessary data with which to equip the student of science who has a leaning towards the theory of descent ; failing these such a one is in danger, when, or if, he becomes more taken with the theory, of falling a victim to the speciousness of the materialistic exponent of evolution. He is not prepared for argumentation ; looking upon descent as incompatible with teleology and driven to a choice between them he plumps for the former, to him the more apparent truth. Such was the type of student so easily transformed by Haeckel and Huxley. ' Faith begins where science ends,' said the first-named of these materialists. A modification of the axiom, ' Faith ends where science begins,' was a formula applicable as a general rule to the student of the untutored kind presented to Haeckel.

Evolution is to-day widely accepted in the scientific world as the ground plan of animal development on the earth. It is only a theory, but one of such wide significance and varied import that it attracts and holds many minds, to whose conformation biological science would make little appeal were it not for this basis of explanation to anchor them. To such minds a few questions naturally arise from

another statement of Father Agius, that the actual origin of the human race from a single pair is an article of faith, because taught as an essential part of the doctrine of original sin. Is this article of faith consistent with the view that the human *bodies* of our first parents might not have been the result of an act of direct and immediate creation? Is the single pair limitation conceivable on the hypothesis of indirect creation of the human body? Is it conceivable on the hypothesis of direct creation of souls in the indirectly created bodies? This dual form of creation—firstly, indirect for body, by evolution (evolution producing morphological change in the primarily created creature), and secondly, direct for soul—is a possibility put forward by Wasmann.¹ 'It is certainly not an indispensable part of the idea of the creation to believe that man as a whole was created directly by God, through an extraordinary interference with the laws of nature; body and soul may have been created by God in different ways, the former indirectly, the latter directly.' The author does not apparently give this view as his own; he states nowhere that he believes in the grounds for that view as a biologist. The present writer expresses no opinion of the kind either, no views on the relationship of theromorphic forms to *homo sapiens*, but he would draw attention to the fact that while some scientists consider pithecanthropus to be a man-like ape, and some take it for an ape-like man, there are others who look upon it as being neither. The last-mentioned hope that paleontology will one day reveal better forms for their argument.

Wasmann's view, if it be legitimate to entertain it, is one well adapted to the Catholic scientific mind. Father Agius, in his paper, started with the intention of outlining the general features—'so as to be able to fix the Catholic point of view all the more accurately.' It is just this Catholic point of view that it is desired to grasp in the writing of this one, because of failure to learn from the other how far a definite theological ruling affects the acceptance of the theory of evolution and accessory theories concerning its exposition. We have, for instance, apparently conceded that there is some reasonable ground for the basis of comparison between the ontogenetic development of individuals and the phylogenetic development of the tribe or species—the so-called biogenetic law. But just how far the concession goes is not

¹ Loc. cit. p. 439.

easy to determine from the limitations of such an article; yet it is an important consideration. The treatment of this part of the subject by its great exponent Haeckel¹ is clothed throughout with the caudo-mechanical conception of the processes involved; here Haeckel confuses 'why' with 'how' in his efforts to strip phylogenesis of teleological possibilities. In discussions on the significance of natural selection much confusion has crept in because of failure to discriminate between 'how' and 'why.' One is struck by the constant use of the latter word in Haeckel's *History of Creation*; over and over he contends that Darwin showed 'why' the world inhabitants have undergone change. The natural selection theory attempts to show nothing but the mere method of the change, that is 'how'; Darwin practically said that the first cause of selection was unknown. The 'why' is of course throughout given a bearing on the broad question of a plan or purpose in nature.

In our present quest there must needs be little to occupy our attention in the views concerning initial forms of life. No one of the exponents of evolution of note confines himself to one original type of living form. Haeckel, a pure monist, premises one or a few; Darwin allows four or five, and so on to those who contend that there must have been several. We are not discussing the mechanical or monistic view of the appearance of these forms by archigony; nor are we considering the various arguments advanced for the impossibility of spontaneous generation, or its conformity with the Catholic point of view by giving the word spontaneous a different significance. The question is: May we accept these (several if necessary) primitive forms, primitive in type and ontogenetically immature, as owing their origin to supernatural agency (creation) and consisting of living matter (protoplasm), a complex chemical compound endowed by the Creator with extraordinary powers of metamorphosis and expansion? May we conceive that a process of evolution brought this matter and these living types to a state of perfection—the human body—adapted for the implantation of a rational soul? This, it must be repeated, yields nothing to psychic evolution, or pseudo-animist variant of it. Father Agius is concerned with the claims of the zoologist, who 'ignores psychic factors,' and makes no reference to those of the mental evolutionist, who is in reality a more

¹ *History of Creation.*

formidable opponent. A recent work of the Spaniard, Ingenieros, *Psychologie Biologique* (French translation), gives an exhaustive account of this aspect of the subject, experimental and comparative psychology, etc., and their bearing on it. It is sufficient to remark here that observations and facts of a purely scientific kind are faithfully given by him, but the application of them and resulting conclusions are for the most part quite erroneous.

Pending a reply to the question set out for primary species we may consider further details in Darwin's theory, though our considerations are bound to be affected by the nature of the reply. He first laid stress on the limits existing to the supply of material in nature for the maintenance of life; but the multiplication of living organisms is so extensive that more of these are produced than could possibly be accommodated, and therefore there is a constant struggle going on between them for the means of life. In this struggle for existence the strong survive; they are best fitted to acquire the necessary sustenance, while the others die for lack of it or are killed off. The surplus in nature is limited by destruction of the seed or of individuals, the chief checks to the increase of which are parasites, epidemics, weather, want, preying animals. Wallace, independently of Darwin, hit upon the theory of natural selection; it was the latter who developed it.

Adaptation to environment by variation, that is change of structure of the animal in changed surroundings—direct variation—or change in the offspring only, at least visible change—indirect variation—involving also change of habit and of function, is an essential process in the theory. It is the property supposed to enable the animal to react so as to fit it for the struggle. It would be of little consequence as an argument for the mutability of species, were the changes thus acquired by a particular individual or generation not transmitted to subsequent generations. The promulgator of the theory naturally included this, but was careful to note the marked conservative tendency of inheritance or preservation of original characters working *pari passu* with it—like tending to produce like. These inherited characters are sometimes noted in atavism, where the individual resembles a remote ancestor.

A few examples of direct variation may here be cited. The axolotl, normally a water animal, may leave this habitat and take to the land; in such a case it has been

known to grow lungs to replace gills. Tadpoles, on leaving the water, grow air-breathing apparatus also. The triton, like the tadpole, grows lungs, and its gills disappear when it goes into the air, but if taken and shut up in a tank at this time, instead of being allowed to go into the open air, the gills remain and no lungs appear; it remains like the other salamanders, which naturally never change their water-breathing apparatus. Degenerate changes in parasites are of the same order—structural—as well as degeneration of wings, muscles, etc. Numerous instances of such change are to be seen both in nature and as a result of artificial selection. Artificial selection is the term given to the efforts of farmers and others who improve stock by special breeding methods, as well as to those of the experimental worker, like Darwin, for instance, who claimed to have brought about some striking structural changes in pigeons in the course of a few generations.

Habit variation is a well-known phenomenon. Animals adapt themselves readily to new conditions, and where this fails they succumb; in captivity some species are much more easily adaptable than others. Adaptation of function is much allied. An example of this recently came under the writer's notice in Paris. Professor Lapicque, of the Sorbonne, was performing experiments with sea-weed to prepare it for horses' food. Having bleached the weed, he tried it on the animals; at the end of six days he was about to despair of success, because the material was not being digested, but he then noticed that some of it was; persevering with the thing he found that the horses digested it in full after about a fortnight's 'training,' and from the condition of the animals so fed, and the work which they were able to perform, no doubt remained that it was well assimilated and acted as an excellent food. The digestive apparatus of the horse became adapted to the new function.

Professor Adami, in the Croonian Lectures,¹ drew attention to the well-known facts of immunity from diseases. In this we have an adaptation of a new property, not the mere evoking of a present one or the persistence of a chance variation. All these and similar instances of variation must be conceded; it is a different problem, however, when it comes to the transmission to offspring.

Stockhard's experiments at the Cornell University and

¹ *British Medical Journal*, June 30, 1917.

others are supposed to supply evidence of transmission of acquired characters. Stockhard subjected male guinea pigs to the fumes of alcohol and then tried breeding from them. From twenty-four matings there were only five litters with a total offspring of twelve; of the twelve, seven died in convulsions and the rest at two months were half the normal size. When these last were mated the offspring were still worse, and so on to the fourth generation. It is of small import that the transmitted defect is not always precisely the same as in the parent. It is, of course, not in accord with the claim that only useful variation shows a marked tendency to transmission. There is no need to go over the old stock arguments for and against this inheritance of acquired characters. Artificial selection—one of the chief phenomena favouring it—does give some surprising results in altering species in the course of a few generations. The evidence derived from it, however, is principally that of intensification of existing properties rather than that of acquirement of new. Adami has succeeded in producing from harmless microbes a new race of poisonous germs by altering the conditions of their growth. The innocent germs of the natural form are innocuous, but after a few generations in changed circumstances they produce disease, and maintain that virulent character in subsequent generations.

Habit variation sometimes bears a peculiar relationship to structure. Upland geese have webbed feet, but they never take to water; they have changed their habitat and habits. Birds like the diving thrush, on the other hand, without webbed feet, take to the water in search of food. Certainly this habit variation is maintained in subsequent generations. A case of habit variation which is of great interest is that of maintaining and adapting to all exigencies a sudden artificially produced change in an organism, not of structure but of transposition. It is seen in the hydra, a small fresh-water animal, which consists of a simple tube-like body, a head and a cul-de-sac tail end. The interior surface of this tube is for digestion, the exterior for respiration. The hydra can be turned inside out, and in this condition it remains—the surface which formerly digested now taking on the function of respiration, and the respiratory surface digesting. Now the view of natural selectionists is that did such a change prove useful one could conceive its becoming permanent in the species.

All readers of Darwin are not in agreement as to the

significance of the theory, either from a purely scientific standpoint or in its bearing on ulterior views of the universe and supernatural influence. There are different forms of Darwinism. For Spencer and his congeners it is the coping stone to the edifice of mechanism or materialism in science; they would have it clinch and perpetuate the view that everything is explained by environment. According to this, environment is the active agent, the animal being merely passive in its responses. But for others, who accept the theory of the struggle for survival, it reveals a purpose and refutes mechanism; the vital theory connotes a purposive reaction on the part of the animal to extraneous stimuli, a reaction which, in its turn, connotes *a priori* Intelligence for the plan. The term Darwinism should more strictly be Spencerism. Darwin certainly, when he wrote the *Origin of Species*, did not consider natural selection as bearing the non-telic character bestowed upon it by later exploiters. He was no scoffer, and frequently referred to the Creator in his work. 'To my mind,' he says, 'it accords better with what we know of the laws impressed on matter by the Creator that the production of the past and present inhabitants of the world should have been due to secondary causes like those determining the birth and death of the individual.'¹ Wasmann carefully distinguishes between Darwinism in its restricted sense, which is Darwin's theory of natural selection, and its wider sense, which is the generalisation of that theory to a so-called Darwinian cosmogony, which must be rejected absolutely. The extension of natural selection to monism is a mischievous act committed in the name of science.²

Criticism of the theory is confined to a few heads. Firstly, the absence of transitional forms is against the mutability view. Secondly, the acquirement and modification of instinct make a complex problem for explanation. Thirdly, there was the difficulty of accounting for the sterility of hybrids with the fertility of mongrels; and lastly, how great complexity in some organs with great simplicity in others are to be reckoned as products of the same moulding process—the eye, for instance, as compared with the tail. The absence of linking forms is attributed by adherents to defects in the geological record, and to extinction, the tendency to which, in the narrow belts where species mix, is great, while the tendency to variation is slight in this junctional

¹ *Origin of Species*, p. 449.

² Loc. cit. p. 160.

region. Both sides of the instinct argument are too complex even for a short survey here; suffice it to mention a particular impression gained from the reading of it: the views of the biologist-theologian, Wasmann, on instinct seem to differ but in some slight particulars from those of Darwin. Instinct, if it must be regarded as a property with which the animal is specially endowed, need not be regarded as a primarily perfect or elaborate one—evolution does not imply the formation of something from nothing. The third objection has been met by such facts as that of the fertility of some hybrids, even where the parents belong to different genera. It is also held that domestication affects the development of reproductive powers in crossing. The dualistic conception of the universe implies that this failure to propagate is specific and designed to keep species pure. Where the progeny is fertile some observers, Kölreuter, for instance, contend that the parents are not pure species. The case of the goat and sheep is sufficient to refute this contention of Kölreuter's. The fourth and last-mentioned obstacle, that of dissimilar organs, gave Darwin little trouble: he took no interest in trying to establish or to maintain non-telic attributes for his theory. He would be doing so by attributing varying complexity according to purposive adaptation to the same cause-mechanical basis.

Fleischmann's views on the theory of descent, referred to by Father Agius, are discussed at length by Morgan,¹ who holds that while the theory lacks absolute confirmation it is the one which best accounts for the facts. This is the view of many a discriminating student, even were his professor to try to teach him differently; it best accounts for the facts. Morgan is a biologist of conciliatory and moderate type. He says that we can profitably reject much of the natural selection theory, and especially the idea of variation arising *because* of its utility. We have instances of the opposite, one of which just occurs to the writer: the hydra, already referred to in another connexion, will, if its head be split longitudinally, develop two perfect heads; if each of these be again split it develops four heads, and so on—eight, twelve heads. There is variation, but where is the call for it? Yet Morgan admits that adaptation is widespread. He considers the theory inadequate to account for the *origin* of the power to

¹ *Evolution and Adaptation* (1903).

regenerate lost organs—the crab, for instance, grows a new leg where a leg has been cut off. Having given numerous instances of adaptation as it is to be understood, in which is included the development of variation, he says we know nothing of how it occurs. Morgan also refers to acquired immunity from disease and poisons.

There is a mingling of issues in that transmutation and descent have come to mean nearly the same thing as evolution; there is a difference of course. Descent is based on the geological, comparative, and embryological evidence referred to by Father Agius. Descent by what Dall calls saltatory evolution would be so fast in comparison with the extreme slowness of variation, on which Darwin insisted, that the intermediate forms or links so much sought after would never really have existed; that is, to contend that a rapid change has occurred under the intensive action of environment, and the new form has been preserved. It is only in the final step in descent, where from one order in the mammalian kingdom is supposed to evolve another order, and where anatomical differences between the two are slight, that links are chiefly wanting. In the lower stages they are quite frequent: pterodactyl, for example, lies between reptiles and birds; while the monotremes, platypus, etc., lie between reptiles and mammals. It is but right to state that these are not considered as true intermediate forms by many biologists, but they possess numerous features in common to both kingdoms, laying eggs like reptilia they suckle their young like mammalia.

Morgan,¹ notwithstanding his strong criticism of certain phases of selection, sums up with the statement that the condition of the organic world requires for its explanation the application of the 'principle of selection in one form or another.' To repeat, there are Catholic men of science who feel, if they do not actually think, with Morgan that he is not far wrong; would they be far wrong from the teleological point of view in thinking with him in this fully? Is the occurrence of mutations that are not adaptive an objection to the teleological fitting of natural selection? In illness, physical and mental, we have change which is not adaptive. Is the doctrine of pre-formation to exclude the possibility of trial and error as a property of living matter? The combination of trial and error is one of the commonest features of mentation, and though the psychic realm is altogether a different

¹ *Evolution and Adaptation.*

sphere it is one ordered by the Creator. It is a difficult thing to examine these problems without seeming to want to fathom the inscrutable mind of the Creator ; the present effort, however, is merely directed towards ascertaining how far certain scientific probabilities, if not truths, explanatory of so-called natural selection, are to be regarded from the Catholic standpoint. The word 'natural' in the term cannot imply the exclusion of supernatural pre-ordination or direction. Father Agius thinks that St. Augustine's conception of the universe did not embrace evolution of species. Wasmann, however, thinks it reasonable to apply to living organisms St. Augustine's idea that God created matter and allowed the universe to develop automatically by His laws.¹

Numerous experiments have been performed on the developing ova of some of the lower species, with a view to observing the adaptive properties of living matter. Such interference with nature processes of course goes further than ordinary accidental change in environment, but in principle is allied to it. The results indicate that pre-formation is markedly evident. Especially in the earlier stages, disturbing agencies fail to alter the course to the pre-destined form. Some injuries, however short of fatal, can produce deformities and monstrosities. There is evidence of epigenesis or adventitious development in some of these results.

In conclusion, the suggestion is again put forth that Darwin applied his theory of natural selection to the subconscious as well as to the unconscious, the former lifting it from the domain of the passive in giving scope for the conditioning of the reaction from within. The attempt to apply it to the higher mental faculties, to demonstrate evolution of these, is an entirely different proposition.

While the writer has endeavoured to set out a few important points favouring the belief in continuity of structure and function in the vegetative life of organisms in general, including the human body, he has also put tentatively some suggestions bearing on what seems to him a plausible explanation of that continuity. He has put some questions concerning the relationship of the belief and its grounds to religion and hopes that an answer, or answers, will be forthcoming.

D. T. BARRY.

¹ Loc. cit. p. 274.

NOTES AND QUERIES

THEOLOGY

BANNS

I

REV. DEAR SIR,—1°. Speaking of dispensation in banns you say that 'at present the etiquette of the matter requires that the dispensation be obtained from the Ordinary who has jurisdiction over the bride.' Is that statement reconcilable with Canon 1028?

2°. Caius, aged 24, domiciled in a city parish, spent nine months, in 1916, with an uncle who lives in the next parish—also in the city. He is now about to be married. Must I lay the matter before the Bishop, and have the banns proclaimed in the uncle's parish? It seems a waste of energy.

3°. John, a resident in diocese A, and Mary, a resident in diocese B, come to diocese C to be married. Can the Bishop of C dispense in banns? Canon 1028 gives power to the *local* Ordinary.

4°. If, in the last case, the Bishop of C cannot dispense, who can?
B. R.

II

REV. DEAR SIR,—1°. Who is the *parochus proprius* of Canon 1023, § 1? Is it the parish priest of domicile or quasi-domicile? Or the parish priest of month's residence as well?

2. . . . In this parish we shall soon have the trouble that confronts us every year. The neighbouring parish belongs to another diocese, and marriages between the members of the two parishes are very common. The bridegroom in such cases has to go a long journey to get a dispensation in banns from our own authorities. Then he must go a longer journey still for a dispensation from the representative of the other Bishop. Not only that, he must pay a fee in both cases. Is the double dispensation necessary?

VICARIUS.

III

REV. DEAR SIR,—As there are parties in this parish [in Scotland] intending to contract marriage in Ireland soon, I am anxious to know if it will be necessary to have banns proclaimed.

I understand that in the Irish diocese, where the marriage is to be contracted, banns are not published—by custom. Seeing that, as I understand, it is the Bishop of this Irish diocese who should dispense, may it be taken for granted that the banns need not be published here, or will it be necessary to apply to the Bishop of the Irish diocese for dispensation?

D. L.

These three queries—and several others that have reached us—cover partially the same ground. To prevent useless repetition, we may sum up the general principles before replying individually. And we would ask the correspondents whose letters are *not* quoted to take this reply as if given to themselves.

Where are the banns to be proclaimed? There may be special laws on the matter—they usually deal with the cases of *vagi* and soldiers—in any particular diocese, province, or nation. Into these we cannot enter: the discussion would be interminable and, for any individual inquirer, of very little use. It is enough to state that these special laws may be opposed to the Code, or may add to the Code without opposing it. In the first case, they are null and void, in the second they are strictly binding in the particular locality for which they were framed (6).

So far as the *general* law is concerned, Canon 1023 gives the rule. It prescribes that the banns must be published, 1°, by the 'proper' parish priest (§ 1), 2° by the parish priest of the place in which either of the parties spent six months after reaching the age of puberty, if the Ordinary thinks that a less formal investigation will not meet the requirements of the case (§ 2), 3°, by the parish priest of the place in which either spent a period less than six months, if there be special reason for suspecting that an impediment has been incurred, and if the Ordinary on that account comes to the same conclusion as in the second instance (§ 3).

The second and third regulations give little trouble. They are definite, concrete statements—much better than the pre-Code teaching that banns should be proclaimed wherever the parties had 'recently spent a considerable time.' No one could say what 'recently' meant—anything from six months to five years found defenders. Nor was the meaning of 'considerable' much better defined—six months or a year or thereabouts. That is all settled now; 'recently' is extended to mean 'at any time since the parties reached the age of 14 or 12'¹; and six months—in abnormal cases even less—must be taken as 'considerable.' But not in the sense that, when these conditions are fulfilled, the banns *must* be proclaimed: only in the sense that the Ordinary may prescribe them. His discretion is the ultimate court of appeal. He may even dispense with 'regular proof' occasionally. When a troubled querist asked, 'If a person after reaching the age of puberty has lived for more than six months in far-off, distant places, from which regular proof of freedom can only be secured after a rather lengthy period, and if the marriage has to be contracted soon, is "freedom" sufficiently established in the case by the oath of the individual himself along with the testimony of two witnesses—or, if two are not procurable, of one at least—who have lived with him in those distant places,' he was assured that 'the matter is left to the prudent judgment of the Ordinary; who may, in accordance with Canon 1023, § 2, prescribe other proofs

¹ Though the age for valid marriage has been raised to 16 and 14 (1067) the age of puberty remains as before (88, § 2).

instead of the 'regular,' including, if necessary, the supplementary oath.'¹

The main difficulties centre round the 'proper parish priest.' As regards banns, who is he? On the principles of the Code we should say:

1°. The parish priest of any parish in which either of the parties has, at the time of the marriage, a domicile or quasi-domicile (94, § 1).

In an exceptional case, that might mean that the publication would have to take place in nearly a dozen different places. But the case *would* be exceptional; in the general run of things, the number will be one or two. It may be well to remember, moreover, though the Code says nothing about it—that the teaching of the old-time authorities may still be availed of, viz., that there is no obligation, or that at least a dispensation may be very easily granted, when the domicile or quasi-domicile has been secured very recently, and when, in consequence, the parties are little known in the district and their chance of having contracted an impediment there negligible.² But, on the other hand, it has to be kept in mind that the domicile or quasi-domicile may be more easily secured now than under the old legislation. The conditions are fulfilled:—

(a) As before, when one or other of the parties has taken up residence in the *parish* with the requisite intention (92).

(b) When one or other has taken up residence in the *diocese* with the requisite intention, and has been staying (for some considerable time) in the *parish* (92, 94, § 3).

(c) When one or other has, even without any special intention, remained in the *diocese* for six months, and has been staying (for some considerable time) in the *parish* (92, 94, § 3).

(d) *A fortiori*, and perhaps on a multiple title, when one or other has remained for six months in the *parish* (92, 1097).

2°. Most likely, the parish priest of the place in which either party has resided for a month. Canon 94, we admit, says nothing about them; but Canon 1097—the canon in the matrimonial sphere—puts him side by side with the parish priests of domicile and quasi-domicile (§ 1, 2°, 3°), and suggests that he stands on a higher plane than the parish priest of the *vagus*—to be mentioned presently. At the same time we think that, when the period is only a month or thereabouts, the consideration already mentioned should have its weight—the obligation will not be very strict: at the very least a dispensation may be readily granted.

3°. The parish priest of the place where a *vagus* has been staying for some considerable time—more than a few days, less than a month (94, § 2). We add the phrase 'for some considerable time,' as we did already in connexion with domicile and quasi-domicile, though the canon says simply, 'actu commoratur.' For this reason: the 'actu commora(n)tur' of Canon 94, § 2, § 3, must be taken to imply the same as

¹ See I. E. RECORD, September, 1918, Fifth Series, vol. xii. p. 253.

² See e.g., Gasparri, *De Matr.*, n. 209.

the 'actualis commoratio' of Canon 1097, § 1, 2°. In the second case it *must* involve a 'considerable' stay; else we should have the legislator solemnly assuring us that 'a man should be married in the place where he has spent (at least) a *short* time.' The assurance would be quite unnecessary, for, outside the case of marriage by proxy, he could not possibly manage to be married anywhere else.

But, in the case of *vagi*, the remark already made may be repeated more confidently. Their stay is short at best—if they remained a month, they would cease to be *vagi* for matrimonial purposes. The obligation of publishing their banns in the place of marriage is, therefore, not one that need cause the priest concerned much acute anxiety.

If there be reasonable grounds for a dispensation, who is empowered to grant it? Canon 1028 gives the answer. The 'proper' local Ordinary. The adjective 'local' (in Latin the genitive 'loci') is inserted to mark out the Bishop, Vicars-General and Capitular, etc., as distinct from the higher superiors in exempt clerical Orders (198, § 2). For determining the 'proper' Ordinary the rules are exactly the same as those for determining the 'proper' parish priest: domicile or quasi-domicile (diocesan or parochial), a month's residence, etc.—all suffice to establish a claim.

The canon goes on to define matters that might otherwise be debated. It decides:—

1°. That the 'proper' local Ordinary may dispense from the obligation of having the banns published in an extern diocese (§ 1). The meaning is not very clear. When A (belonging to diocese B) is to marry C (belonging to diocese D), may the Bishop of B remit the obligation of banns in diocese D—thereby directly dispensing A and C? Or must his powers be exercised only in regard to his own subject, A? The canon does not specify: and anyhow it is no easy matter to resolve into its component elements an obligation that is almost essentially composite, that affects A *only* in relation to C, and *vice versa*. But, theoretically, the view suggested in the second query seems correct: the Bishop of B is not the 'proper' Ordinary of C, and it is only the 'proper' Ordinary that can give a direct dispensation (§ 1). If that be so, the rule covers only the case in which a Bishop's subject has a domicile or quasi-domicile in another diocese. For, as we have seen, when he has merely lived for a time in the other diocese, there is no need for a dispensation: the obligation does not arise unless the Bishop so decides (1028, § 2, § 3).

But all that only in theory. In actual fact, the Bishop *can* dispense—at least indirectly. That is the *practical* conclusion derived from teaching entirely independent of Canon 1028—based, in fact, on what we have called the composite nature of the obligation. The banns-restriction is one that affects the mutual relations of the partners, not the partners individually; and a restriction of that kind, so some

authorities claim, ceases when *one* of the parties is liberated. A contract is void if *one* party fails to give consent; a bridge cannot stand, if *one* of its two pillars is undermined: somewhat in the same way the banns-obligation comes to an end when *one* of the partners is exempt or dispensed—if A is free to marry B, then B is free to marry A. The principle is not very well established. It was admitted, for instance, under the *Tametsi* decree in reference to mixed marriages, but is rejected by the Code in the same connexion (1099, § 1, 2°). But it is championed by such leading authorities¹ that, whatever its defects in theory, it may be adopted as a safe rule in practice until formally condemned by competent authority in some particular department.

A Bishop may refuse to grant a dispensation unless the banns are proclaimed, or a dispensation given, in the diocese of the extern partner. In that sense, at least, he may insist on a double dispensation. But, apart from action of that kind, a dispensation given to one partner will, in practice, free the other.

2°. The canon adds that, when there are several 'proper' Ordinaries, the right of dispensing is reserved to the Ordinary in whose territory the marriage is contracted (§ 2). This marks an advance on previous law. The final regulation, though, is much the same as its predecessors. When the marriage takes place outside the territories of *all* the 'proper' Ordinaries, none of them has any right of preference (§ 2): the authority first appealed to has, we presume, the right to see matters through.

That leaves us free to answer the queries. For convenience' sake we have numbered the paragraphs in the letters.

I. 1°. We have had some trouble in discovering the sentence quoted. We find it was published in October, 1915. That was under the old régime: we were trying to give the law as it stood, not to prophesy what it would be two years later. But indeed as regards the point at issue, the law has made little or no change. It does state that the dispensing power is vested in the Ordinary of place of marriage (1028), but it also prescribes that 'as a rule the marriage is to take place before the parish priest of the bride' (1097, § 2).

2°. The Bishop may not insist on the publication; if so, there will not be much energy wasted after all. And we are far from satisfied that 'B. R.' is bound to submit the matter to the Bishop. He will note that the canon (1023, § 2) does not speak of a six months' stay in another 'parish': it says 'in another *locality*.' Without straining terms unduly, we may say that the uncle's and nephew's residences are both situated in the *same* 'locality.'² And there is no need to be over-scrupulous in regard to the law. It affects only liceity; its purpose can often be secured very effectively by other methods; the conclusions to which it leads

¹ Lehmkuhl, ii. 864; Gasparri, n. 183; etc.

² Cf. Lehmkuhl on Clandestinity, ii. 889.

in abnormal cases must be squared with the principle of fitness and with the dictates of common sense.

3°. Neither John nor Mary, we take it, becomes a subject of the Bishop of C. If so, we think the Bishop cannot grant a dispensation. When 'B. R.' states that the canon 'gives power to the local Ordinary,' he is right so far. But he should have added another adjective: the power is given to the 'proper' local Ordinary (1028, § 1).

4°. The Bishops of A and B are both competent (1028, § 2).

II. 1°. The first query has been answered above. 2°. Also the second.

III. From 'D. L.'s' statement it would seem that neither of the parties will be subject to the Irish Bishop at the date of the marriage. But other suppositions are possible. So:—

1°. If the hypothesis just stated be correct, the banns must be proclaimed in Scotland (1023, § 1), or a dispensation secured from the Scotch Bishop (1028, § 1).

2°. If one partner has become subject to the Irish Bishop—on any of the titles mentioned above—the latter gives the dispensation (1028, § 2). He may insist on banns, or inquiry, in Scotland, in view of the period spent there by his subject (1023, § 2, § 3). As for the Scotch partner, the dispensation given by the Irish Bishop will, at least indirectly, avail *him* also.

3°. If both become subject to the Irish Bishop:

(a) the dispensation he gives will apply to both directly;

(b) inquiry, or publication, in Scotland is a matter for the Irish Bishop's discretion.

Other combinations and permutations are possible—say, when the marriage takes place in Ireland, but outside the Irish diocese to which one or other has become attached. But 'D. L.' will be able to deal with them when they occur. And we need not add that what we have said is true only on the supposition that there are no extraordinary circumstances that will justify the Irish parish priest in falling back on the principles of 'epikeia,' and dispensing with minor formalities.

RECENT ROMAN REPLIES

The majority are dealt with very fully in our Canon Law section.¹ Of the others, four or five were discussed by anticipation in the October (1919) number of the *I. E. RECORD*,² and a few remarks were made on all of them in the January (1920) issue of the *I. T. Quarterly*.³ On a few technical points we may be pardoned for making a remark or two in a subsequent issue.

M. J. O'DONNELL.

¹ See below, p. 62 sqq.

² Pp. 309-13.

³ Pp. 91-96.

CANON LAW

SOME DECISIONS OF THE PONTIFICAL COMMISSION FOR THE INTERPRETATION OF THE CODE OF CANON LAW

SEVENTEEN decisions of the Pontifical Commission for the interpretation of the Code of Canon Law have been published in the December issue of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*.¹ A few of them have very little interest for Ireland and similarly situated countries; no comment upon them, therefore, is needed. The Theological Correspondent will deal, or has dealt, with those that fall within his own department; we shall make a few remarks upon the remainder.

I

DELEGATION TO HEAR CONFESSION

In the list of decisions published, the third has reference to delegation to hear confessions. The question submitted to the Commission was the following:—

Whether, in accordance with Canons 199, § 1, and 874, § 1, parish priests, vicars of parish priests, and other priests delegated *ad universitatem causarum*, can delegate jurisdiction for the hearing of confessions to priests, either secular or religious, or can they, at least, extend for these same, if they are already approved, their jurisdiction beyond the limitations, of place or persons, within which, in accordance with Canon 878, § 1, it has been circumscribed; or do they require for this purpose a special faculty or mandate of the local Ordinary?

The answer given to this query was: 'In the negative to the first part, in the affirmative to the second.'

This reply is clearly contained in the provisions of the Code itself. According to Canon 199, §§ 1 and 3, indeed, those who have ordinary jurisdiction and those who have been delegated *ad universitatem causarum* can subdelegate their jurisdiction, at least in individual cases, unless the contrary is expressly provided in law. There is, however, such a provision regarding jurisdiction to hear confession in Canon 874, § 1, where it is clearly implied that the granting of delegated jurisdiction is reserved to the Ordinary of the place where the confessions are heard.

It may not be out of place to reproduce here the remarks which we made on this particular point in our article on 'Jurisdiction,' in the issue of the I. E. RECORD for March, 1919:—

A person who has ordinary jurisdiction can delegate it either partially or totally, unless in any particular case there is an express prohibition of law (c. 199, § 1). The best known of these prohibitions is that in regard to jurisdiction to hear confessions. For those who maintained, under the old discipline, the distinction between jurisdiction and approbation, theoretically, this prohibition did not exist. Theoretically, all who had ordinary jurisdiction to hear confessions could delegate it. But,

¹ See below, pp. 72-75.

the need of approbation from the Ordinary of the place rendered delegations by anyone else useless, so that for all practical purposes the prohibition really existed. In the Code the distinction between jurisdiction and approbation has disappeared, and the power of delegating is expressly restricted to the Ordinary of the place (c. 874, § 1).

II

THE ADMISSION TO A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTE OF THOSE WHO BELONGED
TO A NON-CATHOLIC SECT

The seventh decision has reference to one of the diriment impediments to admission into a religious institute. The Commission was asked: 'Whether the words *qui saectae acatholicae adhaeserunt* of Canon 542 are to be understood of those who, moved by the grace of God, have come to the Church from the heresy or schism in which they have been born; or rather of those who have lapsed from the faith and have joined a non-Catholic sect.'

The answer was: 'In the negative to the first part, in the affirmative to the second.'

Amongst those who are prohibited, in Canon 542, from validly entering the novitiate of a religious institute are 'those who have belonged to a non-Catholic sect' (*qui saectae acatholicae adhaeserunt*). According to this decision, the prohibition applies only to those who, being originally Catholics, have lapsed from the faith and have become members of a non-Catholic sect, not to those who have been born in heresy or schism. We believe this to be a restrictive interpretation. Even though it may be contended that the word *adhaeserunt* implies deliberation, still it may be truly predicated of adult members of a non-Catholic sect who have been born therein. The expression 'have belonged,' the official English translation of *adhaeserunt*, lends colour to the same view; in fact, it implies that even those who have been born in a non-Catholic sect, but who have been brought up as Catholics from their earliest years, are included in the prohibition.

Some doubts may be raised regarding the position of those who have been born and baptized in the Catholic Church, but who, through the lapse of their parents, or for some similar reason, have been brought up from infancy as non-Catholics. In our opinion, such persons are not included in the prohibition. Positively, the decision states that the words apply to those who have fallen away from the faith and attached themselves to a non-Catholic sect. The words *defecerunt* and *adhaeserunt* imply, we think, deliberation, and, consequently, they are not applicable to those whose secession from the Church took place before they had attained the use of reason.

III

THE SUFFRAGES DUE TO NOVICES AND TEMPORARILY PROFESSED RELIGIOUS
AFTER DEATH

The eighth query proposed for solution to the Commission was the following: 'Whether in accordance with Canon 567, § 1, and Canon

578, n. 1, novices and professed religious with temporary vows, if they are anticipated by death, have a right to the same suffrages as professed with solemn vows or with simple perpetual vows, even though the constitutions previously approved by the Holy See ordain otherwise.'

The answer was:—

In the affirmative and *ad mentem*. The *mens* is this: Orders and religious Congregations can prescribe appropriate and identical suffrages for all novices, temporarily professed religious, and professed religious with solemn vows or with simple perpetual vows, in their constitutions, which are to be corrected and submitted for approbation to the Sacred Congregation of Religious, in accordance with the decree of the same Sacred Congregation of the 26th June, 1918.

Again, there is nothing in this decision which the Code itself does not clearly express. Canon 567, § 1, in regard to novices, and Canon 578, n. 1, in regard to temporarily professed religious, are quite explicit on the point; and in virtue of Canon 489, rules and constitutions opposed to the prescriptions of the Code are abolished. A quotation from our article on 'Nuns and Sisters,' in the I. E. RECORD of December, 1918, will give some idea of the change which the new regulations on this matter, have effected in the pre-Code discipline:—

If they (novices) die during the novitiate, they have a right to the same suffrages as are prescribed for professed members (c. 567). This was not the case hitherto. By a decree published in 1912, novices in serious danger of death were permitted to make their profession, even though the full period of the novitiate had not expired; and thus they became participators in all the suffrages to which professed religious, when dying, had a right. The present disposition, we think, obviates the necessity of such profession—as a matter of fact, there is no mention of it in the Code

IV

THE RIGHT OF NOVICES TO DISPOSE OF THE USE AND USUFRUCT OF THEIR PROPERTY FOR THE PERIOD DURING WHICH THEY ARE BOUND BY SIMPLE VOWS

The ninth decision is also concerned with a certain aspect of religious life. The question referred to the Commission was the following: 'Whether the words *nisi constitutiones aliud ferant* of Canon 569, § 1, refer to the word *libere*, so that it is lawful to determine by the constitutions for what purpose novices should destine the use and usufruct.'

The answer was: 'Constitutions approved before the promulgation of the Code are to be observed, whether they take away from the novices the right of disposing of the use and usufruct of their property, or limit or define this right.'

A glance at Canon 569, § 1, suffices to show that this interpretation of it is purely declaratory. 'Before the profession of simple vows, whether temporary or perpetual,' it states, 'the novice must hand over the administration of his property to whomsoever he wishes, for the whole period during which he will be bound by simple vows, and, unless

the constitutions determine otherwise (*nisi constitutiones aliud ferant*), dispose freely (*libere*) of its use and usufruct.' This canon, therefore, clearly permits the constitutions to take away or limit a novice's right to dispose of the use and usufruct of his property. It will be noted, however, that no such permission is conceded in regard to the right of determining the person of the administrator.

V

THE MENDICANTS OF WHOM THERE IS QUESTION IN CANON 621, § 1

The tenth decision concerns mendicants. The query submitted to the Commission was the following:—

Whether Canons 621, § 1, is to be understood only of religious who are called mendicants in the strict sense; or is to be understood also of those who are designated by such a title in a wider sense, as are the Brothers of the Order of Preachers.

And in the hypothesis of an affirmative answer to the first part:

Do the said mendicants need the permission of the Ordinary, if they wish to collect alms for the building, ornamentation, etc., of their churches?

The answer was: 'In the affirmative to the first part, in the negative to the second. As regards the permission to be obtained from the Ordinary, provision is made in the aforesaid Canon 621, § 1.'

To understand the importance of this decision, it is necessary to have before us briefly the regulations of the Code regarding the collecting of alms by religious. According to Canon 621, § 1, mendicants, to collect alms in the diocese where their house is situated, need only the permission of their own superiors; outside the diocese, however, they require the written permission of the local Ordinary. All other religious belonging to institutes with papal approbation, in virtue of Canon 622, § 1, must obtain not merely the permission of the local Ordinary, but also a special indult from the Holy See. The formalities prescribed for mendicants are, therefore, much less exacting than in the case of other religious; and hence the practical nature of the question.

The Commission has decided that Canon 621, § 1, is to be understood only of mendicants in the strict sense of the term. Now, mendicants in the strict sense are those only who are incapable of holding property, not merely as individuals, but also in common as a community. Originally there were several Orders of this description. The Council of Trent, however, conferred upon them all, with the exception of the Friars Minors of the Strict Observance and the Capuchins, the privilege of holding property in common.¹ Afterwards two other Orders, the Discalced Carmelites and the Jesuits, renounced this privilege²; so that, at the present time, there seem to be only four Orders that can be called mendicant, in the strict sense—the Friars Minors of the Strict Observance, the Capuchins, the Discalced Carmelites, and the Jesuits. All the others, such as

¹ Sess. XXV. c. 3, de Regul.

² Cf. Wernz, tom. iii. n. 597.

the Dominicans, who are commonly called mendicants, are such only in a wide sense, and are consequently, in this matter of collecting alms, subject to the same regulations as the non-mendicant institutes.

CAN ILLEGITIMATES AND CONVERTS BE ADMITTED TO A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTE?

REV. DEAR SIR,—Would you kindly tell me whether an illegitimate girl can become a nun, and what steps she must take before entering. A nun of my acquaintance is in communication with two girls who are anxious to become lay-sisters in a foreign convent. This nun asked me could they be received. I said, Yes, with a dispensation, but added that I would give more definite information later. I find in the new Code no mention of a dispensation. I wish you, therefore, to give me light on the question. The case of one of these girls is a little more complicated. She was born of a Catholic mother, and was very probably baptized a Catholic, but was afterwards taken by a Protestant woman, and was apparently a Protestant until she reached the age of eight. Then she, of her own accord, became a Catholic, and was re-baptized conditionally by the priest. The certificate of this baptism is the only one available. As these are practical questions of general interest, you may publish them in the I. E. RECORD.

SACERDOS.

The Code of Canon Law does not mention illegitimacy amongst the impediments which prevent valid or lawful entrance into the religious life.¹ In regard, indeed, to those intended for the priesthood in a religious institute, any irregularity, and therefore illegitimacy, constitutes an impedient impediment; but this point, however, has no bearing upon the present case. So far as general law is concerned, therefore, it is quite certain that an illegitimate girl may become a nun or sister. This really marks no change in the pre-Code discipline.

Whilst illegitimacy is not, and has not been, as a rule, an impediment to entrance into the religious life by general law, it may be such in virtue of the particular constitutions of individual institutes. As a matter of fact, the *Normae*, to which new Congregations were to conform, put 'illegitimates not properly legitimated'² amongst those who were not to be admitted to the religious life. We may conclude, therefore, that all Congregations founded since 1900, the year in which the *Normae* were published, and very many founded previously, have a constitution of this nature. It is hardly necessary to remark that subsequent marriage in accordance with the terms of Canon 1116, suffices for legitimation.

The constitutions of the institute which these girls intend to join should, therefore, be examined; and, if it is found that they refuse admission to illegitimates, a dispensation must be sought from the competent authority; otherwise, of course, no special permission is needed.

According to Canon 542, n. 1, those who have belonged to a non-Catholic sect cannot be validly admitted to the novitiate of a religious

¹ Cf. Canon 542.

² *Norma*, § 61—'Illegitimi non rite legitimati.'

institute. Whatever difficulties might have been hitherto experienced in applying this prohibition to the second case submitted by our correspondent, they have disappeared with the publication of the interpretation of this particular section of the Code which has been recently given by the Commission. As we saw above, the Commission has declared that the words *qui saectae acatholicae adhaeserunt* of Canon 542, n. 1, are applicable, not to those who have been born in heresy or schism, but rather to those who lapsed from the faith and joined a non-Catholic sect. We saw further that the lapse of which there is question in this decision is a deliberate one, and consequently cannot be verified in the case of those whose secession from the faith took place before they attained the use of reason. In our opinion, therefore, this girl is quite free, so far as this prohibition is concerned, to enter any religious institute.

ALIENATION OF ECCLESIASTICAL PROPERTY

REV. DEAR SIR,—There is a small farm, value for about £500, attached to this parish, which it is desired to alienate for the purpose of obtaining funds to repair the parish church and the curate's house. Is it necessary for this purpose to obtain an indult from the Holy See? Or does the permission of the local authorities suffice?

PAROCHUS.

If the value of the property were the only point that had to be considered, the local authorities would be quite competent. According to Canon 1532, § 1, n. 2, permission from the Holy See is not necessary unless the value exceeds 30,000 francs, which, in normal exchange, is equivalent to about £1,200. There is, however, another factor in this case which must be taken into account. The purpose of the alienation is to expend the proceeds in repairing the parish church and the curate's house. Now, Canon 1531, § 3, states clearly that the money derived from the alienation of ecclesiastical property should be invested in safe securities; and as this is a general law, and as no powers over it are conceded to local authorities, the Holy See alone can dispense from it. It is evident, therefore, that in the present case an indult must be obtained from Rome, not so much, indeed, for the alienation, as for permission to have the money expended in the way specified.

The *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* for November last, publishes a case decided by the Congregation of the Council, which involved the point at issue in the present query. The matter is dealt with so clearly and succinctly in the preliminary discussion, that a quotation cannot fail to be useful. Lest the technical nature of some of the expressions employed should lose some of their force, we shall give the relevant paragraph in the original:—

Quibus positis, sequeretur etiam res pretiosas quae mille libellarum valorem non excedunt, alienari ab Ordinariis posse, servatis solemnitatibus praescriptis in Can. 1530-1532, ex quibus potissimum attendenda est, ad casum nostrum, clausula can. 1531, § 3: '*Pecunia ex alienatione percepta, caute, tuto et utiliter in commodum Ecclesiae collocetur*':

i.e., pecunia retracta non statim erogari valet in usus etiam pios et necessarios, sed immo conservanda est *ad fructum*; ut ergo erogetur seu consumatur, licet ad amplificandam ecclesiam, ut in casu factum est, necessaria est semper Apostolicae Sedis licentia, seu dispensatio super obligatione hac, quam data lex in laudato canone perspicue et explicite, nullaque concessa exceptione, imponit.

J. KINANE.

LITURGY

THE REVERENCES TO BE MADE IN GIVING BENEDICTION OF THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT

REV. DEAR SIR,—As decrees appear occasionally which modify the reverences to be made by a priest while giving Benediction (*cum ostensorio*), it is difficult to find a manual that supplies all the reverences to be made during the Service. Hence one notices that these reverences differ in different churches. If the question is not too unwieldy, will you kindly say what are the proper reverences to be made by a priest during the Service.

SACERDOS.

From the wording of the query we infer that our correspondent is concerned with the ordinary Benediction (*cum ostensorio*) given by a single priest—without Deacon and Subdeacon, or even an Assistant, to expose the Blessed Sacrament. Briefly the reverences in the order of the ceremony should be as follows¹: (1) *Bow* to the cross on leaving the sacristy; (2) *Genuflect in plano* on arrival at the foot of the altar; (3) Kneel for a short prayer of adoration on the first step (customary, not prescribed); (4) Ascend the altar, spread the corporal, open the Tabernacle, and *genuflect*² on one knee; (5) Take the *custodia* from the Tabernacle, close the latter, open the Monstrance and the *custodia*, put the Blessed Sacrament (in the lunette) into the Monstrance, place the latter in the centre of the altar, and *genuflect* on one knee; (6) If there is a throne, take the Monstrance, mount the steps (if necessary), place it upon the throne, descend and *genuflect* on one knee; (7) Turn to the right, descend so as not to turn the back on the Blessed Sacrament, and *kneel* on the first step; (8) *Bow moderately*,³ rise, step

¹ Benediction not being strictly a liturgical ceremony does not occur in any of the official books of the Roman rite. As a consequence, it varies somewhat in different countries. As authorities on the complete ceremony consult *Ritus servandus in solemnibus expositione et benedictione SS. Sacramenti* (Burns and Oates 1915); Fortescue, *Ceremonies of the Roman Rite* (pp. 240-246); Muller, *Handbook of Ceremonies*, etc.

² Genuflect in front of the Tabernacle, having the hands on the altar. An assistant in this case genuflects (with hands joined) a little to the right, in order not to turn his back on the celebrant.

³ The more general practice is to *bow profoundly* both here and in No. (9), and this would seem more consonant with the double genuflection. But the *Ritus servandus* directs, 'praemisâ inclinatione mediocri.'

slightly towards the Gospel side and put incense into the censer without any form of blessing; (9) Kneel again, receive the censer and *bowing moderately* before and after, incense the Blessed Sacrament in the usual way; (10) *Bow slightly* during the singing of the words *Veneremur cernui*; (11) At the words *Genitori Genitoque* incense the Blessed Sacrament—all as in No. (9); (12) After the Versicle and Response rise, sing the Prayer, kneel again on the first step, receive the humeral veil¹ and, *without bowing*, rise and ascend to the predella; (13) *Genuflect* on one knee, turn the ornamented side of the Monstrance away from yourself, take it through the ends of the humeral veil, turn round and bless the people; (14) Raise the Monstrance to the level of the eyes, lower it below the breast, raise it again to the level of the breast, turn with it first to the left, then to the right (as in the *Orate Fratres*) and place it on the altar²; (15) Kneel on predella, return humeral veil and, without another genuflection, take the Blessed Sacrament from the Monstrance, restore it to the *eustodia*, close it and the Monstrance, open the Tabernacle and, *without genuflecting*, place within it the *eustodia*, and then *genuflect*; (16) Close the Tabernacle, fold the corporal, place it in the burse, restore the latter to its place against the gradus, and without further genuflection or bow³ descend to the foot of the altar; (17) *Genuflect in plano*, return to the sacristy and bow to the cross on arrival.

PROFESSED RELIGIOUS AND THE PRIVILEGE OF ACTING AS SUBDEACONS AT A HIGH MASS. THE USE OF THE STOLE IN THE RECONCILIATION OF A CONVERT. SHOULD THE ANTICIPATED SUNDAY MASS HAVE THE 'CREDO'? THE NAME OF THE ORDINARY IN THE CANON OF THE MASS

REV. DEAR SIR,—I shall be obliged if you will kindly reply to the following queries in the next issue of the I. E. RECORD:—

1. Have professed Religious who are not in Orders the privilege of acting as Subdeacons at a High Mass?

2. Should a priest in reconciling a convert wear the stole when he does not absolve from excommunication; and when he does absolve should he wear the stole throughout the ceremony?

3. When a Sunday Mass is anticipated should the *Credo* be said?

4. When an Ordinary of a diocese has more than one name, e.g., Henry Edward, is it sufficient to mention only one in the Canon of the Mass? I fancy I have learnt that one name is sufficient, though I cannot lay my hand on the authority.

INQUIRER.

¹ If the Monstrance has been placed on a throne to which the ascent is made by steps or a ladder, a genuflection is made before the ascent and after the descent, and the humeral veil is usually not received till then. The priest receives it kneeling on the edge of the predella, and then proceeds with the blessing, as in No. (13).

² There is an alternative though less usual way of giving the blessing, i.e., turning first to the left, then to the right, then back again to the middle and then by the left to face the altar.

³ Sometimes we observe a bow to the cross, but it is not prescribed.

1. We are not aware that religious profession carries with it any such privilege. A professed Religious, even though he has not received first tonsure, enjoys certain privileges proper to clerics, e.g., the *privilegium fori*, but we have no evidence that this special privilege of assisting as Subdeacon at the Mass is included amongst them. The Congregation of Rites, questioned as to whether one who had not received the Subdiaconate might act as Subdeacon in a Solemn Mass, is very explicit on the point, and makes no exception in favour of Religious. The following question and reply are dated July 17, 1894: 'Num qui Subdiaconatus ordinem nondum recipit, Subdiaconi munere fungi valeat in Missa Solemni?'—'Affirmative; dummodo clericale saltem tonsura sit initiatus, manipulum non ferat et vera urgeat necessitas.'¹ And again, in a decree dated May 14, 1905, it is stated: 'Clericus ad munus subdiaconi obeundum in Missa Solemni, nunquam deputetur, nisi adsit rationabilis causa et in minoribus ordinibus sit constitutus, aut saltem tonsura initiatus.' The reception of at least first tonsure is, therefore, a prerequisite for acting as Subdeacon in the Mass in any circumstances, and this, as far as we know, equally applies to seculars and professed Religious. The following comment of Ojetti reflects the views of liturgists on the matter: 'At debet esse necessario clericus, etsi sit regularis, necnon solummodo in casu praevisae et absolutae necessitatis, idest dummodo non adsit alter.'²

2. On the points raised herein the Ritual is not at all clear, nor do authorities seem to be in agreement. The result is that custom seems to regulate the usage differently in different places. Some prescribe the use of a purple stole throughout the ceremony,³ others⁴ prescribe only the surplice—except, of course, for the actual Baptism and the Confession. We think that the stole should be also used for the absolution from excommunication, but for the remainder of the ceremony we know of no reason, apart from custom, that would justify the use of it.

3. Yes, the *Credo* should be said. The anticipated Sunday carries with it its ordinary privileges as far as the Mass is concerned, and the recitation of the *Credo* is one of these. It retains the *Gloria*, too, if the particular Sunday were entitled to it.⁵

4. We agree with our correspondent that it is quite sufficient to mention the first of the two names in the recitation of the Canon. Though unable for the moment to discover any definite regulation in the matter, we find the tenor of several decrees decidedly against the multiplication of names unnecessarily in the liturgy of the Mass. The rubric in question directs the insertion of the *nomen* (not the *nomina*) *Antistitis* and we think in the particular case the insertion of the name *Henrico* leaves no room for ambiguity and adequately designates the Ordinary.

¹ Decr. 3832.

² *Synopsis Rerum Moralium*, vol. iii. p. 3839.

³ Vide the *Rituale Parvum* (published by Duffy & Co.), p. 76.

⁴ Vide *Ceremonies of the Roman Rite* (Fortescue), p. 402.

⁵ See the directions in the Irish *Ordo*, or the outline of the Calendar annually published in the *Ephem. Liturgicae*.

of the place. The decrees¹ referred to prohibit appendages to the names of Saints in the Collects of the Mass, e.g., Franciscus (*de Paula*), Petrus (*Nolascus*), Franciscus (*Xaverius*), and we fancy the reason given in one of the decrees for the prohibition has some degree of plausibility also in the present instance: 'Quum horum Deus non indigeat ad dignoscendum in cuiusnam Servi sui nomine Oratio sibi designatur.'²

THE FEAST OF A TITULAR IN RELATION TO THE REFORMED RUBRICS OF THE BREVIARY

REV. DEAR SIR,—In the reformed Rubrics of the Breviary (*Additiones et Variationes*, tit. vii. par. 1) it appears that in Lauds of a 1st Class double a commemoration is made of any double major, or minor, and of any semi-double occurring on the same day, except in the case where a 1st Class double is a Primary Feast of Our Lord kept by the Universal Church. Now, in a church whose Titular is the Sacred Heart the latter Feast is Primary. Can it, therefore, be described as 'Festum primarium Domini I classis Ecclesiae Universalis,' in the sense of the rubric?

SACERDOS.

☞ No; as the Feast of the Titular it is Primary, but as a Feast of the Universal Church it ranks as a Secondary Feast of Our Lord. The Office of the Feast, therefore, is not exempt from the prescribed commemorations, even when, as in this instance, it happens to be that of the Titular of the Church.

M. EATON.

¹ Decr. 583; 2319; 2637.

² The prohibited appendages of course refer to the places of origin of these Saints, and we are fully aware that the cases are not parallel, but nevertheless the prohibition of them serves to indicate the mind of the Church.

DOCUMENTS

THE PONTIFICAL COMMISSION FOR THE INTERPRETATION OF THE CANONS OF THE NEW CODE REPLIES TO A NUMBER OF PROPOSED DIFFICULTIES

(October 16, 1919)

PONTIFICIA COMMISSIO

AD CODICIS CANONES AUTHENTICE INTERPRETANDOS

DUBIA

SOLUTA IN PLENARIIS COMITIIS EMORUM PATRUM

Can. 6.—1. Utrum praescripta decreti S. C. C. diei 30 nov. 1910 'Decorem domus Dei' de chori disciplina in urbe servanda, I-VIII, adhuc vigeant.

Resp. : Affirmative.

Can. 10.—2. Utrum vota religiosa simplicia perpetua ex parte voventis, emissa ante promulgationem Codicis in Religionibus votorum sollemnum, sive virorum sive mulierum, sint moderanda quoad modum dimissionis religiosorum et quoad effectus dimissionis a iure antiquo vigente ante Codicem.¹

Resp. : Affirmative.

Can. 199, § 1 et 874, § 1.—3. Utrum ad normam canonum 199, § 1, et 874, § 1, Parochi, Vicarii parochorum, aliive sacerdotes ad universitatem

¹ Cadono per conseguenza i commenti fatti in Riviste pur autorevoli ad altro dubbio o incompletamente o indebitamente pubblicato. Ecco, per maggior chiarezza, la domanda presentata alla Commissione, alla quale domanda il dubbio corrisponde: 'Fr. Iosephus Antonius a S. Ioanne in Persiceto, Procurator Generalis Ordinis Fratrum Minorum Cappuccinorum, ad pedes Sanctitatis Vestrae provolutus, quae sequuntur humiliter exponit:

' In Ordinibus regularibus virorum sive etiam monialium stricte dictarum, vota simplicia, quae usque ad diem Pentecostes h. a. 1918 solemnibus praemittebantur, erant (et sunt) *perpetua* ex parte voventis (S. Congr. super st. Reg., *Sanctissimus*, 12 iun. 1858, n. I; et S. C. Episc. et Regul., *Perpensis*, 3 maii 1902, n. V); eaque vota, usque in diem quo vigere coepit Codex Iuris canonici: (a) *apud regulares viros* in Ordinibus clericalibus, ex iustis ac rationabilibus causis, solvebantur ex parte Ordinis in actu dimissionis professorum (*Sanctissimus*, n. III et IV; et quoad religiosos etiam Ordinis laicalis militari servitio adscriptos, S. C. de Relig. *Inter reliquas*, 1 ian. 1911, n. VIII); (b) *apud Moniales* vero solvebantur ab ipsa Sede Apostolica, ad quam recurrendum erat in singulis casibus iuxta praescriptum decreti *Perpensis*, n. XII.

' Porro, quum dimissio huiusmodi professorum non videatur contemplari

causarum delegati, possint sacerdotibus sive saecularibus sive religiosis delegare iurisdictionem ad confessiones recipiendas, aut saltem iisdem iam approbatis iurisdictionem extendere ultra fines loci vel personarum, intra quos ad normam can. 878, § 1, fuerit circumscripta; an ad id egeant speciali facultate seu mandato Ordinarii loci.

Resp.: Negative ad primam partem, affirmative ad secundam.

Can. 395, § 1.—4. An vi canonis 395, § 1, Episcopus teneatur pro quotidianis distributionibus, tam in Cathedralibus quam in Collegiatis, tertiam partem fructuum separare, etiam si in dictis ecclesiis distributiones chorales, quamvis tenues, originem repetant ex privilegio apostolico.

Resp.: Affirmative.

Can. 396, § 2.—5. An optio, de qua in canone 396, § 2, censeatur prohibita, etiam ubi viget ex speciali indulto apostolico.

Resp.: Affirmative.

Can. 422, § 2.—6. Utrum Canonici iubilati sint exempti a servitio altaris pro sua vice praestando, non obstante contraria consuetudine.

Resp.: Affirmative.

Can. 542.—7. Utrum verba *qui sectae acatholicae adhaeserunt* canonis 542 sint intelligenda de iis, qui Dei gratia moti ex haeresi vel schismate, in quibus nati sunt, ad Ecclesiam pervenerint; an potius de iis qui a fide defecerunt et sectae acatholicae adhaeserunt.

Resp.: Negative ad primam partem, affirmative ad secundam.

Can. 567, § 1, et 578, n. 1.—8. Utrum, ad normam canonis 567, § 1, et canonis 578, n. 1, novitii et professi a votis temporaneis, si morte praeventantur, ad eadem ac professi a votis sollemnibus, aut professi a votis simplicibus perpetuis, suffragia ius habeant, etiamsi aliter ferant constitutiones antea approbatae a S. Sede.

Resp.: Affirmative et ad mentem.

Mens est: Ordines et Congregationes religiosas possunt congrua eademque suffragia pro omnibus novitiis, temporanee professis et professis a votis sollemnibus aut professis a votis simplicibus perpetuis, praescribere in suis constitutionibus emendandis et pro approbatione exhibendis ad S. C. Religiosorum, ad normam eiusdem S. Congregationis Decretum diei 26 iunii 1918.

saltem explicite sub tit. XVI, lib. II, Codicis, de *Personis*, infrascriptus Procurator Generalis Ordinis FF. Min. Capuccinorum humiliter quaerit.

Utrum praedicti Regulares, *votis tantum simplicibus sed perpetuis* obstricti, dimitti deinceps possunt, sicut olim, vi decr. *Sanctissimus* S. Cong. super st. Reg., 12 iun. 1858, n. IV. respect. *Inter reliquas*, S. C. de Relig., 1 ian. 1911, n. VIII; vel, si agatur de Monialibus, ad normam decreti *Perpensis* S. Congr. Episc. et Regul. 3 maii. 1902, n. XII, ita ut, data dimissione, ab omni vinculo dictorum votorum et obligatione liberi fiant;

vel utrum etiam quoad eosdem professos servare licebit modum dimissionis qui, sub cap. I, tit. XVI, lib. II, Codicis, servandus praescribitur circa Religiosos qui vota *temporaria* nuncuparunt;

et, quatenus affirmative ad hanc secundam partem, quaeritur utrum Religiosus (regularis sive monialis), hoc modo dimissus, ipso facto solutus habendus sit ab omnibus votis religiosis, uti de dimissis professis votorum *temporariorum* statuitur in can. 648.

Can. 569, § 1.—9. Num verba *nisi constitutiones aliud ferant canonis 569, § 1*, ad vocem *libere* referantur, ita ut liceat per constitutiones determinare in quem finem de usu et usufructu a novitiis sit statuendum.

Resp. : Constitutiones ante promulgationem Codicis approbatae servandae sunt sive novitiis adimant ius disponendi de usu et usufructu suorum bonorum, sive hoc ius limitent, seu praefiniant.

Can. 621, § 1.—10. Utrum canon 621, § 1, intelligendus sit tantum de religiosis mendicantibus strictu sensu dictis; an etiam de illis, qui latiori sensu tales appellantur, uti sunt Fratres Ordinis Praedicatorum.

Et quatenus affirmative ad primam partem :

An dicti mendicantes indigeant Ordinarii licentia, si velint stipem petere in dioecesi pro aedificatione, ornatu, etc., suarum ecclesiarum.

Resp. : Affirmative ad primam partem, negative ad secundam; quod vero attinet ad licentiam ab Ordinario obtinendam provisum in cit. can. 621, § 1.

Cann. 756 et 98.—11. Utrum qui ad preces parentum, contra praescriptum canonis 756, a ritus alieni ministro baptizati sunt, pertineant ad ritum in quo sunt baptizati, vel ad ritum in quo, iuxta praescriptum canonis 756, baptizari debuissent.

Resp. : Prout casus exponitur, negative ad 1^m partem, affirmative ad 2^m.

Can. 822, § 4.—12. Utrum facultas celebrandi Missam in domo privata sit ab Ordinario, ad normam canonis 822, § 4, interpretanda restrictive.

Resp. : Affirmative.

Can. 987.—13. Utrum, ad normam can. 987, impeditis adnumerandus sit is, cuius pater vel mater tantum est acatholicus, alter parens catholicus. Et, quatenus affirmative, an etiam eo in casu, quo matrimonium mixtum datis cautionibus cum dispensatione in hoc vetito contractum fuit.

Resp. : Affirmative in omnibus.

Can. 1205, § 2.—14. An sepultura fidelium, quae locum obtinet in ecclesia subterranea, censenda sit facta in ecclesia in sensu canonis 1205, § 2.

Resp. : Affirmative, si agatur de ecclesia subterranea, quae sit vere et proprie ecclesia, divino cultui addicta.

Can. 1215.—15. Utrum periculum offensionis, vulgo *malumore*, ex parte fidelium et cleri sit, ad normam canonis 1215, gravis causa, quae excuset a transferendis cadaveribus fidelium e loco in quo reperiuntur, ad ecclesiam ubi funus persolvatur.

Resp. : Negative, et consuetudinem non transferendi cadavera fidelium, antequam tumultentur, e loco in quo reperiuntur in ecclesiam esse reprobendam.

Cann. 1355, 1356, 1441.—16. An in collatione parocciarum non reservatarum possit Episcopus imponere pro una vice tantum moderatam taxam favore Seminarii, etiam si parocchia de qua, obnoxia sit tributo huic Instituto solvendo.

Resp. : Recurrendum esse in singulis casibus ad S. Congregationes competentes.

Can. 1990.—17. Utrum Ordinarius, praetermissis iuris sollemnitatibus in Constitutione Apostolica *Dei miseratione* requisitis, matrimonium possit declarare nullum cum interventu tamen defensoris vinculi matrimonialis, quin opus sit secunda sententia, hisce in casibus, nempe.

(1) Si duo catholici, in loco certe antehac obnoxio cap. *Tametsi* Conc. Tridentini, vel post Decretum *Ne temere*, matrimonium civile tantum inierunt, omisso ritu ecclesiastico, et, obtento civili divortio, novum in Ecclesia inire student matrimonium vel novum matrimonium, civiliter ininitum, in foro Ecclesiae convalidare.

(2) Aut catholica pars, quae cum acatholica, spretis Ecclesiae legibus, in templo sectae protestanticae (in loco certe antehac obnoxio cap. *Tametsi* Conc. Tridentini, et ubi Benedictina declaratio extensa non est, vel post Decretum *Ne temere*) matrimonium contraxit, obtento civili divortio, in facie Ecclesiae novum matrimonium cum catholico consorte inire vult.

(3) Aut apostate a fide catholica, qui in apostasia civiliter vel ritu alieno se iunxerunt, obtento civili divortio, poenitentes ad Ecclesiam redire et cum parte catholica alteras nuptias in Ecclesia celebrare desiderant.

Resp. : Casus supra memorati nullum iudicalem processum requirunt aut interventum defensoris vinculi, sed resolvendi sunt ab Ordinario ipso, vel a Parocho, consulto Ordinario, in praevia investigatione ad matrimonii celebrationem, de qua in can. 1019 et seqq.

Romae, 16 octobris, 1919.

PETRUS CARD. GASPARRI, *Praeses*.
ALOISIUS SINCERO, *Secretarius*.

INDULT REGARDING FAST AND ABSTINENCE IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE PHILIPPINES

(November 10, 1919)

ACTA SS. CONGREGATIONUM

SACRA CONGREGATIO CONCILII

INDULTUM DE ABSTINENTIA ET IEIUNIO PRO AMERICA LATINA ET INSULIS
PHILIPPINIS

Plures ex America Latina Sacrorum Antistites nuper ab Apostolica Sede suppliciter expostularunt ut iisdem perdurantibus causis benigne renovaretur indultum circa abstinentiam et ieiunium die 1 ianuarii 1910 pro America Latina et Insulis Philippinis ad decennium concessum. Quum hae preces in generali conventu diei 8 novembris 1919 ad trutinam revocatae fuerint, Eñi Patres huius S. Congregationis Concilii memoratum indultum pro America Latina et Insulis Philippinis ad aliud decennium quidem prorogandum, sed, quo magis congrueret novi Codicis iuris canonici hae in re praescriptis, prout sequitur moderandum censuerunt. Quapropter statuerunt ut :—

(1) Ieiunium sine abstinentia servetur : feria VI Quatuor temporum in Adventu, feriis IV Quadragesimae et feria V Maioris Hebdomadae ;

(2) ieiunium et abstinencia : feria IV Cinerum et feriis VI Quadragesimae ; (3) abstinencia sine ieiunio : in Vigiliis : (a) Nativitatis Domini, (b) Pentecostes, (c) Assumptionis B. M. Virginis, (d) Apostolorum Petri et Pauli vel Omnium Sanctorum ; (4) in reliquis vero servetur forma praecedentis Indulti, firmo etiam, quoad abstinenciam et ieiunium, privilegio Nigritis et Indis Americae Latinae concesso a Leone XIII Constitutione *Trans Oceanum*, die 18 aprilis 1897.

Quam resolutionem in audientia subsequentis diei a subscripto Secretario relatum, SS^mus D. N. Benedictus PP. XV ratam habere et confirmare dignatus est, eamque publici iuris fieri mandavit, contrariis non obstantibus quibusvis.

Datum Romae, ex Secretaria eiusdem S. Congregationis Concilii, die 10 novembris 1919.

D. CARD. SBARRETTI, *Praefectus*.
I. MORI, *Secretarius*.

THE NEW PARISIAN TEMPLE ERECTED IN MONTMARTRE AND DEDICATED TO THE SACRED HEART, RECEIVES THE TITLE OF A MINOR BASILICA AND IS GRANTED PRIVILEGES

(September 27, 1919)

TEMPLUM PARIENSE 'VOTI NATIONALIS,' SACRATISSIMO IESU CORDI DICATUM, BASILICAE MINORIS TITULO AC PRIVILEGIIS DONATUR.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.—Parisiis, in Monte qui dicitur Martyrum, eo quod sanctus Dionysius, illius civitatis episcopus, cum sociis sancto Rustico presbytero, sancto Eleutherio diacono aliisque pluribus, ibidem, sub Domitiano Caesare, sanguinem suum fudit pro Christo, hodie intuentium admirationem sibi conciliat nova ecclesia in honorem sacratissimi Cordis Iesu exstructa et communiter *Voti nationalis* nuncupata, ex voto quod anno MDCCCLXX, urbe obsidione cincta, nonnulli pii fideles, pro liberatione et salute patriae, voverant. Quod votum ut ad effectum deduceretur, venerabilibus Fratribus Galliae Episcopis adprobantibus, institutum et per totam Galliam propagatum est Sodalitium vulgo *Sainte Ligue du Vœu national au Sacré Cœur de Jésus*, cuius sodales et piis precibus et frequenti Corporis Christi sumptione iram divinam placare et meritas noxarum poenas avertere nitentur. Cui operi fel. rec. Decessor Noster Pius PP. IX, Litteris Apostolicis ad praesidem Leonem Cornudet, die xxxi mensis iulii anni MDCCCLXXII datis, benedixit et sequenti anno MDCCCLXXIII haud mediocrem pecuniae vim benigne contulit. Deinde piam illam unionem, quae sibi ecclesiae sub titulo sacratissimi Cordis Iesu aedificationem proposuerat, in Archiconfraternitatem evexerunt et pluribus indulgentiis et privilegiis auxerunt fel. rec. Decessores Nostri Litteris Apostolicis diebus xx mensis februarii, vi mensis martii, xi mensis septembris anni MDCCCLXXVII et die iv mensis martii anni MDCCCLXXIX Piscatoris annulo obsignatis. Cum autem fideles e Gallia Romanorum Pontificum, Praesulum suorum et piorum laicorum quos memoravimus, optatis egregie respondissent, eo vel magis quod

duabus legibus decreto n erat eiusmodi opus ad utilitatem publicam pertinere, deliberatum est piacularis templi aedificationem inchoare secundum formam ab architecto Abadie, anno MDCCCLXXIV, delineatam et a curatoribus 'Voti nationalis' approbatam. Atque anno MDCCCLXXV, altero saeculo exeunte ex quo Dominus Noster Iesus Christus Cor suum beatae Mariae Alacoque conspiciendum dedit, mense iunio, Ioannes Hyppolitus S. R. E. presbyter cardinalis Guibert, archiepiscopus Parisiensis, adstante, cum Nuntio Apostolico apud Rempublicam Gallicam ac pluribus Archiepiscopis atque Episcopis, ingenti cleri populique multitudine, solemniter 'solvens votum anno MDCCCLXX conceptum a populo cum bellum in Germanos saeviret,' demisit lapidem fundamenti novi aedificii sacratissimo Cordi Iesu dicati. Interea, donec praefata ecclesia perficeretur, oratorium publicum eo ipso loco exstructum est et curis commissum Congregationi Oblatorum Mariae Immaculatae, qui, pietatem peregrinorum foventes, sacris ibidem muniis assidue multos annos functi sunt; quod quidem ad sacellum fideles non modo ex Parisiensi dioecesi, sed etiam ex variis provinciis Galliarum atque ex regionibus exteris frequentissimi confluebant. Progressu temporis, ob laboriosum murorum opus, Castri Nantonis lapidibus confectum, tam lente aedificium crevit, ut anno tantummodo MDCCCLXXXI, die XXI mensis aprilis, idem Archiepiscopus Parisiensis in prima ecclesiae inferioris seu cryptae cella absoluta atque sancto Martino Turonensi dicata, Sacrum peragere potuerit. Deinde, die XIX mensis novembris anni MDCCCLXXXVI Benedictus Maria cardinalis Langénieux, archiepiscopus Rhemensis, adstantibus sibi omnibus, quotquot ad sacram aedem convenerant, Praesulibus ac presbyteris atque populo confertissimo, solemniter duas apsides lustravit; et anno MDCCCXL, die XIII iunii, festivas sacratissimi Cordis Iesu in ala magna aedis superioris tandem celebrata est. Praecedenti vero anno MDCCCLXXXIX frons praecipua templi istius inaugurata fuerat, conspicua forma, anaglyphis statuisque mirabilis, quae, Parisios spectans, inscriptum refert titulum *Sacratissimo Cordi Iesu Christi Gallia poenitens et devota*. Octoginta tribus altis columnis structilibus fundata innixaque sacrae aedis magnifica moles, antiqua artis christianae romanae-byzantinae lineamentis speciosa, ex duabus nunc ecclesiae superpositis constat. Princeps tholus e medio tecto sublime tollitur; prope apsides turris celsissima exsurgit, unde suos edit concentus aes totius Galliae multo maximum, quod clerus, proceres populusque Sabaudiae, praeunte Archiepiscopo Camberiensis cum Episcopis Provinciae, coacta stipe, dono dederunt cum quinquagesimum sacerdotii sui natalem fel. rec. Decessor Noster Leo XIII ageret. Ambae vero ecclesiae, superior et inferior, quae per plures scalas inter se communicant, non modo amplitudine atque altarium et sacrae suppellectilis copia, sed mirificae artis praestantia excellunt; pariterque stemmatibus nominibusque cuiusque eorum gentis ornantur, qui, erga sacratissimum Cor Iesu pietate incensi, largam in erigendum templum stipem contulerunt. Quod ut exstrueretur et perficeretur, plus tricies mille millia librarum impensa sunt; atque ingens haec pecuniae summa ita munusculis ex omni parte Galliarum congesta est, ut aemulatione inter se omnes certaverint Galliae tum dioeceses, tum familiae

religiosae, pia sodalitia, exercitus ac classis, homines ex omni conditione, quotquot domum, ex instituto Sancti Foederis, quod memoravimus, templum hoc condi voluerunt 'in argumentum amoris erga sacratissimum Cor Iesu, ad luenda et pianda gentis Gallicae crimina, ad opem Dei et praesidium obtinendum ut Gallia ab hostibus et Romanus Pontifex in libertatem asserantur.' Constat popularium pietatem cotidie vehementius exarsisse; enimvero usque ad hunc diem, peregrinatione fere cotidiana, non modo ab urbe Parisiorum, verum etiam a dissitis tum Galliae tum coloniarum regionibus, turmatim ad aedem sacram confluerunt ex omni ordine cives, sanctissimum Eucharistiae Sacramentum, diu noctuque venerationi publicae propositum, adoraturi Eiusque opem imploraturi. Quamquam vero monumentum hoc perpetuum voti, quo Gallia poenitens et devota sacratissimo Cordi Iesu se obstrinxerat, iam perfectum erat, pluribus de causis, ob proximum praesertim taeterrimum bellum, Archiepiscopus Parisiensis et Galliae Episcopi impediti sunt quominus sollempnibus illud caeremoniis consecrarent et dedicarent. Porro, immani bello absoluto, sanctuarium istud votivum, die XVI proximi mensis octobris, omnibus Galliae adstantibus Episcopis, erit tandem ritu solemniter consecrandum. Ad significandam vero tum pietatem in sacratissimum Cor Iesu Nostram, tum benevolentiam qua Galliam, filiam Ecclesiae primogenitam, prosequimur, decrevimus Parisios mittere venerabilem fratrem Nostrum Antonium S. R. E. cardinalem Vico, episcopum Portuensem et Sanctae Rufinae, Sacrorum Rituum Congregationi praefectum, qui Nostram personam gerat et faustae solemnitati Nostro nomine praesideat. Cum autem dilectus filius noster Leo Adulphus presbyter cardinalis Amette, ex dispensatione apostolica archiepiscopus Parisiensis, quo 'Voti nationalis' templi decus maxime augeatur, Nos suppliciter rogaverit, ut eidem sacrae aedi dignitatem, titulum et privilegia Basilicae Minoris impertiri dignemur; Nos votis his annuendum ultro libenterque censuimus. Quare, collatis consiliis eum VV. FF. NN. S. R. E. Cardinalibus Congregationi Sacrorum Rituum praepositis, Motu proprio ac de certa scientia ac matura deliberatione Nostris deque Apostolicae potestatis plenitudine, praesentium vi perpetuumque in modum, enunciatum templum votivum, sacratissimo Cordi Iesu dicatum, in Monte Martyrum, archidioecesis Parisiensis, a die solemniter eiusdem consecrationis peragenda, dignitate ac titulo Basilicae Minoris honestamus, cum omnibus honoribus, praerogativis, privilegiis, indultis quae Minoribus almae huius Urbis Basilicis de iure competunt. Decernentes praesentes Litteras firmas, validas atque efficaces semper exstare ac permanere, suosque integros effectus iugiter sortiri et obtinere, illisque ad quos pertinent nunc et in posterum plenissime suffragari; sicque rite iudicandum esse ac definiendum, irritumque ex nunc et inane fieri si quidquam secus super his, a quovis, auctoritate qualibet, scienter vel ignoranter, attentari contigerit. Non obstantibus contrariis quibuslibet.

Datum Romae apud sanctum Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris, die XXVII septembris MCMIX, Pontificatus Nostri anno sexto.

A NEW DIOCESE IS ERECTED IN THE EAST INDIES

(September 10, 1919)

LITTERAE APOSTOLICAE

NOVA IN INDIIS ORIENTALIBUS DIOECESIS PATNENSIS ERIGITUR

BENEDICTUS PP. XV

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.—In suprema Principis Apostolorum Cathedra, nullis quidem meritis, divinitus collocati, Praedecessorum Nostrorum vestigiis inhaerentes, spiritualibus fidelium necessitatibus et fidei atque evangelicae veritati provehendae Apostolica Nostra auctoritate providere satagimus, Iam vero cum in septentrionali Indiarum Orientalium territorio, gravibus obstantibus difficultatibus atque illius praesertim amplitudine, impar sit evangelicorum operariorum inibi adlaborantium numerus, novaque dioecesis opportune efformari posse videatur, quae, aliis accedentibus sacerdotibus, uberius fidei incremento consulere possit; Nos, collatis consiliis cum VV. FF. NN. S. R. E. Cardinalibus negotiis Propagandae Fidei praepositis, quo melius prospiciatur catholicae fidei utilitatibus atque incrementis, haec, quae infrascripta sunt, decernenda in Domino existimavimus, Nimirum, Motu proprio atque ex certa scientia et matura deliberatione Nostris deque Apostolicae Nostrae potestatis plenitudine, praesentium vi, ex territoriis, quibus integre constant actualis Praefectura de Bettiah et regio Nepol, nec non orientalis plaga dioecesis Allahabadensis, quae iacet ad meridiem fluminis Ganges, quaeque pars est novarum civilium provinciarum de Behar atque Orissa, districtum includens de Behar portionemque districtus de Patna et districtus de Bhagalpur, novam dioecesim formamus, fundamus, cui nomen ab urbe Patnensi facimus; pariterque decernimus ut episcopi residentiae locus in civitate Bankipur figuratur et nova Patnensis dioecesis ad provinciam ecclesiasticam Calcuttensem pertineat, tanquam illae Metropolitanae Ecclesiae suffraganea, eiusque cura Societatis Iesu Missionariis demandetur, Similiter per praesentes, de Apostolicae Nostrae potestatis plenitudine, statuimus, ut dioecesi Allahabadensi, cui adhuc et Patnensis nomen erat, unicus et exclusivus in posterum sit titulus Allahabadensis. Haec vero mandamus, decernentes praesentes Litteras firmas, validas atque efficaces semper existere et fore, suosque plenarios et integros effectus sortiri atque obtinere; illisque ad quos spectat vel, in posterum spectare poterit, in omnibus et per omnia plenissime suffragari; sicque in praemissis iudicandum esse ac definiendum, atque irritum et inane fieri si secus super his, a quoquam, quavis auctoritate scienter, vel ignoranter, contigerit attentari. Non obstantibus Apostolicis Constitutionibus ceterisque omnibus in contrarium facientibus quibuscumque.

Datum Romae apud sanctum Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris, die x septembris MCMXIX, Pontificatus Nostri anno sexto.

P. CARD. GASPARRI, *a Secretis Status.*

DECREE REGARDING THE NOMINATION OF AN APOSTOLIC VISITOR FOR THE MISSIONS OF CHINA AND THE NEIGHBOURING KINGDOMS

(July 22, 1919)

SACRA CONGREGATIO DE PROPAGANDA FIDE

DECRETUM

CIRCA NOMINATIONEM VISITATORIS APOSTOLICI IN MISSIONES SINENSIS REGIONIS FINITIMORUMQUE REGNORUM:

Cum in amplissimae Sinensis regionis ac finitimorum regnorum missionibus, laeta, Deo adiuvante, his postremis temporibus, catholica fides incrementa susceperit, ac ampliori libertate a publicis auctoritatibus ipsa donata sit, hoc Sacrum Consilium christiano nomini propagando, earum missionum necessitatibus commodisque optat uberius prospicere ut, uniformi ad sacrorum canonum normam roborata disciplina atque animorum viriumque inter varias Missiones arcta consociatione firmata, ad feliciores progressus res christiana adducatur.

Qua de re, ab infrascripto eiusdem S. Congregationis Cardinali Praefecto, facta relatione SS^{mo} D. N. Benedicto PP. XV in audientia diei 17 iulii c. a 1919, Sanctitas sua decrevit ut Apostolicus Visitor in Sinenses regiones ac finitima regna mitteretur, eo fine et consilio ut, de mandato atque auctoritate Apostolicae Sedis Missiones perlustrans, omnia accurate investigaret de praesenti Missionum statu ac necessitatibus; consultisque eorum Praesulibus, praesertim de futuro, si fieri queat, antistitum omnium cogendo generali conventu, cum iis agat de iisdem negotiis; et postea, peracta integra visitatione, Romam veniat ut Sedi Apostolicae ea proponat quae sibi maxime opportuna videantur ad maiora catholicae religionis incrementa promovenda; datis interim, si quae moram haud patiantur, provisionibus, quas magis in Domino expedire iudicaverit, ac ceteris peractis quae, iuxta traditas eidem Visitori Apostolico per ipsam S. Congregationem instructiones, demandata fuerint.

Hoc autem Visitoris Apostolici munus, eadem Sanctitas Sua committendum iussit R. P. D. Ioanni Baptistae de Guébriant, Vicario Apostolico de Canton, quem egregiae animi dotes ac rerum experientia ad id officium apprime commendant; eum omnibus facultatibus necessariis et opportunis.

Qua super re praesens decretum confici Sanctitas Sua iussit, contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

Datum Romae ex aedibus S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, die 22 iulii 1919.

G. M. CARD. VAN ROSSUM, *Praefectus*.
C. LAURENTI, *Secretarius*.

L. ✠ S.

REVIEWS AND NOTES

LE CHRIST, VIE DE L'ÂME. Conférences Spirituelles par D. Columba Marmion. Abbaye de Maredsous (Belgique). London: Washbourne; Burns and Oates.

THIS book has reached its fourth edition. That alone is a clear index of its worth. As Cardinal Mercier says in his Preface to it: 'Les pages sont bienfaisantes. Elles reposent l'âme. Elles simplifient la vie chrétienne.' The main purpose of the author is to dispel darkness and doubt from troubled souls, to expand those souls and free them from their own slavery. The Conferences are the fruit of several years of reflection and prayer. They were given to audiences of various kinds. The author, having had no idea of publishing them, had not committed them to writing. But some of his audience, believing them to be of permanent benefit, took abundant notes and begged the author to publish them. Father Marmion, realizing their imperfections, as they were delivered in a language other than his mother-tongue, did not see his way to publish them as they were. A devoted friend set himself the delicate and difficult task of gathering together the numerous notes and of co-ordinating them with a definite plan. The simple style of the author is preserved throughout, so also is the characteristic method of the author faithfully preserved. The Conferences are mainly a commentary on the words of Christ: 'Come to Me; I am the Life of your souls; you will find this Life only in Me, but you will find it in abundance'—*Veni ut vitam habeant et abundantius habeant*.

There are nineteen Conferences in all, covering about 580 pages. The author shows Divine Providence embracing in the same plan of pre-destination Christ, the Word made man, and ourselves. Then, following the doctrine of St. Thomas Aquinas on the meditation of Christ, the Sanctifier of souls, he shows in Him, true God and true Man, the unique and universal exemplar of all holiness, the meritorious and satisfactory cause that has paid to divine justice the price of our salvation, according to the words of St. Paul: 'And being consummated, He became; to all that obey Him, the cause of eternal salvation, called by God a high-priest according to the order of Melchisedech' (Heb. v. 9). Finally, Christ is the efficient cause of our holiness, for, always following the doctrine of the Apostle St. Paul, whom our author never wearies of quoting, 'Of Him are you in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and justice, and sanctification, and redemption' (1 Cor. i. 30).

Having shown the office of Christ under its different aspects, Father Marmion considers the realization of the divine plan in souls. Christ

forms His mystical body, the Church, visible and invisible. But the Holy Spirit has formed Christ—at least it is thus that theology expresses itself in the word ‘appropriation,’ and the ‘Spirit of Jesus’ completes the work of our sanctification. Thus is portrayed the picture of the work of Christ eternally conceived in the plan of the Heavenly Father and realized by Christ, the Mediator, and by His Sanctifying Spirit. Christ is in the centre of the plan and of the work of God. In His theandric Person He includes all—*Tu solus sanctus, Tu solus Dominus, Jesu Christe*. The whole substance of evangelical spirituality is in this formula, as Father Marmion wisely says: ‘For certain souls the life of Christ Jesus is a subject of meditation among many others. That is not enough. Christ is not one of the means of the spiritual life; He is our *whole* spiritual life.’

The second portion of the work is devoted to showing the work of the soul that wishes to receive abundantly the divine life of which Christ is the source. Faith in the divinity of Christ constitutes the first step towards this life. Baptism, first of all the Sacraments, makes the recipient a disciple of Christ. By this sacrament of adoption and initiation, the Christian becomes a participator in the glorious life and death of his divine Master. These two aspects of the spiritual life, so well expressed by St. Paul, must embrace the whole existence of every Christian.

The author then shows in detail how we ‘die in sin,’ how ‘we live for God.’ He develops the laws to which are submitted the exercise and the increase of this life for God, the sources at which especially it nourishes itself, the Eucharist, as a Sacrifice and as a Sacrament, prayer, whether it be that of the Church, in her liturgy, or of mental prayer, ‘the spreader of the gifts of the Holy Spirit.’ Love of a soul for Christ necessarily embraces all that composes the mystical body of Christ. In the first rank is the Virgin Mary, who by her divine maternity entered into the very essence of the Incarnation. The last Conference shows how the ‘plenitude of the mystical body of Christ’ is received only in the beatitude of eternal life, the final terminus of our predestination, the consummation of our adoption in Christ Jesus.

Thus end these Conferences, which bring out in bold, living relief the mystery of Jesus. All is led back to Christ, the source of all grace, of all life, of all sanctity,

This fertile thought that affects the unity of the work brings out also its force. A mere dry analysis deprives the book of its devotional flavour. It must be read and meditated on with the heart as well as with the head, as it is with all his soul of an apostle that the author throws himself into the Conferences. The scriptural perfume that one breathes in every page of the book shows that the work has been prepared in prayer. Souls desirous of the interior life will welcome this work with gratitude. Religious communities, especially, to which these Conferences were given, will gather many flowers and fruits from them.

It is a beautiful work indeed, well planned and well edited. The matter of the Conferences is summarized in a very readable synopsis,

and an exhaustive index will prove useful to the reader desirous of looking up any particular point. The author, throughout his Conferences, relies on St. Thomas Aquinas as his sure and beloved guide. All his friends, and all former students of Clonliffe College, will gladly welcome this learned and devout work of the gifted Abbot of Maredsous, who received his early training in the Dublin Diocesan College. We shall look forward with pleasure to his next work that is in preparation, *Le Christ dans ses mystères*.

M. R.

ESSAYS ON POETRY. By George O'Neill, S.J., M.A., Dublin: The Talbot Press; London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1919.

THESE essays on Poetry are written by one who has given to the subject he undertakes to interpret a long and considerable study. It was a happy thought of the author to make available for the public his opinions on poetry which hitherto were in a special manner reserved for those who foregathered around his chair in University College, Dublin. These latter will recognize in the work much that has hitherto characterized the author's thought in this department, and more particularly as regards the first part of the book, which deals explicitly with poetry, and has been 'written with a more definitely didactic aim than the rest—for the instruction of students rather than for that general reader whom the courteous author supposes at the outset to know nearly everything.' The attempt herein made to seek a criterion for poetry ends, as most such efforts end, in attaining to a definition of poetry which may satisfy some, but is not likely to satisfy all who seek for pleasure in 'linked words.' Taste, as regards poetry, differs with most men in some slight degree, and the choice of what one likes is perhaps the greatest indication of taste. With what Father O'Neill has written I am inclined not to disagree, for the simple reason that what he writes expresses his point of view, and that 'where doctors differ. . . we do well to show ourselves receptive rather than original, eclectic rather than partisan.' One passage, however, can hardly be allowed to pass without breaking a lance. 'Shelley,' writes Father O'Neill, 'we may be certain, would not have shared that enthusiasm of our prosodic specialists which bursts into eloquence over sonorous emptinesses. Keenly susceptible to the sensuous charm of such a piece as Coleridge's *Kubla Khan*, he would nevertheless have considered utterly topsy-turvy Professor Saintsbury's judgment on that little-meaning rhapsody—that "it is not easy to think of a greater piece of poetry than *Kubla Khan*."' Obviously Father O'Neill is not at one with the prosodic specialists who burst into eloquence over 'sonorous emptinesses' and no one will disagree with him; but does he believe that *Kubla Khan* is 'sonorous emptiness' and a 'little-meaning rhapsody.' If so he denies, perhaps, to the imagination one of its highest functions—the power to create the atmosphere in which it works for effects. He would seem to limit poetry to an elaboration of the real and actual or ordinarily possible

events, or to what, from such a point of view, amounts to the same thing, the imaginative treatment of generally accepted modes of thought and belief. The merit of *Kubla Khan* is that it tends to oppose such a critical attitude, for it is an example of how the imagination can create the material in which it works for effects—a veritable giving 'to airy nothing a local habitation and a name.' The imaginative process which produces a work such as *Kubla Khan* is so rare that one critic has called it 'a psychological curiosity.' I can recall the effect of this process even in the case of prose-writers, as, for example, Edmund Burke. The latter, although he once wrote with an almost too intimate knowledge of 'the anodyne draught of oblivion,' took (so I believe) no opium. In the case of *Kubla Khan* it is easy to divine a faculty of the imagination that is often set into artificial operation by the drug to which Francis Thompson fell a victim.

What is said in the present work concerning the poetaster, the versifier, the mediocre poet and the minor poet is interesting, but one turns with great pleasure to read the delightful essays on Aubrey de Vere, William Allingham, Thomas Boyd and Gerard Hopkins. Alienated somewhat from England by the religion he embraced, and from Ireland by the circumstances of family tradition and environment, Aubrey de Vere has fallen between the attentions of two critical schools. Our critic finds, and justly so, a cause for his want of popularity in the fact that 'his genius haunts cold heights of speculation, or seeks warmth only at spiritual fires.' De Vere was, however, an early exponent of a type of poetry which, in Ireland at least, has become a cult, namely, the interpretation in English verse of the spirit of old Irish heroic tale and saga. Those who have read the latter in the original will, I think, agree with the remark that: 'De Vere's resettings of old Irish legends, both Pagan and Christian, have often a noble and virile, though not exuberant life. It is, indeed, hardly the life of the old sagas.' Father O'Neill hopes for a *revanche* as regards De Vere's work, but perhaps what the most sanguine can hope for is not that he will secure a great and sustained popularity, but that he will continue to attract the attention of a choice and select circle of readers. In the cause of William Allingham's popularity Father O'Neill is also a knight-errant, but his way is made smooth for him by the existence of an excellent anthology of the poet's work in the Golden Treasury Series. A poet, Allingham found himself in the uncongenial atmosphere of officialdom—an Irishman, he sought an English literary environment where he was not wholly at his ease. To these circumstances was added the fact that, as his diary indicates, he had the companionship of men among whom the *maladie du siècle* was not unknown. Thomas Boyd is studied in a very brief essay and mainly by means of extracts from his work. More true to his Celtic sense than Allingham, Boyd strikes deep down into poetic veins of inspiration and his work is, as a consequence, on the whole authentic and genuine.

The essay in the present volume on Gerard Hopkins is one of real intrinsic value, because the author can speak from first-hand sources of information concerning the connexion with Ireland of the poet whose

work has so recently been edited by the Poet Laureate. It may therefore be of interest to quote what is written in this regard :—

In 1884 came the most notable event of Father Hopkins' years in the Society. He was invited to Dublin to be a Fellow in Classics of the newly-established Royal University of Ireland. It became his business to examine twice yearly a couple of hundred candidates drawn from every part of Ireland and to profess Greek in University College, Dublin. Although the establishment conducted by his Irish religious brethren in St. Stephen's Green was unofficial, unendowed, and in various ways sadly restricted, yet the prospects for the new Fellow might well have seemed propitious. Of his professional competence there was no doubt : Jowett had pronounced him one of the finest Greek scholars that had passed in his time through Balliol. His duties might have pleasantly recalled the old Balliol days, Pater and the redoubtable 'Master' ; the perfume of Newman reminiscences still hung about the house in Stephen's Green ; on the College Staff were Thomas Arnold and Ormsby and Stewart and Fathers Darlington and Browne,—Englishmen, Oxonians and Newmanites like himself ; the society in which he moved had even more than its due share of intellectual gifts. By labours which could in no sense be called hard or uncongenial he was called to further Newman's noble enterprise on behalf of higher Catholic education—an enterprise none the less glorious in itself or attractive to a fine spirit because tangled with hindrances and mortifications. Large freedom of movement was conceded by his superiors, and he formed many congenial acquaintances. Music was a frequent and much prized recreation. Perhaps some of his happiest moments were spent with children when he met these in friendly houses. Though sometimes silent and abstracted, his usual demeanour with his house-companions—including the sixteen or twenty resident students—was cheerful and unconstrained. . . . Thus, during those years, Father Hopkins' situation might seem to have been a favourable one. Yet from the beginning his health, his spirits, his capacity for work or enjoyment seemed to sink. The causes are not obvious, though we believe they were simple enough. Some facts that might be, or have been, cited as such, turn out, when properly regarded, to be symptoms rather than causes. Ireland, that has captivated so long a succession of incomers, failed to win from him a single line of poetry ; it remained his land of exile. Yet, in the sole poem in which Ireland is mentioned, there is no complaint of his Irish associates.

To seem the stranger lies my lot, my life
Among strangers. Father and mother dear,
Brothers and sisters are in Christ not near
And he my peace, my parting, sword and strife . . .

'In the life I lead now,' he wrote at the same time to Mr. Bridges, 'which is one of a continually jaded and harassed mind, if in any leisure I try to do anything I make no way—nor with my work, alas ! but so it must be.' Here, too, there is no suggestion of any source of trouble outside himself. And the strongest expressions he uses in sonnets, which the Poet-Laureate not unjustly calls 'terrible,' are such as these : 'self-yeast of spirit a dull dough sours,' 'a curse' which seems to reign within him. These internal troubles, together with a minute conscientiousness and his slight frail physique, rendered an intolerable burden to him the task of marking the few scores of candidates' answer-books, which each summer or

autumn came into his hands. . . . What the intelligent eye may read in all the author's utterances is this: a temperament, a bodily constitution, exceedingly high-strung, delicate and sensitive, and a prolonged trial of spiritual desolation, an 'obscure night' of the soul.

Few will disagree with what Father O'Neill writes concerning the style of Gerard Hopkins, his 'far-fetched phrases . . . and sometimes insoluble syntax.' His love of compound words and his involved syntax may, perhaps, be due to his classical learning, particularly Greek. He casts his words about, forgetting that when using an uninflected language this cannot be done unduly without involving the sense in obscurity.

In regard to Gerard Hopkins I like to think, that if his life was troubled, if its duties pressed unduly upon him and here he found not rest, that now peace, which he once sought, is his:

I have desired to go
 Where springs not fail,
 To fields where flies no sharp and sided hail
 And a few lillies blow.

I have asked to be
 Where no storms come,
 Where the green swell is in the havens dumb
 And out of the swing of the sea.

Not only by his style but by his power to illustrate his themes by apt quotations, Father O'Neill gives, in this work, continued evidence of a high literary taste and of the genuine instincts that prompt him as regards his studies in literature.

J. MACS.

A WIFE'S STORY: JOURNAL OF ELIZABETH LESEUR. Translated from the French. London: Burns and Oates.

In a long and intensely human introduction the husband of Elizabeth Leseur tells the story of the *Journal*. It was begun in 1899 and finished in 1914, a short time before her death. It is not a journal in the true sense; it was not written day by day, but only when the authoress felt the need to pour out in secret the thoughts and emotions that filled her heart. It is the history of a soul and gives the principal stages of its evolution. As the authoress wrote for herself alone her conscience disclosed itself to God in all simplicity, truth and freedom, without a thought of style. The existence of the *Journal* was known only to Mme. Leseur's sister, to whom a few passages had been given in confidence. Before her death the authoress wished to burn the MS., but the persistent and affectionate appeal of her sister providentially prevented the destruction.

The book consists of the first part of the *Journal* from 1899 to 1906, a *Book of Resolutions, Rule of Life*, from 1906 to 1912; *Thoughts for Every Day*; and the second part of the *Journal*, from 1912 to 1914. Voluntary poverty, sacrifice, and forgetfulness of self, utmost charity towards God and neighbour, are the theme of the pages. One might well suppose

them to have been written by a religious. Yet the writer was a woman of the world, living in fashionable Parisian society, and fulfilling unexceptionally the obligations of her state. She was thirty-three when she began to write the *Journal*, and had read and travelled much. She knew Latin, English, Russian, and Italian, and was well versed in the arts. She was an amiable and accomplished hostess and a rare friend, with a singular wealth of affection which attracted to her numerous people of all sorts and conditions, the atheist, the anti-Catholic, the worldling, and the religious, who sought her counsel and frequently put it into practice. She was a saint and an apostle in her sphere of life.

It must not be supposed that this ascension to wonderful sanctity was easy and uneventful. Unfortunately—perhaps fortunately and providentially—her husband had fallen a victim to materialistic influences, and was carried on to paganism and atheism. He sought out weapons to combat Catholicism. Strauss, Havet, Renan, Reville, Harnack, and Loisy were assiduously studied by him. His wife became the object of his proselytism. He meant to destroy her faith. She read many of the atheistical books put into her hands by him and felt herself approaching the abyss. But, being a woman of sane and steady judgment and uncommon good sense, she gathered together a library of the great masters of Catholic thought—fathers, doctors, mystics, St. Jerome, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Francis de Sales, St. Teresa, etc. She thus acquired a reasoned and substantial faith, powerfully equipped to meet all opposing arguments. Her surroundings provided nothing but opposition, and her husband, taken up with politicians, journalists, artists, etc., and with contributing to anti-clerical papers with redoubled criticism and raillery, helped to shut her up in her spiritual solitude and wound her spirit.

Up to 1908 she lived more or less like everyone else, and her friends, seeing her so active, alive and spirited, never suspected how heavy a cross she carried in secret. Besides, she was a martyr to sickness and suffering, which she bore with perfect resignation and sweetness. It was from her invalid's chair that she directed the greatest number of souls and became the source of that spiritual radiance which shone from her in her last years. Her whole life teaches the utility of suffering. It deepened her faith and expanded her charity. She sacrificed herself incessantly for others and established Catholic charitable institutions, which she personally supervised in spite of her indifferent health. Her letters to her friends in widely differing circumstances are counted by hundreds. Most often they are purely letters of direction, for that was the rôle which her faith, her charity, her Christian virtue, her dearly-bought experience, her surprising rectitude of judgment, had led her to play almost in spite of herself.

After her death, when everything seemed to collapse around him, M. Leseur threw himself into the reading of the manuscripts, and a revolution took place in his whole moral being. He read in them that his wife had made a pact with God, vowing to exchange her life for his return to the faith. The reading brought him inspiration and grace, and his

former hostility quickly gave way to the wish to know Catholicism. 'Elizabeth,' he says, 'had led me to the truth, and in my inmost being I can feel her still guiding me to a more perfect union with God.'

What strikes one most about this unique, arresting, and beautiful *Journal* is not the perfection of form or the quality of feeling, but the clear reasoning, the Gospel-like vitality, and above all, the soundness of the doctrine, as if the authoress had been a serious student of theology. A blind friend, led to the faith and to the practise of religion by Mme. Lescur, to whom the *Journal* was read, has asked leave to have it written in Braille for herself and for her companions in misfortune. The book has already been crowned with success. It cannot fail to gain many admirers and to make a lasting impression on readers, no matter in what sphere of life they may move, for the reflections reveal eternal truths, realized in a generous, ardent, apostolic, and Christ-like soul.

We have since learned that the husband of Mme. Lescur has asked permission to enter a religious Order.

M. R.

BOOKS, ETC., RECEIVED

- America* : A Catholic Review (December).
The Ecclesiastical Review (December). U.S.A.
The Rosary Magazine (December). Somerset, Ohio.
The Catholic World (December). New York.
The Austral Light (November). Melbourne.
The Irish Monthly (December). Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.
The Catholic Bulletin (December). Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.
The Month (December). London : Longmans.
Revue Pratique d'Apologétique (December). Paris : Beauchesne.
Revue du Clergé Français (December). Paris : Letouzey et Ané.
Revue des Jeunes (December). Paris : 3 Rue de Luynes.
The Fortnightly Review (December). St. Louis, Mo.
The Lamp (December). Garrison, N.Y.
La Documentation Catholique (December). Paris : 5 Rue Bayard.
St. Joseph's Advocate (Winter Quarter). London : Mill Hill.
Venerable Sister Catherine Labouré. London : Burns & Oates.
L'Amour Chrétien. Par A.-D. Sertillanges. Paris : Gabalda, 90 Rue Bonaparte.
The Things Immortal. By Father Garesché. New York : Benziger.
Talks to Parents. By Joseph P. Conroy, S.J. New York : Benziger.
Labour. By Rev. M. M. O'Kane, O.P. Belfast : Society of St. Vincent de Paul, Bank Street.

THE SAD PLIGHT OF THE PHILIPPINE CATHOLICS

BY REV. T. A. MURPHY, C.S.S.R.

THOSE of us who were old enough to read the newspapers at the time of the Spanish-American War will remember the big victory won by Admiral Dewey over the Spanish fleet in Manila Bay, on May-day, twenty-one years ago. That victory marked a great turning-point in the history of the Philippines. Four months later, when the treaty of peace was signed in Paris, Spain received 20,000,000 dollars, and ceded the whole Philippine Archipelago to the United States. It was no mean territory which thus changed rulers by battle and by treaty. The Archipelago consists of more than 3,000 islands, and of these about 400 are inhabited, and 600 others are large and fertile enough to be inhabited. The remaining 2,000 are big rocks, rising out of the sea. The largest island is Luzon, the capital of which is Manila, famed as an Eastern port, and for its export of Manila hemp. This island of Luzon is 41,000 square miles. In other words, it is larger than Belgium, Denmark and Holland combined. The second largest island is Mindanao, with an area of 38,000 square miles. It is formed of some of the richest land in the world. It happens that this year a census of the Islands has been taken, but up to the time of writing the results have not been published. Government experts, however, declare that the results will show a population of eleven or twelve millions in the Philippines.

A Filipino writer (in the *Philippine Review*) supplies some interesting information with regard to the foreigners living in these Islands. He says :—

The great majority of foreign-born residents fall into two classes : first, Asiatics ; and second, Americans and Europeans. Of the first class, the Chinese are by far the most numerous, numbering not far from 50,000. They are almost exclusively engaged in commercial pursuits. Many of them are married to native women and expect to remain permanently in the country. The Japanese are immigrating more rapidly than any

other foreign people. Of the second class, Americans are the most numerous, and Spaniards a close second. Probably nine-tenths of the purely commercial activities of the Islands are still in the hands of foreign-born residents.

The Filipinos, although living near China and Japan, do not belong to the yellow race. They are Malays (for the most part), and brown, or light copper, in colour. They are straightly built, although of a smaller and slighter build than Europeans. When the Spaniards first came to the Philippines, less than 400 years ago, the Filipinos numbered only some 500,000. They were nomadic and uncivilized. 'They are a crafty and treacherous race,' wrote Legaopi, at the time of the Spanish conquest; 'they are a people extremely vicious, fickle, and untruthful, and full of superstitions.' But no sooner had the Spaniards entered the Philippines than began the spiritual conquest of this pagan people for Jesus Christ; and when the history of this conquest has been written, the Catholic Church may point it out as one of the most glorious pages in her missionary annals. Catholic Spain has done a mighty work for the preservation, uplifting, education, and general betterment of this poor benighted people whose lands she colonized.

THE RELIGION OF THE FILIPINOS

To understand the thoroughness with which the Spaniards did their work we have but to look at the figures of the official census of 1903, which, out of a total population of 7,635,426, gives 6,987,686 as civilized and 647,740 as belonging to wild tribes. In other words, the blessings of civilization were brought to eleven-twelfths of this savage people, by the labours of the Spaniards. Another evidence of their thoroughness was the love for the Catholic religion which they implanted in the hearts of the Filipinos. When the Americans first took possession of the Philippines, a Commission was appointed to examine into the condition of the Islands. After a long inquiry, and after examining numerous witnesses, the Commission published its conclusions. The following is the verdict of these American Commissioners with regards to the religion of the Filipinos:—

The Filipino people love the Catholic Church. The solemnity and grandeur of its ceremonies appeal most strongly to their religious feelings, and it may be doubted whether there is any country in the world in which the people have a more profound attachment to their Church than this one.

A few hundred thousand of the Filipinos are Mohammedans ; some six or seven thousand are still pagans ; Protestant Missionary Societies, by dint of pouring money into the country, have secured a few followers, but the vast majority of the twelve million Filipinos are Catholics. Even non-Catholic writers, living in the Philippines, have borne witness to the fact that the Filipino will either be a Catholic or have no religion whatever. It is worth while citing the remarkable testimony of one or other of these writers. For instance, Fred. W. Atkinson, first American General Superintendent of Education in the Philippines, writes as follows in his book, *The Philippine Islands* :—

Conditions are such as to urge the Roman Catholic Church . . . to send its best material, just as soon as an adequate supply of them can be made available, to revivify and reunite the Philippine Catholic Church, for it is the religion best suited to the temperament, spirit, and character of the various Philippine races. . . . Philippine Catholicism is in reality the concrete embodiment of the spirit and character of the people ; it has become so inter-mixed in their very fibre, it seems so naturally fitted to them, . . . that it cannot be doubted, however loath Protestant Missionaries may be to accept the conclusion, that it alone is the religion for these people and will continue to be.

Permit me to add : if we get priests.

Miss Mary H. Fee, a well-known American lady who lived for a number of years in the Philippines, writes in the same sense as Mr. Atkinson, in her book, *A Woman's Impression of the Philippines* :—

To the complacent Protestant Evangelist, who smacks his lips in anticipation of the future conquest of these Islands, I would say frankly that there is no room for Protestantism in the Philippines. . . . Protestants will, of course, make some progress as long as the fire is artificially fanned. There will always be found a few who cling ardently to it. But most Americans with whom I have talked (and their name is legion) have agreed with me in thinking that it will never be strong here. . . . Roman Catholicism is just what the Filipino needs. . . . I am quite sure that the Catholic clergy are certain that Protestantism holds no threat for their Church in the Philippines other than that it may be the opening wedge in a schism which will send the Filipino not only out of the Church, but to rationalism of the most Voltairian hue.

NEED OF PRIESTS

It is clear, then, even to non-Catholic observers, that the Filipinos will either be Catholics or will lose all religion whatsoever ; and it is sad to have to put on record, side by side with this striking testimony, that many Filipinos are fast losing their faith. In several districts already the

Sacraments are being neglected, even the Sacrament of Matrimony; the number of people attending Mass is growing smaller and smaller, the churches are falling into ruin, and the people are steadily drifting out into a dark, wide sea of indifference. These sad results have not come about through any scientific scepticism—even supposing that such a thing exists. Not in the least. They have come solely through want of Catholic schools to teach the faith, and through want of priests to preach to the people, and to administer the Sacraments. The rising generation is growing up in ignorance of the truths of religion, and the older generation is deprived of its necessary helps. It needs no prophet to see that this must lead to the loss of the faith. The evil consequence is made all the more certain, by the presence in the Islands of a great number of the agents of American Evangelical and Bible Societies, who are labouring openly and secretly to undermine the faith of the natives. The wolves are in the fold, the flock is in danger, and if true shepherds do not come forward to the rescue, it is to be feared that much of what was won, at so great a cost of labour and self-sacrifice, will be lost to the Church. And let it be remembered that it is only at a great cost of labour and self-sacrifice it can be preserved. The priest who enters the Philippine field must be prepared for great labour and much suffering. But it is also true that in no other field of the Church can he expect so abundant a return for his labours, whether we consider, on the one hand, the numbers confirmed in the faith and placed once more on the right path, or on the other, the consolation which every true priest must feel at seeing his labours for God visibly crowned with success.

What has just been stated with regard to the pressing need of more priests is the sad experience of all who have been labouring for souls in this distant portion of Christ's vineyard. The truth is, that out here in the Philippines there are countless baptized Catholics growing up in almost complete ignorance of their religion, because there is no one to teach them. There are countless others who know something of their religion, and who would gladly approach the Sacraments, but there is no priest to hear their confessions, or to break to them the Bread of Life. The words of the Prophet may be repeated here, in a sense that is tragic indeed: 'The little ones have asked for bread, and there was none to break it unto them.' Every day, Filipino

Catholics die without a priest to assist them in their last moments ; for there is no priest within reach, or only a priest who cannot possibly attend to all the dying in his vast parish. Of late years this state of things has grown steadily worse, and at present it is appalling. On the one hand, there are few countries in Europe that can send out Missionaries now, and on the other godless education is turning the minds of young Filipinos to things other than the work for souls.

In the diocese of Jaro there are thirty-two parishes without a priest, and in the Seminary at Jaro there are only about twenty-five seminarists, including as seminarists boys who have only just begun to study Latin. In Cebu, in the olden time, there used to be about fifty students of Theology, whereas the seminarists, at present including students of Theology and others, are only about half that number. In the diocese of Zamboanga there are only four native priests, and there are thirty parishes without any priest.

It is not easy to state the exact number of parishes in the Philippines in which there is no priest. Mere numbers besides would not give any adequate idea of the state of things here. In reply to a letter asking for some details of the diocese of Jaro, Father L. Rogan, an Irish priest of the Mill Hill Society, wrote as follows, and what he says may be applied to many other districts of the Philippines :—

Many of the parishes that have a resident priest could easily keep two active priests busy, and in quite a number of parishes there is plenty of work for three. Yet in all these places there is only one priest, and in many cases he is old and feeble. There are parishes in this Diocese that have sixteen, twenty, twenty-four, thirty thousand people in them, and only one priest to attend to all. The extent of some of the parishes is ten miles by ten, ten miles by twelve, ten miles by fourteen, twelve miles by twelve. This I find to be the extent of many of the parishes. Then in many cases there is no road, or only one road, and the result means 'biking' through rice-paddies, and you know what this can be in wet weather.

Owing to the death of some of the native clergy the want of priests is being very acutely felt at present in the Cebu diocese. Perhaps I could not do better, to make the reader realize the sad condition of things that obtains in the Philippines, than to take the example of one parish in the Cebu district, and see what the want of priests means to it. I select this particular parish, not because it is worse off than others, but because I happen to have lived in it for

some time, and I have thus been able to get detailed information on the spot. Like many of the Philippine Islands, Cebu consists of a long mountain-range, with plains extending from its base to the sea. The parish which I wish to describe extends from the coast-line some fourteen miles back into the heart of the mountains. It is about six miles in width. It has a population of 24,000, and how rapidly its population is increasing may be judged from the fact that the number of deaths in one year in the parish was 370, while the number of births was 1,253.

In this parish, in Spanish times, there were three priests, two Spaniards and a native. At present it has only one priest (a native) to administer to its 24,000 Catholics. And be it remembered that many of the parishioners live in the heart of a mountain-range over which there is no road. In fact there is only one road in the whole parish, and that is just at the extremity of it, along by the sea-coast. Supposing that every one who is of age to do so in the parish went to confession just once a year, this would mean that the Cura (Parish Priest) should hear on an average about fifty confessions every day of the year. Hence it may be inferred that the decree on Frequent Communion for children, or for anyone else, must remain a dead letter, through sheer impossibility of receiving the Sacraments. Indeed, Communion, even once a year, is practically impossible for many. So also is assistance at Mass on Sundays. How can poor people, weak from constant heat, and oftentimes from lack of nourishing food, be expected to travel over many miles of mountain, with no road, and to attend in large numbers at a distant church? The Spanish friars had little chapels built in outlying districts, but it is only very rarely that Mass can be said in these chapels now.

Into the parish which I have been describing—where one priest has charge of 24,000 souls—came the news, about a year ago, that the Parish Priest of a neighbouring parish had been transferred elsewhere by the Bishop. There was no one to take this priest's place, so the Bishop wrote to ask the Cura, who had already charge of 24,000 people, to take over the neighbouring parish as well. This, then, has been the arrangement for the past twelve months: the Cura, who had already work on hands for four or five priests, has now a second parish to attend to! He is not a young man either; he is well over fifty.

This parish of Calmont may be regarded as a normal

Philippine parish. There are others in a far worse condition. We have given Missions in many country parishes, with a population varying from thirty-one to forty-five thousand souls, all Catholic, and having only one priest to look after their spiritual wants. To make matters still worse, sometimes a parish is left to the care of a priest who, through age or infirmity, is incapable of any work. Take, for example, a parish just a little to the north of the one I have been describing. It has a population of 12,000, and the only priest in charge is eighty-three years of age!

These few facts are sufficient in themselves to show how great is the harvest in the Philippine Islands, and how few indeed are the labourers. Here the question arises: how has this state of things come about?

The answer to that question brings us back to the revolution of 1896. At the outbreak of the revolution there were over eleven hundred friars in the Philippines. The number of canonical parishes was seven hundred and forty-six, and there were in addition two hundred and twenty-one mission-parishes, and the total number of Catholics was calculated at 6,559,998. But the revolution brought with it the expulsion of the friars. Unfortunately they were popularly regarded as having identified themselves with the Government which the Filipinos were struggling to cast off, and thus lost the sympathy of the people, and incurred the hostility of the revolutionary leaders. This hostility was further increased by an almost world-wide campaign carried on by the Masonic Press against the friars. Thus it came about that after the revolution many of the friars had to leave the really splendid and heroic work to which they had devoted themselves in the Philippines. Some retired to Manila or Cebu, and about seven hundred of them left the Islands and returned to Spain, or sought new fields of work in China or South America.

This was indeed a sad ending to the glorious work of the friars in the Philippine Islands. Probably no body of men ever did so much for another nation as the friars did for the Philippines. It would be easy to give facts, and quote authorities, to show what zealous, devoted Missionaries the Spanish friars were. It will be sufficient to quote a paragraph from an excellent authority, Frederic Sawyer. Mr. Sawyer knew his subject well. He lived long years in the Philippines, travelled much, and wrote a large volume, full of detailed information, about the Islands. He

is an Englishman and Protestant. Here is what he says with regard to the friars :—

To sum up the religious Orders, they were hardy and adventurous pioneers of Christianity, and in the evangelization of the Philippines, by persuasion and teaching, they did more for Christianity and civilization than any other missionaries of modern times. Of undaunted courage, they have ever been to the front when calamities threatened their flocks ; they have witnessed and recorded some of the most dreadful convulsions of nature, volcanic eruptions, earthquakes and destructive typhoons. In epidemics of plague and cholera they have not been dismayed, nor have they ever in such cases abandoned their flocks. When an enemy has attacked the Islands they have been the first to face the shot. Only fervent faith could have enabled these men to endure the hardships and overcome the danger that encompassed them. They have done much for education, have founded schools for both sexes, training colleges for teachers, the University of Santo Tomas in Manila, and other institutions. Hospitals and asylums attest their charity. They were formerly, and even lately, the protectors of the poor against the rich, and of the natives against the Spaniard. They have consistently resisted the enslavement of the natives. They restrained the constant inclination of the natives to wander away into the woods and return to primitive savagery by keeping them in the towns, or as they said, ' Under the bells.'

Now, however, the friars are gone, and the result is a lamentable want of priests in the Philippines to-day. The Mill Hill Society of London has sent some priests to the rescue. Austria, Germany, Belgium, Australia, and Ireland have also sent some priests. A few American priests have succeeded in getting away from their own vast work at home and coming here. But the numbers fall altogether short of the work to be done. As the country is progressing materially, it is sad to see the fine churches and convents built by the Spaniards in many places going to rack and ruin. It is still more sad to see the ruin of souls which is threatening to become widespread through the land. The late Dr. Boylan, Bishop of Kilmore, who spent some time in the Philippines studying conditions here, summed up his conclusions in a brief phrase : ' There is no place in the world where priests are more needed than in the Philippine Islands.' And I may add, nowhere can they save more souls who, humanly speaking, will be lost without them.

THE REQUEST FOR MISSIONS

To make the needs of the Philippines more clearly understood, I can hardly do better than take up some of the

letters that reach us, Redemptorists, from various sources in the Islands, but especially from Bishops and priests, asking for Missions, and telling of the distress of souls entrusted to their care. A few extracts, with a word of explanation on them, will suffice.

Among the letters preserved at our house at Opon there is, for instance, one from a native Filipino Bishop, asking for Missions in nine 'pueblos' (parishes), or at least in the 'pueblos mas importantes' (more important parishes). This letter was written three years ago, and although we are very anxious to go to his Lordship's assistance we have not yet been able to give a Mission in even one of the parishes he mentions. Later on, the same Bishop wrote urging us to found a house in his diocese, and offering a site and a goodly sum of money to help on the building. This kind offer we have had to decline. Indeed we have had to decline similar offers from practically every Bishop in the Philippines. There is endless work for Missions in these Islands and a wide field for many Missionary Societies. Even in the Visayan group of Islands, where we work, we cannot cope with the Missions that come pouring in upon us. Last year a Superior of Spanish friars (there are of course some friars left in the Philippines) came to us from another diocese with a request for nine Missions in parishes entrusted to the care of his Order. It will be some years yet before these can be reached: other Missions nearer to us and longer asked for will claim attention for many a day to come.

'When will you come to give a Mission to us?' a young priest asked one of our Irish Missionaries recently; and he added, 'I was ordained last December and now I have charge of five parishes.'

Among the letters on Mission topics at Opon there is one—written after a Mission—by a native Cura to one of our higher Superiors. Having stated his conviction that the Missions 'are, and ever will be, a powerful aid to the Secular Clergy in coping with the work of their parishes, especially in these days, when vocations to the priesthood are so few,' the writer proceeds to give a sketch of the work done and incidentally shows the need of workers.

There were 12,000 Communions during the Mission [he writes], and every day some three thousand people assisted at the exercises. About two thousand children attended the children's mission, and the number of First Communions was as high as eight hundred. Two hundred and thirty-five pairs who were living in concubinage returned to God, and

received the Sacrament of Matrimony. . . . In my humble opinion ir-religion will never triumph in our parishes as long as we can have Missions, no matter how much evil-minded people work against us. . . . Having thanked God, who moved the hearts of my people, I desire to thank Your Reverence. . . .

These requests for Missions come to us, as I have said, not merely from Bishops and priests, but from other sources also. Our Missions are all given in Visaya, the home-language of the people. Yet in our Mission archives there is a petition addressed to the Fathers by the principal people of a district, where a Mission was being conducted, written in English. As the document is short, and as it shows the work of the Mission as seen through native eyes, and is in itself a very eloquent plea for more Missionaries for the Philippines, I will quote it in full, and with all its quaintness. It is signed by the local Justice of the Peace, the Municipal Treasurer, the Municipal Secretary, Municipal Councillors, 'A Chinese Catholic,' the Principal Teacher of the Public School, the Chief of the Police, in fact, practically by everyone who was anything in the little 'pueblo,' It bears the date of June 26, 1916, and runs as follows :—

The Padres Redentoristas : Greeting :—

We, the undersigned, faithful Catholics of this town, have the honour to request the presence of the Mission in this locality until the 15th day of the next month of July. This ardent desire obeys the following reasons :

1. Thousands of people in our mountains and neighbouring townlands, who have just come down, are all willing to confess, and some of them to marry. There are another hundreds of people who are coming down sometime this week. Now, due to the short lapse of time in which the Mission stay here, we presume that many of the people cannot accomplish their wish to confess, to marry, to attend the Mass, and to hear the sermons.

2. In this parish there are yet many 'puyopuyo' (concupinari) who have just been convinced to receive the Sacrament. Most of them need three weeks in order to prepare for their marriage. In the first place they live far away in the mountains and never confess since their youth ; so it will take time for them to learn and examine their sins.

3. The more the Mission stay here for long time, the more the people want to go to the Church. It shows that the people recognize the great importance of the Mission in regard to save the spirit of the human body.

4. The town people, as true Catholics, are not satisfied with the three weeks' work of the Mission. They want the Missioners to stay in this town at least two weeks more, because they are ready to go to the Church morning and afternoon, and especially it is their pleasure and satisfaction to hear the preach or sermon, which are all based from the sweet words of the Great God our King.

Hoping to receive your favourable consideration.

Very sincerely yours —

Then follow more than sixty signatures. The reader may ask what was the result of the petition. This: the Mission was prolonged for a week more, and then the Fathers were so utterly wearied out that the Superior had to recall them home. They had been giving Missions from New Year's day till July with only a few days' intermission.

A few remarks about that Mission will help to give an idea of what Missions are like in the Philippine Islands. The name of the place from which this quaint petition came is Dalaguete, some eighty miles to the south of Cebu. Four Fathers went there for a three weeks' Mission, but as we see, in answer to the request given above, another week was added, during which five Fathers were kept busily engaged. The congregation, morning and evening, numbered 8,000. Great numbers remained three days, four days, and many even a week, and yet could not go to confession. The food and money they brought with them had run out. Many of these people lived at a distance of ten hours' walk into the mountains. They brought with them a supply of food, and when this became exhausted, serious injury to health followed in some cases. Many people over seventy years of age had never received the Sacraments. At least 751 couples, living in illicit unions, received the Sacrament of Matrimony. I say at least, for there were many others waiting to be registered at the time the Fathers were leaving the Mission. The number of Communion reached 23,092. In addition to the work done for the adults, a special Mission was given to the children during the first week. Great as was the success of the Mission in Dalaguete, yet there were many who were unable to get to confession. Though the Fathers had the assistance of three other priests, yet on the morning of their departure they found the church filled with people waiting for confession. But they had to go, they were utterly worn out, and there was another Mission awaiting them in Buena Vista. So great was the desire of these people to go to confession, that when they heard of a Mission in Badyan, on the opposite coast, they crossed the mountains before the Mission began, and thus were the first at the confessional. The Mission in Dalaguete took place in July 1916; the Mission in Badyan was given in April 1919. Thus two and a half years elapsed before the people who were left unheard in Dalaguete were able to go to confession.

One word more about the Dalaguete Mission. The people subscribed 400 peses (over £40) for a Mission Cross.

Since the Mission they have kept up the pious custom of praying before that Cross every Sunday. It stands a good distance from the church, on the sea-shore. They wished to have it there, to encourage them when out on the stormy sea. And here I may observe that it is remarkable with what tenacity the people cling to the pious practices they learn during the time of Mission. The Mission hymns have an especial attraction for them, and I have often seen all the people of a village or a countryside pause in the midst of their business or amusement to join in a Mission hymn.

These few remarks will give the reader an idea of what a Mission is in the Philippine Islands. As may be naturally expected, the work of the Missionary out here in the Philippines is very different from what it is in Ireland. When there has been no priest in a parish, and no religious teaching in the schools for twenty years, the Missionary has in many cases to begin at the rudiments; and where there are multitudes waiting on him he has often to be satisfied with imparting the necessary truths, and making the best arrangement he can for future instruction. In many cases the difficulty of his task is increased by the evil work of the proselytizer, who has tried to lead astray the shepherdless flock. Then there are civil and otherwise irregular unions, which have to be rectified by the Sacrament of Matrimony; children have to be baptized, and the sick who are unable to attend the Missions in the churches have to be visited in their homes. Add to this the almost interminable work of hearing confessions, and you have an order of the day that leaves the Missionary few moments of leisure. But all this labour is more than compensated for by the immense good that the Missions are doing for religion in the Philippine Islands. They are, as the present Bishop of Cebu declared, 'the one great hope of saving the faith in these Islands.' This, too, is the conviction of other Bishops in the Philippines, as is evident from their repeated applications for the establishment of Missionary houses in their dioceses. But so far we have had only one answer to these applications: 'The labourers are too few.'

One other important result of our Missions here I have not touched on yet. It is this: not only do they prevent the masses of the people from drifting into indifference, heresy, and schism, but they also bring back many of those fallen away from the faith. The number of such conversions on Missions ranges between one hundred and

six hundred. Moreover, the Missions have this surprising result that they neutralize to a great extent the evil effects of the State schools through their influence on the teachers. For it must be borne in mind that, since the American occupation, practically all the schools are under the control of the State, and all religious teaching forbidden during school hours. The teachers are Filipinos, who, as a rule, have grown up without opportunities of practising their religion, or in a state of indifference owing to the prevailing indifference in the State Colleges in which they were trained. Now we find that on our Missions these teachers are amongst those who make the Mission best, and not only do they make it themselves, but they use every effort outside school hours to induce the children to do the same. The results of their efforts are most consoling. Practically all the children attend the Mission regularly and receive the Sacraments. Many of them begin the Catechism for the first time. Hence a part of the necessary equipment of a Missionary coming into a parish is a thousand or more Catechisms. We can hardly exaggerate the importance of thus saving the children from the baneful effects of irreligious education. All other work can succeed in only deferring for a time the inevitable ruin of the faith in the Philippines, but the work done for the children is the one great hope of keeping this country what it is at present—a Catholic country.

IRELAND AND THE PHILIPPINES

At first it may seem a far cry from this country to Ireland. Yet, when one comes to reflect more on the matter, it is astonishing how many links one discovers binding the two countries together. Among the priests who worked here in Spanish times, there were some very zealous and saintly Irishmen, and after centuries they are still remembered by the Filipinos. And to-day Irishmen, and women too, are found working for God, all over the Philippines. Those splendid Missionaries, the priests of the Mill Hill Society, have no better workers in their ranks than the sons of the 'Old Land.' The only English-speaking Catholic College for the higher education of boys in the Philippines is the De La Salle College of Manila, and nearly all the members of its staff are Irish, or of Irish descent. A very successful English-speaking College for girls in Manila is under the direction of a near relative of 'Joe Bigger.' The only priests who give Missions in the sense that we use the word

'Mission' in Europe—that is, who go about giving spiritual exercises for a few weeks in each parish—are the Irish and Irish-Australian Redemptorists. But beyond all this, the Philippines are linked to Ireland by the fact that the Head of the Church in this country is our distinguished countryman, his Grace, Dr. M. J. O'Doherty, Archbishop of Manila.

Dr. O'Doherty is still a young man. He was born at Charlestown, Co. Mayo, in 1874. A few years after his ordination at Maynooth, he was appointed Rector of the Irish College of Salamanca, and subsequently was consecrated Bishop of Zamboanga in the Philippines. When Dr. Harty was transferred to an American See, about three years ago, the young Bishop of Zamboanga was appointed to take his place as Archbishop of Manila. His Grace has won golden opinions from the men of many races living in the Philippines; and as one would expect from the traditions of our race, and considering the particular needs of this country, he has distinguished himself especially by his work for Catholic education in the school, and for the continuation of that education in the Press. He speaks Spanish and Irish as fluently as he speaks English.

Perhaps these few links with Ireland may yet grow into a golden chain, which will be the salvation of the Philippines. Why should they not? We Irishmen have turned back to our past. The language and music and skill of other days are returning to the land—coming into their own, *βυιθεαδασ μορι λε οια*. But they are not coming alone. They cannot come alone. The spirit, without which they would have neither life nor colour nor beauty, is coming back with them. We are turning more and more to our old ideals; and what higher or holier ideal comes shining out of the past than that Ireland, in God's mysterious Providence, is to be the spiritual light of the world. Ireland was the light of the known world in the days of her greatness. Her children went through the highways of the earth, 'peregrinantes pro Christo,' carrying the love of Christ and the love of *επιη* in their heart, and holding aloft the blazing torch that guided men's feet to God. In the darkness that is now closing down upon the world, will not Irishmen go forth again, and hold up before the eyes of men the only symbol that can save them, the only light that can guide them—a flaming Cross. If Ireland, which God has chosen to lead so many of the nations to His knowledge and love, fail in her

Mission, what will become of this earth of ours? If the prophet lose the vision who will declare it to the people?

.

These few remarks will, I hope, be the means of bringing more assistance to this only Christian nation of the East. They show, in the first place, that there is an abundant harvest already ripe in the Philippines. It will, I think, be a surprise to many to learn that there are such splendid religious dispositions in these poor people, who are in truth hungry for the word of God. Their wonderful eagerness for it, and their self-sacrificing endeavours to approach the Sacraments, are unsurpassed in Missionary Annals.

In the second place, they show that the labourers are few. Immense good is being done, but, alas! much must be left undone because there are no hands to do it. It is a heart-break for the Missionary, at the end of a Mission, to leave without a shepherd the flock that he has been at such pains to seek out and collect in the desert and lead back to safe pasturage. It is easy to understand why there is a scarcity of native priests when we consider the troubled time through which the Church in the Philippines has passed. The wonder is that there are so many, when even in pre-revolution times the greater number of priests came from without. That outside supply is necessarily limited now on account of many obstacles, such as language, climate, and want of resources. These difficulties are not as great as they appear, but they are sufficient to turn young priests aspiring for the foreign Mission to other and more congenial fields of labour. The result is that the poor Filipinos, with all their love for the Catholic faith, and with all their eagerness to avail of every opportunity, are left like sheep without a shepherd. It is sad indeed to see souls crying out for help—children seeking for bread with none to break it to them—poor Filipinos, who, with all their waywardness, will be Catholics or nothing, crying out for priests to come to their assistance: and few priests can come!

My young countrymen, I venture to repeat to you, in concluding these pages, the words of our Redeemer to His disciples: 'Lift up your eyes and see the countries, for they are already ripe to harvest.'

And to my compatriots, young and old, men and women, I would recall that other passage of the Gospel which has echoed down the centuries, awaking zeal for souls in many

a fervent heart: 'And Jesus went about all the cities and towns, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom. And seeing the multitudes, He had compassion on them, because they were distressed and lying like sheep that have no shepherd. Then He saith to His disciples: The harvest indeed is great, but the labourers few. Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest that He send forth labourers into His harvest.'

Oh, Ireland be it thy high duty
To teach the world the might of moral beauty,
And stamp God's image on the struggling soul.

T. A. MURPHY, C.S.S.R.

PRIORY OF ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST, NEWTOWN, NEAR TRIM

BY VERY REV. PHILIP CALLARY, P.P., V.G.

MANY years ago I contributed some papers to the I. E. RECORD on the ancient ruins of Trim. Quite recently a clerical friend pointed out to me two venerable piles outside the town, left unnoticed, and at the same time observed that a short History of them would be most opportune at the present time, and highly appreciated by the members of the Archaeological Society, lately established by the priests and people of Meath. Might I then ask the kind permission of the Editor of the I. E. RECORD to publish a couple of papers in his valuable and widely read periodical. Mr. Conwell, the well-known antiquarian, when stationed in Trim as District Inspector of National Schools, spent many of his leisure hours amongst the old ruins with which the locality is studded, and published at the time a pamphlet under the title *A Ramble Round Trim*.

The starting point of his circular tour was about a mile to the east of Trim at Newtown cross-roads, not many perches away from the Priory of St. John the Baptist, the subject of our present sketch. Before coming to the Priory itself one cannot help observing, on the edge of the road near the south-east corner of the Priory, a remarkable round tower in a pretty fair state of preservation. It is thirty feet in height, forty round the base, with a shaft about thirty feet in circumference, and divided on the inside into three storeys. On the first storey there is a window or opening looking towards the north, on the second storey one looking towards the south, whilst on the third storey there are two windows commanding a good view of both north and south. Here also we find a recess jutting out near the top, seven feet high and three feet wide, quite large enough for a man to stand upright in, even though he donned his helmet. From the windows facing

every side and the recess on top, it is surmised that this tower had been built as a watch tower for the protection of the adjoining premises, and the recess on top was set apart for the sentinel, who took up his position there in order to give timely warning of the approach of the enemy.

A few yards further on we arrive at the Priory and its appurtenances. Looking at the ruinous condition of the old buildings from the public road, it is by no means easy to make much out of them, or to realize that within these old ivy-clad walls there lived long ago a religious community, who devoted their lives to the sick poor of Trim and the adjoining parishes, in that portion of the Co. Meath. But, notwithstanding their present appearance, there can be no doubt the original buildings were most imposing, both in design and in execution. Their extent may be gauged by the fact that the boundary wall, which can still be traced on every side, is fully eighty yards in length and forty yards in width, and encloses not less than a statute acre of land. The buildings in front have all the appearance of a fortress. They consist of a square castellated keep, three storeys high, and measuring from the surface of the ground to the parapet forty feet, together with a massive stone tower which rises eight feet above the main building. From this tower on the west end a range of buildings ran parallel to the Boyne, and within a few yards from it, till they met another tower on the east end, similar in size and shape to the corresponding one on the front or west end. The entrance to the courtyard or premises was from the outside, through a semicircular arched gateway of solid stone, five feet three inches wide by nine feet two in height, whereas the approach to the towers was from inside, through a narrow opening only big enough to admit one person, who could ascend to the top by means of a spiral stone staircase of forty-six steps. One cannot help observing that stone was a prominent feature in every part of the building : stone staircases, roofs, jambs, stone window cases and doors, whereas there was a complete absence of anything in the shape of timber, or anything frail or combustible, as if the main purpose of the builders was to guard the premises against the danger of fire, which it seems was the favourite method of attack employed in those days when powder and cannon-ball were not as yet in evidence.

On close inspection one can easily discern the different

parts of the building inside. On the ground floor, near the tower on the front or west end, we find a kitchen, with its stone vaulted roof; a large fire-place, with the chimney running up the whole height of the tower, and serving the rooms on the two upper storeys—all the fire-places converging into the same flue. The rooms in front from top to bottom were used as the living house for the friars and their attendants. Next came the Hospital proper, with the dormitories, day-rooms, and other apartments for the various classes of patients, and finally, at the far east end, we come to the Chapel, which was a rather spacious building, being fully 119 feet long by 24 feet wide. Only a small portion of its south side-wall, about seven feet, is left standing, but the east gable is still almost perfect, and shows the framework of a beautiful triple window $17\frac{1}{2}$ feet wide and 10 feet high, at the back of the high altar and probably furnished with stained glass, which served to throw a dim religious light over the Altar and Sanctuary and set them off to advantage.

Looking at these elaborate buildings, and examining closely their strange castellated style, one is curious to know the original founder and builder. From the scant evidence available I am afraid it is hardly possible to come to any satisfactory conclusion on that point. Even Dean Butler, who lived for forty years in Trim, and who all his life long had been a most careful collector of every scrap of information bearing on the antiquities of Trim, could throw no light on the subject. His statement, to say the least of it, is most vague and unsatisfactory; 'The Bishops of Meath were either the founders or great benefactors of St. John's Priory.' It is quite certain the Bishops who took up their official residence in Trim, and made it the mensal parish of the diocese, would naturally be expected to be benefactors of a charitable institute like the Priory, and give it all the moral and material support in their power, but it is by no means certain, or even probable, that they would undertake to found an hospital and build it in the extraordinary and very expensive style of the old Priory. We might even infer so much from an observation made by the good Dean himself. In his notice of this Priory he says: 'The ruins of St. John's are very extensive, though by no means remarkable for regularity of style, nor have they much the appearance of a *religious foundation*.' Quite so. If they have not much the appearance of a religious foundation, it is hardly logical to attribute the foundation to any

ecclesiastic, much less to any great Prelate, whose economic sense and bump of caution are, as a rule, pretty fully developed, and would therefore make him slow to start a building intended merely as an hospital and build it in such an extravagant style as the Priory.

Having thought out the subject very carefully, I would venture to give the credit of this foundation, not to any ecclesiastic, but to Walter De Lacy, who lived in the Castle of Trim (King John's Castle), and who not merely inherited his father's property in Meath but also his taste for castle building. When Hugh De Lacy obtained the grant from Henry II of the rich palatinate of Meath, he forthwith began to build castles all over his vast territory, the last one at Durrow, King's Co., where he met his tragic death in 1186. His two sons, Walter and Hugh, became his heirs—Walter falling in for Meath, and Hugh for Ulster and Connaught. For one reason or another both became very jealous of De Courcy, their formidable rival, and never lost an opportunity of supplanting him, till at length they compassed his death. On hearing of the advent of King John to Ireland in 1210, and of his visit to Trim, fixed for the 2nd and 3rd of July in that year, they became alarmed, and fearing to face the King and answer the charges of the murder of De Courcy and other crimes alleged against them, fled precipitately to France. Whilst there they concealed their identity.

In the *Book of Horwth*, an ancient authority on these subjects, we are told how in France they obscured themselves in the Abbey of St. Taurin, Evreux, Normandy, and gave themselves up to manual labour as digging, delving, gardening, planting, and greffing, for daily wages, for the space of two or three years. The Abbot was well pleased with their service and upon a day, whether it was by some inkling or secret intelligence given him or otherwise, demanded of them what birth and parentage they were and what country they came from? When they had acquainted him with the whole he bemoaned their case, and undertook to become a suitor for the King for them. In short, he obtained the King's favour for them thus far, that they were put to their fine, and restored to their former possessions, so that Walter De Lacy paid for the Lordship of Meath 2,508 marks, and Hugh, his brother, for Ulster and Connaught, a large sum.

Walter never forgot the hospitality he received in the Monastery of St. Taurin, and brought many of the monks into Ireland and gave them farms of land and great entertainments in Foure 'the which Walter De Lacy had formerly builded.'¹ Furthermore, in remembrance of the kindness

¹ *Trim Castle*, p. 22, note by Pembridge in Camden: 'In 1218 the Abbey of St. Fechins of Foure was made a cell of the Benedictine Abbey, St. Taurin, Evreux, Normandy, and this continued till the 27th Henry VI, when the authority of the Abbot of St. Taurin was abrogated by Act of Parliament; from thence the monks of Foure had power to elect their own Prior.'

of the Abbot he took his nephew (his brother's son) with him, one Alured, whom he knighted and made the 'Lord of the Denge.'¹

It was about this time (1216-17) that Walter De Lacy, in gratitude to God for his restoration to his former possessions and in reparation for the crimes of which he had been guilty, founded the Priory of St. John's, Trim, and, when finished, handed it over as a free gift to the ecclesiastical authorities for the benefit of the sick poor of Trim and of the adjoining parishes of that part of the Co. Meath. Simon Rochfort, the then ruling Bishop of Meath, lost no time in requisitioning the services of the Crutched Friars, and asked them to take charge of the Hospital, and to carry out to the letter the intentions of its princely founder. These friars were then a well-known religious community. They claim to have been established at an early period in the East, and to have taken part in the Crusades, in looking after the sick and fever-stricken in the camp, and the wounded on the field of battle.² They came subsequently into Italy and there established 208 houses, extending over five provinces—Bologna, Venice, Rome, Milan, and Naples; and finally found their way into Ireland. In a back number of the I. E. RECORD, I happened to see a list of the religious foundations in New Ross,³ the first being that of the Crossed or Crutched Friars, so called from the staff they carried in their hands which was surmounted by a Cross, and also from the fact that a Cross of red cloth was embroidered on their habit, as a distinctive badge of their Order. It was the establishment of this house in New Ross (*circa* 1195), which gave its name to a street in that town, still known as Priory Street. These were the men into whose hands Simon Rochfort committed the care of St. John's Priory. Under their management it soon became the one great central Hospital of the Midlands, and received moral and financial support, not merely from local sources, but also (as we shall see) from substantial subsidies of land and other forms of property granted for its upkeep by several Acts of Parliament. For over three centuries it carried on its

¹ Ware's *Annals*, quoted in *Trim Castle*, p. 23. Orpen, in his work *Ireland under the Normans*, vol. ii. p. 258, expresses the view that though most of the details of this story can be shown to be apocryphal, it is not improbable that the De Lacys did actually seek shelter and hospitality from the monks of St. Taurin at Evreux.

² *Cath. Encyc.*, vol. iv.

³ I. E. RECORD, Fourth Series (1900), vol. viii. p. 244.

philanthropic work amongst the sick poor, till the memorable day, July 16, 1539 (31st of Henry VIII), when the Commissioners of the King came to demand possession of the Priory and of everything belonging to it. Armed with the King's writ there was no course open to the Prior except to hand up the keys, and put his name to a document which, strange to say, was styled a deed of voluntary surrender. If it could be called voluntary at all, it certainly had annexed to it what is styled by theologians, '*involuntarium secundum quid*,' somewhat in the same sense as one gives up his purse to a highwayman, who points a loaded pistol at his head. Whatever may be said of the propriety of calling the deed *voluntary* or *involuntary*, there can be no doubt of its comprehensiveness. It included every kind of property, down to the smallest article of commercial value, as may be seen from the following detailed schedule:—

Containing a church, two towers, an hall, storehouse, kitchen, brew-house, two granaries, a pigeon-house, and haggard; also messuages, twenty acres of arable land, being part of their demesne on the south side of the Boyne; seventy acres of arable land, twelve of pasture, being part of the said demesne on the north side of the Boyne; and a close, containing an acre of pasture, with three gardens in Newtown, annual value besides reprises, 101s. 4d.; four messuages, six cottages, 120 acres of arable land, and twenty of pasture, with a mill on the river Blackwater, in the town of Clonguffyn, of annual value, besides reprises, £4 16s.; a castle, six messuages, forty acres of arable land, and forty of pasture, moor, and underwood, in Longwood and Atomodarire, annual value, besides reprises, 52s. 4d.; seven acres of arable land, and three of pasture, in Ballreyn, annual value, besides reprises, 4s. 8d.; two acres of arable land, with the three Warrenstowns, in the parish of Knockmarke, annual value, besides reprises, 2s.; two acres of arable land in the townland of Agher, in the aforesaid parish, annual value, besides reprises, 2s.; twenty acres of arable land in the townland of Trim, annual value, besides reprises, 20s. 8d.; five messuages, three cottages, 160 acres of arable land, three of meadow, and six of pasture, with the appurtenances in Downkenne, annual value, besides reprises, £19 5s. 6d.; one message, forty-eight acres of arable land, two of meadow, and two of pasture, in St. John's-town, annual value, besides reprises, 6s. 8d.; sixteen acres of arable land in Moyhangaye, annual value, besides reprises, 16s. 6d.; six acres of arable land in Coraghetown, and an annual rent of 7s. 4d., payable out of the lands of Thomas Plunkett, of Rathmore, Christopher Plunkett, Jun., Richard Proudefote, Nicholas Ford, &c., annual value, besides reprises, 13s. 4d.; twenty acres of arable land in Richardstown, annual value, besides reprises, 20s.; also one message with a garden in the town of Inche, annual value, besides reprises, 4s.; and thirty acres of arable land in Moher, near Kells, annual value, besides reprises, 20s.; with the following rectories appropriated to the said Prior and his successors:—Tillanoge, and the appurtenances, annual value, besides reprises, £10 13s. 4d.; and Fennor, with the appurtenances, annual value, besides reprises, £6 13s. 4d.

It is a great pity that the books giving a full account of the institute are not forthcoming. They would tell us the amount of good done daily in the Hospital, the average number of beds available for intern patients, and the vast number of extern patients who came for casual medical and surgical treatment, and other very interesting particulars. They would reveal also the cruel hardship inflicted on the sick poor by closing against them the doors of an institute established and endowed for their benefit, and, furthermore, the iniquity of appropriating their property and applying it for purposes altogether alien to the intentions of the original beneficiaries. There are, however, a few important items which have survived the wreck, and are for many reasons well worthy of being kept in perpetual remembrance: 'A.D. 1281. Walter, the son of Alured the younger, granted to this house an annual rent of 40s. out of the Manor of Magathreth, in this County, in pure and perpetual alms.' Taking the different relative values of money now and then, 40s. at that time was a substantial sum, especially when given yearly. The donor (Walter) was a direct descendant of Alured, nephew of the Abbot of St. Taurin, Evreux, Normandy, whom De Lacy brought over with him to Ireland, and to whom he gave a large estate in the heart of Meath together with the honour of knighthood, as well as making him 'Lord of the Dingle.' If we ask ourselves why this particular Priory was the object of his special beneficence, giving it 40s. yearly in pure and perpetual alms, what answer could be more natural than this: Is there any other institute in the world which had such claims upon his charity as the one built by his best friend and the benefactor of his family, Walter De Lacy? This subscription, to my mind, has an additional value, since it tends to corroborate the opinion I put forward in the beginning of this paper, that the credit of founding St. John's Priory belongs of right to Walter De Lacy.

1395—18th Richard II. The King permits the Prior and Convent of the house or hospital of St. John of Newtown, near Trim, to acquire in perpetuity the advowson of parishes not exceeding £10, according to their taxation, and six carucates of arable land not held in capite. He also confirms them in all their possessions in Ireland. Dublin, 24th of March.

1427. John Pakkere was Prior. Edmund, fourth brother to Sir Bartholomew Dillon, who was made Chief Baron of

the Exchequer in 1513, was Prior of Newtown and Luske. The Prior of this house paid every year half a marc proxies to the Bishop of Meath. This sum may seem small, but it is important, as showing the Priory was subject to the jurisdiction of the Ordinary of the place, the Bishop of Meath.

Laurence White was the last Prior, the same one who surrendered this house and its possessions to the Commissioners of the King, Henry VIII. Two days afterwards we find the following entry:—

July 18—31 Henry VIII.—Fiant for grant of the following yearly pensions:—£10 to Laurence Whyte, late Prior of St. John's, Newtown, near Trim; and 26s. 8d. to Patrick Dongan, issuing out of the profits of the rectories of Finnerw and Tollanaghoge.

Although the eviction of the friars from their peaceful home at Newtown closed the last chapter in the history of the Priory as a hospital, it did not put an end to the material buildings, for soon after the surrender of the house Sir Robert Dillon got a grant of it from the King and let it at a yearly rent to a family named Ashe. This family held a high position in society, and their names figure amongst the gentry as Town Commissioners and also as Members of Parliament for the Trim borough. During their residence at St. John's, as they still continued to call it, they effected many changes in the entire premises, in the interior and exterior of the principal building, which they desired to make as suitable as possible for all domestic purposes, and to give it the appearance of a purely secular edifice.¹ We find, for instance, on the front two semicircular arched gateways, 18½ feet wide and 13 feet high, which could not be used for any practical purpose, as a transverse vault of stone lies immediately behind them, but were put there solely to relieve the monotony of so much dead stone-work, and to give lightness and variety to the appearance of the west front, which faces the public road. In the course of time the Ashe family died out, and when the house ceased to be inhabited the premises soon fell into decay. With the roof off, wind and weather played havoc with the entire building, and left it in the sad state of decay in which we now find it. I have seen some time ago a curious old tombstone in the chancel of old St. Patrick's, Trim, erected to the memory of some of the Ashe family, the last of those who

¹ Alfred Conwell, *A Ramble Round Trim*.

lived in St. John's. On the surface of the stone was a shield, a chief ermine, 3 pleons impaling chevrons for Ashe; with 2 crests, a griffin's head on a coronet, and a squirrel for Ashe—with the following inscription partly obliterated :—

Love and age have joined in one
 To lay these two under this stone.
 Sir Thomas Ash, his Lady Elizabeth
 ashes in this house of death ;
 both having run their glasses,
 to be revived from ashes.

With this splendid specimen of the poetic genius of those days, it is time for me to close this prosy paper, and simply remind the patient reader of the salient points connected with the history of St. John's Priory. It was founded by Walter De Lacy, who, having built and finished it in a superb style, handed it over as a free gift to the ecclesiastical authorities for the benefit of the sick poor. Simon Rochfort, the Bishop of the diocese, lost no time in requisitioning the services of the Crossed Friars and giving the premises into their hands. Under their management, and with the moral and material support of all classes of the community, it soon became the great central hospital of the Midlands, the friars working and toiling in it with zeal worthy of all praise until the fateful day of their eviction, which was carried out by the Commissioners of Henry VIII.

Of the stately buildings which stood out so boldly for many centuries on the south bank of the Boyne at Newtown there is nothing now left but a few crumbling walls, clothed with ivy, and a tangled mass of debris and weeds to tell the tale of a once renowned institute, established for the relief of the sick poor of Trim and its vicinity, and also for the successive generations of poor people who lived within a convenient distance of the once flourishing Capital of Royal Meath.

P. CALLARY.

AMUSEMENTS FORBIDDEN ON SUNDAYS

BY REV. DAVID BARRY

THE practice of organizing various forms of public amusement on Sundays has become so widespread, that it is no matter for wonder that even those of the clergy who have anything but sympathy for Pharisaism or Sabbatarianism are considerably exercised as to the line of duty they should follow in regard to the promoters of these pastimes. And the path of reformers or would-be reformers is not rendered easier by the fact that certain amusements or entertainments that they consider incompatible—if not with the hearing of Holy Mass—at least with the Sabbath rest, and the spirit of prayer and recollection that it is intended to arouse and foster, are encouraged by the clergy in, perhaps, the next parish.

One priest very strongly objects to amateur theatricals that are held in his parish on a Sunday evening, while the dramatic class that conducts them is, on the next Sunday, utilized by a neighbour to aid in the equipment of a school. Again, the owners of itinerant picture shows cannot be expected to understand how the law of the Sabbath as interpreted in one parish precludes their exercising their art, whereas a few miles away they can ply their business quite unhindered. And in some dioceses athletic sports are held in such suspicion that the clergy are forbidden to attend them; whereas at no great distance they are positively fostered by ecclesiastics as a valuable antidote to the allurements of the public-house and other occasions of sin.

Now this varying attitude of the clergy is not entirely owing to the fact that circumstances alter cases, and that amusements in themselves lawful may become objectionable, by reason of the persons who get them up, or because of the conditions in which they take place. For I think it must be admitted that our knowledge of the law protecting the sanctity, and proscribing the desecration, of the Sabbath

is, as regards the matter in question, somewhat hazy and indefinite. And it may be that a modest attempt to clarify our views, and to lay down—however provisionally—a uniform standard, will remove what is a source of embarrassment for the clergy, and one of disedification or of grumbling among the laity.

Now in the first place, as regards the classes of occupation that are definitely and unequivocally forbidden by the law of Sabbath observance, both the knowledge and—what is more important—the practice of our people are, on the whole, satisfactory. But I trust that a few words to show the particular species of buying and selling that are forbidden may not be too much out of place; because I know that different interpretations of this branch of the law obtain among the clergy, which naturally give rise to different practices on the part of the laity. What, then, is meant by the precept of abstaining ‘a publico mercatu, nundinis aliisque emptionibus et venditionibus’¹? Does it embrace every transaction to which what I may call professional buyers or sellers are parties, and is it lawful only for those who are not traders by avocation to buy and sell on Sunday? Or, on the other hand, does the prohibition merely extend to what we call fairs and markets?

Well, the reasons in favour of each solution are given very fully by St. Alphonsus²; for the question has evidently been for a long time debated in the schools, though as time goes on there is a progressively marked tendency to answer it in the sense of the liberal view. St. Alphonsus himself lays down definitely that selling in public shops is forbidden; he adds, however, that the reason is the avoidance of scandal: ‘Ecclesia tantum venditionem in publicis officinis prohibuit, ratione scandali.’³ And in the notes to the latest edition of his Moral Theology the editors seem to rule out all dealings in shops, making no mention of the Saint’s explanation or restriction based on scandal.⁴ On behalf of the liberal side may be quoted his unqualified acceptance of the view of the Salmanticenses, that articles of food and drink may be sold on the Sabbath; though these theologians mistakenly appeal for support to a decree of the Congregation of Rites.

¹ New Code, can. 1248.

² *Theologia Moralís*, Gaudé’s ed., lib. iii. tract. iv. n. 285 sqq.

³ Op. cit. n. 286.

⁴ Note (a) to n. 286.

The Saint also makes his own of their view that the sale of 'boots, candles and such things' is lawful, on the ground that as the price of these is already determined, dealing in them does not distract one's attention from the service of the Lord by the sordid anxiety—and perhaps the heat—incidental to haggling and chaffering. But if this principle be admitted, it is plain enough that most other commodities may be purchased on Sundays, no less than the articles specially referred to. In fact, the Saint explicitly sanctions the sale of a horse or of a house on Sunday, even though the negotiations are protracted—but evidently only in circumstances where such a transaction takes place more or less privately, and not in a place specially set apart for buying and selling. And he concludes¹ his treatment of the subject by mentioning, without reprobating, the view that all contracts that are not effected by deed, or at least those not in writing, are, in a sense, private, and may be permitted without disrespect to the law of the Sabbath.

The principles of St. Alphonsus are summarized and various rays of light from other theologians are brought to a focus by Lehmkuhl,² who confines the prohibition to 'mercatus et nundinae quae publice cum strepitu fiunt.' And following Benedict XIV, he goes on even to exempt 'nundinae quae certo die affixae sunt.' Indeed, he explicitly allows shoemakers, etc., to keep their shops open on Sundays, even though the expenditure of some labour is necessary in order to fit their customers; partly on the ground of the triviality of the infringement of the law, and partly for convenience' sake.³

Auctions are certainly prohibited on Sundays by the ecclesiastical, no less than by the civil, law. And though the theologians say they may be tolerated in certain circumstances, personally I should be very slow to give any countenance to them; for in my experience when they take place on a Sunday they are often associated with an orgy of drink.

So far the teaching of the authorities is definite and satisfactory. But when we come to the question of amusements we lack their guidance in details, and have only general principles to fall back on. And I hope that what is a voyage of discovery—judging from the books I have been

¹ n. 286.

² *Theologia Moralís*, 11th ed., ii. n. 704.

³ *Op. cit.* n. 707.

able to consult—will not be brought to an untimely end by the reefs and shallows of an uncharted sea. Now, considering the purpose of the Sabbath in the first place, and in the second, the nature of the works and occupations that are expressly banned, one will have no difficulty in reaching the conclusion that, broadly speaking, dramatic entertainments of a purely secular character are prohibited on Sundays. Indeed this is so generally recognized by the people that there is no need to delay in proving or emphasizing it. And the public sentiment or conscience—and custom, which is the concrete and permanent embodiment of it—is in this matter considered decisive, within limits, as to what is allowed. ‘Proinde,’ says Ballerini,¹ ‘egregie S. Alphonsus injeicit mentionem *aestimationis hominum*; quippe communis sensus et consuetudo inde proveniens optime explicat legem. . . . Habenda est ergo ratio consuetudinis.’

If, however, a play is acted not by professionals, but by amateurs, whether in a regular theatre or in one improvised for the occasion—a school or a court-house—I think no clear proof can be adduced that it is unlawful on Sundays. I know, indeed, that it may be argued that such a performance is as detrimental to the Sabbath rest as one given by professionals; and that both are calculated to distract and alienate our thoughts and affections from what are their proper objects, on Sundays especially. And I admit that, judging by purely theological standards, it is not easy accurately to define the difference between the two. But the feeling or judgment or Catholic instinct of the people is quick enough to appreciate it. So much so that as a rule they frequent amateur performance without any qualms; whereas it is only those whose standpoint has been secularized, and whose consciences have been blunted, that patronize a professional entertainment on a Sunday or holiday.

Besides, I venture to think that, on theological principles, as amateurs are, as a rule, acting for some public or charitable purpose, their efforts are entitled to a certain amount of toleration that could not be extended to professionals, whose object is purely and simply private gain. For many theologians,² if not all, make a great distinction

¹ *Opus Theologicum Morale*, ii. tract. vi. sect. iii. n. 29.

² See St. Alphonsus, *op. cit.* n. 283; Laymann, *lib.* 4, tr. 7. cap. 2, n. 6; Tanqueray, *Theol. Moralis*, i. n. 1039; Slater, *Moral Theology*, p. 265. This distinction is not admissible in the case of works that are purely servile.

between certain works that are on the borderland of 'servile' and 'liberal,' according as these are engaged in for profit on the one hand, or for the purposes of recreation and charity on the other.

And clearly there is no reason why the performers or one of them, or the person who organized the entertainment, may not be a genuine object of charity, and a proper beneficiary of the proceeds. Of course I am assuming that such plays are in themselves unobjectionable, and in the circumstances of their presentation not specially liable to abuses. It is essential, for instance, that they conclude at a reasonable hour, and that certain persons would not go to them without a responsible escort—and to secure this, whether the performance be on a Sunday night or another night, must be always a source of the greatest anxiety and difficulty for the clergy.

I am aware that some, on any hint being given that amateur theatricals are not a violation of the Sabbath, will at once take alarm, and talk about 'the thin end of the wedge,' etc. But, fortunately, we are not all lawmakers; our function is only to interpret the law to the people. And so far as I know, the general law gives no sanction to the indiscriminate banning of these entertainments. On the contrary, they would all come within the 'opera liberalia'¹ which are permitted, were it not for the custom which is the crystallized public feeling of what is in harmony with the worship of God and the care of our souls. So, under correction, I would maintain that the prohibition of them is of strict interpretation, and the line, I think, need be drawn only so as to exclude professional performances.

Moreover, at least in the country and in small towns, the audience at one of those entertainments is not likely to be nearly as large on other evenings of the week as it is on Saturday and Sunday evenings; so that the clergy are almost coerced to allow it on one of the two. And personally, on account of the danger of Holy Mass being missed if it takes place on Saturday night, I would prefer that Sunday be selected.

In regard to picture shows, the standard theologians, of course, are silent, but I would venture to say that the same principles apply to them as to dramatic representations.

¹ So much so that Lacroix implies *without any restriction* that plays are lawful (*Theologia Moralis*, lib. iii. pars i. n. 590).

That is to say, the opening of a regular or licensed picture-house would be a gross breach of the Sabbath. But if a few amateurs hold a cinematograph exhibition, perhaps as an adjunct of a concert, there is not, I think, *positis ponendis*, much to be said against it.

And even though an individual is more or less a professional, if he be in poor circumstances, and be amenable to any directions the priest may give him, I do not see any great objection to his giving an exhibition occasionally, even for his own private gain; especially if so large an audience could not be got together on a week evening. Because, if such an entertainment be technically a violation of the Sabbath, it is regularized by the unusual profit accruing. For as Lehmkuhl¹ says: 'Ob lucrum non diurnum quidem, sed pro conditione operantis *magnum* seu *extraordinarium* excusatio saepe admitti potest; quia operariis non leve incommodum est transmittere debere opportunitatem magni lucri, quo sibi suisque providere possint.'

To hold dances on Sundays is not considered sinful—and for one reason, I suppose, because these are usually more or less private. Ballerini² gives another: 'Choreae vero seu saltationes etsi . . . corporale quid videantur, solum consistunt in quadam corporis agitatione ac motione ad ejus levamen et ut sic ipsum cooperetur exultationi et gaudio animi et ita etiam pertinent choreae ad liberalem actionem.' But if people are admitted indiscriminately to dances, and if they are not under the control of resolute and responsible persons, the priest, on account of the evils incidental to them, could not be better employed than in trying to put a stop to them, whether on Sunday or on any other day.

Concerts being less liable to abuses, may be permitted with less hesitation. The words of Ballerini³ are in point: 'Haec opera non sunt servilia et musica quidem; tum quia musica inter artes liberales computatur, tum quia per se non est opus servorum neque ex genere suo fit ad serviendum; tum quia ordinatur solum ad animi oblectamentum et de se excitat mentem estque actus quasi sermocinationis certo modo factus. Nec naturam mutat, quod interdum fit ob mercedem.' However, I am disposed to question his last statement on the principle I have enunciated more than

¹ Op. cit. n. 712.

² Op. cit. n. 20.

³ Op. cit. n. 19.

once ; that, namely, which draws a clear distinction between professional performances and an occasional entertainment organized for a purpose of public utility or charity, such as providing a supply of coals for the poor during the winter.

As regards horse-races, I have not been able to find any reference to them under the Third Commandment in the theologians I have had an opportunity of consulting. But custom and the feeling of our people are not only a sufficient indication that they are forbidden, but an effective barrier against them as well.¹ In fact, toleration of racing on Sundays may be taken as a sure sign of the decadence of Catholic spirit and of an advanced stage of the secularization of public opinion. And in a couple of cases within my knowledge the clergy by adopting a clear and firm, but courteous, attitude of opposition succeeded in defeating the attempt once for all.

As for horse shows, a theologian in whose views I place the greatest reliance was clearly of opinion that they were unlawful ; and on a certain occasion when an important one of them was fixed for a holiday, he succeeded, partly by his personal influence, and partly by a threat of public action, in bringing the Committee round to his view.

Seeing that horse-races are certainly forbidden, I cannot understand how it is permissible to hold athletic sports ; at least if they are extensively advertised, and are likely to draw people from a wide area. Because every reason that makes racing undesirable, applies in almost equal degree to the case of these sports.² For in both we have ‘*jurgia et dissensiones et secularem distractionem . . . unde quietem et vacationem in die festo intentam maxime impedirent.*’³ And the attitude of ecclesiastical authority in some dioceses is sufficiently indicated by the following regulation :—

Cum compertum sit magnos populi ex dissitis locis concurrentis concursus, ad ludos athleticos peragendos, cum debita diei Dominicæ observantia componi vix posse, et aliis malis, præsertim inebrietati in juvenibus occasionem præbere, parochorum, et eorum coadjutorum erit populos sibi commissos ab hujusmodi coneursibus die Dominicâ dissuadere, nec ipsis parochis nec aliis sacerdotibus licebit eis interesse, nec ullo modo favere.

As for hurling and football, considering how widespread

¹ See Statutes of the Maynooth Synod (1900), n. 287.

² See Maynooth Statutes, loc. cit.

³ Ballerini, op. cit. n. 39.

they are, and how much custom has to do in determining the negative side of the Sabbath observance, it is, indeed, a courageous theologian—or a rash one—who would venture to condemn them. But if the clergy cannot or ought not to forbid them, they can and should make every effort to secure that those who go to them hear Holy Mass before they leave home, instead of being satisfied with the intention of hearing it—which is often defeated—when they reach the venue of the match. No abuse in this respect attaches to matches between local teams; they are, of course, a legitimate and commendable form of recreation.

DAVID BARRY.

THE TRIALS OF SOME IRISH MISSIONARIES

BY REV. JAMES P. RUSHE, O.D.C.

V. THE VALESIAN FORMULARY, A.D. 1660-1671

THE spirit of hopefulness animating our Irish Missionaries of the seventeenth century is well illustrated in the case of the Discalced Carmelites, notwithstanding any very natural depressing effects caused by a certain Act of the General Chapter of 1653 to which due reference has been made.¹ Indeed, the aspiration of the Teresian religious in Ireland, for the eventual restoration of their Province, came under formal notice at the succeeding Chapter when, on their behalf, the assembled Fathers discussed such steps as might best insure practical provision being made for the reception and education of subjects destined for the Irish Mission. And this, although reliable information to hand indicated anything but encouraging prospects for the future of the Church in those countries where, we are assured, the Faithful lay crushed beneath the burden of interminable woes.² Writing from London on the 1st of January, 1658, Father Patrick of St. Brigid draws a terrible picture of the times; mentioning, casually, that nine priests were then detained in prison awaiting their, apparently, inevitable doom: among them a Father John Baptist of Mount Carmel, who had joined the Order in Ireland fully a quarter of a century previously.³ The writer's own struggles, at this period, have already been dealt with; attention being drawn to his intimate relations with Dr. Edmund O'Reilly, Archbishop of Armagh, whose name stands out so conspicuously

¹ I. E. RECORD, Fifth Series (June 1901), vol. ix. p. 483 sqq.

² Ibid. p. 487.

³ This and the other letters, dated from London the same year, are now preserved in the General Archives of the Order. (*Plut.* 187—among the papers relating to the English Mission.)

in the then current affairs.¹ In a letter despatched from Belgium, during the course of the same year, Father Paul of St. Ubald could only confirm those disheartening tidings ; still he would not have the Authorities of the Order in Rome lose sight of the project under discussion at the recent General Chapter ; and suggests the Teresian seminary at Louvain for the training of students from both Irish and English Missions.² It is further significative of the trials of such members of the Order as had ventured to remain on in Ireland, that they were unable to send a Procurator to the General Chapter of 1659 ; the only allusion to the Irish Mission being an official record of the unanimous acclaiming of the cause of those three Teresian Confessors slain by the Puritans in hatred of the Catholic Faith.³

If within the next twelve months the restoration of the Stuart dynasty argued for the Faithful, in England and in Ireland, speedy toleration of the proscribed religion, their revived hopes were sadly discounted, at the very outset, by rumours as to the nature of the conditions which so great a privilege would, undoubtedly, entail—rendering acceptance impossible on the part of all professing the necessity of allegiance to the Holy See. For one of the first measures sanctioned by Charles the Second was to establish his royal father's murderers in possession of the lands which they had seized ; this action being defended by the contention that loyalty to the Faith, for which the Transplanters had suffered so grievously, was incompatible with fealty to the Throne.⁴ Yet, a few years before the King had protested, most solemnly, that should it please God to bring about his accession ('quando Deus ipsum restituerit') he would deny nothing to his Catholic subjects : too long the victims of barbarous laws.⁵ And even if many grave and earnest Catholics were then deceived in thinking the conversion of Charles himself already assured ('quin sit futurus et ornamento et utilitati Ecclesiae Dei') ; he must have been well aware of the edification given to the Courts of Europe by his own mother in the practice of her religion, seeking its solaces in a Carmelite nunnery after her husband's

¹ Letter dated 26th of November, 1658.

² Among the papers relating to Irish Mission. (*Plut.* 190.)

³ *Acta Capituli Generalis*, xix. f. 99b.

⁴ *Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. x. p. 84.

⁵ Cf. the letter of Dr. Peter Talbot—afterwards Archbishop of Dublin—dated : 'Coloniae, 17 Novembris, 1654.' *Historical MSS. Commission, Tenth Report*, Appendix, Part v. p. 357.

tragic fate.¹ Harkening to the baneful counsels of an equally degenerate son of another pious Catholic mother, once the King felt secure in possession of the English crown he allowed Ormonde an absolutely free hand in the management of Irish affairs: knowing that it was this favourite's avowed policy to overthrow Papal Supremacy, no matter by what questionable means.² With this nefarious object in view, the intermediary chosen for the insidious deception of the Irish Catholic clergy was the Franciscan Friar, Peter Walsh, who had long been in the enjoyment of the Viceroy's dubious patronage.³

Knowing that the Faithful of Ireland, priests and people, were most anxious to counteract the pernicious aspersions on their loyalty, Walsh suggested to those representing them the expediency of a congratulatory address to the King, to be submitted through the now all-powerful Duke of Ormonde. A number of leading members of the clergy, secular and regular, including the Archbishop of Armagh, the Bishop of Meath, the Vicar-Apostolic of Dublin, and other Prelates, together with the Superiors of the Dominican, Teresian, and Capuchin monasteries in Dublin, did not hesitate to avail themselves of the Franciscan's own promised good offices: authorizing him to present their dutiful homage to Charles II, on behalf of the Catholics of Ireland, who, likewise, confidently besought the boon of religious toleration.⁴ But the wording of this petition did not lend itself to express Ormonde's sinister purpose; and feigning disapproval of the terms employed, he instructed Walsh to draft that 'Loyal Remonstrance,' which was, subsequently, sprung upon the unsuspecting people. So grossly offensive was the tone of this precious document towards the Holy See, that even before its ulterior motive had become more clearly apparent, as totally subversive of the doctrine of Papal Supremacy, the devoted Catholics took alarm, now thoroughly suspicious of the persistent efforts of the unscrupulous Walsh to win them over to his patron's heretical views. In the later development of the

¹ *Ibid.* p. 358.

² The comments, throughout, on Ormonde's conduct are based on admissions in the new (1912) *Life of James First Duke of Ormonde, 1610-1688*, by Lady Burghclere, cf. vol. ii. p. 50 sqq.

³ *Life of Ormonde*, l.c. cf. *D.N.B.*, vol. lix. p. 218. Also, Cogan's *Diocese of Meath*, vol. ii. p. 96 sqq. for several useful chapters on the subject, drawn chiefly from Renehan's very valuable *Collections*, edited by Dr. M'Carthy.

⁴ Walsh's *History of the Remonstrance*, Part i. p. 4 sqq.

question, they had the intrepid Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Peter Talbot, to encourage them in their truly heroic resistance; and, in the meantime, Dr. Edmund O'Reilly, Archbishop of Armagh, boldly declared, in presence of the Viceroy's spies, 'that he would rather have both hands consumed than subscribe the Remonstrance.'¹ It seems that the original petition reached London in the month of January 1661; and we may here inquire, with advantage, into the identity of that Superior of the Discalced Carmelites whose name appears among those of the other signatories.

We have seen above that Father Paul of St. Ubald was by no means sanguine of an immediate improvement in Irish affairs, when commenting on the subject in 1658. Hence he must have been one of the many exiled clergy, placing implicit confidence in the gratitude of the recently restored King; because he was back in Dublin in 1660, presiding over the Teresian community there in the absence of Father Agapitus of the Holy Ghost. He was the 'Father Stephen Browne' whose signature is attached to the memorial entrusted, in the first instance, to Ormonde's Franciscan agent. But his name in religion is appended to a document of far greater historical importance, intended for the instruction of the General Chapter of his Order, held in Rome the following year. It is in Father Paul's own handwriting, dated from Dublin, the 20th of August, 1661; and, also, signed by Fathers John of the Mother of God, Columba of St. Michael, Kieran of St. Patrick, Laurence of St. Thomas, Hilary of St. Augustine, and Angelus-Joseph of the Conception—with a special note to explain that their Vicar, Father Agapitus of the Holy Ghost, was then absent from Ireland.² There is no allusion to the Valesian Formulary, or to its author Peter Walsh; so, obviously, the Viceroy was still biding his time 'to work a division amongst the Romish clergy.'³ Judging from the letter before us, those Teresians themselves seemed quite confident that the

¹ *Life of Ormonde*, vol. ii. p. 51. As this work is written from the non-Catholic point of view, of course it was impossible for the author to grasp the actual nature of the vital issue at stake.

² This letter is now preserved among the Irish Papers in the General Archives of the Discalced Carmelites. (*Plut.* 190.)

³ The admission was made by Ormonde himself, writing to Lord Arran in 1680. In the new *Life*, this is described as 'a somewhat Machiavellian policy' on the part of the Lord-Lieutenant, in his contention 'against the opposition of the Pope and his creatures.'—Vol. ii. p. 51. (From *Carte*, vol. v. p. 131.)

Irish Church had entered upon the enjoyment of a long-delayed season of religious toleration; relying on facts deemed of a most encouraging nature. For example, Catholic priests might now appear on the streets of Dublin without being openly molested; they might even venture to discharge their sacerdotal duties privately—saying Mass, visiting the sick, and administering the Sacraments; and it was no longer so dangerous to speak to the Puritans themselves, with whom they could transact business with comparative immunity.

The Fathers mentioned by name in this letter had each his own field of missionary labour, with ample scope for his zeal. In illustration of the efforts made, and the successes already achieved, we are given a series of brief notices on the Religious thus engaged. It seems that Father Agapitus of the Holy Ghost usually resided in the County Wicklow; having betaken himself thither after his escape from prison in Dublin, effected by means of a rope which enabled him to scramble through a window and scale the outer walls.¹ He had made numerous conversions in the meantime; while Father Paul of St. Ubald was equally successful in the same respect, in the city itself, ever since his return from exile. The Catholics of a certain district, about twenty miles from Dublin, were entirely dependent on the spiritual ministrations of Father Hilary of St. Augustine throughout the terrors of the Cromwellian régime; and Father Laurence of St. Thomas had been emulating the same spirit of Elian zeal when seized by the heretics, and subjected to a harsh imprisonment for four years, before the intervention of some influential friends insured his release.² Both Father Columba of St. Michael and Father John of the Mother of God were obliged to take over complete charge of parishes owing to the paucity of secular priests in the country: the former in the County Down; the latter in the neighbourhood of Dublin.³ Father Kieran of St. Patrick, also, devoted himself to the spiritual welfare of the Faithful in the North of Ireland, and greatly to their profit; although he, too, was captured by

¹ Reference will be made, presently, to the narratives left us by Father Agapitus himself concerning his own experiences at this particular epoch.

² His name appears in the *Book of Teresian Missionary Obits*; but no date is assigned. However, we can supply this omission from one of the narratives which we owe to Father Agapitus of the Holy Ghost.

³ This is the latest mention of Father Columba of St. Michael, who, according to the *Book of Missionary Obits*, died in 1669—(I as I have found the entries in this *Book* anything but accurate).

the heretics and suffered the privations and miseries of prison-life during the lengthy interval of six weary years.¹ We are assured, moreover, that the two lay-brothers, who had risked the perils of the times by remaining on the Irish Mission, proved themselves most useful to those Catholics upon whom they depended for the means of livelihood, instructing the children of such to the best of their ability when to do so was accounted a crime. As no allusion is made to the apostolic activity of Father Angelus-Joseph of the Conception, we may safely infer that he had only just returned from Belgium. But we learn elsewhere that before his exile he was one of the victims of Cromwellian barbarity, which he is said to have survived almost miraculously.² His name appears among the Teresian Exiles as one of the Religious who found refuge in France; there is later evidence, however, to show that Father Angelus-Joseph was resident in Brussels on the 16th of July, 1653. Altogether, those Discalced Carmelites were responsible, under God's providence, for the conversion of more than a thousand souls during the past seven years; not exclusively Protestants, since among those reconciled were certain Catholics who, weakly yielding to the severity of their trials, had fallen away from the Faith.³

These facts were merely submitted in proof of the abundant spiritual harvest awaiting labourers on the Irish Mission; for there was a lamentable need of priests to meet the requirements of the Faithful and to instruct those anxious to correspond to the conversion grace. The assembled representatives of the Restored Order of Carmel are entreated, accordingly, to take into serious consideration the present condition of the once flourishing Province of St. Patrick, realizing what vital interests are at stake for God's greater glory and for the welfare of His persecuted Irish Church. Most effective aid might now be rendered in forwarding so grand a project by reconstructing the Province to the extent of nominating a Provincial and local Superiors as the indispensable preliminaries to the opening of a novitiate for Irish subjects once more. Such the means adopted to provide for the wants of this Mission by the other

¹ Neither does the name of Father Kieran of St. Patrick appear after this date; although 1699 is given as the year of his death in the *Book* just quoted.

² We shall find Father Angelus-Joseph associated with a later crisis in the history of the Irish Discalced Carmelites.

³ In dealing with this phase of the subject, Father Agapitus comments on how marvellously few were the instances of such apostasy.

religious Orders in Ireland, notwithstanding all inconveniences due to the rigorous enforcement of the penal laws.¹ In the case of the Irish Teresians, the matter had become all the more urgent recently owing to the death of two of their exiled brethren in Belgium; Fathers Paul-Simon of Jesus-Mary and Fortunatus of St. Anne, both of them summoned to their reward in the course of this year.² The death of Father Cherubinus of St. Gabriel must, also, have occurred abroad about the same period; for there is no reference to his name after 1655, as we have already seen; and although Father Columbanus of the Blessed Sacrament survived until 1662, we cannot say, for certain, whether he ever returned to Ireland.³

As so many of the documents now under review reveal an appalling picture of Cromwellian vandalism, mention may be made of a curious instance, in relief, which presents the Protector's soldiers as 'patrons of learning'; and which is not entirely dissociated from the later history of the Irish Carmelites. We are told that in 1661 the collection of MSS. in Trinity College, Dublin, 'was raised to a position of first importance by the acquisition of Archbishop Ussher's Library, which had been purchased for the University a few years previously by the officers and soldiers of Cromwell's army in Ireland.'⁴ The original press-markings show that two Carmelite items of the utmost interest, whether from the liturgical or historical standpoint, belonged to this famous collection: the *Ancient Ritual of the Order*, and the *Kilcormic Missal*, containing obits of that monastery down to the very date of the Suppression.⁵

When in Rome, in 1662, Father Agapitus of the Holy Ghost prepared a formal statement on the actual condition of Ireland during the occupation of the country by the troops in question; and if he furnishes no evidence to suggest that

¹ From the letter quoted.

² The date is omitted in the *Book of Obits*.

³ I E. RECORD, vol. ix. p. 486. The *Douai MS.* has: (a) 'P.F. Paulus-Simon a J.-M., Hybernus, Brugis, 5 Sept. 1661.—Aetas 40. Prof. 20' (f. 213); (b) 'P.F. Fortunatus a S. Anna, Hybernus, Antwerpiae, 2 Dec. 1661. Aetas 58. Prof. 39' (ibid., f. 214), (c) P.F. Columbanus a SS. Sacr., Hybernus, Bruxellis, 20 Apr. 1662.—Aetas 81. Prof. 47' (ibid. l.c.). A MS. list—containing some obvious inaccuracies—of the Discaled Carmelites on the Irish Mission in 1659 includes a Father *Columbanus of St Dymphna*; and this was, probably, the Father 'Columbanus a S. Delphino' mentioned in the *Book of Missionary Obits*.

⁴ *Catalogue of MSS. in T.C.D.* p. 1.

⁵ I have edited the former.

the purchasers of the Ussher Library were inspired by 'love of true learning,' his official report leaves little room for doubt as to how the origin and object of 'Old Trinity' would have appealed to them in their fanatical detestation of the Catholic Faith. The Fathers assembled in Rome for the General Chapter that year bore eloquent testimony, by acclamation, to the cause of three Teresian victims of similar fanatics, cruelly slain by them in the early stages of the Puritan campaign.¹ The presentation of such instances of heroic constancy by Father Agapitus of the Holy Ghost has been pronounced of supreme importance in vindication of the integrity of the motive for which our Irish Confessors of the period laid down their lives. Here it will suffice to say that the Latin text of the narrative is easily accessible in another place; and is, in reality, but confirmation, in copious detail, of various facts mentioned in that appeal from Dublin quoted above and endorsed by a number of those who had survived the ordeal of such relentless oppression.² Father Agapitus did not assist at the General Chapter of 1662 as canonically-elected socius of the Religious in Ireland; but it is certain that his visit to Rome at this juncture was in furtherance of the project specified in the same appeal: the providing for the future of their beloved Mission, which the Irish Teresians held more closely at heart than ever under the, apparently, still bright auspices of the Stuart Restoration.

If, however, his own enthusiasm led the Superiors-General to foster confidence in regard to the stability of religious tolerance, both in England and Ireland, towards the Catholic subjects of the new King, they would have been painfully disillusioned by the news that reached Rome from London in the January of 1663. As if in practical protest of their determination to frustrate any such hope for the permanent relief of the Faithful, the heretical authorities had issued warrants for the arrest of two Irish Discalced Carmelites—Fathers Patrick of St. Brigid and Thomas of Jesus—then known to be in the city; and they were dragged to prison through the streets of London in circumstances well calculated to intimidate and mortify their co-religionists.³

¹ *Acta Cap. Gen.*, lib. ii. f. 114b.

² Cf. *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, vol. ii. p. 204 sqq. A contemporary copy, signed by Father Agapitus of the Holy Ghost, is preserved in the General Archives of the Discalced Carmelites. (*Plut.* 190.)

³ The letter containing these details, and written by Father Patrick of St. Brigid, is preserved among the English Papers. (*Plut.* 187.)

The case aroused considerable interest even in Court circles, being chronicled by the Diarist Pepys, who draws special attention to the very detail which, when writing to Rome, Father Patrick of St. Brigid assigns as what would be urged against them in positive proof of their guilt: the fact of Father Thomas of Jesus having been seized while offering the Holy Sacrifice, and led away actually wearing the sacred insignia of his priesthood, described by Pepys as 'the Vests.'¹ Consequently, the mere thought of liberty of conscience had by this time become dispelled. The reply to Father Patrick's letter is, likewise, extant; and in it both Religious are earnestly exhorted by the Superiors-General of the Order to endure this grievous trial, as they themselves best know how, so that their fortitude and patience might edify and encourage the persecuted Catholics of London. Meanwhile, every effort would be made—especially by securing the intervention of the Queen Mother—to bring about their release with least possible delay.² This favour was obtained in the course of the same year; but on condition that Fathers Patrick and Thomas should accept the alternative of perpetual banishment from the British Dominions, under the usual capital penalty which return on their part would entail.³ Nevertheless, it is gratifying to think that, far from acting as a deterrent, this awful threat seems to have proved rather an incentive on the very first opportunity afforded them of risking the perils of the Mission in their native land once more.⁴

It will be remembered that in one of his interesting letters from London Father Patrick of St. Brigid had alluded to the arrest of Father Laurence of St. Thomas, one of the signatories of the memorial prepared, in form of an appeal, for the General Chapter of 1662. And now we have to consider another important document of the period in which the death of this zealous Missionary, at Dundalk, in 1664, is attributed to a malady contracted during his long and cruel captivity in Drogheda.⁵ Father Agapitus of the Holy Ghost is the author of the narrative which this document contains;

¹ Under date of the 16th February, 1663, Pepys has: 'It seems a priest was taken in his vests officiating somewhere in Holborne the other day,' etc.

² *Ex Lib. ii. Epistolarum Definitorii Generalis, 1640-1700.*—The pagination ends at f. 104.

³ From the narrative of Father Bede of St. Simon Stock. (English Papers, *Plut.* 187.)

⁴ The subsequent experiences of both will occupy attention later on.

⁵ I. E. RECORD, vol. ix. p. 488.

and we owe it to what transpired at the General Chapter of 1665, when he again visited Rome, but, on the present occasion, as official representative of the Irish Mission.¹ He attended the opening Session on the 24th of April; and, on the 28th instant, after the cause of the three Religious of that Mission, whom the heretics put to death in hatred of the Faith, had duly been acclaimed, he submitted a petition for the establishment of a novitiate for Irish subjects at Rochelle. In passing reference to current events in Ireland, Father Agapitus said that he had committed to writing his own experiences since the last General Chapter; and it is with these we are about to deal.² Since, however, the project before the Capitular Fathers seemed to militate, in some way, against the interests of the Province of Aquitaine, Father Agapitus promptly suggested, as an alternative, that the desired purpose could be realized by an arrangement which would admit of Irish postulants being professed and educated in the convent at Trent.³ Hence, the matter was immediately referred to the Definitory-General to consider and provide for the requirements of the Mission. Turning, then, to the narrative in question, we notice that it ends abruptly with the record of the death of Father Laurence of St. Thomas, and bears neither date nor signature. Fortunately contemporary evidence enables us to add these important details, identifying the author, who begins by recounting what had befallen him when on his way back to Ireland from Rome three years previously. Another Irish Discalced Carmelite, resident in Italy at the time, also alludes to these remarkable occurrences when recalling his own experiences of the Irish Mission: expressly associating them with Father Agapitus of the Holy Ghost.⁴

We learn that on that occasion Father Agapitus spent several months in London as the guest of a distinguished convert to the Catholic Faith; in whose house he himself had the consolation of receiving, not only the gentleman's own daughter and sister, but several friends, into the

¹ *Acta Cap. Gen.* . . . 1665, f. 121b. and f. 128b.

² The MS. is preserved among the Irish Papers. (*Plut.* 190.) Date and authorship are based both on intrinsic and extrinsic evidence.

³ *Acta Cap. Gen.* . . . 1665. l.c.

⁴ Father Felix of the Holy Ghost, whose narrative is preserved among the Irish Papers. (*Plut.* 190.) All documents in this series are written in Latin, except it is expressly notified to the contrary.

Church.¹ Indeed, so great was our informant's success, in this respect, he would gladly have remained on in London for some further time but for the activity displayed by the royal agents in 1662 to secure signatures to the 'Loyal Remonstrance' drawn up by the Franciscan Walsh, and approved by the Duke of Ormonde as an acceptable test of Catholic allegiance to the Crown. No sooner had these agents become aware of the arrival of Father Agapitus in London than they insisted upon his conforming to what they urged as an indispensable condition of residence there, and of exemption from arrest. Having protested his inability to subscribe to the 'Formulary,' he endeavoured to evade capture by appealing to the Queen Mother, who found herself quite powerless to assist him. So his sole alternative was to make good his escape to Ireland betimes, if at all possible in the circumstances. He furnishes a graphic description of that eventful journey, recording how certain travellers were wont to engage freely in such serious conversation as interested them in those early years of the reign of a monarch little in sympathy with his Puritanical environment. Of course the casual companions of Father Agapitus of the Holy Ghost were ignorant of the fact of his being a priest when discussing with him various points of Catholic dogma. Nor do their suspicions appear to have been aroused when his own comments on the same were all directed to demonstrate the unassailable position of Christians in union with the Church of Rome.² Eventually he reached Dublin safely, although barely escaping shipwreck within sight of the Irish coast. It seems he had not yet recovered from the hardships of that perilous voyage before the author of the 'Loyal Remonstrance' waited upon him to urge, in person, the necessity of Father Agapitus and the other Irish Teresian Friars subscribing to this Formulary, in order to insure, for the Catholics of Ireland generally, a generous measure of religious toleration. Otherwise, those Discalced Carmelites should, undoubtedly, find themselves in open conflict with the Government; and this would imply, at best, immediate banishment from Ireland.³ Fathers Paul of St. Ubald and John of the Mother of God were

¹ From the narrative (II) of Father Agapitus of the Holy Ghost. When at all possible, the pious Queen Henrietta Maria never hesitated to use her influence at Court on behalf of both English and Irish Teresian Missionaries. But not always, as in the present instance, with success.

² *Relatio* (II), l.c.

³ *Ibid.*

present at the interview, which assumed the character of a controversy : Walsh vigorously defending the orthodoxy of his Formulary ; while Father Agapitus was no less emphatic in denouncing it as utterly untenable from the truly Catholic point of view.¹ Seeing that there was not the least likelihood of his attaining his object, Ormonde's intermediary now warned Father Agapitus and the others, for all of whom he professed the warmest personal esteem, of the inevitable consequences of their attitude ; and, as a matter of fact, we are told that thenceforth the Irish Teresians were constrained to use the utmost precaution to retain their liberty, and dared no longer hope that the Faithful would be permitted to exercise their religion in peace. Yet Peter Walsh took it upon himself to announce publicly that once the 'Loyal Remonstrance' had been signed by leading representatives of Irish Catholics, clergy and laity, religious toleration would be established throughout the land. But, according to Father Agapitus of the Holy Ghost, the chapel in which the Franciscan uttered this pledge was instantly wrecked by fanatics, who availed themselves of the opportunity to perpetrate one of those sacrileges against the Real Presence so heart-breaking to those whom the Dogma inspires with such reverential awe.²

In face of all this, the Teresian Fathers succeeded in saving their own chapel in Dublin, although unable to admit the Faithful there ; and compelled to recite the Divine Office in a very low tone, for fear of attracting Ormonde's spies. Moreover, each of the Fathers had a special place where he might offer the Holy Sacrifice early every morning in safety ; and in secret, too, they were obliged to visit the sick and discharge the other duties of the Sacred Ministry. However, little by little, the devout Catholics of Dublin had begun to come to those secure retreats for the solaces of their religion ; often taking with them well-disposed Protestant friends, so that frequent conversions still ensued. Thus, despite the obstacles with which the priests of Dublin, both secular and regular, had to contend, it is here stated that since the accession of Charles II the Catholic population of the city had been increased by the reconciliation of fully ten thousand

¹ It has been shown that Fathers Agapitus, Paul, and John of the Mother of God are identified as the Rev. Thomas Dillon, Rev. Stephen Browne, and Rev. John Rowe respectively. Cf. I. E. RECORD, vol. vii. p. 565. See, also, Walsh's *History of the Remonstrance*, p. 575, and *ibid.* p. 4 sqq.

² *Relatio* (II) quoted.

heretics.¹ But in country districts the Protestants held themselves more aloof from their Catholic neighbours; and the Discalced Carmelites on the Mission of Athboy and Loughrea, for instance, did not receive the same very desirable encouragement in the exercise of their onerous labours.² In these circumstances Father Agapitus of the Holy Ghost had set out for the General Chapter of 1665, entrusted with that petition from his brethren which he urged before the assembled Fathers with such commendable zeal. He spoke with all the more confidence, remembering the eagerness of a number of the Irish Teresian exiles to hasten to his assistance—risking all dangers—if now permitted to return to Ireland: Father Felix of the Holy Ghost from the Province of Piedmont, where he was sub-prior of the convent of Asti; Father Patrick of St. Brigid from Belgium; Father Bernard of the Assumption from Genoa; Father Edward of the Kings from Aquitaine; and Father Christian from Wirtzbourg in the Province of Cologne.³

Once again, all plans for the future welfare of the Irish Teresian Mission were delayed by the renewed activity of Peter Walsh, who became more importunate than ever this year; so much so, that, at the instigation of his implacable Patron, he proposed to have the question of his Formulary settled definitely at an assembly of the Catholic clergy in Dublin, to which Father Agapitus of the Holy Ghost (Rev. Thomas Dillon), as Vicar-Provincial of the Discalced Carmelites, found himself summoned by a letter dated the 18th of November, 1665, immediately after his return from Rome.⁴ It was represented to the Prelates who, yielding to the stress of circumstances, had consented to attend, that they might regard this as a final opportunity of protesting their loyalty to the Crown, lest their *silence* might arouse suspicion owing to the recent declaration of war against Holland and France.⁵ But they were given clearly to understand, in the Duke of Ormonde's name, that the only terms of allegiance admissible had already been incorporated in the Valesian Formulary still awaiting their signatures. With

¹ *Relatio* (II).

² At a later period Loughrea became the chief centre of the activities of the Teresians in this respect, when a new phase of the Valesian question occasioned a very violent revival of the persecution, especially in Dublin.

³ From the narrative of Father Felix of the Holy Ghost, f. 2b.

⁴ *History of the Diocese of Meath* (Cogan), vol ii. p. 109 sqq. The author draws largely from Walsh's *History of the Remonstrance*.

⁵ *Ibid.*

the ardent hope of utilizing this instrument to 'work a division amongst the Romish clergy . . . to the great security of the Protestant cause in Ireland,' bitter was the resentment of the Viceroy over the issue of that Assembly, held, 'within earshot of the Castle,' on the 11th of June, 1666: the framing of a *new* Remonstrance, to which any Catholic might subscribe freely, affording ample evidence of loyalty to the King without prejudice to the supreme authority of the Pope.¹ As for certain other propositions which Walsh himself would have forced upon the Assembly, these were unanimously rejected, being so objectionable that nothing could induce the clergy present to adopt the same. Whereupon Ormonde gave instructions for the instant dispersal of those representative Catholics, and for the arrest of the Prelates whom he held primarily responsible for the frustration of his infamous plans. One of his victims on this occasion was the aged Archbishop of Armagh, who has left a most touching account of what he himself then endured in the cause of orthodoxy before the actual carrying out of the sentence of perpetual banishment pronounced against him for his heroic resistance of so relentless an enemy of the Catholic Faith.² The 'Great Plague' was still raging in London, and one of the proscribed priests, conspicuous for their noble self-sacrifice during that dread time, had acquired this spirit in the Dublin novitiate of the Discalced Carmelites: the Father John Baptist of Mount Carmel mentioned by Father Patrick of St. Brigid as one of the prisoners detained under the Cromwellian régime, not knowing whether the result of the tedious deliberations of the authorities would mean for them speedy, if brutal execution on the scaffold or the horror of transportation to the Barbadoes as slaves.³

Yet another victim of Ormonde's vindictiveness was Dr. Nicholas French, the exiled Bishop of Ferns. Writing from Ghent, in 1667, to congratulate Pope Clement IX on his elevation to the Chair of St. Peter, this Prelate could only say of Ireland: ' . . . in desertum pene redacta est in fine saeculorum quia multae ferae depastae sunt eam.'⁴ Father Patrick of St. Brigid was, also, an exile in Belgium at the same time ;

¹ *Ibid.*

² Cf. *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, vol. i. p. 440. Also the *Life of James First Duke of Ormonde*, vol. ii. p. 51 sqq. The sources utilized by the author are not very helpful to a critical student of the question

³ From the MS. account of the English Teresian Mission. (*Plut.* 187.)

⁴ *Spicil. Ossor.*, i. p. 454.

and in a letter of the 20th of July the following year, he, too, expressed himself as being seriously alarmed for the Irish Church because of certain news of that Mission which had reached him recently.¹ He would bring the same under official notice of the Superiors-General of the Order, in the hope that, at their instance, practical steps might be taken in Rome to ward off those menacing insidious dangers. The outlook was somewhat more reassuring in England just then; at least to the extent of the Teresian Fathers in London venturing, unhindered, to preach to the Faithful who frequented the chapel of the Spanish Embassy. Whereas in Ireland the situation had become critical in the extreme, owing to the persistency with which Ormonde's agents proclaimed the *political* expediency of the Valesian Formulary, striving to impress less wary Catholics who might have failed to grasp the nature of the destructive principles which it contained.² Moreover, it appears that unscrupulous persons were fostering a revival of the controversy between the secular and regular clergy as to their respective rights in the administration of the Sacraments; and this with the malign object of arousing prejudices that could only prove harmful to the Catholic cause in Ireland. As if these matters were not sufficiently disquieting in themselves, yet another extraordinary emergency had just arisen fraught with most bewildering consequences to the devoted clergy of Ireland. A brother in religion of the notorious Walsh, a member of the Franciscan community in Dublin, announced publicly that he had received a Papal Bull appointing him Visitor Apostolic of the Irish clergy, secular and regular, with fullest powers: including the right to exercise this function by delegation at his own discretion.³ At first, the Fathers of the Society of Jesus alone challenged his authority in their own case, not satisfied with the alleged comprehensive scope of his commission. Then even those most sanguine, in all good faith, that the Visitor had really been empowered by the Holy See to settle satisfactorily the questions at issue between the seculars and regulars, and to end the hardships and annoyances due to the Valesian Formulary, grew alarmed at his method of procedure in matters of so serious a kind. They saw Peter Walsh and his partisans received into favour,

¹ This important letter is now preserved among the Irish Papers. (*Plut.* 190.)

² From the letter quoted.

³ Father Taafe was the Franciscan in question; and a very clear exposition of his imposture is given by Cardinal Moran in his *Memoir of the Venerable Oliver Plunket* (2nd Ed), p. 28 sqq.

while a number of those who had subscribed to the condemned 'Loyal Remonstrance' were now delegated, by one claiming to be the Pope's representative, to make the Apostolic Visitation throughout Ireland. On the other hand, those known to be most strenuously opposed to Ormonde's intermediary were openly censured, under pretext of having exercised privileges to which they had, according to the Visitor, no legal right; although the same might be traced, directly, to Papal bestowal to their predecessors in former times. Consequently, Father Patrick of St. Brigid submitted to the Superiors-General of his own Order the very critical state of affairs on the Irish Mission, urging the necessity of safeguarding the interests of the Teresian Fathers there in the event of injurious allegations being made against them in Rome.¹

The crisis—with its curious later phase to which Father Patrick of St. Brigid refers²—may be said to have ceased (for the moment, at least) by the dismissal of Ormonde from the Lord-Lieutenancy, in 1669. From the same year dates a striking manifestation of the zeal on the part of the Irish clergy and of earnestness among the people, both so long hampered in their respective duties by the vexatious controversies prevailing under the late Viceroy's oppressive administration. His successor, Lord Berkley, had more liberal and tolerant views for the government of Ireland, rendering it possible for many of the exiled priests to resume their missionary labours there once more.³ The Venerable Oliver Plunket hastened to take up his own heavy burden of responsibility in the archdiocese of Armagh, to which he had recently been appointed on the death of Dr. Edmund O'Reilly. And it is an interesting coincidence that it was in 1669, also, a young Teresian Friar had begun to prepare himself for his eventful career in England, during the course of which it became his great privilege to assist the martyred Primate at Tyburn in the very act of laying down his life for the Faith.⁴ We are assured that there were twelve

¹ The letter of Father Patrick of St. Brigid, l.c.

² A letter transcribed in the *Memoir of the Venerable Oliver Plunket* (*supra* l.c.) shows how such an imposture became possible owing to the family connections of the Franciscan Taafe, who was brother to Lord Carlingford (cf. *The Diocese of Meath*, vol. ii. p. 116).

³ The testimony of the Venerable Oliver Plunket, in this connection, is most valuable. (*Memoir*, Chapter vii. *passim*) He himself was indefatigable in his efforts to repair the mischief caused by the Valesian Formulary.

⁴ From the MS. account of the English Teresian Mission. (*Plut.* 187.)

Discalced Carmelites on the Irish Mission; canonically visited by a representative of the Prior-General of the Order in 1668. Still, the need of additional help became all the more pressing at this period for the reason just assigned; and, furthermore, a number of familiar names disappear from the Annals of the Province within the next few years.¹ Special mention is made of the death of Father Angelus-Joseph (McCarthy) of the Conception, who died in 1669, because he was one of the first postulants received in the Dublin novitiate; and had survived the barbarous treatment experienced at the hands of the Cromwellian soldiers: a fact well known to his contemporaries, apparently, although no particulars are furnished by the witnesses who testify to the heroic merit of his trials.² Fathers Paul of St. Ubald, Gregory of St. Elias, and, probably, John of the Mother of God, had preceded him to the grave, all dying in Ireland.³ To the same period must be attributed the death of Father Agapitus of the Holy Ghost; although the 'Rev. T. Dillon, supposed to be a Carmelite,' appears as the hero in a popular 'Sketch' of the later penal days—very strongly reminiscent of some of the episodes recorded in one of the narratives written by Father Agapitus.⁴ Nor should omission be made of the learned Irish Theologian, Laurence of St. Teresa, who died, in 1669, at an age when he might still have cherished those fond aspirations of being at length permitted to return to his native land; whence, immediately after his religious profession, he had to flee to escape the fury of the Puritans. A 'Father Cornelius of St. Mary' is said to have died in Ireland the following year; but this is the only reference to the name in the documents relating to the Irish Mission. Then there is that 'F. Levin' of the Discalced Carmelite residence at Athboy, whom the Venerable Plunket praises as a good preacher, in a letter dated the 25th of September, 1671: this was Father John of the Cross, mentioned elsewhere by Father Paul of St. Ubald;

¹ Vol. ii., *passim*.

² *Ibid.*, f. 27.

³ The names of Father Paul of St. Ubald and Father John of the Mother of God occur in the *Book of Missionary Obits*; but the dates given are, clearly, inaccurate, as can be shown from more reliable sources.

⁴ The death of Father Agapitus of the Holy Ghost is also recorded in the same *Book*, without any date being assigned; but he must have died *before* the year 1673; while that of Father Angelus-Joseph is erroneously ascribed to the year 1667. In the *Lista de' Seminaristi* of the Teresian Missionary College, Rome, this interesting entry appears: 'Votum Missionum—Die 6 Jan., 1632—Fr. Angelus-Joseph a Conceptione, Hybernus' (f. 4).

and, finally, Father Hilary of St. Augustine, whose name occurs among the Teresian missionary obits the same year.¹

Commenting on the disadvantages of admitting postulants to religion in Ireland in the present unsettled state of affairs, the Martyred Primate also informs us that 'neither the Capuchins, nor the Jesuits, nor the Carmelites had a novitiate there, being aware that they could not give novices a proper training in this Kingdom.'² The various inconveniences mentioned by him, when speaking of the Franciscans, will account for the extreme reluctance of the Authorities in Rome to grant dispensations requisite for the opening of a Teresian novitiate at Loughrea, notwithstanding the brighter prospects of their Order in Ireland at this particular period. For the exiled priests, named above, seized the occasion to urge the feasibility of such a project, quite confident of eventual success. The Superiors-General were more inclined to second their efforts, as the undertaking would be under the experienced control of Father Patrick of St. Brigid, who, it seems, gave good reason to show that community-life might now be led, in perfect security, at Loughrea. But we shall see that, although the inauguration of the same project fully justified his best anticipations, the sequel proved a bitter disappointment: directly assignable, moreover, to yet another little-known phase in the history of the Valesian Formulary after Ormonde's return to power.³ Yet the interval sufficed for the reception and profession of quite a number of most desirable subjects, destined to perpetuate, eventually, the zeal of their predecessors on the Irish Mission in circumstances with which the remaining documents of the present series have to deal.

JAMES P. RUSHE, O.D.C.

To be continued.]

¹ *Book of Obits.*

² *Memoir*, pp. 76-92.

³ It is hardly necessary to add that the sources to be utilized were not at the disposal of the author of the *Life of James First Duke of Ormonde*.

THE ROMAN LITURGY OR HOLY MASS

BY REV. OSWALD DONNELLY, C.P.

‘Salute Prisca and Aquila . . . and the church that is in their house.’
—Romans xvi. 3-5.

Pope Innocent I (401-417), in a letter to Decentius, Bishop of Gubbio, because of the *Disciplina Arcani*, merely refers to the Canon of the Mass in saying : ‘After all these things, which I may not reveal, the kiss of peace is given, by which it is shewn that the people have consented to all that which was done in the holy mysteries.’¹

IN studying the history of the Liturgy, or as we in the West call it, the Holy Mass, the *Disciplina Arcani*, or Discipline of the Secret, must be taken into account, for it was undoubtedly owing to it that the Fathers did not express themselves more clearly and more fully on the Sacraments and other dogmas of the Church.² It has been said that the Discipline of the Secret began in Tertullian’s time (160-240) ; but this is inaccurate. It was our Divine Lord who first used it : ‘Without parable He did not speak unto them [the people],’ St. Mark tells us, ‘but apart, He explained all things to His disciples’³ ; and commanded its practice : ‘Give not that which is holy to dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest, perhaps, they trample them underfoot.’⁴ The ‘holy’ thing which must not be given to the unworthy is especially the Holy Eucharist.⁵

Some find evidence of the Discipline of the Secret in chapter iii, verses 1 and 2, of the first Epistle to the Corinthians : ‘And I, brethren, could not speak to you as unto

¹ Ep. ad Decentium (Epis. xxv.) in P.L. xx. 553.

² ‘Haec disciplina in Oriente usque ad finem saec. v., in Occidente ad medium saec. vi. videtur durasse.’—Hurter, n. 377.

³ Mark iv. 34.

⁴ Matthew vii. 6.

⁵ ‘Ce *sanctum*,’ writes M. Adhémar D’Alès in his *Théologie de Tertullien*, p. 320, ‘qu’il ne faut pas jeter aux chiens, c’est évidemment aussi, et surtout, la sainte Eucharistie.’ He cites, in confirmation, one of the *Canons* of Hippolytus of Rome († 237). ‘Ceterum clerici caveant cum sollicitudine ne quemquam ad sumenda sacra mysteria, nisi solos fideles.’

spiritual, but as unto carnal [people], even as unto little ones in Christ. I have fed you with milk, and not with meat; for hitherto ye were not able to hear it, neither now are ye able'—considering their weakness as Christ considered the weakness of His hearers when instructing them: 'He spoke to them as they were able to hear.'¹

The reason of the Discipline was twofold: (a) the danger of profaning holy things; (b) the fear lest the catechumen, used to the monotheism of Judaism or the polytheism of Paganism, might be scandalized by the new teaching. Hence, the mystery of the Most Holy Trinity, the confectio of the Sacraments, and, it is said, even the Lord's Prayer were kept secret from the catechumens till within a few days of their baptism.² 'Sans doute,' says M. D'Alès, 'l'Église n'a jamais songé à cacher ses usages et son culte comme on cache un crime. Mais il était naturel qu'elle voulût dérober les choses saintes aux regards profanes.'³ Yes, and Holy Church not intending it, the Discipline of the Secret has hidden much, too, from us.

In the East, the word Liturgy means the Mass, and the Mass only; whereas in the West, it means all the rites and ceremonies that are used by the Church in the administration of the Sacraments and in her sacred offices.

Did the Apostles celebrate Mass? St. Luke answers this question for us.⁴ Describing the moment when the Holy Ghost selected Paul and Barnabas for the episcopate, he says: *λειτουργούντων δὲ αὐτῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ*. Erasmus, in the classical Latin translation with which he accompanied his edition of the Greek original of the New Testament (the *Novum Instrumentum omne*), gives the cited passage as *cum illi sacrificarent Domino*. St. Luke uses the same word in speaking of Zachary's period of [priestly office

¹ Mark iv. 33.

² *Τὰς τῶν φωτιζομένων κατηχήσεις ταύτας, τοῖς μὲν τῷ βαπτίσματι προπερχομένοις, καὶ τοῖς τὸ λουτρὸν ἔχουσιν ἤδη πιστοῖς, εἰς ἀνάγνωσιν παρεχόμενος, μὴ δὲ τὸ σύνολον μήτε κατηχουμένοις, μήτε ἄλλοις τισὶ τοῖς μὴ οὖσι χριστιανοῖς ἐπεὶ τῷ κυρίῳ λόγον δώσεις.*—S. Cyrillus Hieroso., *Monitum post Procatechesin*. The six last of the Saint's catechisms, in which he speaks of Baptism, Confirmation, and the Mass, were given to those about to be baptized during the week preceding their baptism. Clear references are made to the *Disciplina Arcani* in Tertullian's *Apologeticus*, c. 7; in St. Augustine's treatise on St. John's Gospel, c. ii. v. 3; by St. John Chrysostom in his homily on the first Epistle to the Corinthians; by Theodoret in his commentary on Numbers, c. 10; by Pseudo-Dion. Areop., *Eccles. Hierarchy*, ult. cap., etc.

³ *Le catéchuménat et l'arcane*, *Théologie de Tertullien*, p. 321.

⁴ Acts xiii. 2.

in the temple : αἱ ἡμέραι τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ.¹ So, too, does St. Paul, in referring to the insufficiency of the sacrifice offered by the priests of the Old Law : πᾶς μὲν ἱερεὺς ἔστηκε καθ' ἡμέραν λειτουργῶν . . . τὰς αὐτὰς . . . προσφέρων θυσίας, etc.² 'λειτουργῶ idem est ac sacrificare.'³ The sacrifice to be consummated is called the λειτουργία, from which comes the word Liturgy, or the Mass. The verb λειτουργῶ has another meaning : to perform public duties, to do the State service. Those who fulfil or hold public offices are called λειτουργοὶ. St. Paul spoke of them as λειτουργοὶ Θεοῦ.⁴ The work done—λειτουργία—is a *public* service, hence, says a writer quoted by Migne ; 'cum sacramenti cujusque distributio privata quodammodo sit, quia in commodum tantam utilitatemque suscipientis instituitur, sola est sacrificii divini celebratio, quae cum in praesentium et absentium utilitatem cedat, et in totius ecclesiae bonum offeratur, potiori prae caeteris jure λειτουργία dici potest.'⁵

Eusebius informs us that the Apostles remained in Jerusalem for several years after the Ascension.⁶ During that time they celebrated the Divine mysteries. One feels that St. John's vision of a solemn Liturgy was not all a vision.⁷ The mysteries would be carried out according to a prescribed form, which, when the Apostles afterwards separated, should be the norm or canon that all followed. What form did the nascent Liturgy or Mass take? Some seek the answer to this query in the New Testament. Dr. Kraus outlines it from this source :—

The reunion began with the reading of a passage from the Old Testament, which was afterwards explained. A sermon followed (Acts xx. 7). Then there was singing of psalms and a prayer (Col. iii. 16). The letters of the Apostles were read (Col. iv. 16 ; 1 Thess. v. 27). Hymns and doxologies were chanted (Ephes. v. 19 ; Col. iii. 16). The consecration of bread and wine (Acts xx. 11) on the altar (Heb. xiii. 10) formed, with the holy Communion, the Liturgy properly so called. The fraternal kiss, φίλημα ἀγιον, brought the Mass to a close.⁸

But a better proof for the form or norm of the Mass as it was in Apostolic times, in its essential parts, is the Mass

¹ Luke i. 23.

² Hebrews x. 11.

³ Migne, *Theolog. cursus complet.*, vol. xxiv. p. 1466.

⁴ Romans xiii. 6.

⁵ Migne, *Theolog. cursus complet.*, vol. xxiv. p. 1467.

⁶ Euseb., *Hist. Eccles.*, vol. v. c. 18.

⁷ Apocalypse, chaps. iv. 2-4, v. 2, 6, 11, 12 ; vi. 9, 10, and vii. 17.

⁸ *L'Histoire de l'Eglise*, Kraus, vol. i. pp. 99, 100.

as it is to-day in the different rites. In all these, it is composed of the same parts : the readings or lessons from the Old and New Testaments, the sermon, the offertory, the preface or exhortation, the *sanctus*, the prayer for the living and the dead, the consecration made by the words of Christ, the adoration and breaking of the Host, the Lord's Prayer, the Communion, the blessing given by the celebrant.¹ 'There is an obvious unity underlying all the old rites that go back to the earliest age,' says Dr. Adrian Fortescue ; 'the medieval idea that all are derived from one parent rite is not so absurd.'²

No Liturgy was committed to writing before the fifth century—doubtless because of the *Disciplina Arcani*—excepting the one that is found in the so-called 'Apostolical Constitutions,' which were written not later than 390 ; but in his first Apology (lxv.-lxvii.) St. Justin³ describes the Mass as it was celebrated in Rome in 150 :—

After the believer is baptized, and so made one of us, we lead him to the congregation of the brethren, as we call them, and then pour out our souls with great fervour, in common prayer, both for ourselves, for the person baptized, and for all others, in every part of the world ; that having embraced the truth, our lives may be as becometh the Gospel, and that we may be found doers of the word, and so at length attain eternal salvation. We salute one another with a kiss, at the end of the prayer. After this, bread and a chalice of wine and water are brought to the bishop, which he takes, and offers up praise and glory to the Father of all things, through the name of His Son and the Holy Ghost. . . . When the bishop has finished the prayers and the thanksgiving service, all the people present conclude with an audible voice, saying, *Amen*, which in the Hebrew language signifies, *So be it*. The Eucharistical office being thus performed by the bishop . . . those we call deacons distribute to every one present this Eucharistical bread and wine. . . . This food we call the *Eucharist*, of which none are allowed to be partakers but such only as are true believers, and have been baptized in the laver of regeneration, for the remission of sins, and live according to Christ's precepts ; for we do not take this as common bread and common drink, but as Jesus Christ our Saviour was made flesh . . . and had real flesh and blood for our salvation, so we are taught that this food, becoming Eucharistic by the prayers and words of which He Himself is the Author, is the flesh and blood of the same incarnate Jesus. . . . In every Eucharistical sacrifice we bless the Creator of all things, through His Son Jesus Christ, and through the Holy Ghost : and on the day called Sunday, all who live

¹ *Dictionnaire de Théologie*, vol. iv. p. 68.

² Fortescue, 'Liturgy,' *Cath. Encyc.*, ix. p. 308.

³ St. Justin Martyr (b. 100, converted 130, d. 165-67) stands out as the one Father of the Church who published her teaching and practices to the unbaptized. He did so in order to free himself and the Christians of his time from the charge of impiety preferred against them. Some say, too, in the hope of converting the Emperor Antoninus Pius, to whom he dedicated his Apology.

either in the city or country meet together in the same place, where the writings of the Apostles and Prophets are read, as much as time will allow. When the reader is finished, the bishop delivers a discourse to the people. . . . At the conclusion of the discourse, we all rise up together and pray. Prayer being ended, as I have observed, there are bread and wine and water offered, and the bishop, as before, sends up prayers and thanksgivings. . . . Then the consecrated elements are distributed to, and partaken of by, all who are present.

From this description, especially from the last section of it, we evolve the following order of the Holy Sacrifice in St. Justin's time :—

1. Readings from the Prophets and Apostles (Epistle and Gospel).
2. Sermon by the Celebrant.
3. Prayer of the people (place of Creed).
4. Offertory—bread, wine and water.
5. Celebrant offers prayers and thanksgivings (Preface and Canon).
6. Consecration with the words of the Institution.
7. Holy Communion.

Dr. Fortescue writes :—

From about the fourth century our knowledge of the Liturgy increases enormously. . . . We have definite rites fully developed. The more or less uniform type of Liturgy used everywhere before crystallized into four rites from which all others are derived. The four are the old Liturgies of Antioch, Alexandria, Rome, and Gaul.

'Antioch first absorbed the rite of Jerusalem.'¹ The Fathers of the Second Council of Trullo, held in 692, voiced their belief that St. James of Jerusalem was the founder of that rite. Peter went from Jerusalem to Rome *via* Antioch.² Now, it was always believed that the Roman Liturgy came from St. Peter. Such was the expressed conviction of Popes Innocent I (401-417) and Vigilius (537-555).³ No change was made in the Canon of the Mass from Pope Gelasius' time (492-496) till that of St. Gregory (590-604). This is certain. The latter added the words *diesque nostros in tua pace disponas* to the 'Hanc

¹ Fortescue, in articles on the 'Liturgy' and the 'Canon,' *Cath. Encyc.*, vols. iii. and ix.

² 'Il fonda l'Église d'Antioche, et, au sortir de là, si nous en croyons Eusèbe, il parcourut la Cappadoce, la Bithynie, le Pont. Selon toute apparence, il arriva vers l'an 42 à Rome' (Kraus, vol. i. p. 83); and, 'ibi viginti quinque annis Cathedram Sacerdotalem tenuit, usque ad ultimum annum Neronis' (S. Jerome, *Liber de Viris Illustribus*, c. i.).

³ *Dictionnaire de Théologie*, vol. iv. p. 74.

igitur,' and placed the Pater Noster before the breaking of the Host, whereas in the other Liturgies it comes after this action. It has been said that Pope Gelasius changed the order of the Canon; but how then account for the words of Pope Vigilius, who wrote, in sending the Canon to the Spanish in 538, that it was of Apostolic tradition? ¹ Did he mean only as regards its substance, not also its form and arrangement? The Church has preserved the Canon with so much reverence and conservatism since St. Gregory's time that Pope Benedict XIV could write: 'No Pope has added to or changed the Canon since St. Gregory.'² Is it to be believed that she was less reverent and less conservative of it in the years anterior to Pope Gelasius? Additions there must have been made to it (the names of the martyrs added to it is one instance), but surely they were so slight that the Canon which we say to day is the same as was said by Peter and Paul and Luke and Mark in Rome.

The Canon that we say is always the one . . . that remains as it was in the days of Gregory I, and that goes back far behind his time till its origin is lost in the mists that hang over the first centuries when the Roman Christians met together to 'do the things the Lord commanded at appointed times' (I. Clem. xl.). Through all the modifications and additions that, in recent years especially, have caused our Missal to grow in size, among all the later collects, lessons and antiphons, the Canon stands out firm and unchanging in the midst of an ever-developing rite, the centre and nucleus of the whole Liturgy, stretching back with its strange and archaic formulæ through all the centuries of Church history to the days when the great Roman Caesar was lord of the world ³

—to the days when the Holy Sacrifice was offered in the house of Prisca and Aquila in Rome.⁴

OSWALD DONNELLY, C.P.

¹ *Dictionnaire de Théologie*, vol. i. p. 353.

² *De SS. Missae Sacrificio*.

³ Fortescue, 'Canon of the Mass,' *Cath. Encyc.*, vol. iii. p. 261.

⁴ *Romans* xvi. 3-5.

THE MAYNOOTH MISSION TO CHINA

SIXTEEN PRIESTS LEAVE FOR CHINA IN MARCH—APPEAL FOR
IRELAND'S HELP

It is now a little over three years since it was first announced in the Press of this country that the Irish Bishops, at their general meeting at Maynooth, had given their blessing and approval to a scheme which was laid before them of founding an *Irish National Mission to China*. At that time the promoters of the project were five priests in Ireland and two in China. The first year and a half was spent in preaching throughout the country the needs of the Missions in China, and putting before the people of Ireland from the pulpit and through the press the appalling lack of priests in that vast region. In February 1918, the founders of the Mission were enabled to open the National Missionary College at St. Columban's, Dalgan Park, Galway. In April of the same year the first priests of the Mission were ordained at Maynooth College, and in June of last year St. Columban's celebrated the first Ordinations within its own walls.

Hitherto the Superiors of the Maynooth Mission to China devoted all their energies to laying the foundations of a large and widespread organization, in constructing the machinery which was to send to China year after year a band of priests trained in Ireland who would give their lives to the preaching of the Gospel to China's teeming millions. They endeavoured to carry on in favour of the pagan Missions an active and living propaganda, which would re-awaken in the breasts of the Catholic people of Ireland that fiery enthusiasm for the propagation of the Truth for which our nation has been ever remarkable. All that was necessary before the priests actually set out for China. The work before them is unspeakably great; it is immense; it requires all the forces, both spiritual and temporal, which we can throw into it; and it was of the first importance to provide

for the production of these forces before the men actually began their work.

But that period of preparation has now so far advanced that the Mission has undertaken work in the country to which they have devoted themselves. The Holy See has recently assigned the Irish Mission to China a stretch of territory to be evangelized by its members. The nature and extent, the magnitude of this territory, have been elaborately set forth in the January number of *Far East* by Mr. Ignatius Ying Ki, the Chinese Professor at St. Columban's College, and it will be sufficient here to touch on the more interesting features. The Irish district in China is situated 'in the heart of the heart of China.' Its capital is the city of Hanyang, one of the famous Hankow group of cities, with a population of about 600,000. It is one of the most important cities in the whole of China, a city of which every Chinese is proud. It is situated on the Yang Tze Kiang, and is approachable by the largest ocean liners—in fact, it is part of the largest river port in the world.

The task which has been set the priests of the Irish Mission is gigantic. They have to find priests to preach the Gospel to about *five millions of people*; they have to divide this vast multitude into workable parishes, in which the people will be within reach of the priest; they have to build churches, chapels and schools; they have to provide for the teaching of the orphans and of the young; they have to provide higher education for the sons and daughters of the Chinese; they have to found a college for the education of native students, who will be the future priests and Bishops of China. In a word, they must build up and set working in their own vast territory a healthy, vigorous Chinese Church. It will be obvious that such a task requires all the aid that we, the Catholic Irish nation, can give. It will require vast sums of money, it will require large numbers of priests, the best we can give—priests of sanctity, of strength, of initiative and intellectual power.

True, next March sixteen of the Maynooth Missionaries will leave our shores to pitch the camp which the future legions will occupy; true, that this is an exceptionally large number of Missionaries to be sent out by any Missionary body; but it seems almost pathetic when one remembers the numbers which will be needed to make the work anything like complete. But now that Ireland has already shown her determination to stand by her children who

become exiles for Christ, now that the Holy See has shown its deep appreciation of our efforts by confiding to us such an important field of labour, there can be little doubt that we shall avail of the opportunity that is offered us of becoming one of the very foremost among the Missionary Nations of Christendom. And we would add that it is certain that what we do for the cause of the Faith will redound a hundred-fold to the honour and glory and credit of the Fatherland.

CORRESPONDENCE

ECCLESIASTICAL SCULPTURE

REV. DEAR SIR,—Could you find a place in the I. E. RECORD for the following short extract from Ruskin?

‘ Be assured that endurance is nobler than strength, and patience than beauty ; and that it is not in the high church pews, where the gay dresses are, but in the church free seats, where the widows’ weeds are, that you may see the faces that will fit best between the angels’ wings in the church porch.’—(*Two Paths*, Lecture iv, third last paragraph.)

And in the same lecture, speaking of ‘ nobleness of gesture and feature in the human form ’ he bids us remember that ‘ the highest nobleness is usually among the aged, the poor, and the infirm.’

Bearing these words in mind might help us to form correct judgments as to the features and forms of our church statues. May not the same principles be applicable to the figures in our stained glass windows and in our Stations of the Cross?

Your obedient servant,

P. B.

DOCUMENTS

PRONOUNCEMENT OF THE IRISH HIERARCHY AT A GENERAL MEETING HELD AT MAYNOOTH ON TUESDAY, JANUARY 27

I

THE EDUCATION BILL

THE Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland assembled on January 27th at Maynooth, his Eminence the Cardinal Primate presiding.

The following pronouncement was adopted :—

(1) We endorse the statement issued by our Standing Committee in condemnation of the Education Bill, which is the most denationalising scheme since the Act of Union, and we recommend that statement to the earnest study of our people.

[Last Easter the principle of the Bill was rejected by anticipation with a resolution published by the Standing Committee. We direct that both documents be republished and read in the churches, together with the statement now issued.]

(2) Until Ireland is governed by her own Parliament we shall resist by every means in our power any attempt to abolish the Boards of Primary, Intermediate, and Technical Education.

(3) The Bill is an attempt on the part of the British Government to grip the mind of the people of Ireland, and form it according to its own wishes. We are convinced that the enactment of the measure would deprive the Bishops and clergy of such control of the schools as is necessary for that religious training of the young which Leo XIII declared to be a chief part in the cure of souls.

(4) In any case, should the Government force the Bill on Ireland and set up an educational department controlled by British Ministers, no matter what their religion may be, it will be our duty to issue instructions to Catholic parents in reference to the education of their children in such a deplorable crisis.

(5) As the indirect taxation takes as much from the poor man as from the rich, and as the income per head in Ireland is not near a half of what it is in Great Britain, the system of identical indirect taxation results in draining an altogether excessive amount of revenue year by year from Ireland; and this evil is greatly aggravated when such a service as education, in which, if anywhere, compensation might be expected to manifest itself, is starved instead, despite constant protests.

It is, moreover, a gross and intolerable abuse of public power to

endeavour to make the just remuneration of our teachers depend on the passing of a Bill that is framed in defiance of the will of our people and utterly repugnant to the interests of Ireland, whether educational, national or religious.

(6) We have intense sympathy with the teachers in the grievances to which they are so unjustly subject, and we shall do everything in our power to help in securing fair treatment for the excellent body of instructors, primary, secondary and technical, on whose services the public welfare so much depends.

We think the country should combine to insist on justice to the teachers, apart from the national indignity of a Bill like this, and the intolerable burden of rates it imposes in addition to the enormous pile of over-taxation.

✠ MICHAEL CARDINAL LOGUE,
Primate of Ireland, Chairman.

✠ ROBERT BROWNE,
Bishop of Cloyne,

✠ DENIS O'KELLY,
Bishop of Ross,

} *Joint*
} *Secs.*

II

STATE OF THE COUNTRY

The principle of disregarding national feelings and national rights and of carrying everything with the high hand, above the head of the people, has, we are sorry to say, become a general rule of government in Ireland, and has brought about the dreadful confusion and disorder from which the country unhappily suffers, and which we view with deepest distress.

The legitimate demand of Ireland that she should be accorded what is now the acknowledged right of every civilized nation, and for the establishment of which as a world principle the late war was waged, at least ostensibly, at the cost of so much suffering and misery, the right, namely, to choose her own government, has not only been denied to her, but every organ for the expression of her national life has been ruthlessly suppressed, and her people subjected to an iron rule of oppression as cruel and unjust as it is ill advised and out of date.

The result is what might have been easily foreseen, violent collisions and retaliations between exasperated sections of the people and the forces of oppression, growing ever more serious, and eventuating too often in the most sorrowful tragedies on both sides.

And while the Government is thus occupied almost exclusively in the odious work of political repression, and the police diverted from their proper functions as the guardians of civil order, the lives and property of peaceful citizens are left unprotected and a free opportunity afforded to the wicked for the perpetration of robbery and murder, forms of crime hitherto rare in Ireland.

We have already, with a deep sense of responsibility, published our united protest against this unhappy state of things. We once more renew our appeal, if indeed it is now possible to make our voices heard above the din of the prevailing confusion. We would represent to the advocates of military rule in Ireland that government by force, which was never right, is to-day wholly obsolete and cannot hope to prevail for long against the democratic spirit now animating the world.

We have, therefore, to declare that the one true way to terminate our historic troubles and establish friendly relations between England and Ireland, to the advantage of both countries, is to allow an undivided Ireland to choose her own form of government.

And meanwhile we appeal to our own people to exercise patience under the terrible provocations to which they are subjected, to remember the law of God, to combine amongst themselves for the prevention of crime, to restrain the promptings of revenge, and abstain from deeds of bloodshed and outrage calculated to bring on themselves and their country shame and the anger of Heaven.

The following members of the Hierarchy were present :—

- Most Rev. Dr. HARTY, Archbishop of Cashel.
- Most Rev. Dr. GILMARTIN, Archbishop of Tuam.
- Most Rev. Dr. O'DONNELL, Bishop of Raphoe.
- Most Rev. Dr. BROWNE, Bishop of Cloyne.
- Most Rev. Dr. HOARE, Bishop of Ardagh.
- Most Rev. Dr. FOLEY, Bishop of Kildare.
- Most Rev. Dr. KELLY, Bishop of Ross.
- Most Rev. Dr. O'DEA, Bishop of Galway.
- Most Rev. Dr. FOGARTY, Bishop of Killaloe.
- Most Rev. Dr. GAUGHRAN, Bishop of Meath.
- Most Rev. Dr. M'HUGH, Bishop of Derry.
- Most Rev. Dr. M'KENNA, Bishop of Clogher.
- Most Rev. Dr. FINEGAN, Bishop of Kilmore.
- Most Rev. Dr. NAUGHTON, Bishop of Killala.
- Most Rev. Dr. COYNE, Bishop of Elphin.
- Most Rev. Dr. COHALAN, Bishop of Cork.
- Most Rev. Dr. MACRORY, Bishop of Down and Connor.
- Most Rev. Dr. HACKETT, Bishop of Waterford.
- Most Rev. Dr. MULHERN, Bishop of Dromore.
- Most Rev. Dr. O'SULLIVAN, Bishop of Kerry.
- Most Rev. Dr. CODD, Bishop of Ferns.
- Most Rev. Dr. HALLINAN, Bishop of Limerick.
- Most Rev. Dr. O'DOHERTY, Bishop of Clonfert.

DOUBT REGARDING THE VALIDITY FOR INDULGENCES OF
CERTAIN METHODS OF CHANTING THE LITANY OF THE
BLESSED VIRGIN MARY

(July 21, 1919)

[The decree, which was published in January 1920, refers to three abuses in the chanting of the Litany (two of which are fairly common in this country), and a doubt is expressed as to whether such methods avail for the gaining of the Indulgences granted for the recitation of the Litany. The abuses are: (a) omitting the second *Kyrie eleison* at the beginning of the Litany; (b) joining three invocations under one *ora pro nobis*; (c) reciting the *Agnus Dei* only once at the end. The decision of the Sacred Penitentiary is that the Indulgences are not gained by these methods of recitation, and the Holy Father orders the correction of such abuses wherever they prevail. (See later Liturgical Notes in I. E. RECORD, March 1920).]

S. POENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA

SECTIO DE INDULGENTIIS

DUBIUM

CIRCA INDULGENTIAS LITANIIS MARIALIBUS ADNEXAS

Propositum fuit huic S. Tribunali sequens dubium :

‘Quibusdam in locis consuetudo invaluit Litanias Lauretanis sic cantandi ut (1) semel tantum recitetur *Kyrie eleison* (Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison, Christe audi nos, Christe exaudi nos); (2) invocationes mariales ternae coniungantur cum unico *ora pro nobis* (Sancta Maria, Sancta Dei Genitrix, Sancta Virgo Virginum, ora pro nobis); (3) semel tantum pariter dicatur *Agnus Dei* (Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi, parce nobis, Domine, exaudi nos, Domine, miserere nobis).

‘Attento can. 934, § 2, *Codiciis Iuris Canonici*, quaeritur utrum hac ratione fideles lucrari valeant Indulgentias Litanis adnexas.’

Sacra Poenitentiaria, mature consideratis expositis, respondendum censuit : *Negative*.

Hanc autem sententiam, ab infrascripto Cardinali Poenitentiario Maiore Ss^{mo} Dño Benedicto Pp. XV, in audientia diei 18 vertentis mensis relatem, Sanctitas Sua confirmavit, et insuper declarari iussit : *praedictam consuetudinem non esse approbandam, ideoque ab Ordinariis prudenter curandum ut in locis ubi viget submoveatur*.

Datum in Sacra Poenitentiaria, die 21 mensis iulii, anni 1919.

O. CARD. GIORGI, *Poenitentiarius Maior*.

F. BORGONGINI DUCA, *Secretarius*.

L. ✠ S.

DECREE CONCERNING THE BEATIFICATION AND CANONIZATION OF THE SERVANT OF GOD, FORTUNATUS REDOLFI, PRIEST OF THE CONGREGATION OF REGULAR CLERICS OF ST. PAUL

(November 12, 1919)

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM
MEDIOLANEN.

BEATIFICATIONIS ET CANONIZATIONIS SERVI DEI FORTUNATI REDOLFI, SACERDOTIS PROFESSI E CONGREGATIONE CLERICORUM REGULARIUM S. PAULI, BARNABITARUM.

In oppido Zenano, Brixienſis dioceſis, primus ex decem filiis Iosep Redolfi et Angelae Tonni, progenie et cenſu praestantium, die 8 novembris anni 1777, ortus est Servus Dei Fortunatus Redolfi, qui, ob grave vitae periculum statim lustralibus aquis ablutus, vix convaluit, in parochiali ecclesia sub conditione baptismum cum ritualibus caeremoniis accepit. Speciosus forma moribusque integer ac suavis, succereſcebat puer sub domestica disciplina in timore Domini, ab idoneis magistris diligenter instructus litteris bonisque artibus. A prima aetate in pauperes et egenos liberaliter egit; et suos ac extraneos, potissimum coevos, in societatem honorum operum efficaciter adscivit. Avunculi consilio et parentum voluntate, anno 1787, Modoetiam missus, in Collegio pro iuvenibus educandis, sub regimine sacerdotum, qui ad Societatem Iesu iam dimissam pertinebant, latinas graecasque litteras artemque diagraphicam didicit. Sacro chrismate confirmatus et ad sanctam Synaxim primum admissus, dein bis in mense angelico Pane se reficere consuevit. Collegii alumni, statis diebus, praesertim in Quadragesima, frequentare solebant ecclesiam Barnabitarum, S. Mariae de *Carrobiolo*, et sacris Maioris Hebdomadae officiis salutariter permotus, Dei Famulus consilium, quod antea iam menteolvebat, se totum Deo in religiosa S. Pauli Congregatione mancipare, recogitavit et patefecit, prompto animo dispositus quantocius exequi. Verum, exortis quibusdam obstaculis, tum ex parte parentum minime annuentium separationi, tum ex metu furentis in Gallia perturbationis et imminentis in Italiam Gallorum incursus, Fortunatus sanctum propositum ad opportuniora tempora differre coactus est. In patriam reversus, vitam domi fere claustralem duxit, a mundanis oblectamentis et conversationibus alienus et sacramentis assiduus atque orationi. Attamen, prouti erat inclinatus, graphices ac picturae studiis et operibus incubuit, ad hunc peculiarem finem, ut in posterum, hisee artibus utens, sacras aedes decore exornaret et pueros ac adoleſcentes magis alliceret ad fidem religionemque catholicam animose profitendam atque fideliter deservendam. In Longobardia, sub annum 1799, Republica Cisalpina ad instar Gallicae constituta et bello adversus Reges confoederatos instaurationis fautores indicto, Fortunatus, militiae et nobilium cohorti adscriptus, stationem posuit Brixiae, Mediolani et MODOETIAE. Nihilominus quotidiana recitatione Officii Beatae Mariae Virginis, frequenti sacramentorum perceptione, aliisque naturae et gratiae prae-

sidiis suffultus, commilitonibus suis vitae intemeratae etiam in castris exempla praeuisse perhibetur. Foederatorum principum copiis parta victoria, pulsus trans Alpes Gallis et Republica Cisalpina dissoluta, Redolfi cum sua cohorte a militia dimittitur et ad meliora castra absque ulla mora transire statuit. Revera, annuente suae conscientiae moderatore, de parentum consensu, omnia sua bona vendit in levamen et utilitatem pauperum et Modoetiae, apud collegium Barnabitarum Sanctae Mariae de *Carrobiolo*, die 30 septembris, eodem anno 1799, tyrocinium inquit. Hoc feliciter peracto, a Patre Provinciali Francisco Fontana, postea, Congregationis Sancti Pauli Praeposito Generali et S. R. E. Cardinali religiosum habitum accipit ac dein religionis vota simplicia emittit. Mediolani autem, quo se contulerat ad studia theologica in collegio Sancti Alexandri peragenda, solemnia vota, anno 1802, rite nuncupavit eodemque anno ac subsequenti, per gradus ad minores et maiores Ordines promotus, die 14 iulii anni 1803, primum Sacrum pietissime litavit. Paulo post, Superiorum iussu, Cremonam petiit, ubi in publicis scholis Barnabitarum Ipse, acri ingenio et facili eloquio praeditus, munus sibi commissum tradendi humanas litteras egregie gessit. Suavi ac prudenti disciplina adhibita, intra et extra scholam suos, alumnos attrahebat ad vitam sobriam, iustam et piam agendam; unde non minus discipulorum quam Cremonensium civium admirationem et amorem sibi conciliabat. Ad meliorem corporis et valetudinis firmitatem curandam primum Modoetiam, dein Bononiam concessit. In hac civitate, tum in Collegio Sancti Aloisii, tum in scholis externis ad Sanctam Luciam, optimus magister docuit, simulque sacrum ministerium exercuit in ecclesiis et oratoriis cum spirituali emolumento fidelium. Biennio vix elapso, ex obedientia, Laudem Pompeiam petit, ibique sacras conciones ad populum singulis dominicis habet. Paucos post menses accidit, ut impia et crudelis Ordinum religiosorum abolitio Parisiis decreta, ad Longobardiam, Galliae subiectam, extenderetur. Tunc, e Laudensi asylo expulsus, primum Modoetiam redit et in Collegio Sanctae Mariae Angelorum praeceptoris munus resumit, deinceps, ab avunculo invitatus, qui erat archipresbyter in oppido Adro, Brixiensis dioecesis, de consensu superiorum, illuc se contulit, auxiliatricem operam eidem praestiturus. Humilis, pauper et sibi austerus sicut antea, iugiter mansit fidelis alumnus suae Congregationis, spiritu et professione, suumque avunculum archipresbyterum tamquam legitimum superiorem recognovit eiusque mandatis continuo libenterque paruit. Hinc vicina oppida sacris expeditionibus peragravit et in pago *Capriolo* Sororibus a Sancta Ursula earumque puellis pietatis magister datus. Adri degens in ecclesia Sanctae Annae quam Ipse instauravit ac depinxit, oratorum fundavit pro iuvenibus, ad instar oratorii Sancti Philippi Neri. Extat adhuc Modoetiae tabula a Redolfi picta, referens sanctos oratorii Patronos Philippum Nerium et Aloisium Gonzagam cum selectis iuvenibus ad altare Beatae Mariae Virginis confluentibus. Hoc opus votivum Ipse fecit ob supervertam surditatem, uti sibi bonum ad humilitatem et sanctificationem, quod constat ex inscripto tabulae titulo: 'Surdus gratiarum ergo.' Simile quoque oratorium pro puellis ibidem instituit, quas prudentibus piisque

foeminis dirigendas concredidit. Vertente anno 1816, summa annonae penuria Longobardiam devastante, sacerdos Redolfi apparuit velut angelus charitatis, omnibus inculcans largitatis et misericordiae opera plenamque in Deum providentissimum fiduciam. Indigentibus procuravit et suppeditavit eleemosinas, vestes et rem frumentariam. Post pactum Vindobonense anni 1815, regus publicis compositis et ad pristinum statum restitutus, Ordines quoque religiosi instaurati sunt, et cum ceteris in Longobardia etiam Familia Barnabitarum. Fortunatus, redux ab exilio et a sodalibus vocatus, in Collegium de *Carrobiolo* remeavit, ubi, per quinquennium cathechesim populo tradidit atque oratorium erexit, sex post menses translatum in ecclesiam suburbanam S. Mariae a Gratiis, pro alumnis publici gymnasii et civilis conditionis, qui primo anno quadraginta supra ducentos iam adnumerabantur. Alterum simile oratorium, sub titulo et patrocinio Virginis Dolorosae, pro puellis fundavit et rexit usque ad annum 1831; praetermissis aliis huiusmodi foundationibus variis in locis. Tandem Dei Famulus, iam aetate provecta, lethali morbo vexatus, sacramentis Ecclesiae piissime receptis, in medio suorum sodalium atque alumnorum placidissime animam exhalavit, die 8 aprilis anni 1850. Ad corpus Servi Dei publice expositum, sicut ad funus solemniter celebratum, existimationis et devotionis causa, frequentissimus adstitit populus, qui ipsum cadaver ad commune coemeterium usque ad sepulturam comitatus est.—Fama autem sanctitatis, quam Fortunatus Redolfi in vita sibi comparaverat, post obitum magis in dies clara et aucta, causam dedit ut Processus super ea, auctoritate Ordinaria, in ecclesiastica Curia Mediolanensi conficeretur. Quo expleto et Romam ad sacram rituum Congregationem delato, servato iuris ordine, quum, scriptorum Servi Dei revisione rite peracta, nihil obstaret quominus ad ulteriora procedi posset, instante Rm̃o P. Ianuario Ricotti, Congregationis clericorum regularium S. Pauli Barnabitarum Generali Procuratore et Postulatore, attentisque litteris postulatoriis Eñorum S. R. E. Cardinalium Andreae Ferrari archiepiscopi Mediolanensis, et Alexandri Lualdi, archiepiscopi Panormitani, et plurium Archiepiscoporum et Episcoporum, necnon Capitulorum Ecclesiarum Cathedralium, parochorum et sodalitatuum religiosarum tum saecularium, virorum et mulierum, praesertim ex diocesis Mediolanensi, Brixienti et Laudensi, Eñus et Rm̃us Dñus Cardinalis Vincentius Vannutelli, Episcopus Ostiensis et Praenestinus, huius Causae Ponens seu Relator, in ordinariis sacrorum rituum Congregationis comitiis subsignata die ad Vaticanas aedes coadunatis, sequens dubium discutiendum proposuit: *An signanda sit Commissio introductionis Causae, in casu et ad effectum, de quo agitur?* Et Eñi ac Rm̃i Patres sacris tuendis ritibus praepositi, post relationem ipsius Eñi Ponentis, auaito voce et scripto R. P. D. Angelo Mariani, Fidei promotore generali, super quaestione discussa, omnibus sedulo perpensis, rescribendum censuerunt: *Affirmative seu signandam esse Commissionem introductionis Causae, si Sanctissimo placuerit.* Die 11 novembris 1919.

Facta postmodum de his Sanctissimo Domino nostro Benedicto Papae XV per infrascriptum Cardinalem Sacrae Rituum Congregationi Praefectum relatione, Sanctitas Sua rescriptum eiusdem sacrae Con-

gregationis ratum habens, propria manu signare dignata est Commissionem introductionis Causae beatificationis et canonizationis Servi Dei Fortunati Redolfi, sacerdotis professi e Congregatione clericorum regularium S. Pauli, Barnabitarum, die 12 eisdem mense et anno.

✠ A. CARD. VICO, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae,
S. R. C. Praefectus.
ALEXANDER VERDE, Secretarius.

L. ✠ S.

DECISION OF THE HOLY ROMAN ROTA FIXING THE
BOUNDARIES OF CERTAIN PARISHES

(January 31, 1919)

[The decree was published in December, 1919.]

SACRA ROMANA ROTA
DERTHONEN.

FINIUM PAROCHIALIUM SEU DOMORUM VINDICATIONIS

Benedicto PP. XV feliciter regnante, Pontificatus Dominationis Suae anno quinto, die 31 ianuarii 1919, RR. PP. DD. Guilelmus Sebastianelli, Decanus, Ponens, Ioannes Prior et Aloisius Sincero, Auditores de turno, in causa Derthonen.—Finium Parochialium, seu domorum vindicationis, inter Sac. Ioannem Baptistam Bracesco, parochum loci 'Vaccarezza,' repraesentatum per legitimum procuratorem Rev. D. Hectorem De Angelis, advocatum, et Sac. Ioannem Canegallo, parochum loci 'Casella,' repraesentatum per legitimum procuratorem Rev. Ioannem Baptistam Nicola, advocatum, sequentem tulerunt definitivam sententiam.

Exstant in dioecesi Derthonen duae paroeciae finitimae, quarum una nomine *Vaccarezza* sita est in montana regione, altera, cui nomen *Casella*, reperitur ad ima vallis fluminis *Scriviae*. Inter praefatarum parochiarum rectores controversia mota est, ad quem pertineat iurisdictio in domibus *Cason di Tonno, Manzanè, Macciò, Magnano*, aliisque humilioribus ad dexteram et sinistram ripam torrentis *Brevenna* erectis. Episcopus Derthonen. ad dirimendam controversiam decretum edidit die 14 septembris 1911, in quo domus supra memoratas adiudicavit parochi *Casella*. Decreto non acquievit parochus *Vaccarezza* et ab Ordinario petiit, ut quaestio definiretur iuris ordine servato. Quod revera factum fuit a Curia Derthonensi, quae, processu rite instructo, die 31 decembris 1914 sententiam tulit, qua domus *Cason di Tonno* aliaequae sitae ad sinistram ripam torrentis *Brevenna* dicebantur pertinere quoad dominium parochi *Casella*; quae vero ad dextram eiusdem torrentis iacent, eidem parochi subesse debebant non ratione domini, sed ratione possessionis. Ab huiusmodi decisio actor appellavit ad Curiam metropolitanam Ianuensem, quae, nova instructoria peracta, die 11 septembris 1916 confirmavit sententiam iudicium Derthonensium. Parochus *Vaccarezza*, victus sed non fractus, ad H. S. Auditorium provocavit; et hodie tertio causa

proponitur sub dubio a partibus concordato : *Utrum iurisdictio super domum vulgo Cason di Tonno aliasque domus sive ad ripam dexteram sive ad sinistram torrentis Brevennae competat parochio Vaccarezza in casu.*

Ius quod spectat.—Quaelibet parocchia suam habere debet peculiarem ecclesiam, suum peculiarem rectorem ac suum determinatum territorium (C. I. C., can. 216). Semel autem territorii, limitibus a legitima auctoritate constitutis, isti nec praescriptioni, nec mutationibus sunt obnoxii (can. 1509). Haud raro vero accidit, ut quaestio oriatur circa duarum parochiarum fines, ex eo praesertim, quia deest ordinationis ecclesiasticae documentum, quo iidem fines fuerunt determinati. Hac in hypothesis attendi debet observantia sive in linea interpretativa, sive in linea praescriptiva. Quae observantia primitus erui debet ex antiquis libris et antiquis documentis, etiamsi non pertineant ad publicum archivium, unde in cap. 13, tit. XIX, lib. II *Decret.* Romanus Pontifex tradit quaestionem circa limitationem duarum dioecesium solvendam esse ‘secundum divisiones, quae per libros antiquos vel alio modo melius probabuntur.’ Attendendi ulterius sunt testes, qui asserant de publica voce et fama vel deponant de auditu ab eorum maioribus. Spernenda tandem non sunt adminicula et coniecturae, quae sola quidem non sufficiunt, sed una cum aliis argumentis possunt controversiam dirimere. Videre deinde interest, quatenam fuerit actio ab actore intentata. Hic enim rem, domum aut fundum sibi vindicare potest innixus argumento, quo demonstrat rem, domum aut fundum ab alio iniuria possideri propter confusionem terminorum; vel etiam asserta ius sibi competere in re, domo aut fundo ab alio possesso praecisione fere facta a terminorum confusione. In primo casu actio instituitur finium regundorum; in altero agitur de rei vindicatione.

Ad quamcumque ambiguitatem tollendam animadvertendum est, iuris civilis Doctores primam actionem vocare actionem finium regundorum duplicem, secundam finium regundorum simplicem. Inter utramque actionem hoc maximum discrimen est, quod in prima actione magistratui a iure datur facultas iudicandi ex aequo et bono, in secunda autem attenditur principium—in pari causa melior est conditio possidentis—quia qui possidet titulum habet possessionis, quo adversarius destituitur. Imo qui possidet, nihil tenetur probare, quia, actore non probante, reus, etsi nihilo praestiterit, obtinuit. Ad rem Serafini, par. 99, n. 5: ‘Nell’ *actio simplex* il convenuto, di fronte al diritto formulato dall’attore, si mantiene in una posizione puramente negativa; nell’*actio duplex* al contrario assume una posizione attiva rispondendo all’attacco dell’attore con una contro affermazione di quel medesimo diritto che è vantato da quest’ultimo. Nell’un caso la vittoria dell’attore dipende unicamente dalla prova del diritto asserito, come la sconfitta dall’insufficienza della prova medesima; nel secondo caso, al contrario, la vittoria di una delle parti dipende dalla pozziorità delle prove da lui addotte in confronto di quelle addotte dall’avversario: come la sconfitta dalla pozziorità di quelle addotte dall’avversario sulle proprie.’

Modo ad factum.—Sac. Bracesco, parochus Vaccarezza, in prima et in securda instantia principaliter et primario petiit sibi adiudicari domos controversas, secundario firium determinationem. In dubio autem concordato in H. S. Tribunali actum tantummodo est de domorum vindicatione, uti manifestum est ex verbis ipsius dubii. Hinc iuxta ea quae superius in iure exposuimus, antequam perpendantur argumenta a Rev. Bracesco allata ad ius sibi vindicandum super easdem domos, in tuto collocandum est, quinam ex litigantibus iurisdictionem super easdem domus quasi possideat. Et, ut clarius procedamus, primitus agendum est de domibus *Magnano*, *Macciò* aliisque erectis ad ripam dextram torrentis *Brevenna*.

Ex actis certum est iam ab anno 1892 usque ad annum 1910, quando nempe lis mota fuit, parochum *Casella* parochialem iurisdictionem super praefatis domibus exercuisse. Hoc testantur omnes illi testes a parochu Bracesco adducti, qui referunt ipsum conquestum fuisse cum Episcopo Derthonensi, quod Rev. Cortasso, qui tunc parochiae *Casella* praerant, iniuria exerceret iurisdictionem in domibus *Magnano* et *Macciò*. Cum autem Episcopus parochu Bracesco dixerit ne Sac. Cortasso, qui senex erat, contradiceret, ipse mandato Superioris ita obtemperavit, ut nec inde, etiam e vivis sublato Rev. Cortasso, praefatas domos uti propriae parochiae subiectas retineret. Verum quidem est actorum ante annum 1892 semel vel bis benedixisse tempore paschali domibus *Magnano* et *Macciò*. At cum non constet de aliquo alio actu iurisdictionali, una aut altera benedictio non potest constituere actum possessionis, praesertim si advertatur quod parochus Cortasso, uti deponit Cresta Aloysius, cum cognovisset 'che l'odierno parroco di Vaccarezza venne a benedire le case dette Magnano e di Macciò...mosse lagnanze al parroco di Vaccarezza, che fino all'anno scorso non venne più a benedire le case.' Quod confirmat Sac. Angelus Nicorelli, qui fuit Vicarius Rev. Cortasso: 'Ricordo—ait—che essendo sorta contestazione per la casa di Macciò circa la giurisdizione parrocchiale tra il parroco di Vaccarezza ed il defunto Arciprete di Casella, questi mi diede ordine 'di recarmi a benedire detta casa per mantenere il possesso di giurisdizione. Quanto alla casa del Magnano non sorse mai dubbio che fosse di Casella.' Concludere itaque oportet, iam saltem ab anno 1892, parochum Casellae fuisse in quasi-possessione iurium parochialium super domibus ad ripam dexteram torrentis *Brevenna*. Hinc patet nullo prorsus fundamento inniti patronus Rev. Bracesco, quando scribit admittendam esse in casu possessionem cumulativam aut delegationem factam a parochu Vaccarezzae parochu Casellae: utrumque enim aperte contradicit iis, quae superius exposita sunt.

De domo *Cason di Tonno*, aliisque sitis ad ripam sinistram torrentis *Brevenna*, acta extra dubium ponunt parochum *Casella* privative super praefatis domibus iurisdictionem exercuisse ab anno 1845; i. e. plusquam per annos sexaginta. Habemus enim librum status animarum parochiae *Casella*, in quo adnotatur coniuges Rossi anno 1845 habitasse in regione *Berchi* in qua sita est domus *Cason di Tonno*. Deinde anno 1847 parochus *Casella* spatio unius mensis bis egit funera praefatorum

coniugum, quibus sacramenta administraverat, ipsorumque mortem scripsit in registis parochialibus subsignatis a duobus loci sacerdotibus. Ulterius funeribus interfuit sodalitas parochiae *Casella*, quae nonnisi pro parochianis intervenire solet. Notandum praeterea est coniuges Rossi fuisse pauperrimos, proinde, si non fuissent parochiani, libenter parochus *Casella* funera reliquisset parochi *Vaccarezzae*. Tandem contra huiusmodi funera nulla adfuit protestatio ex parte parochi *Vaccarezzae*, qui ignorare non poterat praefata funera; multi enim testes, ab eodem parochi allati, testati sunt se habuisse de peractis funeribus notitiam. Quando autem anno 1910 domus *Cason de Tonno*, quae fuit per longum tempus deserta, iterum habitari coepit, parochus *Casella* Rev. *Canegallo* novos incolas iure meritoque habuit uti suos parochianos. Adversus haec parochus *Vaccarezzae* unicam opponit benedictionem eidem domui ab ipso datam tempore paschali. At, quid valeat haec unica benedictio contra recensitos actus vere et proprie iurisdictionales, nemo est qui non videt.

In tuto igitur ponenda est favore Rev. *Canegallo* parochi *Casella* possessio exclusiva et pacifica iurium parochialium in omnibus domibus controversis; quod de cetero ipse actor recognoscit, quamvis asserat sibi competere super praefatas domus dominium et iurisdictionem; ait enim: 'In questa determinata zona comprendente il Cason di Tonno e le case del Magnano e del Macciò, il diritto di giurisdizione è mio *mentre lo esercita il parroco di Casella*.' Perpendenda itaque sunt argumenta, quibus Sac. *Bracesco* assertam sibi vindicat iurisdictionem.

Primum argumentum desumit ex confinibus civilibus, quibus, ait respondent fines ecclesiastici. At hoc principium non potest afferri ad aliquam controversiam circa fines dirimendam, possunt enim in erectione alicuius paroeciae et municipii diversi constitui fines, quia relationes hominum cum municipio non eadem sunt ac relationes hominum cum paroecia; unde videmus diversas paroecias erectas in territorio unius eiusdemque municipii et unam paroeciam erectam in territoriis, quae ad diversa pertinent municipia. Quare H. S. Auditorium constanter tenuit a finibus iurisdictionis temporalis inferendos non esse fines iurisdictionis spiritualis (*De Luca, De Iurisd. disc., I, n. 17*). Ad summum principium allatum potest constituere coniecturam, praesumptionem et nihil aliud. Deinde, admissio etiam principio, confines civiles *Vaccarezzae* non sunt ponendi, prouti vult actor, prope confluentem cursum torrentis *Brevenna* et flumen *Scriviae*; hoc enim, uti ostendit pars adversa, non eruitur neque ex mappis Instituti geographici militaris, neque ex decreto Ministri italici ab internis, neque ex deliberationibus sive Consilii provincialis Ianuensis, sive Consilii municipalis Savenionis. Ceterum confines parochiae *Casella* respondere finibus civilibus municipii, saltem prouti nunc sunt, ostenditur ex declaratione Syndici *Casella* diei 28 maii 1911.

A finibus civilibus gradum facit Rev. *Bracesco* ad fines naturales, asserens quod, his finibus attentis, vallis torrentis *Brevenna* adiudicanda sit parochiae *Vaccarezza*, vallis dero fluminis *Scrivia* parochiae *Casella*. At, iunta Card. *De Luca, De Regaliis, disc. CXXX, n. 20*, 'viae, flumina et similia, tanquam fines publici et invariables, distinguere quidem solent

territoria et iurisdictiones, sed non est confirmatio, quae concludit per necesse.' Et merito; territoria enim inter paroecias generaliter et praecipue dividuntur ratione habita distantiae et difficultatis accedendi ad parochialem ecclesiam. In casu autem non adest notabile discrimen neque quoad distantiam, neque quoad asperitatem viarum quoad fideles habitantes in domibus controversis; quin imo domus v. g. *Trucco* et *Manzanè* proximiores sunt parochiae *Casella*, quam parochiae *Vaccarezza*.

Tertium argumentum actor sumit ex eo quod ruinae *Cerello* et praedium *Costi*, quae reperiuntur in latitudine inferiori ac *Cason di Tonno*, ac quaedam capella aut aedicula B. M. Virgini vulgo *della Guardia* dicata et sita in regione *Piano di Massà*, ultima ala dextra vallis *Brevenna*, absque dubio pertineant parochiae *Vaccarezza*. At haec aliaque id generis ad summum probarent fines parochiarum locorum *Vaccarezza* et *Casella* satis regulares non esse, quod tamen ex planta, quae prostat in summario, non apparet, minime vero evincunt parochiae *Vaccarezza* subesse quoque domos controversas.

Remanet postremum argumentum derivatum ex testibus. Verum testibus parochi *Vaccarezza* contradicunt non minori numero testes parochi *Casella*, quare ex testibus certum argumentum non habetur. Testes praeterea allati a Sac. Bracesco in aliquibus discordes sunt et valde contradictorii. Ita ex gr. Iosepha Battara asserit Andream Roghitt confessum fuisse limites parochiae *Vaccarezza* esse illos, quos actor praetendit; at Roghitto, excussus, oppositum testatus est. Item testes diverso modo referunt colloquium habitum a parochi *Vaccarezza* cum eius Episcopo; quidam enim loquuntur de iurisdictionis parochialis exercitio in domibus *Magnano* et *Macciò*, alii vero de licentia concedenda Rev. Cortasso transeundi per territorium parochiae *Vaccarezza*. Pariter sunt qui deponunt parochiam *Vaccarezza*, anno 1847, fuisse suo rectore viduatam, ut sic explicent actus exercitos a parochi *Casella*, de quibus supra egimus; dum constat, ex regestis Curiae, quod tunc temporis parochia *Vaccarezza* suum habebat parochum. Quidam circa funera coniugum Rossi deponunt eadem clam fuisse peracta, quod falsum est; alii loquuntur de quarta funeraria soluta a parochi *Casella* parochi *Vaccarezza*, quod pariter falsum est, cum defuncti erant pauperrimi. Haec aliaque, quae brevitatis causa omittuntur, in dubium saltem revocant vim probativam testium allatorum a Rev. Bracesco.

Cum itaque nullo valido ac firmo argumento actor probaverit iurisdictionem sibi competere in domos, de quibus est quaestio, ex iis, quae in iure exposuimus, parochus *Casella* turbandus non est a pacifica possessione, quam obtinet, praedictarum domorum. Quin imo, cum possessio quoad domum *Cason di Tonno* aliasque ad sinistram torrentis *Brevenna* erectas sit plus quam sexagenaria, dicendum est favore ipsius parochi inductam fuisse praescriptionem.

At parochus *Casella* non sola innititur possessione, sed positiva affert documenta ad probandum domos controversas suae parochiae pertinere. Revera hoc concorditer deponunt fere triginta testes, ostendunt regesta parochialia, ac testatur antiquissimum documentum Sac. Dovadola anni 1562, in quo ita fines parochiae *Casella* describuntur:

‘E se confina con granaia et bagoora piu avanti, se trova un altro fosato detto li soglij, il qual fosato parte in spirituale fra ternano parochia di Vaccarezza et la pieve de la casellà si cala giù dal monte, e si va a fenire nel fiume detto Caverna, di poi si vien giuso drieto a detto fiume sin rente avosio diritto al monte di la dal fiume, e si monta suso per la schiena sino al monte detto il carmo.’ Quamvis hoc documentum dici nequeat publicum, attamen, propter eius antiquitatem maximi ponderis est.

Etenim libri ecclesiarum antiqui ‘propter eorum antiquitatem probant pro Ecclesia, atque istud vel maxime locum habet, quando agitur de probandis finibus ac territorio’ (Reiffenst., II, XXII, 14, 121). Est praeterea documentum exaratum a Sacerdote, qui uti Capellanus et Archipresbyter inservivit ecclesiae *Casella* per spatium 50 annorum, quique quatuor seniores parociae vocavit, ut eum instruerent de re, quam scribere volebat ad commodum futurorum parochorum. Vim huius documenti recognovit etiam actoris Patronus qui plura scripsit ad infirmendam eius auctoritatem, quae tamen ridicula sunt et prorsus despicienda. Etenim falsum in primis est documentum esse informe, carere videlicet initio et data, incipit enim: ‘Anno Domini 1562 die 6 augusti io Domenico de Dovadola,’ etc.; futile deinde est existentiam ipsam in dubium revocare Sac. de Dovadola, qui parochiae *Casella* addictus fuit, uti diximus, per 50 annos, quod patet ex registis parochialibus, quibus subscripsit usque ad annum 1601. Futile pariter est arguere ex eo quod documentum conscriptum fuerit vernaculo pedemontano, cum auctor se dicat romanicum. Nam primo dialectum romanicum potest facile expers conspiciere in scriptis Sac. Dovadola. Deinde, etiamsi scriptor se dicat romanicum, post decem annos commorationis Casellae, poterat optime linguam loci addiscere eademque, lingua conscribere.

Quibus omnibus rite diligenterque perpensis, Nos infrascripti auditores de Turno pro tribunali sedentes et solum Deum prae oculis habentes, Christi nomine invocato, dicimus, declaramus ac sententiamus iurisdictionem super domus controversas pertinere non parochi *Vaccarezza* sed parochi *Casella* ad normam sententiarum primae et secundae instantiae, quas confirmamus; i.e. ad propositum dubium respondemus, *negative*, condemnantes parochum *Vaccarezza* ad omnes expensas iudiciales solvendas.

Ita pronunciamus mandantes Ordinariis locorum et ministris tribunalium, ad quos spectat, ut executioni mandent hanc nostram definitivam sententiam, et adversus reluctantes procedant ad normam *C.I.C.*, praesertim tit. XVII, lib. IV, iis adhibitis executivis et coercitivis medijs, quae magis opportuna et efficaciam pro rerum adiunctis existitura sint.

Romae, in Sede Tribunalis S. R. Rotae, 31 ianuarii 1919.

GUILELMUS SEBASTIANELLI, *Dec.*, *Pon.*
IOANNES PRIOR.

ALOISIUS SINCERO.

L. ✠ S.

Ex Cancellaria, 1 martii 1919.

Sac. T. Tani, *Notarius*.

DECREE FOR THE BEATIFICATION AND DECLARATION OF
MARTYRDOM OF MANY SERVANTS OF GOD, MEMBERS OF
THE INSTITUTE OF CHARITY OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUL
AND OF THE URSULINE ORDER

(July 6, 1919)

CAMARACEN.

DECRETUM BEATIFICATIONIS SEU DECLARATIONIS MARTYRII VEN. SERVARUM
DEI MARIAE MAGDALENÆ FONTAINE ET TRIUM SOCIARUM EIUS, EX
INSTITUTO PUELLARUM CARITATIS S. VINCENTII A PAULO, NECNON
MARIAE CLOTILDIS ANGELAE A S. FRANCISCO BORGIA ET DECEM SOCI-
ARUM EIUS, EX ORDINE MONIALIUM URSULINARUM DE VALENCIENNES.

SUPER DUBIO

*An constet de martyrio et causa martyrii, signis seu miraculis in casu,
et ad effectum, de quo agitur?*

In hac vita, quae est hominis militia super terram, iis praecipue, qui ordines et signa sua deserere non erubescunt, quique, postquam a vero Fidei obsequio desciscere haec praesertim coepit aetas omnique circumferri vento doctrinae, tanto excreverunt numero, magno spectaculo sunt quindecim Deo sacrae Virgines.

Quarum priores quatuor ad Societatem pertinent Puellarum a Caritate; sorores nimirum Maria Magdalena Fontaine, Maria Francisca Lanel, Teresia Fantou et Ioanna Gérard; undecim vero reliquae ex Ordine sunt monialium Ursularum, eaeque nomen habent: Maria Clotildes a S. Francisco Borgia, Maria Scholastica a S. Iacobo, Anna Iosephina, Maria Ursula a S. Bernardino, Maria Aloisia a S. Francisco Assisiensi, Maria Laurentina a S. Stanislao, Maria Augustina a S. Corde Iesu, Maria Natalia a S. Aloisio, Anna Maria, Maria Francisca et Maria Cordula a S. Dominico. Iniquo namque iudicio damnatae, extremo cunctae immanique sublatae fuerunt supplicio, gallica furente perturbatione, anno videlicet millesimo septuagesimo nonagesimo quarto.

Equidem, ob multiplex ac varium ingenium, quod ista tam celebris prae se tulit tamque tristi celebritate insignis publicarum rerum conversio, quae, octavodecimo exeunte saeculo, per Galliam facta est finitimasque regiones, arduum sane videri poterit negotium, tot inter hominum millia, quae, horrida ea tempestate, securi ferienda carnifici tradita fuisse constat, veros agnoscere Christi Martyres atque revereri. Ea propter, ad quindecim quod attinet praefatas venerabiles Dei Famulas, ne dubitationibus et ambiguitatibus facilis pateret aditus, interfuit plurimi, quid revera sit, in quod cadere queat christiani martyrii causa, statuere in primis certoque firmare, magistro atque duce Angelico Doctore.

Hic sane, quum hoc expendendum proposuisset sibi; scilicet: *Utrum sola Fides sit causa Martyrii?* laudabili ac sueta adhibita sua disceptandi methodo, quid de re sentiendum esset, hisce significavit verbis: 'Respondeo dicendum, quod . . . martyres dicuntur quasi testes; quia

scilicet corporalibus suis passionibus usque ad mortem testimonium perhibent veritati, non cuicumque, sed veritati, quae secundum pietatem est, quae per Christum nobis innotuit; unde et *martyres Christi* dicuntur quasi testes ipsius. Huiusmodi autem est veritas fidei. Et ideo cuiuslibet martyrii causa est fidei veritas. Sed ad fidei veritatem non solum pertinet ipsa credulitas cordis, sed etiam exterior protestatio. Quae quidem fit non solum per verba, quibus aliquis confitetur fidem, sed etiam per facta, quibus aliquis fidem se habere ostendit, secundum illud Iacob., II, 18: *Ego ostendam tibi ex operibus fidem meam.* Unde et de quibusdam dicitur, *ad Tit.*, I, 16: *Confitentur se nosse Deum, factis autem negant.* Et ideo omnium virtutum opera, secundum quod referuntur in Deum, sunt quaedam protestationes fidei, per quam nobis innotescit quod Deus huiusmodi opera a nobis requirit, et nos pro eis remunerat. *Et secundum hoc possunt esse causa martyrii* (2^a 2^{ae}, quæst. CXXIV, art. 5).

Quibus praeiactis firmiterque constitutis, idem sic est prosecutus Doctor Angelicus: 'Ad primum ergo dicendum quod Christianus dicitur qui Christi est. Dicitur autem aliquis esse Christi non solum ex eo quod habet fidem Christi, sed etiam ex eo quod Spiritu Christi ad opera virtuosa procedit, secundum illud *ad Rom.*, VIII, 9: *Si quis Spiritum Christi non habet, hic non est eius*; etiam ex hoc quod, ad imitationem Christi, peccatis moritur, secundum illud *ad Galat.*, V, 24: *Qui Christi sunt carnem suam crucifixerunt cum vitis et concupiscentiis.* Et ideo *ut christianus patitur non solum qui patitur pro fidei confessione, quae fit per verba, sed etiam quocumque patitur pro quocumque bono opere faciendo, vel pro quocumque peccato vitando, propter Christum; quia bonum hoc pertinet ad fidei protestationem*' (loc. cit.).

Hanc ab Angelico Doctore adeo claram et perspicuam, ut eius est mos, traditam doctrinam ad utramque, de qua agitur, Causam transferre postmodum et aptare non difficile profecto fuit. Idque ut fieret, neque oportuit iis nominatim inniti tamquam martyrii causis, quibus prudentem cautumque virum tuto omnino secureque confidere haud posse apparebat; quandoquidem, eisdem etiam posthabitis, e cunctis aliis, quae, eodem spectantia, prostant in actis, una cum peculiaribus rerum, locorum ac personarum circumstantiis inspectis pensitatisque, prouti utrumque se reapse habuit factum, sat elementorum colligere et sumere licuit, quorum ope facta est potestas necessariam adipiscendi requisitae sive ex parte tyranni, seu persecutorum, sive ex parte venerabilium Ancillarum Dei, causae martyrii demonstrationem; eiusmodi nempe causae, quae, iuxta sancti Thomae Aquinatis doctrinam, apta atque idonea aestimari queat in casu et ad effectum, de quo agitur.

Ita, quae, abhinc quinquennium, instituta fuerat, quadruplicem post habitam disceptationem, progredi absolvi potuit quaestio. Antepreparatoriae siquidem Congregationi una et altera praeparatoria successit Congregatio; die vero decimaseptima proxime superioris mensis iunii, coram Sanctissimo Domino nostro Benedicto Papa XV coacta fuit Congregatio generalis, in qua a Reverendissimo Cardinali Vincentio Vannuelli, causae Relatore, sequens ad discutiendum propositum est Dubium:

An constet de martyrio et causa martyrii, signis seu miraculis in casu et ad effectum, de quo agitur? Reverendissimi Cardinales et Patres Consultores sua quisque ex ordine suffragia tulerunt, quibus tamen omnibus laeto studiosoque animo exceptis, Sanctissimus Dominus noster a supremo Suo ferendo iudicio supersedendum de more duxit, graviterque perpendens, quanti res ponderis esset, spatium sibi sumpsit divinae opis implorandae. Quumque demum suam edicere sententiam decrevisset, hodiernam statuit diem Dominicam IV post Pentecosten; ideoque, sacris Mysteris devotissime celebratis, ad Vaticanas Aedes accessiri voluit Reverendissimos Cardinales Antonium Vico, Episcopum Portuensem et S. Rufinae, sacrae rituum Congregationi Praefectum, et Vincentium Vannutelli, Episcopum Ostiensem et Praenestinum, Sacri Collegii Decanum causaeque Relatorem, una cum R. P. Angelo Mariani, Fidei Promotore generali, meque insimul infrascripto Secretario, eisque adstantibus, solemniter pronuntiavit: *Ita constare de martyrio et causa martyrii venerabilium Famularum Dei Mariae Magdalenae Fontaine et trium Sociarum eius, nec non Mariae Clotildis Angelae a S. Francisco Borgia et decem Sociarum eius, ut procedi possit ad ulteriora, in casu et ad effectum, de quo agitur.*

Hoc Decretum vulgari et in acta sacrae rituum Congregationis inseri mandavit pridie nonas iulias anno MCMXIX.

✠ A. CARD. VICO, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae,
S. R. C. Praefectus.

L. ✠ S.

ALEXANDER VERDE, *Secretarius.*

THE FLORENTINE TEMPLE, 'S. MARIA NOVELLA,' IS RAISED TO THE DIGNITY OF A MINOR BASILICA

(November 13, 1919)

FLORENTINUM TEMPLUM 'S. MARIA NOVELLA' AD DIGNITATEM BASILICAE
MINORIS EVEHITUR

BENEDICTUS PP. XV

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.—Neminem latet inter potiora sacra templa, mirificis artis operibus conspicua, quibus Florentia gaudet, iure meritoque illud accenseri posse quod *Santa Maria Novella* dicitur. A Praedicatorum Ordinis Fratibus erectum, eo tempore quo familia ipsa clarissimis liberalium artium cultoribus abundabat, continuo tam structura, quam ornamentis pulcherrimum evasit, summique magistri tum pictis tabulis, tum sculptis marmore signis illud ornarunt. Accessit iugiter tantae magnificentiae, divini cultus splendor et fidelium ad sacras functiones concursus. Memorare quidem iuvat hoc in templo, adstante Pontificio Legato, pacem fuisse compositam inter Guelphos et Ghibellinos, ibique etiam singulares Concilii Florentini sessiones fuisse habitas atque inde primam processisse per urbis vias sollemnem Corporis Domini

pompam. Plures Romani Pontifices erga ecclesiam eandem benevolentiam singularem significarunt. Eugenius IV, Martinus V, Pius II et Leo X in adnexo coenobio commorati sunt, et constat quidem Pium Pp. VII, rec. mem. Decessorem Nostrum, Romam auctore Deo reducem, in hac ecclesia Ambrosianum hymnum, ovante christiano populo, cecinisse. Pluribus sanctorum reliquiis, tum martyrum, tum ex Ordine Praedicatorum confessorum, ecclesia ipsa nobilitatur; ac pretiosa quidem sacra suppellectile referta est. Cum igitur hoc anno, quo septimum sese vertit saeculum ex quo divus Dominicus Patriarcha, Ordinis Praedicatorum conditor ac legifer, beato Ioanne a Salerno duce, duodecim discipulos suos misit Florentiam, ut illa in civitate Ordinem suum constituerent, dilectus filius Noster Alfonsus S. R. E. cardinalis Mistrangelo, Florentinorum archiepiscopus, una cum dilecto filio Alberto Maria Zucchi, Provinciali Romano, supplices Nobis preces porrexerint, ut, auspiciata occasione, ecclesiam hanc, primam Ordinis enunciati sedem Florentiae, ad Basilicae Minoris dignitatem evehere dignaremur; Nos, tam insignes inelyti illius templi memorias animo repetentes, optatis his concedendum ultro libenterque existimavimus. Quare, collatis consiliis cum VV. FF. NN. S. R. E. Cardinalibus Sacris tuendis Ritibus praepositis, Auctoritate Nostra Apostolica, praesentium vi perpetuumque in modum, ecclesiam a *Santa Maria Novella* nuncupatam, Florentinae civitatis, titulo ac dignitate Basilicae Minoris cohonestamus, omnia et singula privilegia atque honorificentias eidem tribuentes, quae Minoribus Almae huius Urbis Basilicis de iure competunt. Haec concedimus, largimur, decernentes praesentes Litteras Nostras firmas, validas atque efficaces semper exstare ac permanere, suosque plenos atque integros effectus sortiri atque obtinere, illisque ad quos spectant et in posterum spectare poterunt plenissime suffragari; sicque rite iudicandum esse ac definiendum, irritumque ex nunc et inane fieri si quidquam secus, super his, a quovis, auctoritate qualibet, scienter sive ignoranter, attentari contigerit. Non obstantibus contrariis quibuscumque.

Datum Romae apud sanctum Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris, die XIII novembris MCMXIX, Pontificatus Nostri anno sexto.

P. CARD. GASPARRI, a *Secretis Status*.

APOSTOLIC LETTER TO CARDINAL LA FONTAINE, PATRIARCH OF VENICE

(October 8, 1919)

AD PETRUM S. R. E. CARD. LA FONTAINE, PATRIARCHAM VENETIARUM, DE OFFICIIS DELATIS, NOMINE ETIAM CLERI SACRIS EXERCITATIONIBUS VACANTIS, GRATIAS PERSOLVIT

Dilecte fili noster, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.—Officia pietatis, quae tuus Nobis obtulit clerus cum nuper sacris tecum vacaret exercitationibus, non uno nomine grata fuisse scito. Praeter cetera, placuerunt proposita sancta, quibus idem eo fidelius viam sanctitatis sequi se velle scribit, quo miserius a Christo mundus oberrat. Hoc quippe

maxime sacerdotum est *in diebus peccatorum corroborare pietatem* et, ea imitando quae cotidie tractant, sese Deo hostiam offerre pro proximorum salute. Quod muneris et ad promerendum sibi et ad proficiendum aliis uberrimum, ut alacres, in omni opere bono fructificantes, obeant quotquot istic sunt sacrorum administri, Nos quidem, delata officia grato animo prosequentes, illis omnibus tibi que in primis, dilecte fili Noster, caelestium auspicem gratiarum Nostraeque benevolentiae testem, apostolicam benedictionem peramanter in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die VIII octobris MCMXIX, Pontificatus Nostri anno sexto.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

REVIEWS AND NOTES

CATHOLIC SOLDIERS. By Sixty Chaplains and many others. Edited by Charles Plater, S.J. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

How has the religion of Catholic Soldiers in the British Empire stood the test of war? This book contains an abundance of material for an answer to this question. Sixty Chaplains and a large number of officers and men have very kindly written answers to a set of questions sent to them. These answers, as well as some thousands of letters from Catholic soldiers, have been drawn upon, and the material arranged by Father Plater. It is not a controversial book, and nearly everything in the way of comparison between Catholics and non-Catholics has been omitted. Some evidence from the American Army has been added and reflects credit on the American soldiers. This Catholic Report presents very striking contrasts with the General Report on the *Army and Religion* lately published. In the list of contributors to the Catholic Report are enumerated British, Canadian, Australian, New Zealand (also four American) Chaplains. There is no mention of Irish Chaplains. Evidence regarding Irish soldiers is conspicuous in many of the answers given, no doubt, by Irish Chaplains among others. If soldiers are designated Irish, British, etc., why is not a place given to Irish Chaplains? The British Isles are known as Great Britain and *Ireland*. Why will men like Father Plater lend themselves to this obliteration of the name of Ireland and not see the historical falsity in the application of this term *British* to things Irish?

The questions asked were: (1) If the war had affected the religious belief of Catholic soldiers, (2) is impersonal fatalism or a trust in Providence to be found among them, (3) in what way do they regard rosaries, scapulars, medals, etc., (4) are the soldiers well instructed in their religion, (5) to what extent do they practice their religion, (6) are moral falls frequent; are they followed by real contrition and amendment, (7) how many indifferent Catholics return to the practice of their religion; are there many souls of exalted sanctity, (8) do Catholic soldiers look to their priests and their Church for help in the war, and especially when wounded, (9) are they responsive to religion when about to undergo death sentence, (10) are Catholic officers helpful to the priest in his ministry, (11) has the war made men more accessible to the priest, (12) what difference has the war made in the moral and religious character of the men?

The information derived from the answers to these questions is

interesting and will be useful. No doubt, many of the answers are absolutely contrary. But then human beings cannot be labelled uniformly like goods in a window. The general consensus of opinion is highly creditable to the soldiers and supremely consoling. Some points of particular interest emerge from the enormous amount of information and are worth noting. The nearest approach to a temptation against faith is found in a letter from a private: 'I have seen sights out here that have nearly turned me against religion.' It is a solitary case. Belgian and French peasants have greatly strengthened the faith of the soldiers. The thought of those whom they had left at home was an important factor among American soldiers. The Catholic soldier was inclined to be more of a gambler than a fatalist. From the Sacraments he drew a comfort that others knew not of. Rosaries, etc., were not regarded by him as mascots but as protectives, as bits of his 'spiritual uniform,' as part of his kit, as a badge of Catholicism. The Sacred Heart badge was the great favourite among non-Catholics, and even Masons carried Catholic medals.

The war has proved the enormous value of Catholic elementary schools, and has shown their chief weakness, 'religion not made spontaneous enough, too much a part of school discipline.' 'Our method of teaching Catechism must be at fault.' Here is a very interesting report of one of the Chaplains: 'I should roughly say that 95% in the north of England are fairly well instructed. In the south of England perhaps 70%. In Ireland practically everyone. In Scotland, fully 90%. In Australia, 30-40%. In Canada, French, 95%. In Canada, English, 40-50%. In New Zealand, fully 80%.' 'This good result in New Zealand is due to the religious education, and the number of religious houses, especially convent schools.' '99 out of 100 Irish would explain correctly Immaculate Conception, etc. The English often don't know these things. I except Lancashire men, who equal Irish in all respects, and exceed them in Apostolic zeal.' A Knight of Columbus Secretary puts the proportion of well-instructed American soldiers at two-thirds, or three-fifths.

Several Chaplains make the point that there was a better religious spirit among Catholic soldiers in the earlier part of the war than in the latter. 'The English *out of the line* I have found a slack and disappointing lot. The better part of them have been those of Irish extraction.' 'I remember giving Holy Communion one morning in a village church to 900 men of the Connaught Rangers. The curé helped me, with tears streaming down his cheeks. At the end he said: 'those strong men have all the faces of children as they kneel to receive their Lord in Holy Communion.' In an Irish Battalion of which 60% were Catholics, 'practically every Catholic man and officer always went to Confession and Holy Communion before each turn in the trenches.' The same can be said of the Canadians.

It is agreed that the moral standard of Catholic soldiers has not been lowered. Moral falls were somewhat frequent owing to 'most awful surroundings,' 'the loose behaviour of French and Belgian girls,' and

drink. The influence of religion, however, had a wonderful effect on Catholic officers in keeping them straight. 'The average non-Catholic,' says a Major in the Canadian Army, 'is frankly and practically a sense-utilitarian.' As a rule, the contrition and amendment of Catholics were immediate and lasting.

The most encouraging part of the Report is that dealing with the enormous numbers of Catholics who have returned to the practice of religion during the war, after many years of absence. There were many real saints among the men, especially 'among the Irish and Scotch-Irish, leading the holiest, most supernatural lives, devoted to the Blessed Sacrament.' There were 'souls of singular sweetness and innocence.' A French-Canadian boy was asked if he were willing to make the sacrifice of his life, he replied: 'Sure, Father, I did that five months ago, with the intention that peace might come soon.' 'Some men were always wanting Holy Communion.' Many vocations to the priesthood were discovered or matured during the war. A beautiful, but pathetic letter written by a soldier in the American Army on Y.M.C.A. note-paper, with the envelope addressed 'to the Blessed Virgin, Mary and Mother, Queen of Heaven and Earth, Mercy *off* Sinners,' and signed by him, was found by the sacristan of the Cathedral of Blois, on the altar of Our Lady and before the tabernacle. It ran thus:—

'My dear heavenly Mother, Blessed Virgin, I ask your mercy on me, poor sinner, you see how I suffer without you and without Your Blessed Son, Jesus Christ. You know how happy I was when I was at the Holy Mass, and receiving Holy Communion every morning before I went to work, and now, my Dear Heavenly Mother, pray for me that them days will come back soon, that I will receive Your Son in Holy Communion again. That good Jesus Christ sees how I suffer without Him. You know, my Dear Mother, how happy I spent my days with You and Your Son Jesus Christ, and now my Dear Mother, pray for me, your loving child, Walter—Anser prayer soon.'

Father Plater has produced a remarkable report, and successfully accomplished a huge, onerous task. Taking the Report all round the Church has reason to be proud of her sons. Their conduct is an object lesson to non-Catholics and the Report is a witness to the power and influence of the Church for good.

M. R.

A CHRISTIAN SOCIAL CRUSADE. (3rd Edition.) Oxford: The Catholic Social Guild.

SOME time ago an Interdenominational Conference of Social Service Unions was held, consisting of the ten most numerous religious bodies in England. The joint deliberations, that took more than a year to prepare, were drawn up with the greatest care, and a common statement of social principles and a common programme of social reform were issued. This document introduced to the public is now in its third edition. It is compressed to the minimum limit and needs a com-

mentary and a supplement from the Catholic point of view. These are provided in *A Christian Social Crusade*. The Catholic setting is given and Catholic doctrine is brought to bear on, and to elucidate, the problems. The book gives us a firm grasp of Catholic social principles and an increased power of applying them.

The *Statement* deals successively with principles, evils, and remedies. But in the *Commentary* these three are considered together under the headings of the various social questions. We thus get a more comprehensive view of each question in all its details. The questions treated are: Christianity and Social Action, The Basis of Christian Social Reform, The Living Wage, Housing, Employment, The Economic System, Rest and Recreation, Marriage, Education, Duties, and the Family and the State.

The book shows that the contribution of Christianity to social reform is of a spirit rather than of a cut-and-dried programme. Too much stress is laid nowadays on programmes, not enough on the spirit. The sacredness of personality, which is at the root of every social problem, is rightly emphasised. It is the key of all social reform, whether we discuss the question of the Living Wage, Housing, Marriage, Rest and Recreation, etc. On all these questions *A Christian Social Crusade* takes up a reasonable, common-sense attitude. It sets its face against social militarism, against Fabianism, in any shape or form.

We heartily recommend the *Crusade*. It is an encyclopedia of information on social questions—it is the social question in a nut-shell. It sets down the basis, the leading lines, of the social reconstruction of the morrow. It will serve as a framework for all social clubs and for social study. It is clear, concise, comprehensive and logical. It should be read from cover to cover and studied. It provides abundant food for thought. For more detailed information on the various questions it refers us to a large selection of cheap and excellent treatises written by experts. It is a most useful, engrossing and attractive little book, sold for the modest sum of one shilling.

M. R.

A SOLDIER'S CONFIDENCES WITH GOD. *Spiritual Colloquies of Giosuè Borsi*. Translated from the Italian by Rev. P. Maltese, New York; P. J. Kenedy & Sons.

AMONG the heroes of the war there is none more inspiring than Giosuè Borsi, the young Italian lieutenant who died on the Isonzo battlefield while leading his platoon to the attack. He went to the front as a volunteer, with the presentiment always in his soul of sacrificing his life for his country.

Borsi was no hermit, but a young man of the world, poet, scholar, dramatic critic, commentator of Dante, darling of the salons of the gay world of Rome and Florence. His father was a clever journalist who made a political platform of his hatred of the Catholic Church and who brought up his son in an atmosphere of hostility to religion. Out of deference to the wishes of a pious mother the boy was baptized

and made his first Communion, but this was the last for many years. Losing three of his dearest ones in rapid succession shook Giosuè's hopes of earthly happiness, and at the same time brought him into friendly relations with the Franciscan monks of San Miniato in Florence. In the spring of 1915 he found the way of happiness, devoutly received confirmation and plunged with all the ardour of a neophyte into the study of the Holy Scriptures and the writings of the Fathers of the Church.

He began to keep this diary of his talks with God and Mary, and wrote the first thirty-five Colloquies. The last eighteen were written in the trenches; his daily meditations, amid the crash of shrapnel and the thunder of guns. They are in the form of prayers, not written for publication. He believed that Providence inspired him with the idea of praying and meditating in writing. He rose with the lark to fix his thoughts with his pen so that he might find them again and feel them better. He hoped to make this an indispensable and delightful habit.

But for his death these Colloquies would have remained the secrets of a soul. He had to die, for these records of a soul were far too precious to be lost. They are not art, and they were never corrected or revised, yet they are written with vigour, naturalness and ease, with a beauty of form unrivalled perhaps in the annals of modern Church literature. They are the pure outpourings of an intensely artistic soul, of a most refined nature, of a soul in intimate communion with God, overflowing with enthusiasm for a new-found but unshakable faith. They have been called by the best Italian critics the 'finest religious literature that has appeared since the Confessions of St. Augustine.' They are serenely calm and beautiful, bearing the stamp of his individuality. They are the most sublime thoughts that the human mind could conceive. They seem indeed inspired.

The wonderful success of Borsi's little book (many editions of it issued within a single month) warrants the hope that his spiritual Colloquies will be read by the young of future generations and will accomplish untold good. The book will bring home to all Catholic readers the nobility of their faith and the dignity of a consistent Christian life.

M. R.

IN AN INDIAN ABBEY: Some Straight Talks on Theology. By Rev. Joseph Rickaby, S.J. London: Burns and Oates.

THE Indian Abbey spoken of in the title is situated in the hill country, 'somewhere north of Bombay.' It was founded in the twenty-first century by a wealthy London banker, who on his death-bed bequeathed a million pounds for the purpose. Boys are educated in the English schools and universities, and then sent out to fill the vacancies in the monastery, where as lay monks they live a celibate life, making no vows, but only a promise of stability, renewable every five years. At the end of 25 years the monk is pensioned off, returns to England, and becomes

a member of the Board of Directors. Hall Ghât Abbey is not a show place; none but earnest enquirers are admitted to converse with the monks, and for any such enquirers there are means unexplained of obtaining a through ticket from Charing Cross to Hall Ghât station. Some of the returned monks fortunately kept records of their conversations with visitors, and these conversations are now published with the permission of the Lord Abbot and the Board of Directors. So we are told in the Introduction. Yet one hardly requires the Preface to divine that Father Rickaby is himself the wealthy banker who has built the airy fabric of the Indian Abbey and written the dialogues for his mythical monk.

The first chapter is headed *Megalomania*, a heading equally applicable to all the chapters, containing, as they do, types of that disease which makes man try to compass the infinite in his finite brain. Dialogues on *Illogical Postulates*, *Creation and Pantheism*, *Faith*, *Love of God*, *Matrimony*, *Historical Scandals* and *Omnipotence*, follow the chapter on *Megalomania*.

The work is not suitable for popular reading. It is a disconnected series of learned discussions on various scientific and philosophic objections to Catholic principles and doctrines. The reader will meet with Greek and Latin quotations that bespeak the facility and aptness of a master. He will also meet with some doubts, whose only solution is to be found in the humble cry of the father of the lunatic child, 'Credo, Domine; adjuva incredulitatem meam.'

D.

ST. JOAN OF ARC. The Life-Story of the Maid of Orleans. By Rev. Denis Lynch, S.J. Benziger Brothers.

ROMANCE knows no tale more touching and dramatic than that of Joan of Arc. A peasant girl in the poor little village of Domremy, she begins at the age of 13 to receive heavenly visits, and thenceforth almost continually till her death, is directed by her 'Voices.' At their command, when barely 17, she leaves home to lead a soldier's life. Her military genius in council and her inspiring valour in the field, her simple piety and spotless virtue, her day of triumph as she stood beside the worthless Charles VII at his coronation in Rheims, her capture and sale to the English, her long imprisonment and torturous appearances before the iniquitous judges, ending in her condemnation to death at the stake in the public square of Rouen: these are the headlines of the history of the Maid. It requires the touch of an artist to vivify such a saint and heroine.

The short extracts from Lang, Michelet and Coleman, which occupy three pages before the table of Contents, are delightful reading, and perhaps their excellence interferes with a due appreciation of Father Lynch's work. At any rate our initial enthusiasm was cooled by the time we had laboured through forty-five pages of prefatory dissertations. Tastes differ, but for our part we would prefer a life written after the manner of

Bury's *Life of St. Patrick*, in which the author first tells the story of the saint and then supports his facts and assumptions in a series of learned appendices.

The book is beautifully produced by Benziger Brothers, and contains a dozen fine plates.

D.

SCIENCE AND MORALS. By Sir Bertram Windle. London: Burns and Oates.

IT is with great pleasure that we welcome this further contribution of Dr. Windle on the attitude of the Church towards scientific questions and men. Whatever he writes is worthy of mature consideration. As a Scientist and a Catholic he stands out to-day as the foremost champion of the Church in the domain of science. He is fully qualified to occupy this position, for besides being a Scientist and a Philosopher (a rare combination), he shows he has a thorough grasp of Catholic Theology. Yet, he is by no means blind to the faults of Churchmen in their connexion with science, which faults indeed, as he shows, are very rare, much rarer than their opponents try to make out. He shows, on the contrary, how much science owes to Churchmen, and enumerates those who have been pioneers in certain branches of science. The Church has always taken a definite stand in regard to science.

'What the Church does [he says]—and surely it must be clear that from her standpoint she could not do less—is to instruct Catholic men of science not to proclaim as *proved facts* such modern theories—and there are many of them—as still remain wholly unproved, when these theories are such as might seem to conflict with the teaching of the Church. This is very far from saying that Catholics are forbidden to study such theories.

On the contrary, they are encouraged to do so, and that, need it be said, with the one idea of ascertaining the truth? Men of science, Catholic and otherwise, have, as a mere matter of fact, been time and again encouraged by Popes and other ecclesiastical authorities to go on searching for the truth, never, however, neglecting the wise maxim that all things must be proved. So long as a theory is unproved it must be candidly admitted that it is a crime against science to proclaim it to be incontrovertible truth, yet this crime is being committed every day. It is really against it that the *magisterium* of the Church is exercised. The wholesome discipline which she exercises might also be exercised to the great benefit of the ordinary reading public by some central scientific authority. . . . Such constraint, when rightly regarded, is not or would not be a shackling of the human intellect, but a kindly and intelligent guidance of those unable to form a proper conclusion themselves.'

It is here we find the effective utility of Dr. Windle's books. They are safe guides for the ordinary reader in scientific matters. Perhaps in no branch of learning is guidance so necessary as in science. The Catholic Imprimatur stinks in the nostrils of scientists and anti-Catholics.

Yet the State and any decent Christian family has its *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*. The weak ones of the flock must be protected from the wolves. The wolves have a horror of the idea of the Creator. They fit that revulsion into all their speculations. Theophobia is due, as Dr. Windle shows, to the low ebb of religion in the Georgian period, to Evangelicalism, Calvinism and Sabbatarianism of the Victorian era. He speaks with an intimate knowledge of this exaggerated Sabbatarianism. He was brought up in it himself, and gives us a most interesting and illuminative insight into its constitution and consequences. These creeds, he says, had most to do with the spread of materialism. Then science failed, contrary to the expectation and wish of its followers, to explain everything, and there was a re-action towards spiritualism as a substitute for science and for religion. A passing acquaintance with the London of to-day will show how England has gone mad, especially after the war, over spiritualism which requires no particular creed and no special code of morals.

We need mention only a few of the chapters of Dr. Windle's latest book to show their interest and importance: The Gospel of Science, Science as a Rule of Life, Science in Bondage, Science and the War, Heredity and Arrangement, Special Creation, Catholic Writers and Spontaneous Generation, A Theory of Life. The writer everywhere emphasizes the lamentable ignorance of Catholic teaching and the lamentable incapacity for clear-thinking which afflict most non-Catholic scientists. There is nothing in which clear thinking and clear writing are more necessary than in scientific discussions. Scientists, as a rule, seem to be hopelessly ignorant of philosophy. A sense of humour or a gentleman's knowledge might save them from their grotesque conclusions, their dogmatic utterances, and their extravagant theories. Dr. Windle logically and ruthlessly exposes all their fallacies and failures, and brings them to a sense of proportion for the sake of truth and of science.

The Catholic attitude towards science cannot be too often stated, as even amongst well-informed Catholics it is surprising what old controversial skeletons are dragged forth from time to time, which have been buried and damned long since. Dr. Windle's book is admirable in its scientific exorcism of all these bogeys, and will be a safe guide to all interested in scientific questions. It is written in a simple, lucid, and graceful style that makes the subject attractive. We should, however, suggest that where there are very technical names and expressions a note or a definition might be inserted for the better understanding of the ordinary reader. Dr. Windle's books on scientific questions should find a place in all our Catholic libraries and colleges. They will be useful as an antidote to the mass of cheap science primers and publications that even the man in the street has become familiar with. It is a pleasure, an education, and an edification to read Dr. Windle's books.

M. R.

CONFERENCES FOR MEN. By Rev. Reynold Kuchnel. London : Herder.

THESE Conferences were originally delivered at meetings of the Holy Name Society in the States. 'They are now,' the reverend author tells us, 'issued in book form in the hope that they may be of use particularly to Reverend Directors of the Holy Name Society, by suggesting topics and subject-matter for discourses to members of their societies.' In all there are fifty-two conferences in the volume, twenty of them dealing with Socialism and the labour question and fourteen with the upbringing of children. As one might anticipate, the conferences are straight, personal talks, worded with the vigour and directness for which American speakers are noted.

D.

BOOKS, Etc., RECEIVED

- America* : A Catholic Review (January).
The Ecclesiastical Review (January). U.S.A.
The Rosary Magazine (January). Somerset, Ohio.
The Catholic World (January). New York.
The Austral Light (December). Melbourne.
The Irish Monthly (January). Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.
The Catholic Bulletin (January). Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.
The Month (January). London : Longmans.
Revue Pratique d'Apologétique (January). Paris : Beauchesne.
Revue du Clergé Français (January). Paris : Letouzey et Ané.
Revue des Jeunes (January). Paris : 3 Rue de Luynes.
The Fortnightly Review (January). St. Louis, Mo.
The Lamp (January). Garrison, N.Y.
La Documentation Catholique (January). Paris : 5 Rue Bayard.
Le Christ dans Ses Mystères. Par D. Columba Marmion. Maredsous.
Le Christ Vie de L'Ame. Par D. Columba Marmion. Maredsous.
From Dust to Glory. By Rev. M. J. Phelan, S.J. London : Longmans.
Dona Christi : Meditations. By Mother St. Paul. London : Longmans.
Worth : Lectures. By Rev. Robert Kane, S.J. London : Longmans.

OUR SILENT CONGREGATIONS

BY REV. J. J. M'NAMEE

THERE are no people in the world who throng so readily to their churches, and comport themselves so devoutly therein, as the Catholic people of Ireland. Some years ago we had quite an epidemic of self-constituted critics of our church-building activities, who besought us to moderate our zeal, warning us that we were building churches that were entirely too spacious for our congregations, and which, they were certain, would scarcely ever be filled. Time has proved that these good people were quite unnecessarily alarmed, for their fears have been altogether unjustified by the result. The truth is just the exact contrary to their expectation. In many cases the new churches are too small for the needs of the people; hardly can a case be found where a church is too large. And *pace* the pessimists, never was religion more flourishing in the Irish Church than at the present day. Never had the people (thanks to our zealous school-teachers and to our diocesan examiners) such an intelligent grasp of the truths of their faith. Never were the confessionals so much frequented by penitents. Never were the communion rails so thronged with devout seekers of the Bread of Life. Never were missions, confraternities and pilgrimages so popular. *βυρθεαδαρ λε οια αζυρ λε η-α ματαρη αζυρ λε ράοηαιο!*

But, despite their pre-eminent piety and devotion to church practices, the strange fact remains, that there are no people who evince so much reluctance to *active* participation in church functions as our Irish people. Their whole tendency in assisting at public devotions and liturgical functions is towards a state of devout passivity. They display a strange timidity in speaking aloud the responses to even the most familiar prayers in the vernacular; a certain reverent awe restrains them from joining heartily in popular hymns, with the words and music of which they are perfectly familiar; while, owing to their unfamiliarity with even the commoner

Latin hymns and chants, the greater liturgical functions make but small appeal to their devotion. In this respect our people compare very unfavourably with the continental Catholics, and especially with those of the Latin races. The contrast was vividly presented to the minds of those who participated in the great National Pilgrimage to Lourdes in 1913. It was quite a revelation to many of our pilgrims on that occasion to witness the zest with which the French and Belgians entered into ceremonies and processions; the verve and enthusiasm which they brought to the singing of their popular vernacular hymns; and above all, the taste and intelligence with which they sang the Latin Vespers, and many of the commoner chants of the liturgy. Nor, it is to be feared, is it the continental churches alone that excel us in these details of public worship. We must also admit in these matters, though in a less degree, the superiority of the British and American Churches as well.

What, then, is the cause of this strong tendency to silence and mere passivity in public worship on the part of our Irish congregations? Many will at once find the cause in the Penal Laws, which, driving the Irish Church into the catacombs for three centuries, broke her tradition of liturgical splendour, but grounded her people in the love and practice of that plain Low Mass, which, silent and chantless, was the sheet-anchor of Ireland's faith in the days of persecution. There is a danger, however, of our attributing too much to the Penal Days. The writer once knew an old priest—and a very worthy one—who had two formulae, by one or other of which he explained away or excused any detail in which either the practice of the Irish Church in general, or his own in particular, fell short of the exact requirements of the rubrics or the canon law. One was, 'The effects of the Penal Laws are with us still'; the other was that very useful theological tag 'sacramenta propter homines.' A zealous but somewhat cynical assistant of his once replied by parodying Madame Roland's famous dictum, 'Ye Penal Laws, what negligence is condoned in your name!' And most people will agree that, in ecclesiastical matters at least, if we still suffer from the effects of the days of persecution, it is mostly our own fault. It is nigh a century now since the Irish Church rose to a new life of civic liberty. She should ere this have finally cast aside the cerements and grave-clothes that bound her in the tomb of slavery.

How, then, shall we get our people to break with this bad

tradition of super-sensitive shyness in church, and teach them to become vocal in prayer and chant in the service of God? The answer is : by organized and persevering effort. Let us begin with the smaller things first, say, the papal prayers after Mass. Explain to the people that these prayers are supposed to be recited aloud alternately by priest and people. Appeal to them to raise their voices to honour the Mother of God in the 'Holy Mary' and the 'Hail, Holy Queen.' Point out to them the tender beauty of this latter prayer, with its plaintive appeal of the poor banished children of Eve to her whom they greet as 'our life, our sweetness and our hope.' But, and this is a most important point, let the prayer be recited by the priest so slowly, as to render it possible for the people to recite it with him. To try to recite it all in one breath is to attempt the impossible. It must be broken up into sections by an adequate number of breathing spaces, with which the people, following the priest, will very soon become familiar. In some places the custom prevails of priest and people reciting the *Salve* in alternate sections or verses, and it seems a very beautiful and devotional method, which might with advantage be more generally adopted.

Once the priest has succeeded in getting his congregation to respond to these prayers ('Hail Mary,' *Salve Regina*, and the Invocation to the Sacred Heart) he has made a beginning, but only a beginning. He will have a full-voiced response for one or two Sundays ; but, unless he returns to the subject again and again, the old tendency to mere passive assistance will infallibly reassert itself in a short time. It is largely a matter of habit, and new habits are acquired by repeated acts.

The next step might be to secure a proper response from the people to the recitation of the Holy Rosary. Again it will be a matter of sustained effort on the part of the priest. But it is worth while. The Rosary is pre-eminently the popular congregational prayer of the Irish people. Where two or three of them are gathered together, and the circumstances invite to joint prayer (the death-bed of a friend, for example, or some impending calamity), it is to the Rosary that they instinctively turn. Moreover, most Irish families are accustomed to recite it aloud in common every night at their own firesides ; it is only in church that they are content to answer it in an undertone, leaving the public recitation of it to the priest and his acolytes. This tendency must be

fought by frequent exhortation, and by various plans and devices. It is sometimes useful, for example, to leave, in alternate decades, the Hail Marys to the people, the priest himself answering the Holy Marys; or even to divide the people as they sit in the church into two 'choirs,' one answering the other, as in the choral recitation of the Divine Office. Another useful variation would be to have the 'Glory be to the Father' and the response chanted to one of the psalm tones, either in the vernacular, or, as in France, in Latin. This device has the further advantage of counteracting a very regrettable tendency to hurried and indistinct mumbling of this solemn doxology at the close of each decade. As a result of such well-sustained effort, the priest will have the consolation of hearing his people raising their voices with pious enthusiasm to the honour of God and His Blessed Mother in this their favourite prayer. Both he and they will note with satisfaction the contrast between this full-voiced organ swell of praise and supplication, and the dull and cheerless recitation of the same prayer, when the priest has no assistance save the thin and piping treble of a few acolytes.

Once the people have been accustomed to recite the Rosary aloud in this way, they will have found their speaking voice in church, and there will be but little trouble in getting them to respond in a similar way to all other such joint prayers, the Angelus, for example, the Litanies, the Divine Praises. But the priest must bear in mind that this will be impossible for his people unless these prayers are recited by him in a comparatively slow and deliberate fashion. Otherwise, after a vain effort to keep up with his cross-country pace, the majority must perforce abandon the attempt, leaving it to a few of their more daring and nimble-tongued brethren to pursue the officiant, in a breathless wordy race, that is 'admirable' only in the original Latin sense of the word.

When the people have been thus led to find their speaking voice in the church, the much more difficult task remains of teaching them to find their singing voice. Though there has been a marked improvement in recent years, it still remains true that congregational singing is comparatively rare in our churches and that our people, as a body, evince considerable disinclination to join in it. The cause is partly, no doubt, the neglect in most of our primary schools, until recent years, of even the most elementary musical education. This, how-

ever, is not the whole explanation ; for there are many who will join with great vigour in a popular chorus on a festive occasion but find themselves struck dumb when it comes to hymn-singing in church. The true cause is an extraordinary *mauvaise honte*, or silly shyness, that makes them shrink from the sound of their voices in the sacred surroundings of the church. Again there is needed, on the part of the priest, vigorous and persistent exhortation, and the adoption of some plan to give encouragement and to allay nervousness and timidity.

A beginning could be made with some easy popular hymn in the vernacular, suitable for singing before and after Benediction of the Most Holy Sacrament. If there be a confraternity in the parish, it will greatly facilitate the work of introducing general congregational singing ; for the director can very profitably devote a considerable part of the time of the weekly or monthly meetings to the teaching of hymns, which can then more easily be introduced amongst the congregation as a whole. If not, it will be found useful to select a number of the younger folk, boys and girls, who have got voices and are not afraid to use them, to teach the hymn to them, and then to have them scattered judiciously amongst the general body of the faithful in the church, to provide a lead for the others, and to sustain and encourage them in the beginning. When one or two hymns have been learned in this way the main difficulty will have been overcome : the people will have found their voices, and will soon come to discover in the singing a pleasing expression for the pious sentiments of their hearts. Suitable hymn-books can then be provided or placed in the Catholic Truth box ; the people will gladly avail of the opportunity, and new hymns will be learned without difficulty.

The next step should be to secure congregational singing of the entire Benediction Service. This will involve the teaching of the *O Salutaris*, the *Tantum Ergo*, and the *Laudate*, which can be done, as already explained, through the instrumentality of a confraternity, or by the help of a few specially trained young people strategically dispersed through the congregation. It should not be considered enough, however, for them to know merely the words and music of these Latin hymns ; an effort should also be made to teach them the meaning of the words, so that the singing of them may be for them a real prayer of devotion. This may seem a rather large order ; but if a serious effort be made it will be found

quite feasible. Take the *Laudate* for example. The order of the words is so direct, and the words themselves are so familiar from their English derivatives, that any person of average intelligence can easily be taught the meaning of the psalm in a few minutes. The same is true, though in a less degree, of the *O Salutaris* and the *Tantum Ergo*. Then, when the people, or a large percentage of them, have thus mastered the words and their meaning, the singing of the Benediction Service should on all ordinary occasions be left to them, reserving the musical pyrotechnics of the organ gallery for times of unusual solemnity.

So far we have been discussing the people's participation in popular devotions and non-liturgical functions: we now come to consider the more difficult question of their active assistance at the strictly liturgical functions, and especially at the great act of the liturgy, the *Missa Solemnis* or High Mass. And here we are faced at the outset by the fact that High Mass is extremely rare in our Irish churches, even in the stately cathedrals with which the piety of our people has studded the land, and which one would naturally expect to be great centres of liturgical splendour. Once again the Penal Laws are invoked as the explanation, with the addition that High Mass does not appeal to the devotion of our people. To which it may be replied that the Penal Laws are extinct for the past century; and that, if the High Mass does not appeal to our people, it is for the same reason that Low Mass does not appeal to a Presbyterian, because they are unfamiliar with it and do not understand it. Surely there must be something wrong, when the supreme act of Catholic worship, in its original and true form, makes no appeal to the most Catholic people in the world. We cannot admit that the fault is in the High Mass itself, for it is the original and still the normal rite of the Holy Sacrifice, for which the Low Mass is but a comparatively late and much curtailed substitute. The fault must therefore be found in the people themselves, or rather in their religious education.

What, then, is the remedy? Clearly the remedy is to be found in the schools, in which the programme of religious instruction might, with advantage, be made to require a much more detailed knowledge of the liturgy of the Mass than has been hitherto demanded. The objection will at once be raised, that the programme is already too extensive, and that any such enlargement would impose an undue strain on the energies of both teacher and pupils. There is much truth in

this contention, no doubt ; but room could easily be found for this important department of religious instruction, by excluding from the programme, and from the examinations, many questions in Bible History and in Christian Doctrine that frequently figure in both, and which seem entirely too advanced for even the higher classes in our primary schools. It is, of course, entirely a question of relative values ; but it would seem to the writer, at any rate, a better thing to have a senior standard know the words and meaning of the *Gloria in Excelsis* than to have them discourse learnedly on the reviviscence of Sacraments ; a more profitable expenditure of time and trouble to teach them to sing the *Credo* than to overload their memories with such details as the precise dimensions of the Ark of the Covenant.

If some simple scheme of liturgical instruction were adopted in our schools our boys and girls could easily be taught the words and meaning of the *Kyrie*, the *Gloria*, the *Credo*, the *Sanctus*, the *Agnus* ; and those of them who are musically inclined could easily learn, in addition, a simple Gregorian setting of the same, say the *Missa de Angelis*. This may seem a very large order, but it is by no means so difficult as it might at first appear. The present writer has seen a Solemn Mass, at which the entire music of these portions of the Ordinary was rendered in plain chant by a whole congregation, consisting of the members of a confraternity and the pupils of two schools, one a primary school and the other a secondary ; rendered, too, with the taste and devotion begotten of intelligent comprehension of the significance of the words and ceremonies. As the school children of to-day will be the men and women of to-morrow, it would be but a very few years till we should have a considerable percentage of our people capable of following with intelligence and devotion the venerable ritual of the Solemn Mass, and even of singing congregationally at least the easier portions of the Ordinary. High Mass might then become, as it ought to be, at least in the larger churches, the usual form of the Divine Liturgy at the principal Sunday Mass ; or, where this would not be possible owing to a dearth of sacred ministers, the *Missa Cantata* without deacon or sub-deacon, could be substituted. Thus, with a little effort and organization, we might hope to realize in Ireland what Pius X reminded us is the Church's liturgical ideal, the Solemn Mass with the entire congregation as a choir ; and we should remove from our most Catholic nation the reproach

of ignorance and neglect of that venerable liturgy in which the age-long tradition of the Western Church has enshrined the supreme act of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

There are many other liturgical prayers of frequent occurrence in the daily services of the Church, which one would like the people to know and understand. Take the Burial Service for example. What a pity they should know nothing of the meaning of those most beautiful prayers with which the 'Pia Mater' consigns her beloved children to their last long rest. Would it not be possible, with all the opportunities we have in the schools, to let the rising generation of Irish Catholics know something of the meaning of the *Libera*, the *In Paradisum*, the blessing of the grave, and the last prayers? Could they not be taught even to give the responses in the language of the liturgy? No doubt all this will seem very extravagant to hope for or expect, in the judgment of many readers. But we may point to the success of the Gaelic League in a similar attempt to teach the commoner prayers, even to adults, in a language much more difficult to read and pronounce than Latin. Watch an Irish language enthusiast (all honour to him) trying to teach a class of full-grown men and women the 'Ἄπ η-Δεῖται,' and I imagine you will soon be convinced that the *Pater Noster* could be taught in half the time and with but a tithe of the trouble. And why should not our people know and use the *De Profundis* as a prayer for their dead? Would it not be possible for the rising generation at least to recite it in alternate verses with the priest after Mass, thus sharing in those daily suffrages for the faithful departed which are peculiar to our Irish Church, and are offered to supply as far as may be for the foundation Masses that were lost during the days of persecution and confiscation? Then there is the *Magnificat*, Our Lady's own canticle, which might as easily be made as popular with our people as it has long been with the Catholics of France. The same might be said of the *Stabat Mater*, the *Te Deum*, whose wealth of beautiful thought and phrasing is a closed book to the vast majority of the Catholics of Ireland.

Much help could undoubtedly be given in this matter of educating the laity in matters liturgical by the publication of prayer-books that would keep more in touch with the liturgy than our popular books of devotion generally do. The Catholic Truth Society has done some good work in this field, but much still remains to be done. The great field of

operations is, however, unquestionably to be found in the schools; and there the work must, from the nature of the case, devolve principally on the priest, and on the ecclesiastical authorities who are responsible for the diocesan programme of religious instruction. With their opportunities, it should be easy, within a short time, to open up some at least of the treasures of our venerable liturgy, to the devout and receptive minds of a people who have too long been strangers to them.

J. J. M'NAMEE.

MODERN CHURCH BUILDING AND FURNISHING

By R. M. BUTLER, M.R.I.A., F.R.I.B.A.

I.

DURING the past couple of years several articles on church building and decoration have appeared in the *I. E. RECORD* and elsewhere betokening a revival of interest in this subject. Sundry conversations with priests and others induce me to think that some notes of a practical character on the subject of church building and decoration, by one who has had for many years to deal with these matters, may not be devoid of interest. I venture to offer some rather casual remarks in the hope that, possibly, they may prove helpful to some, and perhaps stimulate interest or discussion.

I propose to first touch briefly upon the general aspect of church building and design, and then to consider the chief points of decoration and furnishing.

Modern Irish churches have been the subject of a great deal of adverse criticism, much of it true, some of it merely ill-natured, and very little of it helpful.

One or two of the articles which appeared in the *I. E. RECORD* a year or two ago, to a large extent dealt with some aspects of church building, legal as well as constructional; into these I do not propose to follow in detail. As to the first, I think that of all subjects the law perhaps is that which best exemplifies the truth of the saying that 'a little knowledge is a dangerous thing,' and there is a dictum that 'the man who is his own lawyer, has a fool for his client.' I do not think that a slight acquaintance with the law of building is likely to be helpful. It is a most difficult and complicated branch of legal knowledge, understood by few, even amongst the ablest lawyers. The wisest course is to select the architect and the builder with care and discrimination, and so reduce the risk of litigation. No precaution can ensure immunity from dispute or law, but careful foresight and

prudent guidance may do much to avoid it. Above all, the selection of a builder with a reputation to lose will, more than anything else, tend to put it out of the region of probability. Such builders deserved to be encouraged, and should not be lightly passed over for the sake of a few pounds, for they can save a building owner large sums. They are more common than might be supposed, and when found, should be 'made a note of.'

If a building owner is so unfortunate as to have to face law, then the wisest course is to place himself in the hands of a solicitor in whose capacity and honesty he has absolute confidence, get him to submit the whole matter to some counsel of large experience and special knowledge of building law, and he will soon advise whether the case is worth fighting, or is one that ought to be settled.

It is unnecessary to remark that the modern contract system, based on keen competition in prices, hardly conduces to securing the best materials and workmanship, but it is difficult to find a substitute for it. Recently, owing to the difficulty of making fixed contracts during the war, many works have been carried out on the basis of the net vouched outlay on time and materials being charged, plus a percentage of profit for the builder; and granted a reliable contractor, this arrangement works fairly well; it has proved in some cases quite as economical in practice as the contract system, but, as a rule, it is costly work.

Messrs. Harland & Wolff's great ship-building undertakings have all been carried out on this basis, and, I believe, with perfect satisfaction to those concerned.

Another system is that of 'direct labour,' in which the building owner engages a reliable clerk of works, who employs the workmen and buys the materials. Many buildings have been carried out on this system, but its whole success hinges upon the personality of the clerk of works. Broadly speaking, this system tends towards securing good workmanship, but it is not economical, unless in exceptional circumstances.

If, in each province, a few builders were specially patronized for church work, after proved honesty and capacity, they, in time, would gain a reputation which they would be in no hurry to sacrifice.

A good clerk of works is simply invaluable, and is correspondingly rare: an indifferent one is useless, one might say worse than useless, for he is a broken reed upon which to lean.

The position of clerk of works demands many qualifications. The ideal clerk of works must be practical, possessed of wide experience, with a complete knowledge of all the ordinary trades employed in building, and a respectable acquaintance with many others; added to which he needs infinite tact to steer an even course. Needless to say, the highest integrity is a *sine qua non*. One reason why good clerks of works are scarce is, that men possessing all these qualifications in time usually find themselves engaged in contracting on their own account, this being the only direction in which a clerk of works or builder's foreman can look for advancement in life.

No amount of precaution will safeguard against a dishonest contractor. It is far cheaper to avoid him, and to pay an honest builder a trifle more.

One hears a great deal about the builders who do dishonest work, but very little about the many who honourably fulfil contracts at loss to themselves. If a builder is determined to be dishonest, no amount of watchfulness on the part of either architect or clerk of works will entirely prevent him, though it may do much to circumvent him.

In every work of importance, over a few thousands in value, a clerk of works should be employed. He can save his employer his pay in many ways, other than by detecting actual dishonesty on the part of the builder.

'Bills of Quantities' are an essential part of every building contract of any magnitude. They are the ground work of the contract system, and are prepared by quantity surveyors, a special branch of the building world, whose function is to take the architect's drawings, and usually his specification, if it is written before the quantities or detailed form of estimates are made out, and to set forth in detail therefrom the whole of the quantities of work required for the due execution of the works. These quantities take the form of a detailed estimate, unpriced, to which the competing builders attach their prices, and so frame their tenders. In the majority of cases, they do not examine the architect's drawings, they may look over them, and they rarely read the specification. Hence they rely absolutely upon the accuracy and fairness of the quantities. The reason for this procedure is the convenience of builders, as plainly it would be unreasonable to ask, say twelve builders, to measure a whole work on the chance of one of their number securing it.

I should not recommend an amateur to waste his time

seeking to acquire an expert knowledge of building construction or of materials. It can only be attained at the cost of many years of study. Few architects or builders have gained it without the expenditure of much time, or by dearly bought experience.

It may be laid down that all construction should be sound and honest, the best procurable materials alone being used. In church work sham and cheap construction should be shunned. Sound, honest materials and workmanship, howsoever plain the design may be, are infinitely to be preferred to cheap or showy deception, secured at the expense of good construction, a too common fault, sometimes due to the client's exacting demands, which cannot be realized for the sum available, sometimes to want of courage on the part of the architect, or perhaps to his inability to design a structure, plain, but at the same time artistic, a high test of skill in his calling.

The aesthetic aspect of building stands on a different plane. Time was when every man, aspiring to the culture of a gentleman, possessed a certain knowledge of the arts as part of his ordinary education. Since the eighteenth century this has unhappily ceased, and a study of art come to be considered a purely professional accomplishment, peculiar to those who practise the arts.

The standard of art has, as a consequence, fallen in these countries, and, moreover, many people who have never studied the subject deem themselves competent judges, and impose their taste in architecture, instead of being guided by the advice of those competent to judge.

A study of the writings of such authors as Ruskin and Pugin will be found very helpful in forming a correct taste. Pugin deals in much detail with the principles that should govern architectural detail, and the more one studies him the more clearly does one apprehend the vitality with which he seized upon medieval principles, extravagant as his language often is. His own designs, noble as they mostly are, are somewhat wanting in 'life,' and he was surpassed in the true assimilation of the medieval art by some of those who followed in England. The later school has got closer to the spirit of Gothic than he did, still he was a long way ahead of those who essayed to follow in his footsteps in Ireland. It was pioneer work, and his writings are worthy of all respect. Nothing better has been written on the subject.

Ruskin has enunciated some of the truest principles of art, but is not to be commended to the beginner without a word of caution. He was extravagant both in his denunciation and in his praise, and was not a practical architect. No one has however written better on the art of architecture. Some of the more modern publications on church architecture and furnishing, such as 'American Churches,' and the fine series of works by Mr. F. E. Bond and Dr. Cox on 'Church Furniture,' are valuable and instructive.

During the past eighty years, Ireland has gone through a great church-building era, now almost drawn to a close. It may therefore be thought that this discussion is rather belated, but there will always remain a certain amount of work to be done; many of the churches still require furnishing and decoration, so it is well to profit by the mistakes of the past. The churches built during this period have been the subject of very adverse criticism, and it must be admitted that few of them reached a high or even moderate standard. The reasons for this are plain. History explains clearly why the tradition of good church building had become lost to a greater extent in Ireland than in England. When the Penal Laws were relaxed the most pressing need was to provide accommodation for the congregations. The country had been for centuries ravaged and its ancient fanes laid in ruins. Moreover, the parochial system had never obtained in Ireland to any great extent, the ruins are those of monastic establishments; the inspiration of the village church of the Middle Ages was not present in Ireland, an inspiration so fruitful of good architecture in England during the corresponding period. It is rather remarkable that some of the churches built in Ireland in the first half of the nineteenth century, in Dublin and elsewhere, while the classical tradition still held sway, such as the Pro-Cathedral, Dublin; St. Nicholas of Myra; the Jesuit Church; St. Paul's, Arran Quay; the Franciscan Church, Merchant's Quay, etc., all reached a very respectable level in design, the old scholarly tradition lingering. Similar churches to these are to be found in Cork, and a few provincial cities and towns. In Dublin the Protestant Church of St. George, built very early in the century, ranks even higher as a design, the proportions and the detail are scholarly. St. Stephen's Protestant Church, Dublin, is also a good piece of design of its kind. All of these early nineteenth century churches are somewhat lacking in interest in the interiors.

When the 'Gothic taste,' as it was then called, first penetrated to Ireland, before the advent of the true Gothic revival, a desire to make the churches as imposing as possible, led to size and cheapness of ornamentation being preferred to quality. Later, in the Gothic revival proper, the high standard set by Pugin in his simple but impressive churches at Killarney and Enniscorthy was departed from. Those who followed were not content with his severe simplicity of detail and well-studied proportion, upon which he relied for effect when his resources were limited.

When Augustus Pugin the elder, father of the great Augustus Welby Pugin, started to revive the knowledge of Gothic, the art had been completely lost for centuries, and neither architects nor craftsmen had the slightest idea of how to handle it, their efforts in the 'Gothic taste' were often ludicrous. When A. W. Pugin came to design churches he found himself without craftsmen to carry out his ideas and designs. It was only by interesting certain persons, like Mr. Minton of Stoke-upon-Trent, the tile-maker, his 'ever dear Minton,' that he was enabled to make any headway, and to gradually train up a school of carvers and other artificers.

One fruitful cause of inferior work was the inordinate haste with which many churches were designed, built, and completely equipped. Architects were often required to design a church and prepare the drawings and details in a wholly insufficient space of time; builders were put into competition as to the shortest period in which they would erect the church, while the furnishing and equipment were hurried on, during the building, by various commercial firms, without any ideal or knowledge of architecture, individually or collectively, and without any sympathetic aim. This arrangement saved the architects time and thought, and was to the pecuniary advantage of those concerned, but not to the benefit of the building. Taking all into account, the wonder is not that so many churches are weak and even bad in design, but rather that so much sound building was done. It is said to be an invariable rule, that the demand creates the supply, so it is certain that the demand for rapid completion brought about inadequate study, hurried design, and careless building.

As a further result the architects, through want of practice and patronage, failed to gain that facility in the handling of the attendant arts, which constitute so necessary an adjunct to the artistic success of a building as a

whole. In other words, much of this work was taken out of their hands, and as a result, when it did come to them, they ingloriously followed the simple expedient of entrusting the work of the furnishing of the church to the commercial firms, which saved them much trouble. Moreover, many buildings in Ireland were designed by persons entirely unqualified as architects—unqualified, not merely in the sense of not being qualified by membership of some architectural society, but lacking the necessary knowledge of design.

Taking them as a whole, the churches of this era are soundly and not badly built. Some of them, one is tempted to think, too much so, or to paraphrase Shakespeare, 'would that this too too solid *stone* would melt'!

Some of the churches designed by the late J. J. MacCarthy, such as the Dominican Church in Dublin, and in particular, his fine church at Tramore, are amongst the best work done by a native architect in Ireland during the Gothic revival. The Romanesque Cathedral of Sligo, the apse and the demolished central tower of the Vincentian Church at Phibsborough, Dublin, by Goldie of London, and some of the Protestant churches designed by Lynn, Drew etc., are quite good. But far and away the two best modern churches in Ireland are Killarney Cathedral, by Augustus Welby Pugin, and the Protestant Cathedral of St. Finn Barr, Cork, by William Burges.

William Butterfield designed a very nice little chapel for St. Columba's Protestant College at Rathfarnham, Co. Dublin. The Byzantine Chapel of the Catholic University in Stephen's Green, Dublin, designed by Pollen for his friend Dr., afterwards Cardinal, Newman, has a beautiful interior, and is an admirable example of the right use of materials and the gaining of a fine effect with very moderate resources.

It would have been an admirable thing if a short course of lectures on the principles of art, with special reference to architecture and decorative design, could have been included as a regular part of the ecclesiastical curriculum. An Ecclesiological Society—in which priests, artists, and others interested in art would meet, read papers, and discuss matters of taste in design—would also have great influence in producing a higher standard.

In the eighteenth century, every nobleman or gentleman of means acquired a certain knowledge of the arts, particularly of the renaissance architecture of the day, as part of

his ordinary education, which was not complete until he had made the 'Grand Tour.' In England, the Earl of Burlington, and in Ireland, the Earl of Charlemont, recur to memory for their skill and discrimination in architecture. How good was the taste of the Irish nobility and gentry, whatever else their faults were, in the latter half of the eighteenth century, our splendid old Georgian mansions of Dublin and throughout the country testify. They introduced into Ireland many skilled architects, and were patrons of the other arts. Architecture has been well described as the 'mistress art,' and so it is, for it dominates all the others, but the same principles apply to all.

Before many years of the early Victorian period had passed, there was seen a universal decline in the standard of taste, although it was in these years that Pugin's best work was done. One or two men, like J. S. Mulvanny, architect of the splendid and universally admired Broadstone Terminus Dublin (1850), kept alight the lamp of classical art for years after it had died generally throughout the land. By the middle of the nineteenth century the old classical traditions of Ireland were wholly lost, and the Gothic spirit, lost centuries before, was never re-assimilated in this country.

Generally speaking, too much was attempted in the building of churches. Furniture, stained-glass, and decoration were all too cheap and too pretentious, and the work of the commercial firms, not of artists.

As to the broad question of design, I think the choice of a particular style of architecture is of comparatively little importance. It has been well said that it is 'style' not 'styles' that matters.

It is, however, right that the architecture of churches, in particular, should be based upon national and local traditions and, as far as practicable, built with local materials; foreign and exotic treatments and materials being avoided or sparingly used, and then only for good reason. In this way a sound vernacular treatment, rather than a new style, might gradually be evolved, traditional, but adapted to modern requirements.

There has lately sprung up in this country a notion that Romanesque architecture is in some peculiar way distinctively Irish, and that Gothic is equally foreign. In Ireland architecture followed pretty much the same course as in other countries. A distinctly national type of Gothic was evolved after a transitional period. During the several

centuries of the Gothic period, the country endured a more or less continuous state of warfare, and was frequently ravaged with fire and sword. It was when the native chieftains began to get back some of their power, while Edward III was occupied with his French wars, that the late Irish Gothic reached its zenith, and many fine abbeys were built or enlarged. The arts could not, however, attain their full growth under such conditions, so Irish Gothic was comparatively humble and unpretentious. It is, however, quite suggestive for modern inspiration and development. The beautiful Cistercian Abbey of Holy Cross, Thurles, full of the Southern French, or Spanish and Portuguese influence, is indicative of what a high development the native Irish Gothic might have attained to under more favourable circumstances.

The Irish Romanesque undoubtedly affords suggestion for the creation of a national style of church building, but it must be remembered that architecture, like nearly everything else, has in modern times tended to become cosmopolitan, rendering it more difficult to pick up the threads of native art. This is all the greater reason for salvaging the native tradition.

It is regrettable that in the remarkable literary and artistic renaissance of the last twenty years in Ireland, architecture has found no place. I have lately read, that the past year has seen the largest literary output ever known from the Irish publishing houses.

In the past the inspiration which might have been derived from the beautiful, and in many ways remarkable Irish Romanesque, and the racy and suggestive late Irish Gothic, have been almost entirely overlooked. The great thing, however, is to ensure that whatever is done is good of its kind. The first essentials are to secure good sound building, and freedom from vulgarity.

Architecture naturally divides itself into three main considerations. First, sound construction; second, good proportion; third, good detail. By detail, I mean the elegance and suitability of the forms, the mouldings and enrichments, employed with imagination as well as with a scholarly knowledge. Here some knowledge of the principles laid down by such writers as Ruskin and Pugin, and an acquaintance with the best examples of ancient, medieval, or modern art become invaluable. Anyone possessed of such knowledge will not readily fall into the error of perpetrating a vulgarity. The very use and object of a church implies that it should be free of sham or pretension.

Good taste in architecture may be formed by the study of ancient, medieval and good modern work. At home we have many examples of medieval work, which are not as well known as they should be. In England and abroad such remains are common and should be visited whenever opportunity offers. The best modern church work is to be found in England; the churches of architects like the late J. F. Bentley, designer of Westminster Cathedral, the late G. F. Bodley, R.A.,¹ or the late J. D. Sedding, etc., are always worthy of careful examination. It will be seen with what great taste the interiors are finished and furnished, and how well the true Gothic spirit has been understood, but not *copied*. Mr. Gilbert Scott, A.R.A., has designed for Liverpool a great Cathedral, which, when completed, will, I am sure, be the finest modern Gothic church in the world. Only a portion has, so far, been finished, but it gives some idea of what the whole will be like. The design has been handled in a most original and masterly fashion by the architect.

In America during the past few years, a most remarkable architectural revival has taken place. The recent public buildings reach a level of monumental classical dignity almost unapproached by modern work in Europe. Some of the best and most scholarly church work done anywhere is being carried on by a small group of architects, the pioneers in this ecclesiastical revival having been Mr. Ralph Adams Cram, of Boston, and his former partner, Mr. Bertram Goodhue, of New York. The noble Gothic chapel of the Military Academy at West Point, by Mr. Cram, and their many churches throughout the United States, are monuments to their scholarly knowledge and taste. In particular may be noted the elegance and originality with which the true Gothic spirit, as distinct from copyism, has been revived. The carved oak chancel screens, pulpits, and other fittings are especially worthy of attention.

The Plan of the Church.—The ground plan of the church is of considerable importance, and tradition still exerts a great influence on its form. It should be designed with due regard to comfort and convenience, and the plans of old churches may, with much advantage, be studied. The proportions of the plan materially contribute to the ultimate effect of the building, a fact often

¹ Mr. Bodley's church at Hoar Cross, and others of his, and Mr. Bentley's Church of the Holy Rood, Watford (half-an-hour's journey from Euston), are amongst the most excellent examples I know.

lost sight of. The most common faults in modern Irish church plans are: the nave is almost always too wide and too short for the size of the church and is often too low; the columns of the nave are too thin and mean. These defects are probably in part brought about by the modern desire to obtain a good view of the altar from every point, and to build cheaply. Sometimes there are too many parts, such as nave, aisles, and transepts, for the size of the building, which would be bettered by the omission of one or other, and the space so gained added to the remainder. The most usual defect in Irish churches is the miserably small size of the chancel or sanctuary; even in the largest and most pretentious churches the chancel is often little better than a recess for the altar. No economy is so dearly bought, and none results in such loss of dignity and effect. Nothing tends more to give importance to an interior than a deep, spacious chancel, affording ample space for ceremonies and offices. Most modern churches in Ireland, would be vastly improved by the taking down of the eastern gable and the lengthening of the chancel. It is rare to find an old church, even in a country village, without a dignified chancel.

Sufficient thought is hardly given to the appropriate planning of such adjuncts as baptistery, mortuary chapel, sacristy, confessionals, etc., so as to make them, as it were, part of the plan, and not excrescences.

In many of the modern Irish churches it strikes one forcibly that too much proportionately has been expended upon the shell or fabric, and too little upon its interior decoration and furnishing, though actually, in point of fact, the reverse may be the case. One often sees a church of lofty size, with elaborate stone facing, much costly cut stone, lacking either points of concentrated interest, or uniform elegance of detail, with cheap and ugly Welsh slates, with a thin and poor varnished roof interiorly; mean looking benches, confessionals and stations, decorations chiefly consisting of stencil patterns promiscuously distributed, obviously not the work of artists; stained-glass of bad design and execution; marble altars in which the material is unsuitably applied, brass and other metal work of stock pattern, and so forth. How much better it were had a simpler structure been built, with a better roof and roof covering, and richer and more appropriate furniture and fittings provided.

R. M. BUTLER.

NAN-HOAI-JEN

EARLY JESUIT IN CHINA

BY REV. C. AHERNE

Now that the Missions to China are creating such widespread enthusiasm it may not be out of place to give some account of a remarkable early Jesuit Missionary in that country. With the exception of the first few pages the following paper is taken, in great measure, from the French of *Le Christianisme en Chine en Tartaire et au Thibet*, by the Abbé Huc, author of the celebrated *Travels in Tartary, Thibet and China*. Should the reader be led by the perusal of what follows to read the original four volumes of the author he is sure to enjoy an intellectual feast.

The subject of this article was called Nan-hoai-jen in China, and Father Ferdinand Verbiest, S.J., in Europe. He was born near Courtrai, in Belgium, in 1623, and after joining the Society of Jesus went through a most brilliant course of studies in Spain. Filled with zeal for the glory of God and the salvation of souls, his petition to be allowed to go out to the missions was acceded to, and he was sent by his superiors to China.

It will be remembered that Father Ricci and his companions, stimulated by the zeal and example of St. Francis Xavier, had succeeded in opening the door of China, by exciting the interest, first of the mandarins at the coast, then of a number of viceroys, and finally, of the court at Peking, by displaying maps, illustrated and beautifully-bound books, clocks and watches, mathematical instruments, and especially by their own virtues, philosophical, and mathematical attainments. Father Ricci had the advantage of being a pupil in Rome of the celebrated Father Clavius, S.J., 'the Euclid of his time,' and the man who did most to bring about the reform of the calendar, and to ensure its success, under Gregory XIII.

Father Schall was one of the greatest successors of Father

Ricci. He was in high favour with the last of the Ming Emperors, who commissioned him to correct the imperial calendar. When the revolution destroyed this dynasty he was continued in office under the first ruler of the Manchu dynasty, with whom he became a great favourite. He was appointed president of the Board of Mathematics or Astronomy and, in spite of his will, was created a mandarin of high rank. His elevated position made the provincial authorities friendly to the scattered Missionaries, and the number of conversions increased rapidly. In 1617 the Christians were only 13,000; in 1650 they were 150,000, and in 1664, the period at which we have arrived, they numbered 255,000. Father Schall was even sanguine that the young Emperor would embrace Christianity, but his hopes were dashed by the death of the latter at the early age of twenty-four, in 1662. He left as his successor his son Khang-hi, a boy of only eight or ten years old.

We now come to a turning point in the life of the venerable Missionary. The four regents, who were charged with the government of the Empire during the minority of Khang-hi, began to rule with a high hand. It became gradually known that they were hostile to Christianity and did not like the Missionaries, and it was everywhere felt that the storm would break at any moment. Two years before this time Father Verbiest had arrived in Peking. He had worked for some years in the provinces, but on his reputation for mathematics reaching the capital he was officially ordered to come to the court. His journey was one triumphal march, and he was appointed to assist Father Schall in rectifying the calendar.

The persecution was suddenly precipitated in 1664, by the action of a Mohammedan mandarin and astronomer named Yang-kwang-sien. Perceiving the evil disposition of the regents, he presented them with a memorial filled with blasphemies against Christianity and calumnies against the Missionaries, especially against Father Schall. He was emboldened to do this because he knew that the old Missionary was physically unable to defend himself. He had a sudden stroke of paralysis, brought on probably through anxiety for the Missions, which rendered him speechless and deprived him of the use of his hands, and his enemy thought it would be easy to obtain the condemnation of a man who could neither speak nor write in his own defence. On receiving this horrible description of Christianity the regents

affected to be filled with consternation, and they hastened to proscribe it, and to forbid the Chinese to embrace it, under the most severe penalties. Catholics were menaced and ordered to abandon their religion without delay. The viceroys of the eighteen provinces were commanded to capture the preachers of the Gospel and send them to Peking to be judged. The Mission-stations were ruined and all the Missionaries, amounting to about twenty Jesuits, two or three Dominicans and a Franciscan, were ignominiously carried as prisoners to Peking, and tried at various tribunals. After several months of annoyance they were condemned to be beaten with bamboos and to be sent as exiles into the depths of Tartary. Father Verbiest and Father Schall were bound with nine chains each and dragged by ten furious satellites before various tribunals. The former wrote from his narrow cell to his Provincial as follows :—

How much more agreeable to me is the rattle of the nine chains in which I have been dragged thirty times before the tribunals than the ovations with which I was honoured in my journey through more than thirty towns when I was called to the court. I write this because I know the courage of our members is inflamed at the sight of prisons and tortures, and that those provinces where such torments are to be expected are those that are most sought for by the sons of St. Ignatius. Would that it were given to me to appear with an entire palm, reddened by martyrdom, instead of having to show but a few leaves, a few flowers, that soon fade ! Would that it were permitted to me to appear with a cross of Japan, or a sword plunged in my heart ! May God preserve me, while thus expressing myself, from becoming a fruitless tree.

Father Schall was finally tried, with great parade and pomp, before the two supreme courts of justice, the Tribunal of Rites and the Criminal Tribunal—the former to determine the guilt and the latter to impose sentence. It was a touching spectacle to see this old priest, of seventy-five years of age, bound with nine chains, unable to answer a word to the terrible charges of his accusers and the violent interrogatories of the presiding mandarins, who were filled with hatred and prejudice against him. But God had not left him without a defender. Father Verbiest arose, and above the rattle of his chains and the murmurs of his adversaries, made his voice ring out in a noble defence of the Christian religion, and of his old friend ; and made a generous attempt to deflect the storm upon himself. He did all this in such a magnificent address that even his enemies ‘ could scarce forbear to cheer.’ But the hatred against Father Schall was too great and he was condemned to be strangled. This

sentence appeared to be too light to satisfy the bitterness of his enemies ; so the two tribunals held a joint sitting and sentenced him to be cut into a thousand pieces. This is the most cruel and the most degrading punishment in China. The body of the condemned is cut into small pieces, beginning with the fingers and toes, and after each amputation the blood is staunched by means of quicklime and a red-hot iron.

The sentence was passed on the 15th of April, 1665, and on the next day was presented to the four regents for their confirmation. That day Peking was shaken by frequent and violent shocks of earthquake, which filled the people with the utmost consternation. According to the custom usual on such occasions a general amnesty was granted to all except to Father Schall. The prisons were thrown open and the Missionaries were relegated to Canton. Father Verbiest and three other Jesuits were kept prisoners in their house at Peking, in case their services should be needed by the Government.

Father Schall, as has been said, was the sole exception to the general amnesty. As the shocks were renewed and part of the palace took fire the general consternation continued, and they did not dare to execute the general sentence upon him. The chief regent, Sony, assembled his colleagues and said that the honours heaped on Tang-jo-wang (Chinese name of Father Schall) by the late Emperor, should be a motive for not acting precipitately. He said he feared that the young Emperor would some day bring them to an account for their treatment of a man whom his father had loved and protected. His advice was, then, to shelter themselves by obtaining a decision from the Empress-Mother (the Mother of the late Emperor), so that her signature would exculpate them in case of blame. Sony hoped in this way to save Father Schall. The others accepted his counsel, and the four went solemnly to the Empress-Mother and presented the sentence of the two supreme tribunals which condemned Tang-jo-wang to be cut into a thousand pieces. She was filled with indignation on reading this sentence. She threw it on the ground, stamped on it with her feet, and asked the regents if they had forgotten the esteem and consideration which her son had for a man whom they ought to respect instead of treating as a criminal. She imperiously ordered them to set him at once at liberty. The venerable Missionary did not long survive his sufferings for the Faith. He died on the 15th of the following August.

The next year, the year 1666, which was marked by the death of Sony, the eldest of the regents, was a memorable epoch in the annals of China. The young Emperor, Khanghi, was still a boy, but a boy of extraordinary precocity. From the death of his father he energetically practised military exercises to please the Manchus, and he applied himself most assiduously to science and letters, in study of which consist the greatest merit of the Chinese. He was extremely energetic, courageous, intelligent, and persevering; so that the greatest hopes were entertained of him. Many interesting and characteristic anecdotes are given in the annals of China of this extraordinary youth, whose history was in many respects like that of the Grand Monarch, Louis XIV, whose contemporary he was. He was fourteen years of age when the death of Sony was announced to him. He at once convoked a council of the regents, the presidents of the great tribunals, and the highest dignitaries of the Empire. He presented himself with a noble assurance in the midst of this imposing assembly and after a few moments of profound silence, he declared that the council of regency no longer existed, and that from that moment he would take up the reins of government himself. Chinese historians declare that though he was so young he governed with a wisdom and application which elicited the admiration of his subjects. He gained the love of his people and his proficiency in military tactics and learning placed him above the most qualified in either.

It was early in his reign that that man of sin, that son of perdition, who had caused such terrible sufferings to the Missionaries and their helpless flocks, was the unwilling instrument used by God for the freedom and glory of His religion. Yang-kwang-sien, that intriguing and ambitious Mohammedan mandarin, who attacked them with such virulence, and posed as a patriotic defender of the national honour and the doctrines of antiquity, had his own personal ends in view all the time. When he had ruined and discredited Father Schall he succeeded in getting himself appointed by the regents in his place as president of the Board of Mathematics, by posing as an accomplished astronomer. In this office it was his duty to draw up the imperial calendar, a matter that was always considered in China of the deepest public concern.

Under the Emperors the publication of the calendar was always an affair of the utmost importance. Nothing was

ever published with greater solemnity. The Emperor himself distributed the first copies at court. The princes of the blood, the ministers of state and the presidents of the superior tribunals received it on bended knees. It was sent every year in imperial yellow wrappers to tributary kings and to the Mongol princes. To refuse to receive it was to declare rebellion in the most audacious manner. During periods of revolution, when there were several competitors for the throne, each issued his calendar, and the people in accepting it from one or the other thereby declared on whose side they were. It was a kind of universal suffrage for the head of the State. From this will be understood the importance attached by the sovereigns of China to the publication of the calendar.

Since Yang-kwang-sien had been placed at the head of the Board of Mathematics, or Astronomy, the nation gradually lost confidence in the calendars he fabricated. The highest dignitaries, especially, openly manifested their misgivings and said they doubted whether Yang-kwang-sien knew how to contemplate the heavenly bodies and measure their movements with precision. By the time Khang-hi had reached his twenty-first year he had heard of the doubts expressed, not only by these great personages but also by the common people, and he wished to know what was best to be done. He consulted his principal ministers, and these said they were incompetent to advise on the subject. One of them more courageous than the rest told him that the European mathematicians had a great renown for astronomy all over the Empire; that they had been exiled during his minority, but that a few were still left at Peking and that the most prudent thing would be to consult them on the matter.

Khang-hi found this advice full of wisdom, and sent the four Kalaos, or chief ministers of state, to the Jesuits, to inquire if, perchance, some error had glided into the calendar for the current, and into that for the following year. Father Verbiest replied that the calendars of Yang-kwang-sien bristled with errors. He said, in particular, that the ignorant astronomer had given the following year thirteen lunar months instead of twelve. The Chinese year begins with the new moon and ordinarily consists of twelve lunar months. On account of the number of days and hours that the solar year exceeds twelve lunar months an extra lunar month has to be intercalated once every three, and sometimes once every two, years, in order to get both years to start

about the same time once more. Now Yang-kwang-sien was rather generous in throwing these extra months into the middle of years that did not require them. The mandarins, who were informed of this and other gross errors in the calendar, went at once to report to the Emperor, who was so astonished that he ordered the European Missioners to be called to the palace next day. They were introduced in the presence of all the mandarins of the Board of Astronomy. Khang-hi placed Father Verbiest in front of him and, assuming a gracious air, asked, 'Is it true that you can show us clearly that the calendar is not in accord with the heavens?' Father Verbiest answered that the demonstration would not be difficult; that one of the purposes of the instruments of the Observatory was to spare persons engaged in affairs of estat from the trouble of long and embarrassing methods.

If Your Majesty [he continued] desire to see an experiment, all that is required is to place an upright style on a table or chair in one of the open courts of the palace, and from its height I shall calculate the length of its shadow, at noon, for any day you like to propose. From this it will be easy to determine the height of the sun, and from that its place in the zodiac. You will then be able to see, without trouble, if its true place is marked for that day in the calendar.

This proposal frightened the Astronomical mandarins, but pleased Khang-hi. He noticed their embarrassment with amusement, and asked them if they understood this method of calculation, and if they could make forecasts from the length of a single shadow.

Yang-kwang-sien boldly asserted that he was thoroughly conversant with the method, which was a sure means of ascertaining the truth. He added that, this being so, it was not becoming to the greatness of the Empire that the Son of Heaven should make use of the science of the men of Europe, that barbarous region where the principles of civilization were unknown. Seeing that he was listened to with patience, he tried to cloak his ignorance by making a diversion in appealing to the prejudices of his hearers in a furious tirade which he launched against the Christian religion. His violence displeased the Emperor, who interrupted him and said drily :

I have already declared that the past should be forgotten and that we should now devote our attention to questions of astronomy alone. Why have you had the temerity to hold such language in my presence? Have you not, yourself, solicited me in different petitions to order that search should be made throughout the Empire for the most competent

astronomers? That search has been going on in vain during the last four years. Nan-hoai-jen, who perfectly understands mathematics, has been here all the time and you have never spoken to me of his knowledge. I see that you seek only your own advantage and that you are not a man of good faith.

Then, assuming a smiling air, he put several questions to Father Verbiest, and ordered the prime minister to make arrangements for the proposed experiment. The courtiers perceived at once that he liked the Europeans. He wished to have men of merit near him and he was struck by the faces of these foreigners, which he found full of intelligence, openness and uprightness, things that he did not always discern on Chinese countenances.

When the experiment was about to take place Yangkwang-sien said he did not understand the method of these Europeans. On hearing this the Emperor was filled with indignation, but he thought it well to bide his time until the charlatan was convinced of his ignorance in the presence of his partisans and protectors. The first experiment was made at the Observatory, in the midst of an immense concourse of mandarins. The end of the shadow of the style fell, at the time appointed, exactly on the spot previously marked by Father Verbiest. All the mandarins appeared to be extremely surprised. The Emperor, hearing of the result with a lively interest, ordered that it should be repeated next day. He, himself, fixed that the style should be two feet two inches in length, and that the length of the shadow should be determined for noon. Verbiest prepared a long board to rest on the level, with feet and inches marked upon it, and to the end of this he attached an upright of the required length to serve as a style. The next morning he carried this to the palace, and drew a transversal line on the horizontal board to indicate where the end of the shadow would fall at twelve o'clock. He pointed the long horizontal board north and south on a table in one of the open courts. The sun shone brilliantly, but, as it was a winter's morning and the sun low down, the style cast a shadow of enormous length, with its end far away from the table. When the mandarins saw this they began to smile and chuckle maliciously at what they thought would be the sure discomfiture of the Missioner. Not long before mid-day the shadow suddenly contracted itself on to the table, then to the western side of the board, and at twelve o'clock it stood exactly on the line marked by Father Verbiest. The mandarins expressed their surprise

and admiration, and the prime minister exclaimed, 'We have a great man here.'

Khang-hi was informed of the success of the observation, and he received the instrument most graciously. But as he considered that an affair of such importance could not be examined with too great care he wished that the experiment should be made for the third time on the platform on the top of the tower of the Observatory. Father Verbiest made it with such success that his enemies, who were obliged to be present, could not help admitting that he was right, and praising the European method.

After this he received an imperial order to examine the calendar of Yang-kwang-sien. He made a collection of the most flagrant errors with regard to the position of the moon and the planets for each lunar month, and presented a memorial on the subject. Khang-hi, as if the safety of the Empire depended upon it, convoked a meeting of all the princes, the principal officers of state, the superior mandarins and the presidents of the supreme courts of Peking. He sent a copy of Father Verbiest's memorial beforehand to each in order to enable them to form a correct opinion on the matter. He did not love the late regents and disapproved of their system of administration, especially their treatment of the Europeans, and he wished to profit by this question of the calendar to annul all their acts. It was for this reason that he gave all the solemnity possible to this assembly. Father Verbiest's paper was publicly read and long discussions followed. The principal members declared that, as the correction of the calendar was a matter of the first importance and astronomy a difficult subject, it was necessary to examine publicly by means of the instruments of the Observatory into the faults alleged by the European. This decree having been approved by the Emperor, Verbiest and Yang-kwang-sien received an order to prepare without delay to make observations as to the position of the sun, moon, and planets, and to explain in writing the method they followed. The Missionary obeyed with pleasure and presented his explanation to the Board of Rites. As a test the Emperor directed him to make three forecasts which were to be publicly verified at the Observatory at the appointed time. The first was to foretell what would be the altitude of the sun at noon on a given day. Eighteen days in advance Verbiest marked the position on the great meridian circle and sealed it with his seal, and also

indicated the minute of the ecliptic which the sun would occupy. At the appointed time the sun stood exactly over the spot marked by him, and a large sextant, of six feet radius, set to the equator of the heavens, showed the sun's distance from the equator, and consequently its position on the ecliptic, which exactly coincided with that foretold by him. The second test was to forecast an eclipse of the moon. It took place, as he had said, fifteen days later. This observation was of the utmost importance to Father Verbiest. The position of the moon amongst the stars in the zodiac, when the eclipse took place, was carefully noted by the mandarins, and as they all knew that the sun was then on the opposite side of the celestial sphere, it was patent to all, on looking at the zodiacal circle in the Observatory, that the sun was entering the constellation of Pisces. From this it was obvious that there was no room for a thirteenth moon that year, and that the calendar was evidently wrong. The third test was to forecast the angular distances of the planets on a given night and hour, as indicated by the Emperor. Verbiest calculated these distances and marked them on a planisphere several days in advance, in the presence of many mandarins. His forecasts were verified in every case by actual observation, and proved how erroneous the calendar was.

When Khang-hi was informed of the results he wished that the affair should be solemnly and definitely examined by his Council, but the Chinese astronomers, whose work was censured, obtained, contrary to custom, permission to be present, and by their artifices they found means to divide the votes of the assembly. The mandarins who presided could not bear that the Chinese astronomy should be set aside to give place to that of Europe. They maintained that the dignity of the Empire did not permit innovations of that kind, and that it was better to keep to the ancient methods, with all their faults, than to introduce new ones, especially when it was necessary to receive them from strangers. They spoke in honourable terms of the Chinese astronomers, for the zeal which they testified for the glory of their country, and proclaimed them to be defenders of their ancestors and of venerable antiquity. The Manchu mandarins took the other side and attached themselves to the opinion of the Emperor, who was favourable to Father Verbiest. The discussion became long and heated. At last Yang-kwang-sien, who had gained the ministers of state on his side, and

NAN-HOAI-JEN

counted on their protection, had the boldness to address the Manchus in this way: 'If you give the advantage to Nan-hoai-jen, in receiving the astronomy which he has brought from Europe, rest assured that the Manchus will not be long in China.' At these words, which they took as a veiled threat, the Manchu mandarins arose in indignation, and the Emperor ordered that Yang-kwang-sien should be loaded with chains and taken to the public prison. On his trial all the tribunals found him guilty and his friends turned bitterly against him. He was condemned to death, but the Emperor, out of pity for his great age, commuted his sentence to perpetual exile in the steppes of Tartary.

This event accentuated the striking triumph of Father Verbiest, and it had the most favourable consequences for the Missions in China. He wrote (*Astronomia Perpetua*, p. 20):—

One can form only with difficulty an idea of the influence that this affair exercised over this vain and proud nation. In spite of itself it could not help saying, 'If the astronomy of these Europeans, which they study only to relax their minds and which, according to themselves, they put only in the second place, is so well in harmony with the laws of heaven, how can it be otherwise than that the religion which they profess with such zeal, and which they have come to preach from the other end of the world, is in conformity with reason?'

Father Verbiest was at once appointed president of the Board of Astronomy, and charged to reform the calendar and the method of astronomy used in China. As a commencement he presented a memorial to the Emperor, showing the necessity of erasing the intercalated month from the calendar of the current year. Khang-hi, who was favourable to the proposal, had it examined by his Council. But all the members opposed it on account of the changes which it would involve in the public acts in all the provinces. The national honour, they maintained, would be gravely compromised. How could they acknowledge such a gross error in face of the Celestial Empire? How could they dare to say to the tributary peoples that the Son of Heaven had sent them a calendar completely out of harmony with the stars? They presented, without avail, several requests against the proposal of Father Verbiest. As a last resource they assembled one hundred and sixty members of the Board of Astronomy in the hope of bending him. They conjured him to devise some combination, so as to hide the error and safeguard in the eyes of the people and foreign courts the prestige

of the Government. Verbiest was immovable. He answered that the withdrawal of the intercalated month appeared to him right and indispensable, and that as the heavens were out of harmony with the calendar it was not in his power to make them agree. As the heavens could not make concessions to the calendar it was for the calendar to give way. The Emperor, in his quality of Son of Heaven, settled the question by publishing an edict suppressing the intercalated month.

Great was the astonishment from one end of the Empire to the other, and amongst the neighbouring peoples, when they came to know that a certain Nan-hoai-jen, a barbarian from the depths of the West, had sufficient power to suppress a whole month in the calendar that had been launched into the world by the Son of Heaven. The reputation of the Europeans became considerable in China from that out, and the harassed Christians experienced an end to the evils with which they were overwhelmed. Father Verbiest made use of the confidence which the Emperor had in him to obtain the recall of the Missionaries from Canton to their several Mission stations. An opportunity for doing this presented itself very naturally. Khang-hi invited all who had suffered during his minority to have recourse to him. Father Verbiest presented a memorial, in which he stated that by a crying injustice the authority of the Emperor had been abused to proscribe the law of the true God and banish its teachers. This memorial was first rejected by the tribunal appointed to examine it. Father Verbiest asked for other judges and the Emperor acceded to his appeal. It was finally carried before a general assembly of the great mandarins. After studying the matter for seven days they declared that the Christian religion had been unjustly condemned, and that it taught nothing that was contrary to the good of the state or the duties of subjects. As a consequence the Missionaries were allowed to return to their former posts, but no permission was given to make converts, or to open new stations. This did not much matter as long as the Emperor was known to be so friendly, but it left a loop-hole, which was made use of with deadly effect, later on, by some powerful and bigoted viceroys. The Catholic mandarins who had been deposed were reinstated, and the memory of Father Schall was publicly vindicated. His honorific titles were restored and his ancestors ennobled. The Emperor granted a large sum for the erection of a splendid

monument in his honour, with marble statues and other symbolical figures, according to the custom of the country. This beautiful monument was still intact when Abbé Huc visited Peking in 1850, and was, according to him, worthy of the great monarch who caused it to be erected and of the illustrious Missionary in whose honour it was raised. In the year that the Missionaries were allowed to return no fewer than twenty thousand infidels were converted and baptized. Amongst these courageous and fervent neophytes was a maternal uncle of the Emperor and a high commander in the Manchu army. Father Verbiest was the heart and soul of every enterprise in China for the glory of God and the advancement of religion. At the same time he advanced daily in the good graces of Khang-hi. This untiring young prince had a decided taste for science. During five months the Missionary had to go every day to give him lessons in mathematics and astronomy. He had in his library all the scientific books written in Chinese by the Jesuits, amounting to one hundred and twenty volumes, and he wished for an explanation of the most difficult parts.

At the break of day [writes Father Verbiest] I went to the palace. I was at once admitted to the apartments of Khang-hi, and often I did not leave them before three or four in the afternoon. Alone with the Emperor, I used to read and explain. Frequently he kept me to dinner, and had the most exquisite meats served to me in vessels of gold. These marks of benevolence were truly extraordinary, when it is remembered that in China the Emperor is revered as if he were a divinity, that he is rarely seen, especially by strangers. Ambassadors from distant courts esteem themselves fortunate when they are permitted to see him once, and then they are allowed to do so only from afar. His ministers of state and nearest relatives pass before him in silence and with signs of great veneration. If they have occasion to speak to him they kneel down in front of him.

To lay a solid foundation the Emperor studied the six books of Euclid that had been translated by Father Ricci into Chinese, with astonishing application, under the direction of Father Verbiest. Though he had a thorough knowledge of Chinese, in order to feel more perfectly at home in them he had them translated into Manchu, and in order to be more free in his communications with Father Verbiest he appointed one of his most trusted servants to teach him that language. He got lessons from Father Verbiest, not only in mathematics but in all other branches of science, as well as music. The zealous Missionary gradually disabused him entirely of the fables and superstitions of the pagans, and, at favourable

moments, made him acquainted with the truths of the Christian faith, and showed him their holiness and sublimity. The young Emperor was so impressed that one day he was heard to say that the Christian religion would insensibly destroy all other religions. Nevertheless, he did not dare to declare himself openly. He contented himself with protecting a religion of which he admired the purity and excellence. He had a real affection for the Missionaries, founded not only on the capacity of Father Verbiest, who was regarded as the ablest man in the Empire, but also on the certainty he had acquired, through his secret agents, of the innocence of their manners and the austere and laborious lives which they led at home. He knew everything that took place there, even to their private mortifications. He was, moreover, persuaded that their zeal in his service was disinterested, and that they had no other object but to accredit their religion and teach it to his subjects throughout his dominions. It was an immense step to have gained so much and to have convinced the Chinese that the Europeans had astronomical principles and instruments superior to their own, and thus to have disabused them of the vain and false idea they had of themselves.

The members of the Board of Astronomy were so dominated by the superiority of their new president; they had such confidence in his talents that, forgetting their jealousy, they addressed a petition to the Emperor, begging of him to give an order to Nan-hoai-jen to cast new instruments for the Observatory according to European principles, and to supply means for the purpose. Khang-hi issued a public decree charging him with this important and difficult undertaking. The able Missionary set to work at once, and his efforts were crowned with complete success. He then explained the method of construction, the theory and the use of the instruments, in six volumes, written in Chinese.

In May 1674, he presented the six instruments which he had constructed. They were a quadrant, six feet in radius; an azimuth compass, six feet in diameter; a sextant, eight feet in radius; a celestial globe, six feet in diameter; and two armillary spheres, zodiacal and equinoctial, each six feet in diameter. They were made of bronze, burnished to look like brass, and were so beautifully ornamented with dragons and other figures as to be real works of art. In spite of their great weight they were very easily manipulated, and,

considering the time and the means at his disposal, they were a triumph of the mechanical skill and mathematical knowledge of Father Verbiest. They were in a perfect state of preservation in 1900, the time of the Boxer rising, when the international troops admired them on the platform of the tower of the Observatory, where he had installed them more than two centuries and a half before. Verbiest, who was indefatigable and endowed with prodigious facility, was not long before he was able to offer to his imperial patron thirty-two volumes, in Chinese, on astronomy and mathematical sciences, and a calculation of eclipses of the sun and moon for two thousand years, ornamented with plates and explanations. Khang-hi received this monumental work with lively satisfaction and issued a decree in which he ordered that it should be kept in the archives of the Empire. In order to reward the author he promoted him to be supreme president of one of the sovereign courts in Peking. As soon as the modest priest had knowledge of this distinction he sent in a petition stating that his profession of religious did not allow him to accept such an honour. But he was not listened to, and his fear of giving offence and injuring religion caused him to submit, but with great regret, to receive the following diploma, and to hear it publicly read in the presence of the Emperor, in one of those magnificent and unrivalled halls of the imperial palace :

Eulogium and Titles accorded to Nan-hoai-jen, in a General Assembly held to compliment the Emperor on the occasion of the birth of a successor to the Empire.

DECREE OF THE SON OF HEAVEN.

The form of a well-regulated State requires that good actions and services promptly rendered to the State should be recompensed and duly praised. It is also the part of a prince who governs wisely according to the laws to praise virtue and exalt merit. That is what we do by these letters patent, which, according to our will, are to be published everywhere throughout our Empire, in order to make known to all what regard we have for the services which have been rendered to us with such application and diligence.

That is why, you, Nan-hoai-jen, to whom I have committed the care of my imperial calendar, the rectitude and vigilance which you have displayed in my service, as well as the profound knowledge in every branch of science by the constant application of your mind—all these things have obliged me to establish you at the head of my astronomical academy. You have responded to our expectations, and by working day and night you have fulfilled the duties of your charge. Finally, you have happily brought all your designs to a successful issue, through indefatigable labour of which we ourselves have been the witness.

It is becoming that on the occasion of this great festival, in which all my Empire comes to rejoice with me, I should make you feel the effects of my imperial favour and the esteem in which I hold your person. This is why that, by a singular favour, we accord to you the title of Great Man, which ought to be rendered celebrated everywhere. We order that this title be sent to every portion of our Empire and to be published there. . . . You are the only one on whom I have conferred this favour,' etc.

These marks of favour on the part of the Emperor had an enormous influence in promoting missionary work in the provinces, where the mandarins and people treated the Missionaries as brothers of Nan-hoai-jen.

Soon after this he was requested by the ruling Manchus to come to their assistance in a way that was extremely repugnant to him. Several provinces in the south rose in an attempt to drive out the Manchus. Fifty thousand conspirators were discovered in Peking; the excitement was great, and Father Verbiest had packed up in readiness for flight. Khang-hi continued throughout cheerful and confident. His better trained army defeated the first army of the rebels, but there were several other armies to be encountered in the south. At this juncture the great military mandarins and the members of the military tribunal petitioned the Emperor to get Nan-hoai-jen to cast cannon superior to those they had at their disposal. He excused himself to them by saying that he had little or no knowledge of such matters, that his profession of religion removed him from military affairs, but that he would pray to God for the success of their arms. This reply was badly received. He was told that he need have no more repugnance to undertake the easier task of casting brass cannon than to fabricate astronomical instruments, especially when it was a question of the safety of the State; that a refusal, with such little foundation, would lead the Emperor to suppose that the preachers of religion were but little devoted to the public good, and that they were, perhaps, in collusion with his enemies. When Father Verbiest understood the bad effect these suspicions had on the mind of Khang-hi, he at last consented to superintend the work, in order not to expose the Missions to utter ruin. Like all his undertakings, he accomplished this with remarkable success. Though the war dragged on for a couple of years in the mountains of Yun-nan, the spirit of the revolt was soon broken; and it was realized by all that the success was due to the artillery made under the direction of Father Verbiest. The Emperor

showered upon him signal marks of gratitude, affection and honour.

He was bitterly attacked in Spain, France and Italy, for having taken charge of a cannon foundry at Peking. He answered that there was nothing wrong in supplying arms for the safety of the State, especially as he had obtained through this means full liberty for European Missionaries to preach the Gospel throughout the entire extent of the Empire. He was amply consoled for these attacks by a magnificent brief addressed to him by Innocent XI.

He had been appointed Superior of all the Jesuit Missions in China, and he inspired the Missionaries and their people with some of his own zeal and incomparable activity. This extraordinary man, whom one would think absorbed in scientific labours, never lost sight of the interests of the propagation of the faith. As well as his great works on astronomy he composed several books, in Chinese, on the Christian religion, and with such clearness and elegance, that they are to this day in the hands of the Catholics, and frequently serve to charm the literary. One of them was placed by the persecuting grandson of Khang-hi, the Emperor Khein-long, himself, amongst the officially recognized Chinese classics, not so much for its style as for its logical sequence and unsurpassed clearness of exposition.

When peace was restored Khang-hi made State visits to Manchuria and Mongolia. He was escorted by fifty thousand picked troops, who were constantly manœuvred to keep them in practice and to impress the natives. Father Verbiest was requested to accompany the Emperor, together with one of his companions. He had to determine, in the presence of Khang-hi, the latitude of different places, to calculate distances and measure the height of mountains. The principal reason, probably, was to show to the neighbouring princes what great men had been attracted to China by the magnificence of the imperial court. The aged Missionary found these journeys extremely tiring; but he supported the fatigue with joy, because he could foster the good dispositions of the Emperor towards the Missionaries and their converts. Vast fields appeared to be opened out to him for the spread of the Gospel, and he was frequently asked to send Missionaries into these new countries. Unfortunately, he had none to send. He therefore addressed the most ardent supplications to his brethren in Europe to come to his assistance, at a time when everything was so favourable. His private

notes show his own constant desire and prayers for martyrdom, and how he envied the martyrs who were then suffering in Japan. One of the arguments that he considered would be the most effective in gaining volunteers was that they would have a good chance of gaining that glorious crown in China. People were reminded of St. Francis Xavier when they read his ardent letters. The Prince-Bishop of Paderborn was so impressed that he wrote to Father Verbiest, telling him that he had invested a large sum of money the interest of which was to support eight Missionaries in China. His moving appeals induced Louis XIV to send to Peking, with the approval of the Holy See, five of the most distinguished Jesuits in his kingdom, all members of the French Academy. The worn-out and dying Missionary was filled with joy when he heard they had landed at the coast; but when they reached Peking they found that capital in mourning because Nan-hoai-jen had died eleven days before, 26th January, 1688. The funeral, which had been put off till their arrival, was one of the grandest ever seen in that city. The Emperor wrote his panegyric and stated, amongst other things, that no forecast made by him ever turned out to be untrue.

This Belgian priest was, undoubtedly, one of the most illustrious members of the Society of Jesus. His missionary zeal and his activity and versatility in every branch of knowledge were astonishing. He even made a kind of steam-engine. He fixed a boiler on a small car, and the pent-up steam was made to impinge on vanes attached to an axle which communicated its motion to the axle of the wheels and drove the car to a considerable distance. By a similar arrangement he propelled a model boat. His note on this is: 'Dato hoc motus principio, multa alia excogitari facile est.'

Like many of his brethren, he was frequently and bitterly attacked in Europe. On January 21, 1697, M. Simon wrote in the *Journal des Savants*: 'Father Verbiest, at the end of his life, left a writing for the Emperor, in which, amongst other things, he said to him, "I die content, because I have employed nearly every moment of my life in the service of Your Majesty." The two Apostles who died at Rome could not have said as much to Nero.' These words caused great scandal; but their best refutation is contained in the actual context: 'I die content, because I have employed nearly every moment of my life in the service of Your

Majesty ; but I most humbly beg of you to remember, after my death, that in all that I have done I had no other object in view than to procure, in the person of the most powerful monarch of the East, a protector for the most holy religion of the universe.' As Abbé Huc rightly observes, these words are sublime. The attack is another illustration of how half the truth can be made the blackest of calumnies.

C. AHERNE.

HISTORY OF INNISHBOFIN AND INNISHARK

BY REV. JOHN NEARY

IN a long span of years these twin islands have frequently changed owners. Since the twelfth century they have been, successively, in the hands of the O'Flahertys, the O'Malleys, the Duke of Lorraine, the Cromwellians, the Jacobites, the Williamites, the Clanrickards, the Sligos, the Wilberforces, the Allies, and the Congested Districts Board. We pass in review historic names: St. Colman, St. Leo, St. Flannan, Graine Uaile, Don Bosco, Sir Charles Coote, Colonels Hardresse Waller, Hewson, Honnour, Horton, Riordan, Earl Theobald Burke, Henry William Wilberforce, Thomas William Allies and John McHale. The pre-historic ramparted cliff-forts and ring-forts bring our minds back to a martial race of long-vanished cliff-dwellers.

THE ISLES AND THE ISLANDERS

The islands abound in bold cliffs, chasms, dykes, gullies, reefs and boulder-strewn beaches, but there are several sheltered inlets and bays. At Knock, Innishbofin, there is an admirable land-locked crescent bay, with a sandy bottom, an extensive sandy beach and a useless pier. Innishbofin harbour, with its narrow entrance, long, rocky breakwater and perfect shelter, wins the admiration of all mariners. The North bay is extremely exposed, but separated only by a forty-foot beach from a large, deep lake, which might easily be made the prettiest and safest haven in the West. On this north side of the islands are wild karoos, desolate, houseless, cliff-bound and storm swept, with wide-spreading mountain-commonages and scraw turbaries. Here the islands bear the brunt of the havoc of the league-long breakers, and tremendous seas roll over the high and massive Stags. Even on the comparatively sheltered south side, under the impetus of a south-west gale, mountainous seas have swept Gun Rock and demolished the signal obelisk and light standard.

The habitual environment of the Innishbofin and Innishark men is one of toil and peril, in row-boat, coracle, pookaun, hooker or nobby, buffeted by the foaming breakers and tumultuous swell of the far-flung Atlantic. Inured to hardship, they lead a dangerous existence and win a precarious subsistence from the deep. Many a time they have to make a quick and prompt retreat from the wild weltering chaos of the open ocean to the sheltered coves. Quick-witted, shrewd, nimble, wiry, energetic, their lives are lives of endeavour and endurance, of grit and audacity. Necessity is a hard taskmaster, and many hapless loved ones lie beneath the waves submerged, in the intrepid struggle for existence, by howling winds and boisterous seas. At the beginning of the last century, fifteen hundred inhabitants occupied the islands; the total at present, all enumerated, is over half that number (last census, 801). The area of Innishbofin, with its shoals and outlying appendages, is about twenty square miles, over 2,600 acres; that of Innishark about 615 acres. In a high sea Innishark is unapproachable, and occasionally it is weather-bound for weeks.

The homesteads and holdings are small, and there is little to choose between the old-style thatched cottage and the new ones, with corrugated iron roofs.

The restricted area under tillage and the grazing on the meagre herbage of denuded commonages are of no importance. The women card, spin and knit their home-grown wool into warm garments, and the men practise many minor arts and crafts in connexion with their fishing and farming avocations. They have a deep-seated and abiding love for their sea-compassed homes, and are a guileless, friendly, unsuspecting people—sometimes overmuch so, for there have not been wanting occasions, which they justly resent, when cynical and high-sniffing pundits have been received by the islanders with open-hearted, cordial kindness and welcome, and afterwards they were rewarded by publications which girded and poked fun at their religious observances, traditions, customs and beliefs. It is an ungrateful, unrefined, quack and ill-conditioned person who, under the guise of science, repays homely, courteous unpurchased friendship and wounds sensitive feelings by covert sneer or open contempt, mockery, and derision.

The personal names indigenous to the islands are Davis, Barrett, Darcy, McGreal, Halloran, Courcy, Cannon, Corbett, Hart, Lavelle, Lacy, Linnane, Powell, Scuffle or Scoffield,

Wallace, Ward, Burke, Cloherty, Coyne, Concannon, Cunnane, Connolly, Coneely, Cloonan, Conway, Hughes, Joyce, King, Kenny, Moran, McDonough, Mannion, Melia, Malley, Mogan, Murray, McCann, Naughton, Prendergast, Reilly, Tierney, Toole, Baker.

ST. COLMAN

Roderick O'Flaherty and Hardiman are the chief sources for all who attempt to sketch parochial history in Iar-Connacht. Incidentally one may remark that many unique items from Hardiman, and him alone, found in modern topographies of the West, have strayed or been lost or stolen from his 'pen-fold.' Colman, Leo, Kennach, MacDara, Feichin, (modernized Festy), and Flannan were the saints who evangelized Connemara and the Western Isles.

St. Colman, a Connaughtman, and for thirty-seven years a cloistered cenobite of the Columban monastery of Iona, was raised to the purple as Bishop of Lindisfarne and Northumbria, and defended the Celtic custom at the Synod of Whitby A.D. 664, on the occasion of the Paschal Controversy. Abbess Hilda presided; King Oswy was present. The decision of the Council condemned the Celtic custom, and the Venerable Bede records that Colman, with all his Columban monks and thirty Saxon confrères, abandoned his episcopal throne in loved Lindisfarne and settled again at Iona. The same great authority gives a high and noble account of the holy poverty and penance and laborious lives of St. Colman and his monks, 'whose whole care,' he says, 'was to serve God and not the world, to feed the soul and not the body,' and he goes on to relate how the holy and learned Bishop Colman left Iona and embarked with his community to the island of 'Inisbofinde,' on the west coast of Ireland, and established a Columban monastery, A.D. 665, on this Island of the White Heifer (*Insula Vitulæ Albae*, a name derived from a legend about Lochnateampul, a lake near the monastery). Their island retreat was not without dissension, and a dispute arose about domestic economy and division of labour between Saxons and Celts. St. Colman judiciously separated the disputants, and taking with him the thirty Saxon monks, he established Mayo-of-the-Saxons, within whose consecrated walls, according to Mac-Firbis, sleep forty saints of Leyney. St. Colman died in the year A.D. 674, having lived in religion, as monk and bishop, forty-eight years (A.D. 626-674). His feast is celebrated on the 8th August.

The authority of Bede in matters of early ecclesiastical history in the British Isles is a criterion of truth, and all have accepted without demur his writings as authentic. His references to St. Colman stamps with the hall-mark of truth these details of our Saint's life as genuine and indisputable history.

The present thirteenth-century church, erected on the ruins of the ancient foundation, is now dismantled and in a state of dim defacement, due to the defilement and desecration of the Commonwealth soldiery (A.D. 1552-1560). The style is identical with that of the O'Malley churches, constructed, under the patronage of the Lords of the Owles, in Clare Island. In extent it embraces an area of sixty-five by thirty-three feet, divided into two apartments, the smaller of which is eighteen feet square. This latter had a loft or overcroft, as the corbals are still stoutly sunk in the walls. It was probably a sacristy and habitat for the pre-reformation clerics who functioned in the church. No cut or moulded stone is left, the inside splay of the windows is arched by rough-hewn red sand-stone, and only an old font remains within the ruined shell of the church. The site was admirably chosen, in a sheltered vale, beside a deep lake, with an outlook from the east window on a silver strand and Renvyle mountains. In summertime, when the sun shines and 'no mist nor cloud nor speck nor stain mars the serene of heaven,' this secluded spot is a heaven of tranquillity. Strangers, too, have observed with wonder our glorious sunsets, when the westering sun, robed in his multi-coloured robe of amber, purple, amethyst and gold, sinks to rest in the waves. In the corner of the churchyard there is a well of St. Flannan, covered with recent masonry. As St. Flannan was Bishop of Killaloe, A.D. 640, and had evangelized Ballindoon, Irroslannan, and Bunowen before his consecration, his work in Innishbofin ante-dates by many years that of St. Colman. St. Festy also preceded our saint. St. Festy or Fechin came from the Falls of Eas dara, Ballysodare, and founded Omey, High-Island, Cong and Fore religious houses. He is patron of Leyney and co-patron of Achonry diocese with his preceptor, St. Nathi. The *Annals of Ulster* and of the Four Masters record that Baethen, Bishop of Innishbofin, died A.D. 711; that Malfrichraich, Abbot of Innishbofin, died A.D. 742; that Coencomhrach, of the cave of Innishbofin, died A.D. 893; that Feradac, Abbot of Innishbofin, died A.D. 918; that Gormghal of Ardoilen or High-Island, chief soul-friend of Ireland, died in A.D. 1018, and that

the Vicar of Imaidh (Omev), namely O'Feargusa, died in A.D. 1316.

A just and accurate estimate of St. Colman may be inferred from the character of his famous school of Iona, among whose learned monks he arose to pre-eminence, and from the important office for which he was chosen, the weighty superintendence of the Northumbrian Kingdom. Iona of Columkill was 'that illustrious island, once the luminary of the Caledonian regions, whence savage clans and roving barbarians derived the benefits of civilization and the blessings of religion.' The monks were renowned experts in calligraphy, the art of beautiful writing, and in most intricate illuminative work and painting. The Book of Kells, written by St. Columkill, and the Books of Durrow and Deer are the glory of Irish art. Labour and prayer and the illuminating of Scripture were the duties of the learned community, in which St. Colman spent thirty-seven years, and gained such accomplishments, culture and skill, that he was selected for the episcopal throne of Lindisfarne, to wield the crozier of St. Aidan. 'Wherever Irish monks or Columban missionaries went, they brought their skilled workmanship.' From one quiet habitation of learning and religion, St. Colman and his brethren came to another. They came from Iona to Innishobfin, and a tradition existed that hundreds of students flocked to this remote isle, as they flocked to Mayo, Armagh, and other centres of learning, to imbibe the learning freely taught by Columkill's disciples, when Ireland was called the 'Island of Saints and Scholars.'

ST. LEO

If one may use a poetic phrase, the name of St. Leo is 'embalmed in the choicest perfume of religious recollection,' and though the cold chain of silence hangs around his name in Irish hagiography, no saint in the West has left so many monuments to perpetuate his memory, to wit, St. Leo's Bell, Leabaid-Leo, Teampul-Leo, Crois-Leo, Leac-Leo, Clohawn-Leo, Uaim-Leo, St. Leo's Well, Foth-Leo, and St. Leo's Mount, all on the southern abutment of Innishark. The Bell was extant in Roderick O'Flaherty's day, A.D. 1664, and was preserved until black '47 of the last century, when it disappeared. The Clohawn-Leo is a ruined bee-hive cell. The Teampul-Leo, or St. Leo's Church, is incorporated in the present Innishark Church; the Crois-Leo, St. Leo's Cross, is on the pinnacle of the eastern gable. There is also a small

one-light slit window of the ancient church preserved in the new. The Foth-Leo is a deep inlet or gully, in which is located St. Leo's Well. The Leac-Leo has carved on it the figure of a bishop, with outstretched hands. Uaimh-Leo is St. Leo's cave and Leabaidh-Leo is St. Leo's bed. The Innishark men reverentially salute the Saint's reliques whenever they launch into the deep, and it is a pious custom to show a similar religious reverence to St. Festy and other saints when passing by their islands.

The name of the island appears in the Carew MSS., A.D. 1574, as Inyshourke, and later it is written Ennisherke and Ennisharke. The word is interpreted variously as the 'Island of Love' or the 'Island of Earc,' a pre-Christian personage. The view from Mount Leo, which dominates the isles, is fascinating on a fine day: on one side is the undulating shoreless Atlantic, on the other a world of mountains and vast indented sweep of wild coastland, from Achill to Slyne, and numerous islands, High, Crow, Friar, Omey, Davillaun, Clare, Turk, Caher, nestling in the bright-tinted waves, make an incomparable vista of scenic loveliness. Strange it is that the Feast of St. Leo is strictly kept as a holiday, on which no servile work is done, and best clothes are donned by the Innishark people on the 11th April, the feast of St. Leo the Great. Can it be that the great Leo, who withstood Attila, is revered in Innishark as Pope Gregory is in Arran? The concrete facts forbid the identification with the Leo so vividly venerated in Innishark. Bury and Healy mention the fact that Leo the Great approved St. Patrick in the Catholic faith A.D. 441. He has therefore an association with the Reek, to which Munis brought this Pontifical approval, but none with St. Leo's Isle, except the singular fact noticed above.

There were forty-six families in the island within living memory, but the free emigration partly depopulated it, and now only eighteen remain in a cluster of houses in the shelter of Mount Leo. The area comprised in the island is six hundred and forty acres, the tillage is meagre, the grazing extensive, turbary plentiful and seas around good fishing ground. No more daring or intrepid seamen exist than the Innishark men. To land on the island in any kind of high sea is a stiff proposition. The island badly needs an extension of the stunted pier and the outlay would be small to make at least a safe landing. Around the islands, cod, herring, ling, hawkfish, coalfish, plaice, haddock, whiting, scollop, mackerel, pilchards, oysters, lobsters, etc., abound. Spermacetti and

Greenland whales sometimes come around the shores; a bottle-nose whale was stranded on 1st December, 1919, on East strand. There was some years ago a prosperous sun-fishery here. Gannets, barnacles, wild duck, wild geese, grey and green plover, pigeons, sea-pies, Cornish choughs, with red bills and feet, and curlew inhabit the land and sea area. A large basking-shark was seen off Knock Bay recently.

THE PLACE-NAMES

The names are derived from personal, historical, physical and traditional associations. Twenty coves or caves, six forts, twelve rocks or reefs, eight islands and six lakes enter as component parts into the formation of these picturesque compounds. The prefixes and suffixes 'oogh, oomeen or oan,' a cove or cave; 'dun' a fort; 'carrig,' a rock; 'illaun,' an island, predominate in the names. First: from creeks, havens, bays, gorges, gullies, hills and dells, we have Oogharlea, Ooghnastrappy, Ooghnacappul, Ooghnadoby, Ooghacat, Ooghanunsa, Ooghnagaragh, Ooghnageeragh, Ooghcurreen, Ooghaveagh, Ooghnacronlach, Ooghaneeny, Ooghnacurragh, Ooghnashinnagh, Ooghnagunnel, Ooghanany, Ooghnacarrickadh, Royal Oak Cove, Deadman's Cove, Clement's Cove, Ooghnavaud, Ooghnagalliagh, Ooghvrisly, Clykeecossaun, Bunamullen, Bunafea, Belnabraud, Bellalyon, Boughal, Cailen, Cromal, Cooltra, Bellascoltaun, Pollnatulla, Pollnalecka, Preesaun, Lackagh, Rinnalee, Lactra, Lackatargh, Lugnabuddigy, Turlimbaud, Gubaranduff, Moylanboy, Barnalacan, Ballyheer, Cloonamore, Knock, Gortacorraun, Faunmore, Aitige-Guarim. The names of the islands are Innishbofin, Innishark, Glassilaun, Glassilaunaban, Innisgort, Inniskinnymor, Inniskinnybeg, Innislyon, Davillaun, Glassilaunbelasty, Feacarrick, Carrickge, Carrickastruha, Carrickaneun, Carrickaheelia, Carrigeen, Carricknamoyla, Carricklogher, Schoadoogort. The lakes are Loughnagrooaun, Loughgowlaunagower, Loughnaveneeny, Loughnabraud, Innishbofin Lake, Loughateampul, Loughachanny. The forts are Dooneen, Dunahineena, Dungrania, Doonmore, Glassilaundoon, Alladoon, Dunkeen, Duncenapisha. There are six forts and six ring-dwellings. The forts on the headlands are called 'promontory' 'cliff' or 'wall-rocked platform' forts. Dunkeen and Dunahineenia, from their strength and singular position, have elicited the admiration of enthusiastic archaeologists, who have issued

reams of speculations on cliff-fortresses and the cliff-dwellers who manned them in the dim and distant misty stone and bronze ages.

PRIESTS OF INNISHBOFIN AND INNISHARK

The people cherish vivid kindly recollections of the many priests who ministered amongst them. Every child in the parish knows how Father Redmund Martin Fadden, in A.D. 1834, buried the dead, with his own hands, during a cholera plague, caught the contagion and died in a house in which he was attending a stricken parishioner. His simple annals are recorded on his tombstone ¹:—

Here within the walls of St. Colman's Church sleeps, until death is swallowed up in victory, Redmund Martin Fadden, Coadjutor of this parish. This faithful priest Lecanvy gave to the Tuam priesthood and Boffin gave to heaven on the Ides of March, A.D. 1834. When there was no inhabitant to bury the dead, owing to the prevailing fear of the cholera, the good pastor piously, with reverent hands, used to carry the beloved sheep to burial. Crowned by a holy life and a holy death in the same island in which St. Colman founded his Church he is thus buried. He died of the fever. This monument is erected to his memory by the islanders. R.I.P.

Memories remain also of Fathers Duffy, Moore, MacManus, Flannery, Tom McDonough McWalter, Loftus, O'Connor, O'Boyle, Brennan, Healy, Stosby, Rabbitte, Colleran, Corcoran, McHugh. In the last twenty years, Fathers Lavelle, Mylotte, McGough, Kelly, Rhatigan, Coyne, Lynch, ministered in the islands. The superb new church was

¹ I had some difficulty in deciphering the epitaph, but I discovered a man, eighty-seven years old, who had been baptized by Father Fadden, and thus able to fix the date. Note that XIV. of line six goes with the next line seven.

' Hic intra muros Sancti Colm
ani Ecclesiae dormit donec *mrs* abso
mors absorpta est in victoria Redu^s
Martinus Fadden hujusce *insule* coadjutor
Hunc fidelem sacerdotem Lecanviensis
LUCI Tuamensis Clero Boffinensis /XIV.
Celis SCVO idiis Martii A.D. M.D.CCCXX.
dedit. Dum de *cophui manai anum* unum
trademus. Dum nullus incola tum
habitatum ob metum Cholerae
morbus mortuos sepulchret pastor
bonus oves dilectas pio piis manibus
ad sepulchrum portabat. Sancta vita
sancta morte *coronata* eadem insula
qua Sanctus Colmanus ecclesiam
fundavit et *sepulisse* sic *ollepui* Febri
occubuit. Hoc monumentum in
memoriam ejus incolis hujus insulae
conditum fuit. Requiescat in pace.'

erected by Father Rhatigan, and Father Coyne energetically completed and cleared the structure of all debt. Mr. Cyril Allies co-operated in the undertaking in a munificent manner.

Father Tom McDonough was appointed administrator by Dr. McHale in A.D. 1855 and the Archbishop selected the site and design of the presbytery, fronting the harbour entrance. Both live in island-story, and old veterans love to recite recollections of loved John McHale and his confirmations in the little parterre before the priest's house. In the high garden, beside the presbytery, stood Guarim's castle, redolent of 'old, unhappy, far-off times and battles long ago.' Tradition says that two assassins, instigated and subsidized by Guarim, slew six monks at Clyessaun, and Haneby and Halligan were the ruffians' names. Innishbofin folk are a long-remembered race. About Father Tom's time proselytism first showed its forbidding face in the islands, under the patronage of the agent of Lord Sligo, Henry Hildebrand, the son of a Prussian from Hamburg. The unwarranted intrusion was so fiercely and so to say valorously resented, that, in after years, souperism looked in vain at the islands from the opposite shores of the mainland, and never succeeded in planting one blade of heretical-cockle in St. Colman's or St. Leo's patrimony. In 1860 the Hon. Henry William Wilberforce acquired the islands for £11,000 from the Sligos. He was a relative of 'the amiable, the gentle, the intellectual and refined John Henry Newman,' afterwards the illustrious Prince of the Church, Cardinal Newman. From Mr. Wilberforce the Administrator acquired a competency of land. Cyril Allies secured the proprietorship of the islands in 1876 by discharging the liabilities of Mr. Wilberforce to Newman and Coleridge, London. Cyril was the son of Thomas William Allies, to whom Newman wrote on the eve of his conversion, wishing he (J. H. N.) had one-tenth as much faith as he had intellectual conviction. Allies followed Newman into the Catholic Church, surrendering £800 a year as vicar of Launton, Oxfordshire. Cyril Allies and Canon Allies lie interred in St. Colman's cemetery. Their sumptuously furnished home is now a hotel.

The State Department which succeeded this ideal, sympathetic landlord cannot boast overmuch of its deeds of high achievement since its acquisition of the islands.

CIVIL HISTORY OF THE ISLANDS

The islands, hitherto the patrimony of the O'Flahertys, came into possession of the O'Malleys, Lords of the Owles, probably in the time of Owen O'Malley (1360-1370). Grania Uaile, the 'Dark Lady of Doona,' fortified the harbour on both sides of the entrance, in her day of power, towards the close of the 16th century. Her son, Theobald, became an Earl in 1628, and his descendant, John, was made Baron of Innishbofin in the reign of James II. Don Bosco the Spaniard lives in tradition as a man of large stature, strictly equitable at home and a corsair on the ocean. He had a chain-boom across the entrance, and defended his stronghold for a fortnight against twenty-two ships of the line. He capitulated to the Commonwealth forces in A.D. 1652. Sir Hardress Waller and Colonels Hewson and Sankey recommended the abandonment of the islands A.D. 1655, and £600, with the barque *Elizabeth*, were offered to any contractor to block the harbour. In A.D. 1656 it was decided to erect a fort and repair the fortifications of Innishbofin; that fourteen small cannon and three long cannon be installed, and an able, pious and orthodox minister of the Gospel be settled. We know from Scott, what that meant—'the edge of the sword, and all that.' Sir Charles Coote ordered Colonel John Honnour, in charge of Innishbofin, to clear the island of disaffected persons, and seize all boats. Coote was murderer of Archbishop O'Queely, Prior Tady Connell and Friar Augustine Higgins, at Ballysodare, in 1645. Next year the planter Darcy of Ballynahinch complained that he was losing all profit through the seizure of boats. Those men, Coote, Waller, Hewson and Sankey, conceived and executed the plan of general transplantation of all Irishmen into Connaught. The order, signed by them, is copied by Hardiman from the original Council-Book, Dublin Castle.

With such men in command of fierce soldiers, and a minister to make them 'zealous to slaying,' one can conceive the lot of thousands of unhappy prisoners in the Castle cells and in the underground prison in the frowning north-east cliffs of Innishbofin. There is a tradition here of a massacre as bloody as that of the McDonalds of Glencoe. Fields are still pointed out near Simon King's house which are said to be deeply dyed with the blood of the massacred. When scoundrel hearts, in buff coats and bandoliers, with muskets in their hands and sanctimonious jargon on their lips, could mercilessly kill defenceless victims at Drogheda and Wexford,

Innishbofin would be only a mere bagatelle to their demoniac rage. Macaulay says: 'Cromwell gave free reign to the fierce enthusiasm of his followers, and they, waging war resembling that which Israel waged on the Canaanites, smote idolaters with the edge of the sword.' This is described as his policy in Ireland. In Innishbofin they chained a Bishop to Bishop's Rock at low water, and allowed him to be drowned in the flowing tide. Certain it is that the island was a prison for all priests caught on the mainland, many of whom were shipped to the West Indies. In the new church there is a tablet presented by a Queen's County lady, with the inscription:

In memory of many valiant Irishmen who were exiled to this Holy Island and in particular Rory O'More, a brave chieftain of Leix (now Queen's Co.), who, after fighting for Faith and Fatherland, disguised as a fisherman escaped from this island to a place of safety. He died shortly afterwards, a martyr to his Religion and Country, about 1653. He was esteemed and loved by his countrymen, who celebrated his many deeds of valour and kindness in their songs and revered his memory, so that it was common expression among them: 'God and Our Lady be our help and Rory O'More.'

Sarsfield was Rory's nephew.

On the surrender of Galway on 12th April, A.D. 1652, Colonel Stubbes and his halberdiers captured the bishops and clergy from all parts of Ireland who had taken refuge in the city, and they were imprisoned, some in dungeons in Galway, some in Arran, and some in Innishbofin, until occasion offered to transport them to France, Spain or the West Indies, in whose unhealthy climate they perished. Many were slain, for it had been enacted in this very year by the Cromwellian State Council that every priest in the realm was to be deemed a rebel liable to be hanged, drawn and quartered. The persecution of the clergy in its ferocity is likened by Oliver Burke to that of the early Christians under Nero and Diocletian, and he quotes a manuscript of A.D. 1653 which describes the life of the hunted priest as a warfare and a martyrdom, and states that they breathed by stealth among the hills and woods, where wolves then were numerous, that never was the chase of wild beasts more hot and bitter than the rush of the priest-destroyers.

We have a concrete example of an important dignitary imprisoned in Innishbofin in the person of the Rev. James Fallon, Vicar Apostolic of the diocese of Achonry. In his 'Vita Kirivani,' a Latin life of the Bishop of Killala, John

Lynch, Archdeacon of Tuam, born A.D. 1600, tells us that the Very Rev. John Fallon, a native of Galway City, escaped when Stubbes secured that stronghold. For two years he lived in a hut, covered with leaves and osiers, in the mountains of Connemara. He was seized in 1654, and even his Breviary was taken from him. With many other captive priests he was imprisoned for a time in Innishbofin and then in Arran—'Innisbofiniae Araniaeque Insulis.' They were released after the Restoration in A.D. 1662, but the Vicar died this same year from the hardship he endured—after more than forty years in Holy Orders—'Post annos plusquam 40 in vinea Domini.' Lynch was a school-fellow of Roderick O'Flaherty and MacFirbis.

The masonry of Guarim's and Grainne Uaile's castles, and the cut stone from St. Colman's Church, were used in the construction of Cromwell's Barracks. This military fortress occupied an area of 80 feet by 45, its walls were over 20 feet high south side, and on the north were 50 feet high, abutting sheer on the perpendicular rock. Three diamond-shaped bastions guarded its corners, ramparts ran all around, with thirty loopholes in the curtain walls; nine apartments were used as kitchen, store and guard rooms and the courtyard had a well in its centre. It is now a ruin and 'the canting puritanic tribe, the sour, sulky system, which retained no heat, imbibed no light and transmitted none, but flung its broad shadow over the island cursed with its visitation,' is remembered with execration. Colonel O'Riordan, the Jacobite, surrendered Innishbofin to Colonel Horton, the Williamite, in A.D. 1690. About 1700 a John Burke, sent as Clanricarde's agent, dismantled the barracks and erected a residence, now used as R.I.C. barracks, on the upland across the bay.

Father Lockington, in his *Martyrdom of Ireland*, says:—

For be it always remembered that adherence to the ancient faith was the primary cause of Ireland's being broken on the wheel. The priest was described as a beast to be extirpated and was classified with the wolf. Every church was destroyed; every altar desecrated; every tabernacle broken, in vain endeavour to tear the Faith from the heart of the nation—the Soggarth Aroon! The high sea-cliff saw them bound back to back and pushed to death on the black rocks below; trapped in the Mass-cave, they died in a reek of smoke, sold to the slave trader, they worked under the lash of their owner.

Innishbofin and Innishark have their ruined shrines and pillaged altars, their field of blood, their Bishop's Rock,

their Cromwell's Barracks, with traditions and history of manacled and murdered priests and bishops, and of their Calvinistic 'zealous to blood, pious and godly' minister, and they are now 'firm in the Faith as their own stout mountains, and strong as the sea that lashes their shores.'¹

JOHN NEARY.

¹ An exhaustive biological record of the plant and animal life of the islands, and a survey of the solid and surface geology, were published by the Royal Irish Academy some years ago. Much more matter bearing on Bofin and Shark is still sealed up in the Original Council Book, in Hardiman's unpublished notes, and in other untapped sources.

NOTES AND QUERIES

THEOLOGY

ABSOLUTE OR CONDITIONAL FORMS ?

REV. DEAR SIR,—During the course of my ministrations last season, I had to deal with two particular cases. One was the case of a person who, as everybody knew, lived a bad, indifferent life. The other the case of one who lived the ordinary life of people of the parish. When I reached the home there was no consciousness in either case.

What should have been the exact form of Absolution in either case, and what the exact form of Extreme Unction immediately following absolution ?

I cannot well follow distinctions and sub-distinctions, but should like a short, plain, answer.

PAROCHUS.

'Parochus' wants a short plain answer. But he must allow us time to make a small statement first. We take it that both invalids were alive, that both were probably in danger of death, that in both cases their friends (not themselves) had sent for the priest, that neither had been actually committing mortal sin when he lost the use of his senses, finally that neither had persistently refused the Sacraments as long as consciousness remained. If these hypotheses are not fulfilled the answer must be modified—in some cases considerably, in others slightly, in all to some extent.

Granted their fulfilment, the answer is :—

1°. The Absolution form should have been conditional—the ordinary form with the express addition (mental or vocal) ' si capax es.'

2°. The Extreme Unction form should have been absolute (cf. Canons 941, 943)—the form exactly as given in the Ritual. If there was danger that the patient would die before the separate anointings could be completed, the short form should have been employed.

RECENT ROMAN REPLIES

The last January issue of the I. E. RECORD (pp. 72-75) contained the replies given by the Pontifical Commission to seventeen queries recently submitted. With five of them (Nos. 3, 7, 8, 9, 10) the Canon Law correspondent dealt in the same number (pp. 62-66). On four of the others (Nos. 1, 2, 12, 15) we had already said something in the October, 1919, issue (pp. 310-13) : as regards two of them (Nos. 2, 15), however, we must add, the official version differs considerably from that given in the

Continental magazines from which we borrowed them. On these two, and on the remaining eight, a word or two may not be out of place.

Dismissal of Religious (No. 2).—The official reply contains words ('*Simplicia* voventis' and 'in Religionibus mulierum') that were not found in the *Acta Ord. FF. Minorum* (v. 37, f. 2, p. 21) from which we borrowed the statement through the *Monitore Ecclesiastico* and the *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*.¹ The result is that it applies to a much more restricted class of cases.

It will be remembered that Pius IX (in the *Sanctissimus*, 12th June, 1858) decreed that, in the case of Strict Orders of men, solemn profession should take place only after three years from the termination of the novitiate: during that period the new members were bound by simple vows—'perpetual,' so far as they themselves were concerned, but 'temporary' in the sense that the Order could relax them for just and reasonable cause. The regulation was extended to strict Orders of women in 1902 (*Perpensis*, 3rd May). The only difference was that, in the case of men, the Order itself granted the release (and this was extended to lay Orders subject to military service, by the *Inter reliquas* of 1st January, 1911), while, in the case of women, the relaxation came from the Holy See.

The Code has changed the discipline. In every Order and Congregation, of men or of women, with solemn or with simple vows, there is to be a three-years' period of *really* temporary vows—temporary from the standpoint of the members as well as from that of the Order. After that, there are to be perpetual vows—simple or solemn, as the case may be.

Having established that new régime, the Code makes definite provision for the dismissal, if necessary, of members of both classes—the 'temporary' and the 'perpetual.' But it says nothing of the *third* class—with vows 'temporary' in one sense, 'perpetual' in another.

And—as is evident from the official reply, and from the long note giving the words of the original query²—it is with this third class, and with it alone, that the Commission has dealt. The others—no matter when the vows were taken—are governed apparently by the regulations of the Code (637-72). This is not said definitely in the reply—and there is room for modification later on—but the suggestion is strong.

On the principles involved we may cite what we said already.³ There is no need to discuss minor details. Seeing that the Code has been in force for nearly two years, the class concerned will soon have disappeared.

Canons' Rights and Duties (Nos. 4, 5, 6).—The replies are very remote from practical life in Ireland. Technically, however, they have some interest even for us.

1°. According to Canon 395, § 1, when the 'daily distributions' in Cathedral or Collegiate Churches are small or non-existent, the Bishop is to set aside one-third of the profits, revenues and (fluctuating) income of the members, to be distributed as honoraria for regular attendance. The

¹ See I. E. RECORD, October, Fifth Series, vol. xiv. 1919, p. 312.

² *Ibid.*, January, 1920, pp. 72, 73.

³ *Ibid.*, October, 1919, p. 312.

query was whether this regulation is binding when the 'distributions' originated from Apostolic privilege. Evidently the querist recalled Canon 4, which guarantees the preservation of Apostolic privileges—except when expressly revoked: and he found no express revocation in the wording of Canon 395. But the reply is manifestly the correct one all the same. Canon 395 can be observed without interfering with the privilege in any way.

2°. The right of 'option'—that of the Senior Canon to a vacant prebend—is prohibited by Canon 396, § 2, no matter what 'custom' there may be to the contrary. 'What,' says the query, 'if instead of "custom" there be an Apostolic indult? Are not indults protected by Canon 4?' A question to be asked: logic seems really on the side of the querist. But the answer is against him, notwithstanding.

3°. A Canon 'Jubilarian'—one who gets the distinction from the Holy See after 40 years' worthy service—is assured certain privileges, unless (among other things) the 'custom' is against him (422, § 2). 'Does custom,' asks the querist, 'deprive him of exemption from altar-services?' And the answer is that the exemption remains: it is not mentioned in the canon among the 'certain' privileges that custom abolishes. A mere declaration of the obvious meaning of Canon 422.

Baptism (No. 11).—In accordance with Canon 98, the child belongs to the rite in which it is baptized, unless the baptism has been conferred by the minister of another rite either (a) fraudulently, or (b) in case of necessity, or (c) by Apostolic dispensation allowing baptism in one rite and membership in another. Canon 756 decrees that the baptism is to be conferred in the parents' rite.

What is the meaning of the query? It is not too clear: and the *prout casus exponitur* of the reply indicates as much. But, judging from the words 'contra praescriptum canonis 756,' we should say that the case falls into the first exceptional category specified in Canon 98. If so, the reply is obviously the only one that could have been given.

Heresy and Ordination (No. 13).—By pre-code law a candidate for Orders was irregular when his father, mother, or grandfather was a heretic; not so when his grandmother was the only one tainted. The object of the query was to elicit a declaration as to whether some similar distinction might not be drawn in connexion with Canon 987, 1°, which establishes an 'impediment' so long as the candidate's '(non-Catholic) parents persevere in their erroneous belief.' The answer is unfavourable. The non-Catholicity of *either* parent is enough to give rise to the impediment: and the fact that the parents were married by dispensation (from the impediment of 'mixed religion') has no effect on the result.

There are other points in this connexion that still await solution. Does 'non-Catholic' (987, 1°) include pagans, or only heretics (as in the old law) and schismatics? Does the impediment continue (as it used to do) if the parents die? Does it affect—as it used *not* to do—children born before the parents lapsed into heresy or schism? On these and other matters the reply throws no light. But, of course, there is no reason why it should: the questions were not submitted.

Christian Burial (Nos. 14, 15).—The first reply needs no comment. Canon 1205, § 2, forbids burials in ‘churches,’ and the Commission applies the principle to subterranean structures that are ‘truly and properly’ churches.

Comparing the fifteenth reply with that dealt with in our October issue,¹ we find our fears and prophecies verified. The original reply was intended for a particular locality: this is general. The ‘reprobation’ that ‘overtook the custom of the Southern Italians’ has fallen on similar customs everywhere. Except there be ‘grave excusing cause,’ the corpse must be brought to the church; any custom to the contrary, no matter how old, must be weeded out and never allowed to revive (Canon 5).

Seminary Tax on Parish (No. 16).—The tax contemplated in the query and reply is not the justifiable tax allowed by Canon 1356, § 2, but dangerously like the simoniacal imposition reprobated by Canon 1441 (cf. also Canon 1507). Hence the need for special recourse to the Congregations.

Invalidity of Marriage (No. 17).—Canon 1990 enumerates the exceptional cases in which the Ordinary may declare a marriage invalid without going through the complicated procedure prescribed for normal cases by the Code—contenting himself with definite proof, and with the citation of the parties and the presence of the ‘defender of the bond.’ There is no mention made of the cases specified in the query—all of them instances in which the law of ‘clandestinity’ has been flagrantly outraged. But the reply supplies the defect. The Bishop, and even the parish priest, may deal with them even more summarily than with those the canon does mention. Even the presence of the ‘defender of the bond’ is not required.

PENITENTIAL JURISDICTION IN THE CODE (Can. 892, § 2)

REV. DEAR SIR,—I thank you for the courtesy and great consideration shown to me in the December issue. But there remains a doubt on one point (No. 3, *infra*) and I would feel much indebted for the solution.

1. With reference to the argument No. 8 (*b*) in your reply, the qualifying phrase would, of course, be a phrase applicable to confessors, who are dealt with in the section, as distinct from ‘parochi’ of par. I; e.g. ‘sub eorum jurisdictione,’ and not ‘sibi commissorum.’ The argument, therefore, in so far as it is based on the latter assumption, fails.

2. It is admitted that on three independent grammatical grounds (Nos. 3, 8 & 10) ‘fidelium’ would be understood in an unrestricted sense, so that it becomes necessary to exercise a threefold pull in order to fit the word into the groove of accepted teaching. This necessity militates, perhaps, against the reputation for clear, unequivocal diction justly enjoyed by the compilers of the Code, but, I quite agree, the argument from the context, if uncorroborated, would not be conclusive. Corroborated, it would be a good argument.

3. Gury (I, 221) says: ‘In communi necessitate . . . succurrendum proximo est cum incommodo quidem aliquo, quia id amor proximi exigit;

sed levi tantum.' And Noldin (II, 78, c): 'Proximo in levi necessitate spirituali succurrendum est si absque damno temporali, vel cum levi tantum, fieri potest: caritas enim proximi aliquid certe exigit?' Here is evidence of obligation, small, no doubt, but real. It would not, for instance (No. 9), be incumbent on a Westland Row priest to go to Dalkey, but what if a Dalkey penitent, with a predilection for a particular confessor, occasionally went to Westland Row ('rationabiliter petens')? Again, there will be degrees of necessity ranging from 'levis' to 'urgens,' with, I presume, a corresponding increase in the obligation of the Confessor. Now (No. 6) the Code will not admit any obligation at all unless there is urgent necessity. This is the difficulty.

RUS IN RURE.

We need not summarize the general thesis and special arguments put forward by 'Rus in Rure.' Anyone who is sufficiently interested in the subject will find them stated in detail in our last December issue.¹

In reply to the three considerations now advanced:

1°. If a phrase were added at all, it should, we admit, take the form 'sub eorum jurisdictione.' But there is no need for it. The very idea of 'confessor' involves the idea of 'jurisdiction.' A priest may be a confessor, and even a very privileged confessor, in diocese A: if he leaves the diocese and goes to a place where he holds no jurisdiction, he is *not* a 'confessor' in *that* locality—he is just a 'simple priest.' And, when he is told that, as 'confessor,' he must hear the confessions 'of the faithful' (892, § 2), he knows at once that his obligation is restricted to those for whom he *is* a 'confessor,' viz., 'the faithful subject to his jurisdiction.' To insert the qualifying phrase would be to emphasize a point that requires no emphasis—to express an idea sufficiently conveyed in the term 'confessarius.'

In a covering letter our correspondent says he was 'always under the impression that anyone who hears a confession is a confessor.' The implication apparently is that a confessor of (say) diocese A, who hears the confession of a dying man in diocese B (Can. 882), is a 'confessor' of the second diocese. Now we grant that he is the dying man's confessor for the time being, but we refuse to admit that he is one of the 'confessors' of the diocese—just as we refuse to admit that an 'ordinary' confessor, who absolves a dying man from reserved sins, becomes *ipso facto* a 'privileged' confessor of the diocese. A single act, performed only in virtue of special powers conferred in a crisis, does not modify the normal status of the individual to whom the powers are granted. If 'Rus in Rure' were a simple priest, called upon to give an absolution in danger of death, and if he were asked by the bystanders whether he was a 'confessor' of the place, he would probably forget all about controversy and answer at once that he was not.

2°. The 'three-fold pull' does not overtax the theological muscle. There is a three-fold push from the other side. Though 'fidelium' stands alone, its limitations are revealed by the old legislation, by the teaching

¹ I. E. RECORD, December, 1919, Fifth Series, vol. xiv. pp. 486-9.

implied in the Code itself, and by the use of the term 'confessarius.'¹ If a restrictive clause were expressly added, we could still say that the diction of the Code was 'clear' and 'unequivocal,' but we should have to add that it was 'slightly verbose and tautological.'

3°. Our three degrees of 'necessity'² were marked off with a special view to the arrangements made by the Church for absolution. When theologians speak of the general obligations of charity, the division is made on somewhat different lines. To take, for instance, one of the authorities quoted by our correspondent. In his special section on the subject, Noldin³ takes, 1°, 'extreme' necessity as embracing only the most serious cases involved in our category of the same title; 2°, 'grave' necessity as covering a good few of the cases registered by us as 'extreme'; 3°, 'light' necessity as applicable to many instances that, in the penitential sphere, would be catalogued as 'grave.' His standard being higher, his insistence on the obligation of charity towards one's neighbour is naturally stronger. But the difference is only one of words. If he carried his classification further, he would describe our 'ordinary' necessity as something 'very light indeed.' And, when he states, as our correspondent correctly quotes, that when our neighbour is in 'light' spiritual necessity, we are bound to help him, if we can do so with little or no temporal loss to ourselves, we, guided by our penitential standard, may modify the clause in proportion and admit the obligation only when 'we can help him with *no* temporal loss to ourselves.'

So the Westland Row priest, even though he be on the scene, is not bound to hear the confessions of the ordinary Saturday penitents in Dalkey—the inconvenience involved is quite enough to excuse him from any obligation that may *per se* be supposed to exist. If a penitent comes to the confessional in Westland Row, the case is different: ordinarily speaking, and making allowance for converse cases, there is no inconvenience worth speaking of. But suppose an extreme case—suppose penitents flock from their own churches, where full provision is made for them, and insist on coming in hundreds to a church with which they have no connexion—are we going to insist on an obligation to hear them, or to denounce the local priest if he makes a determined protest?

'The Code will not admit any obligation at all unless there is urgent necessity.' Our correspondent apparently takes 'urgent' in the sense of 'extreme.' That, we think, is not the meaning. Any 'necessity' may 'urge.' If it be 'ordinary' (in our sense), there is practically no obligation whatever on a confessor as such; if it be 'grave,' there is a grave obligation in charity—unless there be a grave inconvenience that excuses; if it be 'extreme,' the obligation will *a fortiori* be grave—unless the inconvenience be *very* serious.

But all this has very little to do with the suggestion put forward by

¹ I. E. RECORD, December, 1919, p. 489.

² *Ibid.*, p. 487.

³ *Th. Mor.*, ii. 75. Others come nearer to the penance-standard: cf. e.g., Lehmkühl, i. 757.

'Rus in Rure' last December. His contention was that, in accordance with the terms of Canon 892, a priest who holds jurisdiction *anywhere* is bound, and of course entitled, to hear the confessions of penitents *everywhere*, at least in cases of grave necessity. The view appeared to us to be out of harmony with all legislation, past and present. That is the main issue: the subsidiary points are of very minor interest.

SOCIALISTS AND EXCOMMUNICATES

REV. DEAR SIR,—In view of the growing importance of the labour movement, will you please express an opinion as to:

- 1°. Whether Socialists, as such, are excommunicate?
- 2°. Whether our Irish Trades Unionists fall under the censure?

PASTOR.

1°. On the first question we gave our views six years ago.¹ And we find no reason for withdrawing them. They read:—

As regards the Socialists, the Church's attitude is, we believe, not quite so severe. The Bull *Apostolicæ Sedis*, it is true, after mentioning the Masons and Carbonarii by name, condemns equally 'alias ejusdem generis sectas, quæ contra ecclesiam vel legitimas potestates seu palam seu clandestine machinantur.' Some of the commentators, emphasizing the last part of the sentence, include under the condemnation all Biblical and clerico-liberal societies, the neo-Protestant (or Old Catholic) sect, and all associations that profess Socialism, Communism, or Internationalism in any form. Others, taking a more liberal and, we believe, a saner view, emphasize the clause *ejusdem generis*, and refuse to believe that any society is specially marked out for condemnation unless it can be classified with the Masons in organization, purpose, and methods. On this principle they would condemn the Nihilists and Anarchists, but they would exempt Socialists, as a body, from the Papal censure. Their opinion is quite probable and safe in practice.²

The prominent Socialists, it is true, both on the Continent and in these countries, have identified themselves with anti-Catholic and, indeed, anti-Christian principles, and anyone who supports these principles or contributes money for their propagation, will incur the excommunication, specially reserved to the Holy See, directed against all who promote or favour heresy.³ But, from the account given by 'Anglicanus,' we may take it for granted that his penitents never thought of any such purpose and are quite excused from the corresponding ecclesiastical penalties.

At the same time the penitents who have joined a Socialistic society are under a grave obligation to renounce it. Though their intention is the best, the mere fact that they are members of the society, and are contributing money to its support, tends to foster an organization that is essentially opposed to Catholic principles in practice and belief. Unless there is some very serious obstacle in the way, the confessor will be well advised to insist on an immediate breach with the society and, in all except

¹ I. E. RECORD, June, 1914, Fifth Series, vol. iii. p. 638.

² It has been strengthened by the Code: Canon 2335 omits 'seu palam seu clandestine,' and against 'favourers of heresy' the censure is now *ferendæ, not latae, sententiæ* (cc. 2314-16).

³ But see previous note.

very exceptional circumstances, on a formal withdrawal of the penitent's name from the list of membership.

We might cite dozens of authorities on one side and the other. But perhaps the readers of the I. E. RECORD would prefer to get the *ipsissima verba* of a man in whom they have confidence—Father Lehmkuhl, S.J. In his earlier works he expressed very unfavourable views regarding Socialists. But time taught him moderation. And in one of his latest works—a *Casus Conscientiae*, published in May, 1913¹—he puts himself the question :—

Aristophanes, operarius, curis domesticis agitatus, cum videat socialistas promittere se opem laturos, adit eorum contiones, nomen dat coetui, cui aliquis dux socialistarum praesidet, et cui finis praestitutus dicitur opem ferre operariis sodalibus labore carentibus et penuria pressis ; compluries stipem contulit, cum collecta fieret ad fines socialisticos et bonum commune assecularum. Cum tempore paschali confessionem instituit, audit a confessario se excommunicationem papalem incurrisse neque absolvi posse, nisi postquam omni illi communicationi cum socialistis renuntiaverit et dein per confessarium recurrat ad ordinarium.

QUAERITUR 1^o quousque extendatur excommunicatio contra sectam massonicam *similesque* sectas.

2^o rectane fuerit agendi ratio confessarii cum Aristophane.

His reply is :—

AD QUAESITUM 1^m R. 1. In bulla *Apostolicae Sedis* nominantur : secta massonica, secta carbonaria, aliae eiusdem generis sectae, quae contra Ecclesiam vel legitimas potestates seu palam seu clandestine machinantur.

Iam quaeritur, numi illa descriptio 'quae machinantur . . .' explicet vocem priorem 'eiusdem generis.' Quodsi ita est, patet sectas non paucas comprehendere, videlicet quoscumque coetus seu societates, quarum finis est vel perturbare rempublicam vel ecclesiasticam auctoritatem evertere. Atque re vera hac interpretatione nixi *D'Annibale*, *Ballerini-Palmieri* alique non pauci enumerant inter sectas hoc articulo perculsas : societates *biblicas*, societates *clerico-liberales*, sectam *neo-protestanticam* (s. veterum-catholicorum), societates quae *communismum*, *socialismum*, *internationalismum*, *nihilismum* profitentur. Cf. *Ballerini-Palm.*, Opus th. m. VII, n. 302.

R. 2. Alii aliter sentiunt, nimirum, ut articulus constitutionis *Apost. Sedis* verificetur, requiri primo similitudinem cum secta massonica in organisatione et directione, secundo similitudinem in fine, quem prosequatur, et in modo, quo finem suum prosequatur. Imprimis ergo requiri, ut directio sectae pendeat ab occultis ducibus ; dein ut finis sit eversio auctoritatis sive ecclesiasticae sive civilis, quem subdolis viis et artibus prosequantur. Quodsi haec momenta adsint, perinde esse, utrum prosequitur finis palam fiat an occulte. Quapropter hi auctores nihilistas quidem et anarchistas cum muratoribus coniungunt, communium vero socialistarum societates ab hoc articulo bullae *Apost. Sedis* eximunt. Quae interpretatio cum probabilis sit, practice potest teneri.—Ita *Vermeersch*, De prohibitione et censura librorum p. 64 sqq ; *Laurentius*, Instit. iuris eccl. n. 555.

¹ Pp. 556-8.

R. 3. Nihilominus vix non omnes, qui uni ex *praedictis* sectis adhaerent eiusque fines scientes prosequuntur, severiore etiam excommunicatione ligantur propter haereses, quas in eo casu non possunt non profiteri vel saltem iuvare. Cf. constit. *Apost. Sedis* ser. I a. 1.

Verum si finis sectae seu societatis formaliter non est haeresis propugnatio et defensio, sed temporale auxilium mutuum aliusve finis in se honestus, etsi haeresis profitendae vel iuvandae periculum adsit, facile ii immunes sunt a censura, qui haeresim atque impietatem sectarum detestantes, cum secta illa communicationem sustinent eamque promovent ex sola causa emolumenti mutui procurandi atque sumendi.

AD QUAESITUM 2^m R. 1. Ex dictis patet confessarium Aristophanis severius iudicasse, cum non constet eum incurrisse excommunicationem propter participationem cum societatibus damnatis.

Neque ex haeresi vel haeresis favore Aristophanes contraxisse videtur excommunicationem speciali modo Romano Pontifici reservatam. Nam cum respiceret solos fines temporales ex se honestos, ne cogitasse quidem videtur de finibus irreligiosis socialistarum, quorum promovendorum periculo se exponat per pecuniae collationem.

R. 2. Attamen gravis obligatio nihilominus Aristophani incumbit omni communicationi cum socialistis valedicendi. Nam illa communicatio tum periculum creat non leve Aristophanis fidei et bonis moribus, tum propter conferendam pecuniam re ipsa pravos fines positive iuvat: quae sane sunt prorsus illicita. Recte igitur postulavit confessarius, ut, si absolvi vellet, socialistis renuntiaret; immo nisi gravis ratio obstet, antequam absolveretur, urgendus erat, ut re ipsa nomen suum e numero socialistarum et eius coetus, qui a socialistis dirigitur, curaret expungendum.

This view, we admit, is, theoretically, not quite certain. But it is at least 'probable.' And, as regards ecclesiastical penalties, the old principle—reaffirmed in the Code (2219, § 1, etc.)—is that a censure is not incurred when there is a solidly probable opinion in favour of liberty.

2°. No, 'Pastor,' we must refuse to make any statement. Even a 'Prussian' might hesitate about shooting down a quarter of million of men.

It is a matter for the Bishops of Ireland, not for an irresponsible writer like ourselves. There is no Irish law, we admit, against our expressing a view. But the *spirit* of the American law binds us.

And the Baltimore legislation (n. 255) reads:—

Ad praecavendum praeterea, ne confusio disciplinae habeatur, dum cum magno fidelium scandalo et auctoritatis ecclesiasticae detrimento, eadem societas in una diocesi damnatur, et in alia toleratur, nolumus ullam societatem, uti cadentem sub una ex classibus indicatis, nominatim damnari antequam Ordinarius rem retulerit ad Commissionem quam pro huiusmodi causis iudicandis nunc constituimus, et quae constabit ex omnibus Archiepiscopis harum provinciarum. Quod si societas damnanda omnibus visa non fuerit, recurrendum erit ad Sanctam Sedem, ut iudicium certum accipiatur et disciplina in nostris provinciis uniformis servetur.

And so we leave it.

M. J. O'DONNELL.

CANON LAW

ALIENATION OF ECCLESIASTICAL PROPERTY

REV. DEAR SIR,—Your reply in January number I. E. RECORD, to 'Parochus,' in regard to Alienation of Ecclesiastical Property, will give pause to many who were of opinion that the Code was the bearer of a message of freedom on this much vexed question of the Alienation of Ecclesiastical Property. At first sight the powers conceded to local authorities in Canon 1532 seem pretty generous. But, in the light of the decision of the S. Congregation of the Council, as published in the *Acta* of November last and quoted in your reply, the power of unloosing by alienation conferred in Canon 1532, merely eventuates in a binding obligation in the light of Canon 1531, § 3, which demands that the money obtained by alienation shall be invested 'caute tuto et utiliter in commodum ecclesiae.' In other words, the powers of alienation conferred on local authorities in the Code are only 'ad fructum,' i.e., in regard to whatever interest accrues from the investment, so that, if there be question of expending the principal, e.g., £500, even on the parish church, an indult must be obtained from the Holy See. And as most of the matters of alienation that come before the local authorities have reference to expending the principal on some work of a religious character, it would be just as easy to ask Rome to grant permission to alienate and expend as to expend alone. There might be some cases where a new investment might be profitable or necessary, but that number is comparatively small.

But the point on which I desire your opinion is whether in the light of our Irish custom there is really need of an Indult from Rome in the case you discussed in the January I. E. RECORD: sale of a small parochial farm of about £500 in value; the proceeds to be devoted to repairs of parish church and curate's house.

Now I have made enquiries from priests of whose knowledge, probity, and experience no doubt can exist; and they assure me that during the past forty years it has been the custom for local ecclesiastical authorities in this country to alienate ecclesiastical property of even greater value than £500 and to expend the proceeds on the church or parochial house, without any Indult from the Holy See at all. Might not the freedom obtained by that custom be now utilized as in the case submitted by 'Parochus.' I respectfully submit the following points:—

1. Of the existence of the custom I think there can be no doubt.
2. It is a custom that is reasonable and has forty years behind it, as Canon 27 demands.
3. I say it is reasonable, and here I adopt your own definition of a reasonable custom. In the I. E. RECORD, October, 1916, discussing the question of selling of pews in churches, you wrote as follows:—

'We see no reason, however, why a legitimate custom might not obviate altogether the necessity of recourse to the Bishop or the Holy See for the special form of alienation involved in the selling of pews. Indeed of the conditions necessary for lawful custom, the only one about the fulfilment of which any question can be raised in the present case is that of reason-

ableness, and even in regard to this there is in reality, as we shall see, no difficulty. The description of this condition as given by canonists is altogether negative. Briefly it may be said that a custom is reasonable when it is neither opposed to the natural or positive divine law, nor is reprobated by ecclesiastical law as a corruption, nor notably interferes with authority in the maintenance of Church discipline.' And on further discussion you admit that the consent of Holy See or Bishop for alienation is not required by divine law. Also you state that customs contrary to alienation legislation were never reprobated as corruptions by ecclesiastical law. And you further admit that such customs against alienation legislation would not notably interfere with ecclesiastical authority ; and, lastly, the Decree of Holy Office 1880 admitted the existence of such customs.

4. The Code in the Canons dealing with alienation contains no reprobating clause against customs, and Canon 5 makes special provision for them.

5. The reply of the Holy Office in 1880 abolished all pre-existing customs. But forty years have elapsed meanwhile, and Canon 27 looks on a forty-year-old custom as a respectable lodger not to be rudely evicted.

FINIS.

We sympathize fully with our correspondent's complaint regarding the practical results of Canon 1531, § 3. In most cases the desire to alienate ecclesiastical property arises from the utility or necessity of expending the proceeds in some pious or religious work. It avails the local authorities very little, therefore, to be allowed to alienate, if at the same time they are forbidden to expend the proceeds of the alienation without the consent of the Holy See. Yet we fear that there is no way out of the impasse. The words of the Canon are clear ; but those of the interpretation of the Congregation of the Council, which though not universally binding has yet considerable authority, are even clearer still. Let us repeat them : ' Special attention must be paid in our case to the clause of Canon 1531, § 3 : " the money derived from alienation must be invested carefully, safely and usefully for the benefit of the Church " : that is to say, the money so derived cannot be immediately expended even for pious or necessary purposes, but must be conserved so as to bear interest ; in order, therefore, that it be expended or consumed, even for the enlargement of a church, as has happened in the present case, there is need always of the permission of the Holy See or, in other words, of a dispensation in this obligation, which the law in the above Canon imposes clearly, explicitly, and without any exception.' ¹

Let us now come directly to the point upon which ' Finis ' asks our views. There is not the slightest difficulty about admitting the reasonableness of a custom such as that postulated by him. We have the gravest doubts, however, whether or not such a custom ever really existed in this country. Certainly, during the three or four years which immediately preceded the publication of the Code, we ourselves have had personal knowledge of a few cases of alienation of property of even less value than £500, in which the Holy See was approached for permission. It is unnecessary,

¹ *Acta Ap. Sedis*, November, 1919, p. 418.

however, to labour the point, because its solution will not affect our conclusion in the slightest. Granted even that such a custom existed, and that, in so far as it is in opposition to Canon 1531, § 3, it was a custom in the real sense of the term, yet it would have been abrogated by the Code. As our correspondent points out, it could have arisen only since 1880, and consequently could have been neither centennial nor immemorial; it was therefore unconditionally abrogated in accordance with Canon 5. The position of customs in existence at the time of the publication of the Code and in opposition to it is regulated by this canon, not by Canon 27: the latter deals only with the rise of future customs.

Again, granted the existence of the custom, in so far as it is in opposition to Canon 1531, § 3, it can hardly be looked upon as a custom in the real sense of the term. In the regulations regarding alienation we must distinguish between two things: the prohibition to alienate; and the command to invest the proceedings in safe securities. In pre-Code days there was no prescription in regard to investment,¹ and consequently there could have been no contrary custom. It is abundantly clear, we think, that, in a matter upon which there has been hitherto no legislation, a custom *contra legem* cannot have arisen. An appeal to such a custom to prevent the incidence of new legislation is, therefore, out of the question.

From all that has been said it follows that our correspondent's appeal to custom, to surmount some of the difficulties arising from Canon 1531, § 3, cannot be sustained.

THE PRIVILEGE REGARDING THE USE OF MEAT ON ONE OF TWO CONSECUTIVE DAYS OF ABSTINENCE

REV. DEAR SIR,—When two consecutive fast days occur, outside of Lent, we have the privilege of using meat at the principal meal on the second of these days. For the ordinary faithful Saturdays are not fast days in Advent. According to the constitutions of their Order a certain community of nuns are bound by a fast on one of these Saturdays. On this particular Saturday may the nuns avail of the privilege of using flesh meat at the principal meal?

In such circumstances may they generally avail of the privilege enjoyed by the ordinary faithful?

A reply at your convenience will oblige.

SACERDOS.

To be in a position to reply to this query we must examine the terms of the privilege to which our correspondent refers. The favour of being permitted the use of meat on one of two consecutive days of abstinence was first granted to the faithful of Scotland by an Apostolic Brief of Pope Pius X, published on 27th January, 1911. In the following year our Bishops asked to have this concession extended to Ireland; and on the 31st June,

¹ It is true, indeed, that there was a regulation in regard to investment in an Instruction of the Propaganda given to the Bishops of Cilicia in 1867. This, however, affected only those to whom it was directed; as far as we are aware there was no general law on the matter.

1912, the Congregation of the Council acceded to the request, insisting at the same time upon strict adherence to the terms of the original privilege (*servata forma et tenore ennuciatae apostolicæ concessionis*).¹ The words of the Apostolic Brief, therefore, are of utmost importance for our present purpose; and hence we shall quote the dispositive portion of this document:—

Wherefore by the mercy of the Omnipotent God and relying on the authority of the Blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul, according to the tenor of this present letter, we concede and grant for ever to all and each of the faithful of the kingdom of Scotland that, with the exclusion of Lent, on Saturdays of Quarter Tense, and on those Vigils which immediately precede or follow either Friday or another day of abstinence, they can freely and lawfully eat meat.²

Our correspondent implies that the Saturday in Advent is one on which the ordinary faithful are not bound to abstain; it is clear therefore that it does not come within the terms of this privilege. Moreover, we are of opinion that the purpose of the concession is to relax only the obligation of abstaining which arises from general law. Indications to this effect are to be found in the fact that the privilege was intended principally for workmen (*operarii*), that it mentioned days on which the obligation was imposed by general law and these only, and that in petitioning for its extension the Irish Bishops referred expressly to the prohibition of the common law.

A CASE OF RELIGIOUS POVERTY

There is a Convent of Sisters whose Rule has been approved by the Holy See. This Convent has not yet been 80 years in existence and therefore has no immemorial custom or one of 100 years' standing. During the years of its existence, the Convent has experienced the growth of a custom which seems directly opposed to the Rule if not to the New Code.

The Sisters' Rule says: 'If, with the Superior's permission, they receive any present from their relatives or others, it must be applied to the use of the Community and not to the particular use of the receiver.'

The contrary custom is this. Relatives and others sometimes make gifts of money—say from 10s. to £10—knowing that it will be applied to the particular use of the receiver and not to the use of the Community. These sums are given to the Sister that she may make presents to the children or to her friends, etc. These sums are not given by the Sister to the Bursar and are not entered in the Books of the House. The Sister takes these sums to the Rev. Mother, who keeps a large cupboard for the purpose of guarding them. In this cupboard there are as many little boxes as there are Sisters in the Community, each box bearing the name of a Sister. When then a Sister receives a money present, she gives it to the Rev. Mother, who puts it in that Sister's box. There it remains till some hawker turns up, selling pious objects, etc. [The Sister goes then to

¹ Cf. I. E. RECORD, September, 1912, Fourth Series, vol. xxxii, p. 309.

² *Acta Ap. Sedis*, vol. iii, p. 58.

the Rev. Mother for some or for all the money in her little box, and, with Rev. Mother's permission, which by custom is never refused, purchases things and gives them away as presents—purchasing and making presents of value of £5 or £10 sometimes. Rev. Mother has never regarded these money gifts to Sisters as the money of the Community, but as money given to the Sisters to be used by them individually for purpose of making presents to friends, etc. Rev. Mother does not like this custom, and asks the following questions:—

1. Is the said custom, by the fact that it is not of 100 years' standing, abolished by Canon 593, which says that all the Religious are bound to order their lives according to the rules and constitutions of their Institute?

The words of the Sister's Rule, given above, seem to be directly opposed to the custom which has grown up.

2. Is the said custom a flat contradiction of Canon 594, § 2, since there does not seem (1) to be incorporation in the goods of the House, and (2) the Rev. Mother's cupboard can hardly be called the common safe?

3. Granting, for argument sake, that this custom is what canonists call 'Imperfect Peculium,' is it

(a) Abolished by the Code on the ground of not being immemorial or of 100 years' standing?

(b) Could it be abolished by Rev. Mother on the grounds that Canon 593 tells her that she and the Sisters are bound to keep their rules—particularly since her Convent is well able, out of Community goods, to supply all the legitimate wants of the Sisters, even to letting them make becoming presents, if necessary?

(c) Is the Rev. Mother even bound in conscience to abolish this custom, so opposed to common life and the spirit of poverty, when she knows that the Sisters will make no opposition to its abolition?

(d) This custom being supposed to be unknown to the Ordinary, is Rev. Mother bound to refer the matter to him, or may she abolish it of her own accord, when she foresees no opposition on the part of the Sisters?

(e) If the rules say nothing about Rev. Mother's powers to expend money, how far may she go in £ s. d. in making a present or letting a Sister make a present to be paid for out of Community money? May she expend several pounds sterling?

In regard to this custom, it may be added further that the Rev. Mother and her predecessors considered themselves free: (a) to refuse permission to a Sister to spend the money she had received; (b) to incorporate it in the money of the House; (c) to refuse permission to a Sister even to accept such money presents.

RELIGIOSUS.

The custom to which our correspondent refers is clearly of one 'imperfect peculium.' Piat's definition of the latter and its distinction from 'perfect peculium' are typical. 'It must be prefaced,' he states, 'that a twofold "peculium" is distinguished: one is called proper or perfect; the other improper or imperfect. The former is property with the faculty of disposing of it freely and independently of any other person, as of a thing belonging to oneself. The latter permits indeed the administration, possession, or detention and use, but with dependence on another, at whose

will it can be restricted, recalled, or taken away altogether.' ¹ Vermeersch, in his explanation of 'peculium,' gives an example which resembles very closely the custom under discussion. 'The notion of "peculium," he declares, 'is present in money, even though it may be deposited with a Superior, which one can use for procuring those things of which one has need in the matter of goods, dress, bedroom furniture and the like.'² He had previously declared that the 'peculium' was imperfect, if its use was dependent on the will of the Superior.³

Is this custom abrogated by the new Code of Canon Law? We are of opinion that the canons referred to by our correspondent are not sufficient for its abolition. Canon 593, which states that religious are bound to order their lives in accordance with the rules and constitutions of their Institute, does not of itself oblige them to observe each individual rule and constitution. It has reference merely to the general tenor of their lives. Even though the purpose of the canon were to impose an obligation in regard to individual rules and constitutions, it could be very reasonably interpreted as applying only to those which were still in force, not to those which had been abrogated by custom or in any other way.

Neither is the custom, we think, in conflict with Canon 594, § 2. Clearly in this canon there is question only of goods and money which become the property of the Institute; whereas in the custom under consideration each individual sister retains the ownership of the presents that are made to her. Canon 580, § 3, 1-2, it may be pointed out, implies that religious with simple vows, apart from any regulation to the contrary in their Institute, become the owners of property given personally to them.

Though the custom may be reconciled with the two canons just discussed, yet there is another with which we believe it to be out of harmony, viz., Canon 594, § 1, which requires all religious to observe accurately the common life: That there is question in this section of the perfectly common life, with which 'imperfect peculium' is incompatible, is evident from the words *accurate . . . etiam in iis quae ad victum, ad vestitum et ad suppellextilem pertinent*. This conclusion is confirmed by the fact that when canonists and ecclesiastical legislators use the expression 'common life' (*vita communis*) without the qualification of 'perfect' or 'imperfect,' they mean by it the perfectly common life.⁴

Even though this custom were centennial or immemorial, it could scarcely be retained; for it is clear from what is stated in the query that there are no circumstances of place or person which would render its

¹ *Prael. Juris Reg.*, tom. i. Q. 274.

² De Relv.: Inst. et Personis, tom. i. n. 276.

³ Op. cit. n. 274: 'Est juis imperfecti, si facultas disponendi semper a Superiori circumscribi aut auferrī possit.'

⁴ Cf. Vermeersch, op. cit. n. 281; Piat, op. cit. n. 276; Benedict XIV, De Syn. Dioec., Leo XIII, c. 12, n. 18 et seq.; Declaratio Pii IX, 1st Oct., 1852; Const. Pastoralis Off. Innoc. XII, 'Cum nihil vitae monasticae conformius, et magis ad conservandum paupertatis religiosae spiritum necessarium, quam vita communis; ordinamus talem vitam in omnibus omnino Monasteriis instituendam ubi non est, omnesque redditus in communi reponendos.'

abolition imprudent.¹ All the *data* supplied, however, go to show that the custom is not of this kind, and that consequently it is abrogated unconditionally.

As regards the procedure to be followed by the Rev. Mother, if the custom has been abrogated unconditionally—the information given in the query, as we have just stated, goes to show that it has—then there is no need for her to refer the matter to the Ordinary. Were the custom, however, centennial or immemorial, her proper course would be to submit the case to the Ordinary, and let him decide as to the prudence or the contrary of the abolition.

In determining the extent of a Rev. Mother's power to make gifts from the Community money, the only canon which gives us any assistance is 537. 'It is not permitted,' this canon states 'to make gifts out of the goods of a House, Province, or Institute, unless by way of almsgiving, or for some other just cause, and with the consent of the Superior and in conformity with the constitutions.' When the constitutions, as in the case contemplated, say nothing as to the amount of these gifts, the Superior must be guided in this matter by other considerations. The principal of these, it seems to us, are the financial condition of the House, Province, or Institute and the nature of the cause on account of which the present is made. Manifestly, therefore, it is impossible for us to lay down any general rule on the point. There can be no doubt, however, that if the financial position of a Community were strong, and the cause were serious, a Rev. Mother's power would extend to several pounds.

DISPENSING POWER OF PARISH PRIEST

REV. DEAR SIR,—I. I am writing to ask if you will kindly solve a difficulty in the interpretation of Canon 1245, § 1. This canon seems to declare that a Parish Priest has the right of dispensing a *peregrinus* who comes to him in his own parish. Now I am anxious to know whether this dispensation holds still, on the return of the *peregrinus* a few hours later to his own parish, or whether it ceases on his leaving the parish of the parochus who granted it?

II. Secondly, what exactly is a '*peregrinus*'?—Would a man come under this heading who left his own parish for a few hours and went to the neighbouring parish to get a dispensation from fasting which his own parish priest refused to give him? If so, surely the Code seems to be rather subversive of the authority of Parish Priests.

SACERDOS.

I. The dispensation certainly holds: departure from the territory of the Superior who has granted it is not now, and never has been, one of the causes on account of which a personal dispensation ceases.

II. As there is no indication to the contrary, *peregrinus* has its ordinary signification as defined in Canon 91. In the circumstances mentioned by our correspondent, the man would certainly be a *peregrinus*, and the parish priest of the place could validly and lawfully dispense him. Of course it is

¹ Cf. Canon 5.

expressly prescribed that there should be a just cause for the dispensation ; and this prevents the regulation from being in any way subversive of the authority of the proper parish priest. Should the latter, when a just cause for it exists, refuse a dispensation, he would be acting most arbitrarily.

J. KINANE.

LITURGY

THE LITANY OF LORETO

A recent decision of the Sacred Penitentiary regarding the indulgences of the Litany of Loreto emphasizes two or three abuses in the chanting of the Litany to which we think attention should be directed. The decision was published in the January number of *Acta Ap. Sedis* and appeared in the February issue of the I. E. RECORD (p. 153). A reference to the decree indicates that the Sacred Congregation had before it three distinct abuses, viz. : (1) omitting the second *Kyrie Eleison* at the beginning ; (2) inserting the *ora pro nobis* only after every third invocation ; (3) chanting the *Agnus Dei* only once at the end ; and the question proposed for an authoritative decision was whether, adverting to Canon 934 of the Codex, the indulgences of the Litany were gained by such methods of recitation. In several canons the Codex deals explicitly with the conditions necessary for gaining indulgences. On the part of the recipient, besides the state of grace (Can. 925, § 1) and the intention of gaining the indulgences (Can. 925, § 2), there is required the fulfilment of the prescribed works—'statuto tempore ac debito modo'—and if, as in this instance, the indulgences are granted for the recitation of a certain prayer 'they are entirely lost by any addition, subtraction or interpolation'—'penitus cessant ob quamlibet additionem, detractionem vel interpolationem' (Can. 934 § 2). Moralists might be inclined to argue that the omissions mentioned in this decree are of a trivial nature, and, taken singly or collectively, could hardly be regarded as sufficiently grave to interfere with the substantial integrity of the prayer, but the wording of the Canon—'ob quamlibet detractionem'—admits of no such distinction, and the authoritative answer of the Sacred Congregation places the matter beyond the region of discussion. The indulgences are forfeited by such methods of recitation and the Holy Father orders that abuses of the kind are to be corrected wherever they exist. In order to gain the indulgences therefore, the Litany, as every other indulgenced prayer, should be said or chanted in its entirety, without omission, addition or interpolation. The *Kyrie*, *Christe*, *Kyrie*, are to be recited at the beginning, the *ora pro nobis* is to follow each invocation in the body of the Litany,¹ the *Agnus Dei*, with its proper endings, is to be repeated three times. In the *Raccolta* (p. 275), which contains the official list of indulgences, the Litany begins with the

¹The custom—peculiar to some of the old books—of joining three invocations and then reciting the *ora pro nobis* three times is not in accordance with Can. 934 in the opinion of the *Ephem. Liturg.* (Jan., 1920, p. 8)—'quia tum detractionem, tum interpolationem causat.'

Kyrie and ends with the *Agnus Dei*, so that the usual prayer at the beginning — 'Sub tuum praesidium' — and the Versicle, Response and Prayer at the end, are not essential to the gaining of the indulgences. These Indulgences are ¹: (a) 300 days each time the Litany is devoutly recited with contrite heart; (b) a plenary indulgence on the five great feasts of the Blessed Virgin, viz., the Immaculate Conception (8th Dec.), the Nativity (8th Sept.), the Annunciation (25th March), the Purification (2nd Feb.), and the Assumption (15th August), to all who shall recite the Litany every day and shall on any of those feasts approach the Sacraments, visit a Church or Public Oratory and pray there for the Pope's intentions.

The carrying out of this instruction will demand an effort from the heads of choirs in this country as well as in other parts of the Church, chiefly owing to the popularity of the abuses to which the decree refers. The most popular tunes of the Litany have stereotyped the defects and it will take some time and trouble to eradicate them. The settings of the Litany which have had the greatest vogue in our schools and churches err either by omission, addition, or repetition, and teachers and choir-masters will need to have their attention called to the inaccuracies of such compositions. Either they will have to be abandoned altogether, and new settings substituted for them, or arranged so as to conform to the requirements of the decree. The singing of the *ora pro nobis* after each invocation in the body of the Litany should cause little difficulty. Inserted in place of one of the three invocations hitherto grouped together, it will not necessitate any change in the old melody. In the *Kyrie* and the *Agnus Dei*, the liturgical rendition of which will cause the greatest difficulty, the only solution we are confident in recommending is a return to the plain Gregorian chant. In the official choir books there are two beautiful Gregorian settings of the Litany, which, apart from their antiquity and their strictly liturgical character, deserve on their own merits a greater popularity than they have hitherto received. These melodies reflect the beauty, dignity and devotion of genuine Church music, and their more general adoption would, we are sure, be an edifying and welcome change from the jiggy anaemic profanities which pass for Litany tunes in some of our popular choir manuals.

A few points of general interest in connexion with the Litany of the Blessed Virgin may here be noted.

(1) It is styled the Litany of Loreto in this decree, as in all previous official documents, because of its association with the Holy House of Loreto, near Ancona, where every Saturday from time immemorial it is sung with great solemnity. There is a consensus of opinion amongst spiritual writers on its beauty and excellence as a prayer of intercession, and the Holy See has time and again extolled its merits and lent it the weight of its approval, but its origin and development into its present form are matters upon which authorities express widely different views.² Some tell us that

¹ Decr. S.I.C., Sept. 30, 1817.

² Some maintain that the oldest Marian Litany is an Irish form given in the 'Leabhar Breac.' O'Curry attributes it to the middle of the eighth century. It was published a few years ago with English translation in Father Toal's 'τὸ πρῶτον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἱεροῦ.'

nothing is definitely known of its origin and history, others believe it to date from Apostolic times, others again trace it back to the translation of the Holy House (1294). The most recent and best informed opinion¹ assigns its origin to the end of the 15th or beginning of the 16th century. It was definitely approved by the Church in 1587.

(2) Without the authority of the Holy See, it is forbidden² to change or add anything to the Litany. A few invocations have been inserted or added in recent times, but the additions have in each instance been made by formal decree. The latest³—*Regina Pacis*—has been added by the present Pope for the term of the war, but, unlike previous additions, the consent of the Ordinary is needed for its public recitation.

(3) We have said that the recitation of the Versicle, Response and Prayer are not necessary for the gaining of the indulgences. In the *Roman Ritual*,⁴ however, they are given with the Litany and should, we think, be added whenever the Litany is publicly recited as part of a liturgical function, e.g., the October Devotions. It should be also noted that the Versicle, Response and Prayer vary according to the different times of the year. In a decree dated Dec. 7th, 1900, it is stated, 'versiculus autem, responsorium et oratio post dictas litanias mutari *possunt* pro temporis diversitate'; but in the latest edition of the *Ritual* the rubric seems to leave no option in the matter, 'Pro temporis diversitate . . . mutantur.' The proper Versicle, Response and Prayer of the Litany coincide with those of the Greater Antiphons of the Blessed Virgin, as appointed in the Breviary to the different seasons, with one exception, viz., the time from Purification to Easter, which in the Breviary has a special Versicle, Response and Prayer, but in the Litany is the same as from Pentecost to Advent.

(4) The additions *Christe audi nos, Christe exaudi nos, Pater et Ave*, after the *Agnus Dei*, which we sometimes notice in authorized prayer books, are not proper to the Litany of Loreto and should not be joined to it.⁵

(5) The indulgences of the Litany, like other indulgenced prayers, may be gained by its recitation in the vernacular provided the version is a faithful one and has been approved as such by the Ordinary.⁶ It may be recited privately or alternately with others or followed mentally while others recite it,⁷ but a private mental⁸ recitation does not suffice for the gaining of the indulgences. In this connexion we might remark that many approved vernacular versions are now out of date, for they lack the invocation 'Mother of Good Council,' and give as the Prayer 'Pour

¹ See *Cath. Encyclopedia*, 'Litany,' by Angelo de Santi.

² S.R.C., August 2, 1631; April 3, 1821; August 5, 1839.

³ Decr. S.R.C., November 16, 1915.

⁴ See Appendix of *Roman Ritual* (1913).

⁵ 'Litaniae Lauretanae concludendae sunt uti in Appendice *Ritualis Romani*, ommissis *Christe audi nos*,' etc.—Decr. S.R.C., December 1, 1900.

⁶ Can. 934, § 2.

⁷ Can. 934, § 3.

⁸ Can. 934, § 1: 'Mentalis tantum oratio non sufficit.'

forth we beseech Thee,' which is not a translation of any of the Prayers of the Litany. It is, of course, the prayer of the *Angelus*. In future editions of popular prayer books we think the editors would be doing a useful work if they inserted a complete translation of the Litany of the Blessed Virgin, including the several Prayers with suitable directions as to the appointed times for saying them.

A CHURCH WITH TWO TITULARS. THE USE OF DOUBLE-FACED VESTMENTS. THE DESECRATION OF AN ALTAR-STONE

REV. DEAR SIR,—I. The church to which I am at present attached seems to have two Titulars. It is known as the Church of St. A and St. B. Should the Feasts of both St. A (in December) and St. B (in September) be kept by us as Doubles of the 1st Class with Ordinary Octaves?

II. Is there any prohibition against the use in normal circumstances of double-coloured vestments, such as the Military Chaplains used, i.e., black on one side, white on the other?

III. An altar-stone that I sometimes come in contact with has one corner broken off. The whole of the little cross representing the place of anointing is not broken but the greater part is. Should it be regarded as desecrated?

M.

I. We know of dioceses having two Principal Patrons, e.g., the diocese of Dublin, but it is rather uncommon to find a church having two distinct Principal Titulars. Though, however, the occurrence is rare, we can easily conceive how it might have happened. Either (1) the church, in the act of consecration, was given two distinct Titulars; or (2) it received one at its solemn blessing, and another at its consecration; or (3) a second Titular might have been added by special indult of the Holy See. However the fact in any particular instance is to be accounted for, the liturgical law prescribing the due celebration of the Titulars' feasts is clear and definite. If they are both Principal Titulars—'aeque principales'—they should be celebrated as Doubles of the 1st Class with Ordinary Octaves. In the Tables of the Breviary we do not observe any such designation as 'Secondary Titular,' to correspond with the 'Secondary Patron' of a diocese, but we are given to understand that sometimes, in addition to the recognized Titular, the name of another Saint or Mystery is found associated with a particular Church, introduced apparently through the piety of the faithful on account of some special circumstance in their past history, inviting their devotion or gratitude. Whether, in such a case, apart from an Apostolic indult, the particular Church may be said to have a Secondary Titular in the Saint or Mystery thus arbitrarily chosen, the celebration of whose feast would be on a par with that of the Secondary Patron of a diocese, viz., to rank as a Feast of Double Major rite, we should hesitate to say. The opinion of the *Ephem. Liturg.*, however, seems sufficiently definite on the question. It says:—

Si vero non sint aeque principales sed unus ex eis introductus pietate populorum, reservabitur primo, vero scilicet Titulari, ritus duplex primae

classis cum octava ; secundus autem (dummodo in caetera concurrent) sub ritu duplici majori celebrabitur, sicut competit Patronis secundi ordinis.¹

II. We have been unable to find any decretorial prohibition of the use of such vestments. We have carefully examined the various decrees of the Congregation of Rites dealing with the colour, form and material of the Sacred Vestments and have sought enlightenment in the works of several recognized rubrical authorities, but have practically failed to elicit any definite information. We confess that we have been disappointed, for on reading the question we formed so decided an opinion of the unlawfulness of the practice, from the rubrical point of view, that we thought it should be an easy matter to substantiate it. We found several decrees of the Sacred Congregation prohibiting the use of multi-coloured vestments,² but except for the unvarying order—‘*Serventur Rubricae*’—given in the replies, which we think rather significant, there is nothing in those decrees on which we could reasonably base an argument on the point at issue. The Rubrics prescribe that the vestments be ‘*decenter munda ac pulchra, non lacera et scissa sed integra,*’ but an advocate of the liceity of the bi-coloured article might, we think, not unreasonably ask how the fulfilment of those conditions is impeded by the use of one form of vestment more than the other. The *Ephemerides Liturgicae*³—a rubrical publication of unquestionable authority—expresses the opinion that the fulfilment of the first two conditions at least—‘*decenter munda et pulchra*’—is utterly inconsistent with the use of the bi-coloured chasuble. It says: ‘*Quae conditiones num comprobari possint in planetis exposito sensu bicolores, maxime in superiori parte, quae collum tangit, lectoribus relinquimus perpendendum*’ But surely the upper part of the chasuble does not touch the neck when the stole is worn, nor does the external beauty or integrity of the vestment very much depend on the material or colour of its lining. The argument has some validity as against the bi-coloured stole. Yet our sympathies completely accord with the conclusion arrived at by this writer—‘*Hinc tenemus, consultius ad minus, planetas ejusmodi non esse adhibendas neque conficiendas.*’ For, apart from any legislation on the point, does it not seem incongruous and unbecoming to have the lining of a garment made of the same rich costly material as the garment itself—that what serves as the interior of the garment to-day may serve as the exterior to-morrow? In normal circumstances, whoever thinks of ordering a double-faced coat, or who so foolhardy as to try to justify the use of it in polite society? Who ever thinks of putting a black lining to a white garment? There are, of course, circumstances of poverty or great convenience that sometimes excuse such anomalies, but, normally, the instincts of good taste and propriety will be slow to tolerate them. In the administration of the sacrament of Baptism, the Sacred Congregation tolerates⁴ the use of the reversible stole, because of its great convenience, but it has lent no

¹ July-August, 1919, p. 265.

² Decrees S.R.C., nn. 2675, 2682, 2769, etc.

³ *Eph. Liturg.*, 1909 (May-June), p. 292.

⁴ Decr. S.C.R. 3086, vii.

sanction to the use of this stole or of any reversible vestment in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. In each instance, when a custom calculated to interfere with her regulations regarding the form, material, and colour of the Sacred Vestments, has come formally under her notice the answer has come—'Serventur Rubricae.' If it has not explicitly pronounced on this abuse we take it that either it has not come formally under notice, or else that it is so obviously unrubrical, so decidedly opposed to the respectability and all round becomingness that should characterize everything in connexion with the Holy Mass, as to need no formal prohibition. The silence of the Congregation in any case is a merely negative argument which proves nothing, and as regards the analogy from the alleged custom of Military Chaplains—on the existence and sanction of which we should like to have more definite knowledge—we shall only remark that many subterfuges are tolerated in war which are reprehensible in time of peace, and that we are here concerned merely with 'normal circumstances.'

III. A decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites dated 3rd March, 1821, states the following: 'Quo vero ad altaria cum integra lapidea mensa, quoties fractura sit enormis, mensa omnino renovanda et ab Episcopo consecranda erit.' A notable fracture, therefore, on the table of a fixed altar or an altar-stone is sufficient to deprive it of its consecration. But what is to be regarded as 'a notable fracture'? All writers seem to agree that if an altar-stone is so badly fractured as to be unable to hold the chalice and paten it has lost its consecration, but whether, in estimating the 'enormity' of the fracture we should take into consideration its location as well as its extent, we find a diversity of opinion. The difficulty of our correspondent illustrates the really practical point in dispute. Rubricists generally hold that the dislocation of one of the lateral crosses from the rest of the stone must, by reason of the anointing, be regarded as constituting a notable fracture. Theologians, such as Lemhkuhl,¹ deny this as an arbitrary and unfounded interpretation of the decree. We think the new Code definitely confirms the former opinion and closures further discussion on the point. Canon 1200, § 2, reads: 'Tum altare immobile tum petra sacra omittunt consecrationem si frangantur enormiter sive quantitate fractionis sivi ratione loci unctionis.' We are of opinion, therefore, that the dislocation of one of these lateral crosses deprives the altar-stone of its consecration, and we think the same should hold when, as in this instance, the fracture includes the greater part of the cross.

VEIL FOR THE MONSTRANCE. USE OF THE STOLE IN THE RECONCILIATION OF A CONVERT

REV. DEAR SIR,—I. In reference to the query answered in the January Number on 'Reverences at Benediction,' is there any obligation to have the Monstrance covered with a veil when it rests on the altar before and after exposition?

II. And in the same issue, in the query re 'Reconciliation of a Convert,'

¹ Vol. ii. (Editio Undecima) quest. 308, p. 180.

does not the Instruction of the Holy Office, dated 20th July, 1859, prescribe the use of the stole in the reception of the Profession of Faith?

SUBSCRIBER.

I. It is rather unusual in this country to have a veil for the Monstrance, though, in other countries, as, for instance, in England, according to the official '*Ritus Servandus in solemni expositione et benedictione SS. Sacramenti*,' the use of the veil is strictly enforced. It covers the Monstrance while it rests on the altar before and after Exposition, in other words, when it is exposed to view on the altar without the Blessed Sacrament. The use of the veil which, like that of the ciborium, should be of white silk, is strictly liturgical, as appears from the following reply¹ of the Sacred Congregation: '*Debetne Ostensorium velo albo, quando stat in altari ante et post expositionem SSñi Sacramenti.*' *Resp.* '*Affirmative.*'

II. We are grateful to our correspondent for calling attention to this Instruction of the Holy Office, which had quite escaped our notice. We stated that in the reconciliation of a convert the stole should be used for the actual Baptism, for the confession and Absolution from excommunication; but that we did not know of any justification, apart from custom, for its use in the remainder of the ceremony. That it was customary to use the stole also for the Profession of Faith we were quite aware, but until we examined this Instruction of the Holy Office as suggested by our correspondent, we did not think that the custom had official sanction. The Instruction, which appears as No. 1689 in the *Collectanea de Prop. Fidei*, in giving the rubrical directions for the Profession of Faith begins as follows: '*Sacerdos super pelliceo et stola violacei coloris indutus sedet in cornu Epistolae,*' etc.

M. EATON.

¹ Decr. S.C.R. 4268 ad 7.

DOCUMENTS

LETTER OF HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL LOGUE TO THE ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS OF IRELAND

ARMAGH,

27th February, 1920.

MY DEAR LORD,—The Chief Secretary seems determined to force his pernicious Education Bill upon an unwilling people. Considering the interest at stake, not merely the temporal, but eternal interests of generations of the children of Ireland, I believe this Bill should be resisted by all the legitimate means at our disposal. Owing to the circumstances in which we are placed, we are powerless to resist it in Parliament. It only remains, therefore, for us to fall back on the active and earnest co-operation of our faithful people.

In the first place, and above all, we must rely on the Divine aid to protect us and avert from us the threatened calamity. Hence, with the consent and sanction of the other Archbishops, I venture to submit to Your Lordship the following suggestions: In the first place, in order to enlist the powerful aid of our National Apostle, St. Patrick, a solemn Novena in his honour, ending on his Feast, should be proclaimed. He has bequeathed to the children of Ireland a glorious inheritance which, with God's blessing, has been hitherto faithfully kept, despite suffering, sacrifices, and persecution; it is for us to see that it be handed down to future generations with equal fidelity. The spiritual exercises of the Novena might include, in all the churches of each parish where facilities exist, the recitation of the Litany of the Saints, to the end of the Litany proper, to secure their protection, especially the protection of the Saints of Ireland; the Rosary and Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. The faithful should be exhorted to assist with earnest devotion at this Novena.

In the second place, an early Sunday should be selected to appeal to God that He may protect and rescue us from the threatened danger. Passion Sunday, the anniversary of the Consecration of Ireland to the Sacred Heart, would be most appropriate for the purpose. In the churches of each parish, wherein facilities exist, there should be exposition of the Blessed Sacrament for an hour after the last Mass, during which the Litany of the Saints, the Rosary and Litany of the Blessed Virgin, could be recited, ending with Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament.

In the matter at issue parental rights, interests and obligations should hold the chief place. Parents are bound to make sure, by every means in their power, that their children are brought up and educated as

faithful Catholics, in a Catholic atmosphere, and under the care and direction of their pastors, whose strict right and leading duty it is to watch over, direct and safeguard the religious education of the lambs of their flocks. Though we have not yet, thank God, arrived at the stage dreamt of by the extreme Socialists, when the children of the people shall become the mere chattels of the State, the Bill in question seems to tend notably in that direction. Hence, as the question bears on religion, and there being danger that a meeting, even for this purpose, might be proclaimed, the fathers of families, in each parish, should be invited to assemble in the parish church, after the devotions, on Passion Sunday, and afforded an opportunity to register their protest against a measure which trenches on their parental rights. Anything in the form of a petition to Parliament would be not only cumbrous, but would likely be thrown aside. It will be enough, therefore, to show the strength of their opposition, if the number present in each case and the fact of their opposition, be communicated to the Press. There should be no discussion beyond registering their votes; those not wishing to protest need not attend; and discussion of any other subject should be rigidly excluded.

It is for the representative bodies, throughout the country, to take such action as they may consider necessary to safeguard the temporal interests of their constituents, which they may find deeply involved.

I am,

My Dear Lord,

Your Lordship's faithful Servant,

✠ MICHAEL CARD. LOGUE.

**A NEW PARISH UNDER THE TITLE OF BLESSED VIRGIN MARY
OF GOOD COUNSEL IS ERECTED IN ROME**

(July 26, 1919)

[The constitution was published in February, 1920]

ACTA BENEDICTI PP. XV

CONSTITUTIONES APOSTOLICAE

URBIS

**ERECTIO NOVAE PAROCHIAE SUB TITULO BEATAE MARIAE VIRGINIS BONI CON-
SILII, IN LOCO 'QUATRARIUM,' VULGO 'IL QUADRARO,' NUNCUPATO**

BENEDICTUS EPISCOPUS

SERVUS SERVORUM DEI

AD PERPETUAM REI MEMORIAM

Inter officia Ecclesiae regiminis propria hoc sane primum obtinet locum spirituali christifidelium bono in universo catholico orbe opportune providere, maxime vero in hac alma Urbe, quae sub ipsis fere oculis Romanorum Pontificum posita est et Eorum curae praecipue commissa.

Cum igitur in aliqua eiusdem Urbis aut finitimorum locorum regione incolarum frequentia crescat, ibi etiam circumscriptionum ecclesiasticarum numerus est augendus, ut animarum cura, inter plures divisa pastores, facilius et salubrius exerceri possit.

Cum itaque extra Urbis moenia, apud tertium circiter miliarium Viae Tusculanae, locum 'Quatrarium', vulgo *Il Quadraro*, nuncupatum, magis in dies ab incolis frequentari coepisset, et necessitas postularet ut ibi animarum curae maioribus praesidiis provideretur, fel. rec. Pius Papa Decimus, Praedecessor Noster, ibi scholam instituit, Monialibus commissam, in qua pueri ad christianam religionem et ad bonas artes informarentur, ibique ecclesiam exstrui iussit, beatae Mariae Virgini Boni Consilii dicendam, in qua, post eiusdem Praedecessoris Nostri obitum, a Nobis perfecta, a die nona mensis augusti anni Domini millesimi nonagesimi decimi sexti sacra peraguntur.

Nunc vero, quum in eodem loco incolarum numerus augeri non desiverit, ad spirituale fidelium ibi commorantium bonum parochiam instituendi necessitas patuit.

Nos igitur, omnibus mature perpensis, praedictam ecclesiam, beatae Mariae Virgini Boni Consilii dicatam, in loco 'Quatrarium,' vulgo *Il Quadraro*, nuncupato, auctoritate Nostra in parochiam erigimus, erectamque per praesentes litteras declaramus cum omnibus iuribus et privilegiis ad parochialitatem pertinentibus.

Dictae parochiae sic noviter erectae attribuimus circa positum territorium, cuius propterea partem ex Sacrosanctae Ecclesiae Lateranensis parochia, partem vero e parochia suburbana sanctorum Petri et Marcellini *inter duas lauros*, suppleto consensu tum Capituli eiusdem Lateranensis Ecclesiae, tum parochi praefatae ecclesiae sanctorum Petri et Marcellini *inter duas lauros*, Apostolicae potestatis plenitudine per easdem praesentes litteras dismembramus.

Novae insuper sic erectae parochiae congruam pecuniae vim constituimus, atque usum domus, quae praedictae ecclesiae adiacet, in parochi pro tempore habitationem concedimus.

Ad haec omnia exsequenda et in primis ad novae parochiae fines, ut supra, statuendos, deputamus venerabilem fratrem Nostrum Basilium, episcopum Veliternum, S. R. E. cardinalem Pompilj, Nostrum in Urbe generalem in spiritualibus Vicarium, eidem tribuentes necessarias et opportunas facultates ad effectum de quo agitur.

Praesentes autem litteras et in eis contenta quaecumque, etiam ex eo quod quilibet, quorum interest, vel sua interesse praesumant, aut in praemissis, seu eorum aliquo ius quamvis ex fundatione, vel dotatione, vel aliquo quovis titulo, habeant, vel habere praesumant, auditi non fuerint ac praemissis iisdem non consenserint, etiam si expressa, specifica et individua mentione digni sint, nullo umquam tempore de subreptionis, vel obreptionis, aut nullitatis vitio, seu intentionis Nostrae, vel quolibet alio, licet substantiali et inexcogitato defectu, notari, impugnari vel in controversiam vocari posse, sed eas, tamquam certa scientia et potestatis plenitudine editas, perpetuo validas esse et fore, suosque plenarios et integros effectus sortiri et obtinere, atque iis omnibus, ad

quos spectat, inviolabiliter observari volumus et decernimus, sublata cuicumque, etiam Cardinalitia dignitate fulgenti, quavis aliter iudicandi et interpretandi facultate, irritum quoque et inane decernentes quidquid in contrarium, scienter vel ignoranter, contigerit attentari.

Non obstantibus Praedecessorum Nostrorum constitutionibus et ordinationibus, ceterisque quibuscumque in contrarium praemissorum, quibus omnibus, de illis eorumque totis tenoribus, praesentibus litteris pro expressis habentes, Motu, scientia et Apostolicae potestatis plenitudine latissime specialiter derogamus.

Nemini ergo liceat ea quae his litteris Nostris statuta sunt infringere, vel eis ausu temerario, contraire. Si quis autem hoc attentare praesumpserit, indignationem omnipotentis Dei ac beatorum Petri et Pauli apostolorum Eius se noverit incursum.

Datum Romae apud sanctum Petrum, anno Domini millesimo nonagesimo decimo nono, die vigesima sexta mensis iulii, Pontificatus Nostri anno quinto.

O. CARD. CAGIANO, *S. R. E. Cancellarius.*
 LODOVICUS SCHÜLLER, *Protonotarius Apostolicus.*
 LEOPOLDUS CAPITANI, *Subst. Reg. ex Spec. Deleg.*

Loco ✠ Plumbi.

Reg. in Canc. Ap., vol. XVIII, n. 52.

**ANOTHER PARISH UNDER THE TITLE OF ALL SAINTS IS
 ERECTED NEAR THE APPIAN WAY, OUTSIDE ST. JOHN'S
 GATE**

(November 4, 1919)

**II
 URBIS**

**ERECTIO NOVAE PAROCHIAE SUB TITULO OMNIUM SANCTORUM, IN REGIONE
 CIRCA VIAM APPIAM, EXTRA PORTAM SANCTI IOANNIS.**

BENEDICTUS EPISCOPUS

SERVUS SERVORUM DEI

AD PERPETUAM REI MEMORIAM

Nihil Sedi Apostolicae antiquius fuit, quam diligenter curare ne auxilia spiritualia christifidelibus unquam deficerent.

Huiusmodi Romanorum Pontificum sollicitudinem praecipue haec alma Urbs experta est, ubi cum in aliqua regione, vel intra, vel extra moenia posita, incolarum frequentia creverit, ibi etiam novas parochias Pontifices erexerunt, eo sane consilio ut spiritualibus necessitatibus fidelium ibi degentium opportune provideretur.

Cum autem in regione circa Viam Appiam Novam, extra Portam sancti Ioannis, incolarum numerus magis in dies augetur, fel. rec. Pius Papa decimus, Praedecessor Noster, iam ab anno millesimo non-

gentesimo septimo munus Congregationi 'Opera divinae Providentiae' detulit curandi ut ibi nova erigeretur parochia.

Sed, ob difficultates in pactionibus de solo comparando, ubi novum templum exstrueretur, dirimendas, non ante annum millesimum nongentesimum decimum septimum templum ipsum aedificari coepit et eodem anno, die festo sanctorum Petri et Pauli, prima fundamenta eiusdem templi, Sanctis omnibus dedicandi, substructa sunt.

Nunc vero, cum novi templi pars iam sit perfecta, ac ibidem a primo huius mensis die sacra peragi coepta sint, curae animarum in illa regione, nulla interposita mora, definitive providere opportunum visum est.

Nos igitur, omnibus mature perpensis, praedictam ecclesiam Omnium Sanctorum, extra Portam sancti Ioannis, auctoritate Nostra in parochiam erigimus, erectamque per praesentes litteras declaramus, cum omnibus iuribus et privilegiis ad parochialitatem pertinentibus.

Noviter sic erectae parochiae attribuimus circa positum territorium, quod propterea e parochia Sacrosanctae Lateranensis Ecclesiae, suppleto eiusdem Lateranensis Ecclesiae Capituli consensu, Apostolicae potestatis plenitudine, per easdem praesentes litteras dismembramus.

Eidem novae parochiae congruam pecuniae vim constituimus, atque usum domus, quae praedictae ecclesiae adiacet, in parochi pro tempore habitationem assignamus.

Ad haec omnia et alia quae necessaria erunt, exsequenda, in primis, vero, ad novae parochiae fines statuendos, deputamus venerabilem fratrem Nostrum Basilium, episcopum Veliternum, S. R. E. cardinalem Pompilj, Nostrum in Urbe generalem in spiritualibus Vicarium, eidem tribuentes necessarias et opportunas facultates ad effectum de quo agitur.

Praesentes autem litteras et in eis contenta quaecumque, etiam ex eo quod quilibet, quorum interest vel sua interesse praesumant, aut in praemissis, seu eorum aliquo, ius, quamvis ex fundatione, vel dotatione, vel aliquo quovis titulo, habeant, vel habere praesumant, auditi non fuerint ac praemissis iisdem non consenserint, etiam si expressa, specifica et individua mentione digni sint, nullo umquam tempore de subreptionis, vel obreptionis, aut nullitatis vitio, seu intentionis Nostrae, vel quolibet alio, licet substantiali et inexcogitato, defectu, notari, impugnari, vel in controversiam vocari posse, sed eas, tamquam certa scientia et potestatis plenitudine editas, perpetuo validas esse et fore, suosque plenarios et integros effectus sortiri et obtinere, atque iis omnibus ad quos spectat inviolabiliter observari volumus et decernimus, sublata cuicumque, etiam Cardinalitia dignitate fulgenti, quavis aliter iudicandi et interpretandi facultate, irritum quoque et inane decernentes quidquid in contrarium, scienter vel ignoranter, contigerit attentari.

Non obstantibus Praedecessorum Nostrorum constitutionibus et ordinationibus, ceterisque quibuscumque in contrarium praemissorum, quibus omnibus, de illis eorumque totis tenoribus praesentibus litteris pro expressis habentes, Motu, scientia et Apostolicae potestatis plenitudine latissime specialiter derogamus.

Nemini ergo liceat quae hisce litteris Nostris statuta sunt infringere,

vel eis, ausu temerario, contraire. Si quis autem hoc attentare prae-sumpserit, indignationem omnipotentis Dei ac beatorum Petri et Pauli apostolorum Eius se noverit incursurum.

Datum Romae apud sanctum Petrum, anno Domini millesimo nongentesimo decimo nono, die quarta mensis novembris, Pontificatus Nostri anno sexto.

O. CARD. CAGIANO, *S. R. E. Cancellarius.*
IULIUS CAMPORI, *Protonotarius Apostolicus.*
LEOPOLDUS CAPITANI, *Subst. Reg. ex Spec. Deleg.*

Loco ✠ Plumbi.

Reg. in Canc. Ap., vol. XIX, n. 16.

**APOSTOLIC LETTER TO REV. OCTAVIUS MARCHETTI, S.J., OF
THE SCHOOL OF ASCETICO-MYSTICAL THEOLOGY IN THE
GREGORIAN UNIVERSITY**

(November 10, 1919)

EPISTOLAE

AD R.P. OCTAVIUM MARCHETTI, S.I., DE SCHOLA THEOLOGIAE ASCETICO-
MYSTICAE IN GREGORIANA UNIVERSITATE.

Diletto figlio, salute ed apostolica benedizione.—Con viva soddi-sfazione vedemmo nel passato anno sorgere in cotesta illustre Univer-sità, insieme all'opportunistissima iniziativa di un Istituto di cultura filosofica e religiosa per il laicato, anche quella non meno opportuna, e del pari necessaria, di una cattedra di teologia ascetico-mistica, mirante a procurare una più profonda formazione religiosa del clero, mercè lo studio scientifico e pratico delle principali questioni concernenti la per-fezione cristiana. Il Nostro cuore si aprì allora alle più liete speranze, facilmente presagendo quali eletti frutti di pietà e di zelo avrebbe recato un insegnamento, che le anime più eminenti per santità e per dottrina ritengono risponda alla realtà di un sentito bisogno. Suole infatti acca-dere che, non esistendo la trattazione di tal genere di studi negli ordi-nari corsi di teologia dommatica e morale, il giovane clero, mentre si nutre di svariate sacre discipline, rimanga poi digiuno dei ver principi della vita spirituale, il cui sano e arduo discernimento gli indispen-sabile per la propria perfezione e per il successo di quel sacro ministero cui è chiamato da Dio. A colmare tale lacuna è sorta, per buona ventura, questa scuola; la quale, non solo tende a preparare dotti direttori di spirito, capaci di guidare le anime per le varie e mirabili ascensioni della santità, ma è destinata nel tempo stesso a correggere quell'ascetismo vago e sentimentale e quell'erroneo misticismo che, o inventati liberamente dall'arbitrio individuale, o attinti a fonti sospette, non mancano purtroppo anche oggi di serpeggiare nel popolo, con grave pericolo delle anime. Ed ora che Ci è dato di constatare il felice esito del primo anno scolastico, come voi, diletto figlio, Ci avete poc'anzi informato con la vostra relazione, Noi ne abbiamo motivo a confermare;

nella speranza che questa istituzione sarà feconda di messe copiosa, consolante e per molti spiriti inattesa. Ce ne dà affidamento non solo l'esperto magistero dell'egregio insegnante, posto saggiamente sotto l'auspice e sicura guida dell'Aquinate, il quale, come nelle altre sacre discipline, così anche in questa apparisce grande Dottore e gran Santo; ma anche il volenteroso impegno di quegli uditori che già si ascrissero al corso, e degli altri che, solleciti di meglio corrispondere alla divina chiamata, si terranno felici di esservi assidui per l'avvenire. Al qual proposito, Ci è parso assai lodevole il vostro divisamento di tenere d'ora innanzi, non una, ma, due lezioni settimanali, con trattazione di materie diverse, per dare agio a chi non possa, in uno dei due giorni, di intervenire egualmente alla scuola e di avere ogni settimana un insegnamento continuato. Degno poi di particolare encomio Ci è sembrato anche il proposito di aprire nell'Università Gregoriana, a lato della scuola, una biblioteca ascetico-mistica, per la consultazione delle principali opere a vantaggio degli studiosi. A nessuno sfuggirà l'alta finalità e la singolarissima importanza di queste ben concepite intraprese, le quali, tendendo ad integrare l'istruzione del clero, gli faciliteranno insieme l'obbiettivo della sua sacra missione, vale a dire la sanctificazione di se stesso e del prossimo. Ci allietta quindi il pensiero che al suddetto corso non solo saranno attratti cotesti a unni di teologia, ma ancora, ed in gran numero, i sacerdoti sì secolari che regolari di quest'alma città, e coloro specialmente a cui compete per ufficio di attendere alla direzione delle anime e che non vorranno esporsi al rischio di lavorare, se non con niun frutto, certo con minore utilità. Così cotesto insigne Ateneo, alle tante benemerenze già acquistate nel campo della scienza, aggiunge ora anche questa, di dar lume ai direttori di spirito; i quali poi, alla loro volta, nei seminari, nei chiostri e tra il popolo cristiano saranno fari di luce, contribuendo alla pratica di quella vera pietà che, nella grazia e nell'imitazione di Cristo, solleva le anime fino ai fastigi di virtù che sono proprii della santa Chiesa cattolica.

Come auspicio dei celesti favori e come pegno insieme della paterna Nostra benevolenza impartiamo di cuore a voi, diletto figlio, a quanti vi prestano aiuto ed a singoli vostri uditori l'apostolica benedizione.

Dal Vaticano, 10 novembre 1919.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

APOSTOLIC LETTER TO THE ILLUSTRIOUS D. HERBERT HOOVER, APPRAISING THE WORK INITIATED BY HIM ON BEHALF OF THE STARVING CHILDREN OF CENTRAL EUROPE

(January 9, 1920)

AD PERILLUSTREM D. HERBERTUM HOOVER : DE OPERA AB EO INITA AD REFI-
CIENDOS PUEROS IN REGIONIBUS EUROPAE BELLO VEXATIS GRATULATUR.

CHER MONSIEUR,

Par l'intermédiaire de Notre cher fils, Monsieur le Cardinal Archevêque de Baltimore, Nous avons reçu de nouvelles informations sur l'œuvre vraiment admirable et providentielle que vous continuez à

développer pour subvenir aux graves et multiples nécessités, dont souffre l'Europe, au point de vue de l'alimentation. De tels bienfaits, qui vous assurent, sans aucun doute, un très haut rang dans l'histoire de la charité chrétienne et, pour ainsi dire, un titre unique à la reconnaissance des peuples, remplissent Notre âme d'une profonde satisfaction et de la plus vive consolation, à la pensée du grand bien qui en découle pour la multitude des malheureux dans cette Europe désolée.

Nous avons appris, en particulier, que vous prodiguez actuellement votre sollicitude la plus empressée et la plus délicate, en faveur des pauvres petits enfants. Nous avons encore présent à l'esprit, et très vivant, le souvenir de tout ce que vous avez fait pour venir au secours des malheureux petits enfants Belges, à un moment où, par manque d'une nourriture apte à soutenir leur frêle existence, ils étaient sur le point de périr. C'est de tout cœur que Nous avons, alors, fait entendre Notre voix pour encourager votre généreuse initiative : et, actuellement, Nous ne voulons pas faire autrement, d'autant plus que ce n'est plus seulement la vie des petits enfants d'une seule nation qui est en péril, mais, selon ce qui Nous a été rapporté, celle de plus de *trois millions* de petits enfants, appartenant à divers Etats d'Europe.

Ainsi donc, pressés par la charité de Jésus-Christ et participant à la prédilection qu'Il avait pour les petits enfants, Nous recommandons de la manière la plus pressante l'œuvre, que vous développez dans ce but, à la générosité de tous les citoyens d'Amérique, sans distinction de foi ou de parti, bien assurés qu'eux-mêmes, dont le cœur reste toujours ouvert à toute noble initiative, répondront avec enthousiasme à cet appel ; d'autant plus qu'ils seront heureux de voir que votre œuvre, étrangère à tout ressentiment et à tout particularisme, a pour but de secourir tous les malheureux, et de préférence les petits enfants innocents de ceux qui furent les ennemis d'hier et qui, actuellement, sont en proie à de plus grandes souffrances.

Nous-mêmes, comme vous le savez, Nous avons été poussés par, ces mêmes sentiments élevés, lorsque Nous Nous sommes adressés à tous les Evêques du monde entier pour exciter la charité des fidèles à secourir, le jour des Sts. Innocents, les petits enfants de l'Europe Centrale, lorsqu'il Nous a été agréable également de recommander l'œuvre *Save the Children Fund* de Londres, qui s'est faite la promotrice d'une initiative analogue. Nous ne doutons pas que la multiplicité de ces efforts n'atteignent, Dieu aidant, les résultats les plus bienfaisants. Nous pensons, par ailleurs, que le but serait plus sûrement atteint si ces diverses énergies se coordonnaient entre elles, dans une sage entente.

Souhaitant de tout cœur le plus grand succès à votre généreuse, activité, nous prions Dieu instamment de vous accorder ses plus précieuses récompenses.

Du Vatican, le 9 janvier 1920.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

REVIEWS AND NOTES

THE STORY OF HILDEBRAND. St. Gregory VII. By E. W. Buxton.
London: Burns & Oates, and Washbourne.

INDESCRIBABLE chaos had succeeded the first ten centuries of the Christian era. The Christian world was in a deplorable condition. Society in Europe and all existing institutions seemed doomed to utter destruction and ruin. The Church herself had not been able to escape from the general debasement. The Popes, though not the Papacy, were the object of the scorn and hatred of the civilized world. 'The whole world,' said St. Bruno, Bishop of Segni, 'lay in wickedness, holiness had disappeared, justice had perished, and truth had been buried.' Simony and luxury had corrupted the Church. The second was largely due to the first.

The struggle between the Empire and the Papacy was looming large in the 11th century. The great impulse towards reform in the Church came from the monastery of Cluny, whose abbot was Hildebrand. The monks of St. Benedict spread themselves out over Europe. Rome began to feel the effect of the movement. The merging of Church and State had once been a necessary precaution against a common foe, but it led inevitably to a loss of high spiritual ideals. In a world where the Empire stood for material things, the Church must shake herself free if she would hold her place as the kingdom of Christ. And so the reform that is chiefly connected with the name of Hildebrand came about as the result of an inward force.

Such a reform stretching, as it did, through every grade of society, affecting Pope as well as priest, prince as well as peasant, called for a man of extraordinary personality to bring it about. Hildebrand for thirty-seven years (1048-1085) governed the Church, either as Cardinal-deacon to Leo IX, administrator of the Patrimony of St. Peter, Archdeacon of the Holy Roman Church, Chancellor of the Apostolic See, or then as Pope. He was a capable and energetic administrator and recovered a large part of the property of the Church from the hands of the Roman nobility and Normans. The two most important transactions—the celebrated decree of election, by which the power of choosing the Pope was vested in the college of Cardinals, and the alliance with the Normans, secured by the Treaty of Melfi, 1059—were in large measure the achievement of Hildebrand. The time at length came in 1073 when he who had been chiefly instrumental in the selection of the Church rulers, who had inspired and given purpose to her policy, and who had been steadily developing

and realizing, by successive acts, her sovereignty and purity, should assume in his own person the majesty and responsibility of that exalted power which his genius had so long directed. He was feverishly proclaimed Pope by the Cardinals, the clergy, and the people. He was clearly the man of the hour. His austere virtue commanded respect, his genius admiration. He was 'a devout man, a man mighty in human and divine knowledge, a distinguished lover of equity and justice, a man firm in adversity and temperate in prosperity.'

Such was Hildebrand when he became Pope. It has been well said that 'Hildebrand found the Papacy dependant on the Empire—he left her free and supported by almost the whole of Italy. He found the Emperor the virtual patron of the Holy See—he wrested the power from his hands. He found the secular clergy the allies and dependants of the secular power—he converted them into auxiliaries of his own.' This was only one side of his work. He realized that Europe had to be reconstructed on spiritual lines. He began through the decrees of his first Lenten Synod his great work of purifying the Church by a reformation of the clergy. Then follows the opposition from Germany and France in the matter of reform, and then the beginning of the conflict between the Emperor Henry IV and Hildebrand which ended (10 years afterwards) in Hildebrand's death in exile in Salerno and in Henry's death in exile in Liège (31 years afterwards).

This great dramatic struggle between the Pope and the Emperor is graphically portrayed in the book before us. It is sufficiently detailed in its essential lines—the meeting of Gregory and Henry at Canossa, the subsequent siege of Rome, and the flight of the Pope, to give the reader a complete picture of all the elements at work and of all the issues at stake. Nothing is stated that is not authoritative. The *dramatis personæ* are depicted in realistic colours, and receive just the proper amount of attention. Chief amongst them stands out in bold relief the romantic and warlike figure of Matilda, Countess of Tuscany, who by her life and her property ably supported Hildebrand in his conflict with the temporal powers. After her, she was the most remarkable personality of that century.

The book neatly brought out, with some interesting illustrations, is one of a series of the Heroes of the Church. It is an excellent addition to that important series. It is clear, concise, and clever. It is rather a history than a biography—a history of the Church in the 11th century which served as the framework of the great figure of Hildebrand, one of the greatest of the Roman Pontiffs, and one of the most remarkable men of all times.

M. R.

PREACHING. By Rev. W. B. O'Dowd. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

A BOOK from the Westminster Library comes with a good family name on it. The present volume will add new lustre to the name, for it is an excellent treatise on the subject of preaching. 'Preach the word in

season and out of season' was the maxim of the Apostles; they gloried in the privilege of being Ministers of the Word, and the conversion of the Gentile world crowned their zeal. Nowadays many regard the duty of preaching as a task rather than a privilege, and critics are not wanting who assert that the age of preaching is evolutionized or revolutionized into the age of journalism. The truth is that when preaching ceases to be 'living and effectual,' the failure is the fault of the preacher. In chapters on *The Making of the Preacher*, *Real and Unreal Preaching*, *The Preparation of a Sermon*, and *In the Pulpit*, Father O'Dowd gathers together the best of what is old, and adds valuable criticisms and suggestions of his own. It is worthy of note that he pays the minimum of tribute to sermon books and books on elocution. After the general treatise on Preaching, he devotes several chapters to the different classes of sermons—Dogmatic and Moral Sermons, Apologetic Conferences, Five-minute Sermons, Controversy, Panegyrics of Saints, Funeral Sermons, Charity Sermons, and Sermons to Children. The Appendix contains three instructions on Preaching from Leo XIII, Pius X, and Benedict XV. As a final appendix, Father O'Dowd gives a Three Years' Course of Sermons for the Sundays of the year.

D.

FROM DUST TO GLORY. By Rev. M. J. Phelan, S.J. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

THIS volume is a sequel to the *Straight Path* in which an anxious inquirer is led to the Catholic Church. It leads him still onward through the Church to Heaven, by way of instruction in the mysteries of Creation and Redemption.

There are ten chapters in the book of 157 pages; Life's Starting-point and Goal, The Glory Due, How Angels Fell, The Fatal Fruit, Life's Dream is O'er, The Trumpet Call, The Bayonet-point, Earth's Priceless Treasure, The Garden's Gloom, The Light of Victory. These interpreted mean: Man made after God's Image, Man made to give God glory, The Sin of the Angels, Adam's Sin, Death and Judgment, Self-sacrifice, The Service of Christ, The Mass, The Passion of Christ, The Resurrection. Some of these chapters are very beautiful, such as the chapters on Death, the Mass, and the Passion. They reach a high order of eloquence and excellence. They are thrilling and convincing.

The book is not a dogmatic treatise. It does not seek to prove by argument but to convince by example. The author drives home his points and their moral by pictorial representation. The pages of history and the book of nature are culled from to illustrate his thesis. There is originality, there is genius, in his handling of these facts. He seeks to touch the heart. The book is a series of sermons, and contains many practical reflections. The author is gifted with keen observation and a poetic fancy. A current of warm devotion runs through the whole book which cannot fail to kindle a fire in the heart of the reader.

We cannot omit to say a few words about the author's style. He considers rightly that the 'varied gifts and graces that so often contribute to make the secular book attractive' should be pressed into God's services by those who consecrate their pens to Him. These are—'the clarified thought, the brilliancy of colour, the happy imagery, the crispness of style, the tuneful period, and the musical rhythm.' He endeavours by these means to lift the treatment of Sacred Truths 'above the region of the monotonous common-place' and invest them with interest. The author is modest enough to fear that he has only partially succeeded. We must candidly confess that to some extent we agree with him. The style is crisp, the colour brilliant, and the period tuneful. But the imagery though happy is not always faithful, the thought not always precise. Precision is sometimes sacrificed to colouring, and faulty construction also ensues. There is too much colour, too much word-painting, which is apt to draw away the attention of the reader from the subject-matter. There is too much straining after wordy effects. Consequently there is monotony, the very thing the author wishes to avoid. This word-painting becomes exaggerated and tiresome. It might be effective in preaching but in a book it loses its grip. Then, again, the book superabounds in examples. A sense of proportion is lost sight of. Nevertheless, the book contains many brilliant and beautiful phrases and similes that are worth treasuring. But there are several statements categorically made which are either inexact or are matters of opinion.

In spite of these imperfections that do not affect the substance and the purpose of the book, it is one that will appeal to many classes of readers. It will develop in them useful reflection, inspire them with noble ideals, and inflame them with the love of God. Love of God is the key-note of the book.

M. R.

DONA CHRISTI. Meditations for Ascension-tide, Whitsun-tide and Corpus Christi. By Mother St. Paul. London: Longman, Green & Co.

THIS book is a continuation of the experienced authoress's previous productions, *Sponsa Christi*, *Passio Christi*, *Mater Christi*. There are 34 meditations in all, ranging from the fifth Sunday after Easter to the Feast of the Sacred Heart. The Feasts of the Ascension, Pentecost, Corpus Christi, and the Sacred Heart form the quadrilateral within which the meditations are contained. Those of Pentecost and Corpus Christi are written round the *Veni Creator Spiritus* and the *Adoro Te*. The rest have scriptural texts for their titles.

The authoress shows a great knowledge and command of the Holy Scriptures as well as of Sacred Liturgy and Church History. These are skilfully and effectively woven into the meditations. All through there is a charming simplicity of style which makes the meditations attractive and effective. What we admire most of all is the authoress's solid common sense allied to profound piety, which are conspicuous in every

page of the book. The meditations are full and practical, and grip the reader. They penetrate into his very soul by their pious appeal. They are distinctly refreshing and original. Those on Corpus Christi and within the Octave are about the most beautiful written on the subject. We sincerely congratulate the gifted Mother St. Paul.

M. R.

BOOKS, Etc., RECEIVED

- America* : A Catholic Review (February).
The Ecclesiastical Review (February). U.S.A.
The Rosary Magazine (February). Somerset, Ohio.
The Catholic World (February). New York.
The Austral Light (January). Melbourne.
The Irish Monthly (February). Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.
The Catholic Bulletin (February). Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.
The Month (February). London : Longmans.
Revue Pratique d'Apologétique (February). Paris : Beauchesne.
Revue du Clergé Français (February). Paris : Letouzey et Ané.
Revue des Jeunes (February). Paris : 3 Rue de Luynes.
The Fortnightly Review (February). St. Louis, Mo.
The Lamp (February). Garrison, N.Y.
La Documentation Catholique (February). Paris : 5 Rue Bayard.
 ΣΓΕΔΛ 'Σεσνοῦν' (ΤΑΘΣ Ó ΜΥΡΕΔΑΘΔ). Dublin : Browne & Nolan.
Sermons on the Mass, the Sacraments, and the Sacramentals. By Rev. Thomas Flynn, C.C. New York : Benziger.
The Grey Nuns in the Far North. By Father P. Duchaussois, O.M.I. Toronto : M'Celland & Stewart.
A Patriot Priest. By Rev. D. Riordan, C.C. Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.
St. Bernard's Sermons on the Canticle of Canticles. By A Priest of Mount Melleray. Dublin : Browne & Nolan.

RECENT IMPRESSIONS OF PORTUGAL

BY REV. M. H. MACINERNY, O.P.

A SIX months' sojourn in Portugal, after sixteen years' absence, is in many ways an interesting and enjoyable experience. The intervening years, of course, have wrought many changes. Old friends are dead and gone. One passes daily the homes which once were theirs, but are now in the hands of strangers, and one breathes a prayer for those kindly generous friends of long ago. Convents in which one often said Mass, or heard Confessions, are now turned to profane uses, their chapels desecrated, their inmates despoiled and driven into exile.

The Monarchy itself, after seven centuries of chequered and often glorious existence, has fallen. It has been extinguished in blood and revolution, and a brand-new Republic stands uneasily in its place. Whatever else the Monarchy did or failed to do, it certainly raised Portugal to the highest pinnacle of her olden greatness, and it dowered the nation with a wealth of superb palaces and basilicas, to say nothing of the countless churches and convents which it founded or subsidized. None of these achievements is likely to be emulated by the modern Republic, which is a child of Freemasonry, and inherits the Atheism, the incompetence, and the intolerance of its parent. Seldom if ever does a true patriot, a broad-minded statesman or a gifted administrator, emerge from the dark lodges of Freemasonry.

The first question that will naturally arise in the mind of a Catholic visitor is: How fares Religion under the new régime? The answer, in the main, is distinctly encouraging, especially to those who remember the religious paralysis of twenty years ago. To account for that paralysis, as well as for most of the evils which afflict Portugal to-day, we must glance at certain forces that have been at work for a century or more.

In 1759, the all-powerful and unscrupulous Marquis of

Pombal suppressed the Jesuits, despoiled them of all they possessed, destroyed their colleges, abolished their University of Evora, deprived them of their Portuguese nationality, and banished them inexorably from Portugal and the colonies. It is but the literal truth to say that religion and education have never recovered from the blow thus struck by Pombal.

The Jesuits, besides their University, had many fine Colleges in Portugal and its dependencies. The higher education of the country was largely in their hands. Their missionary zeal was truly remarkable. The mission fields of Brazil, Ethiopia, India, and Japan were cultivated by a galaxy of martyrs and missionaries drawn from the ranks of the Portuguese Jesuits. In Portugal and the islands their various churches were centres of piety and devotion, where the truths of the Christian faith were zealously preached, and the Sacraments assiduously administered. All these good works were ruthlessly swept away by the domineering and merciless Pombal.

The year 1834 marks another and still more memorable stage in the ruin of religion in Portugal. The old régime of benevolent absolutism—which many regard as the system of government most in harmony with the spirit and genius of the Portuguese people, and under which Portugal became a great and flourishing empire—finally came to an end in that year. The new dynasty prided itself on being Constitutional and Liberal. It was now, of course, a limited monarchy: the King reigned, but did not govern. The task of governing was left to the politicians, who were copious in their professions of Liberalism, while their acts were but too consistently illiberal and un-Christian.

In 1834, after the change of dynasty, the new government signalized its accession to power by a sweeping measure of confiscation and suppression. All the religious Orders were crushed at a single swoop. The priests and lay-brothers who dwelt in religious houses were evicted from their homes, robbed of all they possessed, and turned penniless into the street. Some are said to have died of starvation, others subsisted on a pittance granted by the government, others managed to find a place in the ranks of the parish clergy. The nuns were less harshly treated. Suffered to remain in the convents, they were strictly forbidden to receive novices; their effects were carefully inventoried, and on the death of the last nun in each house, the

convent and its contents passed automatically into the hands of the government. Even as lately as 1897-1903, I remember several convents which fell vacant in this way and were at once seized by the minions of the law.

The Church was always more or less subject to the State in Portugal; but, from 1834 onward, this subjection became a hopeless and demoralizing servitude. The Holy See resisted vigorously, but in vain. When a diocese became vacant, the government presented three candidates, of whom the Holy See was obliged to choose one. Needless to say, the nominees of a more or less Masonic government were not always the best men, though some truly admirable and apostolic men—such as Cardinals Netto and Mendes Bello, Patriarchs of Lisbon, D. Antonio Barroso, the late Bishop of Oporto, and D. Augusto Eduardo Nunes, the silver-tongued Archbishop of Evora—succeeded in slipping through the meshes of government control and securing places on the episcopal bench.

The Bishops could hold no periodical meetings to devise measures for the betterment of religion. As the property of the Church had been indiscriminately confiscated in 1834, all cathedrals, churches, and chapels as well as Bishops' houses and seminaries, were legally the property of the State, and were granted only on sufferance to the ecclesiastical authorities. Even the appointment of professors and the selection of text-books for seminaries was not free from the meddlesome control of the government.

Worst of all, the right of appointing parish priests was almost invariably usurped by the Crown, and was exercised in practice by the politicians. A young man, fresh from the diocesan seminary and wholly lacking in experience, was at once entrusted with the administration of a parish. His meagre salary was paid by the government, without caring a fig whether he became a saint or a sinner. He might become a source of deadly scandal to his parish, as many did; or he might shamefully neglect the duties of his sacred office, as many others did; in either case, the Bishop had no effective power to depose or remove him.

In my time (1897-1903), a certain parish priest in Lisbon was notorious for the life he led; yet the Cardinal Patriarch was powerless to oust him from his place. I remember being told by a Portuguese Jesuit that certain parishes were never known to have a bad priest, while others were never known to have a good one. It was

commonly said, in those days, that a priest had no chance of gaining a good parish unless he and his friends were active supporters of one of the dominant political factions, which were strongly tinged with Freemasonry and sham Liberalism.

The wealthiest parish priest in Portugal, at that time, was a man who paid a small fraction of his income to the curate of his northern parish, and lived handsomely on the remainder in Lisbon, where he was an active politician. His Bishop was powerless to interfere with him. Other men, after being ordained, abandoned the priesthood altogether, and betook themselves to law, or politics, or trade. Facts such as these were widely known among the people, and tended to aggravate the scandals already existing.

Nearly twenty years ago, a zealous young Lisbon priest, who is now deservedly a Monsignore, assured me that he was compelled to sit at his desk for five hours a day, filling up conscription-forms and other government returns; the result being that he had practically no time for the discharge of his duties as pastor. In those days also, if a priest desired to have Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament in his church, he was bound by law to present a notice or petition, written on stamped paper, a certain time beforehand, to the civil authorities.

Facts such as these may suffice to indicate the tyrannies and wrongs which the Church endured at the hands of the Monarchy, during the last century or two of its existence. This grinding slavery was demoralizing alike to clergy and people; it inevitably led to countless evils and abuses. Even in the last years of the Monarchy, which were far from being the worst years, it was impossible to resist the conclusion that religion in Portugal was hopelessly paralysed by State tyranny.

It had long been evident to every intelligent observer that the Monarchy was tottering to its fall. King Carlos and his eldest son were assassinated in 1908, and two years later the doomed dynasty was expelled, its palaces sequestered, and its adherents persecuted. Thus did the Monarchy itself meet with the fate which it had meted out to the Jesuits and other religious bodies. 'The mills of God grind slowly, but they grind exceeding small.'

Let us now glance for a moment at the efforts, timid as they were, by which the Church in Portugal had sought to repair the disasters of 1759 and 1834. In the half-century

which preceded the Revolution of 1910, a partial restoration of the religious Orders had taken place. The Franciscans had nearly a hundred priests, who gave missions and retreats, especially in the northern provinces, though even there the work had to be done more or less *sub rosa*, to avoid offending the tender susceptibilities of the sham Liberal politicians. I remember being told, on passing near a village in the Alemtejo district, that a Franciscan who had lately come to preach a mission, had been stoned out of the place by an illiterate 'Liberal' mob. That, be it remembered, was in the days of the Monarchy.

For nearly forty years prior to the proclamation of the Republic, the Jesuits had a spacious and flourishing College at Campolide, besides a few small houses in other places. The Holy Ghost Fathers had an excellent College in Braga, along with a couple of small places elsewhere. The Dorothean Sisters had a few schools, hardly more than ten, in Lisbon and the provinces. The Dominican Nuns of Bemfica, founded by the noble D. Thereza de Saldanha, had seven or eight houses, of which three were Sanatoria, supported by the munificence of Queen Amelia. To their honour be it said, the various members of the Royal Family were personally favourable to religion, even after the establishment of the Constitutional and 'Liberal' system in 1834, though they could do little to prevent the misdeeds of their ministers. It is hardly too much to say that they were victims of a vicious system which they were powerless to control.

The Little Sisters of the Poor had two or three large establishments for aged and infirm people, while the Good Shepherd Nuns had a house in Lisbon and another in Oporto. The Salesian Fathers had a reformatory for boys, and the Sisters of St. Joseph of Cluny an orphanage for girls—both in Lisbon. The Visitation Nuns of Lisbon had a large boarding-school, which, by a rare and happy exception, had escaped the spoilers of 1834. The Franciscan Sisters of the Third Order had a number of houses, and performed heroic work among the poor. If to these we add two houses belonging to the French sons and daughters of St. Vincent de Paul, and the Irish Dominican Convents of Corpo Santo and Bom Sucesso, which have happily weathered every revolutionary storm, the list will be entirely exhausted. Two or three other Congregations—notably the Benedictines and the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary

—which had one or two houses apiece, were driven out by a burst of anti-clerical frenzy in 1900 or 1902. This was but the prelude to a far more destructive cyclone.

The Revolution of 1910, in a military sense, was a paltry and even ludicrous affair. But from a religious point of view, it was an event of capital importance. In reality, it was a revolt against Christianity even more than against the Monarchy. The reason is not far to seek. Irreligion had been one of the chief characteristics of the Monarchist parties for a whole century, and more especially from 1834 until the fall of the Monarchy. Not that, as parties, they were avowed enemies of Christianity: they posed as Catholics while persecuting the Church. Occasionally they would pay lip-homage to the theory that Catholicism was the religion of the State. But they were 'Liberal' Catholics, all their warfare was professedly waged against 'Jesuitism' and 'Reaction.' In their parlance, 'Jesuitism' was a wide term, which covered such matters as the restoration of the religious Orders, the frequent use of Sacraments, pastoral zeal on the part of a priest, and so on. Any priest who tried honestly to discharge the ordinary duties of his office was set down as a 'Jesuit.' Any layman who heard Mass on Sundays and received the Sacraments regularly was a 'Jesuita de casaca,' which may be translated as 'a Jesuit in disguise.' Any Catholic lady of ordinary piety was stigmatized as a 'beata,' which meant a false and hypocritical devotee. 'Reaction' was a word which suggested something insidiously wicked. In practice any Catholic, whether cleric or layman, who stood up for civil and religious liberty, was denounced as an odious 'Reactionary.' The truth was, of course, that any man whose moral sense was not hopelessly blunted could hardly fail to be a Reactionary; he could hardly fail to react against the hypocrisy, the legalized robbery, and the habitual despotism of the sham Liberals.

Two parties alternately misgoverned the country from 1834 until 1910. These parties vied with each other in their professions of 'Liberalism.' Both parties—the Progressives, who were quite unprogressive, and the Regenerators, who were incapable of regenerating anything—were irretrievably committed to the 'accomplished fact' of 1834, that is, to the suppression and robbery of the religious Orders and the legalized oppression of the Church. When either party wished to create a diversion, in order to dupe the public,

it followed the base French model, by working up a frantic agitation against 'Jesuits' and 'Reactionaries'—and the trick was done.

The Republicans improved on this plan. Irreligion of a still more violent type became the dominant characteristic of the Republican party, who were eager to defeat the Monarchists with their own weapons. Fanatical irreligion became a sort of perverted religion with the Republican faction. Once in power, the Republicans proceeded to carry out their principles, and to wreak their vengeance on the Church with a malignity which earned for the new régime the nickname of 'the mad Republic.' Affonso Costa, the ablest man among the Republican leaders, proclaimed exultingly that religion would be extinct in Portugal in a single generation.

Priests like the saintly Father Barros Gomes and his Vincentian colleague, M. Fragues, were murdered in cold blood. Nuns were subjected to the vilest insults, ejected from their homes, and robbed of all their property. Bishops were deprived of their seminaries and residences, and hunted from their sees. Some three dozen religious houses, the slow growth of half a century, were abolished in a day. No upright man can read *Os Prossritos*—the two volumes in which the Jesuits have recorded the brutal indignities heaped upon them—without a burning feeling of indignation and shame.

A Separation Law, designed for the strangling of religion in the shortest possible time, was passed by the Republican Parliament. This act might be described as a masterpiece of bungling malignity, which in some measure defeated its own purpose. The mask was now thrown aside: the new persecutors of religion were open and avowed infidels. The attitude of real Catholics could no longer be in doubt. The shameful and vindictive unfairness of the Separation Law roused the hostility of every genuine Catholic in the country. In their haste, or perhaps blinded by their hatred of religion, the framers of this Separation Law overlooked the fact that in future the Holy See would be free to nominate the Bishops, and that the Bishops would be free to appoint and control the parish priests. *Mentivit iniquitas sibi*. The Republicans, intending the direst injury to the Church, unwittingly presented her with a charter of liberty. If they blundered, it was not from lack of evil intention.

The teaching of religion in schools was rigorously forbidden. It was made a penal offence for any Jesuit to enter the country, or for any resident to communicate with a

Jesuit outside. About a year ago, a distinguished and cultured writer, Father Cordeiro, who happened to be an ex-Jesuit, returned to Portugal, and was promptly arrested and brought to trial. Condemned in one or two of the lower courts, he has appealed to the higher tribunals, and his appeal is still pending. This indicates the conception of religious liberty which is entertained by Portuguese Republicans. A Jesuit may freely live among Turks or Chinese, or in any civilized nation of the world, but not in Portugal.

For a long time after the revolution many of the churches remained closed, and it was dangerous for a lady to be seen going to Mass with a prayer-book in her hand. Many churches, notably those which belonged to religious Orders, were either closed altogether or turned to ignoble uses. For instance, the public church attached to the historic Convent of Sacramento (Dominican Nuns) in Lisbon, now serves as a shelter for the rubbish-carts of the corporation, or something of that kind. The church of the Irish College, in the same city, has been closed for nearly ten years, and is now falling pitifully into decay. The church and residence of the Jesuits in the Rua do Quelhas, Lisbon, have been converted into a Revolutionary Museum, where among other trophies the rifle used in the assassination of King Carlos is lovingly shown; and the whole collection has, very appropriately, been placed under the care of an apostate Jesuit.

The revolutionists did their utmost to induce the clergy to apostatize, but in vain. Pensions were offered to the clergy, with the idea of bribing them to forsake the priesthood and betake themselves to some secular calling. Some few priests accepted the bribe, and abandoned the ministry; one of these, attired as a layman and wearing a moustache, is now employed in the National Library of Lisbon. Others accepted the pension and continued to discharge the duties of their sacred calling, as, it seems, they were legally and morally entitled to do. Some Bishops absolutely forbade their clergy to touch the pension; others left the question to the conscience of each individual. The vast majority of the clergy spurned the bribe, and for this they deserve the most unstinted praise. Rather than subsist as the paid pensioners of a nakedly anti-Christian government, they nobly preferred independence and poverty. Their action was a courageous leap in the dark; it was a perilous experiment, in extremely unfavourable circumstances, an experiment never before tried in the history of Portugal; and happily,

so far, experience has confirmed the wisdom of their choice. In this, no doubt, they were largely influenced by the splendid example of the French clergy in recent years, as well as by the fact that priests throughout the English-speaking world prefer to live without dependence on the State.

The Portuguese Revolution was responsible for a great deal of brutality and injustice, but it was unaccompanied by the wholesale atrocities that disgraced the French and Russian Revolutions. This, no doubt, was due to the 'brandura dos nossos costumes—the mildness of our manners,' as the Portuguese are fond of saying. In truth, the people of Portugal, when not led astray by designing fanatics or demagogues, are among the most lovable and best-natured people in the world.

The brief but glorious consulate of Sidonio Paes opened a new horizon before the minds of his countrymen and may well have a lasting influence on the fortunes of Church and State. Sidonio Paes was the greatest man that Portugal has produced in the last two hundred years—greater even than Pombal, for Pombal was but a gifted despot, while Sidonio Paes was a magnanimous patriot and broad-minded statesman. A man of extraordinary resourcefulness and daring, after serving as Professor of Mathematics in the University of Coimbra and Portuguese Ambassador in Berlin, he became Provisional President as the result of a well-planned revolution in December 1917. Some months later, his generous and equitable rule secured his election to the Presidency of the Republic by an overwhelming vote of his countrymen. It was the first and only time in the history of Portugal, from 1834 to the present day, that a popular election was freely and honestly held.

Under Sidonio's enlightened rule, diplomatic relations were resumed with the Holy See; prelates and priests returned from banishment; churches were freely thrown open; and the vindictive and vexatious prohibition of church services after sunset was rescinded. Patriotic Republicans, and even the bulk of the Monarchist party, rallied to his standard. The Catholics in general, despite their Monarchist proclivities, were enthusiastically in his favour. There was freedom for every honest citizen, whatever his creed or party; coercion was only for evil-doers. For the first time in several generations, Portugal tasted the sweets of good government. Sidonio Paes became the idol of the people.

His ideal was a noble one—the noblest ideal that has

inspired any Portuguese statesman in modern times. He aspired to create a benevolent, tolerant Republic, which should raise Portugal to her rightful place among the prosperous and progressive nations of the world. He desired a Republic in which the best services of every law-abiding citizen should be utilized for the moral and material benefit of his native land. He wished that Portugal should be a land of liberty and progress, like the United States of America or the kindred Republic of Brazil. He meant to save his country from following in the wake of the persecuting French Republic, or of the volcanic, Freemason-ridden Republics of Mexico and Venezuela. Above all, he would have the government of his country 'broad-based upon the people's will.' In a word, he stood for democracy, as opposed to faction; for Christian liberty, as opposed to Masonic tyranny.

The highly popular and successful rule of Sidonio was gall and wormwood to the secret societies which form the mainstay of the trumpety little factions that have been battenning on the country since the Republic began. Portugal has the misfortune of possessing 4,000 Freemasons and 40,00 Carbonarios; therein lies the crux of her national problem. The lodges of these secret societies are little better than murder-clubs, in which assassinations and crimes of violence are planned. Any statesman who runs counter to the wishes of the secret societies, and of the political groups which they dominate, will be morally certain to share the fate of Sidonio Paes. When Sidonio learned that some of his subordinates had raided the Gremio Lusitano, the headquarters of Portuguese Freemasonry, he is recorded to have remarked sadly—'They have drawn up my death-sentence.'

It was but too true. Shortly afterwards, the *Epoca*, a leading Catholic journal, managed to secure detailed information showing that the assassination of the patriotic President had been decreed by a highly influential Masonic lodge in Paris. A curious story is told as to the manner in which the murderous order was smuggled into Portugal. Its bearer is said to have purchased a large number of books, which filled two or three boxes. The official Masonic document was deftly stowed away in a volume at the bottom of one of the boxes, and thus escaped the vigilance of the Customs officials. This may be a mere legend—one of the many legends that are destined to cluster around the heroic memory of Sidonio Paes. What is certain is that on his

departure for Coimbra and Oporto, laden with gifts and comforts for the poor, towards whom his generosity was always princely, Sidonio was basely murdered in the Central Station of Lisbon, after a single year of beneficent and memorable rule.

His funeral was a demonstration of popular grief, surpassing anything that had been witnessed in Portugal within living memory. It was widely felt that, in a true sense, he had laid down his life as a martyr for his country. Hundreds upon hundreds of Masses have been offered for the welfare of his soul. The immortelles which lie upon his tomb, and crowd the chapel in which his remains have been laid to rest, are almost worth a king's ransom. The other day, as I knelt before his bier in the historic Church of the Jeronymos, I could not help realizing that here, indeed, was a man whose memory will be cherished for ages in the hearts of his countrymen—a man whose noble and inspiring example may well be a burning and a shining light to generations yet unborn.

The tragic end of Sidonio Paes was speedily followed by another tragedy. The young Monarchists, seeing that no worthy successor to Sidonio Paes was likely to arise from the Republican ranks, and knowing that the most capable men in the country were still adherents of the Monarchist cause, attempted a coup d'état, with a view to the restoration of the Monarchy. The attempt, ill-planned and ill-executed, ended in a miserable fiasco. Sidonio's party fell from power, and the country fell once more into the grasp of the corrupt Republican factions which derive their inspiration and support from the secret societies.

The ideal of these societies—in so far as they can be said to have an ideal—is government by faction. They desire that the reins of power shall rotate from one to another of the corrupt, incompetent, and tyrannical factions into which orthodox Republicanism is divided. They desire that each faction in turn shall have the privilege of plundering and misgoverning the country. Each of these factions represents but a small minority of the people. Elections are so marred by intimidation and jugglery that nowadays only a tiny percentage of the electors will take the trouble to record their votes, though they voted in great numbers during the honest régime of Sidonio Paes. To state the matter briefly, each faction climbs into power by fraud, against the wishes of the mass of the people. To say this is to say that the

government of such a faction is a tyranny. Worse still, the faction maintains its power by sheer armed force—by the bayonets of soldiery, the sabres of policemen, and the muskets of bluejackets; in other words, by methods of terrorism. Worst of all, the faction's conduct, while in power, is open to the gravest suspicion of jobbery and malversation; so much so that the ordinary citizen regards the Republican régime as incomparably the rottenest that Portugal has ever known. When the dominant faction has gorged itself, it quietly drops off—either by reason of a hostile combination of other factions, or by collusion between the Front Benches—and another faction steps into power, and begins to repeat the same process.

Such was the condition of affairs during the first seven years of the Republic, and such has been the condition of affairs since the tragic death of Sidonio Paes. The common people, keenly sensitive to governmental influences, had freely assisted at Mass and fraternized with the clergy in Sidonio's time; now, in view of the altered circumstances, they show a feeling of constraint, of hesitation, of timidity. This adds enormously to the Church's difficulties. Given a good government, a good press, a good clergy, and a good system of education, the Portuguese people would be one of the finest, most warm-hearted, and most charming peoples in Europe. Unhappily, for the last century and a half, they have had none of these things, or they have had them very inadequately.

It seems to me that no people in Europe, exposed for the last hundred and fifty years to the multitudinous agencies of evil that have been operating against the Portuguese people—no other people in Europe would have retained so much natural politeness and goodness, so much Christian faith and piety, as the Portuguese people have managed to retain.

Despite all the difficulties which now confront the Church in Portugal, it seems to me that religion is in a better way than it was twenty years ago. There are many reasons which seem to justify this belief. To set them forth in detail would unduly prolong this article.

M. H. MACINERNEY, O.P.

TRIM

A SITE FOR A UNIVERSITY IN 1584

By REV. PETER BYRNE, C.M., LL.D.

THE following extract from an article on the Ruins of Trim is offered as a postscript to Father Callary's interesting paper on the Priory of St. John, in the I. E. RECORD for February. The article from which the extract is taken was published in the *Metropolitan Magazine*,¹ 1858, vol. iii. pp. 661-665. The archaic spelling and expressions of the original are retained.

An excellent and graphic description of Trim in olden days, is given in a memorial presented in 1584, by Robert Draper, Parson of Trim, to Lord Burghley, Lord High Treasurer of England, respecting the foundation of a University in Trim. The rev. gentleman thus presents its attractions :—

'Firste, it is situate in a most fresh and wholesome ayre, XX^{ti} myles from Dublin, and XV from Droghedaghe, an haven towne. The towne itselfe is full of very faire castles and stone houses, builded after the Englishe fashyon, and devyded into fyve faire streetes, and hathe in it the fairest and most stately castle that her Ma^{tie} hath in all Ireland, almost decayed. It hath also one greate and large Abbey, nothinge thereof defaced ; but the church and therein, great store of goodly roomes, in meetly good repair, the howse is put to no use, and will (I think) be easily bought of the owner, Edward Cusack, of Lesmollen. The said Edward hath also a fryary in the said town, a very fit place for a colledge, which also may be easily gotten of him.

'Further, your suppliant hathe a Friery having stanche and good walls for an hall, for 4 or five lodgings, a cellar, a kitchen, a place for lectures with a pleasant backside, conteyning three acres at leaste ; all which your said suppliant will freely give to the furtherance of this good worke. Throughe the myddest of the towne runneth the most pure and clere ryver of the Boyne ; up this ryver might all provision come from Droghedaghe to Trym, by boate, if the statute to that purpose made in Sir Henry Sidneis' time were executed. Harde by the towne is an excellent good quarry ; if they should need any stone, lymestone enough harde at the gate, slates within XI myles and timber enough within three

¹ The writer came across this magazine some years ago in a private library in the County Westmeath. It is but little known. Apparently it had a short life, from April 1857 to September 1858. It was published by W. Robertson, 23 Upper Sackville Street, Dublin.

myles. The country round about verie fruitfull of corne and cattell, yieldinge besides plentifull store of firewood and turfe—a very good and sweet fewell ; and if the statute aforesaid for the setting open of weares and fishing places in the Boyne were executed the fewell, in greater quantitie for small pryce, might be brought down by boate.

‘ Lastly (which is a matter of greater ymportance), the towne is in the myddest of the Englishe Pale, and is well and strongly walled about ; a thinge that will be a meane to draw lerned men thither, and be a greater safety to the whole company of studentes there ; for your honour knoweth that wheresoever the Universitie be founded, the town must of necessitie have a good wall, elles will no lerned men goe from hence, or any other place thither ; neither they of the country send their sonnes to any place that is not defensible, and safe from the invasion of the Irishe. The building of the wall will cost as much as the colledges, which charge will be saved.’

It will be noted that this memorial was presented to Lord Burghley in 1584, that is, within some seven or eight years of the foundation of Trinity College on its present site in Dublin.

At first sight it may appear anomalous that a country town like Trim should be seriously proposed as the home of the new university about to be established in Ireland. But a little reflection will show that the idea was not so far-fetched.

At that time, the end of the sixteenth century, there were only two universities in England, both of which were at a distance from London—Oxford 63 and Cambridge 55 miles.¹ What more natural, therefore, when there was serious question of setting up a university in Ireland, than that the example of England should be followed, and that a suitable town, not too far from the capital, should be fixed on ?

Of course, it may be said that the four universities at that time existing in Scotland had their homes in St. Andrews, Glasgow, Aberdeen, and Edinburgh. Still the new university for Ireland was to be founded by the Queen of England ; and England was naturally taken as a model.

Much, then, could be said for the proposal put forward by the Parson of Trim in his memorial to Lord Burghley. And doubtless the author, in drawing up his memorial in favour of Trim, was encouraged in his design by knowledge of the fact that, in the previous century, Drogheda, a country town like Trim, had been similarly suggested as the site for an Irish university. For this we have the authority of

¹ Durham was not founded till 1831, and London till 1836. The other universities in England and Wales are of quite recent foundation.

Leland.¹ He tells us: 'It was enacted by an Irish Parliament in the year 1465, that an university should be established in the town of Drogheda, with the same liberties and privileges enjoyed by that of Oxford. But this, like other acts of Irish legislation, was totally disregarded and forgotten in the tumult of civil affairs.'

As things turned out, the claim of Trim to be the seat of a university was ignored, but the project of founding an Irish university materialized, and the site selected was the old Monastery of All Hallows, Dublin, where the university, known as Trinity College, continues to the present day.

The date of the charter was 1591. It will thus be seen that the Parson of Trim, though he failed in what, we may assume, was his main object—to make his parish the home of a great university—had read the signs of the time aright when he drew up his memorial in 1584, and presented it to Lord Burghley, who, in the charter, was named as the first chancellor of the new university.

Trinity College is now in the very heart of the capital; but at the time of its foundation it was 'in the neighbourhood of Dublin, near to the south-eastern shore.'² On a map of Dublin, dated 1610, the College is shown standing alone, and well outside the city walls. There are absolutely no houses or buildings of any sort to the north, east, or south, and few to the west. Dame Street did not exist.

Between the gates of the sixteenth-century College and the castellated walls of Dublin lay the Green [known as Hoggin Green], upon which swine and cattle grazed, interfering with the comfort and security of pedestrians, hardly less than the sturdy beggars whose appeal for alms was liable by night to be associated with violence. A stream crossed the common, upon which there were then no buildings save a few cottages, to which early in the seventeenth century were added a hospital and a bridewell.³

In these circumstances, aloofness from the life and turmoil of the capital was, in the early days, at least, of the new university, to some extent provided for; but, how different are things to-day! Aloofness from city life is the last thing that would suggest itself to a stranger standing in front of Trinity College, and certainly such aloofness does not appear to prevail inside the walls.

¹ *The History of Ireland from the Invasion of Henry II.* By Thomas Leland, D.D., Senior Fellow of Trinity College. Book iv. Ch. 3, p. 319. Printed by Brett Smith, 46 Mary Street, Dublin. 1814.

² Leland. Book iv. Ch. 3, p. 324.

³ *Trinity College, Dublin.* By W. Macneille Dixon, pp. 12, 13. London: Robinson & Co., Great Russell Street. 1902.

The following words of the memorial form a significant comment on the spirit that animated the writer—a spirit that would not have found expression in a memorial to Lord Burghley if it had not been the predominating spirit of the English of the Pale—‘Neither [will] they of the country send their sonnes to any place that is not defensible, and safe from the invasion of the Irishe.’

The new university then was not intended for the native Irish. Access to it was denied to them. In the words of the memorial, their coming to it would be treated as an ‘invasion.’ The Irish were naturally lovers of learning, but the policy of the English was to keep learning beyond their reach.

The following passage from Douglas Hyde’s *Literary History of Ireland* (pp. 560–561), relating to the end of the sixteenth century, testifies to this:—

Loud and bitter were the complaints of the Irish at the policy of the English Government in cutting them off from education. Peter Lombard, the Catholic Archbishop of Arnagh, who died in 1625, and who wrote in Latin and published—of course abroad, he would not well do it at home—a ‘Commentary on the Kingdom of Ireland,’ assures his countrymen and all Europe that it had been the steady plan of the English Government to cut off education from the Irish, and to prevent them having a university of their own, despite the keen longing which his countrymen had for liberal studies, and the way in which they had always hitherto distinguished themselves in them. Even, he asserts, while England was still Catholic, her policy had been the same, and when the question of an Irish university was being debated in the English Council it had no bitterer enemy than a celebrated Catholic bishop. When someone afterwards remonstrated with this dignitary for opposing a work so holy and so salutary as the establishment of a Catholic university in Ireland, the answer made him was that it was not as a Catholic bishop he opposed it, but as an English senator. ‘Well for him,’ remarks Lombard grimly, ‘if in the council of God and His saints, when the severe sentence of the Deity is passed upon the bishop, the senator by a like display of nimble wit may escape it.’

When the university so long and so anxiously sought for, was actually founded, ‘most capacious, most splendid,’ as Lombard puts it, *at their expense*, in the shape of Trinity College, Dublin, and they found themselves excluded from its benefits, their indignation, as expressed by Lombard and others, knew no bounds. But their indignation was of little use, because they could not back it with their arms, and when they did so, they were beaten by Cromwell, and their last state rendered twenty times worse than their first.¹

¹ The original Latin text of these passages is given in notes on pages 561–562 of Douglas Hyde’s *Literary History of Ireland*, from Lombard’s ‘*De Hibernia Commentarius*,’ Louvain, 1632.

The picture of Trim as presented to us in the memorial of the Parson of Trim is the picture of a town that, for its size, had many attractions. It was situated on the undulating, fertile plains of Meath. It had the clear waters of the River Boyne flowing through it. It had both inside and outside its walls the ruins of many buildings that were, and still are, of historical or ecclesiastical interest. It was almost within view of the royal hill of Tara. No wonder that, in 1584, and, judged by the standard of life and thought of that time, it appeared to its Parson, and to some others, well fitted to become the Oxford of Ireland.

One who is inclined to ruminate on the past cannot but think how different Trim of the present day would be if the proposal of its sixteenth-century Parson had been adopted. Possibly our educational history of the last three hundred years might also have been different. With what far-reaching consequences to Ireland, who can tell ?

PETER BYRNE, C.M.

MODERN CHURCH BUILDING AND FURNISHING

BY R. M. BUTLER, M.R.I.A., F.R.I.B.A.

II

CONSIDERING the several parts of a church in detail, and taking it for granted that the foundations have been well and truly laid, the first and most important items to claim attention are masonry and cut-stone. The walls of a church intended to last for centuries, it goes without saying, should be strong and massive, soundly built: they are usually too thin. The Irish climate is very exacting, and many churches are damp through thin or badly built walls. In exposed situations it is often, even with the utmost care, difficult to entirely exclude damp. Many devices to ensure against damp have been employed, including hollow walls, brick or concrete linings etc., with more or less success. It would be impossible here to consider them in detail.

Ireland possesses a variety of excellent building stones, and there are few districts in which suitable stone is not to be found within easy reach. Wherever possible, and unless some exceptionally strong reason to the contrary exists, local materials should be used. The local stone is almost certain to weather better than a stone removed from its native air, and this applies most strongly to imported stones, which seldom last in the Irish climate. It is also aesthetically more correct to use the local materials which harmonize more softly with their surroundings and do not jar on the artistic sense. In England and other countries the rural districts have their own peculiar types and forms, evolved through centuries of traditional building. A characteristic stone type is the Cotswold style. From such local traditions no sympathetic architect willingly departs, and if he is not familiar with the local building methods, he makes it his business to become so. Local tradition in building has become lost in Ireland.

In the best and most completely developed medieval work the art of masonry reached the highest possible standard ; one need only look at one of the great cathedrals of England or France to see the skill and care with which the stonework is put together, the scientific ability with which the great vaults are constructed, the thrusts met, and the loads carried, often on the slenderest supports. In this higher development of the medieval styles, the masonry is of excellent ashlar. In the humbler structures the facing is often of the plain rubble walling of the district, giving most charming results.

In Ireland, during the modern church building era, at first chiselled or punched ashlar was employed, and occasionally, with excellent effect, the plain local rubble walling. As time went on, what came to be known as 'rock-faced-ashlar' was commonly used. It was cheaper than dressed work, but more costly than rubble. It is to my mind, as a rule, a singularly ugly facing, and is, I fancy, inclined to harbour damp. When there is much 'rock' on stone, and the stones are large, it takes away from the scale of the building, but so habituated have the masons and stonecutters become to it, that it is next to impossible to get anything else, unless punched or chiselled ashlar facing is specified. I have several times specified rubble facing, and the builders have put in 'rock-faced' stone, owing, I believe, to the difficulty of getting masons to do good rubble facing ; in fact I am afraid it is fast becoming a lost art. As one drives along the country roads in certain districts one may often observe excellent examples of rubble masonry in the older walls enclosing fields or demesnes. Even in the North of Ireland, where freestones are more plentiful, the type of facing known as 'shoddies' is generally used, although the sandstones are capable of making delightful rubble facing, if only the mason knew how to do it. An example of the sensible and artistic use of plain facing is at Killarney Cathedral by Pugin. It is interesting and instructive to observe it and to see what an excellent effect has been obtained with the very sparing use of cut-stone. If one cannot get a good rubble face, I think it is better to pay for 'punched ashlar.' May I here put in a word in favour of the simple white-washed wall of common rubble masonry. It is almost the sole relic of traditional building we have in Ireland, and is quite suitable for an humble country church. It always looks clean and pleasant, never vulgar, and is cheap.

What is now understood by the term 'cut-stone' is chiselled stone in dressings, prepared by stone-cutters. Cut-stone is expensive, and used here, there, and everywhere on the exterior of a church, without any well-defined object, runs away with money which might be expended to much better advantage on other purposes in the building. If one cannot have an entirely cut-stone or punched building face, then I think it is far better to try and get good plain rubble face, and concentrate the interest by employing cut-stone for special features, as in a good doorway, a tracery window, or the like. Breaking up the building often adds interest and avoids monotony when skilfully done, but the introduction of numerous breaks without particular reason other than to 'break it up,' adds enormously to the cost, and is meaningless and ineffective. So, too, are unnecessary finials, crockets, buttresses, etc., which, used without discrimination, only serve to make the church look 'fussy' and suggest the idea that they may have been introduced merely to conceal bad proportions. In fact, many modern church designs would have been vastly improved by a drastic use of india rubber! When stone facing cannot be afforded, good rough cast or pebble dash is by no means to be despised. Smooth cement finish is useful for keeping out the damp, but is better painted or whitewashed, or otherwise treated, and it ought not to be lined out in imitation of stone work.

Next to the walls, the most prominent and important feature of the exterior is the roof covering. It is astonishing how little thought has been given to this important item. In the vast majority of Irish churches, common large thin Welsh slates of ugly purple colour and uniform size have been used, producing an effect as if a huge flat-iron had carefully smoothed them out. Even Pugin and other able architects of the day employed them. But then that was just at the beginning of the Gothic revival, and the older classical practice of concealing the low pitched roofs behind parapets had left its stamp. The only variation was to introduce bands of blue Welsh slates, or to surmount the ridge with a cast-iron cresting. Yet, we had at hand native slate of excellent quality and pleasing grey-green colour, harmonizing well with the native stone. Irish slates were occasionally used, but, owing to the practice of splitting them very large and very thin to compete with the Welsh slates in weight, to which the material does not lend itself, they failed on many roofs and 'got a bad name.' Had they

been used small and very thick, they would have been perfectly satisfactory. Trinity College, the Bank of Ireland, and Dublin Castle are roofed with such Irish slates, quite good after a century and a half. It is now difficult to procure properly manufactured Irish slates.

It is impossible to make a church roof look well with the common large thin slates of commerce. Good, thick, small slates of varying size and broken colour, which are sold by weight, laid in courses of graduated size from eave to ridge, should always be used in church roofs. Of course, they cost more, require more skill and care in handling, but they are worth it and, when well laid, make an almost everlasting roof of good appearance, giving scale and 'texture' to the building. The best slates come from Cumberland and Westmoreland, but good slates are also procured from Cornwall and Precelly in Wales. They vary in colour from a beautiful sea-green to grey-green and silver-grey, sometimes broken by reddish tints. Very effective results may be secured with varying broken tints. Fancy ridge tiles or crestings should be avoided; nothing looks better than a slate roll on the ridge, or a plain ridge tile as near the colour of the slates as possible. Lead was a favourite roof covering in the Middle Ages, but is now prohibitive in cost. Copper makes a beautiful roof covering, but is very costly.

I have dwelt at some length upon walling and roofing, because they are the chief features of the exterior, and when rightly done add great interest to the building.

Brick has been little employed in facing churches in Ireland, and the seldomer the better. Ireland is not a brick country, and ordinary brick walls do not stand well in exposed districts. The only native bricks now procurable are large ugly machine made-bricks of uniform colour, with which it is impossible to make an artistic wall. The modern native bricks are, moreover, too large, and of very poor quality of late. Small handmade bricks of varying colour, which are pleasant to look at, have ceased to be made in this country.

In the East of England, Holland, Belgium, Northern Italy, and parts of Germany, where stone is scarce and brick is the recognized material, there is a brick tradition, and some of the most beautiful churches have been built of this material.

Tiles have scarcely been used at all in this country for covering churches, and it is hardly necessary to discuss

them. Good tiles make a beautiful roof, if used in broken tints or brindled colours.

The roof of a church is a very important feature of the interior. It would be difficult to imagine anything less artistic than the ordinary roof of varnished pitch pine or stained deal, so invariable a feature. To my mind a varnished pitch pine roof is enough to spoil any church. Best of all is stone vaulting, but it is seldom that funds will permit this most beautiful of all treatments to be adopted.

Next to it are open-timbered oak roofs. Some of the most exquisite examples are to be found in England, and have been described as 'the glory of the Eastern Counties.' Such roofs are also too costly for ordinary resources. Many of the Irish church roofs are 'open-timbered,' that is to say that all the constructional timbers are exposed to view, up to the ridge. Apart from the fact that they are usually varnished, and of an unpleasant yellow colour, their great fault is that the timbers are much too light for this treatment. The open-timbered roofs of the Middle Ages were of a massive construction, often richly fretted and carved. Thin timbers are a mere travesty of an open-timbered roof. Where only thin timbers can be afforded, then it is much better to cover them up with a 'waggon ceiling' or barrel vault, sheeted in wood or plastered, or to adopt some other simple device. Where such open roofs already exist, the best thing is to decorate them in colour and gold.

Ireland was once famed for its excellent oak, its superior density and closeness of grain causing it to be preferred by English architects of the Middle Ages for some of the most important buildings. The great open-timbered roof of Westminster Hall, the roof of Henry VII Chapel, Westminster, and the roof supporting the leads of the magnificent Chapel of King's College, Cambridge, came from the woods of Shillelagh.

Pitch pine or Oregon pine, unstained and unvarnished, left in its natural state, is a very suitable material where oak cannot be provided. If the timbers can be heavy, that is to say, the rafters not less than 4 inches thick, and everything else in proportion, then an open-timbered treatment may be attempted, otherwise it is better to cover up the roof: diagonal panels and similar patterns in sheeting always look cheap and vulgar. If carving or moulding be used it should be done in a natural and appropriate way. A brief study of any standard work on ecclesiastical architecture

containing illustrations of old roofs will explain what I mean. Timber vaulting was also used in the old churches and is very effective, either left plain or coloured and gilded, but never varnished. Concrete vaults may be constructed with good effect, and left as a field for colour decoration. They have the advantage of being fire-resisting.

Fibrous plaster is a very useful modern material that lends itself to colour decoration, but it should be used in such a way as not to imitate stone. As the material is actually cast in slabs, I think it is permissible to show the joints if desired, and so gain that effect of 'scale,' and texture too, which is one of the advantages of stone work.

In the old churches the walls were often lined with dressed-stone. It is rarely we find this in modern churches in Ireland, which is a pity, because the stone construction lends scale to the interior, is durable, and in time acquires a soft mellow tone. A sandstone of cream or reddish colour makes a very soft pleasant interior, and obviates the necessity for colour decoration. Hard limestones are apt to show condensed moisture. The architectural treatment of the doors and windows in stone adds much to the dignity of the church.

If, however, it is only possible to finish the interior in plaster, it is better to do it very simply without unnecessary mouldings, or attempts to simulate stone. I prefer a rough finish on the walls, and it is well to avoid the usual practice of finishing the mouldings or angles in white, the rest of the wall in grey, as it adds a jarring note.

The introduction into a church of columns of polished Scotch granite vulgarizes it. One involuntarily associates polished granite with tombstones and public-house counter-tops, and the shiny surface is very distracting. It is much better to have simple stone shafts, moulded if possible. It is also destructive of restfulness to introduce a large variety of materials. It is much better to mould the capitals of the shafts, or even to dispense with them, if ample funds for good carving are not available. The foliage carving commonly seen is without interest. It is purely mechanical as turned out by the journeyman carver. If carving is desired, then let it be the best possible, done by a carver who can impress his individuality on his work, and is capable of varying and giving interest to it.

Modern Irish church seats are ugly, and, as a rule, of varnished pitch pine or deal, which is almost an inevitable

finish for church furniture. The strong yellow colour and shiny surface are objectionable. An effort should be made to secure that the seats be of oak or other good wood, simple but massive in design, and left without varnish or polish. If desired a coating of oil or dull waxing may be applied to the surface. Chairs are not used in this country, but are very common in English and Continental churches. Where good oak pews cannot be afforded, I should prefer rush-bottomed chairs, they crowd up the interior less than pews or benches. Deal fittings, if painted or decorated, are unobjectionable.

In the matter of brass, wrought-iron, and other metal work there is much room for improvement, these being mostly of stereotyped pattern. Enamels are little used, but are a beautiful art, adapted to church use. Some most admirable enamel work has been done of late years in Ireland by Mr. Reeves, of the School of Art, Dublin; Miss O'Kelly, and other artists.

Ireland was, in early days, noted for the unrivalled beauty of its metal work, and the old examples in the National Museum afford admirable suggestion for modern design, but the way in which modern so-called Celtic design is too often reproduced is deplorable.

Confessional boxes are a comparatively modern institution, and there are no very old models. The older ones, found in some Continental churches were much smaller and simpler than the large boxes now common. In St. Nicholas Church, Galway, is a stone confessional built in the wall. Ordinarily, the large wooden boxes used in Irish churches constitute a great obstruction, and when of varnished pine or deal are ugly. They are frequently of a very poor stock pattern. It would be much better if they could be designed as part of the church itself and done in stone, failing this of unpolished oak, partly recessed in the walls. In a new church they should form part of the design.

The chancel itself, as already observed, should be of ample proportions, and be marked off in some very distinctive fashion. In the Middle Ages a chancel screen was usual. These were most commonly of carved and traceried oak, often very rich and elaborate. Many examples of these still exist all over England and abroad in perfect condition. No example remains in Ireland. They are not used in modern Irish churches, and it is a loss, for, apart from their beauty, they served to set the chancel by itself unmistakably. They were termed rood screens, and often bore the holy

rood. From the earliest times the apse or sacrarium was protected by some kind of fence. The first known were railings of bronze or wood. The Church of the Apostles, erected in Constantinople in the fourth century, had a screen of gilded bronze. St. Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople, speaks of the Holy of Holies being accessible to priests only, and fenced off by bronze gilded railings. None of these very early railings, however, survive.

The origin of the medieval choir screen is two-fold, according to Mr. Francis Bond, a very erudite writer on these subjects, partly in altar fences, railing or colonnades, partly in low parapets, partly in the necessity for providing supports for a rood screen, which carried a crucifix and attendant figures, reliquaries, curtains etc. The rood beam developed in Italy into a colonnade, in England into the choir screen of oak or stone. Many of the English screens, particularly in Norfolk and Suffolk, were richly coloured and gilded, and bore decorative figure panels. The red of the poppy, the gold of the corn, the yellow, blue and green of the flowers, were introduced, and gilding was freely used.

It is said that almost every church in Devon and the adjoining counties was once furnished with its rood loft and gallery front, surmounting the chancel screen. In Lincolnshire alone there must have been over a hundred rood lofts.

Altar rails, as now used, are of post-Reformation date, as prior to that, almost every chancel was already fenced by the chancel screen.

Where the church is too short—and most Irish churches are—it is best not to introduce a chancel arch, because it only accentuates the lack of length.

The altar, with the reredos, constitutes the central object of the chancel, and always stood first in dignity and importance in Christian worship in the ancient churches. In the earliest times, the church was but a shelter for the altar. The earliest type was in the form of a wooden table, and in the Greek Church the wooden form endured to the present day. In the Western Church, the stone altar was ultimately preferred. Sometimes a simple block of stone was used.

On either side of medieval altars there were usually side curtains, 'ridels' or 'riddells,' or 'costers.' Examples of medieval altars are fairly numerous in England, and in Ireland a few fine ones remain—at Holy Cross, at Straide, Co. Mayo (until lately used as the high altar of the parish church), the front enriched with figure-carving and canopy

work, etc. These old native Irish altars are of limestone. Why should not the use of Irish limestone for altars and pulpits be revived? Many limestones, moreover, polish well and have a softer tone than Sicilian marble. Finely chiselled limestone would look very well, and be most appropriate.

Reredoses are supposed to have come into general use about the eleventh or twelfth century, and many beautiful examples remain in England, but I know of none in Ireland. One of the finest examples of a medieval reredos still remaining is that of Christ Church Priory, Hants, also the great reredos of Winchester, and that at Sherbourne Abbey.

The reredos should be detached from the altar. Most of the modern altars in Irish churches are unrubrical in character, the reredos being mounted on the altar, and forming a sort of superstructure. A small pamphlet on the correct rubrical construction of altars, compiled by the late Cardinal Vaughan and Mr. Osmund Bentley, published by Burns and Oates, gives much practical information on these points.

In Ireland the altars are usually of Sicilian marble, a very cold looking material in this country, and ordinarily employed and carved in a manner more suited to soft stone than to marble. Marble should be used in broad smooth masses. It lends itself well to simple flowing curves, panelling, and inlays, rather than to elaborate carving. An excellent example of the right use of marble is in the Catholic University Church, Stephen's Green, Dublin, including the fine pulpit.

Marble altars are common in the Italian churches but are not found in medieval Gothic churches, in these countries stone or oak being usual. The reredos in medieval churches is usually of soft stone like Bathstone, which lends itself well to good carving and enrichment. The medieval artists did not hesitate to touch up their carved stonework with gold. Coloured alabaster was also much used, and nothing could be better; it is quite permissible to enrich it with gold and colour, which gives a warm and glowing effect. The following is a description of an English alabaster altar-piece in the South Kensington Museum:—'It was acquired at the sale of Lord Swansea's collection at Singleton Abbey last November, a complete English altar-piece in alabaster, dating from the middle, or second half, of the 15th century. Such altar-pieces were made in considerable quantities from the alabaster quarries at Chellaston, in Derbyshire, and much work

was done at Nottingham. They appear to have been articles of export, and a certain number of complete altar-pieces are preserved in France and Italy and elsewhere, but though many separate panels exist in English public and private collections, no other complete altar-piece, as far as is known, has been preserved in this country. The altar-piece is in triptych form, with its original wood frame painted and decorated with gilt gesso. The lower border bears inscriptions describing the subjects of the panels. These are five in number, and represent the Annunciation, the Nativity, the Holy Trinity, the Ascension of Christ, and the Assumption of the Virgin. At the end of the wings are figures of St. John the Baptist and St John the Evangelist. The colouring and gilding of the alabaster has been extremely well preserved and the whole altar-piece gives a remarkable idea of the brilliant effect produced by such panels, individually often insignificant, when combined in their proper setting. It has been temporarily exhibited in room 62, to the right of the main entrance.' I have not seen this altar-piece, but it should be well worth visiting by anybody who has the opportunity. Such altar-pieces were used as a form of reredos.

Speaking generally, either stone or alabaster is a more suitable material than marble for altars, pulpits, and similar work. Stone shows carving to much better advantage. It is rather a pity, too, that good carved oak work is not more largely availed of for such purposes as a reredos or pulpit. Admirable effects may be obtained at considerably less cost than in marble or stone.

The painting or gilding of either stone or alabaster must, it need hardly be said, be done with great skill and restraint. Marble does not hold shadows well, therefore elaborate mouldings are more or less out of place in this material, and the beauty of its marking and veining and the variety and richness of its colour are thereby lost. Very good effects may be obtained with native Irish marbles, properly used. Alabaster is a material which has fallen much into disuse in Ireland. Very fine effects in altars, pulpits, rails etc., may be produced in this material, which varies in colour from red to white, and is often beautifully marked. It carves well, and may be reinforced with gold and colour. Very elaborate tracery, crockets, finials, and 'tabernacle work,' which would be lost in marble, can be used with effect in alabaster.

The altar table should be of ample length, nine feet is a minimum length for a high altar; the predella and steps should be of easy and ample proportions. Many predellas afford insufficient space for three priests. The predella should be at least 4 feet 6 inches wide in front of the altar, and 12 feet in length. The steps may be either three or five in number, the latter preferable where there is sufficient room; and they are almost always too high and too narrow, which is most inconvenient, and even dangerous. They should not be less than 14 or 15 inches on the tread or flat portion, or more than 5 inches on the riser or vertical part, an easier step would be $16\frac{1}{2}$ inches by 4 inches; but in all cases the riser must be properly proportioned: a rough and ready rule, which generally yields satisfactory proportions, is that the riser, multiplied by the tread in inches, equals 66, sometimes an inch or so may with advantage be added to the tread. The lower the riser and the wider the tread the better. If a chancel be very narrow it is better to run the steps right across the chancel. Between the bottom step of the altar and the communion rail adequate space must be left; it is frequently too narrow. It should not be less than six feet, better if it can be many times that. In the altar itself, the mensa or table-top is often too narrow in front of the tabernacle, the width should be not less than 18" to 20". The height of the altar varies little, a certain standard of 3' 3" to 3' 6" being generally observed.

The remarks as to material made in respect of the altar, apply equally to the communion rails; marble has here the advantage of being easily kept clean. The steps to the communion rail may be one or two in number, and never less than 14" in width, or better still 15" or 16"; where there are two steps, the lower one should be at least 18" or 20" on the tread, so as to accommodate the leg of a person kneeling on the upper step from the knee to the toe, otherwise it is uncomfortable and dangerous.

Other furniture of the chancel, which should be provided wherever possible, and in a permanent and dignified form, as part of the structure, are the sedilia, the piscina, and perhaps an aumbry. In the medieval church the sedilia was often a most beautiful object upon which much labour and skill was lavished. Where there is no sedilia, it becomes necessary to introduce chairs for High Mass into the chancel. Many beautiful examples of sedilia exist in England, and at Holy Cross, Thurles, there is an exceedingly fine late Irish

Gothic one. Such fittings in stone, alabaster, or oak add much to the dignity and richness of the chancel.

It may be remarked that the number of persons possessing a knowledge of the principles of ecclesiastical art is very limited, and a steadily diminishing quantity. For one person who studies this subject effectually nowadays, there were forty half a century ago, in the heyday of the Revival.

One very rich and dignified feature in the chancel is, as a rule, missing in modern Irish churches, that is the use of textile hangings or embroideries, which were very common in the churches of the Middle Ages, in the form of riddels, dossals, and ante-pendium or altar frontals. These often corresponded with the vestments and varied with the seasons. Very rich and beautiful colours and designs of ecclesiastical pattern of modern manufacture could be obtained before the war, and were not very costly, but of course embroidery in gold thread and rich colour would be far better. Embroidery of good designs, or good textiles, add enormously to the beauty of the chancel. I have seen some very fine ecclesiastical embroideries done by the Dun Emer Guild, Dublin. In conjunction with hangings, one naturally thinks of carpets. Poverty frequently compels the use of ordinary Brussels carpet of tawdry colouring and design. Carpets are a very important item, and receive too little consideration. Nothing could be better than specially designed Irish hand-tufted carpets, such as are made by the Dun Emer Guild and the other Irish carpet factories, but they are fairly expensive. Persian and other oriental rugs, of old design, are delightful in colouring and texture and most suitable, but, since the war, have become almost prohibitive in price. Indian rugs of good colour and design may, occasionally, be picked up and are not expensive, but these need discrimination in their selection. Failing these, the next best thing is a good Axminster or Wilton carpet, of self colour, with little or no pattern. They may be had in soft reds, blues and greens, and occasionally in quite good reproductions of oriental patterns. Wherever these cannot be afforded, plain felts can be had in self colours, and are quite cheap and effective, but show foot marks. I have dwelt at what may be deemed undue length upon carpets and hangings, but I think they are very important for their decorative effect.

I may mention, too, that in the artistic design and

colouring of church vestments great improvements have lately been effected by pioneers in the revival of this great art of the Middle Ages, upon which Pugin wrote so fully in his day. The Right Rev. Monsignore le Vicomte de la Villarmois, Protonotary Apostolic, who is an authority on the subject, visited Ireland last year, when I had the privilege of meeting him and seeing some of the vestments, exquisite in design and colouring, which he had with him. A convent in Co. Wexford, and the Dun Emer Guild, have made some very fine vestments under Monsignore's directions.

The floor of the chancel may be of marble, tiles, mosaic, or wood. A real marble pavement is perhaps the best of all. Black and white or grey, with coloured marbles, make a combination which is hard to beat for dignity, solidity and durability. Encaustic and glazed tiles of good medieval pattern in combination are very suitable; exceedingly fine and rich effects can be produced. There are many remains of beautiful old Irish tiles still extant. In the restoration of Christ Church Cathedral, or the Abbey of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, George Edmund Street, R.A., who was in charge of it, collected these old tiles and reconstructed the pavements. Some of the Staffordshire tile-makers still have the patterns of these old Irish tiles.

Some rigid purists consider a marble or mosaic floor out of keeping with Gothic traditions, with which encaustic tiles are most in consonance. There are, however, exceptions. Mosaic was used in Henry VII Chapel, Westminster, and elsewhere.

Mosaic floors as usually designed and supplied to modern churches by commercial firms are inartistic, though showy in colour. Good mosaic is very costly. The modern mosaic is only a cheap imitation as a rule. A good example of a modern mosaic floor is that at St. Finn Barr, Cork, designed by the architect, William Burges. Mosaic is of several kinds: Vitreous mosaic, made from small particles of tile; glass mosaic, and Venetian mosaic, made from fragments of real marble. The floor of the chancel should always be designed by the architect, or by a *real* artist, not by the tilemaker's draftsman, as is usually the case. Woodblock or parquet floors of quite good design can be had. They are warm to the feet and noiseless to the tread, but are not effective except as a background to rugs.

The pulpit in most modern churches is too low, and often placed too near the chancel for effective hearing; of course,

it should never be placed *inside* the communion rails, as is sometimes seen in Irish churches. The traditional position of the pulpit is in the nave on the Gospel side, and it should be placed as far down as accoustic consideration may dictate.

In Ireland the pulpit is usually of marble or stone, and the same remarks apply as to the Altar. When of marble the material is frequently misused and a soft stone or timber form of design adopted with most illogical results. An oak canopy or sounding board, carved or moulded, and enriched with bright colours and gold adds much to the dignity and interest of the interior of the church. Carved oak pulpits are not common in Ireland, but would be a very suitable material, if well designed, in a manner adapted to the material.

A special Baptistry was not common in English or Irish churches in the Middle Ages, it is a more or less foreign feature, but it is perhaps convenient to put the font in a special place where it can be easily fenced off, and this view has been adopted in most modern Irish churches of any size ; in some cases, however, the space is rather cramped for baptisms. The old traditional place for the font was in a prominent position at the west end of the church. Rubrically, the Baptistry should be sunk one or two steps down, but where this is not possible it adds importance to elevate the font a step above the church floor. The font itself should be of stone or other impervious material : marble is suitable and clean. It should always be covered. The cover affords opportunity for the exercise of any amount of skill and taste in design. Many of the old carved oak font covers were marvels of grace and beauty, towering high in the air with tier on tier of richly fretted tracery and crocketing, often coloured and gilded.

Such efforts are beyond the scope of most modern church builders, but the cover should be dignified and as important looking as circumstances permit. The font like the piscina, should always have a special drain discharging, not into a sewer, but into some clean place outside the church. Mortuary chapels are quite a recent innovation, and not much study has so far been given to them. In a new church their position and design should be carefully considered, with due regard to their purpose and use.

Stations of the Cross, from their nature, are best treated as pictures, unless first-class sculpture is possible. In Irish

churches they are frequently unsatisfactory from an artistic point of view. They are generally either oil paintings, or sculptured panels, occasionally they are done in mosaic or opus sectile, and in terra-cotta or modelled plaster. If stone or marble panels, of architectural character and a part of the general design, can be provided in the church, and the funds permit of a sculptor being employed, then this is probably the most satisfactory solution. Terra-cotta, and even plaster, if well modelled on conventional rather than naturalistic lines, and brightly coloured and gilded, are unobjectionable. Next to good sculpture, however, I should say reasonably well-executed oil paintings were best. The subjects should be more or less conventionally treated. Naturalistic pictorialism is out of place. The manner of the pre-Raphaelite school, and the decorative methods of that great French artist, Puvis de Chavannes (1824-1898), afford suggestions for dignified treatment. If oil paintings be used, the surround or frame should be frankly a picture frame of suitable character, preferably rich and gilded, but a simple frame might be substituted. The pitch pine varnished constructions with finials and crockets, and other attempts at architectural features that one often sees, are very ugly. Frescoes in tempera done on the walls afford a further suggestion, but in Ireland the climate would render them perishable, besides which there would be the difficulty of getting artists able to do them. In many foreign churches the Stations are oil paintings in gilded frames, hung on the columns of the nave arcade—it is perhaps as satisfactory a solution as any other. The particular medium of expression employed should be governed by the amount of money and the artistic skill available.

In modern Irish churches the organ is placed on a gallery at the west end of the church and, from the point of sound, it is about the best position, and is otherwise unobjectionable, provided the gallery be designed as an integral part of the church or its furnishing. The gallery added as an after-thought is seldom satisfactory. Where at all practicable the gallery ought to be of stone, or of oak treated after the manner of the old chancel screens, and may be made quite harmonious and effective. Galleries are frequently too large for the church, and detract from its dignity.

In Irish churches the organ case is seldom designed by the architect, and is usually constructed by the organ builder of pine or deal varnished, with unhappy architectural results,

which is a great pity, the organ being a very prominent, feature in the church. In many of the older churches the organ case was a magnificent affair of traceried and enriched oakwork. The pipes were gilded and coloured as early as A.D. 709, according to St. Aldhelm, who is supposed to have erected the first organ at Malmesbury, where he was Abbot A.D. 680 to 705. In the medieval churches the organ was often put on the rood loft. Organ cases do not appear to have come into use till about the close of the fourteenth century, and of these none have survived. The oldest known in these countries, according to Mr. Bond, is at Old Radnor in Wales, where it stands on the north side of the chancel.

Howsoever simple the organ case may be, it should be designed in architectural keeping with the church, and not left to the will of the organ builder, who is not an architect, and devotes little or no attention to this part of the work. The organ itself should be built according to the specification, and subject to the approval of a musical expert.

I shall now come to the very important subject of stained glass and colour decoration, which of late have attracted much attention, and occasioned some discussion in various periodicals. As to some extent they hang together, they may be considered on this basis. Stained glass, from a very early period, was of importance, and in time came to be one of the chief glories of the medieval church. It was essentially an art of the Middle Ages. It flourished from the twelfth to the sixteenth century, when it was on the wane. After the Reformation it became a lost art, which, in the truer sense, was not revived until within comparatively recent years. When the Gothic revival took place, Pugin and others endeavoured to revive the art, with but scant success. Some of the glass of Clayton and Bell has a merit of its own, and was in many respects preferable to that of the phase that followed, but it was crude in colouring and missed the spirit of the old glass. The glass that followed the early Gothic revival was bad in almost every respect. The Munich school and other cheap Continental glass set the fashion. The designs were poor, the colouring bad, and the whole treatment, in its striving after naturalistic pictorialism, vulgar.

Not only was the whole medieval spirit lost, but the very technique was at variance with the true principles of this beautiful art. Instead of the small slabs of pot-metal glass of rich and glowing colour, disposed together to form a

mosaic of a sparkling jewel-like effect with translucent colour the Munich school substituted the cheap and ready fashion of painting whole designs pictorially in the most naturalistic manner on large sheets of glass. The result was a pictorial transparency, not a piece of stained glass. In the old work the leading-up was one of the most essential points in the art, every cut and every line of the lead, being conceived with a view to enhance the design in a strictly conventional manner, and with full regard to the limitations of glass as a medium for pictorial representation.

During recent years in England the art has been to a considerable extent recovered. The glass designed by Burne Jones, notably that at Birmingham Cathedral, also the glass by the late Charles Kempe, and the glass of Mr. Christopher Whall, who did the beautiful modern glass at Gloucester Cathedral, are exceedingly fine, and recall some of the qualities of the best old glass. Messrs. Powell, of Whitefriars, were responsible for some of the most important pioneer work in the modern revival of the art. In Ireland the work of the school founded by Miss Sarah Purser, R.H.A., and the glass of Mr. Harry Clarke is equal to any modern glass, and infinitely superior to any imported from the Continent. The chancel windows of Loughrea Cathedral by Mr. A. E. Child of Miss Purser's studio, and a pupil of Mr. Whall, is admirable and well worthy of a special visit, as is also the glass from Miss Purser's studio, and the splendid work of Mr. Clarke at the Honan Chapel, Cork. No medieval glass remains in Ireland, but there are numerous fine specimens in England. Amongst them may be mentioned the glass at York Minster, Merton College Chapel, Oxford, New College, Oxford, and King's College Chapel, Cambridge. Fairford Church, Gloucestershire, contains one of the most complete collections of old glass existing.

It is gratifying to observe that the work of these Irish artists in stained glass has gained, and continues to gain, wide appreciation far beyond the bounds of this country, and that the importation of stained glass has almost ceased.

In many modern churches what also militates much against the success and unity of the glass is the absence of any ordered scheme of glass design. Style, colour, treatment and subject should all be considered as a whole, and, as far as possible, the work of one artist or group of artists. With such a scheme laid down at the start, one window would follow another in natural sequence, and one window be a

complement to the other, in colour, style, and treatment, instead of jarring with it, as is too often the case. If really good stained glass cannot be afforded, it is much better to be content with honest leaded lights of simple pattern.

It may be incidentally remarked that many churches have too much light in them.

When one comes to deal with the subject of colour decoration in churches, one is struck by the almost entire absence of a really successful scheme anywhere. The decoration of most churches is obviously the work of the commercial firms, conceived without regard to the architecture, without any unity of purpose, or beauty of colour. The most that can be said is, that where good colours and plenty of gold have been used, the result is harmless. But how often, on the other hand, is one prompted to ask, on beholding acres of meaningless insipid stencil work with dull muddy colour, how much better would have been a simple colour wash, or the natural grey or white of the plastered surface. Artists skilled in decorative or applied art of any sort are very scarce in Ireland. The Dublin School of Art has turned out many capable artists, but owing to the want of patronage there is no inducement to the young artists to devote themselves to applied art. They take up other branches of art, become art teachers, or are lost to the country.

When a project of colour decoration is mooted, I think the first consideration should be to ask: Is it well to attempt a scheme, would a wash of colour meet the case, or perhaps would it be best to leave well alone? The answer to these questions depends on several things. Plaster forms an excellent field for colour decoration, and nothing can be finer than good colour decoration. There comes a time in the life of every plastered church when the question arises: Should the walls not be decorated or coloured? If there are ample funds available, and they must be ample, and an artist really capable of devising a scheme is at hand, then it may be contemplated without hesitation; it is, however, but seldom that such a fortunate conjunction of circumstance arises in this country. A well-conceived scheme of decoration, with plenty of gay colour, will, in capable hands, yield fine results. But if gold has to be eliminated, and reliance put on stock pattern stencil work, that is an indication that the work should not be attempted, or else limited to such an area that richness may be ensured.

A plain colour wash of some quiet tone, such as grey or light stone tint with a few points of pure colour, and perhaps gilding, may be made effective, while honest whitewash is by no means to be despised. The subject of colour decoration in churches is a large and most difficult one, and I merely briefly touch on some of the points which I think should guide anyone contemplating a scheme. Colour decoration itself might form the subject for many separate papers.

The usual modern decoration of churches fails for various reasons—it is unarchitectural, too many wide surfaces of dull colour lack richness and interest, and the stencilling is allowed to run riot. The medieval practice was different, and sufficient examples of colour decoration remain to show how it was employed. In many of the oak church screens and pulpits, gold and colour, including panels of painted saints, were freely used. It was not usual to decorate the whole church. In addition to the other woodwork, the roofs were often decorated in colour. It was rather the practice to concentrate the colour, to use each tint in its brightest and purest form, and the principles of heraldic colouring appear to have guided these decorative artists of the Middle Ages to very good results. White was used, but of a parchment shade, not pure; green was a favourite colour, in fact the choice was limited to green, red, and blue, reinforced with gold, black and white. Blue was the customary colour for vaults and so forth, generally powdered with gold stars or devices. Carving is often gilded. Panels of green and red frequently alternate with mouldings of blue. Black is used in moderate quantities, sometimes twisted with gold like a barber's pole. Although such bright colours are used, they are not crude and do not clash. Large broad surfaces of any one colour were avoided, and the effect was to blend the colours harmoniously, the various bright colours being separated by white or gold. Yellow was often used in place of gold. East Anglia had the richest schemes of colour decoration, and stencilling and brushwork were common.

Many of the coloured panels of pulpits and screens are enriched with gold powderings or painted figures. The stencilled patterns are of great variety; roses, fleur-de-lys, foliage, monograms, eagles, pelicans, and various symbolic devices. Sometimes black-letter inscriptions were successfully employed, and delicate patterns in raised plaster work or gesso, gilded, were used on the screens. In the East Anglian

decorative schemes, gold was freely used, with varying schemes of colour. At Heedham the screen is chiefly red and gold, at Ranworth soft gold and vermilion. At Ranworth and Hanstanton, Southwold, etc., are figure panels beautifully treated. The roofs in East Anglia were decorated with great skill and beauty. Other parts of England, especially in the west country, contain many examples of old decoration, but on a less elaborate scale than East Anglia.

Although we have in Ireland no remains of medieval mural colour decoration, save a few fragments here and there, the ancient Irish illuminated manuscripts are unequalled in the exquisite beauty of the colouring and design, and are full of valuable suggestion.

I have so far been speaking of colour decoration as meaning painting and gilding. There are of course other methods, mosaic for instance—here too it is better to cry ‘halt’ rather than proceed with a scheme of mosaic mural decoration, without the most ample funds. Cheap mosaic is nasty; good mosaic, and it requires real gold mosaic to reinforce it, is very costly. A third method is marble wall lining. Very effective results may thereby be obtained. A scheme of wall lining in Irish marbles, a soft grey predominating, and enlivened with a little gold mosaic, is safe, and is not prohibitive in cost, besides being very durable.

In the foregoing remarks I have touched upon the chief points in church building and decoration, just as they have occurred to me, and without the slightest attempt to deal with the subject in an exhaustive fashion. Possibly, however, what I have said may induce some reader to pursue the subject by looking into its literature. In this connexion I think works dealing with the various details of church design and furnishing are more likely to be helpful, and to repay study, than works treating of architecture or architectural history as a whole. Ruskin, Pugin, and that great French writer on architecture, Viollet-le-Duc, are, of course, excellent; but such works as the series of Mr. F. E. Bond and Dr. Cox, on the various details of the medieval church, Messrs. Howard and Crossley’s fine volume on *Church Woodwork*, and Mr. A. L. Champney’s work on *Irish Ecclesiastical Architecture*, will be found interesting; while, as treating of good modern church work, *Recent English Ecclesiastical Architecture*, by Sir Charles Nicholson and Charles Spooner, and *American Churches*, by James MacFarlan Baker, will give some idea of good modern work in England and America, respectively.

Three instructive works on stained glass are *Stained-glass Work*, by Christopher Whall; *Windows*, by Lewis F. Day, and *Stained-glass Tours in England*, by Charles Hitchcock Sherrill, an American writer. I may add, too, that in the National Museum, Dublin, we have a rich storehouse of art, beginning with early Christian art in Ireland down to modern times.

R. M. BUTLER.

THE AUGUSTINIANS IN NEW ROSS

By JOHN B. CULLEN

THE present year marks the six hundredth anniversary of the coming of the Augustinian Friars to New Ross. During all those changeful centuries—through weal and woe—the name, memories and devoted labours of the Augustinian Fathers have been associated with the religious history of the town.

The original Priory of the Order was situated in the present South Street, and with its gardens, cemetery and other belongings occupied the site of an extensive timber yard held close on a century ago by Mr. Edward Hay, and subsequently by Messrs. Galavan & Co. Near the gateway leading to these premises from South Street, at the right-hand side, the stone frame of a Gothic window (late Decor. style) might be observed, built up in the wall, which was all that remained to tell that the place had once been the site of a church. This silent landmark may possibly be in evidence still. The grounds of the Convent extended to the Quay—and since the river in those days flowed in much farther than now, the Friars may have had a waterside entrance like their neighbours, the Franciscans, whose Convent occupied a similar site further down the riverside (Priory Lane). The latter Order had the privilege of collecting certain tolls, for the benefit of their community, from vessels trading to the Port of Ross.

The Austin Friars, in those days, belonged to the English Province of the Order; and like their brethren in the sister-country, owed the founding of their different houses to the charity of some generous benefactors of the noble or wealthier classes. Previous to the Reformation they had forty convents in England and eight in Ireland.

Apparently the Augustinian Priory of Ross came into existence towards the latter part of the reign of Edward II, in the year 1320, but its building was carried on well into the reign of Edward the Third. Its original founder was

William des Roches, a member of an influential Anglo-Norman family which then held several settlements in the country. About a century before, Peter des Roches, Bishop of Winchester, was joint-Regent of the kingdom during the minority of Henry III. He also had been appointed guardian of the person of the young King, on the death of his father. During his term of office as regent, Bishop Des Roches secured several grants of land for members of his family in Ireland, principally, in the Counties of Cork and Wexford, where the surname (Roche) is still general, and is perpetuated in place-names such as Clonroche, Rochestown, Rochesland, Castletownroche, etc. The successive generations of this noble family were noted as munificent patrons and benefactors of the Church, and gave many members to the priesthood. In the County Wexford, for years and years, the name appears in the lists of the secular clergy, as well as in those of the religious Orders—even down to our own day. The seat of the principal branch of the family was Artramont, on the Slaney, some miles north of the town of Wexford.

A few years previous to the founding of the house of the Austin Friars in New Ross Edward II freed the port from certain restrictions, imposed on its maritime trade by the earlier Plantagenet kings, who favoured the mercantile interests of Waterford during their successive reigns, from the time of the Anglo-Norman Invasion. The same harbour was common to both towns, the natural advantages of situation enjoyed by either seaport were fully equal, and hence the disabilities imposed on the one and the privileges and exemptions afforded the other became a source of contention and repeated feuds between the inhabitants of Ross and Waterford. The enactment passed by Edward II in favour of the port of New Ross was probably secured at the behest of Aymer de Valence, Earl of Pembroke, who at this period was lord-palatine of Wexford, and gave to the county town its first Norman charter. He also rebuilt the bridge over the River Barrow (1313), connecting Ross with the opposite county of Kilkenny; students of English history will doubtless remember that De Valence was one of the whilome favourites of the luckless Edward II. As it was in his day the Austin Friary of Ross came into existence, he probably was instrumental in obtaining the confirmation of the King for the founding of the Convent. The royal permission was usually sought in those days for the erection of important religious houses, since it secured for them the protection and patronage oftentimes needful and advantageous in those warful

times. From the foregoing side-lights of history we may conclude that New Ross had something to be grateful for in connexion with the memories of Edward of Carnarvon and of his ill-fated favourite, Aymer de Valence, who was killed in a tournament at Paris on his wedding day (1334).

On the deposition of Edward II his son ascended the Throne as Edward III. His reign inaugurated a period of prosperity for Ross. He granted the town its most important charter (of its many charters),¹ and also provided by statute for the completion of its mural defences (1267). The circuit of the walls, of which some fragments remain, was upwards of a mile in extent—and some ancient chronicles state they exceeded in measurement the radius of the walls of London in that day. There is a tradition that Ross was intended by its royal patron to become the capital of Ireland.² It was then that the streets and thoroughfares of the town were laid out on a definite plan, which practically remained unchanged in modern times. It is interesting to remark that the original designation of the principal streets was taken from the names of the public churches of the town, which were then six in number. Thus the street running from the North Gate to the Market Cross (site of present Tholsel) was called Evin Street,³ after the second abbot of the Celtic Monastery of St. Abban, whose religious settlement at Ros-mic-Treon in the sixth century was the nucleus of the town, and who was venerated as its special patron. St. Abban was, however, a remarkable missionary saint, and founded churches in many parts of Ireland, chiefly in Munster and the Western Province. Although Ross was the site of his most important monastery and school he was not interred there. His successor in the abbacy, St. Evin, however, was buried in the abbey cemetery, as Colgan, the Franciscan historian, refers to Rosponte as '*ubi jacet eminentissimus Evinus.*' Monastereven, on the Barrow (Co. Kildare), takes its name from this saint, who established a monastery on the site of the present town. His festival occurs, according to the Irish Martyrologies, on December 22.

¹ The silver mace (symbol of authority) given with the charter is still preserved in the municipal office, and bears the arms and initials of Edward III.

² There may be some truth in this tradition. A considerable area of ground enclosed within the walls, in the south-east direction, was never built on. These undulating fields were largely used for the interment of those who fell in '98.

³ A section of this street is now styled 'John Street,' from Sir John Ivory, whose ancestor, William Ivory, obtained possession of the site of St. Abban's Monastery during the Commonwealth. Sir John Ivory was founder of the Abbey School, just inside the North Gate of the town.

The portion of the roadway leading from the Market Cross to the Town Hall (till lately the parish church) was styled Austin Street, from the church of the Augustinians, which stood, as we have said, in the present South Street. On an ancient map of the town, the continuing section of the main thoroughfare, as far as the Sessions House, is named St. Saviour's Street, from the ancient chapel which was the forerunner of Trinity Hospital. The final part of the street-way to the Norman South Gate is still called Priory Street—from the Priory of the Crossed Friars, which later on, in the thirteenth century, was transferred to the Franciscans. Mary Street derives its name from the great church of the Canons Regular, on the hillside, whose interesting remains still exist. The parochial church and cemetery of St. Michael, which occupied the site of the military barracks, accounts for the title of the adjoining street.¹

But to return to the main trend of our narrative—the local history of the Augustinians.

There is little recorded of their Priory in New Ross; during the fifteenth century doubtless, then as now, the Fathers shared in the religious administration of the parish and in promoting the instruction of youth.

At the time of the dissolution of religious houses, under the Tudor sovereigns, the property of the Augustinians was very considerable, their lands being, apparently, portion of the 'Crown Lands' originally inherited by the Earl of Norfolk through his mother, who was one of the co-heiresses of William Marshall and Isabella, his wife—the Norman founders of Rossponte.²

In the 31st year of Henry VIII (1539) John Gregory, the last Prior, surrendered the Convent with its appurtenances. He was probably a native of the town and of the same family as Thomas Gregory, who founded Trinity Hospital in the reign of Philip and Mary. His son-in-law, George Conway, was the first master of this charitable institution, and as well Escheator and Collector of the port.

The schedule of the property of the Friary at the time

¹ The subsidiary bye-ways of the town seem to have been named from the different trade guilds whose members had their workshops or lived therein, such as 'Brogue-makers' Lane,' 'Tan Yard Lane,' 'Coopers' Lane,' 'Cooks' Lane,' etc. (See Friar Michael's poem on 'The Walling of Ross' for list of Guilds, time of Edward III.)

² The Earl of Norfolk gave Ross its first charter. He was invested with the title of 'Earl Marshall' in 1247, in right of his mother, Matilda, eldest daughter of William Marshall, Earl of Pembroke, on whom it devolved, in failure of issue in the male line. His estates afterwards reverted to the Crown, 1281.

of its suppression enumerates the following holdings : 'One tenement, one messuage, five gardens, twenty acres of arable land, thirty acres of pasture and two acres of wood.' The buildings and lands, etc., were granted for ever, in capite, by a knight's fee (40s.) to Richard Butler, his heirs and assigns. This nobleman was second son of the 8th Earl of Ormonde, and was created Viscount Mountgarrett in 1550.¹

Although the Priory shared the fate of all the monastic houses, it is *not* probable that the Friars were ejected at the Suppression. It must be remembered the grantee was a Catholic, and that the noble family to which he belonged remained true to the old Faith till the middle of the seventeenth century. In many other parts of Ireland, under similar circumstances, churches were frequently rented out by their new possessors to the religious previously attached to them. As an instance of this fact we may recall that in Holy Cross Abbey (Co. Tipperary), which was granted by Elizabeth to her favourite, Thomas, 11th Earl of Ormonde, the Divine ministrations continued to be celebrated till 1633. It is most likely that a similar privilege was accorded to the Fathers of the Augustinian Convent, New Ross.

One of the Penal laws put into force in 1698 ordained that all Bishops, priests, monks, and friars should quit the kingdom before the May of that year. But despite this enactment many members of the clergy and religious Orders contrived to remain on '*in locis refugii*' assuming various disguises and protected by the vigilance of trusted friends among their faithful flocks.

There is a tradition in Ross that during the dark days of Elizabeth, Cromwell, and the Stuarts daily Mass never ceased to be celebrated in the town.²

Early in the 18th century, when apparently some respite was given to Catholics, Father Joseph Rossiter, O.S.A., took

¹ The lands mentioned lay north of the town, extending along the riverside in the direction of Woodville, etc. The Mountgarrett title was taken from the castle, built on these lands by Bishop Barrett early in the fifteenth century.

The beautiful altar-tomb in the north transept of old St. Mary's (now Protestant) is to the memory of Viscount Mountgarrett's son, who died in 1599.

² Cited in sermon of late V. Rev. Father Conmee, S.J., at the opening of the new parish church of SS. Mary and Michael in 1892.

In the Council books of the old Corporation the following minute appears : 'Ordered—the bell in the Town Hall be given back to Father Anthony Molloy for the Franciscan Abbey, formerly deprived thereof by Oliver Cromwell, Anno 1687.' This shows that toleration of Catholic worship prevailed at that date.

The present writer is of opinion that the bell was never returned, and is the one used in the town clock of Tholsel at present time.

up residence in New Ross (1708) and formed a small community of his religious brethren.¹ About the year 1720 he erected a little thatched chapel on the open space (near Monk's Lane) facing the present church and priory of St. Augustine. A nephew and full namesake of his became Prior of the Convent in 1760. The latter, it was who slated and improved this humble edifice.

Here it may be noted that the parish chapel then stood directly opposite the Friary, but when the new church of St. Mary, in South Street, was completed by Dean Chapman, P.P., in 1808,² the vacated building on the High Hill was given over to the Augustinians. The Very Rev. John Crane was then Prior. During his term of office his brother, Father Philip Crane (of holy memory), secured a lease of the newly-acquired premises and adjoining gardens from Mr. Charles Tottenham, landlord of the town.

Some old inhabitants of New Ross, of a past generation, whose lives extended back to the period of which we write, used to tell a curious story in connexion with the terms upon which this lease was granted. Father Philip Crane, the grantee, prosecuted his ecclesiastical studies (owing to the Penal code) in the Universities of Lisbon and Salamanca, and, consequently, frequently in his student days on his journeys to and fro passed through the French capital. During the troubles of the French Revolution Mr. Tottenham, happening to be in Paris, was arrested on some plea or other and thrown into prison. Father Crane just at the time chanced to be in the city, and hearing of the plight that had befallen his countryman, secured influence with the authorities, the result being that the Irish prisoner was released and allowed to return in safety to his native land. In after years, when Father Philip was appointed a member of the New Ross community, Mr. Tottenham waited on him and asked was there any favour in his power to bestow in return for the extraordinary kindness he received through his good offices in the days of his misfortune. Father Crane at once took the opportunity of seeking a lease of the vacated parish chapel with the ground and garden adjoining it. The

¹ He was a descendant of the Anglo-Norman family, Rossitors of Rath Macnee Castle, barony of Forth. The present venerated Pastor of Ross, Very Rev. W. Canon Rossiter, is of same descent.

² It is an interesting coincidence that the parochial church, opened 1808, was built in the immediate vicinity of the first Friary of the Augustinians, and occupied the site of one of the five gardens mentioned in schedule of their property. The new parish church of SS. Mary and Michael (1892) was erected within the precincts of the medieval Chapel of St. Saviour.

request was immediately granted, and, as the old story goes, the landlord assured Father Philip that as long as a Friar bearing the name of 'Crane' would be resident in the Convent the grateful remembrance of the Tottenham family could be counted upon by the Augustinian Fathers.¹ This may have been only the expression of a passing sentiment but, be this as it may, during the interval between the years 1808 and 1863 Fathers John and Philip Crane (brothers) and their kinsmen, Fathers James, Martin and Patrick Crane, were inmates of the Convent, most of whom held the position of Prior from time to time, while three of them were elected to the office of Provincial of the Order in Ireland.²

About the year 1830-31, during the priorship of Very Rev. James Crane, the building of the present conventual church was undertaken. The design was largely inspired by the style of the Protestant church of St. Mary's, in the vicinity, built in the early years of the same century by a Waterford contractor, named Roberts, who, we may remark in passing, was the ancestor (grandfather) of the late Lord Roberts. For the period in which the New Convent Church was erected (a few years after Catholic Emancipation), it must ever be regarded as a lasting memorial of the taste and zeal of its founder, as well as an evidence of the generosity of the people of Ross.

Although possessing no great architectural pretensions exteriorly, in point of correct proportions and interior ornamentation, the whole structure is justly admired up to the present day.

The vast reredos that fills the entire width of the south-east end of the building is of classic design. This imposing structure forms the back-ground, so to speak, of the three altars of the sanctuary. The proportion of the fluted columns, bearing Corinthian capitals, and the details of the frieze and cornice above are highly creditable to the genius and skill of the local craftsmen (Maddock) by whom the whole work was carried out. The massive

¹ The popular version used to be that the lease would last only as long as a *Father Crane* was a member of the community. In reality the grant was *for ever*, subject to the yearly rent of 10/-. (This was why the new church was dedicated—not consecrated—in 1856, as stated by a recent historian. Consecration could only take place when a church is free of all rent, according to Canon Law.)

² Father Philip Crane died in 1823 (at his obsequies the oration was preached by Dr. Doyle, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin). He was popularly believed to be a saint. The clay taken from his grave, in St. Mary's cemetery, was for long deemed to possess miraculous powers in curing various ailments.

and very beautiful candlesticks that still adorn the High Altar (designed by the elder Pugin) were presented by John Talbot, 16th Earl of Shrewsbury, as were also the entrance gates leading to the grounds of the church. The lamp and other accessories of the sanctuary were due to the same noble and generous benefactor.¹

The Very Rev. James Crane (founder of the church) filled the office of Prior of New Ross Convent for a term of twenty-nine years—1826 till 1855. Of him it might be truly said: '*Si monumentum quaeris, circumspice.*'²

He was succeeded (1855) by Rev. Patrick Crane. One of the latter's first thoughts was the Dedication of the Priory church, which, with all the solemnity of the sacred ritual, took place in the following year, the officiating prelate being the Right Rev. Dr. O'Connell, O.S.A., Bishop of Saldes. As the Decree of the 'Immaculate Conception' had only two years before been promulgated by the Sovereign Pontiff Pope Pius IX, the church was fitly dedicated under the invocation of Our Blessed Lady's now familiar title, and of St. Augustine. Numerous improvements were undertaken and carried out by the energetic Prior, notably the building of the spacious sacristy, with confraternity-rooms adjoining; a fine two-manual organ (by Telford) was installed, a handsome marble holy water font provided (local manufacture), and statues of the Immaculate Conception and St. Augustine were placed in the niches, beside the front door of the church. In addition to this list of costly works may be noticed the erection of wrought-iron gates leading to the Priory residence and to door-ways of the galleries, at either side of the church. Many lesser improvements were effected through the indefatigable energies of 'Father Pat Crane,' as he was familiarly styled.

At his suggestion, too, it may be recalled, that the

¹The 16th Earl of Shrewsbury married (1814) Maria Theresa, eldest daughter of William Talbot, Castle Talbot, Co. Wexford. He was a great patron of Pugin the Elder, whom he employed in works at his English residence, Alton Towers (Staffordshire), and in the building of the Catholic church, Sheffield. He recommended the architect to Dr. Keating, Bishop of Ferns, who availed of his professional services for the erection of several churches in his diocese, viz, the College chapel, St. Peter's, Wexford; the Cathedral, Enniscorthy; the church and convent, Gorey, and churches of Tagoat, Barntown, etc.

²From 1803 to 1816 the Augustinian Fathers had a classical college on the 'Old Road,' of which Father John Crane was principal, and Rev. James Doyle assistant professor—the latter was afterwards Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin (the great J. K. L.). The college was re-opened by Rev. James Crane in 1826.

municipal authorities of the time facilitated the steep ascent of the High Hill (the principal approach to the Friary from the lower part of the town) by providing wide flights of granite steps, arranged at intervals, along the side-path, which were of great public convenience.

Very Rev. Patrick Crane continued in office till 1859, when he was re-elected Prior by the provincial Chapter of the Order till 1863. In the latter year he was translated to the rural Convent of Grantstown (parish of Bannow, South Wexford), where he passed the remaining days of his useful career. During an interim of those years he was Provincial. He entered into his reward in the seventies and was interred in the chapel of Grantstown Convent, R.I.P.

The closing decades of last century witnessed many additional improvements in the Austin Priory of New Ross.

Very Rev. Robert O'Keeffe (Prior from 1875 to 1879) erected the carved oak altar rails, the supporting pillars of which were divided by decorated panels of wrought-iron. This beautiful work was designed and executed by the eminent firm of Messrs. Jones and Willis (Birmingham). About the same time the new Stations of the Cross, in coloured relief (by Mayer, Munich), were presented by various benefactors, as memorials to their deceased relatives, and added greatly to the beauty of the sacred edifice.

Father John Furlong became Prior from 1883 to 1891. The erection of the three beautiful oak altars in the sanctuary (by Mayer) is due to him, as also the series of magnificent stained windows (by the same eminent artist) that fill the lofty lancet-lights of the building. These ornamental additions, alone, must ever remain lasting memorials of his cultured taste and his great zeal for the glory of God and the beauty of His earthly Temple. But his activities did not end here—later on he had the church newly floored and the porch re-modelled under the superintendence of the late Mr. William Hague (Dublin), the eminent ecclesiastical architect, who also prepared the plans for the College of 'Our Lady of Good Counsel,' built in the precincts of the Friary (1890). However, Father Furlong's most important undertaking was the opening of a new approach to the church from Mary Street. This work involved considerable difficulty, as a long and steep incline of ground had to be dealt with. It necessitated the clearing away of old gardens and other *débris*, together with the purchase and removal of some houses on the street-front

below (Mary Street). When completed, the effect of the broad tiers of steps with intervening landings was very striking, reminding one of the approach to 'Our Lady of Puy' (France) and other hill-top shrines, so often met with on the Continent.

Before closing this rather lengthened category of the events that marked the administration of the two last worthy Priors alluded to, we cannot refrain from noticing one which was certainly the loftiest of the projects perfected at the time—this was the renovation of the graceful spire of St. Augustine's, erected in 1834, which, like many similar structures of the period, was formed of a wooden frame-work sheeted with light lead or zinc. This, Father Furlong had newly strengthened and re-covered with metallic plates of ornamental design and surmounted by a gilded cross—the whole effect being very picturesque.

The Very Rev. Prior Furlong closed his life in Ross, and sleeps his last sleep in the grounds of the venerable convent and church he so largely contributed to adorn.

The view from the surroundings of St. Augustine's is interesting, vast, and suggestive of many memories. Overlooking, as the Convent does, the old historic town, the eye may range over miles of the district of Ossory, in the opposite county, from Tory Hill on the south-west to Brandon on the confines of Kilkenny and Carlow. Within that vast panorama, Celt and Gael, Dane and Norman, sage and saint, the conqueror and the conquered have all left their passing impress!

Our pen is running on; the space at our command warns us that our congenial task must draw to a close.

Six hundred years! it is a long span of time since, in the days of the Second Edward of England, Guillaume des Roches founded the monastery of the Austin Hermits beside the waters of the Barrow. All has changed, both men and things, in Rossponte since then, all—save the changeless river, which, as it ebbs and flows, recalls the lines of Tennyson:

Men may come and men may go,
But I go on for ever.

‘ . . . forsan et hæc olim meminisse juvabit.’

JOHN B. CULLEN.

NOTES AND QUERIES

THEOLOGY

INTERPRETATION OF FACULTIES. CONSEQUENCES OF RESERVATION

REV. DEAR SIR,—Will you kindly give me your opinion on the following cases.

1°. A penitent (X) confesses a reserved sin. The confessor, who has only the usual diocesan jurisdiction, decides that the circumstances do not warrant an immediate absolution. So he asks X to come back next week, and in the meantime secures from the Bishop special faculties to deal with the case. X returns, and tells the confessor that he has fallen again into the reserved sin confessed last week. Can the confessor absolve?

2°. After the confessor has received faculties as above, another penitent (Y) confesses the same sin. Can the confessor absolve *him*?

3°. X (belonging to diocese A) commits in diocese B a sin reserved in diocese A. Is he affected by the reservation? If so, how and why? He was outside the territory when the act took place.

M. H.

In connexion with the first two cases, and with many others of a similar kind, the student of Moral Theology manuals will occasionally meet with rules that look somewhat mysterious: and his mystification will grow when, as sometimes happens, he finds them formulated as definitely as if they were based on a Papal decree or on the first principles of moral science. He must apply a corrective. The whole problem is simply one of interpretation: 'What faculties did the Bishop mean to confer?' On that particular point the confessor concerned may be in a far better position to form an opinion than all the theologians that ever wrote. Their views, of course, are useful as furnishing a general test or criterion, but they must be employed as such, and not allowed to dominate the situation. Maxims devised for special cases have been treated by subsequent writers with a respect that would have astonished those who formulated them first: *they* must be handled with special care and caution. The ultimate decision depends on a combination of circumstances: any one of them may have been overlooked by the compilers of the manuals, and may lead to conclusions very different from those generally adopted.

Always bearing in mind, therefore, that some fact or other known only to those concerned may throw new light on the Bishop's intention and nullify conclusions based on general principles, we should say:—

1°. That, in the first case, the confessor can absolve. In favour of

that view we appeal merely to a common-sense interpretation of the Bishop's action. He may be presumed to have granted all faculties necessary for dealing with the penitent's case when it arises—when the confession is made and absolution sought. Whether the sin was committed once or twice or twenty times, whether after repentance or not, whether last week or the week before—all these are matters to which he can be reasonably supposed to have attached no extension or restriction of faculties.

Always, though, on the supposition that the facts do not clearly indicate the opposite. As would be the case, for instance, if he granted jurisdiction 'over sins already committed or confessed' or 'because the Paschal period is coming to an end' or 'in order that the penitent may communicate during the mission' or adopted any other equally unusual formula. In the first case, a sin repeated would remain reserved; in the second and third, the sin (whether repeated or not) would be reserved unless confessed within the period mentioned.

Our general reply may be illustrated from another department of Canon Law. The particular section has been abrogated by the Code, but not because of any defect in the principle to which we appeal. When a diriment matrimonial impediment arose from unlawful intercourse, a Roman dispensation might be executed by the Bishop even though the sin had been repeated with the same individual after the dispensation had been applied for.¹ The case is not quite parallel, but the analogy is close enough to point a moral.

In support of the view we may quote one of our latest authorities:—

An licentia [Fr. Barrett² asks] absolventi a casibus reservatis ad peccata post ipsam commissa extendatur? [And he answers]: Distinguendum est; vel enim data est potestas pro peccatis toties commissis vel narratis, in quo casu ab his solum absolvere potest privilegiatus; vel data est indefinite, in quo casu extensam esse ad alia affirmant communiter juxta S. Alphonsum, dummodo non interponatur magna distantia inter concessionem licentiae et novarum culparum commissionem, quando nempe pro particulari poenitente concessa est. . . . Sic, si non sit ultra mensem dilatio inter concessionem et usum facultatis, privilegiatus absolvere potest et a patris post datam licentiam.

Which is only a slightly different way of saying what St. Alphonsus had said long before³:—

An licentia data de absolventis reservatis extendi possit ad peccata post ipsam commissa? Distinguendum: si concessio facta fuit praecise pro peccatis narratis, vel pro tot vicibus commissis, tantum pro eis valere potest. Secus vero, si licentia est concessa indefinite: ita communissime, et valde probabiliter *Lugo dist. 20, n. 122, cum Bon. et Praepos. Ronc. p. 110, qu. 7, cum Passer, Mansi, et Gabr. ac Salm. de poen. c. 13, p. 3, n. 39,*

¹ Cf. Lehmkühl, ii. 1035 (note), 1038, etc.

² Sabetti-Barrett, *Comp.*, 783 (q. 9°).

³ *Th. Mor.*, vi. 601 (q. iv.).

cum Aversa, Leand., Dic., etc. Dummodo, recte limitant, non interponatur magna distantia (puta ultra mensem : ut ait *Ronc. cum Mansi*) inter concessionem licentiae et commissionem novarum culparum : intellige, si pro quodam particulari poenitente sit tantum impertita licentia. Item bene advertit *Ronc.* praefatam sententiam non procedere, si licentia impertita fuerit intuitu alicujus festivitatis.

The maxim about the month's delay, is one of those to which undue importance may be easily attached. It represents an effort to give definite meaning to the 'magna distantia,' but can claim, of course, no mathematical accuracy. The problem again is one of defining the Bishop's intention. Presumably he restricts his concession to sins connected in some way or other with what we may term the present crisis in the penitent's life. How far that is to be regarded as extending, no one except the Bishop himself can fix for certain. A month may be taken as a rough and ready standard : but, in favourable circumstances, the confessor may utilize his powers after a much longer period.¹

2°. In the second case submitted by 'M. H.' the confessor cannot absolve. If Y could be absolved, so could Z, so could A, B, C, and all the penitents we may care to name. So that the special faculty sought by the confessor and granted by the Bishop would, in some mysterious way, and without direct action by either priest or Bishop, have developed into a general faculty to absolve all penitents. That is out of harmony with all the principles. The confessor holds only what the Bishop grants : the Bishop grants only what he intends : and—unless the opposite is clearly proved—the Bishop intends only a special jurisdiction in favour of the particular penitent whose case has been submitted.

3°. 'M. H.' seems to regard reservation as something 'incurred' by the delinquent—somewhat after the manner of a censure or irregularity. For that view of the case there used to be some authority years ago : recently, and especially under the Code, it has lost whatever degree of probability it once enjoyed. Reservation simply means restriction of the ordinary confessor's faculties. It affects the confessor himself directly, the penitent only when he appeals to a confessor with restricted faculties. So, in the case given, X cannot be absolved by the ordinary confessors of diocese A, because their jurisdiction is restricted : neither can he be absolved by the ordinary confessors of any other diocese in which the same sin is reserved—for the same reason : but he *can* be absolved by the confessors of any diocese in which the reservation does not hold, simply because unrestricted faculties have been granted in that locality. And what is true of X is true of Y (who belongs, say, to diocese Z), and of every other human being who commits the same sin—whether it be in his own diocese or out of it. If they remain outside the dioceses in which the sin is reserved, they may be absolved by any confessor : if they venture inside, they must apply to confessors who hold special faculties. In a sense, therefore, they are all 'affected by the reservation' ; in another sense, not one of them is.

¹ Cf. D'Annibale, n. 347 : 'Quia est beneficium principis et nimirum laedit non oportet illud aestimare ex rigore verborum.'

As against all this, some few maintained that a 'peregrinus' might be absolved from locally reserved cases—and we find the view supported in a book published as late as last December.¹ Internal evidence, as well as the Roman reply of August last, make the position untenable.²

DANCES

REV. DEAR SIR,—What kind of dances come under the prohibition in No. 179, page 83, of the Maynooth decrees?

What action should a priest take in order to 'promote' dances forbidden in the above?

After a Gaelic League Class, an Irish dance is carried on for half an hour. The priest promotes this dance: or, without promoting it at all, he simply remains and looks on. Can he do either without violating No. 179?

An answer in the I. E. RECORD will much oblige.

I. C. P.

We dealt with this matter many years ago, and shall be obliged if 'I. C. P.' consults the reply.³

AN AMERICAN DISCUSSION ON RESERVATION

REV. DEAR SIR,—Would you kindly give your decision regarding the power of pastors and Bishops in America to absolve those guilty of the crime of procuring abortion. This was the moral question at our last conference, and no definite decision was arrived at, with the result that our Bishop declared that, until the question was definitely decided, we should apply to him for faculties to absolve in all such cases. Some were of the opinion that during the Paschal time, in virtue of Canon 899, pastors could absolve from all reserved cases, whether purely episcopal or papal-episcopal, with a censure or without it. Others went further still, and said that priests could absolve from these sins even outside Paschal time, unless the Bishop reserved them specially to himself; and, as our Bishop declared he had no reserved cases now, they maintained that, in virtue of the faculties given them by the Bishop, they could absolve from these reserved cases at any time. Others still limited the powers given in 899 to sins reserved without a censure, and held that, as the procuring of abortion was reserved with a censure, priests had no power to absolve at any time, even during the Paschal season.

Please give your answer in the next issue of the I. E. RECORD, and ease a troubled conscience.

A SUBSCRIBER.

'Subscriber's' letter has taken an unconscionable time to reach us. But perhaps our reply may be of some use to him even now.

Taking it for granted that there are no complications—ignorance, etc.—the case would really seem not to present much difficulty. From a comparison of Canons 899, § 3 and 900, with Canons 2254-6, it would appear

¹ Arregui, *Summ. Th. Mor.* (4th ed.), n. 609.

² See I. E. RECORD, Oct. 1919, Fifth Series, vol. xiv. pp. 313-4.

³ I. E. RECORD, July 1910, Fourth Series, vol. xxviii. pp. 64-71.

evident that the latter deals with absolution from censures, the former with absolution from sins reserved without a censure. It is clear, moreover, that Canon 899, § 3,—which grants parish priests special faculties during Paschal time—has nothing whatever to do with papal-episcopal cases: it deals explicitly with sins ‘which *Ordinaries* have reserved to themselves.’

Now in the case submitted the reservation is papal-episcopal, the absolution is reserved *by* the Pope *to* the Bishop (2350). The crime, moreover, is reserved under censure (*ib.*). The Bishop stated ‘he had no reserved cases now’; but that meant that he himself had reserved none, not that he had granted faculties to every confessor to absolve from the nine sins reserved to him by the Pope.¹

From these facts and principles our conclusions would be:—

1°. That the canonists of the first group—who claimed that ‘during Paschal time, in virtue of Canon 899, pastors could absolve from all reserved cases, whether purely episcopal or papal-episcopal, with a censure or without it’—were extending the pastors’ faculties beyond anything sanctioned by the Code. The Paschal-time concession gives them no special faculties over papal-episcopal cases, nor indeed over *any* sin reserved with a censure. For these they must fall back on specially delegated powers, or on the liberal provisions contained in Canons 2252-4.

2°. That the second group—who believed that ‘priests could absolve from these sins even outside Paschal time, unless the Bishop reserved them specially to himself’—were equally over-generous. There was no need that the Bishop should ‘reserve them specially to himself’: the Pope had already done it. And the Bishop’s remark on the matter means no more than we have already stated.

3°. That the third group were right in fact, though their phraseology might be amended. As things stand, there is a censure attached to every papal and papal-episcopal case, and therefore the statement that ‘the powers given in 899 [are restricted] to sins reserved without a censure’ is equivalent in practice to what seems to us the more correct statement—that ‘the powers are restricted to purely episcopal cases reserved without a censure.’ The latter seems to us the more correct because any day there might be a papal reservation established *without* a censure: if that happened, the first statement would lead to incorrect conclusions.

4°. That, consequently, the Bishop’s practical conclusion was absolutely right.

DOMICILE AND QUASI-DOMICILE. FUNERAL OFFERINGS

REV. DEAR SIR,—A lived with his sister B in parish M (province of Armagh) as a labourer, having quasi-domicile there. From there he went to a hospital in another parish, ill with cancer. He expressed his intention to return to work and reside at a mill in parish M, but not to reside at his former quasi-domicile. While in hospital, B wrote to a cousin asking him to take charge of the invalid, but nothing came of it. The next letter was to a lady C, of parish N (province of Armagh), the parental home

¹ In Canons 2319 (four); 2326, 2343, § 4, 2350, § 1, 2385, 2388, § 2.

asking her to take full charge of him and to have him removed to a hospital in parish P (province of Cashel), as B and her family could no longer keep him owing to his disease. This C did. He remained a considerable time in P, and, having learned that his disease would prove fatal, he told the chaplain that he would not go from the hospital in P, but would remain until his death. He made this statement very definite as there seemed to be some suggestion of his removal. He died there (province of Cashel) and was buried in parish N (province of Armagh), where offerings were taken. Now it appears that Counsel on both sides in a law case (settled outside the court) agree that a farm in parish N is assets of the deceased.

The priests of N contend :—

(a) B's letter refusing to accept A any longer terminated his quasi-domicile on her side ; nor could he make her home any longer his quasi-domicile, for the reason that he would not be allowed.

(b) (1°) A's intention to return to work and reside at the mill was withdrawn and ceased when he mentioned that he would remain in the hospital in P until his death. (2°) His intention to return to reside and work at the mill proves that he had no intention of returning again to his quasi-domicile and so his quasi-domicile ceased. (3°) His intention of returning, etc., to the mill, did not give him any claim to any kind of domicile, for it is necessary for domicile of any kind that there be actual 'commoratio' or residence. Therefore, as far as parish M is concerned, he was a 'vagus.'

(c) From the decision of Counsel on both sides in the case mentioned in the preamble the farm as assets of the deceased carries with it all rights—one of these rights is to reside in the parental home.

(d) Therefore A had a *parental domicile* in N (province of Armagh). The priests in P (province of Cashel) waive any claim ; but, if they have any, point (c) places them on a plane of disinterestedness.

To sum up, they claim the offerings on either of two counts : (1°) that A was a 'vagus' and that the place of offerings has absolute claim, seeing that he died outside the limits of Armagh, or (2°) that he was their parishioner, and theirs only, by right of domicile.

N.

We are fairly safe in saying that at the time A came to live with his sister, he had given up his parental domicile. His subsequent history—and especially the fact that, even when he knew the disease was fatal, he had no thought of returning there—would seem to put the matter beyond doubt.

But he had a quasi-domicile in parish M. And that quasi-domicile remained until he gave up, not merely residence, but also the intention of returning. When he was an inmate of the first hospital, he had not given up that intention. Whether he was to live in the mill or in his sister's house, is a matter of absolute indifference. For domicile and quasi-domicile are attached, not to a special house, but to the parish.

Nor can it be shown that he lost his quasi-domicile even when he went to the hospital in parish P. His sister, no doubt, was unwilling to receive him back ; but even she could not exclude him from the parish.

But, towards the end, it would seem clear enough that the bond with M was broken. The invalid learned of his condition, and, in a 'very definite' statement, expressed his absolute intention to have nothing more

to do with Armagh. That ended everything : he became a parishioner of the parish priest of P, and of no other.

The fact that he was, or became, heir to a small estate in parish N does not keep, or make, him a subject of the northern province. A man may be heir to the whole State of Texas ; but, if he comes to Europe with the intention of not returning, he cannot, no matter how his intention changes, recover his American domicile until he goes back to Texas again.

If all this be true,¹ some of the points raised by N become of little interest. But we may say a word on each of them in order :—

(a) On her side, perhaps, but not on his ; and it is *his* that counts. Except in case of 'quasi-domicile of law,' we do not pick up quasi-domiciles from others, we make them ourselves. Others may oppose us : that does not matter : we are all, we hope, continually doing things to which some one or other is opposed. And that is true, even on the supposition—which is not likely—that she was opposed to his return to the *parish*. If, as seems to be the fact, she only intended to exclude him from her own house, the case is ever so much stronger.

(b) 1°. That is our view.

2°. Rather it proves the very opposite. He meant to return to the *parish*.

3°. Quite true. But he *had* had 'residence' already, and the *onus probandi* lies on anyone who is anxious to have it appear that he had no intention of *resuming* it. If he had that intention, as he evidently had, the quasi-domicile remained.

(c) A man may be left fifty farms in fifty parishes. He has no domicile in any of the parishes, unless he goes and lives there.

(d) Perhaps it is just as well that they do. The general law would give them a hearing, and point (c) would cause them very little trouble.

All of which indicates our views on the two points in the summing-up.

But what about the offerings ? Parish P has given up any claims it might urge under the general law, so the issue is between M and N. The Armagh laws gives little help : A did *not* die, we think, 'outside the borders of the parish' ; and, moreover, the statute attaches no importance to the place of burial. But equity and custom would seem to suggest that the offerings should go to N rather than to M : it was the clergy of N that performed the funeral rites, and presumably it was the parishioners of N that contributed most of the amount. And, if the general law be invoked, *it* would give them everything except the 'parochial portion' payable to men who are generous enough to waive any claims they might assert (1236, § 1).

M. J. O'DONNELL.

¹ On the principles involved see articles in the *Irish Theological Quarterly*, January 1916 (pp. 26-40), July 1916 (pp. 294-307), July 1917 (pp. 230-249.)

CANON LAW

A QUESTION IN CONNEXION WITH NOVEMBER OFFERINGS

REV. DEAR SIR,—Will you kindly answer in your next number of the I. E. RECORD the following query :—

The offerings made by the people for the dead on the 2nd of November (All Souls Day and thereabouts), commonly called the November offerings in Ireland, are divided among the officiating priests of a parish. There is an obligation imposed by a *Diocesan Law* to say a number of Masses in discharge of these offerings. In my Diocese this obligation may be discharged by High Masses, and a *honorarium* of five pounds is allowed for each Mass. Is it lawful for a priest to get these High Masses discharged by another priest or by the Superior of a Religious Order at a lesser *honorarium*, e.g. £1 for each High Mass, because it may happen to be more convenient? Of course the so-called November offerings are not looked on as ordinary manual Masses and are mere parochial revenue. Thanking you for an answer in your columns.

SACERDOS ANXIUS.

The Code requires those who transfer manual Masses to transfer also the full *honoraria*, unless the donor has permitted them to retain a part, or unless the amount by which *honoraria* exceed the diocesan stipend has been given as a personal gift.¹ When Masses *ad instar manualium* form part of the endowment of a benefice or pious cause, the amount by which they exceed the diocesan stipend can also be retained in case of transference, unless the founder has made some contrary provisions.² These are the only express regulations of the Code on this question.

The Masses to be said in connexion with November offerings, as our correspondent points out, are not manual in the ordinary sense of the term, neither are they *ad instar manualium*.³ To determine therefore whether and in how far part of these offerings may be retained when the Masses are transferred, we must have recourse to the old discipline. Cardinal Gasparri, in his treatise *De Eucharistia*,⁴ refers to a decision of the Sacred Congregation of the Council in a case which bears a very close resemblance to that submitted by our correspondent. It would seem that, in Munich and the other dioceses of Bavaria, on the occasion of certain functions, such as funerals and marriages, parish priests received large stipends for the celebration of Masses, and that these stipends were regarded as a partial endowment of the parish. When it became necessary to transfer these Masses, it was much disputed as to the amount of the *honorarium* which should be transferred with them. Was it necessary to send the amount actually received? Or did it suffice to transmit that

¹ Canon 840, § 1.

² Canon 840, § 2.

³ Cf. Canon 826, § 2.

⁴ Vol. i. n. 603.

fixed by diocesan statute or custom for manual Masses? The Archbishop of Munich, having submitted the matter to the Congregation of the Council received, in July, 1874, the following reply:

‘Seeing that the stipends of the Masses of which there is question in the petition constitute part of the parochial endowment, it is lawful for the parish priest, if he cannot discharge them himself, to transmit the Masses to another priest, and to give him the ordinary stipend of the place, whether for Masses that are said or for those that are sung.’¹

A somewhat similar reply was also given to the Archbishop of Cologne, in the same year. In the diocese of Cologne a much larger *honorarium* was fixed by the Ordinary for nuptial than for the usual manual Masses; and again, when transference became necessary, the same doubts arose. Was it the *honorarium* for nuptial Masses that should be transmitted? Or did it suffice to send that fixed for ordinary manual Masses? The Sacred Congregation replied to the following effect. ‘Since there is question of Stole fees, it is sufficient if the parish priest gives the celebrant the ordinary *honorarium*.’²

It is quite clear, therefore, that when the Masses to be said in connexion with the November offerings are transferred by the parochial clergy, it suffices to transmit with them the ordinary diocesan *honorarium* for manual Masses. The diocesan *honorarium*, we need scarcely point out, may be fixed either by statute or custom; when there is question of High Masses it is custom that usually intervenes. If then, in the case under consideration, the diocesan *honorarium* is £1 or less, the priest acts quite lawfully in merely transferring this amount, although he himself receives £5 for each Mass celebrated.

Although the Code, as we have stated already, does not expressly legislate on this matter, yet its regulation in connexion with the transference of Masses *ad instar manualium* helps to confirm the conclusion which we have reached. As we have already seen, if the large *honoraria*, sometimes given for the celebration of these Masses, form part of the endowment of a benefice, in case of transference the amount by which they exceed the diocesan stipend may be usually retained. The Masses said in connexion with the November offerings are not, indeed, *ad instar manualium* according to the technical definition of Canon 826, § 2; they, however, constitute in part the endowment of the parish; and consequently there is the same reason for not requiring the transference of the full *honorarium*.

¹ ‘Attento quod eleemosynae Missarum de quibus in precibus pro parte locum teneant congruae parochialis, licitum esse parochi, si per se satisfacere non possit, Missas alteri sacerdoti committere, attributa eleemosyna ordinaria loci sive pro Missis lectis sive pro cantatis.’

² ‘Cum agatur de juribus stolae, satis esse, si parochus retribuatur celebranti eleemosynam ordinariam.’

**PROFESSORS IN SEMINARIES AND MASSES FOR DECEASED
BENEFACTORS**

REV. DEAR SIR,—I should like to have your opinion on the following little controversy :—

I am attached with other priests to a certain college (diocesan) in Ireland. Besides the obligations connected with the teaching profession we are also required by the college discipline to say a number of Masses each year for the benefactors, living and dead, of the institution. Beyond the ordinary salary which we receive, no other form of stipend is given for those Masses. The question is raised :—

- 1°. Are we bound 'sub grave' to the fulfilment of those Masses.
- 2°. If so, under what virtue? Does strict justice bind us?

Some of my friends are inclined to look lightly on the obligation, regarding it as one rather of mere fidelity or of gratitude. Others as of mere obedience, but question its reasonableness, as no stipend is offered. Others cannot see how strict justice can be affected, as there is no present voluntary agreement to this effect between the actual professors and the authorities. And personally, myself, I am inclined to take a rather strict view of the whole case, I look upon the obligation as grave, and in my estimation it springs from justice—originating from the primary contract entered into between the ecclesiastical authorities.

The question for us is one more for debate sake than practical; however it does raise a most important point in Theology: can a moral body, e.g., a college, a diocese, etc., not enter into a contract with its first benefactors in such a way as to impose afterwards upon future generations a serious obligation in justice.

Your opinion on this point of discussion shall be highly prized by

A SUBSCRIBER.

As the last point—the possibility or otherwise of a moral body entering into a contract with its benefactors and thus undertaking a perpetual obligation in their favour—is the most fundamental, we shall discuss it first of all. Well, of this possibility there is not the slightest doubt; canonists have always taken it for granted, and have regarded it as pertaining to the essence of moral personality. Thus Cardinal D'Annibale writes: 'When once they (moral persons) have been properly established, they are like private persons. They can therefore, acquire for themselves, either by acts *inter vivos* or by wills, enter contracts, take part in judicial processes, etc.'¹ Cardinal Gasparri, in his definition of a foundation, implies even more clearly that corporate bodies are capable of undertaking perpetual obligations. A 'foundation,' he states, is a 'donation of temporal goods made to an ecclesiastical institute, whether secular or regular, on condition of performing some spiritual work either for ever or for a long time.'² But there is really no need of quotation: the matter, as we have said, is a commonplace amongst canonists. And if there had been previously any doubt on this subject, the Code would have removed it; its definition of pious foundations is quite as clear on the point as Gasparri's. 'By the

¹ *Summul. Th. Mor.*, vol. i. n. 44: 'At cum semel rite coierint, instar privatorum habentur. Ideo possunt sibi acquirere actibus seu inter vivos seu ultima voluntate, contractu iniri, iudicio agere,' etc.

² *De S. Eucharistia*, vol. i. n. 559.

name "pious foundations," it declares, 'are understood temporal goods given in any way whatever to any moral person in the Church, with a perpetual obligation or one for a very long time, out of the annual revenues of celebrating some Masses, or of discharging other specified ecclesiastical functions, or of performing some works of piety and charity.'¹

To remove a misconception under which our correspondent seems to be labouring, we must remark that, when a corporate body enters into a contract of this kind the obligation incurred rests primarily on the institution itself. Moral persons, however, must usually discharge their obligations through the instrumentality of physical persons, and hence the latter become bound when they are employed for this purpose by the former. Only when understood in this way is it true to say that a 'moral body can enter into a contract with its first benefactor in such a way as to impose afterwards upon future generations a serious obligation in justice.'

In regard to the present case it is quite clear, therefore, that the diocesan seminary, which is recognised as a moral person in the Church, may have undertaken a perpetual obligation in justice of celebrating certain Masses on account of donations made to it by pious benefactors. Whether such a contract has been entered into is a matter of fact upon which sufficient data have not been supplied to enable us to give an answer. The fact that Masses are actually celebrated for benefactors is certainly not sufficient proof that it has been. It may be that the benefactors merely expressed a wish, without imposing any strict obligation, to have Masses offered for them, or it may be that the Masses are celebrated as a sign of gratitude towards the benefactors, without even a wish having been expressed by them to that effect. The real facts of the case can be established only by an examination of old records, foundation tablets, etc.

In regard to the professors' obligation, again the data supplied are quite insufficient to determine its nature. It is quite possible that it is one of strict justice, arising from a contract entered into between the professors and the Seminary through the latter's representative, in which case portion of their salary would take the place of *honoraria*. There is a presumption that this is really the state of affairs, if the Masses celebrated by the professors are intended to satisfy obligations in justice imposed by benefactors. Again, it is possible that the obligation arises merely from an episcopal law, in which case it would be one of obedience and religion rather than of strict justice. It is also quite possible that there is no strict obligation at all, and that the professors are merely fulfilling a wish of the donors or of the Bishop—the representative of the seminary—in celebrating these Masses. What is the real position of things can be determined only by reference to documents, or to oral tradition amongst the College staff, if any such exists. Looking at the matter, however, from a *a priori* standpoint, one is inclined to think, in view of the very moderate salary which professors receive, that there is no strict obligation in the case.

¹ Canon 1544, § 1.

ATTENDANCE AT THEATRES

REV. DEAR SIR,—In reference to your reply to the first question of ‘Presbyter Liverpoolitanus’ in I. E. RECORD of December:

A question was sent up to Rome by Birmingham on the subject, and on August 2, 1919, the reply was given by the Consistorial Congregation that until the new Provinces hold a new Council the Provincial Councils of Westminster hold good, etc., ‘cum subsistant, perdurant *in illa forma et extensione quas a principio habuerunt*,’ ‘Quapropter in exemplo allato, sacerdos unius provinciae qui contra praescriptum I^{mi} Concil. Prov. West. teatro in alia intersit, subicitur ut antea poenae suspensionis, etc.’ This notification was sent to all the Parochi of the Archdiocese.

Since you are on this subject of theatres, do operas come under the term ‘spectaculis scenis’ of scenic performances? I have an idea that I saw in some Irish synod that priests were forbidden to go to scenic performances and operas; the insertion ‘and operas’ gives one the impression that in Canon Law there is a distinction between scenic performances and operas. Westminster forbids only scenic performances.

SCOTLANDIENSIS.

We are very grateful to our correspondent for acquainting us with this reply of the Consistorial Congregation. The views which we expressed on this matter in our answer to ‘Liverpoolitanus’ are in complete agreement with it. Of course, it is possible that the reply is an extensive interpretation, and consequently, that it does not offer any confirmation of our position. The form of the reply, however, as well as the reasons which we put forward, afford the strongest presumption to the contrary. Anyhow, it settles the question practically.

In our opinion operas are included under ‘spectaculis scenicis.’ Our reason is the fundamental one of all interpretation, viz., the ordinary signification of the two terms. Most probably our correspondent has in mind the last Synod of Maynooth. He is under a misapprehension, however, as to the form of the statute on attendance at scenic performances made by this body. We shall, therefore, quote its exact words; ‘A theatrorum quorumcumque publicorum spectaculis, etiam illius generis quae nomine *opera* designantur, necnon a spectaculis illis quibus vulgo nomen *Circus* tribui solet, prorsas absteineant’ (clerici). Clearly, then, this Irish law affords no justification for the impression that in Canon Law there is a distinction between scenic performances and operas. The statute does not employ the term ‘scenicis spectaculis’ at all, instead it has ‘theatrorum spectaculis’ and includes operas under it. In fact, this inclusion of operas under theatrical performances is rather a confirmation of the opposite view.

SOME CONDITIONS FOR ALIENATION OF ECCLESIASTICAL PROPERTY

REV. DEAR SIR,—Would you kindly let me have, at your convenience, your opinion on the following points in the matter of alienation of ecclesiastical property.

1°. May the valuation in writing (required by Can. 1530. par. 1. 1°.) be made by only one *pro'us peritus*. The use of the plural seems to require at least two.

2°. Is not this valuation, and not the sale price, the guide as to the competency of the Superior, to give permission to alienate? So that if a property were returned in this valuation as worth £1150, but at sale realized £1300, would it not be quite safe to accept such price without fitting permission from the Holy See?

3°. Should the Chapter have this valuation before them when asked to give their consent to alienation?

In this last question I am not necessarily contending that without the valuation the consent would be invalid, but it seems to me that the procedure would be irregular for the following reasons:—

1°. The Code, in laying down the conditions, puts the valuation first.

2°. I take it that the consent required of the Chapter is not a nude assent, but a reasoned consent: exercising their judgment as to whether the position of the Church would be made better by the alienation (*utilitas Ecclesiae*). Their knowledge of what would probably be got for the property (the valuation) would often be an element in enabling them to judge—say, the Church was receiving a rent, and it was proposed to sell the property.

3°. What seems to me the strongest reason is that if the Chapter had not the valuation there would be danger in some cases of their giving consent to the alienation of property which may be worth over £1,200, and would they not have to plead ignorance in order not to incur papal excommunication (*scienter*). Can. 2209 par. 3, '*Si delictum sine eorum opera commissum non fuisset.*'

PAROCHAS.

I. We think with our correspondent, and for the reason given by him, that the valuation must be made by at least two experts.

II. In our opinion it is the valuation of the experts, not the sale price, that must be taken into consideration in determining what Superior is competent to grant permission to alienate. According to the Code the value of the property to be alienated is the determining factor, and the estimation of it by experts is much more likely to represent the true value than the price actually realized. The inconveniences which would arise from making the sale price the criterion of value are so apparent that it is needless to discuss them; they are so serious that only the very clearest evidence would justify us in admitting that such a criterion had actually been set up.

III. For the first and second reasons given by our correspondent, we think it would be the more appropriate procedure that the Chapter should have the valuation before them when they gave their consent. The difficulty suggested in the third reason would be surmounted, if the Chapter gave their consent subject to the condition that the property did not exceed £1,200 in value. By giving a conditional assent of this kind they could in no way be held responsible, if property of greater value were alienated. Another reason that might be suggested for requiring that the valuation should be made first is that, in case it exceeds £1,200, it would be unnecessary to submit the matter to the Chapter at all.

J. KINANE.

LITURGY

THE CRUCIFIX DURING BENEDICTION. THE USE OF LINEN AND LACE ALBS. VEIL ON TABERNACLE OF A SIDE-ALTAR. THE HOUR FOR CELEBRATION OF MASS. ARRANGEMENT OF THE VEIL OF THE CHALICE WHEN CARRYING TO AND FROM THE ALTAR. COLOUR OF THE PREACHER'S STOLE ON SPECIAL OCCASIONS

REV. DEAR SIR,—I am sending you some rubrical points which have arisen for discussion between my fellow-curates and myself, being interested in liturgy. I hope they are sensible, or at least practical. Perhaps some, or even all of them, have been settled in previous issues, but I have had no chance of seeing these, as I opened my subscription towards the I. E. RECORD only some months ago, and since then I find myself a 'would-be-liturgist. . . . Kindly accept our thanks in anticipation.

I. We heard some time ago that there is a new rubric stating that the Crucifix need *not* be removed from the throne during Benediction, when the Monstrance is placed on a thronette on the 'mensa.' Is this so?

II. In many churches, when violet vestments are used on Sundays, ordinary linen albs are always worn instead of the lace ones which appear on all other Sundays. Is this a rubric, or a custom, or neither?

III. If there be a side altar having a Tabernacle, is it correct to have a veil of the colour of the day on it during Mass said there, or can this only be done in the case of the Tabernacle containing the Blessed Sacrament?

IV. The earliest hour for the celebration of private Masses is an hour before dawn. Is there any special time laid down, or will the hour vary in accordance with the season? In other words, does it mean that I can say Mass in summer at about 3 a.m., and that in winter I must wait till about 6 a.m.?

V. The question most disputed among us is the position of the veil of the chalice when carrying to and from the altar. Father O'Callaghan's *Sacred Ceremonies of Low Mass* says distinctly 'the front part of the veil will be turned up over the burse' (Part ii. Ch. I. No. 3)—while Adrian Fortescue's *Ceremonies of the Roman Rite Described*, on the other hand, says, quite as distinctly, that the veil is to be left hanging down in front. Now, which of these is the correct method, or is there a full option? The former way seems more convenient, but the latter neater and (may I say?) more usual.

VI. When a stole is used for preaching, the colour of the day's Office is to be worn. But is it lawful to use a stole of a colour appropriate to the subject of the sermon on special occasions? For instance, would it be allowable to use a red one for a special sermon on the Sacred Passion or at a meeting of a Sodality of the Precious Blood in which all the devotions are appropriate?

B. Mc.

The queries in this letter are all more or less practical and lend themselves to discussion, but the issues involved in some of them are hardly of

such importance as to call for extended categorical replies. In courtesy, however, to our correspondent and his colleagues, who are so laudably interested in liturgical studies, we shall briefly offer an opinion on each of the points submitted.

I. The wording of this query is somewhat ambiguous and suggests the prevalence of a custom which is distinctly unrubrical. We are not sure whether our correspondent means by 'throne,' the fixed throne of Exposition erected over the Tabernacle for the reception of the Monstrance, or merely the roof of the Tabernacle, which sometimes serves as the base of the throne; and again we are in doubt as to the significance of the term 'thronette.' Does he mean by 'thronette' a movable throne in the full sense of the term, which, in accordance with the rubrics, is sometimes placed on the 'mensa'; or the little raised platform or Thabor which has no rubrical sanction, but is sometimes used to elevate the Monstrance on the table of the altar? If the ordinary place of the Crucifix is upon the throne which has been erected for Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament so that alternately the Crucifix and the Monstrance occupy precisely the same position, the practice is unrubrical¹; and, on the other hand, if a real throne exists over the Tabernacle, it seems hardly less unrubrical to place the Monstrance during Benediction on an elevation on the 'mensa' The *raison d'être* of the throne is for the reception of the Monstrance; if the structure becomes the ordinary receptacle for the Crucifix it ceases to be a throne and must no longer be regarded as such. The following response² of the Congregation of Rites is definite on the point: 'Quum difficile sit habere Thronum Expositionis inamovibilem nisi Crux ponatur in eo; quaeritur. Utrum liceat super Tabernaculum erigere Thronum, seu parvum ciborium fixum pro Expositione Sanctissimi Sacramenti; an debeat erigi Thronus tantummodo propter Expositionem et amoveri post Expositionem? *Resp.* Negative ad primam partem; affirmative ad secundum.'

But apart from the ambiguity of the terms and the suggestion of an unrubrical practice which they convey, we have no doubt as to the purport of our correspondent's query. Is there a 'new rubric' stating that the Crucifix of the altar need not be removed during Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament? We have not heard of it, nor, in fact, have we been able to find any rubric regulating the particular point in question. Most of the rubrical books we have consulted prescribe the removal of the Crucifix preparatory to the Benediction Service, and some go so far as to assign a positive reason for the direction—'ubi enim Prototypus adoratur supervacanea saltem adjudicari debet imaginis exhibitio'—but as far as we know, there is no authoritative ruling to that effect by the Sacred Congregation. A question was once disputed amongst rubricists as to whether the cross which had been removed for Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament should, in accordance with the rubrics of the Mass, be restored when the Holy Sacrifice was offered on the altar, and the Sacred Congregation

¹ Decr. 3576.

² Decr. dated May 27th, 1911.

replied¹ :—‘ Etsi aliquando preceperit haec S.R.C. quod in Altari ubi est publice expositum SS^mum Sacramentum, tempore Sacrificii, Crux de more collocetur; non est tamen in suo robore observantia hujus praecepti. Et sane Patriarchales Ecclesiae urbis oppositum servant; supervacaneam enim adjudicant imaginis exhibitionem ubi Prototypus adoratur. Et hac de causa Instructio pro oratione quadraginta horarum Clementis XI, Benedicti XIII et Clementis XII Summorum Pontificum jussu edita, sub silentio praeterit, an locanda removendave sit hujusmodi Crux, relinquens quemlibet in sua praxi.’ According to this decree there is no precept to have the Crucifix removed, even for the Exposition of the Forty Hours,—each church is free to follow its own custom—and we think, *a fortiori*, there is no preceptive rubric for its removal during the brief Exposition at Benediction. In this country we believe it is usual to remove the Crucifix before the Benediction Service, but if in any particular church the opposite custom prevails there need be no anxiety about a ‘new rubric’ to confirm its legality.

II. There is certainly no rubric regulating the point, whatever may be said of the custom prevailing in particular churches. The Sacred Congregation tolerates² the use of lace Albs wherever the custom exists, and makes no distinction as to the colour of the vestments with which they may be associated. We think, however, something might be said for the propriety of having a plain white Alb under violet vestments, which are symbolical of penance. The lace seems more appropriate to festive occasions.³

III. We do not think it correct to have a veil at all, in the strict sense, on the Tabernacle of a side-altar which does not contain the Blessed Sacrament. The Sacred Congregation in prescribing⁴ the Tabernacle veil always speaks of the ‘Tabernaculum Sanctissimi Sacramenti,’ and it is well to note that when the Blessed Sacrament is removed from the Tabernacle so also should the veil. The veil is not merely intended to ornament the Tabernacle; it has a symbolic significance linking it exclusively with the Blessed Sacrament.

This veil may be either permanently white or change with the colour of the vestments of the day,⁵ provided that violet is substituted when the liturgical colour is black.⁶

IV. According to the old rubric Masses might be celebrated ‘ab aurora usque ad meridiem,’ which, with the approval of Benedict XIII and Clement XII, was interpreted to mean that the Mass was not to *end* before dawn or *commence* after midday. The new Code alters the rubric and allows the celebration of Masses to *begin* from an hour before dawn to an hour after midday. ‘Missae celebrandae initium ne fiat citius quam una hora ante auroram vel serius quam una hora post meridiem.’⁷ The time of dawn (aurora) is not mathematically determined for any particular

¹ Decr. 2365 ad 1.

² Decr. 3191 ad 5; 3780; 4048.

³ Vide Decr. 3804.

⁴ Decr. 3035; 3520.

⁵ Decr. 3035 ad 10.

⁶ Decr. 3562.

⁷ Can 821, § 1.

place.¹ It is different in different countries, and varies, of course, according to the season of the year. In these countries it is usually taken to include the hour before sunrise, so that, in accordance with the new legislation, the Mass may begin at any period of the year two hours before sunrise. Theologians teach that a reasonable cause will justify anticipation of the time, varying in extent according to the gravity of the cause.

V. Where there is no clear directive legislation we must be prepared for divergence of opinion, and a consequent divergence of practice. It is distinctly stated² that the veil should hang down in front when the chalice rests on the altar at the beginning of Mass, but there is no authoritative pronouncement, as far as we know, regulating the position of the veil when the chalice is being carried to and from the altar. As a consequence liturgical writers, relying on arguments of convenience, predilection or established custom, give different directions. When there is apparently freedom of choice, one cannot presume to dogmatize on the rubrical accuracy of either custom. Personally, we favour the opinion of Fortescue; we have been accustomed to adopt it in practice, and we think, apart from its more usual acceptance, it best accords with the spirit and letter of rubrical legislation touching the point. The object of the veil is to cover the chalice; the properly dressed chalice has the veil hanging down in front with the cross in the centre³ facing the people, and there is no inconvenience in carrying it thus to and from the altar. On the other hand, the alternative method seems to necessitate the exposure of the lining of the veil and the foot of the chalice, the hiding of the centre cross, and the inconvenience of unfolding the veil when the chalice is laid on the altar, and there appears to be no meaning in or sanction for thus partially covering up the burse of the chalice which is made of the same rich material as the vestments themselves.

VI. The rule that the Stole used for preaching should correspond to the colour of the day's Office does not admit of exceptions, as is clear from several decrees⁴ of the Sacred Congregation. The following decree⁵ dated 26th February, 1892, contains a sufficient answer to our correspondent's query. It was asked: 'An stola concionatoris pro sermonibus festivis de S. Joseph et Annuntiatione B.M.V. quando haec festa occurrunt in Hebdomoda majori debeat esse coloris albi vel violacei? Et an die 2 novembris (vel Dominica sequenti) ad sermonem pro defunctis liceat

¹ Van der Stappen says (vol. iii. p. 242): 'Per auroram intelligitur tempus quo incipit matutinum crepusculum, id est tempus medium tenebras inter et ortum solis; aurora igitur incipit diverse pro diversitate, tum temporis anni tum geographicae longitudinis.'

² Decr. 1379.

³ The cross is usual on the veil of the more precious vestments in this country, but is not prescribed. The Roman veil is not thus ornamented and hangs down equally on all sides of the chalice. When folded, therefore, as is the Roman custom, the foot of the chalice is not exposed (vide Van der Stappen, vol. iii. p. 105).

⁴ Decr. 3157, 3764.

⁵ Decr. 3764 ad xiii.

habere stolam coloris nigri ?' And the reply was : 'Stola concionatoris sit coloris officio diei respondentis, etiam die secunda Novembris.' Where the law is so clear and emphatic, the only answer to our correspondent's query must be a negative one.

THE VOTIVE MASS OF THE SACRED HEART

REV. DEAR SIR,—I would be glad to have your opinion on the following rubrical question. In one of our churches it is usual to hold devotions to the Sacred Heart in the evening of the First Friday. They consist of certain prayers, Sermon and Benediction. In the morning, at 8 o'clock Mass, the choir attend and sing hymns during the Mass. That is the only devotion during the morning.

Under these circumstances : (1) Is it lawful to say the Votive Mass of the Sacred Heart ; (2) and if it is, may the same Mass be said at 7 o'clock, (3) and may the same Mass be said privately at a side-altar ?

SUBSCRIBER.

In order to encourage devotion to the Sacred Heart, Leo XIII, on the 28th of June, 1889, granted permission to add the Votive Mass of the Sacred Heart in those churches and oratories where on the morning of the First Friday of each Month special exercises of devotion in honour of the Sacred Heart are held with the approbation of the Ordinaries. The decree¹ is as follows : 'in iis Ecclesiis et oratoriis, ubi Feria sexta, quae prima unoquoque in mense occurrit, peculiaria exercitia in honorem Divini Cordis, approbante loci ordinario, mane peragentur, Beatisissimus Pater Leo XIII indulsit ut hisce exercitiis addi valeat Missa Votiva de Sacro Corde Jesu ; dummodo in illam diem non incidat aliquod Festum Domini, aut duplex primae classis, vel Feria, Vigilia, Octava ex privilegiatis ; de caetero servatis rubricis.'

To avail then of the privilege of saying this Votive Mass we observe that certain conditions have to be fulfilled, the more important of which are the following : (1) that special exercises are performed in the church or oratory *in the morning* ('mane peragentur') in honour of the Sacred Heart ; (2) that these exercises have the approval of the Ordinary ; (3) that they are so joined to the Mass that, morally speaking, they may be regarded as forming with it one liturgical act ('ut hisce exercitiis addi valeat Missa'). The exercises may take place before or after or during the Mass, but, according to all authorities, they should be in conjunction with it, and have as their primary object the honour of the Sacred Heart. Again, from the very nature of the case, the privilege permits *one Mass only* in the same church or oratory, but if there are two distinct Communities residing in a town or parish who have separate services carried out in the one church in honour of the Sacred Heart, we see no reason why the privilege could not be availed of on both occasions. Such a case would be where the church has a special service for a religious Community residing in the parish and another for the ordinary congregation.

¹ Decr. 3712.

These things premised, we reply to the queries of our correspondent.

(1) We have the gravest doubt as to whether the exercises referred to could be regarded as sufficient to justify the use of the privilege of the Votive Mass. If the devotions mentioned by our correspondent were carried out in the morning in connexion with the Mass we should have no doubt about the matter, but as held in the evening, they do not affect the issue. The question then is: Does the mere chanting of hymns by the choir during the Mass deserve to be styled 'peculiarior exercitia in honorem Divini Cordis,' or should the practice be regarded as sufficient to warrant the approval of the Ordinary—a necessary condition of its validity for the purpose. The schemes of exercises approved as sufficient in places that we are acquainted with usually include 'The Act of Reparation' and Benediction of the Most Holy Sacrament, but there is no rigid rule on the matter. Van der Stappen says: 'Exercitia quaecumque ea esse possunt, dummodo pro objecto habeant honorem SS. Cordis Jesu' (vol. iii. p. 277). Granted, however, that the Ordinary's approval has been duly obtained, for with him rests the responsibility, we should reply to the first query in the affirmative.

(2) No; unless there is a distinct Community, and all the exercises are duly carried out on each occasion.

(3) No.

It might be well to note that this Mass of the Sacred Heart has the character of a solemn Votive Mass, whether it is sung or read. Hence the *Gloria* and *Credo* and *one Prayer*, and the last Gospel is always that of St. John. The Proper Mass is the Votive Mass *Miserebitur*, given in the body of the Missal, with certain changes according to the season of the year.

THE INVOCATION 'REGINA PACIS' OF THE LITANY OF B.V.M.

Writing of the Litany of Loreto in the March issue (p. 247) we stated that the invocation—*Regina pacis*—was added by the present Pope for the term of the war and that the consent of the Ordinary was necessary for its public recitation. This was in strict accordance with the terms of the original decree, which we cited, dated November 16, 1915. To avoid misunderstanding, however, we should have mentioned that, in a subsequent Letter to the Cardinal Secretary of State, issued May 5, 1917, the Pope set aside the original conditions for the insertion of the invocation, and ordered that, from June 1, 1917, it was to be added permanently to the Litany. The Letter reads¹:—

Al quale scopo Noi ordiniamo che, a cominciare dal primo di del prossimo mese di giugno, resti fissata nelle Litanie Lauretane l'invocazione *Regina pacis, ora pro nobis*, che agli Ordinarii permetteremo di aggiungervi temporaneamente col Decreto della Sacra Congregazione degli Affari Ecclesiastici Straordinarii in data del 16 Novembre, 1915.

M. EATON.

¹ *Acta Ap. Sedis*, June 1917, p. 266.

DOCUMENTS

SERMON OF THE HOLY FATHER TO THE PARISH PRIESTS AND LENTEN PREACHERS OF THE HOLY CITY

(February 16, 1920)

SERMO

HABITUS DIE XVI FEBRUARII MCMXX AD PAROCHOS ET AD QUADRAGESIMALES
IN URBE CONCIONATORES.

Or fa un anno, in pari circostanza, Noi chiedemmo al Dottore delle genti con quali parole avremmo potuto salutare efficacemente i predicatori della Quaresima, adunati alla Nostra presenza ; e san Paolo allora ci suggerì di salutarli col nome espressivo di 'uomini di Dio' : *tu autem, homo Dei* (I a Tim., vi. 11). Lo stesso saluto potremmo ora volgere a voi, o dilettissimi figli, che vi preparate a bandire la divina parola in Roma, nella Quaresima ormai imminente. Ma, se il nome che meglio si addice ai predicatori giova a dimostrare il rispetto che loro è dovuto e deve persuadere ad essi le virtù necessarie all'esercizio del loro eccelso ministero, sembra a Noi, che il doppio scopo sarebbe anche più facilmente raggiunto, se si avesse adeguato concetto dell'opera che è commessa ai predicatori. All'amore delle persone e delle cose è necessario vadano innanzi la conoscenza e la stima delle une e delle altre : *nil volitum quin praecognitum* ; e perchè non dire che, quanto meglio radicata è la stima delle persone e delle cose, tanto più giustificato e sincero ne deve esser l'amore ? Perciò un'altra volta Ci siamo rivolti a san Paolo ed abbiamo chiesto a lui una parola, capace di esprimere in maniera comprensiva l'importanza dell'opera affidata ai predicatori. E il Dottore delle genti ha fatto subito risuonare all'anima Nostra l'eco della parola da lui indirizzata al suo discepolo Timoteo : *opus fac evangelistae* (I a Tim., iv. 5).

Certamente è a tutti palese l'importante significato di questa parola, la quale viene a rinnovare, e ad applicare ai predicatori, quell'antico precetto : *age quod agis*, cui è connesso il ricordo della necessità di far bene ciò che si deve compiere. Ma, affinchè a niuno apparisca superflua la parola dell'Apostolo e niuno dica che solo equivale ad inutile ripetizione, Noi vi invitiamo, o dilettissimi figli, a riflettere che san Paolo, nello scrivere a Timoteo : *opus fac evangelistae*, supponeva che il suo discepolo conoscesse e ciò che vale 'per sè' l'ufficio di evangelista, e ciò che un tale ufficio richiede in chi deve adempierlo. Anche Noi pertanto facciamo Nostra la parola di san Paolo : *opus fac evangelistae*, e, mentre la indirizziamo a ciascuno dei predicatori dell'imminente

Quaresima, nel senso in cui il Dottore delle genti la indirizzava al suo fido Timoteo, giudichiamo non inopportuno ricordare prima il carattere proprio, o la natura, dell'ufficio dell'evangelista, e poi gli obblighi o i doveri che un tale ufficio importa. Potremo così sperare che in nessuno dei predicatori, destinati ad annunziare la divina parola ai fedeli di Roma, nella imminente Quaresima, sieno per far difetto le due cose che l'Apostolo supponeva nell'evangelista, quando scriveva al discepolo: *opus fac evangelistae*. E Ci affida anche la speranza che, come lo studio del nome proprio dei predicatori: *tu autem, homo Dei*, ha potuto nel passato anno determinare la stima e l'amore di essi in mezzo il popolo, così questa medesima stima e questo medesimo amore si accresceranno ognor più in questo anno, mercè lo studio di ciò che è in se stessa l'opera del predicatore: *opus fac evangelistae*.

Il divin Salvatore, nei tre anni della sua vita pubblica, diede ai discepoli un insegnamento completo intorno a ciò che i suoi seguaci avrebbero dovuto credere ed operare. Quell'insegnamento però, lungi dall'essere ristretto all'poche persone che allora seguivano Gesù, era destinato a tutte le genti e a tutte le età future. Il divino Maestro dovea quindi determinare anche il modo di farne giungere l'eco a quanti sarebbero stati gli abitatori della terra, in tutti i tempi e in tutti i luoghi, dopo che Egli avesse sottratto alla terra il conforto della sua presenza visibile. E il modo voluto da Gesù fu la missione data agli Apostoli e, nella persona di essi, a tutti i predicatori delle future età, di annunziare il Vangelo a tutti gli uomini, ammaestrando ad osservare quanto Egli aveva prescritto: *euntes in mundum universum, praedicate evangelium omni creaturae* (Marco, xvi. 15)—*docentes eos sercare omnia, quaecumque mandavi vobis* (Matteo, xxviii. 20). Di qui segue che gli Apostoli non sono stati, e i predicatori anche dell'età nostra altro non devono essere, che l'eco della voce di Gesù Cristo. Ma chi potrebbe dire l'eccellenza dell'opera che, in tal guisa, vengono a compiere i predicatori?

Chi riproduce l'altrui voce sembra ravvicinare persona lontana, e chi di persona assente prosegue l'opera sembra colmare il vuoto lasciato dalla dipartita di quella persona. È poi facile intendere che l'eco del l'altrui voce merita di essere tanto più apprezzata quanto più eccellente fu la persona che prima parlò: e del pari, quanto più illustre è stata la persona di cui si prosegue l'opera, la continuazione di questa deve aversi in tanto maggior pregio. Ora ai predicatori è commesso di ripetere gli insegnamenti non di un uomo, ma di un Dio. Come il divin Salvatore additò agli uomini la via per giungere a salvezza, anche i predicatori devono indirizzare e guidare gli uomini nello stesso cammino. L'opera loro si dice di 'evangelisti,' appunto perchè annunzia la buona novella della redenzione compiuta da Gesù Cristo, e addita il facile modo di goderne i frutti. Quando perciò si intima al predicatore di fare opera di evangelista: *opus fac evangelistae*, gli si viene quasi a dire di farsi eco della voce di Gesù Cristo o, se meglio piace, di proseguire l'opera del suo divino insegnamento.

Non abbiamo mestieri di avvertire l'enorme differenza che corre

fra l'opera, autorevole per se stessa perchè divina, dell'incarnata Sapienza e l'opera ministeriale dei predicatori: è a tutti noto che questa non ha valore se non in virtù di quella. Ma non è men vero che l'una e l'altra trae seco l'annuncio della stessa dottrina; non è men vero che l'una e l'altra mira allo stesso fine. Gesù Cristo non ha detto soltanto che la vita eterna sarà data a chi avrà conosciuto il vero Dio e il Figliuolo mandato da Dio (Giovanni, xvii. 3), ma ha detto altresì che 'sarà salvo chi avrà creduto alla parola degli evangelisti'; *praedicate evangelium omni creaturae; qui crediderit salvus erit*. Ecco come l'opera degli evangelisti è associata a quella di Dio; ecco come nell'ordine attuale di provvidenza, la salute eterna non è altrimenti possibile agli uomini che per mezzo della predicazione.

E valga il vero, dopo che il divin Salvatore ebbe posto termine al suo insegnamento pubblico, restò articolo di fede che 'chiunque invocherà il nome del Signore sarà salvo. Ma come invocheranno uno in cui non hanno creduto? E come crederanno in uno di cui non hanno sentito parlare? Come poi ne sentiranno parlare senza chi predichi?': *quicumque invocaverit nomen Domini salvus erit. Quomodo ergo invocabunt, in quem non crediderunt? aut quomodo credent ei, quem non audierunt? quomodo autem audient sine praedicante?* (Ai Rom., x. 13).

Sono due pertanto i titoli della gloria che compete all'evangelista: quello di continuare l'opera del Messia e quello di far cosa che, secondo l'ordinario corso dalla divina Provvidenza, è indispensabilmente connessa alla salvezza degli uomini. Da questi due titoli di gloria risulta così esaltato l'ufficio dell'evangelista, che, intorno alla natura o al carattere di esso, crediamo non possa pretendere di più chi ha intesa la Nostra parola rivolta ai quaresimalisti di Roma: *opus fac evangelistae*. Raccoglietela voi, o dilettissimi figli, ai quali è stata rivolta, e mostrate di apprendere tutta l'eccellenza del suo significato. Se infatti per compiere bene un ufficio è necessario anzitutto di apprezzarne a dovere l'importanza, non potranno non essere buoni evangelisti coloro, i quali sapranno di essere continuatori dell'opera di un Dio, cooperatori alla eterna salvezza del prossimo.

Questa stima, o dilettissimi figli, voi dovrete avere non alle vostre persone, ma all'ufficio a voi affidato. Epperò non solo niuna invidia, niuna gelosia dovrete avere verso coloro che avranno comune con voi l'opera dell'evangelista, ma, mentre procurerete di renderla fruttuosa per conto vostro, dovrete pure augurarla feconda di vantaggi mercè lo zelo altrui.

Risuona ancora l'eco della parola che, al cadere dell'anno passato, Noi abbiamo indirizzata a tutti i Vescovi intorno all'importante argomento della propagazione della fede cattolica in tutto il mondo. I missionari che si recano in lontane regioni per predicare il Vangelo a coloro che brancolano ancora fra le tenebre dell'ignoranza o siedono nell'ombra di morte, compiono opera che deve dirsi: 'di evangelisti' quasi per antonomasia. Noi vorremmo perciò che i predicatori della prossima Quaresima in Roma parlassero almeno una volta, durante il corso della loro predicazione, della ricordata Nostra Enciclica, sia per inculcare

l'obbligo che hanno tutti i fedeli di favorire l'opera delle sante missioni, sia per rendere pubblico omaggio alla sublimità dell'ufficio dell'evangelista. Una certa modestia, più o meno giustificata, avrebbe potuto far morire sul vostro labbro, o diletteggissimi figli, l'encomio dovuto all'evangelista, avreste potuto non volere la implicita lode che ne sarebbe venuta all'opera vostra. Ma se, togliendo dalla Nostra Enciclica l'occasione a parlare, voi additerete all'ammirazione dei vostri uditori le fatiche e lo zelo dei missionari, compirete un'opera di giustizia, e insieme presterete un omaggio alla verità. E non sarà atto di giustizia li rendere maggior lode a chi ha merito maggiore? non sarà culto di verità il dichiarare ognor meglio alla luce degli esempi, che cosa intendeva san Paolo quando scriveva al discepolo, e che cosa intendiamo Noi quando diciamo a ciascuno dei predicatori della Quaresima: *opus fac evangelistae*?

Vi ha però anche un altro modo di attestare efficacemente il pregio in cui dev'essere tenuto l'ufficio dell'evangelista. Questo modo dipende da coloro ai quali un tale ufficio è commesso, e Noi lo ricordiamo ora non per insegnare cose nuove, ma per raffermare voi, o diletteggissimi, in quei giudizi e in quei propositi che già sappiamo essere vostri.

Abbiamo detto poc'anzi che san Paolo, nello scrivere a Timoteo: *opus fac evangelistae*, supponeva che il suo discepolo conoscesse non solo ciò che vale 'per sè' l'ufficio dell'evangelista, ma anche ciò che un tale ufficio richiede in chi lo deve adempiere. E Noi, alla nostra volta, nell'indirizzare la parola dell'Apostolo ai predicatori della Quaresima, non potevamo punto supporre che essi ignorassero gli obblighi o i doveri che l'*opus evangelistae* richiede. Fate dunque, o carissimi, che non apparisca mai esserci Noi ingannati nel respingere con forza una siffatta supposizione.

Ci piace infatti immaginare che chi sa di essere continuatore dell'opera del Messia nulla dica, nulla faccia, nulla tolleri che alla missione del Messia non apparisca perfettamente conforme. È superfluo il dire che l'evangelista deve annunziare il Vangelo di Gesù Cristo, perchè, se ciò non facesse, non meriterebbe nemmeno il nome di 'evangelista.' Ma non è forse inutile aggiungere che l'evangelista deve annunziare 'solo' il Vangelo di Gesù Cristo. I predicatori della Quaresima si astengano perciò non solamente dal parlare di sè, ove una stretta necessità non lo richiegga, affinchè non si possa dire che 'predicano se stessi,' ma si astengano altresì dal portare sul pulpito argomenti che non appariscano evidentemente connessi all'insegnamento del santo Vangelo.

Il primo Vescovo di Madrid,—quel Monsignor Martinez Izquierdo, che, nella Domenica delle Palme del 1886, cadde martire del suo dovere sotto la mano sacrilega di un sacerdote—aveva poco prima ordinato che nella sua diocesi nessun oratore chiudesse l'esordio delle prediche, senza indicare esplicitamente a quale articolo del catechismo si riferisse la tesi che prenderebbe a dimostrare. E Noi ricordiamo che l'unica volta, in cui osammo predicare nella capitale della Spagna nell'idioma del paese, fu in occasione della prima Messa di un sacerdote novello, e anche Noi citammo l'articolo del catechismo, che prescrive la venerazione

ed il rispetto dovuto al sacerdote cattolico. Evidentemente il precepto dello zelantissimo primo Vescovo di Madrid era determinato dal desiderio di impedire l'abuso, allora troppo comune in Ispagna, che i predicatori trattassero argomenti alieni dall'ordine soprannaturale. Ah! quell'abuso ha varcato anche le nostre frontiere, e temiamo che talora abbia violato persino il rispetto dovuto alla Città santa. Oh! come sarebbe dunque opportuno chi i quaresimalisti di Roma si obbligassero a predicare 'tutto e solo' il santo Vangelo! E, poichè ciò che si dimostra insegnamento del Vangelo rimane meglio scolpito nella mente degli ascoltatori, farebbero cosa utilissima i predicatori di Roma se prendessero l'abitudine di additare il vincolo di relazione che le loro prediche devono sempre avere col santo Vangelo. Collocherebbero così sopra base granitica il loro insegnamento; perfezionerebbero il metodo che abbiamo lodato nei predicatori della Spagna, renderebbero agli uditori più facile l'intelligenza delle loro lezioni, e, ciò che più monta, apparirebbero quali esser devono coloro ai quali è dato il nome di 'evangelisti.'

Imperocchè quanto è agevole comprendere, anche per la semplice considerazione del nome, che gli evangelisti devono predicare il Vangelo, altrettanto sarebbe assurdo il supporre che l'evangelista dovesse aggiungere alcunchè al Vangelo, come se l'insegnamento di Gesù Cristo non fosse stato perfetto. E quando escludiamo gli argomenti non necessariamente connessi col santo Vangelo, intendiamo di escludere, quasi a più forte ragione, le citazioni profane, non essendo tollerabile il supporre che queste possano accrescere forza o valore dimostrativo alle lezioni evangeliche. L'evangelista Noi abbiamo detto essere 'eco della voce di Gesù Cristo': oh! quanto si avvilirebbe, se si facesse eco della voce dei filosofi gentili o dei poeti pagani!

Nè si dica che ragioni di polemica possono talora indurre il predicatore ad usare un linguaggio diverso dall'esposizione del Vangelo. Non si dica che egli deve talora tenere in conto il gusto depravato degli uditori, per riuscir meglio nel suo intento di persuaderli della verità evangelica. Imperocchè quando fu che l'Apostolo scrisse a Timoteo: *opus fac evangelistae?* Proprio allora quando gli avea predetto che sarebbe venuto un tempo in cui gli uomini non avrebbero potuto patire la sana dottrina, ma secondo le proprie passioni, per prurito di udire, avrebbero moltiplicati a se stessi i maestri: *Erit enim tempus cum sanam doctrinam non sustinebunt, sed ad sua desideria coaccervabunt sibi magistros, prurientes auribus.* L'Apostolo era andato anche più innanzi, predicando a Timoteo che gli uditori si sarebbero ritirati dall'ascoltare la verità e si sarebbero rivolti alle favole: *Et a veritate quidem auditum avertent, ad fabulas autem convertentur.* Ma che perciò? Egli soggiunse tosto: *Tu vero vigila,* quasi sottintendendo: 'A te ciò non deve importare; tu devi solo pensare a compiere il tuo ufficio.' E, volendo tutto esprimere con una sola parola, allora fu che disse: 'Tu fa l'ufficio di predicatore del Vangelo': *opus fac evangelistae.* Ecco come la parola di san Paolo, studiata nel contesto della seconda epistola a Timoteo, insegna che il predicatore non deve allontanarsi dal Vangelo nemmeno quando i suoi uditori abbiano un gusto così depravato da non patire

la sana dottrina : *cum sanam doctrinam non sustinebunt*. Ai dì nostri si potrebbe forse aggiungere con san Paolo che numerosi uditori *ad fabulas convertuntur*. Ma anche per quest'ora nefasta bisogna ripetere con lo stesso Apostolo : *Tu vero vigila—opus fac evangelistae*.

È ciò che ripetiamo un'altra volta a voi, o diletteggissimi figli, per persuadervi ognor meglio che nè condizioni di tempi, nè circostanze di luoghi, nè esigenze di persone autorizzeranno mai il predicatore cattolico a non conformarsi al precetto di predicare 'sempre e solo' il santo Vangelo.

È forse superfluo di aggiungere che chi fa *opus evangelistae* non deve limitarsi a predicare solo dal pulpito, ma deve procurare che tutta la sua vita sia una predica continua. Sia predica il suo raccoglimento all'altare ; predica la gravità del suo contegno nei passeggi, nelle visite e nei pubblici ritrovi ; predica la serietà dei suoi discorsi famigliari, predica l'amorevolezza del suo tratto nell'accogliere chi a lui ricorre. Anche qui possiamo fare appello all'autorità di san Paolo, perchè il grande Apostolo considera Timoteo obbligato ora ad esortare ora a riprendere, ma vuole che faccia l'una e l'altra cosa con dottrina e con pazienza : *argue, obsecra, increpa in omni patientia et doctrina*. Si può dire che con queste parole san Paolo si aprisse la via al suo comprensivo precetto : *opus fac evangelistae*. E perchè non dire altresì che riepilogasse poi gli obblighi dell'evangelista con quelle altre parole che soggiungeva all'intimazione del precetto *opus fac evangelistae*? Il *ministerium tuum imple, sobrius esto* riassume tutti i doveri del predicatore, perchè *ille implet officium evangelistae*—dice san Tommaso nel Commento all'epistola Paolina—*qui verbo praedicat et opere implet*, e la sobrietà di cui parla l'Apostolo non riguarda tanto la parsimonia dei cibi quanto la discrezione in tutte le opere, come insegna ancora lo stesso Dottore Angelico : *sobrietas ponitur hic pro discretione (Comm. in epist. S. Pauli)*.

Oh ! con quanta ragione ci siamo dunque rivolti a san Paolo per averne una parola che ci facesse conoscere ciò che l'ufficio del predicatore è in se stesso e ciò che richiede in chi deve adempierlo. Voi, o diletteggissimi figli, mostrerete, nell'imminente Quaresima, di aver bene appreso questo insegnamento dell'Apostolo, e la pratica dei discepoli, conforme alla teoria del Maestro, farà meglio apprezzare, anche dai semplici fedeli, *l'opus evangelistae*.

Ad un così desiderabile effetto concorrerà non lievemente il buon esempio dei parroci di Roma, che noi salutiamo 'evangelisti perenni.' Ma vi concorrerà soprattutto quella celeste benedizione, che Noi imploriamo copiosa e sui parroci e sui predicatori di Roma. È sublime l'ufficio affidato agli uni e agli altri, ma la benedizione che per tutti imploriamo dall'alto deve renderlo quanto sublime altrettanto efficace, per la gloria di Dio, per la salvezza delle anime e per la spirituale utilità di chi lo compie.

DECISION OF THE SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE COUNCIL
IN A CASE CONNECTED WITH MASS HONORARIA

(January 11, 1920)

SACRA CONGREGATIO CONCILII
MONTISVIDEI ET ALIARUM.

STIPENDII MISSARUM

Die 10 ianuarii 1920

SPECIES FACTI.—Administrator Apostolicus archidioecesis Montisvidei de antiqua consuetudine plurimarum paroeciarum archidioecesis, et duarum dioecesium suffraganeorum Melensis ac Saltensis, ad hanc S. Congr. referendum esse duxit. Ibi enim parochi vicarii cooperatibus menstruam mercedem 50 pesos solvunt, imposita vicariis obligatione applicandi missam quotidie ad intentionem parochi, qui sibi retinet stipendia missae, non considerata summa ad quam haec re vera per mensem ascenderint. Quod, in nonnullis saltem paroeciis, hoc modo intelligitur, ut ex 50 pesos pars v. g. dimidia tamquam summa fixa assignetur, altera vero quasi per compromissionem tradatur pro stipendiis missarum: haec autem stipendia in nonnullis locis summam illam non aequare, in aliis illam superare solent.—Litteris praeterea 7 sept. huius anni, interroganti Eñño Praefecto respondit habitationem quoque et alimenta a parochis suppeditari; vicariis propter consuetudinem copiam alius pactionis moraliter nullam dari; nec deesse privatas querelas vicariorum de isto usu.—Testatur simul remunerationem vicariis tributam certo esse sufficientem; sed hoc in quaestione vocari, utrum necne haec pactio de missarum applicatione cum can. 840, § 1 componi possit. Addebatur interim in constitutionibus dioecesanis anno superiore, in parochorum congregatione, statutum fuisse ac, auditis archidioecesanis consultoribus, a se approbatum, 'ut in posterum, donec S. C. C. quaestionem dirimat, parochi cooperatibus suis mercedem solvant 25 ponderum, adiecto quotidie missae stipendio integro iuxta taxam, ita ut honorarium menstruum summae 50 ponderum coaequetur.'—Quare reverenter postulabat utrum exposita praxis sustineri adhuc posset.

ANIMADVERSIONES.—Canon 827 iubet ut a stipe missarum quaelibet etiam species negotiationis vel mercaturae omnino arceatur.—Ex can. autem 840, § 1, qui missarum stipes manuales ad alios transmittit, debet acceptas integre transmittere, nisi oblatores expresse permittat aliquid retinere.

Porro, in casu, nulla species negotiationis aut mercaturae adesse cernitur. Nulla *negotiatio*: non enim studiosa collectio eleemosynarum fit cum intentione eas distribuendi inter sacerdotes qui minore stipendio contenti sint. Nulla *mercatura*: non enim tentatur commutatio stipendiorum pro libris vel aliis mercibus aut associationibus (ut vocant) cum diariis; sed habetur tantum collectiva stipendiorum missarum, quae de iure vicariorum essent, tamquam breviori manu facta attributio parochi, qui, pro minis certa summa, certam eamque convenientem in salarium menstruum assignat. Sane modus iste agendi in nullam

reprehensionem incurrit in locis ubi menstruae eleemosynae 25 pesos vix attingunt. Quid tamen in locis ubi talia dari consueverunt stipendia, quae 25 pesos notabiliter superent? Namque priora 25 pesos a parochis solvi solita, tamquam salarium fixum debita videntur. Quo itaque titulo parochi excessum stipendiorum sibi retinebunt? Verum ex litteris ipsius Administratoris Apostolici novimus praeter summam pecuniae stabilem, etiam habitationem et victum a parochis praeberi. Excessus itaque stipendiorum tamquam modica compensatio alimentorum considerari potest. Sed si ita res se habent, parochorum et vicariorum comparari potest cum probatissimo usu religiosorum. Hi, quia in professione religiosa omnes fructus industriae abdicarunt (Can. 580, § 2), missas celebrant ad intentionem Superiorum, qui omnia stipendia accipiunt pro communitate: haec autem decenti religiosorum sustentationi prospicere debet. Vicarii, non omnes quidem fructus, sed missarum stipendia cedunt parochis, qui eorum sustentationi abundanter consulunt.

Ceterum non leve subsidium ad solvendam propositam quaestionem nobis afferunt bina responsa H. S. Congr. in Treviren., *Eleemosynae Missarum*, 11 maii 1888, et in Bredan., *ei. tit.*, 25 febr. 1905.

In priore, ad 3, licita existimata est conventio qua, sive expresse sive tacite, inter aliquos parochos vicariosque statuitur ut, pro commodiore victu vicariis concedendo, 'parochis cedant in cumulo fructus fundationum pinguiorum, et vicariis tribuatur stipendium ab Ordinario taxatum.' In altero responso admissum est ad 1, 'ut pro victu et servitio, vicarii parochis in cumulo cedant fructus missarum pinguiorum, et vicariis tribuatur stipendium ordinarium missae lectae.'—Ad 3 vero declaratum est consuetudinem sustineri qua 'vicarii omnes fere missas ad intentionem parochi celebrare debent, qui eis praestet victum et servitium, dum ipsi ex aerario ecclesiae determinatam obtinent pensione.'

Age porro: responsa ad 3 in Treviren. et ad 1 in Bredan. solvunt casum difficiliorem, quia ibi pars stipendii retinebatur; decreta autem, propter maius periculum abusionum, magis expresse prohibent ne pars stipendii retineatur quam totum. Cf. responsa H. S. C. 1625; 23 dec. 1697; Bullam *Quanta cura*, Benedicti XIV, 30 iun. 1741, et ipsum can. 840, § 1.

In Bredan. autem, responsum ad 3, casum nostro omnino similem contemplatur. Ratio autem responsi istius haec a S. C. Secretario datur, quia decretum *Ut debita* 11 maii 1904, hoc unum vetat, ne ope stipendiorum commercium quodpiam exerceatur, pactionem autem propositam in nullius commercii subsidium vergere.

Novimus autem, ex c. 6, nn. 2° et 3°, in partibus quae cum iure veteri congruunt, canones ex iure antiquo et receptis interpretationibus aestimandos esse: canones porro 827 et 840, § 2, cum iure superiore congruunt. Immo etiam minus severe sonant quam decr. *Ut debita*, quo vigente, responsum in Bredan. datum est. Etenim, in decreto *Ut debita*, n. 9, eleemosynae missarum in alias res commutari aut imminui stricte prohibebantur, dum cc. 827 et 840 volunt tantum ut omnis etiam species negotiationis aut mercaturae absit et integra missarum stipendia transmittantur.

Scrupulus autem quem idem Administrator Apostolicus manifestat, sitne satis spontaneus et liber vicariorum consensus, facile removetur: liber est consensus, quatenus officium vicarii libere acceperint, cum congrua retributione, cuius forma, consuetudine definita, ab ipsis non ignorabatur; nulla autem praesens lex spontaneum consensum in huiusmodi pactionem postulat. Ceterum, in Bredan. similis consuetudinis necessitas vicarios premebat.

Unum tamen observandum superest. Oblator pinguioris stipendii hac etiam spe ad liberalitatem moveri videtur obtinendi, ex grato animo sacerdotis, celebrationem ferventiorum et, fortasse, etiam superadditas preces. Spes ista autem supradicta pactione tollitur. Nec praeterea spernendum est quod a nonnullis (cfr. *Monitore eccles.*, 1919, pag. 92, n. 18) circa can. 827 observatum est, in eo videlicet non solum omne genus negotiationis et mercaturae prohiberi circa stipendium missarum, sed etiam inculcari ut quaelibet vel *apparentia aut suspicio* rei sollicitate amoveatur, prout insinuat in canone verbum illud *etiam*, ibi: 'A stipe Missarum quaelibet *etiam species* negotiationis vel mercaturae omnino arceatur.' Quare praeferenda sane videtur supra relata ordinatio ab ipso administratore facta anno 1918, in parochorum congregatione; idque eo magis quod vicariis gratior erit.

RESOLUTIO.—Die 10 ianuarii 1920, S. Congregatio Concilii, in plenariis Eññorum ac Rñorum Patrum comitiis, rescribendum super relatis precibus censuit: *Propositam consuetudinem remunerandi coadiutores vicarios tolerari posse. Et ad mentem.* Mens autem est, quod 'Administrator Apostolicus operam navet ut in praxi ponatur statutum dioecesanum vi cuius "parochi cooperatoribus suis mercedem solvant 25 ponderum, adiecto quotidie missae stipendio integro iuxta taxam ita ut honorarium menstruum summae 50 ponderum coaequetur.'"'

Facta autem de praemissis SSñno Dño Nostro Benedicto divina Providentia PP. XV relatione per infrascriptum S. Congregationis Secretarium in audientia insequentis diei, Sanctitas Sua datam resolutionem approbare et confirmare dignata est.

I. MORI, *Secretarius.*

LIST OF FEASTS SUPPRESSED IN THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH

(December 28, 1919)

SACRA CONGREGATIO CONCILII

INDEX FESTORUM IN UNIVERSA ECCLESIA SUPPRESSORUM.

Statim ac per responsum diei 17 februarii 1918 a Pontificia Commissione ad Codicis canones authentice interpretandos declaratum fuit, nihil per Codicem iuris canonici immutatum esse a disciplina hucusque vigente quoad dies festos suppressos, quibus in universa Ecclesia obligatio adnexa est missam pro populo applicandi, quidam locorum Ordinarii ab hac S. Congregatione Concilii suppliciter postularunt ut, ad commodiorem quorum interest notitiam, index festorum in universa Ecclesia suppressorum de quibus agitur denuo auctoritative publici iuris

feret. His itaque votis annuens, haec S. Congregatio, ad normam Constitutionis Urbani VIII *Universa per orbem* diei 13 septembris 1642, indicem qui sequitur festorum suppressorum, quibus, iuxta praescripta canonum 339, § 1, et 466, § 1, Codicis, in universa Ecclesia inest onus litandi Sacrum pro populo, edendum statuit, idest :

Feriae II et III post Dominicam Resurrectionis D. N. I. C., et Pentecostes ;

Dies Inventionis S. Crucis ;

Dies Purificationis B. Mariae Virginis ;

Dies Annuntiationis B. Mariae Virginis ;

Dies Nativitatis B. Mariae Virginis ;

Dies Dedicationis S. Michaelis S. Archangeli ;

Dies Nativitatis S. Ioannis Baptistae ;

Dies Ss. Apostolorum : Andreae, Iacobi, Ioannis, Thomae, Philippi et Iacobi, Bartholomaei, Matthaei, Simonis et Iudae, Mathiae ;

Dies S. Stephani Protomartyris ;

Dies Ss. Innocentium ;

Dies S. Laurentii Martyris ;

Dies S. Silvestri Papae ;

Dies S. Annae, matris B. M. V. ;

Dies S. Patroni Regni ;

Dies S. Patroni loci.

Datum Romae, ex Secretaria S. Congregationis Concilii, die 28 decembris 1919.

D. CARD. SBARRETTI, *Praefectus*.

I. MORI, *Secretarius*.

L. ✠ S.

**DECREE OF THE SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE COUNCIL
DEFINING THE LAW FOR THE SECULAR CLERGY IN RE
GARD TO THE WEARING OF A BEARD**

(January 10, 1920)

S. CONGREGATIO CONCILII
WRATISLAVIEN. ET ALIARUM.

LICENTIAE GESTANDI BARBAM

Die 10 ianuarii 1920

SPECIES FACTI.—Eñus Episcopus Wratislaviensis, litteris diei 2 elapsi septembris ad hanc S. C. datis, quae sequuntur exposuit : ‘In variis particularibus casibus S. Congregatio Concilii, ad preces a me commendas, hoc et praecedentibus annis, uni alterive ex mea dioecesi sacerdotibus licentiam gestandi barbam ob rationes speciales concessit. Nunc vero orta est inter canonistas in Germania controversia, sitne hac in re disciplinae mutatio inducta per statuta Codicis Iuris Canonici : ex qua auctorum controversia iam oriri incipit varietas in praxi.’

‘Asserunt quidam auctores, canonem 136, qui capillorum simplicem cultum permittit et de abradenda barba omnino *tacet*, libertatem gestandi barbam modestae formae omnibus saecularibus clericis concessisse, non-

obstante consuetudine per totam Germaniã vigente, quae hucusque vim obligantem habuit. In Germania enim barbã gestare vetitum est partim per Concilia provincialia partim per consuetudinem centenarium superantem. Quo vero ad legislationem dioecesanã, alii asserunt, episcopum decernere posse, prohibitionem in sua dioecesi hucusque vigentem firmam et obligantem manere; alii volunt, episcopum nihil iure communi expresse permissum prohibere posse, nisi ipsi sacri canones id ei aperte concedant vel Sanctae Sedis auctoritate prohibitio confirmetur.'

'Episcopi nuper Fuldae in conferentiam congregati unanimiter censuerunt, vigentem hucusque prohibitionem non esse tollendam. Optandum certe est, ne in hac re, licet minime pertineat ad essentialia status clericalis virtutes, varietate indecenti admiratio aliqua in populo oriatur. Idecirco reverenter peto a S. Congregatione: *An Codice Iuris Canonici data sit quibuscumque clericis saecularibus libertas gestandi barbã, et, respective, an Episcopis competat prohibitionem hucusque vigentem in suo robore sustinere pro dioecesibus suis.*'

ANIMADVERSIONES —Manifestum est vel ex praemissis controversiam non aliud fundamentum habere posse, quam in can. 6, n. 6, ubi edicitur: 'Si qua ceteris disciplinãribus *legibus*, quae hucusque viguerunt, *nec explicite nec implicite* in Codice contineatur, ea vim omnem amisisse dicenda est'—Ut autem canon hic ad rem trahi possit, oportet omnino, non solum ut agatur de vera edita *lege*, atque ut haec ne *implicitè* quidem (praesertim habita ratione can. 20) in Codice contineatur; verum etiam, prout eruitur ex can. 22, oportet ut lex de qua agitur non fuerit lex specialis, pro particularibus locorum (ac temporum) circumstantiis lata, sed lex generalis prorsus, perpetuo et ubique valitura. Ita, post promulgatum Codicem, non obstante huius silentio, declaratione S. C. S. Officii d. 20-22 martii 1918 [*A. A. S.*, X, 136], sustinentur leges et provisiones generales datae contra modernismum, quousque hic error grassaverit; itemque ex declaratione S. C. de Religiosis 15 iulii 1919 [*A. A. S.*, XI, 321], sustinentur decreta circa religiosorum servitium militare, ubi et usquedum circumstantiae hanc necessitatem subire coegerint; et generatim, prouti in praefatis decretis continetur, 'praescriptiones et leges natura sua temporarias ac transitorias' vel quae 'ad circumstantias locorum et temporum habent rationem' quum 'generalis legis rationem non induant,' certum est eas non cadere sub abrogatione can. 6, num. 6, praescripta.

At vero in casu de quo agitur, id est quoad morem non gestandi barbã, animadverti potest: Primo, non agi in casu de vera *lege* ecclesiastica generali prohibitiva. Canones qui ad rem citari solent, v. g. cap. 7 *de vita et honest. Clericorum*, III, 9, ex communi doctorum sententia ita accipiuntur ut solummodo prohibeant barbã nutrire more saecularium studiose compositam; epistolae etiam RR. PP. (v. g. Gregorii VII ad Archiepiscopum Calaritanum; acta conc. Lateran. a. 1514 sub Leone X) tantummodo testantur pristinum morem et institutionem Romanae Ecclesiae, quem a contrariis abusibus defendunt. Nullibi autem reperitur vera et generalis lex morem gestandi barbã ubique et futuris temporibus perpetuo interdicens; haec vero deficientia nonnisi prudentiam

commendat Legislatoris ecclesiastici, quam laudem nec noviter datum Codicem demereri oportebat. Fieri etenim poterit aliquando ut a more barbirasii recedendum fortasse sit, prout vel post Tridentinam Synodum, usque ad exitum saec. xvii, recessum fuisse omnes norunt: nec quemquam fugere potest quam incommodum sit, solemniter datam et firmatam in Codice legem, abrogare.

Secundo, et consequenter: mos iste barbam radendi, prouti historicae eius vicissitudines ostendunt, nonnisi *consuetudine* probatis nempe regionum moribus, quandoque iure particulari firmatis, universalis evasit, saltem quoad locorum circumstantias: quamobrem, quatenus in Codice recipi poterat (idest *implicite* et hypothetice, non absolute) satis receptus videtur ubi Codex, non absimiliter a Concilii Tridentini sanctione (cap. 6, sess. xiv de ref.) 'decentem habitum ecclesiasticum, *secundum legitimas locorum consuetudines et Ordinarii loci praescripta*' clericos deferre iussit, immo universam hanc materiam de externo corporis cultu, salva quidem necessaria unitate disciplinae et conformitate, ad praefatam normam consuetudinis redigendam voluit (c. 136, § 1). Ceterum, absolum prorsus censi debet eorum commentum qui volunt in ipso num. 6, can. 6, abrogatas esse *consuetudines* generales de quibus Codex simpliciter sileat, quasi Legislator benignius egerit erga consuetudines vigentes *contra* canones (cfr. can. 5, coll. cum can. 30), quam erga consuetudines *secundum* aut *praeter* legem.

Tertio: praescindendo a generali praescripto legis, dubium esse nequit quin in casu particularis lex in loco vigens prohibensque barbam gestare, pro norma sumenda sit, non solum quia, ex iam demonstratis, silentio Codicis potius recepta quam exclusa apparet, sed etiam ex explicito praescripto can. 20, ubi docetur: 'si certa de re desit expressum praescriptum legis sive generalis sive particularis' unde pronum est inferre, silente lege generali, sequendum esse particularis legis praescriptum.—Fortius id firmatur, si consideretur praescriptum hoc particularis legis, in casu, conforme omnino esse universali in praesenti Ecclesiae latinae usui et consuetudini, prouti in comperto est: ut autem contra universalem consuetudinem usus oppositus alicubi introducatur, nec sufficere Ordinariorum auctoritatem, sed requiri saltem tacitum supremi Ecclesiae Pastoris consensum. Praestat ad rem litteras referre quas Nuntius Apostolicus apud aulam Bavariae sub die 16 iunii 1863 dedit nomine rec. mem. Pii PP. IX ad Archiepiscopum Monacen. et Frisingen., quae ita sonant:

'Ad aures Beatissimi Patris pervenit in nonnullis Bavariae dioecibus adesse ecclesiasticos viros qui, novitatis vel potius levitatis spiritu perducti, usum iamdiu insoletum barbam gestandi iterum introducere conantur. Quidquid de anteactis saeculis dici debeat, in confesso est modernam et vigentem Ecclesiae latinae disciplinam huic usui prorsus obstare, *novamque consuetudinem, ut legitime introducatur, necessario requirere assensum saltem tacitum supremi Ecclesiae Pastoris.* Hic autem huiusmodi novitatem omnino se reprobare declarat: eo vel magis quod tristissimis hisce temporibus spiritus omnia innovandi haud paucos seducat, et ex una novitate ad aliam facile procedi possit. Quae cum ita sint,

placuit Sanctitati Suae mihi in mandatis dare, ut omnibus Bavariae Antistitibus suo nomine significarem, ab ipsis omnimode curandum esse non solum ut praedictus usus expresse prohibeatur, sed etiam ut disciplinae unitas et perfecta cum Ecclesia Romana, omnium magistra, conformitas in omnibus, ac proinde in habitu et tonsura clericorum servetur, vel, si opus sit, restauretur, ac qualiscumque nova consuetudo vitetur *quae supremo Ecclesiae Capiti apprime cognita atque ab ipso probata non sit.*

'Dum haec Excellentiae Tuae Ill^mae et Rev^mae Beatissimi Patris iussu ac nomine scribo, illam rogo ut me de huius epistolae receptione instructum reddens, mihi etiam indicare velit, quid Excellentia Tua opportunum facere existimaverit, ut praedictus usus, si forte in ista dioecesi manifestari incoepit, extemplo relinquatur, atque nemini unquam in mentem veniat illum introducere.' ¹

RESOLUTIO.—Porro, relatis in plenario conventu Sacrae Congregationis Concilii, die 10 ianuarii 1920, precibus E^mi Episcopi Wratislaviensis, E^mi Patres rescribendum censuere: *Negative ad primam partem; affirmative ad alteram.*

Factaque de praemissis relatione S^mo D^{no} Nostro Benedicto, Div. Provid. PP. XV, in audientia insequenti die infrascripto Secretario concessa, Sanctitas Sua resolutionem E^morum Patrum approbare et confirmare dignata est.

I. MORI, *Secretarius.*

A SCHISMATICAL UNION OF CERTAIN BOHEMIAN PRIESTS IS CONDEMNED

(January 15, 1920)

ACTA SS. CONGREGATIONUM

SUPREMA SACRA CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII

DECRETUM

SCHISMATICA NONNULLORUM E CLERO BOHEMO SACERDOTUM

COALITIO DAMNATUR.

Nunciatum est Sanctae Sedi nonnullos e clero bohemo sacerdotes, quorum impulsu insanae iam antea postulationes eidem Sanctae Sedi oblatae fuerant, postremis hisce diebus illegitime congregatos, schismatico ausu, defectionem ab Ecclesia Romana, aliarum omnium ecclesiarum matre et magistra et catholica unitatis centro, proclamasse atque in nationalem, quam vocant, ecclesiam coaluisse.

Tantum facinus Suprema haec Sacra Congregatio Sancti officii, cui fidem moresque tutandi onus incombis, ex animo detestata, muneris sui esse ducit praefatam ecclesiam seu schismaticam coalitionem, absque ulla mora reprobare, damnare atque anathematizare, ut reapse praesenti Decreto, nomine et auctoritate S^mi D. N. Benedicti XV, reprobat, damnat atque anathematizat, insimul declarans supradictos sacerdotes, cuiusque sint gradus, conditionis et dignitatis, iam ipso facto excommunicationem

¹ *Ex Collectione Lacensi*, tom. iii. p. 547, n. 4.

incurrisse ad praescriptum canonis 2384 speciali modo Sedi Apostolicae reservatam, et si forte (quod Deus avertat) in ea contumaciter insordescant omnibus, aliis per Sacros Canones statutis poenis atque inhabilitatibus quamprimum plectendos fore.

Curent autem pro suo munere Sacri Bohemorum Antistites praesens Decretum ad fidelium sibi commissorum notitiam, quo efficaciori modo in Domino censuerint, statim deducere eosque a schismatica factioni quomodocumque adherendo deterrere, ne forte et iidem fideles in eandem incidant damnationum.

Datum Romae ex aedibus S. Officii, die 15 ianuarii 1920.

ALOISIUS CASTELLANO, *Supremae S. C. S. Off. Notarius.*

LETTER FROM THE SACRED CONGREGATION FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE FAITH PRESCRIBING A COLLECTION ON BEHALF OF THE AFRICAN MISSIONS

(September 29, 1919)

SACRA CONGREGATIO DE PROPAGANDA FIDE
EPISTOLA

AD UNIVERSOS SACRORUM ANTISTITES DE STIPE COLLIGENDA PRO NIGRITIS
IN AFRICA.

Ill^me ac Rev^me Domine.

Summus Pontifex Leo XIII, gloriosae recordationis, nigritarum in Africa miseratus aerumnas, qui, in servitum abducti, supremam animi atque corporis patiebantur iacturam, per encyclicas Litteras, ad universos sacrorum Antistites catholici orbis die 20 novembris 1890 datas, eorum caritati summopere commendavit opus a Se susceptum pro nigritarum in Africa tuenda libertate, iisque ab ethnica superstitione eruendis. Qua super re provide constituit ut, *quotannis, qua die in quibusque locis Epiphaniae Domini celebrantur mysteria, in subsidium memorati operis pecunia stipis instar corrogetur.*

Non defuit Summi Pontificis desiderio pia fidelium voluntas, elleemosynisque ad id collectis non mediocriter sacrae Missiones in Africa recreatae sunt. Verum, labente annorum decursu, evenit ut apud nonnullas dioeceses excidisse videatur pontificii mandati memoria aut languidiori studio iussa serventur, dum, e contra, aliis multis in locis, adnidente Episcoporum zelo, inducta praxis, etiam flagrante bello, stetit hactenus ac viguit.

Quapropter haec S. Congregatio, cui dicti operis demandata est cura, opportunum censuit per praesentes litteras apud universos Praesules enixe instare ut velint, in propria quisque dioecesi, sacro Epiphaniae die, iuxta pontificia praescripta, pecuniam pro Africae nigritis in singulis ecclesiis et sacellis colligendam curare, iis additis hortamentis, quibus fidelium studia ad tam nobile opus excitentur.

Qua quidem occasione commemorandum etiam venit, eiusdem Pontificis iussu constitutum esse ut *pecunia, praedicta die collecta in ecclesiis*

et sacellis,—Romam mittatur ad Sacrum Consilium christiano nomini propagando, cuius munus est cam pecuniam inter singulas Missiones aequa proportione partiendi.

Itaque sine speciali Apostolicae Sedis dispensatione, non ad particulares quaslibet pro redimendis captivis constitutas Societates, sed ad hanc ipsam Sacram Congregationem Fidei Propagandae corrogata, festo die Epiphaniae, ad id operis pecunia mittenda est.

Porro, cum tot ac tantis, praesertim post immanc bellum, sacrarum Missionum necessitatibus consulere oporteat, non dubito quin Amplitudo Tua, quod ad dioecesim sibi commissam spectat, suas partes libenti animo expleat.

Interim Deum ex corde precor ut Te diu sospitem reddat.

Romae, ex aedibus S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, die 29 septembris 1919.

Addictissimus

G. M. CARD. VAN ROSSUM, *Praefectus.*

C. LAURENTI, *Secretarius.*

L. ✠ S.

REVIEWS AND NOTES

IRELAND IN FICTION: A GUIDE TO IRISH NOVELS, ROMANCES AND FOLK-LORE, By Stephen J. Brown, S.J. Dublin: Maunsel & Co., Ltd.

THE author laid the foundation of this monumental work by publishing in 1910 a *Reader's Guide to Irish Fiction*. The idea was to furnish notes on books of all kinds dealing with Irish subjects, whether written by Irish writers, printed and published in Ireland, or not. Hence a classified list of novels, tales, etc., depicting some phase of Irish life or some episode of Irish history, was put together with descriptive and some biographical notes. The first edition of *Ireland in Fiction* was destroyed by fire during the Easter Rising in Dublin in 1916. The new edition has been improved in many ways, and brought up to date. Further information and notes about the books have been added, the biographical notes have been enlarged and are given before the book notes, and the titles of the books have been continuously numbered throughout. Over 1,700 works are listed. The appendices are considerably enlarged and corrected. They are invaluable to readers and writers. They contain (a) useful works of reference; (b) publishers and series; (c) classified lists of Irish fiction, according to the period, subject, etc., Irish historical fiction, Gaelic epic and romantic literature, legends and folk-tales, fairy-tales for children, Catholic clerical life, humorous books, and fiction for boys; (d) Irish fiction in periodicals, defunct and current, and lastly an exhaustive index of titles and subjects of books. The whole matter is dealt with in 362 pages.

With the exception of Mr. Baker's works, there has been no attempt to deal with Irish fiction as a whole until Father Brown set himself the colossal task. How necessary such a work is may be gleaned from an inspection of his book. A *Guide* was indeed a crying necessity. How many books on Ireland are a true reflex of Irish character and life? How many authors are competent to deal with either? What books picture the 'stage-Irishman' and what the real Irishman? These are important questions for anyone desirous of obtaining information as to the class of books on Ireland to read. One requires a book giving true historical background, another a book portraying real historical characters, another a book showing an insight into the soul of the Irish people, depicting its emotions, its aspirations, its ideals. So many people have tried or pretended to try all these, and how few have succeeded! Prejudice and want of knowledge have caused their failure. Yet, even the failures are valuable as a storehouse of suggestion, fact and fancy for later and better writers. Would it be better to allow these failures to pass into merited oblivion?

Father Brown thinks not. 'Booksellers and publishers will naturally continue to push such books, because it is their business to do so, and the public will continue to buy them because it has ordinarily no other means of knowing their contents than the publisher's announcement, the title, or—the cover. A *Guide* would, therefore, surely shirk an important portion of its task if it excluded worthless books, and thereby failed to put readers on their guard.'

The chief object in Father Brown's notes to the books is to help the student of things Irish. A certain amount of criticism is needed. It is given truthfully, fearlessly, concisely. A clear idea of the books is given, an appreciation or characterization also. All this is needed from a Catholic as well as from a national and historical point of view. How many of our modern Irish play-writers and novelists have seen their subjects from *within* or have *lived* in them? How many are like Kickham 'of warm, tender, homely heart—a man born and bred one of the people about whom he writes?' In his *Knocknagow* there is realism of the best kind. He shows the closest observation of human nature and of individual peculiarities. His descriptions are full of exquisite humour and pathos, his details of peasant life quite photographic in fidelity. He knew thoroughly and loved intensely his own place and people. He realized and sympathized with the emotions and ideals of the Irish soul, could laugh or cry with his characters. Put him beside Lefanu, Lever, Lover, Morgan, 'Rita,' Thackeray, Carleton, etc. The comparison is odious. In these we find rank bigotry poking fun at priests and people, bad taste, coarseness, perversion of facts, imperfect qualification, sometimes incompetency to write of Irish affairs and characters. Many of them knew only one class of peasants well—servants and retainers, and knew them only in relation to their masters. Many of them create a wrong impression by pretending that their characters are typical of the average peasant. Many of them wrote to amuse readers, not to depict Irish life, or to depict it with an eye on what the English reader would expect it to be. No doubt some of them, such as Carleton, have written some of the noblest and purest stories in our literature, some of the most complete and authentic pictures of peasant life, some of the best historical Irish novels. The question is, do we want humorous, romantic, ideal, or realistic novels? Do we want a mere story or do we look for truth in character and setting? Do we want a Canon Sheehan or a 'Gerald O'Donovan,' a Katharine Tynan or a 'Rita,' a Kickham or a Lever, a Brian O'Higgins or a James Stephens, a Father Fitzgerald or a Carleton, a Lennox Robinson or a Lady Gregory, a Gerald Griffin or a Samuel Lover?

We shall find material for answering those questions in the notes to the books in *Ireland in Fiction*. We shall find there the defects, the merits, the peculiarities, the eccentricities, the competence, the incompetence, the prejudice, the sincerity, the vulgarity, the moral tone, the ignorance the insight of the authors. If you wish to know the true and the false portrayals of Irish history, life, character and soul, to give a present or a prize of a book in school or out of it, stock a shop or a library in school, college or parish, if you wish to lecture on or to write Irish fiction, you will find in

this *Guide* all the information necessary. You have a complete (as far as space goes), a clear, unprejudiced, account of over 1,700 books.

We cannot praise too highly the gigantic work of Father Brown. We cannot over-estimate its importance. It is a masterpiece of patience, prudence, erudition and skill. It is an encyclopaedia of Irish literature. There are few writers of note included in the *Guide* about whose works he cannot speak from first-hand knowledge. He has had the co-operation of learned and loyal friends in his work of genius. He has laid the basis of a history of Anglo-Irish literature. The future writers of Irish fiction will bless the labours and learning of Father Brown.

M. R.

A PATRIOT PRIEST. By Rev. D. Riordan, C.C. Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son.

THE subject of this excellent little work is Father Casey, parish priest of Abbeyfeale, who died in 1907. The author describes the character of the man and the stirring times in which he moved as a prominent figure. No doubt many such books might be written of similar great priestly figures of the time, but they have not been written, and Father Riordan has done useful work in sketching the career of this stalwart Irish priest and patriot.

To the young generation of Irishmen who have received a liberal education in well-equipped schools and colleges, to the young men who peacefully enjoy and work on their own farms, this little book will be an inspiration and also a reminder of the trials and of the miseries of their grandfathers in middle of the 19th century, in their fight for education, religion, and land. The book is, in fact, a miniature history of Ireland of that time. We are introduced to the very beginnings of the Land League, of which Father Casey was one of the first and strongest promoters. We get a graphic description of the servility of the tenants, hat in hand, appearing before the all-powerful and tyrannical land-agent. But Father Casey taught his people self-respect, self-reliance, and independence. The appearance of the tenants, hat on head, before the agent seemed a sacrilege to the latter, but was the symbol of the new order introduced by Father Casey. The sad story of the numerous evictions, of the miseries of the people, and the superhuman efforts of Father Casey to provide huts and temperance hall, to organize amusements, are all sympathetically and faithfully described. We get a glimpse into the generous, strong, yet boyish personality of the devoted pastor. He was a model priest, both as curate and as parish priest. His life-work is a monument of what one earnest, sympathetic, and patriotic priest can do. He never ceased to blend religion with sound social work as the remedy for all our national ills. For forty years he laboured to uplift his people and to make them true children of God and of Country. He was a pioneer of the language movement and strove to impress on his people the truth of the maxim, 'No language—no country.'

The author shows intimate acquaintance with the conditions of Ireland

in the fifties, and with the whole question of land tenure and with the various Acts passed for the benefit of the tenants. The whole treatment of the subject is really good and instructive, full of useful and interesting historical matter. One incident of an eviction on the farm of one of Father Casey's parishioners is so described that it agrees in every particular with an Irish drama, 'The Eviction,' that long ago, as a boy, we were thrilled by. We really think that the dramatist must have been acquainted with the evictions on the O'Grady Estate.

The author has done justice to a good priest and a valiant Irishman. He has written a very readable story in graceful, easy style. He has made the present generation acquainted with a state of things which it is well to remember, and he displays a spirit that is correct and just and that is inspired with true patriotic ideals.

M. R.

FATHER MATURIN: A MEMOIR WITH SELECTED LETTERS. By Maisie Ward. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

THE importance of Father Maturin's conversion to Catholicism ranks next to that of Cardinal Newman and of Cardinal Manning. It is therefore but fitting that some account of his life and work should be given to the Catholic world. His life was rather a hidden one. The materials, then, for a biography are rather scant. They have been supplied by information given by friends and by the letters he wrote to those seeking his counsel in religious matters. From these Miss Ward has compiled the beautiful book before us. She has accomplished a great and laborious task and deserves a full measure of praise and thanks for her learned and sympathetic Memoir. She weaves into the Memoir any letters of biographical interest left by Father Maturin, and thus gives us an insight into the genial, saintly, and lovable character of this accomplished parson and priest. She analyses also his philosophy of faith, the key-note of which was 'to build up rather than pull down.' That note resounds in his books, sermons, and letters. 'The shreds and tatters of truth already grasped must cover the soul's nakedness as it clothes itself in the new garment.'

Father Maturin's life was one of intense religious interest. As a parson in England he felt the distractions of society, and longed for the seclusion of the Cowley Convent, which early in his career he entered. Even there his counsel in religious matters was eagerly sought by his friends. During his missionary career in America he established himself as a great preacher, and won over thousands to Anglicanism. Yet for ten years before his conversion his life was one of mental torture. He longed to take the plunge but the nearer he came to the brink the more exasperating became the torture and the doubts. He always considered himself as belonging to Rome. 'In coming to Rome,' he said, 'I felt that I simply translated myself to where I belonged. I believe practically what I have always believed, with the addition of the divine authority of the Papacy. That kept me back for a long time.'

When he came over he was fifty years of age, and yet he tells us he felt perfectly at home. Many converts had told him of their sense of

loneliness and of their being shocked at Italian religious customs. His reply was always severe and straight, pointing out the defects in their faith. 'I have got to love Rome more and more,' he wrote, 'and the Italian ways—when they *are* devout I think their ways of public devotions are the ideal ways; there is a lack of self-consciousness and an abandonment impossible to reserved and self-conscious English people. There is a completeness of conviction all around one that is contagious. I think one has but to cross the threshold and enter to find conviction pour in through every sense and faculty. I have found in Rome all that the heart can desire.' It was his warm Celtic temperament that drew him to the homely religious ways of the Romans.

After his ordination in Rome, at the age of 53, he returned to London and did missionary work, especially by preaching missions throughout the diocese. The Diocesan Missionary Society had been recently established by Cardinal Vaughan. Then as the preaching of missions, etc., began to tell on his health he was given the position of college chaplain to Oxford. This gave him great opportunities of coming into contact with the material that he was at home with. He used them well and profitably. But the war put a speedy end to his welcome work. Oxford became deserted. He was invited to America to preach the Lenten Course, and on returning to England he went down in the ill-fated *Lusitania*, sacrificing himself for his brethren, May 7, 1915, in his 68th year.

The second and greater part of Miss Ward's book consists of Father Maturin's letters on religious questions. It is in these that we see really the manner of man he was. They are grouped, not chronologically, but according to the subject-matter. The dates are given but not the names of the persons addressed. They are witnesses to a rare depth of thought, vigour of mind, and force of conviction. Many of them were written when he was a Cowley Father. His experience of society and his study of men, joined to a rare psychological insight and depth of human sympathy, made him a useful instrument for good. The number of conversions he made by his letters and interviews God alone knows. He was always ready to write, but readier to grant interviews, so as to speak heart to heart. He could enter into the situation immediately. His own painful experience had made him a sympathetic listener and a skilful guide. He was not a controversialist or a proselytiser. He strongly condemned all haste. He emphasized, as a Cowley Father, that conversion to Christianity did not mean adherence to the Anglican Church, but that Rome also had her claims, and insisted that loss of faith in the Anglican Church did not necessarily mean faith in the Roman Church. His insistence on essentials and fundamentals was always correct and thorough. His letters on the validity of Anglican Orders are most interesting, coming especially from one who was so much affected by it, and who was wrongly suspected of leanings to the Anglican claim.

Father Maturin held strong views about the movement towards the Catholic Church in England. He boldly told Cardinal Vaughan that he, the Cardinal, was the chief obstacle that kept the people back, as he had seemed in his public utterances to cast doubt on their good faith, and to set up a

line of intransigence that only served to hurt them unnecessarily and prevent them from drawing nearer to the Church. Of the High Church position in particular the view of the two men was diametrically opposed, the Cardinal regarding it a dangerous and specious substitute keeping men back from the Church, Father Maturin looking on it as a teacher of Catholic truth educating them gradually to receive the fullness of truth in the Church.

The book is one that will appeal to various classes of readers—to his own friends and admirers, who will get a fuller and welcome insight into his lovable and straightforward personality, and to all seekers after the True Church, who will find the sympathetic and safe guidance of one who underwent the same agonies of soul and who after years of conflict and in the autumn of his life could say, 'I have found in Rome all that the heart can desire.' The ordinary reader will find it interesting and instructive reading on many points, and cannot but be edified by the nobility, sincerity, and spirituality of soul of a great son of Ireland who became a great asset to the Catholic Church.

M. R.

BOOKS, ETC., RECEIVED

- America* : A Catholic Review (March).
The Ecclesiastical Review (March). U.S.A.
The Rosary Magazine (March). Somerset, Ohio.
The Catholic World (March). New York.
The Austral Light (February). Melbourne.
The Irish Monthly (March). Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.
The Catholic Bulletin (March). Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.
The Month (March). London : Longmans.
Revue Pratique d'Apologétique (March). Paris : Beauchesne.
Revue du Clergé Français (March). Paris : Letouzey et Ané.
Revue des Jeunes (March). Paris : 3 Rue de Luynes.
The Fortnightly Review (March). St. Louis, Mo.
The Lamp (March). Garrison, N.Y.
La Documentation Catholique (March). Paris : 5 Rue Bayard.
The Dublin Review (April-June). London : Burns, Oates & Washbourne.
Gregorianum (Vol. i. Fasc. 1). Roma : Pontif. Universita Gregoriana.
The Annals of Our Lady of the Sacred Heart (March-April). Cork : Sacred Heart College.
Missionary Record of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate. Dublin : Brindley and Sons.
Our Boys (Vol. vi. No. 9). Dublin : Eason & Sons.
A Garland of Our Lady. By A Member of the Ursuline Community, Sligo. London : Burns, Oates & Washbourne.

THE CHIEFTAINS OF FERMANAGH

BY REV. PAUL WALSH

I

THE first part of a *History of Enniskillen* was issued about a year ago. This work is to be completed in three volumes. The author is W. Copeland Trimble, editor of the *Impartial Reporter*, and further described on the title-page as 'author of the "Historical Records of the 27th Inniskilling Regiment" and "Lyrics of Lough Erne"; Justice of the Peace; and Fellow of the Institute of Journalists.' To these imposing qualifications, it may now be added, that the writer on a recent occasion¹ desiderated the re-appearance of Oliver Cromwell to relieve the woes of Ireland. He tells us in his Preface that, the need of a history of Enniskillen being long apparent, he has set himself the task of supplying the want. 'My great object,' he writes, 'is to rescue and preserve before I pass away—and with me many materials which I only possess—information concerning local history,' and he further assures us that notwithstanding many difficulties, such as the 'numerous engagements and employment of a strenuous career,' he is induced to proceed 'lest some of the materials which have been gathered together, and sketches and pictures, should be completely lost to posterity.'

Notwithstanding this announcement, the *History of Enniskillen* must be pronounced a failure. A more faulty production could scarcely be thrown together. Lack of order, want of information, perversions, repetitions, bad grammar, worse spelling and style, and dozens of misprints, disfigure the whole book. Occasionally one meets with remarks which are downright silly; for example: 'The Abbey of Lisgoole had a character and history of its

¹ 'The *Impartial Reporter* in a leading article says: "Ireland may have to be reconquered. . . . A modern Oliver Cromwell is needed, but we do not find him in the Prime Minister, who admires men like the Protector, but will not imitate him." '—*Irish Independent*, March 26, 1920.

own.' What abbey in Ireland, or elsewhere, has not had a 'history of its own'? At p. 18 we learn that 'the *Annals of Ulster* contain a number of references to Lisgool, which are more for the ecclesiastical student than the ordinary reader.' In the paragraph immediately preceding this statement the writer gives a list which purports to be a collection of entries from the *Four Masters*, and which is of exactly the same nature as the *Annals of Ulster* references here described as of no interest to the ordinary reader. One can only conclude that Mr. Trimble has never read the *Annals of Ulster*, or else that no edition of that chronicle finds a place on Mr. Trimble's book-shelves. There is, however, one feature of his work which has some value; the book has about a dozen illustrations, and these will be of use and interest to the future historian of Enniskillen. But even in regard to these the author displays the same carelessness which characterizes the rest of the volume. Page 59 has a reference to a 'picture' which is inserted in the book as far back as page 4, while there is no entry of it at all in the List of Illustrations at the beginning.

It would require a long volume to expose in detail the errors that swarm in Mr. Trimble's pages. After the manner of the colonist historians, he lays great stress on the treachery and the love of killing one another which the Irish chieftains are said uniformly to display. The stock vocabulary of that school abounds in terms like 'natives,' 'savage,' 'barbarous,' 'nomadic,' 'wigwams,' 'aboriginal,' etc. A passage from the *Irish Times*, quoted by Mrs. Alice Stopford Green in one of her books, is typical of the attitude of this class of historian: 'If the Nationalists want for ever to live in the glories of the past and to harp upon them, why do they not go far enough back . . . to the time when they ate their grandmothers . . . and indulged in all sorts of hellish rites.' The advocates of the 'savage' theory of Irish history have been met and answered by the distinguished authoress just mentioned, by Eoin Mac Neill, by Kuno Meyer, by Heinrich Zimmer, and others,¹ and I do not propose wasting space and ink in this connexion on Mr. Trimble of the *Impartial Reporter*. I shall confine myself in the remarks that follow to showing his incapacity

¹ See Alice S. Green, *The Old Irish World; The Making of Ireland and its Undoing; Irish National Tradition*; MacNeill, *Phases of Irish History*; Meyer, *Ancient Irish Poetry; Learning in Ireland*; Zimmer, *The Irish Element in Mediaeval Culture*.

for the performance of the task he has undertaken, and to pointing out some of the blunders that disfigure his opening pages. I shall then, from reliable sources, give a sketch of the Succession of the Chieftains of Fermanagh, a subject on which our author touches with disastrous results.

Page 1. 'A county town was needed for the Maguire territory; which had been converted in 1569 by Sir Henry Sydney, the Irish Lord Deputy of Queen Elizabeth, into a county under the name of Fermanagh.'—This statement is wrong, for the county of Fermanagh was not created until many years after Sir Henry Sidney's time. Mr. Litton Falkiner, who made a special study on the origin of the Irish counties, says: 'In 1575 Sir Henry Sidney made a journey to Ulster with a view to dividing the province into shires, but had failed to effect anything.'¹ Dealing with the 'defects and omissions' in that Deputy's work in Ulster, Sir John Davys writes in his *Discovery* that, 'though the greatest part of Ulster were vested by Act of Parliament in the actual and real possession of the Crown, yet was there never any seizure made thereof, nor any part thereof brought into charge.'² The same authority states definitely in another place that 'after him [Sidney] Sir John Perrot . . . reduced the unreformed parts of Ulster into seven shires, namely, Armagh, Monaghan, Tyrone, Coleraine, Donegal, *Fermanagh*, and Cavan, though in his time [June 1584–June 1588] the law was never executed in these new counties by any sheriff or justices of assize.'³ On September 18, 1585, a commission was appointed under the statute of 11 Eliz. (1569) 'to survey the counties and territories in the province of Ulster not being shire ground, or being doubtful to what shire they belong, to divide them into as many counties as they may think fit.'⁴ A little later we have the grant of Fermanagh to Sir Cuchonnacht Maguire,⁵ which states that the grantee undertook to assist the Queen's officers in Fermanagh 'when his country is made a county.' So that Fermanagh was not formed into a county for at least seventeen years later than 1569. Mr. Trimble quotes the last-mentioned document at page 45 of his book with the characteristic blunder 'when his country

¹ *Illustrations of Irish History*, p. 127.

² *Ireland under Elizabeth and James*, p. 328.

³ *Cit. apud* Falkiner, p. 128.

⁴ *Fiant of Elizabeth* 4763.

⁵ January 17, 1586, *Fiant* 4809.

shall be made into a *country* ! He also mentions at page 2 a statement of Stuart to the effect that Fermanagh was made a shire in 1586, so that the error on the preceding page was made with open eyes.

Page 2. 'The Flight of the Earls on the 14th of September, 1607, old style, etc.'—Not to mention the *Four Masters* and O Cianain, who use the *new* style of dating, and give the date as the 14th, it would be interesting to know how Mr. Trimble would reconcile his statement with the fact that Lord Deputy Chichester reported the Flight on September 7,¹ and the Lord Deputy and Council on September 9.² If the Earls sailed on September 14, *old* style, the English officials must have known of the affair a whole week before it occurred.

Page 3. 'Sir Hugh Maguire, head of the Magwire sept, had in 1595, or a year later, joined his father-in-law, O'Neill, in rebellion.'—This is a case of putting the cart before the horse, for Maguire was in rebellion from the summer of 1593 onwards. There is no mystery at all about the period when he and O'Neill joined forces. Maguire operated with Cormac mac Baron, the Earl of Tyrone's brother, in 1595, and Cormac was then, and previously, known to be acting for Tyrone. On May 5 they assaulted the Castle of Longford, and plundered all the adjoining country,³ and on May 18 Enniskillen was reported in their hands.⁴ A little later Maguire was negotiating with the Deputy about a pardon, and on July 20 he writes from Enniskillen that 'he will do nothing hurtful until he receives an answer.'⁵ Meanwhile Tyrone had opened his campaign with a sharp defeat of Sir Henry Bagenal at Clontibret in the end of May.⁶ O'Sullivan⁷ says Sir John Norris commanded the English in this engagement, but in this he, Mitchel, and others who follow them are in error. Norris landed from England about May 8 at Waterford, and he did not reach Dundalk till June 19.⁸ Some engagements with O'Neill followed, and a despatch of July 20 states that the English learned of the presence of 'the Earl, O'Donnell, Maguire,

¹ *Calendar of State Papers*, p. 259.

² *Ibid.* p. 268.

³ *Ibid.* p. 315.

⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 317, 319.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 365.

⁶ *Ibid.* pp. 319, 327, 328, etc.

⁷ *Historia Catholica*, tome iii. bk. iii. c. ii.

⁸ *Calendar of State Papers*, pp. 316, 337.

and all their forces' not far from Newry sometime earlier in that month. Negotiations about a peace commenced in August. The Deputy wished to deal separately with Maguire, but 'Tirone kept Maguire so jealously that he could not have him dealt with.'¹ The chiefs remained in close alliance till Maguire was killed near Cork, in 1600.

Page 4. 'The O'Donnell, Earl of Tyrconnell.'—The first Earl of Tyrconnell was Rury, brother of Aodh Ruadh. He was never inaugurated according to the ancient Irish custom, and hence should not be styled 'The O'Donnell.'

A note on this page 4 states that the Archduke who was so friendly to the northern Earls was 'of Austria.' Mr. Trimble may have been thinking of a certain Archduke who was assassinated in 1914. Anyhow, the personage so named in 1607 was 'of Flanders.'

Again, on the same page, we learn that 'Constantine Maguire died at Geneva.' This is wrong. Cuchonnacht, or 'Constantine,' Maguire died at Genoa on August 12, 1608. This was not the 'same year' as that in which he left Ireland. The substitution of Geneva for Genoa is due to Mr. Trimble's inability to read the Irish Annals. His only acquaintance with them is through the hopelessly bad English version of Connellan.

Page 5, the Four Masters are said to describe Cuchonnacht as 'a man of superior figure and personal figure.'—One might note that there is no great distinction in a chief, or anyone else, possessing a 'personal figure,' but this is not what the Four Masters say of Cuchonnacht. 'A man of great wisdom and personal beauty' is the description they give. Even Connellan is right here.

Page 11. 'Lisgabhal or Liesgabhail, Ford of the River Fork.'—These names are intended for the Irish form of 'Lisgoole.' Neither is correct, though the second is probably a misprint for *Liosgabhail*, which is the proper Modern Irish form. Every schoolboy knows that *lios* means a fort, not a ford.

Page 12. 'In the year 1106 the religious house of Saint Hugh was endowed by MacNoelus MacKenlif, King of Ulster.'—A King of Ulster might be supposed to have an Irish name, but the name in this passage, if it be any language, is certainly not Irish. The Kings of Cenéal Eoghain claimed suzerainty over the rest of Ulster at the period in

¹ *Calendar of State Papers*, p. 408.

question, and the King of Cenéal Eoghain from 1103 to 1121 was Domhnall Ua Lochlainn. But the confusion of the entry above is solved by a reference to Archdall's *Monasticon*. The latter writer says that in the early ages of Christianity in Ireland there was a monastery at Lisgool, and that the feast of a 'St. Aid or Hugh' was celebrated there on January 25. The Abbey of the Canons Regular of St. Augustine, founded centuries afterwards, is supposed to have occupied the same site. Whether these statements are right, or not, is another question, which Mr. Trimble need hardly be expected to solve.

Page 15. 'Sir Henry Bunekar (*sic*) obtained a grant of the abbey and grounds on the 12th November, 1606, and Sir John Davys purchased them from Sir Henry.'—The first statement here, regarding Sir Henry Brunekar's grant, is taken, with nearly all the succeeding paragraph, from Hill's *Plantation in Ulster*, page 108. No acknowledgment is made, and the text is copied almost literally. To suggest that Sir John Davys 'purchased' his estate in county Fermanagh is sheer perversion. Sir John was no fool, and when lands were going for nothing he, or any of the Castle officials, were not likely to forget themselves. Davys selected his Fermanagh estate early in the proceedings of the Ulster Plantation. When rules were being drawn up to regulate the choice of such servitors as were to be undertakers, one rule was that no servitors but *martial* men were to be admitted 'saving Mr. Attorney-General [Davys], who may have a middle proportion in Clinawly, near Lisgool.'¹ And, accordingly, his patent was passed to him on January 8, 1611. Will Mr. Trimble maintain that the other grantees 'purchased' their estates, after the example of Mr. Attorney-General?

Pages 17–18 purport to give the Four Masters' entries relating to Lisgool. The first two are not found in their *Annals* at all. They were derived by Sir James Ware from the *Clogher Register*. There are mistakes and omissions in the remainder which need not be pointed out here.

Page 39. 'O'Breislin, historian to Maguire.'—No. The O'Breislins were brehons in Fermanagh, not historians.

Page 41. 'One Anglicised form of Cuchonnacht is Connor, and another is Constantine.'—This is quite wrong. Conchubhar is the Irish of Connor.

¹ Hill, *Plantation in Ulster*, p. 330.

Page 41. 'Connor Roe Maguire became the first Baron of Enniskillen.'—Connor Roe Maguire died in December 1625. A grant to *his son* made on January 11, 1628, recounts his services to the Crown, and in virtue thereof, the King instructs his deputy in Ireland 'to grant unto him, the said Sir Brian Maguire, the honour, style, dignity, and place of Baron of Enniskillen.'¹ Mr. Trimble comes nearer to the correct date at page 91.

Page 44. 'John, the son of Philip, and grandson of Thomas More; and Thomas, son of Thomas Oge, also grandson of Thomas More. They were second cousins.'—They were *first* cousins, Mr. Trimble will admit on reflection.

It has been stated above that Mr. Trimble's only acquaintance with the *Four Masters* is through the wretched English translation of Connellan. This limited knowledge is responsible for a number of errors in the work we are discussing. For example, a certain event is said on page 45 to have occurred on the 13th of September, 1484. Anyone who can read the original Irish, or who is in possession of O'Donovan's version in English, will know that the said event took place on 'the thirteenth of the Kalends of September,' that is, on August 20. Similar mistakes occur elsewhere in the volume.

A certain Maguidhir died in 1503. 'Edmond Maguire appears to have succeeded as chief,' says Mr. Trimble. There is no doubt at all about the succession at this point, and Mr. Trimble is quite wrong. Edmond was chief until his deposition in 1484. In this deposition he acquiesced in 1486: 'the sons of Maguidhir (Edmond) were ransomed, and on the same day their father resigned his lordship.'² The entry of this Edmond's death in the *Four Masters* at the year 1507 is not quite correct. It should run as follows: 'Edmond, the son of Thomas Og, son of Thomas Mor, died.'³ Mr. Trimble's mistake is due to the fact that between 1503 and 1527 certain individuals are referred to as 'sons of Maguire.' These he takes to be children of the then reigning Maguire—an altogether wrong assumption. The Maguire from 1503 to 1527 was Conchubhar Mór, grandfather of the celebrated Connor Roe, whom in the end of Elizabeth's reign the Irish called 'the Queen's Maguire.'

Page 48. 'Red Hugh O'Donnell also defeated another

¹ *Patent Rolls of Charles I*, p. 304.

² *Four Masters*.

³ See the *Annals of Ulster*.

English force at a ford on the Avonmore, and went to Spain in 1602 for the purpose of inducing the King of Spain to send an army with a fleet, which likely led to the coming of the Spanish fleet to Kinsale.'—This is a specimen of Mr. Trimble's English. It seems to convey the view that Red Hugh's journey to Spain was responsible for the Spanish aids that fought at Kinsale in the winter of 1601-2. But Kinsale was lost before Red Hugh embarked, as every school-child knows. Another possibility: the passage may mean that the victory on the Avonmore (1598) led to the landing of the Spaniards in 1601; *post hoc ergo propter hoc!*

Page 52. A passage is referred to the Calendar of the Patent Rolls of Elizabeth's reign. This is wrong. The grant there cited will be found in the Fiants of Elizabeth, issued by the Record Office. With his usual carelessness Mr. Trimble prints 'rest' as 'East,' 'county' as 'country,' 'permit' as 'form it,' 'they' as 'then,' and makes sundry other errors in transcribing the document.

Page 54. 'Sometimes this ceremony took place at Sciath-Gabhra-an-tSainridh.'—The author is here quoting from the Four Masters, A.D. 1589. At that year they narrate the inauguration of Aodh Maguidhir at Sciath Gabhra 'precisely.' Mr. Trimble, having nothing better to follow than Connellan, incorporates the adverb in the place-name. Further on he makes *leath-as*, an Irish word meaning 'one shoe,' into 'documents,' while on page 55 the masts of the Lough Erne flotilla are made to stand as a 'grave' along the shore. The latter is no misprint, for the statement is repeated on page 56. The passage where it occurs is taken almost without change from O'Grady's *Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts*, but Mr. Trimble has no use for quotation marks;

Pages 56, 64. Sir George Bingham is made Governor of Connaught. Neither of the George Bingham was ever Governor of Connaught, though Sir Richard was.

Page 58. Sir William Fitzwilliam is said to have conducted in person operations against Enniskillen in February, 1593-4.—Fitzwilliam was in Dublin when the siege took place, and Mr. Trimble actually prints two despatches sent to the Lord Deputy at Dublin from Captain John Dowdall, who conducted the expedition and captured Enniskillen on February 2. The second was penned 'the first daie of our entrie,' and was signed by the officer in command, that is,

Dowdall. A messenger made a statement in Dublin describing how Captain Dowdall secured the castle. This statement is printed on page 63, and yet a few lines farther back Mr. Trimble puts the feat to the credit of 'Captain Bingham.'

That Lughaidh O Cleirigh, the Four Masters who copy him, and O'Sullivan, are all in error in regard to the event here under discussion, can be shown from the contemporary State Paper records. In preparing an edition of O Cleirigh's work I have made the following notes relative to the capture of Enniskillen :—

The Deputy, Sir Wm. Fitzwilliam, was not before Enniskillen in person. He returned from Cavan to Dublin on December 18-28, 1593, *Calendar of State Papers*, 191. Captain Dowdall, 'appointed chief for the prosecution of Maguire,' with 300 men (190), 'has charge of garrison and the whole action' (192). He attacked the castle on January 25—February 4 (204). His account of the capture on the ninth day of the siege (207-8). The ninth day was February 2-12, the date of the second despatch (208). On the 1st and 3rd of that month the Lord Deputy directed letters *from Dublin* to Burghley (202-3). O'Sullivan, in *Historia Catholica*, tome iii., c. vii., bk. ii., describes the capture of the castle, but he wrongly states that Sir *Richard* Bingham was in charge of the operation. The latter, however, detached Captain *George* Bingham to co-operate with Dowdall, which he did under the guidance of an O'Rourke (203, 208).

Page 62. 'An Irish chief's property consisted chiefly of cows.'

One finds it hard to speak with moderation in dealing with ignorant and malicious statements of this kind. The implication they make would seem to be that the English army in Ireland were superior to the natives inasmuch as they set less store on 'cows.' But in connexion with the event discussed in the preceding paragraphs Dowdall boasts of his taking '700 coves from the traitors,' not a bad haul for one who, we are to suppose, despised such possessions. But an Irish chief's property did not consist mainly in cows alone. Here are the words of Fynes Morrison, who knew what he was talking about, and describes events in 1600 thus :—

Our captaines, and by their example (for it was otherwise painfull) the common soldiers, did cut downe with their swords all the rebels corne, to the value of ten thousand pound and upward, the only means by which they were to live, and to keepe their Conaghts (or hired souldiers). It seemed incredible, that by so barbarous inhabitants, the ground should be so manured, the fields so orderly fenced, the towns so frequently inhabited, and the high waies and paths so well beaten,

as the Lord Deputy here found them. The reason whereof was, that the Queen's forces, during these warres, never till then came among them.

Again, writing of the year 1589, he says, 'that kingdome was in the best estate that it had beene in of long time, not only peaceable and quiet, but also *most plentiful in corne, cattel, and all manner of victuals.*

Page 62, *creaghts*, we are assured, 'were a community of relatives in a sept.'—*Creaght*, which in Irish spelling is *caoraigheacht*, originally meant a flock of sheep, and subsequently came to be applied to cattle as well. It was then applied to flocks and their herdsmen. The word does not convey the least notion of 'relatives' or 'sept.'¹

Page 77. Mr. Trimble says the place where the English were defeated in 1598 'is better known as Benburb.'—This is a disgraceful blunder. The defeat of 1598 took place a short distance from Armagh, while Benburb is in county Tyrone, several miles away. Mr. Trimble is here surely mixing up the events of 1598 with those of 1646.

Page 83. A passage quoted from Sir John Davys is meaningless. Several words are miscopied, and one considerable phrase is omitted.

Pages 85-7. Large sections are transferred bodily out of Hill's *Plantation in Ulster*, and no acknowledgment is made.

On page 1 the writer attempts to give the ancient orthography and meaning of the word 'Fermanagh.' He interprets it as signifying either 'the men of the monks,' in allusion to the monastery of Devenish, on an island in Lough Erne, or 'the men of the marshes.' This is nonsense. The following is the correct explanation of the name:—

Several tribe-names in Ireland were plurals of the type of the Gaulish *Ædui*, etc. Examples in Ireland are *Ulaid* 'Ulidians,' which is latinized *Ulathi* in the *Book of Armagh*, *Erainn* 'Ivernians,' and many others. Sometimes *fir* 'men' is employed before these plurals, which then appear in the genitive case. Now, *Manaig*, g. pl. *Manach*, is a people-name of the same kind. The following passage in the Rawlinson Manuscript B. 502, of the twelfth century, establishes this:—

Is do chlainn Ailella moir meic Breccain Manaich Locha Eirne ⁊ Manaich Ulad i. Manach mac Ailella moir meic Feicc meic Breccain meic Daire barruich meic Cathair. 'The Manaig of Loch Eirne and the

¹ See O'Donovan's note on it at *Four Masters*, A.D. 1496.

Manaig of Ulaid are of the descent of Ailill mor, son [read grandson] of Breacan, that is, [descended from] Manach, son of Ailill mor, son of Fiacc, son of Breacan, son of Daire barrach, son of Cathair,' page 128.

See further page 162 of the same manuscript where there is a pedigree of the *Manaig* and the *Manaig Ulad*. According to the genealogists these tribes, or branches of the same tribe, were thus of Leinster origin, and the one was seated in the present county Down, the other about Lough Erne. They were, therefore, *fortuatha* or stranger tribes in Ulster, and one of the branches is so described in O'Donovan's edition of the *Book of Rights*, page 172.

The Fir Manach of Lough Erne were reduced to vassalage, and their rulers, who belonged to the Airghialla race, took the name of the subject people in the course of time. Cairbre Daimairgit, who was King of Airghialla, died in 514 (*Annals of Ulster*) and had seven sons according to the *Book of Ballymote*, page 111. Two of these sons were Nadsluaig and Aed. Nadsluaig is described as ancestor of the men of Farney, in later ages the MacMahons and their kindred. *Æd a quo Fir Manach*, says the genealogist: 'The Fir Manach are descended from Aed.' This Aed was ancestor of O hEignigh and related families, and also, if the genealogies be reliable, of the Maguires, who did not rise to power till the end of the thirteenth century. So that the term *Fir Manach*, which was originally the designation of a stranger tribe in Ulster, ultimately was applied to their rulers who were of an altogether different origin. This is an interesting fact for which there are parallels in other parts of Ireland. The most ancient sept-name of the family of O hEignigh and their correlatives was *Clann Lugháin*, a branch of the Airghialla, and under this name we find in Rawlinson B. 502, page 146, and *Zeitschrift für Celt. Phil.* viii. page 324, a pedigree of Giolla Coluim O hEignigh, who died in 1048, King of Airghialla.

The fifth chapter of Mr. Trimble's book professes to be an account of the early Fermanagh chiefs. It is so erroneous and imperfect that no mere correction of it is possible; it were better ended than mended. I give, therefore, in the following pages a new account compiled from the *Annals* and from other sources mentioned in the sequel.

The earliest mention of Fir Manach in the *Annals of Ulster* occurs at the year 1009. Eigneach, Dubhdara, and Maelruanaidh, ancestors of the three families who gave rulers to Fir Manach during the eleventh and twelfth

centuries, themselves flourished in the second half of the tenth. From this period onwards there are numerous entries in the *Annals* bearing on the present enquiry :—

Eigneach, King of Airghialla, died 962. This person was ancestor of O hEignigh. MacCarthy in the index to the *Annals of Ulster* anglicizes this name 'O'Heney,' but the obvious English equivalent is 'O'Heagny or 'Heagny.'

Dubhdara, son of Eigneach, and ancestor of O Duibhdara, also died 962.

The son of Eigneach (who was son of Dalach) died King of Airghialla in 998. This was possibly Maolruanaidh whose son lived in 1057.

Cathal, son of Dubhdara, King of Fir Manach, died 1009.

Giollacolum O hEignigh, lord of Airghialla, died 1048. This man's pedigree will be given below.

Niall O hEignigh, King of Fir Manach, died 1053.

Domhnall, son of Maolruanaidh, King of Fir Manach, lived 1057.

Giollacriost O Duibhdara, King of Fir Manach, died 1076.

O hEignigh was slain in 1095.

Laighnen O Duibhdara, King of Fir Manach, died 1118.

O Maolruanaidh, King of Fir Manach, died 1126.

Giollacriost O hEignigh, King of Fir Manach, died 1127.

Faolan O Duibhdara, King of Fir Manach, died 1128.

Mac na hOidhche O Maolruanaidh, King of Fir Manach, died 1189.

O hEignigh, lord of Airghialla, died 1199.

O hEignigh, lord of Fir Manach, lived 1200.

O hEignigh is mentioned for the last time in 1212.

The foregoing entries have been abstracted from the *Annals of Ulster* and from the *Four Masters*. The persons to whom they refer were obviously kinsmen. Dubhdara, as already stated, was son of Eigneach, and founder of the family of O Duibhdara, while Maolruanaidh, from whom O Maolruanaidh was named and descended, was a near relative, if not a son, of the same Eigneach. These families drop out of history in the early thirteenth century. At that period Fir Manach began to be dominated by the O'Donnells and other chiefs, and the kinsmen of the rulers of the eleventh and twelfth centuries are no longer in evidence. A number of notices in the *Annals* dating from 1200 to 1300 might be cited here in proof of this, but as Father Dinneen has collected them in his *Maguires of Fermanagh* (pages 9, 10), the reader may be referred to that volume. Towards the close of the thirteenth century the great family of Maguidhir rises into prominence, and down to the seventeenth members of that family alone ruled the seven tuaths of Fir Manach. Their origin and succession will be dealt with in another paper.

PAUL WALSH

'THE HOUND OF HEAVEN'

BY THOMAS P. WHELAN

THE keynote of Victorian poetry is one of doubt, and nowhere is that more audible than in the poems of him who is still acclaimed the master-singer of the Victorian Age. Tennyson is an Agnostic. Arnold despairs and lulls himself into a mournful fatalism. Considered apart from their fine poetical virtues, the lesser lights of that era flicker through the general darkness—so many dull torches in the recesses of a spacious cavern.

There are those who maintain that Francis Thompson is outside the Victorian Age. This is true, but in the same sense that Newman as a convert stands outside that age. Thompson sang of a creed outside of which the Victorians were, but whose beauties appealed to their questioning minds. Newman strove to lead others towards the radiant light of that creed. Thompson sang its doctrines of sorrow, renunciation and penance. He is truly a thorn-crowned laureate, the beautiful but stern realities of whose teachings were untouched by the Agnostic atmosphere of Victorian England.

Of Thompson's poems the most typical is 'The Hound of Heaven.' One would say that it is the counterpart of his own life; it is also, but in a different sense, the counterpart of the lives of certain Victorians who were intellectual Hedonists. The fundamental thought on which the structure of this beautiful poem is based is that of a soul flying from Divine Love and the heroic self-sacrifice which such love entails.

The soul trembles at the teachings of the gentle Saviour Who drained the chalice of suffering in the garden of sorrow, and Who demands all from those who would wish to have all; it seeks refuge in laughter and tears, in its own most secret thoughts and musings, but the love of the Creator still pursues, and vainly the fugitive rushes

Adown Titanic glooms of chasmèd fears.

Turning from itself it seeks in the human hearts around

that shelter and love it so ardently desires, but here also there is no repose, for the term of its hopes is not within the human heart. Its longings are other-world and infinite, and will never be fully realized in what is purely finite and material. Restless, with hopes unfulfilled and with efforts thwarted, the fugitive spirit now turns from the hearts of men and women to the little children, but again its desires are only partially realized ; for, as the eyes of the little ones grow suddenly fair with dawning answers, their angels snatch them away. Having forsaken the human heart, and finding no solace in the lovely eyes of childhood, it diverts its attention to Nature. The term of its hopes, the full satisfaction of its desires, cannot be found in human hearts or human eyes ; perhaps they may be found in the bosom of the great Mother herself. The troubled spirit will sport with Nature's children and share in their bliss. It will wanton with the lady-mother's vagrant tresses, and will banquet with her in her wind-walled palace ; and so it was :

I in their delicate fellowship was one—
 Drew the bolt of Nature's secrecies.
 I knew all the swift importings
 On the wilful face of skies.
 I knew how the clouds arise
 Spumèd of the wild sea-snorings ;
 All that's born or dies
 Rose and drooped with—made them shapers
 Of mine own moods, or wailful or divine—
 With them joyed and was bereaven.
 I was heavy with the even,
 When she lit her glimmering tapers
 Round the day's dead sanctities.
 I laughed in the morning's eyes.
 I triumphed and I saddened with all weather,
 Heaven and I wept together.

In this passage the poet has soared to a high level, and his flight has been sustained. It is in this and similar passages that Thompson proves himself a poet second to none in those qualities which are ever characteristic of great lyrical poetry.

The questing soul has become one in the delicate fellowship of Nature's children. It has drawn the bolt of Nature's secrecies, and knows part of the inner life of that secret world so full of wonder and mystery, where all things are so linked to one another.

That thou cans't not stir a flower,
 Without troubling of a star.

Even here in this world of wonder the thirst of the soul is unslaken. No blissful waters of Nature can quench the burning thirst of the fugitive spirit. Its longings are infinite and transcendent. It seems to recognize that all its questings are vain, all its wanderings futile, and so it ceases its flight and breaks down in an agony of sheer despair.

We have reached the climax of the great lyric—one might say a miniature lyrical drama—and it very fittingly comes to us in one of the most sublime passages of modern poetry. Then the cry of the soul goes out in poignant grief. It looks despairingly on its follies and caprices. Its misspent years have vanished and gone like a mist. No longer are its dreams of any avail :

Yea faileth now even dream
The dreamer, and the lute the lutanist
Even the linked fantasies, in whose blossomy twist
I swung the earth a trinket at my wrist.

They are words of all too weak account to bear the heavy griefs which weigh upon the frail human soul—now that its errors are apparent. The clear light of Faith has not yet dawned upon it, for it is still in darkness, dazed by the smiting lightning, like another St. Paul. The gloom that surrounds it is, after all, only the

Shade of this hand outstretched caressingly.

This poem, whose opening stanzas are so tumultuous, ends in tenderness and pity. There is tenderness in the voice of the Creator as it explains the truths of love and self-sacrifice which have so staggered the fugitive spirit. Yet there are those to whom those truths come as some bright vision laden with light and love. There is pathos in the words of the soul. Its attitude is pitiable and pathetic. The voice of the Creator is no longer like that of a bursting sea, but pitying and caressingly tender :

Ah fondest, blindest, weakest.
I am He Whom thou seekest.
Thou dravest love from thee, who dravest Me.

In the events of daily life we often come into touch with tragedies—real human tragedies, but tragedies which are of the body rather than the soul. Seldom if ever do we come into touch with a real spiritual tragedy, i.e., with a tragedy which is purely of the spiritual order. We

concentrate too much on what is corporeal. 'The Hound of Heaven' is a poem in which a great poet with a surpassing wealth of imagery, with a choice of diction and depth of thought unrivalled in modern English verse, sings the fate of a soul flying from the love of God and the noble self-sacrifice and heroic sufferings which such love entails. It is a poem full of tragic happenings which pertain to the spiritual order. It is a miniature lyric tragedy, now dark and tumultuous, now sublime and awe-inspiring, but withal a tragedy which ends not with the tumult and terrors of tragedy, but in pathos, tenderness, and happiness. The prodigal has returned. Sorrow and tears give place to the whisper of peace and the smile of joy.

Faults Francis Thompson had, but they are the faults peculiar to greatness. The rich beauty of his poems is essentially spontaneous and far superior to the artificial baldness for which modern verse is so industriously making. His wealth of imagery, his beauty and sublimity of thought, his wonderful and sometimes quaint diction, his abrupt rhythm and virile verse-music are all pre-eminent in this poem, for it is typical. Conceits there are, but they are not the affected and ineffectual conceits peculiar to Crashaw and the old metaphysical school. They are, with few exceptions, the subtleties of one who has a clear vision, an unrivalled wealth of words; who effectively sings what he clearly understands.

Many poems are beautiful; few are sublime. Beauty inspires a vivid intellectual pleasure. Sublimity inspires awe. Milton is often sublime, and Dante when he turns from legend and political satire, and concentrates his vision on what is other-world and transcendent, is always sublime. Thompson is very often sublime, and nowhere more than in the following passage:—

I dimly guess what Time in mists confounds,
 Yet ever and anon a trumpet sounds
 From the hid battlements of Eternity:
 Those shaken mists a space unsettle, then
 Round the half-glimpsed turrets slowly wash again,
 But not ere him who summoneth
 I first have seen, enwound
 With glooming robes purpureal, cypress-crowned.

There are many to whom this poem is meaningless. There are critics who will be profuse in epithets to deprecate the worth of this masterpiece. It cannot be fully understood

unless the reader has a sound grasp of the fundamental principles of Catholic asceticism. This is no sectarian poem with an atmosphere charged with vengeful fanaticism. It is the expression in verse, as rich as it is profound, of a great principle exemplified in the pathetic wanderings and ultimate happiness of a human soul. The verse is rich and virile; the verse-music and majestic rhythm sometimes jar with a sudden abruptness, but they often fill the soul like organ-harmonies heard in the dim twilight of some spacious cathedral. There are echoes everywhere. The poem is intensively subjective, as befits the true lyric.

It is the poem of one who suffered and was fugitive. Its moral could indeed be applied to the intellectual Hedonist. It may be interpreted as an illustration of the aberrance of the intellectual but not of the sensual Hedonist. Perhaps it was the story of the poet's own soul, for Francis Thompson erred and suffered. He was a wanderer upon the earth, for he was born in an age that knew him not. Yet never for a moment are we to infer that he discarded any of the essential doctrines of that Faith whose great hierophant he was. His life was truly a tragedy—the tragedy of a soul struggling to work out its true vocation in this world. Thompson was no Hedonist. He has left us a poem which is not only a masterpiece in art, but also in thought; a poem which is sublime and yet intensely human, full of those truths peculiar to the spiritual order—truths which go home to the soul and touch the human heart. It is sad with a divine sadness and wholly devoid of those grosser elements which are so often commingled with human sorrow. It was conceived by a great mind and executed with that artistic taste which discriminates between the crude realism which disfigures beauty and that other realism which borders on the ideal. This thorn-crowned laureate sang as some bright immortal—a nursling of the Muses, holy, sweet, and pure. His poem finds an echo in every heart which has known sorrow and joy, and which, dissociated from the mere grossness of life, is dissatisfied even with the lawful pleasures of intellect and imagination, and pines for the vision of that heaven where stand the promised mansions of Him who is Creator and Father.

THOMAS P. WHELAN.

DR. BERNARD'S NARRATIVE OF THE STORM OF DROGHEDA IN 1649

BY J. B. WILLIAMS

BEFORE giving some account of Nicholas Bernard (or Barnard), the Protestant incumbent of St. Peter's, Drogheda, in 1649, I had better first describe the pamphlet, the material portions of which are transcribed at the end of this paper.

Only one copy of Dr. Bernard's Narrative of the Storm of Drogheda in 1649 is known to exist, and this is in the possession of Mr. C. H. Firth.¹ This tract was first mentioned by the late S. R. Gardiner, in his *Commonwealth and Protectorate*,² and Gardiner quoted a short extract from it, in one of his footnotes to his account of the storm of Drogheda. Part of the same extract was again quoted in a recent controversy with the present writer, who, after a prolonged search, has arrived at the conclusion that Mr. Firth's tract is the only copy known to exist. No biographer of Dr. Bernard has ever noted the existence of the pamphlet, and it is not mentioned either by Anthony à Wood in his list of Dr. Bernard's works (in his life of Bernard in the *Fasti Oxonienses*), or in the similar list in the life in the *Dictionary of National Biography*—which, of course, is fairly up to date.

The pamphlet is a small quarto of 12 pages, without date or title-page. Mr. Firth thinks that possibly there may never have been a title-page. Page 1 is headed, 'A Letter of Dr. Bernard's to a friend of his at Court,' and sets forth that to vindicate himself 'from a misapprehension of me at Court, but such as knew me not, because of my acquaintance with Oliver Cromwell,' he thinks it expedient

¹ I have to thank Mr. Firth for his kindness in furnishing me with a copy of the *Narrative*, to be printed in a collection of contemporary accounts of the Storm of Drogheda and Wexford, which I hope to have published before long, as well as for the description of the tract itself.

² Vol. i., published in 1894.

to set forth his sufferings and services to the Royal Cause, and to explain the nature of his dealings with Cromwell. 'Whereunto,' he continues, 'I have added a brief relation of my sufferings (being so variously reported) in the storme of Drogheda and after it.'

Pages 2 to 8 are 'A Brief Relation of Dr. Bernard's sufferings for His Majesty.'

There is no doubt, therefore, that this pamphlet was printed either about the end of 1660 or during 1661.

Pages 9 to 12 inclusive are set out at the end of the present paper.

Nicholas Bernard was born about the commencement of the seventeenth century, and must have been an Englishman. He matriculated from Emmanuel College, Cambridge, on July 5, 1617, graduated Bachelor of Arts in 1621, and Master of Arts in 1624.¹ In 1626 he was ordained by the famous Usher, Archbishop of Armagh, in St. Peter's, Drogheda, and became the Archbishop's Chaplain and Librarian. In 1627 Dr. Bernard was given the titular deanery of Kilmore, worth about £20 a year, and in 1637 he exchanged this deanery with Henry Jones, D.D., for that of Ardagh, to which, perhaps, the benefice of St. Peter, Drogheda, was attached. On July 13 of the same year Bernard became prebendary of Dromore. On July 15, 1628, Dr. Bernard was incorporated M.A. at Oxford, and to this we owe Anthony à Wood's account of his life and writings, but the date of his subsequent degree of D.D. has not been traced. From this time up to 1649 Dr. Bernard was inseparably connected with Drogheda, so that he was present during the siege of 1641, as well as during the capture of Drogheda by Lord Inchiquin in 1649, and the storm of the town by Cromwell a few weeks later on. Of the first siege of Drogheda, Dr. Bernard has left two accounts, in addition to some other tracts, describing the progress of the Irish Rebellion. He appears in all these as a very great enemy of the Catholic religion, and as a bitter Protestant, some of whose scandalous tales about priests and friars are patently false; but, nevertheless, details of the progress of the war, as well as other incidents not to be found elsewhere, are contained in his pamphlets.

¹ Anthony à Wood. *Fasti Oxonienses*, i. p. 445, and the recently published *Book of Matriculations and Degrees* at Cambridge, by Dr. J. Venn and Mr. J. A. Venn.

He is described in the *Dictionary of National Biography* as a 'keen observer.'

In 1650 Dr. Bernard was permitted by Cromwell to return to England, and in 1651 he was appointed preacher at Gray's Inn, becoming also, at some uncertain date, Almoner to Cromwell himself. When Archbishop Usher died in London, in 1655, Dr. Bernard preached his funeral sermon, and Cromwell directed £200 to be paid to him in order to defray the cost of the funeral.

Chiefly from his appointment to be Cromwell's Almoner, and perhaps, also, to a certain extent, from his controversy about the same time with the celebrated Laudian divine, Dr. Peter Heylyn, whose standard of churchmanship was diametrically opposed to that of Usher and Bernard, the scandal arose that caused the pamphlet I am describing to be printed.

John Crouch, in his congratulatory verses to Charles II, published in 1660, and entitled, *A Mixt' Poem*, seems to hint that Bernard's relations with Cromwell had been unfavourably commented upon outside Court circles, for he mentions him as one who had praised Cromwell, at the end of the lines referring to Drogheda¹ :—

Ask poor Tredah the number of her slaine,
Whose streets had only silence to complain,
Where piles on piles of dead wide breaches fill'd
Which cold blood butcher'd and wild fury kill'd.
One person, he a priest,² the storm did passe
To tell how kind the Sacrificer was.

The last lines undoubtedly convey a reproach to Dr. Bernard. 'Priest' in those days was frequently used for Anglican and (more especially) for Presbyterian clergymen.

Before leaving Ireland Dr. Bernard preached a farewell sermon at Drogheda. It is necessary to quote this in order that it may be compared with his narrative of the storm. The sermon was printed in London in 1651, with a dedication prefixed, to the Mayor and Corporation of Drogheda, and dated, 'London, May 20, 1651.' It forms a little book of 337 pages, and includes a very bitter attack upon the Catholic religion. On page 247 Dr. Bernard says :—
'The religion of the Papists is superstitious and idolatrous,

¹ There is a life of this John Crouch in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. I think he must have been an Irishman. Most of the Crouch family were Irish.

² 'Dr. Bernard,' in a marginal note.

their faith and doctrine erroneous and hereticall, their Church in respect of both Apostaticall.’

On pages 330-332 he sets out the judgment of the Irish Protestant Bishops in 1626, ‘concerning the toleration of popery,’ and on pages 333-336 a further judgment of the same Protestant Archbishops and Bishops ‘as concerning tolleration of Religion,’ in which they refuse to give any sort of toleration to the Catholic faith. On page 311 Dr. Bernard remarks :—

The first Lord’s Day I had the opportunity of preaching to you after that late storme, with which this towne by an extraordinary successe given was immediately taken, September 11, 1649, when not only your goods (according to the custome of warre) were made a spoyle of, but your lives were in the like danger and mine in an equall hazard, but by a special providence of God was preserved. . . . I thought fit to begin with that text . . . (2 Cor. i. 8, 9, 10) . . . The place we were then compelled to meet in was a private chappel, both the churches of the town being demolished, the one by a necessity, being just against the battery, the other, the greater (with which I had relation) casually, at least without any such intention that night blown up with gunpowder, I say, we then being constrained to contract ourselves into so narrow a roome, it was so overburdened (January 27) that not long after I had begun, the main beame of the floore broke asunder in the midst and some hundreds of you instantly sunke downe together, with a gallery founded on the same, then filled with divers of you, which fell upon you too, whereby I despaired of your lives. And I beleeve, according to the former text, you had again the ‘sentence of death’ in yourselves. Notwithstanding, such was the Lord’s wonderful preservation of you in His service that, though there were old men and women with childe involved, yet none had any hurt or a limbe broken or any such bruise, but that within a few days all were seen abroad againe.

On page 320 Dr. Bernard proceeds to give some account of his own adventures during the assault, and states that :—

Though in the heat of prosecution immediatley after the storme through a window of my house two were shot on the side of me, and a bullet shot through the doore touched my hand, yet I had no hurt. And when by violence they had broken in while we were all at prayers, commending our souls to God and imploring His preservation of us, God was so pleased to assuage that present fury of the soldiers that none with me, to the number of about twenty of you, received any further mischief. And immediately after, one, unthought of by me, whom I had not seene in eightene yeares before, who was a Colonell in the Army, came and protected us fully. And I tooke him rather as sent of God, in regard others whom I depended on wholly neglected me. And so much for satisfaction to that censure.

The meaning of the word ‘censure’ does not appear, but is probably explained in the Restoration Narrative.

Wood says that after the Restoration of 1660 Dr. Bernard refused to return to Ireland and to resume possession of his deanery there, 'and perhaps a bishopric, being possessed with just doubts concerning the settlement of Ireland.' The Earl of Bridgewater (John Egerton, the second Earl) presented Dr. Bernard to the Rectory of Whitchurch, Shropshire, and at Whitchurch Dr. Bernard died, on October 15, and was buried on November 7, 1661.

The continual use of italics in the following narrative will be noticed. This is a trick common in the tracts of the Restoration period, and was very much relied upon by Sir Roger L'Estrange, in order to emphasize the points of an argument. First in importance in the narrative itself is the explicit statement that Sir Arthur Aston (who, as Wood tells us, had his brains beaten out with his wooden leg) and 300 men in the Mill Mount surrendered 'upon promise of quarter,' and yet were killed. Many years ago Dr. Lingard, in his note on the Massacres of Drogheda and Wexford, appended to the eighth volume of his *History of England*, expressed the suspicion that the Mill Mount had been surrendered upon a promise to spare the lives of the garrison, and that this promise had afterwards been broken. Lingard was the first historian to discover and point out the following passage in the *Perfect Diurnall* of October 1-8, 1649. He would have been delighted had he known of the corroboration given to his view by Dr. Bernard. The passage in the *Perfect Diurnall*, cited by Lingard, ran:—

Lieutenant-Col. Axtell, of Col. Huson's (*sic*) regiment with some 12 of his men went up to the top of the Mount and demanded of the Governour the surrender of it, who was very stubborn, speaking very bigge words, but at length was persuaded to go into the Windmill on the top of the Mount and as many more of the chieftest of them as it could contain, where they were disarmed and afterwards all slain.

I can add to this another account slightly later in date, but never before cited, fixing the responsibility for the offer of quarter upon Cromwell himself, and proving that it was not due to Axtell's personal initiative.

Seven months after Cromwell's death, when Richard Cromwell still styled himself 'Protector,' the first life of Oliver Cromwell was published by S. Carrington. Who the writer was, and even his Christian name, I have not been able to discover, but, according to the old collector, George Thomason's, manuscript note, his book appeared in 'April,' 1659, and this is confirmed by the dedication in

it to 'His Serene Highness, Richard, Lord Protector.' The title-page runs as follows :—'The History of the Life and Death of his most serene highness Oliver, late Lord Protector. Wherein, from the Cradle to the Tomb, are impartially transmitted to posterity, the most weighty transactions, Forreign or Domestique, that have happened in his time, either in Matters of Law, Proceedings in Parliaments, or other affairs in Church or State. By S. Carrington. "Pax quæritur bello." London. Printed for Nath. Brook, at the sign of the Angel in Cornhill. 1659.'

This book contains 272 pages, and on pages 16-18 gives a detailed account of the Storm of Drogheda. I refrain from setting it all out, as it adds nothing new to other accounts, and will instead cite the passages referring to the offer of quarter.

After saying that Cromwell, 'whose prudence as we have already observed, seconded his valour,' put himself at the head of his men to storm the walls, Carrington goes on to say that Cromwell entered the place

pell mell with his soldiers. At which time the ardour and heat of the victory did appear to correspond with his prudence. For, although his generosity did oblige him to give quarter to those who had so well defended themselves, notwithstanding, deeming it fitting to make that place an example of terror unto the rest of the towns which were garrisoned and which might cost him too dear should they stand out as sturdily and obstinately as these did, he caused all those to be put to the sword who were found to be in arms, and thus he sacrificed 3,000 Irish unto the ghosts of 10,000 English whom they had massacred some years before.

If this was an example of virtue, a reconsideration of the moral code would be necessary. I return to Dr. Bernard's narrative.

After narrating the attempts to kill himself, and how Ewer saved his life, we have a striking picture of Hewson, the anabaptist cobbler (who had but one eye and an 'odd' face), appearing upon the scene. Hewson was the sole witness to the assertion that a number of men burnt in the steeple, cursed their souls as they were burning; which, from Hewson's point of view, was just what a 'Papist' might be expected to do. Dr. Bernard now tells us that Hewson was also the man who burnt them alive, and, in addition, that the day *before* he did this Hewson attempted to blow them up with gunpowder. Both Hewson and Cromwell, in their letters, omit all mention of the attempt

to blow up the steeple, and speak of burning it on the first day. What credit can now be given to the tale that the men cursed their souls as they were dying?

The late John D'Alton, in his *History of Drogheda*, gives the following account of this steeple:—

In 1548 the steeple of this Church (St. Peter's), then represented as one of the highest in the world, was prostrated by a violent tempest. It was replaced by another, of wood, which remained until consumed in Cromwell's visitation of 1649.

Finally, after a description of the terrible scene when the steeple fell down, Dr. Bernard tells us that on the day after that, on the third day, the massacre was still going on, 'even in coole blood,' and that the churchyard and streets were filled with dead bodies to the number of 3,500.

In all this Dr. Bernard is intent only on describing his own sufferings, and has no word of pity for the Catholics whom he hated. These vivid sidelights only appear by accident.

All this renders his narrative as important as it is interesting, and affords ample corroboration of both Lord Ormonde's letters and the letter written to Sir Ralph Verney by James Buck.

A Brief Relation of that Bloody Storm at Drogheda, and the Doctor's sufferings by Oliver Cromwell in it, and after it, with his Preservation.

The 3rd of September, 1649, was the first day *Oliver Cromwell* came before it, in making any attempt to that end; he had a 11 thousand Horse and Foot, compleatly provided, the Town had 3,500. Two days he battered, upon the second day about five of the clock in the afternoon, he assaulted it, but received a *repulse*; yet returning again took it; the *word* was given throughout his Army *no quarter*; the *Mill Mount* where the governour Sir *Arthur Aston* was with about 300 men, was yielded upon promise of quarter, but as soon as it was possessed by them, all were put to the sword, when the town was fully taken, the *Doctor's house* was one of the first the Soldiers fell upon, but by the strength of it could not enter; The Mayor of the Town and diverse others of the *Principall* men that were Protestants, to the number of about 30 came into it for refuge.

There came 5 or 6 who were sent from a *principall officer* (the Doctor's former acquaintance) under a pretence of a guard for his house, but had a Command from him, as soon as they were entred to kill him (which an *earwitness* hath since assured him of). The Doctor denying to open the door to them, one of them discharged a *musket bullet* at him; it passed through the door, and only fired the skin of one of his fingers, leaving a spot upon it, which burned 4 or 5 days after, and did him no more hurt.

Then a *Cornet* of a troop of horse came to his reliefe, and pretending he had an order from the *Generall* to take care of that house, the souldiers

withdrew; and so at a *Back-door* he brought in his *Quarter-Master*, whom he left to secure him. About a quarter of an hour after, another Troop of horse came to the window and demanded the opening of the door. The *Quarter-Master* and himself with an old servant left with him (for he had sent his Wife and Children out of Town) stood close together, and told them it was the minister's house, and *all therein were Protestants*, as soon as they heard the *D. named*, and his *voice*, one of them discharged his Pistoll at him, wherein being a *brace of bullets*, with the one the *Quarter-Master* was shot quite through the Body and dyed in the place, and the other shot his servant through the throat, but recovered; the Dr. was *onely untouched*. After this he made a stand at another place, and seeing the Souldiers breaking in at a low window, he went up to his *study*, where his said friends were making great *Lamentation*, expecting *present death*, they all kneeled down and commended their soules to God. No sooner had the Dr. *begun*, but in comes the souldiers, and interrupts them, threatning them with *Bullets*, but it pleased God they were so mollified that they onely took all they had about them, and fell upon the spoyle of the house. In the midst of these confusions comes one *Colonel Ewres* (whom the Dr. had not seen in 16 years before, and knew not of his being there) and took up his house for his quarters, turned the souldiers out, and made the doores fast for himself.

Not long after came *Colonel Hewson*, and told the Dr. he had orders to blow up the *Steeple* (which stood between the quier and the body of the church) where about *threescore men* were run up for refuge, but the three Barrels of Powder which he caused to be put under it for that end, blew up only the *body of the Church*, and the next night *Hewson* caused the seates of the Church to be broken up, and made a great pile of them under the steeple, which firing, it took the lofts wherein five great *Bells* hung, and from thence it flamed up to the top, and so at once, *Men and Bells, and Roof* came all down together, the most hideous sight and terrible cry, that ever he was witness of at once.

The next day the *Colonel* that had saved the Drs. life comes to him, and tells him he was very *sharply checked* for it, by the *Generall* and many of his *officers*, and that he must yet expect to dye, that no Protection could be had for him; which was confirmed unto him by others also, whereupon divers that came to see him took their leaves as *never* to see him again, and the number of *dead bodies* (with which the *Church-yard* and *Streets* were filled already) daily increasing even in *coole* blood to the number of 3,500 gave him little hope of the contrary: that which at present reprieved him was *Col. Ewres* sending two of his officers which were wounded to be there.

Then was the Proclaiming of his *Majesty*, inciting and encouraging of the Army, and what else might favour ill with the Souldiers, mustered up against him.

The next day *Oliver Cromwell*, with many of his officers, came to the Doctor's house, began with aspersing his *Ordination as Popish*, then the late *Arch Bishop of Armagh*, from whom he had received it, then his *Majesties Title*, and the Doctors *Praying* for him came into discourse; the disputes of which with divers other subjects, which lasted about three quarters of an hower, would be impertinent to be related here, but when he found the Dr. to be of that judgment he had heard, he left him without any assurance of life, onely gave order to the *Governour* to have

him sent up to *Dublyn* as a *Prisoner*. When he came there, it so fell out, that he met *Cromwell* himself, with his officers in the streets, where, after great *Menaces* that he would make him an *Example*, and expressly threatening him with pronouncing the sentence of death upon him, committed him to prison: as he was carried away, besides the votes of all the officers against him, *Hugh Peters* fell most upon him, who (as was affirmed then) had blamed *Cromwell* for saving of his life so long.

Seaventeen dayes he was close prisoner, and afterwards upon Bonds confined six months within the City, and after that sent up to the Army at *Clommel*, permitted to come then with *Cromwel* into *England*, where to himself he never varied in any discourse in the said Subjects, from what he had said to him at the first sight of him.

Thus far his sufferings in that storm, and his Deliverance.

Some Articles Objected against the Doctor, while he was a Prisoner in Dublyn.

I. That he had refused to obey Col. *Michael Jones* his order, for the forbearing the use of *Common Prayer*, in his church at *Drogheda*.

II. That he had Preached a *Thanksgiving Sermon* for the taking of the Town of *Drogheda*, by the Lord of *Inchiquin*, under the Command of the Lord *Marquesse of Ormond*.

III. That he saluted one Col. *Trenchard*, with great joy the Town was taken, accordingly for the King.

IV. That he moved the *Mayor* of the Town to come in his Scarlet to the Proclaiming of the *King*, and that he attended at it himself, and went immediately to the Church, and observed the Book of *Common Prayer*, and in special those prayers for him.

V. His Praying for the Lord *Marquesse of Ormond*, as Lord *Lieutenant of Ireland*, then beseiging of *Dublyn*.

VI. His praying for a Confusion upon *Oliver Cromwells Army* while he was beseiging *Drogheda*.

VII. His withdrawing of some Commanders and Souldiers, from the service of the Parliament, and in special the speeches of one of their Captains upon his deathbed produced, in complaining of the Doctor to that purpose.

VIII. That he was with the Lord *Marquesse of Ormond* at his Camp before *Dublyn*.

IX. That he refused to goe with the Parliament Army, out of the Town of *Drogheda*, but staid with the Lord of *Inchiquin* and his party in it, attended the Lord *Marquesse of Ormond*, when he came back to it, the keeping of a *Fast*, and preaching before him, and praying accordingly for a good successe upon his designs.

X. That he had employed his parts (to use the very words as it was written to him) *against the Saints, and that Interest which the Lord Jesus is now bringing forth into the world*.

And thus he hath been compelled against his own disposition to reckon up those things which else he had not so much as mentioned, he having in all this done and suffered but that which was his duty to do.¹

Finis.

¹ The last paragraph is in smaller type than the rest.

Two slight discrepancies between the farewell sermon and the narrative should be noticed. Firstly, in the sermon, Dr. Bernard interpolates the date of January 27 as that of his first sermon after the storm. And yet, in his narrative, he says that he was confined under bonds, presumably in Dublin, for six months. January 27 was less than five months after Drogheda fell. So that either Dr. Bernard was permitted to return to Drogheda, or his confinement was not so strict as he pretended. In any case it rather gives the impression that he exaggerated his services and sufferings.

Secondly, he states in his sermon that the officer who saved his life had not been seen by him for eighteen years. In his narrative he says sixteen years. Both statements cannot be accurate, for, eighteen years back from September, 1649, would be in 1641, just before the Irish Rebellion began; while sixteen years back would be in 1643, when the Civil War was in progress. Nothing turns upon this, however.

J. B. WILLIAMS.

JEWISH BELIEF IN THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD

BY REV. T. J. AGIUS, S.J.

WE are told in the Book of Genesis that 'Terah took Abram his son, and Lot the son of Haran, his son's son, and Sarai his daughter-in-law, his son Abram's wife; and they went forth with them from Ur of the Chaldees, to go into the land of Canaan; and they went into Haran, and dwelt there . . .; and Terah died in Haran.'¹ 'Now the Lord said unto Abram: Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto the land that I will show thee . . .; and Abram was seventy and five years old when he departed out of Haran . . . and went forth to go into the land of Canaan.'² This was the beginning of the long series of special manifestations of God, in preparation for that grandest act of His love, His actual pitching of His tent³ amongst us, by taking human flesh Himself.

Possibly an idolater himself,⁴ Abraham was chosen from among his family and kin to be the seed of the promise and the recipient and guardian of the mystery of love, hidden from all ages, to be revealed in all its fullness from the midst of the chosen people even unto the ends of the earth.⁵ Gradually, with infinite gentleness and forbearance, the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob did protect and guide His chosen ones out of and in the midst of the vast majority of their depraved and thoroughly corrupt fellow-men. Not, indeed, by placing before them truths beyond their grasp, or by imposing upon them tasks above their strength;

¹ Gen. xi. 31.

² Gen. xii. 1, 45.

³ John i. 14 : ἐσκήνωσεν seems to recall *שְׁכִינָה*, so that the Incarnation itself would be the *Shekinah* amongst us; or the Word is *Shekinah* in the Sacred Humanity.

⁴ Jos. xxiv. 2; Judith v. 6-9.

⁵ Rom. xvi. 25, 26; 1 Cor. ii. 7-10; Eph. i. 9, 10; Col. i. 24-27.

but with gifts and promises, or threats and punishments, lopping off their vices and stimulating them to virtue, making them lean ever more confidently on His own Mercy and Love; opening out their minds and hearts to His most tender Fatherhood; and urging them to imitate His own infinite Perfection and to aspire even to union with His divine Essence¹—‘a peculiar people,’ indeed!²

This of itself would show that even such a consoling truth as the resurrection of the dead was not necessarily known to the Hebrews from their very first intercourse with their loving God. But the traditions of their land of origin, Chaldea, were changed and modified by notions gathered from the peoples among whom they lived; and finally corrected, purified, and elevated to the standards of eternal truth by men of God, raised and inspired by the Holy Spirit who dwelt within them, above the gross superstitions and abominable usages of their neighbours.³ Not that anywhere in the inspired Scriptures does God allow falsehood to pass for truth—much less could God declare true what is false—but He did not reveal the full truth to them at a time when they were not capable of grasping it, even as He did not rebuke their evil ways beyond their strength. He treated them as babes, unable to take strong meats, feeding them with milk as much as they could bear,⁴ until the fullness of time had come for the complete and final revelation made by Christ Our Lord, and entrusted to the infallible keeping of His Church.⁵

One is not surprised, therefore, to find among this favoured people—stiff-necked and wayward at all times⁶

¹ See Is. xlix. 15: ‘Can a woman forget her suckling child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? Yea, these may forget, yet will I not forget thee.’ Similar tenderness is expressed in the other prophecies; even punishment is a proof of His unalterable faithfulness and love. Cf. Osee ii.; Is. xi., xiv. 32; Jer. xiii. 13.

² Deut. xxvi. 18, and *passim* in Old Testament.

³ Deut. xviii. 9-15 and elsewhere.

⁴ Compare Our Lord’s gradual manifestation of the true character of His mission: His Messiahship, His sufferings, death and resurrection—cf. John xvi. 12, 29. Compare St. Paul’s words to his converts at Corinth: 1 Cor. iii. 1 ff (Heb. v. 12 ff.)—a teaching followed by various Popes: St. Gregory with the Angles, St. Nicholas with the Bulgarians.

⁵ Such are many of the expressions and actions alluded to below in connexion with *Sheol*: they are mentioned here, only in so far as they show the kind of beliefs current among the Jews, with regard to the dead—pre-scinding altogether from the question as to whether the biographer, inspired by God, approved of them or condemned them (cf. for example, the rebuke of Job and his false friends, by God, in Job xxxviii.-xli., for their rash utterings).

⁶ Acts vii. 51; Exod. xxxii. 9, xxxiii. 3, xxxiv. 9, etc.

—a tendency to Chaldean worshipping of ancestors, such as the *teraphim* which Rachel stole from her father's house,¹ or the strange gods which Jacob hid under the terebinth,² or the familiar spirits which Saul consulted, despite his own ordinances, at En-dor,³ or even in the house of David, for 'Michal let David down through the window . . . and Michal took the *teraphim* and laid it in the bed, and put a pillow of goats' hair at the head thereof'⁴ to deceive Saul's messengers. It is these household gods,⁵ or spirits of ancestors, amongst other forms of idolatry, which good kings like Josiah⁶ strove to put away, in obedience to the denunciations of the prophets.⁷

For the dead, as they thought, when honourably buried,⁸ entered the pit⁹ or Sheol¹⁰—not unlike the Babylonian Aralû¹¹—the land of dust¹² and disorder,¹³ a land of darkness where the very light is as darkness,¹⁴ situated in the lowest parts of the earth,¹⁵ or even below the sea,¹⁶ above the subterranean waters.¹⁷ It was conceived of as a house provided with different divisions or chambers,¹⁸ whose gates are barred,¹⁹ and where the dead are grouped in clans and tribes and nations²⁰—forsaken of all, even, so it would seem, of God's providence.²¹ Hence it was all-important

¹ Gen. xxxi. 19, 30-35.

² Gen. xxxv. 4.

³ 1 Kings (1 Sam.) xxviii. 6-13: 'I see a god coming up'; cf. Is. viii. 19.

⁴ 1 Kings (1 Sam.) xix. 12-16.

⁵ Compare Judges xvii.; Is. viii. 19.

⁶ 4 Kings (2 Kings) xxiii. 24.

⁷ Osee iii. 4; Ezech. xxi. 26; Zach. x. 2, etc.

⁸ 4 Kings (2 Kings) ix. 10; Ecces. vi. 3; Jer. xxxiii. 1; Ezech. xxxii. 23.

⁹ תב : Ezech. xxvi. 20, xxxi. 14, 16, xxxii. 18; Is. xiv. 15, 19; Lam. iii. 53, 55; Prov. i. 12, xxviii. 17; Ps. xxvii. (xxviii.) 1. שָׁחַת : Job xvii. 14, xxxiii. 18; Is. xxxviii. 17, li. 14; Ezech. xxviii. 8.

¹⁰ Ἅιδου, εἰς Ἅιδου.

¹¹ Lagrange, *La Religion des Perses*.

¹² Job vii. 21, xvii. 26; Dan. xii. 2.

¹³ Job x. 21, 22.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ezech. xxvi. 20, xxxi. 14, xxxii. 18, 24; Ps. lxii. 8 (lxiii. 9), lxxxv. (lxxxvi.) 13; cf. cxxxviii. (cxxxix.) 8; Amos ix. 2.

¹⁶ Job xxvi. 5.

¹⁷ Ps. lxx. (lxxi.) 20.

¹⁸ Prov. vii. 27—Sheol, the chambers of death.

¹⁹ Job xvii. 16, xxxviii. 17; Is. xxxviii. 10; Ps. ix. 5 (4), cvii. (cvii.) 18.

²⁰ See notes 2 and 3 on next page; Ezech. xxxii.; Is. xiv. On the other hand, Job xxx. 23, Ecces. xii. 5: 'Every man goeth to his eternal house, the house appointed for all living.'

²¹ Is. xxxviii. 18; Ps. lxxxvii. 6 (lxxxviii. 5); cf. Ps. cxxxviii. (cxxxix.) 7, 8.

to secure an honourable and peaceful entrance into Sheol,¹ apparently connected with the family grave,² often placed in their own house³—and be gathered among his fathers.⁴ Indeed, reverence for the dead went so far, at times, as to lead to illicit practices, to sacrificial acts of worship: removing the shoes⁵ and covering the head⁶ and beard⁷ as in a sacred place⁸; girding the loins with sackcloth⁹; cutting off the hair¹⁰ and beard¹¹ or making baldness between the eyes¹²; or cuttings in the flesh,¹³ to pacify and propitiate their dead—practices which could not be tolerated by the prophets.¹⁴

So it was with the belief in the resurrection of the dead: the Chaldeans and Persians admitted a resurrection in the body of some favoured individuals at least.¹⁵ Babylonian mythologies represent Marduk as the god of mercy who finds delight in raising the dead, even as Osiris presides over the dead among the Egyptians, and raises the just, leading them before their god Râ. Both Babylonian and Egyptian cults included an extraordinary care for their dead, as if in expectation of a general resurrection in some future time.¹⁶ So, too, in

¹ Deut. xxviii. 26; Eccles. vi. 3; Jer. vii. 33, xvi. 4; Ps. lxxviii. (lxxix.)². Compare Jacob's touching lament in Gen. xxxvii. 35; David's instructions concerning Joab, 3 Kings (1 Kings) ii. 6; the sentence passed on Jezabel, 4 Kings (2 Kings) ix. 10; the curse on the Babylonian tyrant, Is. xiv. 19, 20.

² Gen. xlvii. 30, l. 25; Exod. xiii. 19. See note 4 below.

³ 1 Kings (1 Sam.) xxv. 1; 3 Kings (1 Kings) ii. 34.

⁴ Gen. xv. 15, xlix. 29-33; Judges ii. 10; Num. xxvii. 13; 2 Kings (2 Sam.) xvii. 23, xix. 38. Contrast 3 Kings (1 Kings) xiii. 22.

⁵ Ezech xxiv. 17. Cf. 2 Kings (2 Sam.) xv. 30: David flying from before Absalom.

⁶ Cf. 2 Kings (2 Sam.) xv. 30; Esther vi. 12; Jer. xiv. 3; 3 Kings (1 Kings) viii. 13.

⁷ Cf. Ezech. xxiv. 17.

⁸ Exod. iii. 5, 6; Jos. v. 15.

⁹ Gen. xxxvii. 34 (cf. 3 Kings (1 Kings) xx. 31, 32); 2 Kings (2 Sam.) iii. 31; Is. iii. 24; Jer. vi. 26.

¹⁰ Amos viii. 10; Ezech. xxvii. 31; cf. Is. xxii. 12; Jer. vii. 29; Ezech. vii. 18; Mich. i. 16.

¹¹ Cf. Jer. xli. 5, xlviii. 37; Is. xv. 2, 3. Compare 3 Kings (1 Kings) xviii. 28 with Levit. xix. 28, Deut. xiv. 1.

¹² Deut. xiv. 1, 2.

¹³ Cf. Jer. xli. 5, xlviii. 37; Is. xv. 2, 3. Compare 3 Kings (1 Kings) xviii. 28 with Levit. xix. 28, Deut. xiv. 1.

¹⁴ Levit. xix. 27, 28; Deut. xxvi. 14; Jer. xvi. 7. Some of the practices were tolerated, when their original pagan significance had disappeared. See Is. iii. 24, xxii. 12; Jer. xli. 5; Ezech. xxiv. 17-22; Amos viii. 10; Mich. i. 16.

¹⁵ Lagrange, *La Religion des Perses*.

¹⁶ Le Page Renouf, *Egyptian Book of the Dead*; Maspero, *Dawn of Civilization*.

the Old Testament, writings anterior to Job and Osee (which belong to the eighth century at the earliest) show great care for the dead; which implies a belief in survival of the soul, but does not prove a hope of resurrection in the body.¹

The passage in Job xix. 23-27, as translated by St. Jerome in the Vulgate, gives the first explicit declaration of bodily resurrection. His rendering, however, is disputed as being neither literal nor accurate, as may be seen from the following table.

VULGATE.	HEBREW.		SEPTUAGINT.
	<i>(Father Corluy's Translation.)</i>	<i>(Revised Version.)</i>	
25. Scio enim quod Redemptor meus vivit. Et in novissimo die de terra surrecturus sum;	Novi vindicem meum viventem Et postremus super pulverem surgot	But I know that my redeemer liveth, And that he shall stand up at the last upon the earth;	For I know he is eternal who is about to deliver me. To raise up upon the earth my skin (body) that endures these [sufferings]; for these things have been accomplished to me of the Lord;
26. Et rursum circumdabor pelle mea, Et in carne mea videbo Deum meum.	Et postea pelle mea circumdabuntur haec Et ex carne mea intuebor Deum	And after my skin hath been thus destroyed, Yet from my flesh shall I see God:	
27. Quem visurus sum ego ipse Et oculi mei conspecturi sunt, et non alius: Reposita est haec spes mea in sinu meo.	Quem ego intuebor mihi Et oculi mei videbunt et non alius: Defecerunt renes mei in sinu meo.	Whom I shall see for myself. And mine eyes shall behold, and not another. My reins are consumed within me.	Which I am conscious of in myself, which mine eye has seen, and not another, but all have been fulfilled to me in [my] bosom.

It would seem, therefore, that Job, crushed to dust by his numerous calamities, and cruelly tortured by false friends, whose aim was to inveigh against him, rather than to sympathize with him, soars high above all earthly prospects of comfort and abundance, down to the time, when *Goëli haï* (גוֹאֵל הָאֵי), his living Avenger, shall come, and he,

¹ A number of expressions occurring in various parts of the Old Testament imply a belief in something more than mere survival of the dead, even though they do not lend themselves to a *positive proof* of resurrection in the body: Deut. xxxii. 39; 1 Kings (1 Sam.) ii. 6; Tobias xiii. 2; Wisdom xvi. 13. Again, the expression 'asleep' seems to hint at a re-awakening: Deut. xxxi. 16; Ps. xii. (xiii.) 4, iii. 13 (14); Is. xiv. 8; Jer. li. 39, 57. Finally, it seems certain that immortality and resurrection were conceived of as intimately connected, even in the New Testament: 2 Mach. xii. 44; Matt. xxii. 31; 1 Cor. xv. 13-19, 32.

even with his own eyes, shall see him, though his skin be turned to dust and ashes ! ¹

Osee and Isaias and Ezechiel seek to instil new life and vigour into their despondent and drooping fellow-countrymen by resting their cheering visions of a restored Israel on the reality and certainty of the resurrection :

Yet I am the Lord thy God from the land of Egypt . . . I will ransom them from the power of the grave ; I will redeem them from death : O death where are thy plagues ? O death where is thy destruction ? ²

and Isaias speaks of a future union with all the righteous among the people of Israel :—

Thy dead [O Israel] shall live, my slain shall rise again ; awake and give praise, ye that dwell in the dust : for thy dew is as the dew of herbs and the earth shall cast forth the dead.³

And the vivid description of Ezechiel of graves that are to be rent open, and the people brought out of their sepulchres,

¹ This interpretation is rejected by many Hebrew scholars. Many Catholic interpreters also, following St. John Chrysostom (*Ep. ii. ad Olympiad.* 8, M.G. lii. 562, lvii. 396), deny that Job was speaking of the resurrection. The *Catena Nicetæ* (M.G. lxiv. 620) makes St. John Chrysostom admit that *Job was not ignorant of the resurrection.* - In any case, it is admitted that the text possessed by the Fathers was corrupt, which also explains why St. Justin, St. Irenæus and Tertullian do not mention Job in speaking of the resurrection of the dead.

St. Jerome admits, both in the Preface to his second translation and in his letter to Paula and Eustochium, that he handled his somewhat slippery and tricky originals freely. Yet, he insists that Job did openly and clearly prophesy resurrection in the body (*Ep. liii. 8, M.L. xxii. 545 ; lib. c. Joan. Hieros. xxx., M.L. xxiii. 381*). On the other hand, the present *Massoretic* text is certainly corrupt and unintelligible, especially in verse 26. The interpretation adopted above is demanded by the solemn introduction (verses 23, 24), and the warning (verse 29) which follows the passage ; by Job's despair of *earthly* recovery and his longing for death to free him from his miseries (vi. 8, 11 ; vii. 2, 16 ; xiii. 15 ; xiv. 13-15 ; x. 20-22) ; by his surprise at the actual restoration of his health and goods (xlii. 7-10) and the vision of God as Judge, instead of the Avenger he expected (xlii. 5) ; by his expectation of a new life from above, if not an actual resurrection in the body (xiv. 14, 15) ; by the emphasis on *my own eyes shall see*, which does not harmonize well with Dellmann's version of verse 26, *out of my flesh*. The incompleteness of the epilogue also finds a better explanation in a future restoration of his body, than in the actual restitution of health and possessions.

Finally, it is the interpretation of St. Clem. Rom. (1 Cor. xxvi.), Orig. (in Matt. xxii. 23), St. Cyr. Jerus. (Catech. xviii. 14-20), St. Ambr. (in Ps. cxviii. 18, serm. 10), St. Epiph. (in Anchor. lxxxix-ciii.) and St. Jerome. It is represented in the Catacombs (Kraus, *Roma sotterranea*, 288). It is most in agreement with the beliefs current amongst Egyptians and Babylonians of Job's time.

The silence of the Targumists of the eleventh century *may* be due to anti-Christian tactics ; in any case they are too recent to affect the issue.

Cf. Corluy, *Spicilegium*, i. pp. 278-296 ; Knabenbauer, *Comment.* in loco ; Rose in *Révue Biblique*, 1896.

² Osee xiii. 4, 14 ; cf. vi. 2, 3.

³ Is. xxvi. 19.

and their dry bones covered with flesh and sinews, and clothed in their very skins, to live with a new spirit infused by Almighty God, expresses to the full the expectations of righteous Israelites : a national resurrection and a moral regeneration of the people.¹

The same intense hope is expressed in the Psalms, not for the nation as a whole, but a cry of the faithful soul for its strongest yearning to that fullness of joy which is only to be reached by union and vision of God.

I have called daily upon Thee, O Lord,
I have spread forth my hands unto Thee,
Wilt Thou shew wonders to the dead ?
Shall they that are deceased arise and praise Thee ?
Shall Thy loving-kindness be declared in the grave ?
Or Thy faithfulness in destruction ?
Shall Thy wonders be known in the dark ?
And Thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness ?
But unto Thee, O Lord, have I cried
And in the morning shall my prayer come before Thee.²

For Thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol ;
Neither wilt Thou suffer Thine holy one to see corruption.
Thou wilt shew me the path of life :
In Thy presence is fulness of joy ;
In Thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore.³

. . . I shall behold Thy face in righteousness :
I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with Thy likeness.⁴

With the prophecy of Daniel a clearer insight is given us into the future : not the righteous only, but wicked Israelites as well, shall rise before the Judge—though not all—some unto everlasting life, and others unto reproach : ‘ to see it alway.’ Again, even the just shall not all possess the same glory, but those that are wise ‘ shall shine as the brightness of the firmament ; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for evermore.’⁵

Most graphic of all is the picture given in the Second Book of Machabees. Defiance of pain, threats of a judgment to come on their cruel torturer, unwavering certainty of

¹ Ezech. xxxvii. 12.

² Ps. lxxxvii. (lxxxviii.) 9-13.

³ Ps. xv. (xvi.) 10, 11.

⁴ Ps. xvi. (xvii.) 15.

⁵ Daniel xii. 1-3. It is not certain that Daniel is speaking of any but the persecuted Jews and their oppressors—there is no reason against its extension to all good and bad.

restoration of their bodies, now for a while mangled and destroyed, and a wonderful tone of victory over their deadly enemy, pervades the narrative of the martyrdom of the heroic mother with her brave sons. Not less remarkable is the passage where Razias is shown grasping his bowels with both hands ; and casting them upon the throng, called upon the Lord of life and spirit to restore them to him again ; and so departed this life.¹

So it would seem that in the Old Testament writings there are two expressions of eschatology, not opposed, nor by any means mutually exclusive of one another, but concurrent and supplementary to each other. The one, represented by Job and the Psalms, looks forward to the resurrection of the righteous individual, while the other puts forward a national reinstatement, with punishment of unfaithful Israelites. Osee, Isaias and Ezechiel simply suppose a reviviscence in the body, as also the Book of Machabees ; while Daniel and the Psalmists hint at a spiritual change accompanying the resurrection.

Of great interest to students of the New Testament is the investigation of the views held by the Rabbis and Jewish people at the time when Our Lord was summing up in His own life and death the Law and the Prophets, and, indeed, the whole of the traditions and achievements of the Chosen People.² It is undisputed that the greater portion of the Jewish people under the guardianship of their venerated Pharisees believed in a resurrection of the dead—at least of righteous Israel. They taught that every statement of Holy Scripture expressed in the future tense referred to the resurrection.³ The prayers used in the liturgical services of the Temple were framed especially⁴ to counteract the Hellenistic scepticism of the Sadducees :

O God, the soul which Thou hast set within me is pure. Thou hast formed it, Thou hast breathed into me, Thou preservest it within me, and Thou wilt take it from me and restore it to me in time to come. . . . O Lord of all spirits, who restorest souls to dead bodies.⁵

The Talmudic accounts are so material as to verge on the ridiculous. The *os sacrum*, for example, is taken to be a guarantee of resurrection, for from it will spring the new

¹ 2 Mach. vii. 9-37, xii. 42, 43, xiv. 46.

² Cf. Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, i.

³ Palest. Talmud., *Sanhed.* 90-92.

⁴ *Berachoth* ix. 5 (Babyl. Talmud.), especially the second Benediction.

⁵ *Ibid* lx. b. Cf. Morning and Evening Benedictions used by Jewish worshippers.

man, just as mice are supposed to grow out of the earth.¹ And not only shall the new man rise in his own flesh, but the very clothes in which he was buried shall be restored to him. For, answered Rabbi Meir to Queen Cleopatra's impertinent question, if the grain of wheat which is buried naked rises so gloriously clothed, how much more shall the just be who have been buried in their clothes! And so Rabbi Jeremiah gave orders that he should be laid out in his very best suit, with sandals on his feet, stick in hand and hat on; and he was to be placed on his side, not on his back, so as to lose no time in rising at the coming of Messiah! Nor is this rabbinic story unique. Rabbi Simi taught that the gathering of Israel from the different parts of the world shall take place through underground passages, the corpses rolling towards Jerusalem, the site of New Zion. Whereupon Rabbi Meir asked to be buried near the sea (from Antioch), and have a cord tied round his feet so as to make it easier (for the angels?) to pull him to Jerusalem; which in fact became a pious practice among the Jews of Antioch.² Another Rabbi asks: 'What will they do at the time the Holy One, blessed be He, shall renew His world? as it reads (Is. ii. 7): exalted shall be the Lord *alone* on that day.' To which the answer is given that the upright in question will be given wings, similar to the wings of the eagles, and they will fly over the world. . . . 'to this it is written (Is. xl. 31): . . . they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary; they shall walk and not be faint.'³

The copious apocalyptic literature, Jewish in origin and dating from 200 B.C. onwards to the first and second centuries of the Christian era, fill in the details of the prophetic utterings, generally in a sensuous direction:

And behold! He cometh with ten thousands of His holy ones
To execute judgment upon all
And to destroy the ungodly.⁴

And then shall all the righteous escape
And shall live till they beget thousands of children,
And all the days of their youth and their old age shall they
complete in peace.⁵

though all defilement and unrighteousness and sin are to

¹ Babyl. Talmud (ed. Rodkinson), p. 276.

² Cf. Lagrange, *Le Messianisme chez les Juifs*, iii. 4.

³ Babyl. Talmud, p. 276.

⁴ *The Book of Enoch* (tr. R. H. Charles); Eth. En. i. 9.

⁵ *Ibid.* x. 17.

be removed by Gabriel, and all nations are to offer adoration and praise to the Holy Great One, the Lord of Glory, the Eternal King, sitting on the summit of the high mountain, on his throne of glory.¹ These apocalypses may be grouped according to their content into three main schools of thought, which must have existed at the time of Our Lord, even though the dates assigned to the different compositions may vary by as much as two hundred years:—

(1) *The Orthodox School*, represented at the time of Our Lord's preaching by the Pharisees. The Rabbinic doctrine of the Pharisees is accessible to us in the Songs of Solomon. After the happy days of the earthly kingdom of Messiah, a general resurrection will be followed by the judgment. Those who fear the Lord will find favour in that day; they shall rise for eternal life in the goodwill of God, in the light of their Lord which will never fail—the heritage of life in blessedness. The wicked, on the contrary, will not appear in the day of mercy, but their abode shall be in Hades, in the dark and perdition—an eternal loss, a dreadful fall, an everlasting oblivion.²

(a) *Resurrection in the body for righteous Israelites* is shown in the testaments of Juda and of Zabulon³:

I shall rise again in the midst of you, as a chief in the midst of his sons, and I shall rejoice in the midst of my tribe, in the midst of those who shall have kept the Law of the Lord and the commandments of Zabulon their father.⁴

And they who have died in grief shall arise in joy,
And they who were poor for the Lord's sake shall be made rich,
And they who are put to death for the Lord's sake shall awake to life.⁵

Ethiopic Enoch (i. 36) makes Sheol consist of four divisions, of which one is reserved for sinners who had not expiated their crimes at the time of death (ch. xxii.). These shall receive their full retribution in their bodies on the advent of the Kingdom; the others shall not take part in the resurrection. In chapter xxv., however, *all Israelites* are supposed to be present at the great judgment, when

¹ Eth. En. i. 9, x. 17, xxv. 3-6.

² *Pss. Solomon*, iii. 13-16, xiii. 9-11, xiv. 6, 7, xv. 13-15 (cf. xvii. 50 xviii. 7).

³ *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* (tr. R. H. Charles).

⁴ *Zabul.* x. 2.

⁵ *Judah* xxv. 4.

He shall take vengeance on all and bring everything to its consummation for ever. The righteous and holy shall be given of the fruit of the fragrant tree of life, which shall be transplanted to the temple of the Lord :

Then shall they rejoice with joy and be glad
And into the holy place shall they enter ;
And its fragrance shall be borne in their bones,
And they shall live a long life on earth,
Such as thy fathers lived :
And in their days shall no sorrow or plague
Or torment or calamity touch them.¹

This view corresponds with that expressed in the Second Book of Machabees (vii. 11-29, xiv. 46) and in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs (Levi v. xviii.). Both the Testament and the Ethiopic Enoch agree with 2 Machabees (xii. 42, 43) in describing a *general* resurrection in the body :

In those days the earth shall yield its burden, and Sheol shall give up what it received, and the lower regions shall return its due. He (the Elect) shall choose from among them the just and the holy ones, for the day of salvation is at hand.²

Keep the commandments of God until the Lord shall reveal His salvation to all Gentiles. And then shall ye see Enoch, Noah and Shem, and Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, rising on the right hand in gladness. Then shall we also rise, each one over our tribe, worshipping the King of Heaven. Then also all men shall rise, some unto glory and some unto shame.³

(But the Gentiles) shall be chased out of the whole earth, and cast into the torment of fire, and they shall be destroyed by wrath and by an eternal torment, which shall be eternal.⁴

(b) A *transformation of the risen body* of the just among Israelites is said by Josephus to have been taught by the Pharisees. 'For although it (the body) be dissolved, it is not perished; for the earth receives its remains and preserves them, like seed . . . , but at the sound of God the Creator, it will sprout up and be raised in a clothed and glorious condition . . . in a state of purity. But as for the unjust, they will receive their bodies not changed, not freed from their diseases or distempers, nor made glorious. . . . To these belong the unquenchable fire; and that without end; and a certain worm that dieth not.'⁵

¹ Eth. En. xxv. 3-6.

² Ibid. li. 1.

³ Benjamin x. 5-7.

⁴ Eth. En. xci. 9, 10.

⁵ Josephus, *Discourses to the Greeks*, §§ 5, 6.

According to the Apocalypse of Ezra,¹ after a primaeval silence of seven days the Age which is not yet awake² shall be roused, and that which is corruptible³ shall perish, the Most High revealed :

. . . Then cometh the end and compassion shall pass away and pity be afar off and long-suffering withdrawn.⁴

Deeds of righteousness shall awake, and deeds of iniquity shall not sleep. And then shall the pit of torment appear, and over against it the place of refreshment ; the furnace of Gehenna shall be made manifest and over against it the Paradise of delight.⁵

The (evil) root is sealed up from you, infirmity from your path extinguished. And death is hidden, Hades fled away ; corruption forgotten, sorrows passed away ; and in the end the treasures of immortality are made manifest.⁶

The picture is still sensuous, with rest and plenty, even for these righteous constituted in wisdom and good works, thriving on the Tree of Life.

Baruch⁷ is told that the earth will restore the dead exactly as it received them in order to show to the living that those who had departed have returned again. Then judgment will grow strong, and those who have now been justified will have their splendour glorified in changes, and the form of their face will be turned into the light of their beauty. Time will not age them, for they shall dwell in the heights of that world which does not die ; ' and they shall be made like unto the angels, and be made equal to the stars, and they shall be changed into every form they desire, from beauty into loveliness, and from light into the splendour of glory '—an excellency surpassing that of the angels.

And I saw till the Lord of the sheep brought a new house greater and loftier than the first . . . and all the sheep were within it . . . And those sheep were all white, and their wool abundant and clean. And all that had been destroyed and dispersed, and all the beasts of the field, and all the birds of the heaven assembled in that house, and the Lord of the sheep rejoiced with great joy because they were all good and had returned to His house.⁸

¹ *The Ezra-Apocalypse* (C. H. Box), vii. 29-42, viii. 52-54 (cf. vii. 125, x. 25, 50).

² *Qui nondum vigilat saeculum.*

³ *Corruption* = φθαρτος (ἀων) ; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 42, 50-54.

⁴ *Ezra-Apoc.* vii. 33.

⁵ *Ibid.* vii. 35, 36.

⁶ *Ibid.* viii. 53, 54.

⁷ *Apocalypse of Baruch* (R. H. Charles), l. 1-4, li. 3-12.

⁸ *Eth. En.* xc. 29, 32, 33.

And I saw that a white bull was born, with large horns, and all the beasts of the field and all the birds of the air feared him and made petitions to him all the time. And I saw till all their generations were transformed and they all became white bulls; and the first among them became a lamb, and that lamb became a great animal and had great black horns on its head; and the Lord of the sheep rejoiced over it and over all the oxen.¹

A curious figure to denote the Messiah, here represented as a mere man with no special function allotted to Him except that of transforming non-Israelites.

(c) A *still greater transformation* is postulated by the Book of the Secrets of Enoch,² in which undetermined forms of speech are used to convey the idea of a spiritual body:—

And the LORD said to Michael: Go and take from Enoch his earthly robe, and anoint him with My holy oil and clothe him with the raiment of My glory. And so Michael did as the Lord spoke unto him. He anointed me and clothed me, and the appearance of that oil was more than a great light, and its anointing was like excellent dew; and its fragrance like myrrh, shining like a ray of the sun. And I gazed on myself and I was like one of His glorious ones. And there was no difference, and fear and trembling departed from me.³

Similarly with the Book of Proverbs in Ethiopic Enoch (xxxvii.-lxxi.) the Messiah will recall to life those that have perished on land and sea and those that are in Sheol and hell. He will judge angels and men. The righteous, now at last in unhindered possession of the new earth, will shine with joy, and be resplendent with light. They will be vested with life and become angels in heaven:

And the righteous and elect shall have risen from the earth
And ceased to be of downcast countenance,
And they shall have been clothed with garments of glory.
And there shall be the garments of life from the Lord of Spirits;
And your garments shall not grow old,
Nor your glory pass away before the Lord of Spirits.⁴

(2) Directly opposed to the orthodox teaching of the Pharisees were the *Sadducees*. The Gospels and Acts represent them as *denying* not only resurrection of the body but even the *immortality of the soul*. 'As touching the resurrection of the dead, have you not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of

¹ Eth. En. xc. 37, 38.

² *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Charles-Morfill), xxii.

³ Secr. En. xxii. 8-10.

⁴ Eth. En. lxii. 15, 16.

Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.'¹ Josephus fully corroborates the view taken of them in the Gospels, and exhibits them as thoroughly imbued with Epicurean and Stoic principles, which admit of no possibility for either survival or resurrection.²

(3) *The Hellenistic School*, whose brilliant exponent was Philo.³ For him the Platonic philosophy found its completest expression in the Torah. Moses had already described the 'genii' as angels.

These are souls fluttering about in the air . . . immortal and divine, moving about in that sphere which is most akin to the mind. Of these some descended into the bodies; others ever shrink from all earthly contact. The latter are consecrated to the Supreme Father and Maker of all, who makes use of them as His ministering angels in ruling mortal men. The former, on the other hand, having entered into human bodies, as if plunged in a stream, are at times completely engulfed in its whorls. Sometimes, however, struggling against the current, they succeed in emerging out of the troubled water, and then flying back to whence they came. These are souls who, exquisitely taught by highest philosophy, from first to last ponder over the death of their body, that they may attain the incorporeal and incorruptible life near Him who is uncreated and incorruptible. . . . For the flesh is the chief cause of ignorance, as evidenced by him who says: Wherefore can the spirit of God not stay, because they are flesh . . . (Gen. vi. 3). A wise man looks not upon death as the extinction of his soul, but rather as the separation and freedom from bondage of the body, to return there whence it came: for it came from God.

The Essenes⁴ and Therapeutae⁵ also restricted themselves to a belief in the immortality of the soul; the body being a prison-house in which the soul is held in fetters and prevented from soaring aloft in full liberty. This doctrine depends on the conception of matter as essentially malignant. Resurrection of the body would involve a perpetuation of evil. So, too, in the Book of Jubilees,⁶

And at that time the Lord will heal His servants,
And they shall rise up and see great peace,
And drive out their adversaries.

¹ Matt. xxii. 23; Mark xii. 10; Luke xx. 27; Acts iv. 1, 2, xxiii. 8.

² Josephus, *Bel. Jud.* Bk. 2, viii. 14; *Antiquit.* xviii. 14.

³ Philo (ed. Mangey), *De gigantibus*, p. 285; *De mundo*, p. 1153; *De Abrahamo*, p. 385—cf. *Leg. allegor.* i. 12 (i. p. 32).

⁴ Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* Bk. 2, viii. 2-13; *Antiq.* xiii. 5/9, xviii. 1/5; *Vit.* 2. Philo, *Quod omnis probus liber*, 12; *Apol. pro Jud.* ii. (cf. Lightfoot, *Colossians*).

⁵ Philo, *De vita contemplat.* ii. p. 471.

⁶ *The Book of Jubilees* (R. H. Charles), xxiii. 30, 31.

And the righteous will see and be thankful,
 And rejoice with joy for ever and ever,
 And will see all their judgments and all their curses on their enemies,
 And their bones will rest in the earth,
 And their spirits will have much joy,
 And they will know that it is the Lord who executes judgment
 And shows mercy to hundreds and thousands and to all that love Him.

Others would include in the Hellenistic School works like the Book of Wisdom and the Assumption of Moses,¹ which seem to ignore the resurrection of the body, though no definite rejection can be proved. For the Book of Wisdom a good case in favour of incorruption could be made from vi. 18, 19, and ix. 15. The Assumption of Moses, after describing the levelling down of the high mountains, the darkening of the sun and the retirement of the sea into the abyss, shows the Eternal God alone appearing to punish the Gentiles, and

Then thou, O Israel, wilt be happy,
 And thou wilt mount upon the neck[s and wings] of the eagle,
 And [the days of thy mourning] will be ended.
 And God will exalt thee
 And He will cause thee to approach to the heaven of the stars
 And He will establish thy habitation among them.
 And then wilt thou look from on high and wilt see thy enemies in
 Gehenna,
 And thou wilt recognize them and rejoice,
 And thou wilt thank and confess thy Creator.²

Finally, in 4 Machabees a Stoic ideal is aimed at, not devoid of supernatural motives and powers. No resurrection of the body is hinted at, even in the descriptions of the martyrdom of the mother with her seven sons. The Patriarchs will receive the righteous to enjoy communion with God (*ζῶσιν τῷ Θεῷ*),- vii. 19, etc.); the wicked will be tormented in fire for ever.³

One may conclude, therefore, that the primitive belief in the resurrection of the dead—vague and indefinite as it was, and charged with superstitious and idolatrous practices—was gradually purified from all accretions, and defined by God's inspired messengers to His chosen people. By the time of the advent of Our Lord, despite the influences of pagan philosophy and culture, the main current of

¹ *Assumption of Moses* (R. H. Charles), x. 3-10.

² *Ass. Moses* x. 8-10.

³ 4 *Mach.* viii.-xii.

orthodox teaching in Israel looked forward to a resurrection in the body for all Israelites, immediately preceding the General Judgment which was to close the Messianic era on earth. Christ Our Lord, through His Apostles, definitively fixed the doctrine of the resurrection of the body for all men, good or bad, Jew or Gentile alike :

This I confess unto thee . . . that there shall be a resurrection both of the just and the unjust.¹

For we must all be made manifest before the judgment-seat of Christ, that each one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he hath done, good or bad.²

T. J. AGIUS, S.J.

¹ Acts xxiv. 14, 15.

² 2 Cor. v. 10.

THE POST-PENTECOSTAL SUNDAY MASSES

BY REV. EDWARD STEPHENS

WHEN Pope Pius X restored to common observance the Sundays after Pentecost, he rescued from the danger of obsolescence a series of Masses which form an integral portion of the Roman Missal. The first day of the week is the earliest feast in the calendar, and the title 'Lord's Day,' which marks its dedication, is one of those golden phrases which fell from the pen of the inspired writer of the Apocalypse. Ever since the Reformation, whilst the division between liturgical and popular devotional services has tended to become more and more marked, popular devotion has also tended to make the liturgy subserve its purposes, and one result has been that Sunday lost its right to its own special outward solemnity, and the very name which it bears in the Rubrics ceased to have any significance. Yet, if it be truly the 'Lord's Day,' nothing but the weightiest reasons should ever avail to oust it from its rank and precedence. The *Missae De Dominica*, at least as far as their Collects is concerned, go back to the days of the Gelasian and Gregorian Sacramentaries; these, with the Leonian, are three of the earliest liturgical documents of the Roman Church. While the Gelasian and Gregorian Sacramentaries may fairly be allowed to represent, the one the Roman Mass Book at the beginning, the other at the end of the sixth century (there is sufficient weight of opinion among scholars to justify this view),¹ it is uncertain whether the Leonian Sacramentary has any right to the name at all. No one can say whether it ever had any connexion with St. Leo the Great, or whether it ever was a Mass Book and not rather a collection of prayers drawn up for private use. Only one manuscript copy of it exists—a mutilated codex, which forms one of the chief treasures of the Chapter library

¹ Cf. *Downside Review*, October 1917, p. 47.

of Verona. This copy lacks the Masses for the first three months of the year, and also the Canon—an irreparable loss to the scientific study of the origin of the Roman Mass. There is fair reason to conclude that the Canon was identical with that found now in the *De Sacramentis*.¹

The Masses are arranged according to months and days, and are assigned with the utmost profusion. The date of the original manuscript is a matter of conjecture. A recent English editor of the *Leonianum*, the Rev. C. Feltoe, claims that the Verona codex is itself an original and *sui generis*,² with an antiquity going back no further than the seventh century. Sir E. Maunde Thompson, of the British Museum, is inclined to assign the seventh century as the date of the manuscript.³ Most scholars fix a period for the original (which they do not hold the Verona manuscript to be) between the years 440 and 480 A.D. It matters not much what the real character and date of the document is, whether a Sacramentary or a mere private collection of prayers, whether of the fifth or of the seventh century, since in its collection are found a large number of the earliest prayers of our present Missal, although not under corresponding dates. One might quote, for example, the Collect which stands in our present Missal for the thirteenth Sunday after Pentecost: 'Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, da nobis fidei spei et caritatis augmentum et ut mereamur adsequi quod promittis fac nos amare quod praecipis'—the prayer now used at Mass over the blessing of the water at the Offertory and the prayer so often said against the persecutors of the Church, 'Ecclesiae hic quaesumus Domine.' It only needs the slightest acquaintance with the very pronounced style of the 'Majestic Leo' to recognize similarities of style and rhythm in some at least of the contents of the book which bears his name. The number of Roman topographical allusions is not without importance.⁴

The Gelasian Sacramentary purports to be the *Liber Sacramentorum Romanae Ecclesiae*. No one will seriously maintain that we have it now as it was drawn up by Pope Gelasius I (492–496). 'It is an ordered collection in the form of three books. Speaking from the bulk of the

¹ *Downside Review*, October 1917, pp. 58, 59.

² *Sacramentarium Leonianum*. Edited by Rev. C. L. Feltoe, Introduction, p. xv.

³ *Ibid.* p. vii.

⁴ Cf. Duchesne, *Origines du culte Chrétien*, 2nd Edition (English), p. 139.

contents of each book, the first contains the Missal and other Offices connected with the ecclesiastical year; the second, Masses for Saints' days; the third presents a large body of votive Masses, with a certain number for Sundays and week-days.'¹ As to its authorship, Edmund Bishop has this to say: 'By general acquiescence of the learned, rather than by consent after any specific and recent critical investigation, the *Gelasianum* is commonly allowed to pass, either as an actual production of Pope Gelasius I (492-496), or, at least, as dating from about his time.'² The manuscripts of it which we possess are Gallican work of the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries. Many of the distinctive Roman features are omitted. There is no mention of a Roman basilica: 'All prayers relating to certain Offices proper to Roman observance, the Mass of St. Anastasia on Christmas Day, the Greater Litany, April 25, the procession at Easter Vespers, the *collectae* or assemblies at certain feasts, have been suppressed.'³

Yet the groundwork remains distinctly Roman, and into it have been inserted many features of Gallican origin. Stranger still, the use made of the book in one century in Gaul differs greatly from that made of it in another century. The seventh-century manuscript represents a purer Roman origin than does the eighth. How the book came from Rome to Gaul is not apparent, but once in Gaul it became widely popular. Hence arises the puzzling anomaly that the Gelasian Sacramentary, which ought to be the Roman Mass Book of the early part (at least) of the sixth century, contains later liturgical developments which are not found in the Gregorian Sacramentary, a fact which has led more than one writer astray. Fortunately we have authentic knowledge of the history of the introduction of the Gregorian Sacramentary into Gaul, and are therefore the better able to trace the influence of this introduction upon the development of the whole of the Roman Liturgy as it now exists.

When Charlemagne succeeded in bringing barbaric Europe into an ordered and civilized system of government, he turned his attention to the securing of liturgical uniformity instead of the liturgical chaos which existed throughout

¹ E. Bishop, *Liturgica Historica*, p. 40.

² *Ibid.* pp. 42, 43.

³ Duchesne, *Origines du culte Chrétien*, 2nd Edition, pp. 130, 131. Quoted, *Liturgica Historica*, p. 43.

his dominions. There were in use Gallican books pure and simple, Gallican books with a slight Roman tincture, and Roman books with a large Gallican admixture. Nothing would achieve his purpose more effectually than the introduction of the Roman rite as carried out in Rome, and he therefore applied to Pope Hadrian for a copy of the Roman Mass Book. Pope Hadrian did not immediately comply with the request, but about the year 791 the desired book came. It was described in the covering letter as 'the book arranged long ago by our holy predecessor, the God-inspired Gregory.' Hence Mgr. Duchesne calls it now 'Sacramentaire d'Hadrien.'

But the path of a liturgical reformer is notoriously not a smooth one—witness the stool flung at the minister's head in Edinburgh as a protest against the imposition on the Scots of the Book of Common Prayer. The new book thus sent to Gaul failed immediately to oust its old Roman and Gallican rivals. All the nations of Europe have their own religious psychology. The Romans, with their gravity, and the Gauls, with their exuberance, differed in their ideals and in their requirements. The new Roman book lacked what the Gauls, for centuries, had devised and pondered over as the vital means of nourishing their faith and devotion. One has only to compare the Roman rite of ordination in the new Gregorian book with the old Gallican rites, to measure the contrast and the disappointment.

Charlemagne was compelled to compromise. If he did not act officially others would act unofficially. He drew up a supplement¹ to the *Gregorianum*, containing a choice of much that was required, and set forth the new book, with a preface by Alcuin, which served at once to explain Charlemagne's purpose and to mark the distinction between the Pope's book and the latest authoritative supplement. In course of time the Preface ceased to appear in its official place, or else was dropped; convenience was more and more consulted, and the contents of the supplement were little by little incorporated into the body of the book. Hence, while Pope Gregory gave the Church four prophecies on Holy Saturday, and the Gelasian Sacramentary² ten, Gallican thoroughness required twelve, and twelve stand

¹ Cf. Edmund Bishop, *Liturgica Historica*, 'Earliest Roman Mass Book,' p. 51. Edmund Bishop, *Downside Review*, July, 1919, p. 7.

² The later and more Gallican Rheinau codex of the Gelasian gives twelve prophecies.

and are read in the Roman Missal, down to the present day.

For our purpose it is necessary to point out here that the Gelasian Sacramentary and the Gregorian book sent by Hadrian differ materially in the provision which they make for the Masses of the Sundays after Pentecost. In the Vatican manuscript of the Gelasian, a series of fifteen Pentecostal Masses is found; a full series exists in the later codex known as the Rheinau manuscript. With some trifling exceptions these Masses are identical with the corresponding Masses of the present Roman Missal. As a rule a choice of collects is given, usually two, sometimes three and rarely one in number—the Secret and the Post-Communion follow. Perhaps it is due to a failure to observe this that the Mass *Pro Tempore Belli* has for its Post-Communion prayer (which ought really to have reference to the Communion just received) the prayer which stands as the second in a choice of three in the Gelasian,¹ and the third of three in the Gregorian.² In the Sacramentary sent by Hadrian these Pentecostal Masses do not appear at all.

It would be easy and obvious to infer that Pope Gregory omitted in his book as unnecessary such a series of Masses. The question, however, is complicated by the discovery that in the seventh century palimpsest at Monte Cassino, examined in 1909 by Dom A. Wilmart,³ the sets of Masses for the Sundays after Epiphany, Easter, and Pentecost are found, and these Masses are textually the same as those found in Alcuin's Supplement to the Gregorian Sacramentary. It is certain that this manuscript, the oldest of its kind, was written in Rome or in the neighbourhood of Rome. Hence we may reasonably ask if Pope Hadrian reformed the Missal—as he reformed the Office books.⁴

More information may some day be gathered on this point, but for the present it must be regarded as another of the mysteries attaching to the development of the liturgy in Rome.

Yet, whether these collects are an integral part of the Gelasian book, whether they were retained by Gregory and excluded by Hadrian, they are certainly Roman in origin

¹ Cf. Wilson edition of Gelasian Sacramentary, p. 272.

² Cf. Wilson edition of Gregorian Sacramentary, p. 198.

³ E. Bishop, *Liturgica Historica*, p. 78.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 63 (note.)

and character—not a few of them exist in the Leonian Sacramentary. Their period of origin, therefore, will range (according as we date the Leonian book) from the fifth to the seventh century. Cardinal Newman says of Cicero, that whereas all his classical rivals wrote Latin, he wrote Roman. The compliment may not undeservedly be paid to these virile specimens of Latin Prose. They are Roman in the lines of their architecture and in the religious psychology which their fondness for the use of those essentially Roman words ‘*Pietas*’ and ‘*Mens*’ so notably marks.¹ In them lingers the austere dignity of phrase and rhythm which only an imperial people could fashion as the expression of their genius. They catch up in terms noble and reserved all the aspirations of the Christian Church. They expound the faith and teach the truth against the heresies of the day—the law of prayer giving the law of belief. They blend the conciseness of theological statement with the comeliness of high literary art. Their texture is fragrant with the prayer and praise of Saints. They breathe the spirit of the Church—not of the Catacombs, but of the Basilicas. They are echoes from the chair of the Bishop, and their serenity, because it rests on the consciousness of Apostolic might, is not disturbed even when the barbarians were sweeping through Italy to thunder at the gates of Rome. And yet the very stateliness of their reserve is alien to those intimate outpourings of personal emotion which is so arresting a feature of the Eastern Liturgies. The difference is a fundamental one, lying deep in the cleft which divides East and West.

What the Collects lack in this respect is found in amplest measure in the antiphonal portions of the Mass, which provide a means of stirring the feelings of the soul with a warmth and freedom impossible in collected prayer. While the Offertory and Communion show more independence of choice, drawing usually from the Psalms but also from other portions of Holy Scripture, the Introits and Graduals of the Masses which we are discussing are invariably from the Psalms,² and, as a rule, it will be found that those portions of the Psalms were chosen which most meet the public and private needs of the hour.

¹ Cf. *Downside Review*, July, 1919. p. 14; ‘The Liturgical Reforms of Charlemagne,’ E. Bishop.

² Exceptions are Introit for 20th Sunday, 21st Sunday, 23rd and 24th Sundays, taken from Dan. iii., Esther xiii., Jeremias xxi.

The Masses for the proper and common of Saints emphasize the glories and sufferings of the Saints and Martyrs. That is indeed due from the Church Militant to the Church Triumphant. The Sunday Masses, however, emphasize the relations between God and the Church, or between God and the individual soul. Their burden is a belief in God's all enfolding Presence, a longing to see His Face, a conviction of His power, a sense of His Providence and of His readiness to help—that He is our light and our refuge. We are bidden to sing to Him, to proclaim His praises, to rest under the shadow of His wings. He is entreated to bow down His ear and hearken to us. These and all human heart-stirrings find their expression here where Christian Saint and Hebrew Prophet have etched and moulded.

EDWARD STEPHENS.

THE TRIALS OF SOME IRISH MISSIONARIES

BY REV. JAMES P. RUSHE, O.D.C.

VI—THE VICISSITUDES OF THREE REIGNS, A.D. 1671-1699

THE documents—preserved in the General Archives of the Discalced Carmelites—which record the progress of the Irish Teresian Mission, subsequent to the period of the Valesian Formulary, bring the present series to a close.¹ It enhances their interest and importance that they include the personal narratives of two of the Friars—Fathers Felix of the Holy Ghost and Joseph of the Nativity—who had experienced the keen disappointment of the Faithful of Ireland over the callous ingratitude of Charles II; who were sad witnesses of the frustration of sanguine hopes entertained on the accession of his brother James; and who still survived the hardships falling to the lot of the Irish clergy, generally, during the Williamite régime.² Meanwhile, we learn from a letter of Father Bede of St. Simon Stock—one of the English Teresians intimately associated with his Irish brethren, as we have seen—that, notwithstanding the grave losses sustained by the death of sorely needed missionaries during the conflict with Ormond's unscrupulous agents, not a few Discalced Carmelites remained in Ireland, in 1670, to uphold the cause of Catholic orthodoxy as earnestly as their zealous predecessors.³ They had no official representative at the General Chapter of the Order the following year; but, otherwise, there is abundant evidence to show the trend of their activities at this particular epoch; and, certainly, these are very extraordinary, considering the

¹ I. E. RECORD, February, 1920.

² These two narratives, largely drawn upon by Father Blasius of the Purification, are preserved among the Irish Papers (*Plut.* 190).

³ Father Bede's letters are to be found among the English Papers in the General Archives, (*Plut* 187).

circumstances of the times. Far from having been deterred in their efforts by the avowed hostility of Peter Walsh and his powerful patron, their ambition now extended to the establishment of their own novitiate in Ireland: a project upon which, they were convinced, the future welfare of the Mission would depend; and already their exiled brethren had received permission to return from the Continent with this special purpose in view.¹

In confirmation of Father Bede's statement, other sources reveal that, about the year 1670, the Teresian community at Dublin comprised Fathers John of the Mother of God—apparently the successor of Father Agapitus of the Holy Ghost as Vicar Provincial—Paul of St. Ubald, Gregory of St. Elias, Angelus-Joseph of the Conception, Thomas of Jesus, James of St. Dymphna, John of the Cross, Cyril of St. Albert and a Father Malachy, to whom no further allusion is made. There were three lay-brothers: Joseph of St. John Baptist, Nicholas and Stephen.² And although it is known that four of these religious died between the years 1669 and 1672, other Teresians were then exercising the sacred ministry both at Athboy and Loughrea. There were, moreover, those returning exiles: Fathers Patrick of St. Brigid, Bernard of the Assumption, Edward of the Kings, and Christianus; together with Father Felix of the Holy Ghost, who was so eager to second the project submitted at the General Chapter of 1665 that he would gladly have resigned his office as Sub-prior at Asti to risk the perils of the Mission in his native land.³ However, the state of suspense due to the Valesian difficulty proved a serious check to such devotedness; and it was not until the year 1672 that he and Father Patrick of St. Brigid could enter on the self-same undertaking with every assurance as to its ultimate success. They were soon followed to Loughrea by Fathers Bernard and Edward, equally eager to participate in the practical measures being taken there for the immediate re-opening of the Irish novitiate. For, although the recent recall of the Duke of Ormonde argued well for religious toleration in Ireland, it was deemed a wise precaution to make the ruined friary at Loughrea serve the purpose in hand, since the new community there might

¹ From the narrative of Father Felix of the Holy Ghost. (f. 3b.)

² The tenth chapter of the *MS. History of Father Blasius* deals with this subject.

³ *Ibid.*

count on the patronage of several influential Catholic families.¹ Father Cyril of St. Albert is mentioned in the document quoted as a member of the Dublin community ; but he appears to have been in charge at Loughrea on the arrival of Father Patrick of St. Brigid and the other exiles, who at once set about rendering the dilapidated buildings habitable, in order that they might follow therein the Regular Observance, as prescribed for Teresian Colleges, pending the conventual elections after which the exercises proper to the Novitiate would duly be introduced.²

No sooner had some fanatical Protestants of the neighbourhood become aware of what was being done in the ancient Carmelite monastery than they informed the Governor of the Province : drawing his particular attention to the enormity of the ringing of a small bell to summon the friars to the various acts of community. This official instantly forbade the practice ; and when Father Patrick of St. Brigid remonstrated, protesting that they were perfectly justified in their conduct which violated no law, the Governor threatened to denounce the religious to the Privy Council.³ They were not alarmed as to the issue, seemingly ; and proceeded with their elections in due course, Father Bernard of the Assumption being chosen Prior, and Father Patrick of St. Brigid Sub-prior and Master of Novices. The first four postulants received the Habit on the 8th of September, 1672 : Brothers Joseph of the Nativity, Henry of St. Patrick, Peter of St. Laurence—natives of Loughrea ; and a Brother Elias of St. John Baptist, who came from Munster. Brother Antony of All Saints entered on the 1st of November the same year ; and another aspirant was admitted in the course of 1673. Together with these junior religious, the Loughrea community consisted of five Conventual Fathers and a lay-brother named John Baptist of St. Joseph, sent from Dublin, a survivor of the Cromwellian persecution. All were most earnest in their vocation, the priests being, likewise, very zealous in discharge of their missionary duties ; in which latter respect Father Patrick of St. Brigid achieved much success, even among the heretics of the neighbourhood—his converts including certain persons in the employment of Lord Clanricarde.⁴

¹ *MS. History*, l.c.

² *Ibid.*, which includes some details not given by Father Felix of the Holy Ghost.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*

So encouraging were their prospects at this juncture, the Fathers thought they might venture to rebuild their monastery which, in pre-Teresian times, had suffered greatly at the hands of Elizabethan vandals, and, subsequently, from the method of 'thoroughness' adopted by Cromwell's agents. The charitable people of Loughrea hailed the project with enthusiasm, and Clanricarde himself promised to supply all the timber needed. But the work was interrupted by 'royal command'; for Lord Clanricarde had been denounced to the Council as being solely responsible in the matter: his design, according to the apostate Catholic who accused him, including the establishment of *two* convents to serve as fortresses against the State Church in the West of Ireland.¹ This express allusion to a *second* religious foundation at Loughrea is, unquestionably, positive confirmation of the local tradition, ascribing the introduction of the Teresian nuns there to this very period and associating with the same event the name of Father James (Breslane) of St. Dymphna.² However, when Father Blasius of the Purification—the historian of the Discalced Carmelite Missions, to whose forethought we owe the two personal narratives already mentioned—infers that the ensuing violent revival of the persecution against Irish Catholics was the outcome of the Loughrea incident; the contemporary evidence at our disposal does not admit of our accepting an otherwise plausible conjecture.³ The Edict of Banishment then promulgated is to be attributed to quite a different cause: revealing, rather, a reaction produced by Lord Berkeley's policy of tolerance in dealing with the situation in Ireland, which Ormonde interpreted as a reflection on his own method of administration implying the enforcement of the Loyal Remonstrance on the Faithful. It is not likely that this important phase of the question would have been known to those upon whose information Father Blasius relied; but we cannot afford to lose sight of it in the present connexion, seeing that the Duke of Ormonde's more recent apologists are responsible for grievously erroneous assumptions in suggesting that his attitude towards Irish Catholics, from the beginning, can be explained away on grounds of mere political expediency.⁴

¹ *MS. History*, l.c.

² This illustrates the importance attaching to well-established local tradition, and I have come across other documents in further support of the contention.

³ *MS. History*, l.c.

⁴ Cf. *Life of James, First Duke of Ormonde*, vol. ii. p. 177.

Nowhere is the evidence against Ormonde more conclusive, in this respect, than in his treatment of Peter Talbot, the heroic Archbishop of Dublin, now numbered among the Servants of God, whose cause, in defence of religion, is before the Sacred Congregation. And it may be mentioned, without any prejudice to the same, that this Illustrious Prelate happens to be one of the victims of the infamous calumnies promulgated in the pamphlet entitled 'Foxes and Firebrands'; but his formal defence must be reserved, of course, for another place. The second son of that Sir William Talbot—'legal oracle of the Catholic party in the Irish House of Commons' during the reign of King James the First—he was a distinguished member of the Society of Jesus, and became intimately acquainted with Charles II at Cologne; his appointment to the see of Dublin almost synchronizing with Ormonde's dismissal from the Lord-lieutenancy of Ireland.¹ On return to his native land, Dr. Talbot had openly pronounced himself absolutely opposed to the insidious policy advocated by Peter Walsh; whereas his relations with the new Viceroy were entirely cordial. So much so as to suggest to the fallen favourite a base means of avenging himself for the Archbishop's resolute action in regard to the Valesian Formulary. It seems Ormonde had still sufficient influence at Court to awaken uneasiness by commenting adversely on the alleged growing intimacy between Talbot and Berkeley; so misrepresenting the circumstances as to produce the impression of its being a direct menace to the Throne, indicating imminent restoration of the Papal Supremacy in Ireland.² The result of these insinuations was eminently satisfactory from the Duke's point of view: whether as calculated to bring about, eventually, his own rehabilitation in the royal esteem despite the intrigues of his private enemies; or in revenge for what he himself described as the 'oppression' of the renegade Friar Walsh and other supporters of the Remonstrance.³ In the address of the English Parliament to the King, it was urgently submitted that nothing but most rigorous application of the Penal Laws against Catholics would meet the emergency; the Archbishop of Dublin being singled out for virulent denunciation as a dangerous enemy to the State. Thus,

¹ Cf. *D'Alton's History of the Archbishops of Dublin*. p. 430 sqq. Also, *D.N.B.*, Vol. 55, p. 327.

² Cf. Notice in *D.N.B.*, Vol. 8, p. 52 (Butler). And *Life of Ormonde*, vol. ii. p. 179 sqq.

³ *Ibid.*

even while the senior novices were preparing for their religious profession, in that humble Teresian friary at Loughrea on the Feast of Our Lady's Nativity, 1673, the heroic victim of Ormonde's cruel vindictiveness had no alternative save to lie in concealment until an opportunity offered, enabling him to escape to Paris, whence Dr. Talbot issued his memorable address to the Faithful of the persecuted Irish Church the following year.¹

It is recorded that when Brother Antony of All Saints took his Vows, on the 1st of November, 1673, the Prior availed himself of the occasion to put clearly before the community the nature of the perils now threatening them owing to the renewed stringent enforcement of the dread Penal Laws. Writing on the 27th of January, 1674, the Venerable Oliver Plunket furnishes a singularly graphic account of some of the hardships entailed, when 'all the convents and novitiates were destroyed, and the novices scattered throughout the country.' He himself was among the fugitives 'deeming it necessary to take to his heels. The snow fell heavily, mixed with hailstones, which were very hard and large; a cutting north wind blew in the face, and the snow and hail beat so dreadfully in the eyes, for some time it was scarcely possible to see with them.'² A copy of the Edict of Banishment was forwarded to Loughrea by the Vicar-Provincial, Father Bernard of the Assumption; and prompt measures were taken to insure the safe departure of the recently professed novices for France; while Father Patrick of St. Brigid and the other Conventual Fathers would endeavour to remain on in Ireland to assist and encourage the Catholics under these new harsh trials. To one of the novices in question—Brother Joseph of the Nativity—we are indebted for a thrilling narrative of their experiences at this crisis: recording how he, and Brothers Bernard of St. Martin, Henry of St. Patrick, Peter of St. Laurence, Antony of All Saints, and a Brother Elias of St. John Baptist (who had not yet taken the religious vows) made their way to Galway, disguised as seculars, where they received hospitality from two of his own aunts.³ Brother John Baptist of

¹ *Hist. of the Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 439.

² *Memoir of Oliver Plunket*, p. 275. Cf. *MS. History*, l.c.

³ The name of Brother 'Elias of St. John Baptist' does not occur again, and may be a lapse of memory on the part of Father Blasius of the Purification. 'Ward' is given, elsewhere, as the family name of Brother John Baptist of St. Elias; and I am inclined to think that Brother Antony of All Saints was known in the world as 'Dogherty'; while the evidence indicates 'Burke' as the patronymic of Father Patrick of St. Brigid.

St. Elias was to have accompanied them, but he got permission to visit a friend living at some distance from Loughrea, who promised to arrange for his journey to France later on. As Brother Joseph's relatives were personally known to the Governor of Galway—Sir Oliver St. George—there seems to have been no trouble in securing a safe-conduct for him and for his companions when they at length secured passage on a French vessel about to make the return voyage. This, however, was only the beginning of their adventures which included the capture of their ship by the Dutch before their eventual arrival in Spain. Having spent some time in visiting various Spanish convents, they proceeded to Toulouse; and, finally, in the course of the year 1675, they were instructed to leave for Malta and continue their studies there, both in Philosophy and Theology, under an Irish Father named Victorinus of St. Dymphna.¹

Although the Irish Discalced Carmelites were represented at the General Chapter of 1674 by Father Thomas of Jesus, the Acts contain nothing to assist us in appreciating the effects of the Edict of Banishment on the Faithful of Ireland generally.² But it is quite manifest, from other contemporary sources, that, notwithstanding the vigilance of the civil authorities, the clergy, secular and regular, were indefatigable in attending to their missionary duties; the Venerable Oliver Plunket being one of the witnesses to their zeal.³ In the case of the Teresian Friars, members of the Order were thus earnestly engaged in Dublin, Loughrea, and Athboy; the energy displayed by Father Patrick of St. Brigid in coping with the difficulties around them meriting the highest commendation.⁴ Their chief anxiety was to insure the future welfare of their Mission by opening a house for the reception and training of their own subjects somewhere on the Continent. Having been elected by his brethren to represent them at the General Chapter of 1677, Father Patrick succeeded in convincing the assembled Fathers that this project might be inaugurated at Aix-la-Chapelle, the new Irish foundation serving the twofold purpose 'pro educatione Novitiorum necnon pro Refugio tempore persecutionis.' Unforeseen obstacles must have

¹ From the narrative of Father Joseph (Power) of the Nativity, f. 4b.-f. 12b. *passim*.

² *Acta Cap. Gen.* . . . anno 1674, f. 164b.

³ *Memoir*, p. 171.

⁴ *M.S. History*. l.c.

arisen subsequently ; for on the 6th of September, 1678, he wrote to the Procurator-General of the Order, dwelling on the urgency of the matter and proposing certain steps that might be taken to promote success ; if needs be, even direct appeal to the Emperor.¹

Special interest attaches to this letter, because of the references made to current Irish events after the writer's return to Dublin.² On the whole, he takes a more sanguine view of the situation, explaining that the Teresian community there had, that very week, resumed conventual life in their renovated monastery—dedicated to Saints Joseph and Anne. The Fathers had expended fully a thousand florins on the improvements made in both convent and chapel ; but the conveniences which they now enjoyed well repaid this outlay. The buildings occupied a central position, with a garden attached and a satisfactory water supply ; while the cells and the usual monastic offices were all that could be desired, in the circumstances. Care had also been taken to decorate the chapel becomingly ; so that, already, not alone were the Faithful of the city attracted thither, but many non-Catholics came to hear the sermons and instructions designed for the enlightenment of those really in earnest concerning the welfare of their souls. From this, continues Father Patrick of St. Brigid, it was surely permissible to infer that an appreciable lull in the storm of persecution had, at length, ensued ; justifying the Fathers in looking forward, confidently, to the future of their Mission. A present great drawback was the paucity of priests to discharge the duties incumbent upon them ; for there were only five or six Conventuals and two lay-brothers ; neither had they any young religious among them, and none of them could be said to possess robust health ; the two brothers being the most infirm of all, and nearly blind. Hence, it was not easy to carry out the Regular Observance as perfectly as they could wish ; especially owing to the extreme poverty of those whose alms formed the principal means of support for the community, leaving an exceedingly narrow margin to provide for the wants of the invalids. However, it was for the Definitory-General to grant all needful dispensations for the time being, empowering the Vicar-Provincial to meet the requirements of each case according to his own prudent discretion. In

¹ ? Leopold I of Austria.

² Cf. *Acta Cap. Gen.* . . . anno 1677, f. 177. The letter is among *the Irish Papers* (*Plut.* 190).

conclusion, therefore, it is impressed upon the Procurator-General that the immediate establishment of the proposed novitiate at Aix-la-Chapelle would prove the most effective solution of all difficulties; insuring zealous substitutes, in due course, for those Irish Teresian Missionaries who had, by this time, spent their strength in so arduous, if so profitable a field of labour.¹

Yet that very year, A.D. 1678, a furious fanatical outbreak against the Catholics, both in England and in Ireland, has to be recorded: the motives assigned being the discovery of an alleged 'Popish Plot' to murder the King in London, concurrently with the assassination of the Lord-lieutenant of Ireland, as revealed in a document supposed to have been picked up in one of the streets of Dublin. The Duke of Ormonde had recently been placed at the head of the Irish Government once more; and not even his reputation prepares us for the action now taken by him to discredit the Catholic cause.² Some time previously, Dr. Talbot had, through the intervention of the Duke of York, been permitted to return to Ireland; in order that he might dispose himself for death there, being afflicted with a fatal malady. Nevertheless, Ormonde had the Archbishop instantly arrested, as one of the alleged conspirators, and cast into a dungeon at Dublin Castle, where the hardships of his imprisonment secured for him the martyr's crown. The heroic Prelate had the consolation of being assisted in his agony by the Venerable Oliver Plunket, who was detained in the same place of captivity for a while before eventual removal to London to meet his own glorious doom.³ The former died in 1680, and the latter the following year; but, in the meantime, A.D. 1679, a General Visitation of the Discalced Carmelites had been held in Ireland.⁴ This duty was entrusted to a Belgian Teresian called Father Charles of St. John; his companion on that occasion being Father Lucian of St. Teresa, of the English Mission, who records very vividly his experiences during the same period: telling how he had actually been present at the execution of the Venerable Oliver Plunket, being specially privileged to pay a tribute of piety to this 'great Martyr's' sacred remains.⁵

¹ From the letter quoted.

² Even the author of the new *Life of James, First Duke of Ormonde*, makes no attempt to extenuate such brutal treatment of Dr. Talbot. (Vol. ii. p. 272 sqq.)

³ *Memoir*, p. 393.

⁴ *Brevis Relatio Missionis Anglicanae* (Plut. 187).

⁵ *Ibid.*

It is obvious, then, that the Superiors-General of the Discalced Carmelites kept themselves officially informed of the progress of events on both English and Irish Missions ; and the absence of a representative from Ireland is expressly noted in the Acts of the General Chapter of the Order, held at Bologna in 1680. The allusion becomes somewhat significant in light of the fact of few Capitulars being able to attend that Chapter owing to the prevalence of the plague in neighbouring districts, and to the precautions taken by the authorities at Bologna to prevent contagion.¹ It is just possible, therefore, that the assembled Fathers had heard of the arrival of the Irish Procurator in Italy and were in constant expectation of his presence amongst them to the end. At all events, Father Patrick of St. Brigid is known to have been in Genoa about the same time, and it is stated that he died there in 1682. His name disappears from all documents of a later period ; so Father Blasius of the Purification must be held at fault in inferring that Father Patrick was not appointed Vicar-Provincial of the Irish Teresians until the General Chapter of 1683 ; because the evidence points to his having been the immediate successor of Father Thomas of Jesus.² Meanwhile, those young religious, who were obliged to suffer exile immediately after their profession at Loughrea, had been ordained priests and several of them had begun their missionary labours in Ireland. Their Professor in Malta, Father Victorinus of St. Dymphna, had accompanied them home, and was appointed Vicar-Provincial after the recent death of Father Patrick of St. Brigid. But one of their number, Father Bernard of St. Martin, had died at Bruges, on the way back ; while Father Peter of St. Laurence did not long survive the rigorous conditions under which the Irish clergy were then exercising their sacred functions among the Faithful.³ Neither did circumstances admit of Father Joseph of the Nativity sharing the labours of his brethren in Ireland for some considerable time ; as he had been detained at the Missionary College of the Order in Rome and was, afterwards, elected Prior of one of the convents of

¹ *Acta Cap. Gen.* . . . anno 1680, f. 181 sqq.

² From the narrative of Father Felix of the Holy Ghost, f. 9. Cf. *MS. History*, chap. xxii.

³ *MS. History*, l.c. It may be repeated here that the method adopted by Father Blasius throughout does not make for the clear understanding of the Italian text, which, however, I have compared with the originals wherever possible.

the Roman Province, to which he became temporarily affiliated. At a later date his name is to be found associated with that of Dr. Dominic Maguire, O.P.—Venerable Oliver Plunket's successor in the See of Armagh—who had been senior chaplain at the Spanish Embassy in London : in which office the new Primate was now replaced by that Father Charles of St. John, mentioned above as Visitor-General to Ireland a few years previously.¹ Much prominence is given to the name of Father Victorinus of St. Dymphna in the Acts of the General Chapter of 1683, for which he had proceeded to Rome as elected Procurator of the Irish Teresians. But this is to be ascribed rather to his connexion with an extremely complicated case in which the King of France intervened, personally, concerning certain matters at issue between the Discalced Carmelites who were his own subjects and others among the Capitulars; as recorded in a voluminous correspondence still preserved in the General Archives, but with no bearing whatever on then current Irish affairs.²

So far as the Teresian Missionaries were concerned, the accession of King James II, in 1684, argued an immediate favourable change; because it was well known that his royal consort entertained highest esteem for their Order; her aunt being the saintly Mother Mary Frances of the Holy Ghost, Prioress of the Carmelite Convent at Modena. Hastening to avail themselves of this promising condition of things, the Irish Fathers resolved to make another serious effort to assure the welfare of the Mission by re-opening their own Novitiate at Loughrea.³ They had not succeeded in doing so by date of the General Chapter of 1686, to which they were not in a position to send the usual representative.⁴ Death deprived them of two senior religious the same year—Fathers Cyril of St. Albert and James of St. Dymphna. The former is said to have made his profession at Limerick when Father Patrick of St. Brigid was Superior there; and, as we have seen, the name of the latter had been associated with Loughrea from as far back as 1646; to him, likewise, being assigned, by local tradition, the credit of having established the nuns of his Order there at a later

¹ From the narrative of the English Mission. (*Plut.* 187.)

² *Acta Cap. Gen.* . . . anno 1683, f. 197b. There is no allusion to the Irish Mission.

³ *MS. History*, l.c.

⁴ This Chapter was held at Bologna.

date.¹ According to an official document of the period, a Father John Ward was Prior at Loughrea in 1686; he is to be identified with Father John Baptist of St. Elias, whose name appears in the Acts of a Chapter held there soon after the crisis now imminent of which Father Lucian of St. Teresa treats in such graphic detail, preparing us for the Revolution which was characterised throughout by bitterest hatred of the Faithful.²

At first the King's presence in the country appears to have revived hope in the breasts of his Irish co-religionists to an amazing degree, none being more sanguine than the Discalced Carmelites for the reason just assigned. A zealous and learned French Friar, Father Angelus of St. Joseph, who had made the General Visitation of the English Mission in 1681, and had since remained on, as chaplain, at the Spanish Embassy, was sent over to discharge the same office in Ireland in 1688. Acting in virtue of the authority delegated to him, he proceeded forthwith to the election of Superiors both in Dublin and Loughrea. Father Bernard of the Assumption was chosen as Prior in the former instance; and since it had been decided to admit novices again at Loughrea, we find Father Henry of St. Patrick now accepting responsibility for their training. Although Father Angelus returned to London in the August of the same year, it is officially stated that he represented the Irish Mission at the General Chapter of 1689, after which he was appointed Vicar-Provincial of the religious in Ireland.³ When passing through France, on the return journey, he took back with him a Father Martial of St. Dominic and a choir-brother named Nicholas, who had been sent to the Paris Province for his studies, but with whose health the climate there did not agree. A Father Adrian and a lay-brother followed from Lille in the Flemish Province; and their advent enabled the little community at Loughrea to discharge the obligations of the Regular Life all the more diligently. They were so engaged when the Prince of Orange landed in Ireland, and defeated the Jacobite army at the Boyne, on the 1st of July, 1690. The narratives before us show how seriously the fortunes of the Irish Teresians were prejudiced by the issue of that fatal battle; and we

¹ Cf. *MS. History*, l.c.

² From the narrative of the English Mission, to which Father Blasius of the Purification, also, had access; but to one not familiar with contemporary events this section of his *MS. History* could only prove extremely confusing.

³ *Acta Cap. Gen.* ab anno 1689 ad annum 1704, f. 11b. Also f. 21b. and cf. *MS. History*, l.c.

learn that several of the members of the Loughrea community accompanied the Irish army on its retreat to Limerick after a memorable, if unsuccessful stand at Aughrim. Fathers Adrian and Martial managed to escape from Ireland by acting as chaplains to the French troops; the lay-brother, whom Father Angelus had recalled from France, was to have gone with them; but became so dangerously ill on the way, they managed to send him back to Loughrea where he died. Both Father Angelus of St. Joseph, the Vicar-Provincial, and Father Luke of St. Elias were present at his death, having still evaded the Orange emissaries who had begun to terrorize the Catholics of the neighbourhood.¹ Father Blasius remarks that this lay-brother's name had escaped his memory; however the obit happens to be recorded in the Douai MS. under the year 1691: 'Frater Hyppolitus a S. Marco, Don. Hybernus, (in Hibernia). Aetas 32. Prof. 8.'²

Even for a few months after the Battle of Aughrim, the community at Loughrea fostered hope of the final triumph of the Jacobite cause; encouraged, no doubt, by the confidence of Father Angelus of St. Joseph in the support promised by his own country to Ireland. Still, we can notice a prudent reserve in the Acts of a Chapter held there on the 24th of April (4th of May), 1691. In allusion to the 'uncertainties' of war, it is stated that the Dublin community had been occasioned grave inconveniences thereby for several years.³ Then follow the names of the Conventual Fathers now on the Irish Mission, six of whom were actually Capitulars in that Chapter at Loughrea: Fathers Angelus of St. Joseph, Vicar-Provincial; Henry of St. Patrick, Prior of the Novitiate; John Baptist of St. Elias, Sub-prior and Master of Novices of the same community; Felix of the Holy Ghost; Luke of St. Peter; Patrick of the Cross; and Columbanus of St. Martin.⁴ Formal record of the *lawful* absence of Father Bernard of the Assumption, Prior; Father Victorinus of St. Dymphna, Sub-prior; and Father Thomas of

¹ *MS. History*, l.c. Father Blasius here gives 'Luke of St. Elias,' but in the Acts of the Loughrea Chapter the name is written, more accurately, *Luke of St. Peter*.

² The entries in the Douai MS. may be regarded as official, enabling us to correct some of the many mistakes occurring in the *Book of Missionary Obits*—a careless transcript from an important codex no longer available. For example, this *Book* has: 'P. F. Hypolitus a S. Marco, missus in Hyberniam, ibique mortuus est 1691.'

³ *Plut.* 190.

⁴ According to a local tradition, *five* Teresian Friars assisted at the burial of General St. Ruth in the Carmelite 'Abbey' at Loughrea.

Jesus—members of the Dublin community—is duly made; all three being, as a matter of fact, either in prison or in some secure place of concealment, whither they had betaken themselves to elude the fanatical Orange soldiery.¹ The Fathers had assembled in the usual course, as prescribed by the Constitutions, to elect local Superiors and a Procurator to represent the Irish Mission at the approaching General Chapter. Reasons are submitted in justification of the proceedings, notwithstanding the condition of the Dublin community; for it was impossible for its members to lead conventual life as ordained by Canon Law. They could still communicate with each other secretly; and, in secret, continued to exercise their missionary duties among the Faithful of the city and suburbs, just as fervently as their predecessors in former equally trying times. The principal furniture of their convent was, also, in the safe custody of friends, pending the victory that would vindicate the Catholic cause in the war now being waged.² The issue of the Chapter was the election of Father John Baptist of St. Elias as Prior at Loughrea, with Father Bernard of the Assumption as Sub-prior and Master of Novices; Father Felix of the Holy Ghost became Prior of the Dublin community, with Father Thomas of Jesus as his Sub-prior; while Father Angelus himself, the Vicar-Provincial, was unanimously chosen to represent the Irish Fathers at the General Chapter of 1692, Father Luke of St. Peter being elected as his substitute.³

An authenticated copy of the Acts was at once forwarded to Rome, with a covering letter signed by Fathers John Baptist, Felix, and Luke: urging the pressing needs of the Mission on the consideration of the Superiors-General; and explaining the importance of having one so familiar with the same, from an absolutely unbiassed point of view, as Father Angelus of St. Joseph to submit their requirements to the representatives of the entire Order; a copy of his Patent as Socius to the General Chapter being, likewise, enclosed.⁴ Father Angelus must have added further arguments

¹ From the original Acts (*Plut.* 190).

² *Ibid.*

³ Father Blasius of the Purification mentions several other Discalced Carmelites as being in Ireland at this time; but only in the case of a Father Augustine do we find any reference to them in the separate documents of the period. It is known (from a letter among the English Papers) that Father Augustine had been Sub-prior at Ancona, and that he was at Cologne in the October of 1686, on his way back to Ireland. (Cf. the original Acts of the Loughrea Chapter.)

⁴ *Ibid.*

under separate cover ; since there is preserved a copy of a letter to him from the Definitory-General in answer to one just received, and this is dated the 16th of June, 1691. This reply contains instructions as to the immediate steps to be taken for confirmation of the Loughrea proceedings by the authorities in Rome ; and, certainly, reveals deep sympathy with the Irish Teresians in their present trials, express reference being made to the recent death of Father Victorinus of St. Dymphna : ‘ qui bonum certamen certavit, cursumque suum feliciter consummavit, et unde expectamus distinctam sui martyrii perpassi relationem.’¹ From this it would seem clear that Father Victorinus had succumbed to the hardships endured while in prison for the Faith ; although Father Blasius has but passing comment on his arrest and subsequent release. Seeing that the sufferings of Fathers Bernard and Thomas were similarly severe, perhaps it did not occur to the historian that the case of deceased called for special remark, although the victim had actually fallen into the hands of his persecutors.²

After the battle of Aughrim (July, 1691), Fathers Angelus, Luke, and Columbanus, together with Father Patrick of the Cross and two choir novices made their way to Limerick ; while Father Henry of St. Patrick ventured to remain on at Loughrea, sheltered by some Protestant friends. But their influence did not suffice to save the Teresian friary from destruction at the hands of more intolerant heretics, subsequent to the violation of the Treaty of Limerick ; compelling Father Henry and several of his brethren who had rejoined him to improvise a little chapel close by, wherein they persevered in administering the Sacraments to the cruelly tried people. Shortly before the departure of the other religious from Loughrea, Brother Nicholas, a student, and an aged lay-brother, Joseph of St. John Baptist, died there. Father Angelus, as we have seen, had taken the former to Ireland when returning from the General Chapter of 1689 ; the latter had rendered invaluable services to the Missionaries, both secular and regular, during the Cromwellian régime. Aware of the secret retreats of certain of the Irish Bishops, Brother Joseph was wont to risk his life by visiting them repeatedly, in order to procure the Holy Oils for priests striving to evade the vigilant

¹ *Ex Lib. Epist. Def.-Genl. II, 1640-1700.*

² *MS. History, Chap. xxi. passim.*

Puritans.¹ When returning to Loughrea, from the home of some relatives in the County Tipperary, Father Felix of the Holy Ghost was arrested by the Williamite agents ; and both he and Father John Baptist of St. Elias were taken to Galway where they spent some time in prison, until they at length consented to leave Ireland.² Fathers Angelus, Luke, and Patrick—and, presumably, the two choir novices—sought and found hospitality in the Province of Avignon ; and in the course of the self-same year Father Angelus wrote thence to the General of the Order in quite a hopeful strain concerning Irish Teresian affairs.³

Such singular optimism can only be accounted for, in the circumstances, by the writer's own personal convictions as to the efficacy of France's intervention in the cause of Catholic Ireland ; and in the truly marvellous efforts still being made by the religious on that Mission to resist utter extinction under the new and most oppressive régime. Hence, he implores the authorities in Rome to spare no pains in fostering so praiseworthy an endeavour. It is now of vital importance that immediate provision should be made for the reception and education of the numerous desirable postulants manifesting their eagerness to perpetuate, at every risk, this genuine spirit of Elian zeal in Ireland.⁴ Although chosen Procurator of the Irish Mission, as explained, Father Angelus of St. Joseph did not assist at the General Chapter of 1692 ; on which occasion the interests of the Fathers then in the country were committed to the discretion of the newly-elected Definitory, until such time as the state of Ireland again admitted of community life, indispensable for due practice of the Regular Observance. With this object in view, Ordinations were made prescribing, in particular detail, how the welfare of the Irish Mission might best be served at the present juncture : the Father-General reserving to himself the right to modify the same to meet any new emergency.⁵ And these sufficed until the General Chapter of 1695, when it was decided to send Father Joseph (Power) of the Nativity to

¹ *MS. History*, l.c. The statements in the concluding section of this *MS.* are very vague at times ; and, occasionally, quite misleading.

² *Ibid.*, l.c. A.D. 1715 is the date assigned for the death—in Paris—of Father Felix of the Holy Ghost : whose family name may have been ' Felim Kennedy.' (?)

³ Father Angelus of St. Joseph—Joseph Labrosse—died in 1697. This letter is preserved in *Plut.* 190, and is written in Italian.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ A contemporary copy of these Ordinations is preserved in *Plut.* 190

Ireland as Vicar-Provincial, in the hope of his being able to re-establish the Novitiate at Loughrea.¹ For rumours had gone abroad as to the sincere desire on the part of King William III to grant religious toleration to his Irish Catholic subjects after the death of Queen Mary, the Protestant daughter of the unfortunate King James. The personal experiences of the Discalced Carmelites of the Irish Mission hardly bear out the contention advanced by the Viscount Taaffe on behalf of the Prince of Orange, whose military genius appears to have appealed strongly to so staunch and distinguished a Catholic. Because, about this time, two of them—Fathers John Baptist of St. Elias and Mathias (? Antony) of All Saints—came to implore the intervention of the King of Spain for relief of the persecuted Irish Faithful.²

However, Father Joseph of the Nativity—usually mentioned as the Rev. Joseph Power, O.D.C., in various documents of the period—joyfully undertook the task entrusted to him; and was accompanied to Ireland by a lay-brother named Pius of the Visitation. There were very few Teresians now in the country, probably not more than six; and even these it is not easy to identify. For this purpose the *Book of Missionary Obits* is simply hopeless; whereas the MS. of Father Blasius of the Purification—especially the concluding section—is anything but reliable in matters of this kind, as the industrious author seems to have trusted much to his memory in recording the facts contained in his narrative. But the critical student of the Italian text should not have any serious difficulty in dealing with the tangles which those frequent slips involve: as when the death of a 'Father James of the Assumption' is assigned to the year 1693; since he may prudently infer that this was the actual date of the demise of Father Bernard, a former Vicar-Provincial, bearing the same distinctive title. Now, turning to the *Book of Obits* a 'Father James of St. Bernard'—also

¹ *MS. History*, l.c.

² Cf. *Observations on Affairs in Ireland, from the Settlement in 1691*, by Nicholas Lord Viscount Taaffe: London, 1766, p. 6 *et passim*. The reference to the King of Spain occurs in a 17th century codex containing: 'Scritti appartenenti alla antichità e dottrina dell' Ordine Carmelitano,' f.327-444. Father Felix of the Holy Ghost mentions the fact of Father Antony having been Master of Novices at the convent of La Scala in Rome; and, according to the *Book of Obits*, he died in 1720 but *not* in Ireland. The obits of neither Father Columbanus of St. Martin nor Henry of St. Patrick are given: the family name of the former may have been *Coleman*; that of the latter *Brady* (?)

mentioned by Father Blasius—is said to have died in Ireland in 1695, in the 35th year of his age. It is quite certain, however, that this religious was still alive in 1719, and that he held the office of Vicar-Provincial as late as 1725, after which his name does not appear in any of the memorials extant. Whether the entry in the *Book of Obits* may be taken as suggestive rather of the return of Father James (Smith) of St. Bernard to Ireland in 1695, it would be pure speculation to say; but were this permissible, we should have greater confidence in submitting 1693 and 1694, respectively, as the actual dates of the coming of a Father Jerome of St. Teresa, and a Father Antony of the Resurrection—both in their 26th year—to the Irish Mission; and not the close of their careers, at so very early an age, in this country as the *Book of Obits* records.¹ Neither may we rely on the accuracy of the entries concerning such senior religious as survived until the advent of Father Joseph of the Nativity. Although we may reasonably admit that Father Thomas of Jesus died in 1700; still it is hardly credible that the death of Father Kieran of St. Patrick had only occurred the previous year: seeing that the name of the latter is not given in what we must regard as the official list of the Discalced Carmelites in Ireland submitted to the Superiors-General of the Order on the occasion of the Chapter held at Loughrea.²

Whatever hopes Father Joseph of the Nativity may have entertained for eventual success of his undertaking, these were speedily dispelled as soon as his arrival became known to the authorities through the treachery of an unhappy apostate. Availing himself of the commotion caused by rumours of an alleged attempt on the life of King William the same year (A.D. 1695), his wretched accuser denounced Father Joseph as a Papal Envoy sent to negotiate the dethronement of the Prince of Orange; and the New Vicar-Provincial's arrest followed, instantly, as a matter of course. Fortunately, his calumniator was seized with remorse betimes, taking effective measures to insure Father Joseph's release; but his victim was compelled to go into immediate

¹ Neither of these names appears in any of the other documents at our disposal, but it is possible that they were both on the Irish Mission at the date mentioned above

² We have seen that Father Henry of St. Patrick was joined, at Loughrea, by several of the other Teresian fugitives; and these must have included Father John Baptist of St. Elias, who was again arrested in 1695, at the same time as Father Joseph of the Nativity (*MS. History*). Among their companions in captivity at Galway were several Franciscans and Dominicans.

exile, if he would avoid threatened recapture in the troubles befalling the Catholics of Ireland during the closing years of the 17th century.¹ The Act of Banishment was revived in 1697, and in a 'Particular Account of the Romish Clergy, Secular and Regular, in each parish of the diocese of Dublin,' drawn up by the civic authorities that very year, there is reference to certain Carmelite Friars lately residing in the convent at Wormwood Gate in the Parish of St. Audoen. Only two were known by name, 'Arthur Walsh and one Dalfin,' but others, among them several lay-brothers, were 'supposed to be skulking about the towne.'² It would be mere conjecture to recognize in either of these proscribed priests any Teresian Missionary mentioned in the series of documents before us; yet it is significant that a 'Father John Dolphin' happens to be one of the Irish Discalced Carmelites whose memory has come down to us, by tradition, from the penal times.³ Three of the religious of that period were among the exiles assisted by Dr. Dominic Maguire in 1699, at the instance of the Holy See; and later on, the same illustrious Archbishop of Armagh was in correspondence with Father Joseph of the Nativity as 'Agent,' in Rome, of the Irish Bishops.⁴ And it was to Father Joseph Pope Innocent XII turned for reliable information concerning the progress of events in Ireland, on hearing those glowing reports spread through the Courts of Europe by emissaries of William III, now anxiously sensitive, it seems, about his reputation in the matter of religious tolerance. But, speaking from recent personal experience, Father Joseph's testimony, as to the hardships endured by Irish Catholics under the *new* laws, was not calculated to reassure the Sovereign Pontiff on the grounds put forward to substantiate a notoriously shameless claim.⁵

Nevertheless, the documents concluding the present

¹ *MS. History*, l.c. 'The humble petition of John Collman, Carmalett fryar from the County of Galway'—transcribed in *Irish Priests in the Penal Times*, by Rev. W. P. Burke, p. 145 sqq.—seems to establish that the unhappy apostate in question was one of Father Joseph's own subjects. But it would be impossible to identify this particular 'Carmalett fryar' as one of the religious named in the Teresian documents of the period.

² The MS is dated 2nd March, 1697; and is preserved in Marsh's Library, Dublin.

³ The list was published in *Carmel in Ireland*, p. 233 sqq.

⁴ *Spicil. Ossor.* ii. p. 347.

⁵ I. E. RECORD, Fourth Series, Sept. 1906 and Sept. 1907.

series are likewise dated 1698-1699; and demonstrate finally that, no matter how oppressive the trials borne by our Irish Missionaries of the 17th century, they ever looked forward to the future with buoyant hope of victory in the end.¹ One of the most important of them is a retrospect of the struggles made by the Teresian Friars in those later times, submitted as an appeal to the Superiors-General of the Order for sympathy and succour in this truly heroic endeavour to perpetuate their predecessors' spirit of zeal. Although neither signed nor dated, there is intrinsic evidence to show that it was written by Father Joseph (Power) of the Nativity; whose other preoccupations did not hinder him keeping fixedly in view the needs of his long-suffering brethren, striving wearily against the monotony of misery to which the Faithful of the Irish Church were pitilessly subjected during the next five and twenty years. The author ardently urges their claims for special consideration, pointing out how the Superiors-General might best cooperate in furthering the interests of the Order in a country always most loyally devoted, no matter at what sacrifice, to the Catholic Cause.² In the correspondence of the year 1699—including a holograph letter of King James the Second to the Superior-General in reference to the affairs of the Discalced Carmelites at Loughrea—there is abundant proof of the influence which Father Joseph Power could command, when it became a question of securing direct intervention of the Holy See on behalf of the victims of so cruel a persecution.³ He himself had the consolation of living to behold the fruits of his own generous perseverance, in this respect, in the comparative flourishing condition of the Irish Teresian Mission, despite the crushing penal enactments of the reign of Queen Anne.⁴ But the papers preserved in the General Archives relating to this period form a distinct series for review at some future time. Meanwhile, the fact of the present writer having been instrumental in the discovery of the sources, which afford a sufficiently satisfactory account of the progress of the Discalced Carmelites in Ireland from the accession of Charles I until the

¹ General Archives (*Plut.* 190).

² This *Statement* is preserved among the Irish papers (*Plut.* 190).

³ The holograph letter of King James is, also, among the Irish papers.

⁴ Father Joseph of the Nativity died in Rome in 1725; but his name is not included in the *Missionary Obits* of the Order. At this date there were upwards of twenty Teresians in Ireland.

death of King William III, is gratifying compensation for his responsibility in the production of certain volumes drawn from 'authorities' now known to be very unreliable indeed; not that the inevitable inaccuracies to be met with in either of these books led to any exaggeration of our zealous Missionaries' enduring trials.¹

JAMES P. RUSHE, O.D.C.

¹ In this connexion it is curious to find that the late Cardinal Moran has: 'In the month of August, 1620, Father Nicolaus a Sancto Patricio, a Carmelite, was appointed Vicar-apostolic of Elphin, which office he seems to have retained till 1625; the Brief of his appointment being preserved in the *Archiv. Secret. Brevium*, Rome.' (I. E. RECORD, First Series, vol. ii. p. 155; and *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, i. p. 128.) Whereas, elsewhere, we read in a Petition—signed and sealed, and dated the 31st August, 1624—in favour of Malachy O'Queely for nomination to the See of Killaloe: 'Fr. Nicholas de Sto. Patritio, Prior Provincialis Ordinis Eremitarum S. P. Augustini S.T.D. et Vicarius Apostolicus Elphinensis Dioecesis.' (*Hist. MSS. Commission Report on the Franciscan Manuscripts*, p. 77; and cf. Article I. of the present series in the I. E. RECORD for August, 1915, Fifth Series, vol. vi.)

DOCUMENTS

DECREE REGARDING THE SOLEMN CANONIZATION OF BLESSED GABRIEL OF THE CONGREGATION OF THE PASSION, OF BLESSED MARY ALACOQUE, AND BLESSED JOAN OF ARC

(March 8, 1920)

DECRETUM

PRO SOLEMNI CANONIZATIONE BEATORUM GABRIELIS A VIRGINE PERDOLENTE,
MARGARITAE MARIAE ALACOQUE ET IOANNAE DE ARC.

Omnibus feliciter expletis, quae iuxta sacros canones praemitti praescripta sunt, ut beati Servi Dei Gabriel a Virgine perdolente, clericus professus Congregationis Passionis, Margarita Maria Alacoque et Ioanna de Arc, Virgines, in Sanctorum albo recenseantur; Ssm̄us D. N. Benedictus Pp. XV, in huius diei Consistorio, proximam festivitatem Ascensionis D. N. I. C., die XIII mensis maii, pro solemnī Canonizatione beatorum Gabrielis a Virgine perdolente et Margaritae Mariae Alacoque assignavit, dominicam vero sequentem pro Ioanna de Arc. Insuper nonnullos ante dies, hoc est VII maii, novum Consistorium fieri decrevit in quo sententiam Episcoporum in re tanti momenti exquirat. Et ad hunc finem praescribit ut omnes Antistites, qui sunt intra centesimum ab Urbe lapidem, si possint, Romam petant et praefatis Canonizationis solemnīs adstant, etiamque, nisi grave aliquid obstet, Consistorio diei VII maii intersint, votum suum edituri. Ceteros Italiae et proximarum regionum Archiepiscopos et Episcopos, ut romanum iter ad eundem finem aggrediantur, peramanter invitat. Remotiores vero de hac tam iucunda at extraordinaria solemnitate certiores reddit. Ne autem frequentibus ad Urbem itineribus nimium graventur Episcopi, Sanctitas Sua benigne indulget ut, qui hac occasione Romam advenerint et memoratis solemnīs interfuerint, eximantur ab obligatione visitandi sacra Limina prima proxima vice.

Datum Romae, ex aedibus Sacrae Congregationis Consistorialis, die 8 martii 1920.

L. ✠ S.

✠ C. CARD. DE LAI, Ep. Sabinen., *Secretarius*.

✠ V. SARDI, Archiep. Caesarien., *Adessor*.

MONITUM

CAEREMONIARUM PRAEFECTI

Rm̄i Archiepiscopi et Episcopi qui, iuxta adnexum S. Congregationis Consistorialis convocationis decretum, Romae sacris canonizationum

Solemnis Praefecto (*Piazza Capranica, 98 Roma-20*) per epistolam significant quo circiter die venturi sint, ut Praesulum numerus opportune cognoscatur, et ipsi schedulas, intimationes, nec non a Ss. Rituum Congregatione canonizandorum acta, pro Consistorio tempestive accipere possint.

Ne vero Apostolici cursores in schedularum distributione ancipites haereant de Episcoporum domiciliis, oportet ut ipsi Archiepiscopi et Episcopi in scriptis eundem Caeremoniarum Praefectum de suo quisque domicilio certiore faciant.

Idem Antistites secum deferent vestes praelatitias laneas violaceas, cum mantelletto pariter laneo violacei coloris, biretum, rocchetum, pluviale simplex ex lamina argentea, sin minus ex serico damasceno albo, amictum, mitram ex linea tela alba, et cappam laneam violaceam pro Consistorio; quibus vero cappae praesto non sint, ex benignitate Sanctissimi Domine nostri Papae, ad Consistorium fas erit accedere indutos mantelletto supra rocchetum.

Antistites autem, Cardinalitia dignitate praeferentes, praeter vestes et cappas cardinalitias tam *rubei* quam *violacei* coloris, pro Solemnis canonizationum habebunt calceos rubeos, amictum, planetam albam opere phrygio aureo distinctam, mitram serico-damascenam cum vimpa at superpelliceo pro capellano caudatario, qui induet vestem sericam violaceam cum crocea lanea violacei pariter coloris.

Praesules ad Ordines vel Congregationes religiosas pertinentes quoad rocchetum et qualitatem ac colorem vestium, consuetum morem servabunt.

A die 1^a maii e cappis Eñorum at Rñorum S. R. E. Cardinalium, Episcoporum et officialium Curiae tollentur pelles ermellinae, et Cardinales ac Antistites aliique de capella, domo vel familia Pontificis, ad Ordines vel religiosas Congregationes non pertinentes, vestes sericas induent.

DE MANDATO SS^{MI} D. N. PAPAE.

Romae, die 8 martii 1920.

CAROLUS RESPIGHI,

Protonot. Ap., Caerem. Praefectus.

L. ✠ S.

DOUBT REGARDING THE INTERPRETATION OF A CANON OF THE CODE REGULATING THE OBLIGATION OF CHORAL SERVICE IN THE CASE OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE CATHEDRAL CHAPTER

(February 14, 1920)

SACRA CONGREGATIO CONCILII

BOIANEN.

SERVITII CHORALIS

Die 14 februarii 1920

QUAESTIO.—Pontificia Commissio ad Codicis canones authentice interpretandos nuper ad hanc S. Congregationem solvendum remisit dubium, a canonico theologo ecclesiae cathedralis Boianensis de sui

Episcopi consensu propositum, cuius tenor hic erat: '*Il canone 416 del Codice di diritto canonico stabilisce: In statutis capitularibus iusta designetur norma, ad quam canonici et beneficiarii in servitio altaris fungantur per turnum tum officio celebrantis tum etiam ministerio diaconi et subdiaconi, exclusis tamen ab hoc ministerio dignitatibus, canonico theologo, poenitentiario, et, si praebendae distinctae habeantur, canonicis ordinis presbyteralis. Sebbene le fonti addotte in calce al succitato can. 416 (tra le quali Conc. Trid. sess. XXII, De ref. c. IV, e Caer. Ep., c. VIII, che parlano di assistenza al Vescovo), lascino intendere che il riferito disposto debba riguardare anche l'assistenza del ministero di diacono e di suddiacono da prestarsi al Vescovo, pure, per eliminare qualsiasi dubbio, il sottoscritto prega l'Eminenza Vostra Revma, che si compiaccia chiarire se il disposto del Can. 416 succitato esenta il canonico teologo ed il penitenziere dal ministero di diacono e di suddiacono anche quando pontifica il Vescovo.*'

ANIMADVERSIONES.—Argumentum ab oratore deductum per se solum ad dubium dirimendum profecto non sufficit. Ut enim in ipsa Praefatione Codicis (ed. cum notis) monemur 'vix animadvertere attinet, canones haud semper cum suis fontibus omni ex parte in sententia congruere'; quo in casu normae adhibendae praescribuntur dilucide can. 6. n. 3 et 4, ita sane ut ius quoque vetus in adnotatione fontium recensitum, non semper praesupponatur canonicis corrigendum, sed opportunum quoque perhibeatur ad *supplendum* quod in canonicis aptum locum forte non invenerit. In casu praescriptum cap. VIII. n. 1 *Caerem. Episcop.* (cui consonant cap. IX n. 1 et cap. X n. 1) haec exhibet: 'Episcopo sive missam celebret vel ad Vesperas officium faciat, vel si illis tantummodo sit praesens, convenit suos adsistere canonicos, qui, si in ecclesia sint distincti ordines, seu praebendae presbyterales et diaconales, erunt *duo primi* canonici ex ordine diaconali. Quod si forte in aliqua ecclesia nec dignitates neque ordines distincti essent, tunc erunt *duo primi* canonici, vel dignitates, immediate sedentes post primam dignitatem, vel post primum canonicum.' Ut facile liquet, ab hoc praescripto quaelibet abest mentio exceptionis favore canonici theologi ac poenitentiarii: nihilque profecto impedit, quominus v. g. canonicus theologus qui praebendam possidet diaconalem, ex praescripto Caeremonialis, si sit primus vel alter in suo ordine, teneatur Episcopo in ministerio diaconi aut subdiaconi ministrare.—Quamobrem, si praescriptum istud ad normam can. 416 accipiendum sit, iam dicendum erit Codicis promulgatione *correctum et innovatum*, ita quidem ut, tum in prima, tum in altera eiusdem praescripti periodo, addendum sit 'exclusis tamen ab hoc ministerio canonico theologo ac poenitentiario.'

At vero, haec correctio, ad normam can. 2, non est de facili praesumenda, quum, immo e contrario, 'omnes liturgicae leges vim suam retinent, nisi earum aliqua in Codice *expresse* corrigatur.' Sed in casu, quin de expressa cogitare liceat, nec implicitam haberes correctionem, quum in can. 416 procul dubio non agatur nisi de chora'i ordinario servitio a canonicis *erga canonicos* exhibendo: loquitur enim canon de canonicis vel beneficiariis in officio *celebrantis*, de ministeriis

quibus *per turnum* fungi debeant, non solum canonici sed etiam *beneficiarii*; quae omnia nullo modo aut titulo aptari possunt ad assistentiae praestandae Episcopo, a qua excluduntur beneficiarii, exsulat officium celebrantis, multoque magis turni cuiuspiam notio. Crescit haec difficultas consideranti, exceptionem in Codice concessam favore canonici poenitentiarum et theologi, si absque limitatione accipatur, novam esse in iure, quum hucusque uterque eximeretur ab hoc ministerio praestando, *dumtaxat* dum suis specialibus detinebatur officiis audiendi confessiones aut legendi docendique (cfr. v. g. S. C. C. in Montis Alti *Oneris*, 22 dec. 1906 et iura multa ibi recensita): quamobrem nec legislator eam exemptionem directe et expresse sancire voluisse videtur, sed potius indirecte, quum prima intentio canonis 416 feratur, ut palam legenti est in '*iustam designandam normam*' pro servitio altaris, per quam normam, in singulis casibus designandam, potius quam ipsa auctoritate canonis, exceptio illa in concreto firmetur: nec absonus erit cogitatu casus, in capitulis in quibus praebendae distinctae habeantur et canonicus theologus ac poenitentarius non sint in ordine presbyterali, ubi exceptio illa, ad hos quoque constanter et absolute extensa, officere possit *iustitiae* constabiliendae normae, quippe quae praeter modum coarctaret numerum eorum qui in turnum ministerii advocari possent. Quidquid de hac re sit consentendum, certe incongruum magis apparet, non tam per Codicem quam potius per normam servitii choralis in singulis capitulis constabiliendam, innovatum arbitrari Caeremonialis Episcoporum de quo agimus generale praescriptum.

RESOLUTIO.—Sacra Congregatio Concilii, in plenariis Eñorum ac Rñorum Patrum comitiis in Palatio Apostolico Vaticano habitis die 14 februarii 1920, proposito dubio, nimirum: *An, vi can. 416 C. I. C., canonicus theologus et poenitentarius exempti sint ab officio diaconi et subdiaconi praestando Episcopo solemniter celebranti* respondendum censuit: *Negative, et servetur Caeremoniale Episcoporum.*

Facta autem de praemissis Ssño Domino Nostro Benedicto Div. Prov. PP. XV relatione per infrascriptum S. Congregationis Secretarium in audentia diei insequentis, Sanctitas Sua datam resolutionem approbare et confirmare dignata est.

I. MORI, *Secretarius.*

POWER IS GIVEN TO VICARS AND PRAEFECTS-APOSTOLIC TO NOMINATE A VICAR-DELEGATE

(December 8, 1919)

SACRA CONGREGATIO DE PROPAGANDA FIDE

EPISTOLA

AD VICARIOS ET PRAEFECTOS APOSTOLICOS, QUA POTESTAS IPSIS FIT
NOMINANDI VICARIUM DELEGATUM.

Reverendissime Domine,

Iuxta can. 198 Codicis I. C., Vicariis et Praefectis Apostolicis ius non competit sibi eligendi *Vicarium Generalem* sicut fas est Episcopis

residentialibus; sed ipsis potestas tantum est nominandi, cum muneribus in singulis casibus determinandis, delegatum qui etiam alius esse potest quam provicarius, de quo in can. 309.

Sed cum ex alia parte opportunum videatur Superiores Missionum auctoritate pollere sibi deligendi aliquem vicarium, qui practice eadem gaudeat iurisdictione quam ius canonicum Vicariis Generalibus tribuit, non exclusa habituali potestate executioni mandandi rescripta pontificia atque utendi iisdem peculiaribus facultatibus quas haec S. C. Ordinariis locorum communicat, SS. D. N. Benedictus divina Prov. PP. XV, in audientia habita ab infrascripto Cardinali Praefecto S. C. de Propaganda Fide, die 6 novembris anni 1919, haec in bonum Missionum sua benignitate concessit: I. Sanavit nullitatem actuum iurisdictionis positorem ab illis missionariis qui forsitan ut vere Vicarios Generales se gesserunt. II. Elargitus est Ordinariis Missionum potestatem nominandi *Vicarium Delegatum*, si eo indigeant, cui practice concessa sit omnis iurisdiclio in spiritualibus et temporalibus, qua ex Codice I. C. uti potest Vicarius Generalis in diocesi.

Ex hac concessione, omnibus Superioribus Missionum facta, nunc tu poteris Vicarium Delegatum nominare, qui gaudeat omnibus facultatibus Vicario Generali tributis, ad normam can. 368, § 1°, 2°.

De numero autem et de officio Vicariorum Delegatorum in unaquaque Missione eadem valeant quae de Vicario Generali in Codice I. C. statuta sunt (can. 366 et seq.). Quae dum tibi communico, Deum precor ut te sospitem incolumenque servet.

Romae, die 8 decembris, 1919.

Addictissimus

G. M. CARD. VAN ROSSUM, *Praefectus*.

C. LAURENTI, *Secretarius*.

CARDINAL MERCIER IS NOMINATED PRESIDENT OF THE 'PIA UNIO CLERI' FOR ALL BELGIUM

(February 2, 1920)

DECRETUM

DESIDERATUS S. R. E. CARD. MERCIER, ARCHIEPISCOPUS MECHLINIENSIS,
NOMINATUR PRAESES IN UNIVERSA REGIONE BELGICA PIAE UNIONIS
CLERI PRO MISSIONIBUS.

Ut gravissimo officio, quod Ecclesiae incumbit praedicandi Evangelium per universum orbem, christifideles pro suis viribus validius cooperentur, nihil magis conferre potest quam eorum studium ad tam nobile opus, impensa atque assidua sacerdotum cura, excitare atque fovere. Hunc in finem nuper orta est *Unio cleri pro missionibus*, quam Ssmus D. N. Benedictus Pp. XV, multis ditatam indulgentiis atque spiritualibus auctam privilegiis, per suas Litteras Encyclicas de fide propaganda modo datas, summopere commendavit, atque ut in omnibus diocesis erigeretur se in votis habere significavit. Ut autem in nobilissima Belgarum natione, quae sacras missiones iamdudum apostolicis viris opibusque plurimum iuvat, praedicta Consociatio firmius stabilietur

et vigeat, haec S. Congregatio Christiano Nomini Propagando, vigore facultatum sibi a Summo Pontifice tributarum, eiusdem *Piae Unionis cleri pro missionibus* Praesidem in universa Belgica regione per praesens Decretum nominat et constituit Eñum Virum Cardinalem Desideratum Mercier, Archiepiscopum Mechliniensem, cum omnibus iuribus ac facultatibus tali muneri adnexis; cuius auctoritate et ductu nihil est dubitandum, quin studium erga sacras missiones in ea regione iam adeo fervens, vividius etiam ad catholicam fidem per orbem promovendam flammescat. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Datum Romae, ex aedibus S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, die 2 februarii 1920.

G. M. CARD. VAN ROSSUM, *Praefectus*.
C. LAURENTI, *Secretarius*.

L. ✠ S.

**DOUBTS REGARDING THE MASSES TO BE CELEBRATED ON
CHRISTMAS DAY AND ON ALL SOULS' DAY IN CERTAIN
CONTINGENCIES**

(January 26, 1920)

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM
ROMANA
DUBIA

CIRCA TRES MISSAS IN DIE NATIVITATIS DOMINI ET COMMEMORATIONIS
OMNIUM FIDELIUM DEFUNCTORUM CELEBRANDAS.

A Sacra Rituum Congregatione sequentium dubiorum solutio expostulata est; nimirum:

1. 'An Sacerdos, qui ob debilitatem visus aliamve iustam causam ex Indulto Sedis Apostolicae celebrat aliquam ex Missis votivis aut Missam quotidianam Defunctorum, possit in die Commemorationis Omnium Fidelium Defunctorum ter Sacrum facere, eandem Defunctorum Missam quotidianam repetendo?'

2. 'An idem Sacerdos, qui pariter ex Apostolicae Sedis Indulto Missam Deiparae votivam aut aliam votivam celebrat, valeat in posterum die Nativitatis Domini eandem prorsus Missam ter dicere?'

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, audito specialis Commissionis suffragio, omnibus perpensis, rescribendum censuit:

'*Affirmative ad utramque quaestionem facto verbo cum Sanctissimo; de cetero rite servatis tum Constitutione Apostolica Incruentum altaris Sacrificium, 10 augusti 1915, tum Rubricis ac Decretis dies Nativitatis Domini et Commemorationis Omnium Fidelium Defunctorum respicientibus.*'

Quam resolutionem, Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Benedicto Papa XV per infrascriptum Cardinalem Sacrae Rituum Congregationi Praefectum relatam, Sanctitas Sua ratam habuit et probavit, die 26 januarii, 1920.

✠ A. CARD. VIGO, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae,
S. R. C. Praefectus.

L. ✠ S.

ALEXANDER VERDE, *Secretarius*.

**AN APOSTOLIC DELEGATION IS ESTABLISHED IN JAPAN, AND
TO IT IS ALSO COMMITTED THE CARE OF COREA AND
THE ISLAND FORMOSA**

(November 26, 1919)

IN IAPONICO IMPERIO APOSTOLICA DELEGATIO CONSTITUITUR EIDEMQUE
ETIAM COREA ET INSULA FORMOSA COMMITTUNTUR.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam. Quae catholico nomini aeternaeque fidelium saluti bene, prospere ac feliciter eveniant, ea ut mature praestemerit, Nos admonet supremi Apostolatus munus, quo in terris, licet immeriti, fungimur. Hoc ducti consilio, fidei catholicae incremento per universonum terrarum orbem advigilamus et ad populos etiam longo disiunctos spatio oculos mentis Nostrae convertimus. Iam vero minime Nos latet fidem catholicam iam pridem in Iaponiam a divo Francisco Xaverio invectam illas illustrasse gentes, postea vero teterrimis obtenebratam calamitatibus diu delituisse, donec denuo, superiore saeculo, veluti nova felicioris aetatis aurora populis illis illuxit. Neque ignoramus anno MDCCCLXXXI fel. rec. Decessorem Nostrum Leonem PP. XIII ut enascenti illi Ecclesiae robur adderet, ecclesiasticam in eodem Imperio hierarchiam excitasse, Metropolitana Sede in urbe Tokiensi, universae regionis principe, constituta. Nunc autem non sine magna laetitia comperimus, aliis ibi institutis Missionibus novisque eo missis Evangelii praeconibus, uberrimos in illis insulis catholicam religionem progressus obtinuisse, ideoque in eam mentem venimus christianum nomen in illis regionibus singulari Pontificiae voluntatis significatione firmare. Idcirco, collatis consiliis cum VV. FF. NN. S. R. E. Cardinalibus negotiis Propagandae Fidei praepositis, ut, novo supposito robore atque impulsu submotisque quae forte obstant difficultatibus, amplioribus vigeat religio incrementis, pariterque ut benevolam propensionem Nostram erga Iaponiae nobilissimam gentem testemur luculenter, Motu proprio atque ex certa scientia et matura deliberatione Nostris deque Apostolicae Nostrae potestatis plenitudine, praesentium vi constituimus, ut Apostolica Delegatio in Iaponico Imperio habeatur, huiusque vigilantiae et curis, praeter Iaponicam regionem universam, Coream etiam Formosamque insulam committimus. Decernentes praesentes Litteras firmas, validas atque efficaces semper exstare ac permanere, suosque plenos atque integros effectus sortiri atque obtinere, illisque ad quos pertinent, sive pertinere poterunt, nunc et in posterum plene suffragari; sicque rite iudicandum esse ac definiendum, irritumque ex nunc et inane fieri, si quidquam secus super his, a quovis, auctoritate qualibet, scienter vel ignoranter contigerit attentari. Non obstantibus contrariis quibuscumque.

Datum Romae apud sanctum Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris, die XXVI novembris MCMXIX, Pontificatus Nostri anno sexto.

P. CARD. GASPARRI, *a Secretis Status.*

DECREE FOR THE BEATIFICATION AND CANONIZATION OF
THE SERVANT OF GOD, JOACHIMA DE VEDRUNA DE MAS,
FOUNDRRESS OF THE INSTITUTE OF THE CARMELITE
SISTERS OF CHARITY

(January 14, 1920)

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM
VICEN. SEU BARCINONEN.

BEATIFICATIONIS ET CANONIZATIONIS SERVÆ DEI IOACHIMÆ DE VEDRUNA
DE MAS, VIDUÆ, FUNDATRICES INSTITUTI SORORUM A CARITATE.

Barcinonis in parochia Sanctæ Mariæ *del Pino*, a genitoribus Laurentio de Vedruna de Mas et Teresia Vidal, pietate non minus quam nobilitate præstantibus, die 16 aprilis 1783, ortum duxit, eodemque die lustralibus aquis abluta est, imposito nomine, Ioachima inter sorores minima. Iuxta morem familiæ, prima institutionis elementa domi accepit, curisque parentum ipsa, peculiaribus animi dotibus ornata, præ ceteris natis, respondisse fertur. Humilis, pia, obediens, laboribus studiisque addicta et coram Deo iugiter ambulans, sororibus ac familiaribus domesticæ vitæ exemplum præferbat. Ad sacram Synaxim primitus admissa, ab illo cælesti pabulo vocationis religiosæ sensus hausit et fovit. Propositum tamen ingrediendi Carmelitidum monasterium, prouti optaverat, ob teneram adhuc ætatem exsequi non potuit, illudque differre coacta est. Interim, velut apis industria mellisque opifex, meditatione, oratione, lectione spirituali ac sacramentorum perceptione fructus ferebat salutare. Temporis progressu, ita Deo disponente, puella, decem et septem annos agens, patris monitis et confessarii consiliis coniugium suadentium, se docilem præbuit, atque in ipsa parochiali ecclesia Sanctæ Mariæ *del Pino*, die 24 martii anno 1799, rite nupsit optimo ac nobili viro Theodoro de Mas, e Vicensi urbe. Benedictio Dei descendit super coniugio, fidelitatis, pacis, prolisque foecundo, etiam per civilem et catholicam filiorum utriusque sexus educationem. Duæ enim ex puellis, in religiosa domo ad institutionem concreditæ, maior *Valbonæ*, minor *Petralbæ*, dein, gestiente præ gaudio matre, inter sodales cooptatæ in respectivo monasterio, virtutis et sanctitatis fama inclaruerunt. Sexdecim post annos, orbata viro pie defuncto, die 4 martii anno 1816, Ioachima sola sustinuit multiplicis prolis onus, licet, coniugali vinculo soluta, ad perfectiorem et claustralem vitam ineundam se magis inclinatam agnosceret. Unde in locum *Manso Escorial*, prope Vicensem urbem, una cum filiis, se recepit, maternis officiis sedulam operam impendens. Eo tempore, pacis sequestra, summa patientia et suavi fortitudine concordiam obtinuit inter affines circa bona demortui viri sui. Insimul, ad caritatis opera peragenda, valetudinarium eiusdem civitatis adibat atque aegrotis ibi degentibus, veluti ancilla, demisse inserviebat. Quum vero filiorum bono iam plene providisset, antiquum propositum de vita religiosa amplectenda studiose recogitavit, simulque in animo habuit condere institutum piarum foeminarum pro puellis egenis et ob dotis defectum impeditis

ad statum religiosum profitendum, necnon pro aegrotis pauperibus ac derelictis quibus salutare atque opportunum auxilium afferretur. Itaque ad hunc finem, praehabito tum Episcopi Vicensis tum probati viri Stephani de Olot, sacerdotis ex Ordine Capuccinorum, consilio et consensu, die 6 ianuarii anni 1826, Ioachima vota religiosa emisit coram eodem Episcopo et, die 26 februarii ipsius anni, novem pauperes piasque mulieres ad vitam religiosam secum suscipiendam adduxit, assignata aede *Escorial*, ubi eius vir obierat, extra muros Vicensis civitatis, quam paulo post mutavit in alteram magis aptam et conductam intra ipsam urbem, ut facilius liberiusque pueros et puellas erudire atque infirmos pauperes, sive in domibus sive in nosocomiis, iuvare posset una cum sodalibus. Instituto cui nomen *Congregatio Sororum Carmelitarum a Caritate*, ab Ordinario loci approbato, traditae sunt regulae a praeclaudato religioso conscriptae. Quae quidem regulae tam ab Episcopo Vicensi quam ab aliis Praesulibus, nempe Barcinonensi, Gerundensi ac Terulensi, approbatae, decurrente anno 1880 Apostolica confirmatione sanctitae sunt. Sodales, pluribus in domibus iam constitutae, tria simplicia religionis vota, perpetua tamen, nuncupant. Quae in singulis domibus degunt, praesidi subsunt, omnes vero Generali Antistitae plenam obedientiam profitentur. Dei Famula fundatrix et Instituto regendo praeposita totis viribus temporali et spirituali eius incremento prospexit, speciatim per selectas Superiores locales et per personalem domorum visitationem. Inter pietatis opera valde commendabat sororibus, ut nunquam cubitum irent, quin antea conscientiam diligenter excuterent et augustissimum Eucharistiae sacramentum devotissime inviserent. Exorto et furente in Hispania bello civili, Ioachima cum sodalibus Galliam petere debuit, plerisque insidiis, molestiis et periculis in itinere animo constanti et caelesti ope superatis. Quum Perpinianum pervenissent omnes incolumes, pia muliere auxiliante, domum habitationis invenerunt, ibique sive laborando sive aegrotis adiuvandis tempus traxerunt, praeunte Ioachima, quae sodalibus verbo et exemplo fidem et fiduciam in Deum animose infundebat. Extincto hispanico bello et republica in pace composita, Institutum sororum e tertio Ordine Carmelitarum a Caritate, vivente adhuc fundatrice et praesertim post eius obitum adeo floruit per observantiam regularem, pietatis et caritatis opera, et catholico-socialem iuventutis educationem, hodiernis etiam temporibus recte consonam, ut domo principe Vici bene fundata, in aliis civitatibus et provinciis Hispaniae, uti Matritensi, Barcinonensi, Hispalensi, Valentina fuerit propagatum; ducentae enim domus et mille ac septingentae sodales et ultra adnumerantur, atque aliarum domorum erectiones expostulantur. Verum Ioachima, assiduo labore et morbo, quo ante fuerat correpta, debilitata, imminentem e vita discessum persentiens, omnibus morientium sacramentis devotissime susceptis, die 28 augusti anno 1854, in domo a caritate, Barcinone, indica lue in ea civitate grassante, unum et septuaginta annos agens, bonisque operibus dives migravit ad Dominum. Quivis ordo civium ad corpus expositum invisendum confluit, aestimationis et venerationis sensus palam ostendens; donec, solemnium funere rite peracto, ipsum corpus in sepulchro Barcinonensi depositum

fuit : deinceps anno 1881 in domum Vicensem Institutii primariam translatum, subter aediculam Sancti Raphaëlis Archangeli apud hortum continentem, in pace quiescit. Itaque fama sanctitatis Servae Dei, adhuc viventis in triplici statu nempe libero, coniugali et religioso, post eius obitum magis in dies usque in praesens clara et diffusa etiam per ipsius gesta publicis commentariis consignata a praestantibus viris Cardinali Sanz y Forés et a P. Iacobo Novell, S. I., excitavit Rñm Dominum Episcopum Vicensem ad Processum informativum auctoritate Ordinaria conficiendum super eadem fama, iuxta veteres recentesque normas. Quibus actis processualibus rite absolutis et ad sacram Rituum Congregationem delatis, servato iuris ordine, de Causae introductione disceptatum est. Instante enim Rño D. Carmelo Blay, eiusdem Causae postulatore, attentis litteris postulatoriis quorundam Eñorum S. R. E. Cardinalium, plurium Rñorum Archiepiscoporum et Episcoporum praesertim Hispaniae, necnon Capitulum Ecclesiarum Cathedralium, Praepositorum Ordinum seu Congregationum regularium utriusque sexus, praeunte Antistita Generali Institutii Sororum Carmelitarum a Caritate, una cum praesidibus domorum *de la Cortés et Petralbae*, aliorumque virorum et mulierum e coetu nobilium, quum scriptorum Servae Dei revisione peracta, nihil obstaret quominus ad ulteriora procederetur infrascriptus Cardinalis Antonius Vico, Episcopus Portuensis et S. Rufinae, huius Causae Ponens seu Relator, in ordinariis sacrorum rituum Congregationis comitiis subsignata die ad Vaticanum coadunatis, sequens dubium discutiendum proposuit : *An signanda sit Commissio introductionis Causae, in casu et ad effectum, de quo agitur ?* Et Eñi ac Rñi Patres sacris tuendis ritibus praepositi, post relationem eiusdem Cardinalis Ponentis, audito voce et scripto R. P. D. Angelo Mariani, Fidei promotore generali, omnibus accurate discussis et perpensis, rescribendum censuerunt : *Signandam esse Commissionem introductionis Causae, si Sanctissimo placuerit.* Die 13 ianuarii 1920.

Facta postmodum de his Sanctissimo Domino nostro Benedicto Papae XV per infrascriptum Cardinalem Sacrae Rituum Congregationi Praefectum relatione, Sanctitas Sua rescriptum eiusdem sacrae Congregationis ratum habens, propria manu signare dignata est Commissionem introductionis Causae beatificationis et canonizationis Servae Dei Ioachimae de Vedruna de Mas, viduae, fundatricis Congregationis Sororum Carmelitarum a Caritate, die 14, eisdem mense et anno.

✠ A. CARD. VICO, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae,
S. R. C. Praefectus.

ALEXANDER VERDE, *Secretarius.*

L. ✠ S.

DOUBT REGARDING THE INTERPRETATION OF THE DECREE
'INTER RELIQUAS' (JULY 15, 1919) IN THE CASE OF CERTAIN
CONGREGATIONS AND RELIGIOUS INSTITUTES

(November 30, 1919)

[This Decree was published in *Acta* of March, 1920]

SACRA CONGREGATIO DE RELIGIOSIS

DUBIUM

S. Congregationi de Religiosis propositum fuit sequens dubium circa declarationem quoad Decretum *Inter reliquas*, datam sub die 15 iulii 1919, videlicet :

'Utrum in Congregationibus seu Institutis Religiosis, in quibus ex Constitutionum praescripto post Novitiatum vota annualia emittuntur, Alumni servitio militari adstricti, absoluto Novitiatu admitti valeant ad professiones annuales.'

S. Congregatio, re mature pensata, respondendum censuit :

'*Affirmative* : ita tamen ut vota annualia cessent si Religiosi ad servitium militare vocentur, et eo die quo militiae effective adscripti et disciplinae militari subiecti evadant.'

Facta autem de his relatione Ss^{mo} D. N. Benedictio Pp. XV, in audientia diei 30 novembris 1919, ab infrascripto Secretario, Sanctitas Sua eandem resolutionem approbare dignata est et publici iuris fieri mandavit.

L. ✠ S.

✠ MAURUS M. SERAFINI, O.S.B., *Secretarius*.DECREE FOR BEATIFICATION OR DECLARATION OF MARTYR-
DOM OF THE VENERABLE SERVANTS OF GOD, CHARLES
LWANGA, MATHIAS MORUMBA AND THEIR ASSOCIATES
OF UGANDA

(February 29, 1920)

VICARIATUS APOSTOLICI UGANDEN.

BEATIFICATIONIS SEU DECLARATIONIS MARTYRII VENERABILIVM SERVORVM
DEI CAROLI LWANGA, MATHIAE MURUMBA ET SOCIORVM VULGO 'DE
UGANDA.'

SUPER DUBIO

An constet de martyrio et causa martyrii, signis seu miraculis in casu et ad effectum, de quo agitur?

Studiose simul et iucunde historiam perlegenti praenobilis huius beatificationis, seu declarationis martyrii, causae, quaedam, sponte velut sua, in conspectum se produnt adiuncta, quae causae ipsius dignitatem ac praestantiam mirum in modum exornant atque commendant.

Initio namque ducto a supplicii loco, mens statim ad Africam respicit; quippe quae hoc recenti, quod adeo pulchrum atque praeclarum Ecclesiae peperit, triumpho, ad vitam suam verique nominis gloriam revirescere visa est. Quaedam siquidem peculiaris eiusdem penitoris

Africae regionis pars, quam *Ugandam* vocant, abhinc plenum nondum expletumque saeculi dimidium, apostolicis irriganda sudoribus, Missionariis commissa fuit, quos non ita pridem, pro Arabum praesertim et Nigritarum conversione, instituerat clarae memoriae perillustris tunc et Reverendissimus Carolus Martialis Lavigerie, Algeriensis archiepiscopus, quibusque *Alborum Patrum* nomen accessit. Qui sane apostolicorum suorum, quos brevi potius temporis intervallo exantlaverant, laborum opimum satis satque conspicuum et fructum retulisse atque praemium, iure meritoque nunc laetantur : qui quidem fructus quodque praemium, quanti pluris sit faciendum, lectissima haec causa ostendit planeque significat.

De viginti enim ac duobus agitur Servis Dei, quos veluti incohortes duas secernere iuvat : quarum prior tredecim numero complectitur Dei Famulos, qui igne sunt absumpti quique vocantur : Mbaga Tuzindé, Bruno Séron Kuma, Iacob Buzabaliao, Kizito, Ambrosius Kibuka, Mgagga, Gyavira, Achilles Kiwanuka, Adulphus Ludigo Mkasa, Mukasa, Kiriwanvu (Kilwanon), Anatolius Kiriggwajjo, Lucas Banabakintu, Carolus Lwanga. Altera vero reliquis constat novem, qui non uno eodemque, sed diverso supplicirum genere fuerunt interempti ; eisque nomen est : Athanasius Badzekuketta, Pontianus Ngondwé, Gonzague Gonza, Mathias Kalemba Murumba, Andreas Kagwa, Noé Magwalli, Iosephus Mukasa Balikuddembé, Ioannes Maria Muzei (Iamari) et Dionysius Sebuggwao.

Revera, ut locus monet, ab extrinsecis ad intimum digredienti totius causae meritum, hoc probe dignoscendi iustoque pretio aestimandi non difficile facta fuit potestas, omnia et singula sedulo industrieque investigando et perpendendo, quae eo potissimum spectabant, ut tyrannus quis exstiterit, seu persecutor, quaque motus ille causa fuerit ad mortis poenam eamque tam saevam tamque teterrimam Dei Famulis infligendam, clare distincteque edocerent ; simulque, alix ex parte, exploratam facerent atque compertam singulorum Servorum Dei personam, aetatem, conditionem aliaque generis eiusdem, maximeque ponerent in aperto causam, qua, quin vel minime exhorruissent, festinarunt immo illi admirabili animi festivitate atque laetitia obviam ire neci omnium atrocissimae, eique superiores prorsus, cunctis spectantibus ipsisque obstupescentibus carnificibus, strenue invicteque sese probaverunt.

Cuncta haec vir prudens, aequus, iustusque veritatis investigator diligenter naviterque quum collegerit, mente complexus fuerit atque meditatus, hoc ipso omne in promptu habet, quo certam ac tutam capiat iudicii deliberationem ; quandoquidem ex omnibus, quae supra posita sunt, una simul sumptis expensisque, quaedam necessaria tamquam rei consecutio, nedum martyrii causaeque martyrii iusta atque legitima naturali itinere descendit demonstratio, verum et martyrii ipsius singularis quoque splendor emicat atque nobilitas.

Hac via et ratione propositam quaestionem explanare licuit atque enucleare ; reique obtinendae accurata non minus quam severa ubertim contulit disceptatio, quae, semel instituta, bis, ceu de more, repetita deinceps fuit ; anteparaepratoriae quippe Congregationi praeparatoria

successit eamque subsecuta est Congregatio generalis, quae, die decima huius vertentis mensis, coram Sanctissimo Domino nostro Benedicto Papa XV coacta fuit, in qua a Reverendissimo Cardinali Vincentio Vannutelli, causae Relatore, sequens ad discutiendum propositum est Dubium : *An constet de martyrio et causa martyrii, de signis seu miraculis in casu et ad effectum, de quo agitur?* Omnes, qui convenerant, tum Reverendissimi Cardinales, tum Patres Consultores, suas quisque ex ordine exposuere sententias, quas tamen Sanctissimus Dominus noster, intento admodum prosecutus quum fuisset animo, ad Sancti Spiritus lumen, in tanta re decernenda, implorandum, cunctis, qui aderant, indixit preces. Iis interim congruum relictum quum iam fuisset spatium, pro supremo Suo proferendo iudicio, hodiernam tunc eligit diem Dominicam secundam in Quadragesima ; ideoque, divina Hostia ferventer oblata, ad Vaticanas Aedes advocari iussit Reverendissimos Cardinales Antonium Vico, Episcopum Portuensem et S. Rufinae, sacrae rituum Congregationi Praefectum, et Vincentium Vannutelli, Episcopum Ostiensem et Praenestinum, Sacri Collegii Decanum causaeque Relatorem, una cum R. P. Angelo Mariani, Fidei Promotore generali, meque insimul infrascripto Secretario, eisdemque adstantibus, solemniter pronuntiavit : *Constare de martyrio et causa martyrii venerabilium Famulorum Dei Caroli Lwanga, Mathiae Murumba et Sociorum, in casu et ad effectum, de quo agitur.*

Hoc autem Decretum publici iuris fieri et in acta sacrae rituum Congregationis inseri mandavit, pridie kalendas martias anno MCMXX.

✠ A. CARD. VICO, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae,
S. R. C. Praefectus.

ALEXANDER VERDE, Secretarius.

L. ✠ S.

REVIEWS AND NOTES

FATHER WILLIAM DOYLE, S.J. By Alfred O'Rahilly. London : Longmans, Green & Co.

FATHER DOYLE was born in Dalkey in 1873. At eighteen he entered the Jesuit novitiate, and was ordained priest at thirty-four. For two years he was on the staff of Belvedere College. During the following seven years he was occupied in giving missions and retreats. Towards the close of 1915, he became a Military Chaplain. Less than two years later he was killed near Ypres; and 'somewhere near the cross-roads of Frezenberg, where he lies buried with them, the chaplain and men of the 48th Brigade are waiting together for the great Reveille.'

Mr. O'Rahilly tells us in the Preface that the *Life*, which was intended at first to be only a brief memoir, has grown into its present dimensions owing to the discovery, among Father Doyle's few belongings in Rathfarnham Castle, of a series of spiritual journals and personal records. The deceased had left explicit instructions that, in the event of his death, these intimate papers should be burned unopened; but other counsels prevailed, and from these private self-revelations most of the present book has been compiled.

Father Doyle's main attraction all through life was self-immolation. 'At the beginning of Lent, when he was quite a little boy, an old aunt, chancing to go into his mother's bedroom, found him gesticulating and talking in front of the mirror. "You villain, you wretch," he kept saying to his reflection, "I'll starve you, I'll murder you! Not a sweet will you get, not a bit of cake will you get!"' As a novice in Tullabeg, he wrote: 'Darling Mother Mary . . . I . . . solemnly commence my life of slow martyrdom by earnest hard work and constant self-denial. *With my blood I promise thee to keep this resolution . . .*' Verifying these words to the letter, he uses his own blood for the ink and seals! Years did not cool his boyhood enthusiasm, and even the hardships at the Front were not enough for him. 'Sometimes I kneel down,' he wrote, 'with outstretched arms and pray God, if it is part of His divine plan, to rain fresh privations and sufferings. But,' he humorously adds, 'I stopped when the mud wall of my little hut fell in upon me—that was too much of a good joke.'

In a special chapter on *Mortification and Suffering* Mr. O'Rahilly gives the reader a vivid idea of the extraordinary thirst for penance which ever raged in Father Doyle's breast. 'Other souls may travel by other roads,' he once wrote, 'the road of pain is mine.' Absolute, complete sacrifice of every comfort was what he conceived to be the mysterious appeal of Our Blessed Lord to him; and so he

kept constantly resolving, promising, even vowing to refuse Jesus nothing that He asked, to bear every little pain and inconvenience without relief, to give himself no gratification whatsoever at meals, even when not well or on feasts, and to increase his corporal penances. 'You must be your own executioner . . . I want from you a suffering love,' were the words which Father Doyle says he heard spoken clearly and forcibly in his soul as he knelt one night in 1913 before the tabernacle. His intense desire for suffering led Father Doyle at times to practise mortifications which—to apply Mr. O'Rahilly's comments to the particular case—it would be hard to justify on general principles. Sometimes the mortifications merit to be called foolish or whimsical; sometimes they deserve to be more strongly condemned as unwise and exaggerated. Standing up to the neck in a pond at 3 o'clock on a freezing winter's morn; taking the discipline with a heavy chain; rolling in furze, and walking through nettles till the whole body was one big blister, smarting and stinging—these are rightly included in a section headed 'Holy Follies.' Mr. O'Rahilly, by quotations and examples, repeatedly helps us to place these incidents in their true spiritual perspective.

Father Doyle effectively concealed his spirit of mortification under a bright and genial manner and an unwearying activity. In social circles he was recognized as the type of a perfect gentleman and cultured priest; on missions he was an enthusiastic and successful worker; with nuns he was a favourite for retreats, for confession and for direction.

In 1914 he offered himself to be a Military Chaplain. 'I long to go and shed my blood for Jesus, and if He wills it, to die a martyr of charity,' he remarks in his private diary. A year later, in November, 1915, he received his appointment from the War Office. The story of his one-and-a-half years at the Front is told in a series of beautiful letters, chiefly to his father, supplemented by some notes and jottings. To abbreviate the account would but spoil it. Suffice it to say that Father Doyle spared no toil and shirked no danger; that he was beloved for his gaiety and revered for his piety; and that when he was numbered among the slain, private soldier and general, Catholic and Orangeman, bore tribute to his heroism and their loss.

In this biography Mr. O'Rahilly has given us a new evidence of his own literary versatility. And, however opinions may differ on other points, there are few, if any, who will not agree that Father Doyle's life, as it now stands revealed to us, was a marvellous one, paralleled only by the lives of the great ascetics of by-gone days.

D.

THE ENGLISH CATHOLICS IN THE REIGN OF QUEEN ELIZABETH. By John Hungerford Pollen, S.J. 1558-1580. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

THE task which Father Pollen proposes to himself in this volume is to describe the history of English Catholicism as a whole from the accession of Elizabeth till the rise of the counter-Reformation about

twenty years later. This is a work which was very much needed, for though the events of the period have been frequently treated of by Protestant writers, Catholic books, so far, are merely accounts of individual efforts on behalf of the old religion, or biographies of martyrs, confessors, or other notable persons belonging to the ancient faith. The author of the present volume points out that the publication in recent years of many series of documents bearing on the religious changes under Elizabeth makes it possible at present to discuss the history of the Catholics with some approach to completeness. The State Papers of England and Spain, in part now accessible, and other materials of various kinds have been utilized by Father Pollen, and his book runs to about four hundred pages, embracing, besides its nine chapters, an account of his main sources, abundant references to authorities, and a full and carefully compiled index.

There are two points that strike one at once at the outset of the re-establishment of Protestantism as the religion of England. The first is the extraordinary hypocrisy and double-dealing displayed by the Queen before and immediately after her accession. The second is the suddenness with which the Church re-organized by Mary collapsed before the onslaught of the Protestant party. A few days before Queen Mary died she recognized Elizabeth as her heir on condition 'that she should maintain religion as she (Mary) had restored it.' In January, 1559, Elizabeth was crowned by the Bishop of Carlisle, and swore at the ceremony to preserve to him and the churches committed to his care 'all canonical privileges and due law and justice,' and to protect and defend him, 'as every good king in his kingdom ought to be protector and defender of the bishops and churches under their government.' Before the year was out the Bishop of Carlisle, and all the remaining Bishops in England were deprived of their sees, and many of them imprisoned, the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity having been passed in the meantime in both Houses of Parliament and confirmed by the Queen's assent. The other remarkable circumstance connected with the re-introduction of Protestantism must always remain a reproach to English Catholicism. Indeed, Protestants, no less than Catholics, says Father Pollen, must feel ashamed of the 'immediate surrender' of the clergy and the laity. The Bishops were the only party to make even the appearance of a fight at this stage. Various reasons are put forward to explain or account for the almost total defection of the clergy, but when everything is said, it still is extraordinary that the great majority of the English priests accepted the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity without a struggle, while, as for the laity, Jewel wrote at the time 'that the ranks of the papists have fallen almost of their own accord.' To the credit of Ireland it should be remembered that such things did not happen there. Bagwell, a strong Protestant, admits that 'a Primate not acknowledged at Rome had small chance of reverence from the Irish masses' (*Ireland under the Tudors*, v. ii. p. 356), and other authorities might be quoted to the same effect.

The fortunes of the Catholics in England went from bad to worse

for nearly fifteen years of the Queen's reign. Various efforts were made in the beginning to restore friendly relations between Popes Paul IV and Pius IV and the English Court. They were of no avail. Then came the landing of Mary, Queen of Scots, the rising in her favour in the North, the sentence of excommunication and of deposition against Elizabeth. These events led to increased severity in the operation of the laws against the Catholics, who were believed to be in sympathy with the partisans of the executed queen. These matters are ably described in the first half of the volume under notice. The remaining chapters deal in the main with the improvement in the condition of Catholicism which may be said to have synchronized with the growing influence of the Douay Seminary, founded as far back as 1568 by Dr. William Allen. Here some English exiles congregated to study for the priesthood, and in 1574 the first of them made his way to England to labour in the mission field. The English College in Rome, established a few years later, soon commenced to send home zealous men to work, and in the case of some of them, to suffer for the old religion.

Father Pollen's work carries the story of the Catholic struggles down to the year 1580, when the Jesuit Father Persons and others arrived from Rome. For the period embraced in the volume, it is likely to become the standard work of reference. The author has given many years' study to his subject, and he has pieced together from a vast variety of sources a most interesting narrative. His best recompense would be that the fruits of his labour should become known to all students of Catholic history, and we wish his volume the success it undoubtedly deserves.

PAUL WALSH.

BOOKS, ETC., RECEIVED

- America* : A Catholic Review (April).
The Ecclesiastical Review (April). U.S.A.
The Rosary Magazine (April). Somerset, Ohio.
The Catholic World (April). New York.
The Austral Light (March). Melbourne.
The Ave Maria (March). Notre Dame, Indiana.
The Irish Monthly (April). Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.
The Catholic Bulletin (April). Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.
The Month (April). London : Longmans.
Études (April). Paris : 12 Rue Oudinot (VII^e).
Revue Pratique d'Apologétique (April). Paris : Beauchesne.
Revue du Clergé Français (April). Paris : Letouzey et Ané.
The Fortnightly Review (April). St. Louis, Mo.
The Lamp (April). Garrison, N.Y.
Revue des Jeunes (April). Paris : 3 Rue de Luynes.
The Homiletic Monthly (April). London : Burns & Oates.

THE PRINCIPLE OF RELATIVITY AND EINSTEIN'S LAW OF GRAVITATION

By REV. PATRICK J. BROWNE, M.A., D.Sc.

THERE are three periods in the history of physical theory which we must consider in order to arrive in logical sequence at the Law of Gravitation formulated by Einstein in 1915. The first is that previous to the famous experiment of Michelson and Morley in 1887; the second goes from the time of that experiment to the announcement by Einstein, in 1905, of what is now known as the restricted Principle of Relativity; the third lies between that date and 1915, when Einstein advanced a further Principle of Relativity, containing what he called a Principle of Equivalence and a Law of Gravitation differing from Newton's and dispensing altogether with the notion of attraction at a distance.

It is well to state at the outset that the Principle of Relativity, though coupled in the minds of some of its adherents with philosophic idealism, by no means involves such idealism. Those complete Relativists hold that we can know nothing but phenomena, and that all our Physics is merely a statement of the inter-relations of such phenomena. But we can believe in the real existence of matter, motion, and time, and the Principle of Relativity only commits us to holding that we cannot measure quantity in those things absolutely, because we are entirely dependent for such measures on our foot or metre rules and our clocks, and any universal law of change in the dimensions or rates of these instruments would for ever escape us. But, though we may not discover the absolute changes of our measures of space and mass and time, we may find a relation or relations between them which will fit in with the results of experiment. A Principle of Relativity was inherent in all the science of dynamics for a long time known as Newtonian, Newton being the first to formulate clearly, and to develop to a large extent, the three celebrated Laws (or rather axioms) on which it depends. The science treats of the molar motions of

bodies under the action of forces, and its axioms are (a) that every body, if undisturbed, remains in a state of rest or uniform motion in a straight line; (b) that the rate of change of motion in any direction is proportional to the force in that direction; and (c) that to every action there is an equal and opposite re-action. Now these laws allow us to discover only the motion of bodies relative to one another; the whole framework of any system of bodies we are treating might (along with ourselves) receive a uniform motion in any direction without our becoming conscious thereof. There is no use objecting that we might know it by noting the change of our position relative to the sun, or a fixed star, because we do not know if those bodies are really fixed; their absolute motion is unknown to us, and Newtonian dynamics gives us no means of finding it. The principal force in Newtonian dynamics, gravitation, was an attraction in a straight line between two bodies, proportional to the product of their masses divided by the square of the distance between them. It merely depended on relative position, by no means on velocity. Though it raised the enormous philosophic difficulty of action at a distance, it gave an excellent account of the behaviour of the celestial bodies. But it could not solve the problem of finding the absolute velocity of any one of them. Paradoxically enough, there is one part of the motion of bodies which dynamics can determine absolutely and uniquely, their rotation. There is a definite axis, and no other, through the centre of gravity of a body about which it rotates, and the amount of that rotation is also definite.

Let us turn now from dynamics to the very different physics of light and electricity. Newton imagined a ray of light to be an emission of particles in a straight line from the bright body. The phenomenon of refraction led to the conclusion that a refracting substance, such as water or glass, exerted an attraction on the particles of light. From this it should follow that the velocity of light in water or glass was greater than that in air or vacuum. But later experiments proved the contrary, and the Wave Theory of Huyghens gained acceptance. Light was conceived as an undulation, transmitted with great though measurable velocity through an elastic medium, the aether, pervading all space unoccupied by matter as we know it. The fact that two rays of light, when brought together, even though travelling in the same direction, do not necessarily produce

greater intensity, but may even result in darkness at certain points of co-incidence, confirmed the wave theory. Maxwell went further and showed that electricity and magnetism could also be explained as aethereal undulations of the same kind as light. It remained to discover whether the aether should be considered as bounded by the surfaces of material bodies, pushed forward by them as they moved, and closing in behind, or whether material bodies moved through it, like very porous sponges through water. An experiment by Fizeau in 1851 showed that the velocity of light is less against than with the current in moving water, and established the superiority of the porous sponge idea.¹ So we must consider the aether, as a whole, to be practically at rest while matter moves with large velocities through it; and it is only in this way that the astronomical phenomenon known as aberration, that is, the apparent change of position of distant stars, according to the direction and magnitude of the earth's relative motion, can be satisfactorily explained.

To all this it must in justice be added that no experimenter or theorist has ever discovered the aether as anything else except nominative case to the verb 'undulates.' Still, its existence had to be postulated, and, leaving aside the question of its absolute velocity at any point, which may well be regarded as beyond human ken, physicists began to ask if any experiment would reveal our velocity relative to it, the most absolute of our velocities that they hoped to discover. Apparently, the hope was not vain. If our earth is moving at any considerable speed through the aether, light, they thought, must travel to us with different velocities, the slowest being in the direction of our motion, and the fastest against it.

To examine this, Michelson and Morley performed in 1887 an experiment which must be described in some detail. Light was directed from a source to a thin plate, which acted both as a reflector and a transmitter, inclined at a half right angle to the direction of the rays. The transmitted rays went practically straight through, fell perpendicularly on a mirror a certain distance away, and returned to the same point on the plate. The reflected rays travelled at right angles to the transmitted ones, and they too were returned to the plate by perpendicular incidence on a mirror, both

¹ Because the diminution or increase of light-velocity is not equal to the speed of the water, but only to a fraction of it. This points to a partial convection of the aether by the moving water.

mirrors being equidistant from the plate. Some of the rays reflected from the first mirror are also reflected from the plate, perpendicular to their direction, and some of the rays returning from the second mirror are transmitted through the plate. Those two sets of rays now coalesce at the plate, after having travelled back and forward the same distance in two directions perpendicular to each other.

Now suppose the apparatus to be oriented so that the initial light travels in the direction of the earth's 'absolute' motion. (The apparatus was mounted so that it could be turned in any direction.) The initial light and the first transmitted rays are then travelling 'up stream' in the aether; the transmitted rays, when returning, are travelling 'down stream.' The first reflected rays from the plate are travelling 'across stream' in their back and forward journey, and it is easy to prove that they ought to return to the plate a little before the former ones. Hence interference between them ought to be observable after their coalescence.

No such interference was, however, noted, though Michelson and Morley could have detected one, due to an earth-velocity of three kilometres per second through the aether. Now the average velocity of the earth relative to the sun is thirty kilometres per second, and changes direction every six months; hence, unless we wish to justify the physical conceptions that preceded Galileo, we are bound to assume that in general its 'absolute' velocity is much greater than three kilometres per second.

Professor Fitzgerald, of Trinity College, Dublin, suggested that all bodies experience a certain contraction in the direction of their motion relative to the aether, the contraction being so slight that it would require a velocity of more than 42,000 kilometres per second in order to make lengths reduce by one-hundredth. This would shorten the 'up-stream' and 'down-stream' paths of the rays of light in the experiment, and the contraction is just what is necessary in order to have no interference when the apparatus is turned in any direction. It could never be discovered by measuring, because our metre rule would experience a similar contraction. But, if it existed, it was thought that it might be discoverable in some other way. It is well known, for instance, that a transparent body which is isotropic, i.e. which has the same index of refraction for light in all directions, loses that property if heavily compressed in one direction. The Fitzgerald contraction ought to be equivalent

to such compression, and to cause the same effect, but Lord Rayleigh and Brace found no effect observable. Hence, if the contraction hypothesis is kept, some of the laws of light-propagation would have to be modified. The contraction in an isotropic conductor of electricity should produce changes of conductivity in different directions; Trouton and Rankine tried, and found no such changes; hence the laws of electric flow would have to be altered. Finally, two equal and opposite charges of electricity were mounted at each end of an insulating bar suspended by a thread attached to its middle point. In the laboratory they are apparently at rest, but, actually, they must be moving with the earth's velocity, and must, therefore, be equivalent to two opposite electric currents. But the expected mechanical effects of the magnetic and electric forces of two such currents could not be noticed by Trouton and Noble, who performed the experiment. The conspiracy for concealing the earth's absolute motion should therefore include, not only those volatile agents, light, electricity, and magnetism, but also the humbler forces of mechanics.

Lorentz and Larmor actually gave a mathematical law of transformation of the electric and magnetic forces at every point in the medium, just suitable for concealing the Fitzgerald contraction and the motion of the earth. It was quite legitimate for them to transform those forces throughout space, since their magnitudes are not observable except where there is electric charge or magnetic pole strength. There is then a Lorentz-Larmor scheme of the universe, corresponding to every possible absolute velocity of the earth, and as it is impossible to determine that velocity, we cannot find out which scheme is the true one, though each has a different metre, a different second, and, following mathematically from those differences and from the laws of conservation of mass and momentum, a different gram.

One thing is common to all the systems : each gives the same velocity for light in kilometres per second. *The achievement of Einstein in 1905 was to prove mathematically that this fact, and with it the fact that it is impossible to discover the absolute velocity of the earth, could be made the basic axioms of the whole theory.* It was a natural fundamental hypothesis, because we are ultimately dependent on light signals for our exact measures of space and time. We are

led to the conclusion that it is only events happening at the same place which keep the same sequence for all observers ; events happening at different places which would be simultaneous in one system would not be so in another, though both observers corrected their observations for the light-time. This result is a mathematical consequence ; it cannot be proved or disproved by experiment, for it is only coincidences in both place and time that can be directly observed.

Two observers passing each other in space with great relative velocity and briefly comparing notes, would each come to the conclusion that the other's metre rule was shorter than his own in a certain ratio, and that the other's second and gram were greater, in the same ratio. It is presupposed that each has the same value for the velocity of light in metres per second. And the Principle of Relativity says that there is no means of deciding between them. Each applies his system to the world, and finds no contradiction.

The difference in units of mass also implies that an observer must give a greater value to the ' mass ' of a body in motion in his own system than when it is at rest relative to himself. This does not mean, as is sometimes concluded, that the amount of matter in the body has increased. ' Mass ' in the present sense denotes ' inertia,' the quantity by which the velocity is multiplied in the expression for the momentum. This ' inertia ' must be thus slightly increased in order to make the law of conservation of momentum strictly hold.

Besides the velocity of light, there is another quantity (or rather set of quantities) connected with the motion of a body for which observers in all the systems will record the same numerical value. Let us take for convenience the velocity of light per second as our unit of length, keeping the second as unit of time. Suppose a body moving in any manner, and call any two adjacent points on its path P and Q. Let the distance PQ be l (in our new units), and let t be the time taken by the body to describe it. The velocity of light being unity, v , the velocity of the body, will be some fraction less than unity, and l , which is equal to vt , will be less than t . *All observers will give the same numerical value for $t^2 - l^2$.* Let us call it s^2 . The quantity s is then an *invariant* for all the systems.

Suppose now the body to move under no forces from a

point M to a point N well apart. According to Newton's first law of motion, it will move in a straight line with constant velocity. Connect the points M and N by an indefinite number of curves adjacent to the straight line, and make the body describe any of these curves with varying velocity, slightly different from its velocity in the straight line. Include also the cases in which it describes the line MN with slightly varying velocity, sometimes greater, sometimes less. Remember also that the interval between start and finish is in all cases to be the same. *It can be established mathematically that the sum of the elements 's' taken from point to point all along the Newtonian path is greater than their sum along any of the other paths; and further, that this rectilinear path of constant speed is the only one which possesses the property just mentioned.* We may then use this property as a mathematical equivalent, in a form invariant for all the systems, of Newton's law of motion under no forces. The 'first law' itself has not, quantitatively, this invariant form, for the distance apart of the two points, the time of transit, and the speed would have values varying with the system followed. The property is a most important one in the sequel, for it is by means of it that Einstein finds the curved paths of free motion of bodies in gravitational space and time.

The equation $s^2 = t^2 - l^2$ is characteristic of the non-gravitational world. By changing our unit of length and time we can clearly turn it into the form $s^2 = p^2 t^2 - q^2 l^2$, p and q being two numerical constants; the velocity of light becomes p divided by q . Our invariant property of motion under no forces still subsists. In the subsequent discussion we shall take the kilometre as our unit of length, and the small interval light takes to travel a kilometre as unit of time. Taking the constant of gravitation (in the Newtonian system) to be unity, an approximate arithmetical calculation gives 1.47 as representing numerically the gravitational mass of the sun.

Suppose now a modern windowless Noah's Ark to be fitted out, not to keep out the rain, but for a long cruise through aethereal space. Within it are physicists, with all the instruments necessary for performing the Michelson-Morley and other experiments. The Ark is constructed as an enormous projectile, placed in a still more enormous cannon, and shot into space with such great velocity that it finally settles down in an orbit round the earth or the moon.

If its inhabitants survive the first shock, they will notice immediately that all gravitation has disappeared within their dwelling-place. That is because they are moving freely, and because the gravitational effect of the Ark itself on the bodies within it is inappreciable. There being no limit to the freedom of hypothesis, we will suppose also that their delicate instruments are undamaged. Will they be able to discover their absolute velocity or their acceleration (due to gravitation) by any of the above mentioned experiments? *Einstein says no; they will find the same impossibility as the physicists of earth. This is his Principle of Equivalence, which he has added to the Principle of Relativity in order to make it applicable to the case of gravitation.*

They will then, for happenings within their Ark, discover the restricted Principle of Relativity and its consequences. They will find, with our previous hypotheses regarding units, the invariant $s^2 = t^2 - l^2$ or $p^2 t^2 - q^2 l^2$, p and q being numerical constants, and also our invariant expression of the first law of motion. But if we, or observers on another planet, consider their motion and the free motion of bodies within their abode, we say that they have certain accelerations. Nobody can decide between us and the adventurers.

Einstein set himself to discover an expression for the invariant s , holding for all observers in the symmetrical gravitational field of a large spherical body (the sun). It is remarkable that he has found it, not by any modifications *ad hoc*, but by general mathematical considerations of the nature of four-fold continua, of which space and time combined form an example. It would complicate matters needlessly for the non-mathematical reader to give the exact expression, but a very close approximation to it is the following,

$$s^2 = (1-k)t^2 - (1+k)l^2,$$

k being, outside the sun, a very small but variable quantity, equal in fact to twice the already mentioned gravitational mass of the sun (1.47) divided by r , the distance of the point from the sun's centre, measured in kilometres. Within the walls of the moving Ark it will be practically a constant, hence the delusion, or what we suppose to be such, of its inhabitants. As before, s^2 is measured in this way only for the interval between two adjacent positions of a freely moving body. At infinite distance from the sun, k will become zero, and we get the original expression for s^2 .

We have therefore to assume that ranging from a vast distance away towards the sun's centre, the second is becoming slightly longer, and the metre rule slightly shorter *in virtue of position alone*. The value for the velocity of light at any point will be, according to our general law, the square root of a quantity which is equal to $1-k$ divided by $1+k$; this square root is, to a first approximation, equal to $1-k$. The velocity of light will then change slightly with the distance from the sun's centre, becoming unity at infinite distance.

Such are the fundamental hypotheses of Einstein's theory of gravitation; it remains to put them to whatever experimental tests can be devised. The first test is, naturally, the motion of a planet round the sun. *By the Principle of Equivalence, the path must have the property that the sum of the elements 's' along a portion of it, between two fixed points, traversed in a fixed interval of time, must be a maximum in the sense already indicated, namely, for all slight changes of position and velocity.* The orbit has of course to be tangential to the direction of velocity at any point of it, and it is easy to see that it must have an inward curvature. The velocity of light is vastly larger than that of the planet; hence in the expression for s^2 , the quantity $(1-k)t^2$ is preponderant. Take now two points connected by two curves, one of inward, the other of outward, curvature. Draw radial lines from the sun's centre, cutting both curves; they meet the curves of outward curvature first. Now k diminishes with the increase of radial distance; hence $(1-k)t^2$ will be greater for the curves of inward curvature than for those of outward. The amount of inward curvature is, however, limited by the consideration that the factor $1+k$ of the subtracted quantity $(1+k)t^2$ is on the increase as we go inwards.

We cannot go through the complete mathematical reasoning in this paper; suffice it to say that we find practically the Newtonian orbit with a slight but observable and most important difference. We may add that the difference is hardly appreciable except in the case of the planet Mercury. It depends on the eccentricity of the orbit, which is notably greater in the case of Mercury than of the other major planets, which have nearly circular orbits. The perihelion of Mercury progresses in the orbit at a rate of 40 seconds of angle in a century; in other words, in the course of a century the planet becomes late by something between three and four minutes of our time. This

fact had long been noted, but not explained, by astronomers. Various modifications of Newton's Law of Gravitation had been made to explain it; but any that did so brought in perturbations which were too great in the case of the other planets. It is one of the triumphs of Einstein's theory that it explains this retardation without disturbing the general planetary arrangement.

The next experimental test suggested by Einstein had not been hitherto made; in regard to it, he made a prediction which the event has verified. It concerns the path of a ray of light in gravitational space and time. The maximum property of the sum of the elements s along the path of free motion fails in the case of motion with the speed of light, because when the velocity of light is unity, t is equal to l along its path, and s^2 , which is equal to $t^2 - l^2$, is zero; the same holds for the general case of s^2 equal to $p^2 t^2 - q^2 l^2$. We have to fall back on another principle, namely, that the time which light takes to travel from one point to another is a *minimum* when compared with all slight variations of the path. Instead of summing the elements s , we sum the elements t . This law gives us the broken path of light when passing from one medium into another of different refractive index; it has been established experimentally that the velocity of light in a medium varies inversely as the refractive index of the medium. To get the path of a ray between two points whose join is not perpendicular to the common boundary of the media, this law tells us that our method must be to increase the path up to a certain point in the medium of smaller refractive index, and to diminish it in the other; hence the bending of the ray, and hence also the curved path of light through transparent matter stratified in media of continuously varying refractive indices. By the Principle of Equivalence, the law must hold all through the gravitational field. We have seen that the velocity of light in our units is $1 - k$ at any point; hence it diminishes nearer the sun, and light must traverse the space round the sun in the same way as it would go through a medium stratified in concentric spheres with the sun as centre, having a refractive index which increases towards the sun. This would give for the path of the ray a hyperbola of very small inward curvature, with the centre of the sun as focus. Light travelling from a very distant star, just grazing the 'limb' of the sun, and coming to earth, must have this curvature, and Einstein calculated that

when it reaches the earth it is deflected from its original direction by 1.75 seconds of angle. Hence a star ought to send its rays to us after the sun has come into the line of vision. But owing to the brilliance of the sun's light, the test could only be made at a total eclipse. It was made at Sobral, in Brazil, in 1919; photographs taken during the eclipse showed stars which were known to be behind the sun, and the estimated deflection agreed almost exactly with Einstein's.

We should be on our guard against concluding, as is sometimes done, that this deflection is due to gravitational action on what has been called the 'weight' of light, or even on portions of electro-magnetic energy which are present all along the track of light in the aether. We have seen that the velocity of these things precludes them from the method applied by Einstein to the ordinary motion of bodies. If we treat them as subject to a Newtonian gravitational attraction we find, contrary to our hypothesis, that the velocity of light increases as it falls towards the sun. We find also—and here the experimental test is decisive—that the total deflection is exactly half that indicated by Einstein's theory. Einstein's result is a deduction from the law of minimum time, and from nothing else.

We come now to the last, and, so far, the least obliging of the crucial phenomena to which Einstein makes appeal. We know that the different colours in the spectrum are produced by light-emitting particles in the bright body with different periods of vibration, periods which grow longer as we go from the violet to the red. By the principle of equivalence, every observer will find the period of one of those atoms in his own part of space, and at rest relative to himself, to have the same numerical value as a fraction of his second of time. Now we have seen that this second on the outer part of the sun must be considered by an observer on the earth as longer than his own. Hence, for us, the solar light-atoms must vibrate more slowly than the same atoms in our laboratories, and we ought to notice a displacement of the whole solar spectrum towards the red end as compared with the spectrum of the same light taken from a terrestrial source. The amount of the displacement reckoned by Einstein is exceedingly small, but still, if it exists, it is measurable, and all observations hitherto have given values varying from zero to half the predicted amount.

The difficulties of the experimental test are great, arising

mainly from the rotation of the sun and the presence on its outer surface of unknown atmospheric currents. The suggested causes of failure are numerous, but no definite conclusion has been reached. The matter must therefore be regarded as in suspense. But two things are certain. If Einstein's statement is verified, the Principles of Relativity and Equivalence govern all the phenomena of Nature, on the smallest as well as on the greatest scale. If it is not, the periods of vibration of light-atoms, and many more infinitesimal motions in Nature, all now known under the general name of Quantum Phenomena, give an *absolute* measure of time, irrespective of their position in the gravitational field, when at rest relative to the observer. This is in violent contradiction to the Principle of Equivalence in its classic form ; and fundamental changes have to be made in the theory if the Fraunhofer lines in the spectrum refuse to move in Einstein's favour. For the effect can be noted in other, non-gravitational, fields, and is called the Doppler effect. The lines move towards the red end in the spectrum of a source of light which has a uniform velocity or uniform acceleration relative to the observer, or which lies in a field of centrifugal force, in other words, is moving round the observer with constant angular velocity. But if those tiny Quanta escape the influence of gravitation, there must be some essential distinction between the gravitational field and all others, of which the Principle of Equivalence has failed to take account.

P. BROWNE.

DR. MURRAY OF MAYNOOTH

BY REV. E. J. QUIGLEY, P.P.

READERS of Canon Sheehan's fine story remember—perhaps some did not understand the reference—that amidst the babel of voices in after-dinner conversation were heard the words, 'Paddy Murray and George Crolly.' When strangers heard that these were the names of two eminent divines, two leaders of theological thought in Ireland, and two of the most famous professors in the National College, Maynooth, they may be shocked at the seeming irreverence and too great familiarity. But the calling of church dignitaries by their Christian names is never a note of irreverence nor of familiarity. It is a mark of endearment and appreciation. And never was this mark more lovingly bestowed than when thousands of students and priests referred thus to their dear old college don, Dr. Murray. He was the idol of his students, who loved him for his learning, his kindness, his wonderful powers of teaching. They admired him for his theological fame, for his simple, childlike piety, and lastly for his wit and humour. So, these essays may interest those of his pupils who survive; it may give to students of his work, *De Ecclesia*, a new interest, and in those who sing or listen to his fine 'Song for the Pope,' it may inspire a love for the quaint old saint and savant.

In the old Ulster town of Clones, on the 11th November, 1811, Patrick Murray, son of Philip Murray, shopkeeper and farmer, was born. The town has the ruins of an old abbey, founded and ruled over by St. Tighernach. Within a few yards of the house where Murray was born stands a round tower and a fine old market cross. Clones town was the scene of one event in the career of Owen Roe; and Blessed Oliver Plunket presided at a synod held there. Patrick Murray was the fourth child in a family of eight. His father, a man of energy, was busied about his shop and lands, and the care and education of the children fell to the mother.

She (née Mary Corley) was a woman of piety, refinement, and ability. Her sisters were nuns. One was a foundress of the Poor Clare Convent in Cavan; another, a nun in Newry. It was the fervent wish and prayer of those good women that some of the Murray boys should become priests. The boys had inherited their father's good looks and energy and their mother's piety and ability. Two of them became priests—Edward, who died in Dublin diocese, August, 1851, and Patrick, the Maynooth professor.

The Murrays were what Ulster people call 'old residents' in Clones. The old headstones in the Abbey graveyard show that for nearly a century, and probably for longer, their ancestors were buried in that holy ground. They had money to pay for the education of their boys and girls—but schools were few and poor in quality. Readers of Carleton's 'Hedge School' remember the description of the schoolhouse, of the master, of the fun and the noise, of the daily offering of two turf, of the evening invitation to the poor teacher to share the food and fire of his poor pupils. To a school, probably a bit better socially and educationally, went the young Murrays. It was built on the roadside, near the farm now known as Fern Hill. Of his early schooling we know nothing. Whether the master was a man severe and stern to view, whether people wondered how one small head could carry all he knew, whether the boding tremblers learned to trace the day's disasters in his morning face—we don't know. But a contemporary pupil recorded, 'The Murrays were all smart boys and girls. Peter and Patrick used to be put to teach the big boys; and they were clever lads at that work.'

The schoolhouse probably was a poor mean building, and the master, a Mr. Jameson, had probably little skill in imparting knowledge. Hence, we can picture young Murray with his slate and 'cutter,' his quill pen, his drying sand for his freshly written page, his books, and a strange collection they were. In those days there were no readers for the standards, as we have now, and after learning the alphabet, there being no books made for words of two syllables, pupils struggled to read some little pious books. *Catholic Christian Instructed*, *Think Well On It*, and *Ward's Cantos* were favourite volumes; and, of course, the Catechism and prayer-books were universally used as readers in schools taught by Catholics. This arrangement was so very faulty that pupils in hedge schools for seven years could not read

simple words. A very practical and efficient step was taken by the Cork Charitable Poor Schools (1793) to set right this educational folly, when it ordered the teachers to classify boys in the following order :—

1. Class boys only learning letters.
2. Class boys of Ab, Eb, etc.
3. Class boys spelling words of one syllable.
4. Class boys spelling words of two syllables. . . .

But the book which was a sorrow to young Murray was—Gough. Gough was a Quaker schoolmaster in Lisburn, and there wrote his famous work on arithmetic. He did not know his subject, but he ‘supplied a long felt want,’ and his book was a universal curse to poor Irish lads and lasses. He knew no theory, explained little and poorly, and is quite wrong, plainly, stupidly wrong, in his explanation of the theory and practice of the Rule of Three. But he had plenty of ‘examples’ and ‘queries,’ and was a boon to lazy and ignorant schoolmasters. Some of his ‘crambos’ stick in Arithmetics still, for instance, ‘the snail and the pole,’ is a Goughism; but even the Intermediate examiners on Honours papers cannot rival Gough’s :—

If for a moidore and a crown, just fifteen yards I buy,
How many yards of that same cloth for 15 crowns had I?

Down in yon meadow, well strewn with grass
I just took an acre to tether an ass;
How long must the cord be, that can let it feed round
On no more nor no less than an acre of ground?

Murray hated Gough and all his works and pomps, and the renunciation of them left him free from annoyance and temptations about surds, quadratics of unknown quantities, perimeters, parallelopipeds, cosines, and other such non-essentials of education and salvation.

The dawn of the religious vocation rejoiced the hearts of his parents, and Patrick and Edward Murray were sent to a classical school near their own town. There were no residential colleges in those dark days, but the watchful care of the good mother supplied the element of piety needed, and the Rev. Mr. Naggs, a Presbyterian minister, supplied the learning. Dr. Murray had the kindest recollections of his strict, old teacher, who was punctual, kind, patient, and, above all, impartial. The young Papists got the same sauce as the Protestant and Presbyterian lads. And the minister loved the tiny, gay, clever Papists, and in after

days was their guest in Dublin. Does it not seem strange to read that Murray, the great upholder of Catholic doctrines, he who charged and routed so many opponents of holy Church, should, in his boyhood, learn from a Presbyterian minister, a follower of Knox? It was the only way.

I find in the Appendix to the Eighth Report of the Commissioners of Education that Dr. Higgins, Bishop of Ardagh, studied Latin and Greek at a school conducted by a Protestant minister, and several of the other Bishops were, I know, educated at Protestant schools, one of which at least was conducted by an Arian clergyman. Three of the present professors of Maynooth College got the entire or a part of their preliminary education in academies conducted by Protestant clergymen.¹

Why did not the priests teach classics in the Irish towns in those days? Some few did teach. But, as a priest's work is nearly all done at the hours at which nature and custom place schoolmaster work, teaching was an impossible task. Priests were few; not sufficient in number for parochial duty amongst the immense population of their parishes. And then, too, it may be written of some clerics then living what Gil Blas wrote of his reverend uncle: 'Il aurait encore bien voulu m'enseigner la langue Latine . . . le pauvre chanoine; il n'en avait de sa vie su les premiers principes; c'était, peut être, le chanoine le plus ignorant.' For, as knowing old Carleton wrote in *Denis O'Shaughnessy*, 'Franky is no *finished* priest in the larnin'; he's but a scowdher' (i.e., half baked, half educated).

What did Mr. Naggs teach Master Patrick Murray, in that ugly manse, in that old town, a hundred years ago? We may be sure that he read and re-read some editions of *Lily's Latin Grammar*, composed in Pre-Reformation days by Dean Colet of St. Paul's, for the use of his usher, Lily, and his pupils. And, probably, in Greek Grammar, he read the Rules of Dr. Neilson. But what texts he used, which authors he read in classics, we know not. But of one thing we may be sure, that exercises in Latin and Greek composition were few and short, for the defect of early nineteenth century classical teaching was quantity. Boys were allowed, encouraged, urged to read much and many classics of ancient Greece and Rome. The reading and turning same into loose, barbarous English, without attention to structure of sentence, clauses, idioms, historical geography, antiquities, was considered education. It was a very unscientific form

¹ *Life of Archbishop Crolly*, by Rev. George Crolly, Dublin, 1851.

of mental training. All agree now with what Newman wrote fifty years ago, and for which the secondary education of these countries has done so much, viz., that knowledge, accurate, judicious, critical, is real, useful knowledge, and that the knowledge begotten of desultory reading is a thing of poor quality.

Suffice it then to say here that I hold very strongly that the first step in intellectual training is to impress upon a boy's mind the idea of science, method, order, principle and system, of rule and exception, of richness and harmony. This is commonly and excellently done by making him begin with grammar; nor can too great accuracy or minuteness and subtlety of teaching be used towards him, as his faculties expand with this simple purpose.¹

Murray and his contemporaries had poor opportunities for this real, solid education in classics. Their teachers were generally strangers to accurate scholarship and always strangers to good teaching and educative methods. The type of entrant to university study in Newman's dialogue, may perhaps be a fair picture of the entrance examination in 'young' Maynooth. It shows a university tutor struggling to find out how much the matriculation candidate knows. The tutor asks, 'What are the Latin and Greek books you propose to be examined in?' Candidate, 'Homer, Lucian, Demosthenes, Xenophon, Virgil, Horace, Statius, Juvenal, Cicero, Analecta, Matthiæ.' 'But what are the two books, one Latin, one Greek, I am to examine you in?' Candidate is silent. . . . Tutor, 'Don't flurry yourself.' Candidate, 'Oh, Xenophon and Virgil.' Tutor, 'What work of Xenophon?' Candidate, 'Xenophon.' Tutor, 'Xenophon wrote many works. Do you know the names of any of them?' Candidate, 'Xenophon,' and so on, and so on.

Naggs taught his brainy little pupils to love poetry and to commit much of it to memory. Beginners learned by heart Thomson's *Seasons* and *The Deserted Village*. Bigger boys memorized Pope and Milton. For, Mr. Naggs being of the Puritan religion, loved its poet, Milton, and disliked a naughty author named Shakespeare. The Puritan soldier in Scott's *Woodstock*, Chapter III, gives the Puritan view:—

'Scoff not,' said the soldier, 'lest I, being called thereto by the voice within me, do deal with thee as a scorner. Verily, I say, that since the devil fell from heaven, he never lacked agents on earth; yet nowhere hath he met with a wizard having such infinite power over men's souls as this

¹ Newman, Preface, *Idea of a University*.

pestilent fellow, Shakespeare. Seek a wife a foul example of adultery, here she shall find it.—Would a man know how to train his fellow to be a murderer, here shall he find tutoring.—Would a lady marry a heathen negro, she shall have chronicled example for it.—Would any one scorn at his Maker, he shall be furnished with a jest in this book.—Would you be drunk, Shakespeare will cheer you with a cup.—Would you plunge in sensual pleasures, he will soothe you to indulgence, as with the lascivious sounds of a lute. This, I say, this book is the well head and source of all those evils which have over-run the land like a torrent, making men scoffers, doubters, deniers, murderers, makebates and lovers of the wine-pot. . . .’

The Rev. Mr. Naggs and the pious Mrs. Murray laboured to educate the boys in learning and piety; and an old crone taught their retentive minds bits of Burns’s poems, Irish history, hot and romantic, and scores of tales concerning devils, ghosts, fairies, witches, warlocks, wraiths, banshees, giants, dragons, and enchanted castles. Years afterwards the little boy, then an old man, used to tell the tiny tots in Dublin and in Clones some of the old tales, and his store was so large and his method so excellent that he was highly esteemed by his youthful listeners.

But the peaceful, prosperous Ulster town of Clones, as it is to-day, is not the Clones of a hundred years ago. Orangeism and bigotry were rampant and unceasingly vicious. Catholics were ever on their defence. Children coming from school, the labourers in the fields, the unoffending men and women in their poor cabins, were ever vigilant of attack. Scenes of bloodshed were frequent. Protestant criminals were always freed by their pious and peace-loving fellows at sessions and assizes. The law winked at their offences and found some Papist scapegoat to avenge itself on. The writer of this essay saw and heard the judge (on the bench) who sentenced a Catholic to death for stealing a goat! He heard the same man, on the booze, admonishing young Papists about adoring graven images. For the law leaned ever to piety, and often to the proselytism which disgraced English effort in this country during the last century. The imported nobility gave patronage and support to every effort against the Catholic religion. In Ulster, Lord Farnham spent years in defaming the Catholic Church, bribing Catholics with bibs and bacon to adopt the Farnham faith. Earl Roden, in Down, was a pillar and ground of Protestantism, and sought in vain for crowds of perverts. Even dozens failed to seek his support. The smaller fry, paupers like the noble (?) houses of Sligo, Rossmore, Bandon,

were fiercely anti-Roman, and did their part. They became patrons of societies for the perversion of priests and Papists.

The Catholics had lost courage, lost hope and self-respect; they saw no sunrise, all was dark. They were idle because industry enriched the landlord only; they drank too much; they kept up family feuds and faction fights. In every market and fair they heard street preachers deriding and mocking all their most sacred beliefs. They heard God's Mother scorned; they heard Confession laughed at; the Eucharist blasphemed; the Pope and the priests consigned to hell. They saw the landlord's smile for the pervert, saw his prizes and presents to his Protestant tenants—but through all, God's holy and all-powerful grace kept them loyal to the old faith.

Clones was a nest of bigots. The landlords, squires, agents, doctors, lawyers, were all rampant, virulent bigots. The villas about the town were called by Old Testament names: Mount Salem, Silloe's Brook, Mount Sion, etc. Their people bore—in accordance with Puritan tradition—Old Testament names: Isaac, Abraham, Abel, Joshua. A priest going from home at night required a guard to save him from Protestant zelots.

It is worth remarking that the Catholics and Protestants in that quarter of the country are easily distinguishable from each other by a native of the place. I could, in my boyish days, have passed through a crowd of thousands, and told with almost unerring accuracy who belonged to each of the two religions.¹

My native town, which is situated in the upper part of Co. Monaghan, became about the middle of the year 1827, and continued for a long time after, perhaps the most renowned scene in all Ireland of perpetual conflicts between the Orangemen and Catholics. I was an eye-witness of the first of these encounters as well as of most of those that followed for fifteen or sixteen months after. It was on the part of the assailants of a most savage and cowardly description. The attack was commenced on a fair-day by a body of the Protestant party, most of whom had, according to a preconcerted plan, come from remote localities for the purpose. The Catholics, not suspecting what was in store for them, were totally unprepared, and, of course, at once put to flight—though not without some exhibitions of heroic bravery, one of which I remember very vividly—for the Orangemen were all armed with bludgeons, and sustained by a body of two or three hundred yeomen, who, before the attack had lasted five minutes, appeared suddenly and as if by magic in the Orange ranks, with their guns, bayonets, red coats and helmets. These attacks, in every instance, commenced with the Orangemen, were repeated from week to week afterwards on market day, but especially at the fairs that were held on the last Thursday of each month, until the trade of the town, which had been previously in a flourishing state, was utterly ruined.

¹ Murray's *A Night in an Orange Lodge*.

These heroes drank toasts—

Here's to the tree that's watered with Papist blood and never fades.
Here's to the little house in the bog that's built with the bones of Papishes
and thatched with the skins of priests.

And they sang—

Och, it's us that bate the Papists at the Clownish fighting fair,
For the boys of Lisbellaw had a noble body there.
We chased them through the Diamond and down Fermanagh Street,
Till not a Popish face in the town you could meet;
And the loyal Clownish veomen, they did join us in the fun,
Till like water in the gullions, the rebel blood did run.¹

In this atmosphere of politics and polemics was reared the future champion of the Church. And for his town and townsfolk he had ever a very warm wish.

In August, 1829, he entered Maynooth, being then eighteen years old, and, as he himself characteristically declared to the Royal Commissioners in 1853, he was amongst the first batch of emancipated students.

From the foundation of Maynooth College in 1795, its aims, its teaching, its endowment, its staff and its products, were objects of hostility. 'With respect to the College of Maynooth, heavy and unfounded slanders have been thrown out against that establishment.'² The College Staff sometimes replied in refutation of the charges, but the campaign of lies was so widespread, so continuous, and so varied, both at home and abroad, that the effort seemed useless. The Maynooth Grant was a theme for parliamentary and for pious genius. Thousands of good people subscribed annually in England and Scotland large sums for the conversion of Ireland and the extirpation of Maynooth. Daily papers and weeklies spat on the vile College. Novelists spiced their wares with Maynooth, e.g., Thackeray, Kingslake, Reynolds. Lever, the associate and friend of Mortimer O'Sullivan, a Kerry pervert, who became rector of Tanderagee, began in *Harry Lorrequer* his life-long attack on the Irish priesthood by his description of the drunken professors of Maynooth, going from the officers' mess, cursing the Pope, as the pass word. In every one of Lever's books the Irish priesthood is reviled, pictured as sots, crafty, mean, vile, avaricious, grossly immoral. Lever's circulation was over a million copies. In the English towns,

¹ Dr. Murray's *Essays*, vol. i.

² Report of Lord Plunket's speech, House of Lords, March 13, 1829.

McGhee, O'Sullivan, Gregg, and McNeill vomited venom on Irish priests and people and on Maynooth. In Dublin, the *Christian Examiner*, edited by Rev. Cæsar Otway, gathered up abuse and garbage weekly, devoting much of it to Maynooth men and Maynooth means. The Catechism Society, where Carleton was a clerk, had a staff of forty clerks. It was only one of several proselytizing and villifying societies. These societies were ever issuing invitations to controversy. In Carlow, it led to bloody noses, and broken heads. In other places it was scouted and driven off. But in Dublin, things were very tame; Catholicity was of a pale, unmuscular type, so that in Bleakley's shop window, 35 Lower Sackville Street, were displayed pictures 'representing two heathen idols, hideous and misshapen, with the Catholic Eucharist between them. Underneath was written, "Three idols, adored by three different classes of idolators." Another picture was an illustration representing the Eucharist gnawed by a mouse.'¹ A Carlow clergyman issued a tract, which had a wide circulation, it is called, 'Murderous Maynooth,' and a lady, shocked by the evidence at the Commission, given by an expelled student, about certain sexual sins, explained by Peter Dens and re-explained by the Maynooth dons, translated the offending words into plain, bad English, and sent her booklet broadcast!

Into poor, struggling Maynooth College went young Murray in 1829. And there for eight years he was a student, reading his Dunboyne course, the higher or post-ordination course, under Dr. McNally, his future Bishop. To reach Maynooth the Clones lad had a journey of three days, through Cavan and Meath. On his arrival in college he met his class-fellow, George Crolly, destined to be his life-long bosom friend and companion, to be the glory of his college. How different the poor squalid college of that day is to the fair and beautiful college of to-day. Then there were few buildings, and these few poor and mean. Students were huddled together, lecture halls were small, rooms too large or too small—congestion everywhere. And the service of God, study, college rules, food were governed, marred, and made annoying by the official visitors, nearly all narrow-minded bigots, full of suspicions and prejudices, more anxious to censure than to approve. Some of the students

¹ *Saints and Sinners*, by O'Neill Daunt, Dublin, 1844.

from the north and from the west of Ireland reached the college by boat. The fare from Dublin to Maynooth, first cabin, was half-a-crown, from Mullingar it was five shillings and ten pence.¹ Many of the students were great dandies, displaying immense cravats, knee buckles, silken hose, silver shoe buckles, gold chains, and seals of magnitude. All, even the senior students, wore collars and cravats, similar in shape to those we see in pictures of O'Connell and Archbishop McHale. For, in 1829, when Masters Patrick Murray and George Crolly entered Maynooth, the clerical collar of our day was not worn. In September, 1830, a student of four years standing, aged eighteen, Master Charles Russell, wrote to his mother in Co. Down :—

I dare say you have not yet heard of a change we have been obliged to make in our dress. We don't wear white cravats any longer. Instead we wear a kind of stock, such as perhaps some of you may have seen on Dr. Murray's priests. They are of black silk, with a flap hanging down before, so as to cover the breast of the shirt, and over the stock itself, coming down nearly half way, is a piece of white muslin. They are rather a curious thing, and I think, with all respect, a little ridiculous. We should have gotten notice in time to provide them before we returned. The nuns in the convent make them, and charge for each of the stocks 3s. 6d., and for the bits of muslin 7d. I am told they are so easily soiled that we will be obliged to change them nearly every day. The muslin things are called *rabbahs*.

This young letter writer became Dr. C. W. Russell, President of Maynooth College, living there as pupil and priest for fifty-five years. Three years previously this lad described his daily routine after entry to the college :—

I like the place very well for so far. I was not examined until Saturday. I stood for first class, but I do not know whether I will be in the first or not. We have a great deal of praying to do here. When we get up in the morning (which now is at six, but will soon be at five o'clock) we have to dress ourselves, make our beds, clean our shoes, sweep our rooms and wash ourselves, in twenty minutes. Then a bell rings for the *Angelus Domini*; five minutes after another bell rings to assemble us in the prayer hall for morning prayer. After this is over we return to our rooms till eight, when the bell rings for the Mass. . . . I bought a bed and furniture for £5 5s. . . . The lay college is quite different from the ecclesiastic, and it is one of the rules not to hold any intercourse with those in the other college. I got a cap and cloak; the price of them is £1. . . . We go to confession once a fortnight, oftener if we please, but we are obliged to go once a fortnight.²

We write private essays for Mr. Boylan, the Professor of English, and I had the honour of giving the first to him. It was on love of country. He said it was not at all bad, and he never says more.

¹ *Life in Old Dublin*, p. 92.

² *Irish Monthly*, 1892.

In the same year (1827) he writes :—

I am sure you will excuse my long silence, when I inform you that I have been so busily engaged in the English class this time back that I have had scarcely a moment unoccupied. Never in all my life [he was then fifteen years old] did I write so much. Two private essays each week I intended to write. But Mr. Boylan told us he would only allow one or two between each day appointed for reading them.

Into the company of young Russell went Murray and Crolly in 1829. From the extracts taken from Russell's letters we get glimpses of old college life and of the precocious Russell. In his case, the child was father of the man, and his boyish mental effort, essay writing, was to be his life-long work, for he was an author of repute and an essayist on many themes in the *Dublin Review*, the *Edinburgh Review*, and Chambers' *Encyclopedia*. Murray and Crolly entered the Rhetoric class, and in the prize lists Crolly was first in every subject. Murray's progress was slow; but by persevering study he won in his class a fame second only to Crolly. To neither, God gave the five talents, but both had received the two, and neither buried their gifts. In 1835 Crolly and Murray became Dunboyne students; and two years later Murray became a curate in Francis Street, Dublin. The year spent here was, as he always said, of great help to him in the teaching of Moral Theology, for it brought him into touch with all sorts and conditions of souls. But his love of books, his love of study, his love for his old college, were calling him back to Maynooth. He competed for the vacant chair of English and French, was appointed in 1838, and settled down to spend that long and splendid career of strenuous work for the glory of God's Church and for the honour and benefit of Ireland and her priesthood.

The duties of the chair of English and French were not heavy nor numerous. At some periods the attendance of students was voluntary. The subjects were not necessary for salvation; they were subsidiary subjects; they were subjects of an arts course, not subjects of a theological training college. Time for studying the necessary minimum of professional priest studies was short. The scholastic structural programme was peculiar. It tried to combine the work now done by secondary schools with purely theological training, and it failed. Students believed they knew too much English and that the study of French was a work of supererogation. Hence young Father Murray

had time to read a goodly course of English classics, to study French, Italian, and German. Amongst the literary flotsam and jetsam which Murray left are his exercises in these languages. It is quite refreshing to see the young professor struggling to turn into French, Italian, and German, 'The air was warm and not a breath came to refresh our lungs.' 'Who broke the looking-glass?' 'Have you been whistling?' He had wonderful industry, read systematically, slowly, and with pen to mark or copy passages of beauty, passages for comment. His study of the languages and literatures of England and of Europe was his daily work, even in the midst of his deeper studies. He read Milton, Shakespeare, Burns, and Pope with great care, as his old books show, from their markings and worn appearance. In French he read Racine, Bossuet, and Fenelon's *Telemaque*. His German study was a toil, and his copy of Goethe shows that he translated with difficulty and dictionary; and his translation words, scribbled on the text, show that *Mignon*, *Der Sanger*, were difficult, even to a professor of Murray's ability and application. For the professor's knowledge of modern languages was self-acquired, without guide.

In 1841, he stood another concursus, was awarded a chair in Theology, and began the long tenure of forty years theological study, teaching, and writing. His official lectures were not so numerous as the lectures in a corresponding office nowadays are, so the young professor had plenty of time to study, to construct, to reason out his lectures, to arrange their points, their order of delivery. Above all, he took pains to *teach* his classes. For, to all his students Murray was a painstaking and an excellent teacher. Nowadays, with so many works on pedagogy, the practice of teaching, elocution, and excellent text-books on the subject-matter, it is hard to imagine an indifferent professor, a faulty professor, *sicut uter in pruvina*—cold, hard, stiff, dry, uninteresting. But the important work of priest training, the important matters dealt with, inspired Murray to take extreme pains in preparing, revising and delivering his lectures. For an hour before his lecture the little professor walked in the bower walk inside the gate of the Junior House grounds, reading and revising and memorizing his lecture, and this practice continued, even when he was thirty years a theology professor. No wonder he was beloved by his students, for

whom he was individually and always industrious and patient.

Ireland was in the first half of the nineteenth century in a desperate plight. About the Act of Union it may be written—*scinduntur theologi*. Priests and Bishops were its foes and its friends. Then came the long and bitter discussion about the Veto. Priests and Bishops were its dearest enemies and its partial supporters. The State payment of the clergy had important and ardent clerical aiders and abettors. They wrote much on the matter, as did those clerics who were opposed to State aid. Then the struggle for Emancipation was fierce and universal. The fearful bigotry which it drew to light was terrible and long-lasting. As I said before, these islands were full of bigots and of bigotry. The 'Second Reformation' in Ireland was during Murray's student and early professor days at its height. Lord Plunket, speaking to Archbishop Magee, who, as a young Papist in Trinity College, had turned from the faith of his forebears in Fermanagh, remarked that the 'priests were ignorant and awkward, inefficient as logicians, and timid and blundering in society.' Such men could make no manner of stand against an ably organized and simultaneous assault from the expert divines and scholars which Trinity College was then daily sending forth. Hence, bands of educated speakers were let loose with pen and pamphlet, rant and rhyme, to befoul Roman Catholics and their faith. They were to challenge priests and Bishops to public controversy, and were, of course, confident of success. The controversies had quite other effects. The parsons were poor at logic, worse at Scriptural proof, halting in exposition, weak in objection, and wretched in defence. But the old principle of slinging plenty of mud, with the certainty that some should stick, was proved in Ireland. Apostacy was not unknown in any part, and particularly amongst the half-educated people in cities and towns. The Catholics everywhere saw the want of schools, where a priest could teach the teacher, and the teacher give rational instruction in religious knowledge and the practices of religion, prayers, preparation for the sacraments. But in many parishes in Ireland there were no roofed-in churches. The existing hovels were too small and too few for school uses, but they were in constant occupation by poor men, struggling daily to teach the wretched, starved, half-naked children. Priests were few in number and over-wrought

with the working of large and populous, badly roaded, districts. In some parishes, even in 1834, a priest was a rare appearance. At an inquest held on a poor wanderer, found dead in a barn near Lough Neagh, his bundle betrayed that he was a priest who, in disguise, attended the wretched Papists. A woman said that he was a civil man, he called to see her often, and she gave him a bit, but she thought it was a blanket he had in the bundle; if she had known it was a priest's robes she would not allow him to darken her door. In the panegyric of the Very Rev. John Kennedy, Dean of Killaloe, by the Rev. John Egan (1879), it was stated:—

When Father Kenny was ordained in 1814, there were few churches which were not the merest hovels—there were wide tracts of country without a church at all—there were men living till within the last few years who had seen the venerable priest, whom we have only known in positions of dignity, attending his sacred duties, barefooted, in his first curacy of Kilmihill.

What must have been the state of the Catholics, priests and people, in Derry, Antrim, and Down?

All called to Maynooth to help to repel and to crush the New Reformation. This she did by giving her students a good training, the best possible, during their short course, in order to redeem their lack of previous training or education. But Maynooth was in fetters. It had to work by stealth.

It has been sometimes remarked, most unreasonably, that no Irish priest has yet taken his place in the front rank of those who are labouring to restore Irish literature. We can point to the illustrious names which we have already mentioned in this article, and, amongst others, to Dr. Lanigan, who has not been dead twenty years. The clergy laboured under two insuperable difficulties; for, first, they could scarcely snatch a moment for study from the active duties of the mission; and, secondly, all their books were taken away and destroyed or locked up in Trinity College, Stowe, or some other place, where, until very lately, a Catholic priest would not dare to think of entering. The professors of Maynooth were the only persons from whom any co-operation could have been hitherto expected, and the library of that establishment is not only destitute of manuscripts, but it does not even contain a single copy of the printed works of Wadding, Scotus, or a great many other illustrious Irishmen. Besides, the professors of Maynooth could assign quite as satisfactory a reason for their silence as the first of the forty which the major of a certain town pleaded as an apology for not saluting his sovereign—he had no cannon; for, unless they had previously obtained permission, they were absolutely prohibited from publishing anything under pain of expulsion. . . . We have, indeed, been told that many anonymous writings of great

merit were from the pens of professors of Maynooth who dare not, however, acknowledge them.¹

‘ Writings of very great merit ’ had come from the pens of Dr. MacHale, and others. Amongst them all, few did such fine work, useful and continuous, as Dr. Russell, Father Crolly, and Father Patrick Murray. The *Dublin Review* was started in 1836 by Archbishop Wiseman. In its second number Dr. Russell began his essay writing, and continued contributing, sometimes one and sometimes two, articles to each subsequent number, for twenty years. He was joined by Murray and Crolly, who for many years contributed well and constantly to the useful and solid pages of that periodical.

E. J. QUIGLEY.

To be continued.]

¹ Rev. Dr. Kelly, Maynooth Professor, in *Dublin Review*, 1847.

THE HOLY SEE AND THE PROTECTORATE OF THE CHINESE MISSIONS

BY REV. M. V. RONAN

I

AN important international problem is involved in the question whether the establishment of a Nunciature to Peking is an invasion of the rights of France. The Pontifical Nunciature would, of course, be concerned in looking after the apostolic vicariates and prefectures of all China and in safeguarding their interests, their legal security, by means of diplomatic relations with the Peking Government. Now, France exercises in China a diplomatic and consular protectorate over all the Missions and over all Christian communities, a protectorate founded on international treaties, a protectorate that is in full sway and that has been exercised in the most businesslike manner by the official representatives of France for the last seventy-five years. Would, then, this Apostolic Nunciature in China interfere with this privileged position acquired by France and nobly maintained, and which constitutes the principal title to her political influence in the Extreme East?

It must be remembered that in China Catholic Missions, more and more flourishing, count 47 vicariates or apostolic prefectures, of which 24 have a French personnel and the remaining 23 a foreign personnel, Italian, Spanish, Belgian, Dutch, Austro-German. With the exception of the Austro-German Mission of Chang-Toung, all Catholic Missions and Chinese Christian communities are diplomatically and legally under the religious protectorate of France.

The diplomatic and consular protectorate of France over the Chinese Missions is first mentioned in the Treaty of Whampoa, October 24, 1844; it is formulated in article 13 of the Treaty of Tien-Tsin, June 25, 1858, legalized in 1869, and more clearly enunciated by the convention of Augustus Gerard, 1895, and of Stephen Pichon, 1899.

According to all these texts the Chinese Government, out of regard for France, recognizes in the Christian Missions, of all denominations and all nationalities, the legal right to establish themselves and form Chinese Christian communities.

Christian missionaries, whatever their denomination or nationality, may enter and travel freely through China under the guarantee of a passport issued by the French consuls. All matters of dispute concerning any of the Christian communities established in China must be settled by friendly action between the Chinese authorities and the representatives of the French Government. The diplomats and consuls of France have always acted loyally in the exercise of the religious protectorate. And, when necessary, soldiers and sailors have joined in to settle these matters, and international aid was sometimes called in, as in 1860 and 1909. But the religious problems of the Catholic Missions have always devolved upon France.

In a letter written in 1897 by M. Poubelle, French Ambassador to the Vatican, to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, M. Hanotaux, dealing with the communications with the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda, Cardinal Ledochowski, with regard to the French protectorate over the Chinese Missions, the writer says: 'Each of these communications has drawn words of thanks from the Cardinal.' And the Charge d'Affaires in Peking, M. Doubail, writing to M. Hanotaux on the same matter, says: 'This testimony of gratitude (of the Cardinal) is well-deserved, for I do not believe that at any time our religious protectorate has been as solidly established in China and its results as effective as at present.'

But there is another aspect of the situation. If the religious protectorate of France in China is advantageous to Catholic Missions it is not less advantageous to the political and national interests of France. It procures for France an exceptional prestige in the Extreme East. Now, in a measure, it is to the Holy See itself that France is indebted for the continuance of this religious protectorate, inasmuch as it is exercised even over missionaries of non-French nationality. The matter is of great consequence.

No doubt, the rights of the protectorate rely on diplomatic privileges, recognized in good and due form by the Chinese Government, to the French Government. But nothing could prevent the Chinese Government, if it

considered it opportune and advantageous, to recognize in any other foreign Power the same privileges of religious protectorate of which France has been for so long the sole beneficiary. Whether to diminish the importance of the political rôle of France in the Extreme East or to secure, by way of exchange, certain diplomatic or economic advantages, China could grant to the different foreign Powers the power to issue passports to the missionaries. No one doubts that China has the power and the strict right to act thus, and that several European States have endeavoured to attract her to this system.

But why and how has France preserved this protectorate over 23 vicariates and apostolic prefectures in China, where the Catholic missionaries are not of French nationality? Because the Holy See has always prescribed, and continues to prescribe, to the missionaries, even of non-French nationality, to have recourse exclusively to the diplomatic and consular protection of the representatives of France. And then, whatever might be the possibility, for this or that foreign Government, of having an understanding with the Chinese Government, the Catholic clientèle of France would be (morally speaking) intangible, thanks to the Vatican.

Such is the meaning of the celebrated rescript of the Propaganda, *Aspera rerum conditio*, of May, 1888, concerning the exclusive rights of the protectorate of France in the East. The constant practice of the Holy See does away with all equivocation. Then, in 1905, the White Book of the Holy See adds official confirmation to the interpretation of a rule laid down at first for the Missions of Turkey. And in a decree of the Chinese Government of 15th March, 1899 (the essential passage is reproduced in the Pontifical White Book) we read: 'In case of grave difficulties (which cannot be regulated on the spot) the Bishop and the missionaries of the place will demand the intervention of the minister or consul of the *Power to which the Pope has entrusted the religious protectorate.*'

We must, then, not forget that France and the Vatican have in China mutual obligations. Catholicism owes much to the generous protection of France in China. But France in China owes as much to the free benevolence of the Holy See. The officials of the Quai d'Orsay are wanting in an obligation of gratitude and justice when they try to forget this essential element of historic truth.

II

Would the Holy See interfere with the rights of France and of its religious protectorate by the establishment of a Nunciature in Peking? The French Republic has always appeared to believe it would. Let us see whether she is right or wrong.

On two occasions Leo XIII wished to establish diplomatic relations between the Vatican and the Government of Peking. On two occasions, in 1885 and 1886, French diplomacy opposed it in a threatening manner and put an end to the project. The first diplomatic attempt took place at the time of the war in Tonkin and the rupture of France with China. France was no longer represented at Peking, and the charge of affairs was entrusted to schismatic and persecuting Russia. Leo XIII would have wished to establish a medium of permanent and direct relations between Peking and the Vatican to look after the temporal interests of the Chinese Missions. The negotiations dragged along and nothing definite had yet been concluded when the Franco-Chinese war came to an end and when the representative of France re-appeared in Peking to take up his former duties.

The second attempt resulted, in 1886, in the initiative of the well-known statesman, Li-Houng-Tchang, who sent to the Vatican George Dunn, who but a short time before had been partner in a commercial establishment in Chang-Hai, and who had become one of the principal agents of a Telegraph Company in China. George Dunn's mission had for its primary purpose an exchange of territory between the Crown and the Apostolic Vicariate of Peking; the Catholic cathedral would be demolished, so as to allow enlargement of the gardens of the Empress, but it would be reconstructed elsewhere at the State's expense. This first question that was raised outside the French Embassy served to introduce the project of a Nunciature at Peking. The project conformed to the most ardent wishes of Leo XIII. The principle was at once agreed to. Mgr. Agliardi, afterwards Cardinal, would have been the first Nuncio accredited by the Holy See to Tsoung-li-Yamen.

As soon as this negotiation came to the knowledge of the French Government, the opposition of the Quai d'Orsay was stronger still than in the preceding year. In vain did Leo XIII declare that the Nunciature of Peking should act in unison with the French Legation that would be always

invested with the special rôle of protector of the Catholic Missions. The Minister of Foreign Affairs, President of the Council, M. de Freycinet, was obdurate, and replied to the Vatican almost in the same terms that, later on, under Pius X, M. Combes used. On the 12th August, 1886, for example, M. de Freycinet ordered Count Lefebvre de Bethaine, French Ambassador to the Vatican, to quit Rome for an indefinite period as soon as the Pope should have nominated a diplomatic delegate to Peking. M. de Freycinet pushed very far the threat of legislative reprisals against the Church of France: 'This defiance (of the Pope) will be seriously taken up by the enemies of the Church, and they are numerous. The suppression of the Embassy to the Vatican will be the first reply. Those who think that matters will remain at that will be very much astray.'

On September 16 an official note from Cardinal Jacobini informed Count Lefebvre de Bethaine that the Holy Father, 'taking into consideration the present circumstances, after the recent communications, had in his wisdom decided—without prejudice to the rights of the Holy See—that the departure of his representative to China should be put off.'

Leo XIII preserved a bitter memory of this diplomatic check, and, especially on the 30th January, 1894, expressed his persistent regrets when he received in audience M. Auguste Gerard, who was appointed Plenipotentiary Minister of France to Peking. The Pope expressed the hope that he would be able some day to send to China, if not a Nuncio to the Imperial Government, at least an Apostolic Delegate, furnished with purely religious powers over all Catholic missionaries and their Chinese Missions. M. Gerard sets forth as follows the proposal of Leo XIII:—

The presence of this ecclesiastical delegate, necessary or at least desirable, for the appointment of bishops (after the definitive organisation of the hierarchy), for the reunion and presidency of synods, for the good order of canonical administration, would provide a useful help to the protecting Power, whose acts it would second and to whose authority it would give sanction, it being, of course, understood that the delegate would have only spiritual powers and that the French minister would have sole charge and responsibility of relations between the government and the native authorities.

French diplomacy did not look with favour on this project, as it feared that in consequence of the correspondent wishes of the Holy See and Tsoung-li-Yamen, the Apostolic

Delegation would be transformed at the first favourable opportunity into an Apostolic Nunciature, charged with treating with the Government of the Empire. Thus, up to the year 1918, everything remained in this matter in *statu quo*.

III

Two classes of facts appeared to suggest, for some years past, the establishment of an Apostolic Nunciature to China and to give a new lease of life to the project that had been laid aside in 1886. On one side, the progressive and considerable development of the Catholic Missions and of the Chinese Catholic communities rendered normal and desirable that the presence of an official and permanent envoy of the Holy See should give sanction to this altogether new importance of the Catholic Church in China, which would appear officially, with its distinct personality, in place of appearing merely as the protégé, the client of a European Legation. On the other hand, the Revolution of 1912, which had overthrown the rule of the Manchu Emperors and which had set up a new oligarchy under the name of the Chinese Republic, marked (or seemed to mark) a decisive step taken by China in the assimilation of its political laws and customs to the forms of government which existed among contemporary nations. Notwithstanding the lamentable and chronic disorder of the Chinese Republic, the general line of this evolution was no longer in doubt; and it is easily understood that the Holy See would be solicitous, on every opportune occasion, to draw profit from it for the honour of the Catholic religion.

Now, in 1918 the Government of Peking formally proposed to Pope Benedict XV to establish a permanent exchange of diplomatic representation between the Holy See and China. What influences and what considerations inspired this project? Malevolent conjectures have naturally been spread abroad to account for the fact. The truth is that really trustworthy information is absolutely deficient on the question. The only tangible and certain fact is that the Chinese Government, the same that is in diplomatic relation with the different European nations, addressed to the Vatican the positive offer of accrediting a representative to the Holy See and of welcoming in Peking, according to the project conceived for many years, a Pontifical Nuncio.

Benedict XV in 1918, just like Leo XIII in 1886, could regard such an overture only as a pleasing one; all the more, as we have said, as the establishment of direct relations between Peking and the Vatican seemed to correspond better to-day than in 1886 to the prevailing conditions. The favourable occasion then being offered, the Sovereign Pontiff thought it his duty not to allow it to escape. He acquiesced in principle in the proposals of the Chinese Republic. The French Ambassador to the Vatican, then, would consider it his duty to demand guarantees for the rights of the religious protectorate in China which had been legitimately acquired and generously exercised by France. The Pope would have willingly consented to enter into friendly negotiations on the subject, since, as we shall show later on, Benedict XV wished to place side by side the diplomatic Mission of the Nuncio to Peking and that of the Minister of France, in his capacity of official protector of Catholic Missions. The question would have been seriously discussed. Perhaps the Pope would have been led to delay still longer the establishment of a Nunciature. Perhaps he would have returned to the idea of an Apostolic Delegation without diplomatic character. The result would have clearly depended on the adroitness of the French Ambassador to the Vatican.

But France had no Ambassador to the Vatican! It would be too much to expect that the political and diplomatic interests of France should have been as well looked after, when she deliberately and obstinately neglected to defend herself, as if she had taken the trouble to have herself represented at the Holy See. 'When,' says M. de la Brière, in the *Revue Pratique d'Apologétique*, of July, 1919, 'in such a case as we have before us, a measure is adopted which is apt to satisfy us fairly well, what right should we have to be astonished at it, and, I ask, of whom then would we have the right to complain?'

Early in July, 1918, it was officially decided that, on one side, the first occupant of the Apostolic Nunciature to Peking would be Mgr. Angelo Petrelli, Apostolic Delegate to the Philippines, and but lately in charge of two diplomatic missions to the Imperial Court of Japan, and that, on the other side, Tai Tcheng Ling, Plenipotentiary Minister of China, resident in Spain, and already accredited to the Governments of Madrid and Lisbon, would be likewise accredited to the Holy See. He would come in person

to the Vatican every time that negotiations of a special kind would require his presence. So also, up to 1895, when a permanent Chinese Legation was established in Paris, a single Plenipotentiary Minister, usually resident in London, was simultaneously accredited by the Celestial Empire to the Governments of England, France, Belgium, and Italy.

This convention between the Holy See and China for the establishment of a two-fold diplomatic representation at the Vatican and at Peking was indeed an undeniable victory for the policy of the Holy See. But France exercised pressure on the Chinese Government, and obtained that China should for the time being renounce the idea of entering into direct and permanent relations with the Roman Papacy. The French Minister at Peking, supported by two of his colleagues of the *Entente*, declared that the establishment of diplomatic relations between China and the Vatican seemed to him a violation of the letter or of the spirit of the solemn conventions that entrusted to France the care of Catholic interests in China; the Government of Paris would tolerate no such offence in this matter. The consequences of its displeasure would fall in some way on the Government of Peking. In short, threatening protests were sent, which had effect.

Nevertheless, by a diplomatic trick, that was not wanting in cleverness, the leaders of the Chinese Republic found means of retracting nothing on the question of the principle itself of the future establishment of a Pontifical Nunciature at Peking and of a Chinese Legation at the Vatican. They shielded themselves behind a question of personnel in order to bring about an adjournment *sine die*. The Government of Peking informed the Vatican that it did not agree with the choice of Mgr. Angelo Petrelli as Apostolic Nuncio in China. Some said, in fact, that there were reasons for believing that Mgr. Petrelli would be a prelate of Germanophile opinions, since he had been but lately in cordial and courteous relations with Admiral von Hintze, so that the appointment of this prelate would not be consonant with a diplomatic mission to a people like the Chinese in a state of war with Germany. Consequently, the Chinese Minister at Madrid, Tai Tcheng Ling, was told to defer his diplomatic mission to the Vatican.

The pretext was paltry. The Germanism of Mgr. Angelo Petrelli could not be so scandalous, seeing that it had not prevented him from filling, to the general satisfaction,

two official missions to a great State at war with Germany, namely, the Japanese Empire.

But, by means of an objection, well or ill founded, on the personality and opinions of the occupant of the future Apostolic Nunciature, China put off the exchange of diplomatic relations between Peking and the Vatican without even referring to the value of the negotiations entered into and to the conclusions that they would entail in the future. Once more things were in *statu quo*. But the project of the Nunciature had clearly gained ground. The Chinese Press had given it to be understood that their Government in no way renounced the right to bring up the question again as soon as political events should cease to place grave obstacles before it.

IV

The Pontifical project of establishing a Nunciature at Peking had for its end not to *substitute* the mission of the Apostolic Nuncio for that of the Plenipotentiary Minister of France in China, but to *place* the two *side by side*. The matter had been set out with all desirable precision on the 22nd August, 1918, by a message from Cardinal Gasparri, Secretary of State of Benedict XV, to the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris: a document meant to be brought to the notice of the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, M. Stephen Pichon.

To begin with, the Cardinal rightly notes, a considerable portion of the mandate reserved to the future Apostolic Nuncio is, by reason of its religious character, absolutely foreign to the rôle and competence of the diplomatic representative of France to Peking:—

To secure more perfectly unity in the apostolic work entrusted to the different Religious Orders or Congregations; to increase, according to opportunities, the number of the Apostolic Vicariates and Prefectures, or to modify their territorial boundaries, in accord with the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda; to give counsel or direction to the Apostolic Vicars and Prefects in doubtful or difficult cases; to spur them on to undertake and to develop such and such work of the apostolate—in particular, the establishment of a native clergy;—to correct mistakes that might be made; to put down abuses that even the purest zeal is not always competent to prevent; to watch over and provide for the exact observance of discipline in religious communities of men and women; to transmit to someone in authority the decrees of the Holy See and to exact their execution; to submit to the Holy See the names of those capable of filling the highest ecclesiastical positions; to keep it in touch with the religious situation in China and to indicate to it the measures necessary

to improve it ; to judge ecclesiastical cases in the first or second instance as the case may be ; to give, without having recourse to Rome, dispensations included in the extensive powers granted to it ; and, in general, to promote the development of religious life, with all the amplitude allowable.

That is certainly a vast programme of spiritual action, which could not encroach on any temporal jurisdiction and which would in no way detract from the exercise of the diplomatic and consular protectorate of France over Catholic Missions in China. |

So far, the above statements could fit in with the duties of an Apostolic Delegate as laid down in the New Code of Canon Law, can. 267. Now, the Holy See wishes to send to China an Apostolic Nuncio whose duty would correspond to that laid down in the first paragraph of the same article, that is to say, would unite to the rôle of canonical supervision over ecclesiastical establishments a rôle of diplomatic representation to the secular government. One would see in Peking, not a simple Apostolic Delegate, as in Constantinople or in the United States, but an Apostolic Nuncio, as in Madrid and Vienna, in Brussels and Munich.

Cardinal Gasparri wishes to show that his idea of the diplomatic mission of the Nuncio in Peking is one of friendly liaison with the French Legation.

The truth is that the Nunciature would favour rather the rights and privileges of the French Protectorate. In fact, if, in the future, in spite of the Republican régime of liberty, the intervention of France, in conformity with Article 13 of the Treaty of Tien-Tsin, became necessary for the defence of the Christian religion ; certainly the Nuncio, who would be the first person interested in it, would support this intervention with all his power. Again, he would see that *all the Catholic missionaries, no matter of what nationality, would faithfully carry out the directions given by the Holy See, which alone could give them, namely : to give to the representatives of France the liturgical honours that are due to them, and to apply exclusively to them for protection in their differences in secular matters with the Chinese authorities, or to obtain the passports that they would need, without prejudice naturally to the agreements made by France with the other Powers.*

Besides, the Holy See would not fail, on its side, to give to the Nuncio precise instructions in this matter ; and the French Minister in Peking could easily see that they were carried out. Similarly, the French Minister, in agreement with the Nuncio, could, on many occasions, assist the latter in the accomplishment of his spiritual mission.

Thus, from the cordial co-operation of the Apostolic Nuncio with the French Minister would result many real advantages and a greater prestige for the Catholic Church and for France.

V

Could anyone in good faith deny this ?

Far from pretending to *substitute* one right for another, the Holy See would *place side by side, co-ordinate* legitimately one right with another, both just and both respected.

The establishment [says M. de la Brière] of an Apostolic Nunciature in Peking, then, interferes in no way, in principle, with the religious protectorate of France in China. This protectorate receives even a more explicit recognition and guarantee than ever. We are not going, in defiance of texts and facts, to turn into a grievance against Rome the act accomplished by Benedict XV in the normal exercise of his mission of Pontiff and in his office of Sovereign.

Doubtless, the simultaneous presence in Peking of a Plenipotentiary Minister of France and of an Apostolic Nuncio, having *now and then* to attend to the same litigations, might give rise to delicate situations. But, when it is a question of serving corresponding interests, the difficulties in the case could be solved by a sincere effort of mutual good will. The recent Roman declarations set out with perfect frankness what kind this cordial co-operation should be from which both Powers have each a certain amount of profit to draw. Besides, would diplomacy be diplomacy, worthy of its name, worthy of its traditions, if it did not possess the fine art of rounding off corners ?

The whole thing would be to try loyally to round them off, instead of giving to lawful measures a sinister meaning and of raising at will, as certain journalists and politicians have done, pretexts for quarrel and occasions for conflict.

VI

What plausible argument could the French Ambassador to the Vatican, if there were such, bring forward in favour of a continuance of the *statu quo* ; a *statu quo* in which the Papacy continues to be unrepresented diplomatically in Peking, and in which the exclusive charge of the Catholic protectorate, with the political advantage it entails, belongs to the representatives of France in China ?

There might be room to bring forward an argument of historical expediency, drawn from the interest of the Catholic Missions and of their security in the present condition of the Chinese Republic.

The system that the Holy See appears to contemplate rests on the idea generally admitted in Europe of the present

condition of things in China. The Pontifical Nuncio would treat in a friendly manner with the governors of Peking about the politico-religious affairs of the Catholic Missions and the Chinese Christian communities. The action, altogether moral, of the Nunciature, would, as a rule, suffice to settle contentious questions. Recourse to the French Power, so that it might use, if necessary, intimidation and force, would take place rarely and only in exceptionally grave and difficult cases. Evidently, there would be no question of complicating or retarding everything in supposing that two distinct jurisdictions, Pontifical Nunciature and French Legation, would necessarily be successively put into action, each in its own way, for the solution of each problem to be settled in ordinary circumstances.

Now, this project clearly supposes that the general conditions of life of the country tend to become nearly normal, in the usually-accepted conditions of order, public peace and security, in short, with a certain governmental regularity. China, in fact, is in process of becoming modern and European.

But, contrary to the complacent thesis of official optimism, contrary to the fictions written on paper, the formal and unanimous testimony of the most conscientious Europeans, the most trustworthy, residing in China (many of them have come back to France during the last two years, in consequence of mobilization), the testimony of those who have seen and heard and lived on the spot, informs us that the appearance is deceitful, that the Chinese Republic is in full disorder, from north to south, from east to west. Peace and public security are also disturbed, religious liberty is as gravely menaced there, as artfully and with impunity violated there, as it has been in the worst periods of the last fifty years.

Superstitious and idolatrous practices continue to be imposed in the Government schools, under pain of expulsion. They continue, in fact, to be exacted in the army in such a way that the officers who refuse to conform to them are sometimes obliged to put an end to their career. The civil authorities often refuse to the missionaries and to the Europeans the right of acquiring land and property within the very limits that authorizations, legally obtained according to international treaties, provide. Under many a form, a persistent hostility towards Christianity, and especially towards Catholicism, is manifest.

In such a state of affairs would there be anything untoward in establishing a new régime, that would envisage for Catholicism in China conditions that would be nearly normal of security and of equity ; a new régime, in which the diplomatic guardianship of religious interests would be usually entrusted (except in very grave cases) to a Power that would appeal exclusively, by way of moral persuasion, to the good faith of the Chinese authorities ?

Truly, the French Ambassador would perhaps have a chance of making the Holy See, even to-day, admit the utility of habitual and exclusive recourse to the diplomatic and consular protection of France. For a long period even, it might be that the interest of the missionaries and of their works would demand the maintenance, pure and simple, without any partition of prerogatives, of the political protectorate of a State that safeguards, when necessary, the rights of its clients against sailors, soldiers and guns.

These are serious considerations that have nothing in common with the despicable quarrel that was raised with the Holy See when it was accused of violating the prerogatives of France by holding to the principle of the Nunciature in Pekin. We must not confound a question of historical expediency with a problem of right.

VII

In his speech of the 19th November, 1901, on the religious protectorate in China, Waldeck-Rousseau expressed himself in words that were, at least, worthy of a statesman :—

Whatever may be the opinion of men, whatever may be their political doctrines, however far they may proceed in their doctrines, none, let it be well understood, will do credit to 'the government' unless it looks beyond the immediate surroundings in which vibrate all the political passions, however noble they may be, on which our home politics are fed . . . , unless it looks farther, on the bank of some river or at the foot of some mountain-chain, to see what is to the interest of France, her future, her greatness.

One can, doubtless, conceive creation within the boundaries of an ideal country, self-sufficient and happy, having no past, no rivals, without the necessity of looking around her and of reckoning with this axiom— that the *questions of pre-eminence are sometimes questions of preservation.*

But, gentlemen, we are not that country ; we have a history, we have learned by too many sad experiences that it is not always enough not to go backwards when the whole world is growing up around us. . . . And that is why, in a similar way, a little pride, a proper care for a point of honour, are only ordinary prudence.

These are appropriate thoughts, expressed by one of our adversaries in noble words.

Let us draw [says M. de la Brière] the conclusion that even in this matter they force upon us:

The political and diplomatic problem of the religious protectorate in China teaches us, like so many other analogous problems, what place Catholic traditions hold in the national and permanent interests of France under the sun of the two worlds.

The conditions in which is exercised and maintained the French protectorate of the Extreme East help us to understand what a precious and indispensable help there is for France in the traditional fidelity of the Apostolic See of Rome to respect for French rights and for the traditions of French friendship.

There are contacts created by facts, by the nature of things, which one cannot, with impunity, neglect to take into account. Let us not, by self-conceit, despise the fruitful lesson of past experience.

What constitutes, in this whole business, as grave injury to France is not that, to-morrow or the next day, there may be a Pontifical Nuncio in China, but that there is delay, even to-day, in sending to the Vatican a representative of France.

M. V. RONAN.

A BRIGHT SPOT IN DARKEST AFRICA

By REV. T. A. SULLIVAN

IN the minds of many people there is a lurking suspicion that much of the noble energy expended on Foreign Missions is more or less thrown away, or rather, that it might be exerted more usefully nearer home, where results can be seen, and where more labourers are needed. In other words, there is a doubt—often unexpressed—that Foreign Missions are not really worth while, that the results are in no way proportionate to the sacrifices that are made for the conversion of the heathen.

We know that work among the heathen must be praiseworthy and necessary, for Christ has commanded it; and He has shown the value of immortal souls, whether the bodies they inhabit be white or black, by dying for them all. We know, too, that there cannot be any strict proportion between the self-sacrificing labours of the missionary and the souls he saves, for it is all a question of God's grace, and even saints have laboured a whole lifetime, without reaping the harvest they have sown. But we are all very human, and we feel that our faith would be more lively and our enthusiasm more keen if we could but convince ourselves that heathens do become Christians in fairly large numbers, and that their Christianity is real, solid and lasting.

Happily for us, God realizes our weakness—He realizes our craving for tangible results. He realizes, too, the splendid self-sacrifice of His priests and nuns, and, to encourage them and us, He seems to choose, as it were by turns, different portions of the earth, wherein to show the power of His grace in abundant conversions and in works of Christian piety.

One of these chosen spots is undoubtedly the Mill Hill Mission in Uganda and British East Africa, officially known as the Vicariate Apostolic of the Upper Nile.

The history of the Uganda Mission is a fascinating one.

It is not much more than forty years since Sir H. M. Stanley first discovered that country, and some of the Christians living to-day remember the explorer's visit and how they resented it. In 1877 the Church Missionary Society sent missionaries to Uganda, and these Protestants were followed about a year later by French Catholic missionaries, the White Fathers, of Cardinal Lavigerie's Society.

The progress made by Christianity aroused the jealousy of two tyrannical kings, Mtesa and Mwangi, and under the latter more than three hundred natives suffered and died for the Faith. That was in 1886—only thirty years ago—and twenty-two of these heroes have just been beatified. Two years later, Catholics and Protestants united to put down the rising influence of Islam, and thus saved the fair kingdom of Uganda from the blight of Mohammedanism.

Unfortunately, trouble arose between the Catholics and Protestants, and a religious war ensued, in which the Catholics were defeated. In 1894, Uganda became a British Protectorate, and a religious compromise was attempted, which would have apportioned the south of Uganda to the Catholics and the north to the Protestants. That would have meant that men would have shown the Almighty which nations should become Protestant and which should become Catholic!

To counteract this unwarrantable division and to safeguard the universality of the Church, it was necessary that British Catholic missionaries should be introduced. Hitherto, the only Catholic missionaries had been French, and thus French and Catholic had become synonymous, as had English and Protestant. In these circumstances both Rome and the British Government looked to St. Joseph's Foreign Missionary Society, of Mill Hill, London, and Cardinal Vaughan was asked to send out some of his missionaries. In the same year, 1894, Father H. Hanlon was recalled from North India to be consecrated Bishop of Teos and Vicar Apostolic of the Upper Nile, and the following year he set out for Uganda with four missionaries.

Happily, the Uganda Railway, which was completed in 1902, has put an end to many of the difficulties which confronted Bishop Hanlon and several subsequent caravans. A long dreary march of more than eight hundred miles, fever and attacks from hostile tribes, often resulting in loss of life and property—these are occurrences of a not very remote past.

The journey being completed by a trip across Victoria Nyanza, which now takes eighteen hours but which then took three weeks, the Bishop procured land at Nsambya, and there pitched his tent. He had a huge task before him. In addition to gaining the goodwill of the Government officials—a task which Bishop Hanlon's tact accomplished very successfully—he had a vast vicariate to administer, stretching over an area of more than forty thousand square miles, and counting scarcely a solitary Catholic, for it was the Protestant and heathen portion that had been handed over to Mill Hill. But the Bishop and his little band were not dismayed. They mastered the language and soon had the nucleus of a Christian community around them.

In the Kingdom of Uganda the land was truly ripe for the harvest. These intelligent natives imbibed the doctrines of Christianity with remarkable eagerness, and in a very short time Churches and Catechumenates had to be built. They were primitive, it is true, consisting of timber, mud and leaves, but they were all that the slender resources of the Mission could afford. Gradually these buildings were replaced by more permanent structures of sun-dried bricks, but buildings of wattle and daub are frequently met with even yet in the outlying Missions. More priests came out from Mill Hill year by year, but often, alas, they merely replaced the older missionaries who had succumbed to the deadly fevers of Central Africa.

From Nsambya the outlying regions were visited. Native Christians, who had received special instruction in our holy Faith and who were anxious for the salvation of their heathen neighbours, accompanied the missionary as catechists, and settled down in distant villages, where they gathered round them the children and a few adults for instruction. No sooner had he settled a catechist in one village than the missionary proceeded to another village, where the same method was followed, for priests were scarce and the area extensive. This paucity of priests could be overcome only by increasing the number of catechists, but even this was limited by the missionary's resources; for, although the catechists often required no remuneration for their services—so zealous were they for the spreading of the Faith—still they had to live.

As often as possible the priest visited these scattered Catechumenates and examined the candidates, the most

advanced of whom were sent to the Mission Station to be prepared for Baptism by the priest himself. Gradually the remote villages became Mission Stations, and from there the missionary widened his circuit and planted the outposts of Christianity further afield.

In this way Uganda itself has been evangelised, and at the present time more than half the population is Christian. Intensive cultivation, as it were, has also been carried on. Missionary Sisters, from St. Mary's Abbey, Mill Hill, were introduced, and they have done excellent work in their schools and hospitals. The priests, too, have opened High Schools for the sons of chiefs, and very good results have been obtained, for the Baganda are an intelligent race, and more than seventy per cent. of them can read.

The Baganda, too, have a good deal of Home Rule, and there are many posts open to educated natives. With their more ample resources the Protestant missionaries of the C. M. S. have been able to increase their educational facilities, and, in order to prevent the Catholic natives being unduly handicapped in their material prospects, the Mill Hill missionaries have been obliged to go in for higher education, as far as their slender means would allow.

But Uganda is only a small portion of the Upper Nile Vicariate, which stretches from Abyssinia to what used to be German East Africa. Traders from Uganda had spread the news of the good tidings brought by missionaries, and many of the surrounding tribes were eager to hear more about it. Some, alas, were not so eager, but all had to be given their chance, and, from an early date, priests made excursions into these more or less savage territories.

In Usoga, the country next to Uganda, on the east, progress was recorded very quickly, and to-day a number of flourishing Mission Stations are to be found in that region. In this success native catechists from Uganda have had a large share. At times, especially at the beginning of the great war, the missionaries have been unable to pay the catechists even the small sum required for their maintenance, but with one accord they have stated their determination to continue their good work, pay or no pay.

It is in the evangelisation of more remote places, such as Bukeddi, that the Uganda catechists have shown their sterling worth. We rightly praise the European priest who leaves his home and country to live among strange races, with different manners and customs, and with strange

and often unpalatable food. But how can we praise sufficiently men who were heathens but yesterday, men who have no long Christian tradition behind them, and yet who are willing to undergo all these privations for the sake of the Gospel? Such are the Uganda catechists.

For them to leave Uganda and to live in such places as Bukeddi is almost as great a change as for a European to go to the Foreign Missions. The language is utterly different, the customs too, and the food is quite foreign to them. Yet there has been no dearth of volunteers. The missionary spirit has taken hold of these erstwhile pagans, and no sacrifice is too great for them to make if only they can spread the blessings of the Faith among their less favoured brethren. Here we have a touching example of the foreign missionary idea on the Foreign Missions themselves—an example that would put many home-Christians to shame.

On one occasion, when one of our priests in Uganda was asking for volunteers for the Bukeddi Mission, every one of his catechists was anxious to go, and the difficulty was to restrain them. After the sermon a native came to the priest and gave him an offering of four pence—a large sum for a native—for those who were going to Bukeddi! Need we wonder that God blesses the work carried on by such living faith?

Visible results are just beginning to bless the work in Bukeddi, and also further south, in Kavirondo, where missionaries have been labouring since 1903. Several tribes have not yet been touched by missionary endeavour, for how can 60 priests evangelise a series of countries covering 40,000 square miles? Not very long ago chiefs from the district round Lake Salisbury made a journey of several days to beg Bishop Biermans—who succeeded Bishop Hanlon in 1912—to send them priests; but the Bishop had to refuse, on account of scarcity of missionaries, a scarcity which is more keenly felt since several of the priests had to suspend their missionary labours in order to administer to the native troops and porters in German East Africa.

A short account of the position of one of the Mill Hill priests among a hitherto hostile tribe will show more conclusively than pages of explanation the influence which the Catholic missionary wields, even in Darkest Africa.

Some distance from Victoria Nyanza, in a north-easterly direction, lies a region known as the country of the Bakakamega. For years they had resisted all efforts of the

Government, and officials were in danger of their lives when endeavouring to deal with the independent Bakakamega. In the course of time Father Witlox, a Mill Hill missionary, was sent amongst them and he gradually secured their goodwill. By means of a few homely remedies which he carried in his small medicine-chest he increased his reputation, and the nations flocked round Lókesi, as they called the priest.

The Government were not slow in recognizing his influence, which they increased by making Father Witlox a magistrate, with power to settle all disputes between the Bakakamega chiefs. This made the chiefs doubly anxious to keep in favour with their judge, and before long the priest was recognised by them as their king.

Every Sunday Padre Lókesi holds a reception in the open air. Standing on a small platform, he harangues the crowd, which usually numbers about three thousand, mostly heathens, making them recite the prayers, and then giving them an instruction on the truths of our holy religion. In this way he has made several hundreds of converts, and now he has another priest assisting him. The natives are ready to carry out his slightest wish. Whenever he has visitors, he merely informs the chiefs, and in a very short time he has provisions galore. If the Government require anything, for instance, men to do some work, the priest is informed, and he apportions the task among the chiefs and the work is done without a murmur.

If a visitor to Central Africa were to ask where Bakakamega is, he would probably be met with a look of blank dismay; but let him inquire for Lókesi, and anyone within a radius of 300 miles will be able to direct him. Truly a priest-ridden people!

The present state of this flourishing Vicariate can be seen from a few of the statistics for the year 1919. Twenty-three head-stations have been established, with numerous sub-stations, and 832 catechists are assisting the missionaries. The Catholic population numbers 39,484, while there are 33,672 catechumens. Baptisms average 4,500 a year at present, more than half of them being baptisms of adults. Of the spiritual condition of the native Catholics figures can offer but a slight indication, though the 200,950 Confessions heard and the 314,740 Holy Communions administered last year speak as eloquently as mere numbers can.

When we remember that these Christians are the children of martyrs we are not surprised to learn that many of them are daily communicants, and that their daily lives compare most favourably with those of the more devout of our Catholics at home. It is not an unknown thing for a native chief to be found every morning of the week in chapel at the early hour of five o'clock for morning prayers, followed by half an hour's meditation, Mass and Holy Communion, as a preparation for his daily work, which begins at seven o'clock. Among old and young, men and women, are to be found models of every Christian virtue, and the missionaries working amongst the Baganda are convinced that some of them are living saints.

Thus has God blessed the work of His missionaries in the very heart of Africa. True, it has not been one long unbroken triumph, for in Uganda, as elsewhere, there have been trials, disappointments, and apparent failure. Plague, fever, and sleeping-sickness have annihilated whole communities; storms and winds have destroyed mission buildings; worst of all, tribes have resisted the grace of God for years. Of this we have not spoken, for God's blessing has surmounted all obstacles and made Uganda one of the bright spots of Darkest Africa. As the traveller on reaching home forgets the weariness of his journey, its dangers and its hardships, in the joy of his safe arrival, so the missionary of Christ heeds not his disappointments when he has tracked down the stray sheep whom he has gone thousands of miles to seek. One anxious thought, however, crosses his mind, as he thinks of the countless other sheep still without the fold, and of the fewness of the shepherds to gather them in. And he prays God that the triumphs of the mission-field may move many generous hearts to come forward and take a share in this divine work, and by their labours and sacrifices hasten the day when the whole world shall be gathered into the one fold of Christ.

THOMAS A. SULLIVAN.

NOTES AND QUERIES

THEOLOGY

HONORARIA AND DEPRECIATION OF CURRENCY

REV. DEAR SIR,—In case of a bequest of a considerable sum, say £100 for Masses, and when custom only could be relied on to determine the number of Masses to be celebrated, it was customary in my diocese to tax the bequest at the rate of six Masses to the pound.

In view of the depreciation of the pound to less than half its pre-war value, would it be lawful to tax the bequest now at the rate of two or three Masses, at most, to the pound? If not, would four Masses to the pound be sufficient?

A SUBSCRIBER.

Custom may certainly be relied on, in special cases, as the determining factor in fixing the honorarium. But we must remember that it is, at best, only a supplementary factor; the real test, when available, is the Bishop's decree—promulgated, if possible, in the diocesan Synod (831, § 1). And when, in the absence of a decree, we have to rely on custom, we must be sure that there is a *real* custom—the well-established practice of the more important section of the community concerned—not the practice of a few nor, *a fortiori*, a mere desire on the part of even the majority.

Now we are afraid that 'Subscriber,' at least if he lives in Ireland, will have some trouble on the first count. These matters, so far as we are aware, *have* been arranged by Episcopal decree; and, in some cases, to our own knowledge, the amount has been fixed since money started on its downward course. If there is such a decree in 'Subscriber's' diocese, he must be content with the amount it allows him—'nec sacerdoti licet ea majorem exigere' (831, § 1). We may expect that those responsible for fixing the sum will take due account of the conditions that have reduced fixed incomes in this country to one-third their pre-war value. The Pope himself has already made provision for the Italian clergy in this respect: and the Congregation of the Council has suggested to a Bishop, who had applied to it for help and guidance, that the raising of the diocesan honorarium would be the best possible method of meeting his difficulties.¹ But, till the Bishop has acted, 'Subscriber' must stand

¹ Reply of June 15, 1918.

by the older standard : though, of course, both he and the others concerned may use all constitutional methods to propagate their own views on the advisability of having the standard changed.

On the second count, too, it would appear very unlikely that 'Subscriber' may proceed to lessen the number. If there is no decree, neither, so far as his evidence goes, is there any custom in his favour. There *was* a custom—but it did not favour him : that it has had a more friendly successor he leaves us free to doubt. The advisability of a more liberal custom is perhaps evident enough : its actual existence has not been proved—and that, unfortunately, is the important point.

FUNERAL OFFERINGS

REV. DEAR SIR,—According to the present Armagh Statutes, if a man dies in his parish the P.P. of that parish has a right to all the funeral offerings. If, for the sake of convenience, he is waked in a neighbouring church in a parish where he had neither a domicile nor quasi-domicile, has the P.P. of this church any right to any of the funeral offerings, even though he may have the right to read the funeral service : or do the Armagh Statutes still prevail ? For my part I think there is no canon in the New Code upsetting the arrangements of the Armagh Statutes in regard to funeral offerings. I conclude this from Canon 22 on laws, and from other sources.

JUSTITIA.

The second portion of Canon 22—on which 'Justitia' appears to rely—is not so very much to his purpose. It deals with extra-Code legislation, and leaves Canon 6 to regulate the laws contained in the Code itself.

But we agree with 'Justitia' all the same. The Code, and the decisions of the Roman Congregations, show great respect for local laws and customs in regard to funeral offerings—as we had occasion to remark more than once in connexion with previous replies on this same subject. The Armagh law still stands ; and, under the Armagh law, the Parish Priest of a parish in which the deceased is merely 'waked' has no claim whatever to the offerings.

BEQUEST FOR CHARITABLE PURPOSE

REV. DEAR SIR,—I want your advice on a matter that troubles me. Three weeks ago I got a surprise. It was a pleasant one at the time : I am not so sure about it now. I was informed that a plot of land—only small, value about £600—had been left to me, without any condition attached. I had had very few dealings with the testator while he was alive, and had certainly no claims of any kind on or against him, so the wind-fall surprised me. Now I find from the lawyers that the bequest comes to me only because it failed in law to go to a charity : the testator died within a fortnight of making the will. Some of my friends tell me that I am bound to hand the farm over to the Institution specified in the will. But, if so, why did the testator make the bequest unconditional ? Does

that not indicate that his wish to benefit the Institution was conditional, and that I am free to do as I please? [Abridged from a longer document.]

LEO.

From 'Leo's' statement of the case, we have no doubt whatever that he is bound in conscience, though not in law, to apply the bequest, and every portion of it, to the purposes specified in the will of the deceased.

That may seem a strict view to take in view of the clause which brought him the 'windfall.' So it would be, if we could consider these matters apart from the civil enactments that have aimed for centuries past at curtailing our freedom to dispose of our property for charitable purposes. But these laws, unfortunately, are a hard reality that must be faced, and their consequences in the theological sphere cannot be ignored.

Though the English and the Irish statutes are by no means identical, the English must be referred to—at least by way of illustration.¹ During the Plantagenet period there was a long series of 'Mortmain' laws; with these the student of Moral Theology is fully acquainted²: and, anyhow, they do not concern us here very closely. The first that does concern us is the so-called 'Mortmain' Act of 1736. To put the matter 'in general terms,' we may say: (1) that this Georgian Act applied only to gifts for *charitable purposes*; (2) that it applied to gifts of land, of charges on land, of interest in land, or of money to be laid out in land; (3) that it made gifts for any of these *for charitable purposes* void if made *by will*; and that (4) it also made void such gifts *for charitable purposes* if made *by deed* or other instrument operating *inter vivos*, unless the deed or the instrument was executed at least *twelve months before the death of the donor*, and unless also certain other prescribed conditions were complied with.³ It was one of the most hypocritical in the whole series. Professing to provide against 'improvident alienations or dispositions made *by languishing or dying persons*, or by other persons, to uses called charitable uses . . . to the disherison of their lawful heirs,' it was dictated solely by a bigoted desire to discourage gifts to charity. It left everybody free to disinherit as many heirs as he pleased in favour of any use that was *not* charitable. It operated whether the persons were 'languishing' or not. And it squandered the property of men who had no heirs at all—as when it expended on a Royal Pavilion the life-savings of old Roger Troutbeck, who had left everything to the Charity School at Wapping because, as he stated, he had 'no relation nor kindred alive to the best of [his] knowledge or belief, having outlived them all, and [because] it is natural for all men to have a regard for their native place, and where the seeds of their education were first planted.'

¹ For the convenience of those who have a copy of *O'Connell, Archbishop Murray and the Board of Charitable Bequests*, published by the Archbishop of Dublin four years ago, we give the facts as stated in two of the Appendixes (23*-26*, and 32*-35*). The complicated history is given very clearly.

² See O'Dea, *De Just. et Jure*, p. 111.

³ Quotation from Walsh, *op. cit.*, p. 23*

In 1764 a special case arose. There had been a bequest for charitable purposes : and a codicil directing that, if the bequest were found void in law, the trustees were to apply it to other charitable uses as near to the testator's intention as the law *would* allow. The codicil was pronounced by Lord Northington a fraud upon the law of 1736, and declared null and void.

That decision came in for castigation in a case that came up for hearing nearly a century later—a case that will interest 'Leo' very much. The will this time had been drawn up in 1831, but its fate was not decided till 1857. Money was left to four trustees to be paid to a charitable society. The property was personal ; but, as the society's activities apparently included land purchase, there was danger that the Statute of 1736 might be applied. So, in 1833, a codicil was added, providing that 'if any part or parts of the will should by any law then in force be considered not to have their full operation, the money was to go to the same four men, as joint tenants, *'free from any trust or condition whatever, express or implied.'* The last clause is the one that concerns us now. It is the lineal ancestor of what has come to be known in Ireland as the 'O'Hagan clause'—the clause that troubles 'Leo.'

The case in favour of the bequest was, it will be noted, stronger in 1857 than in 1764. In the latter, there was a trust of some kind ; in the former, from the legal point of view, none whatever. Even as regards the will of 1764, Lord Northington's decision was treated by the new judge, Vice-Chancellor Page-Wood, as of little or no authority. But that by the way. The important point for us is that the new judge refused to find any 'fraud upon the law' in the codicil of 1857. The point was raised that the appointment of the *same* four men indicated that the previous trust continued. To that he replied that the proof was insufficient : 'that bequest is expressed by the codicil to be made to them "free from any trust or condition whatever, expressed or implied" ; and, that being so, it is impossible for this Court [to convert the bequest into a bequest upon trust] unless it can convert the legatees into trustees by proof of *some communication between them and the testator*, importing that the testator intended a trust, which they in effect undertook. Here no such case is attempted to be made.'¹ 'Leo' will find, we think, that the italicized clause has some bearing on his case. The absence of communication between himself and the testator may only be an indication that the latter knew where the pitfalls lay, and was determined to avoid them.

Coming to the Irish Statutes we find, in the 16th section of the Charitable Bequests Act of 1844, a provision to the following effect :—

After the commencement of this Act, no donation, devise, or bequest, for pious or charitable uses in Ireland, shall be valid to create or convey any estate in lands, tenements, or hereditaments, for such uses, unless the deed, will or other instrument containing the same shall be duly executed three calendar months at least before the death of the person executing the same.²

¹ Op. cit., p 35*.

² Op. cit., p. 14.

Now, if a testator who has made such a bequest is afraid¹ that he will die within three months of the day on which the will is executed, and if he is anxious that the bequest take effect in spite of all the civil law says to the contrary—what is he to do? Manifestly take a hint from the case decided in 1857. Devise the land to some person to hold in trust for the charity he wishes to benefit; *and* add a clause providing that, in case the bequest proves void for any reason, the land is to go, either to the same person—or, still better, to some other—‘free from any trust or condition whatever, express or implied.’ He will select someone who, he feels certain, will not turn the gift to his own use. And, to make security doubly sure, he will abstain from any communication—with the person mentioned in the added clause—that might afterwards be proved to imply that, in spite of the words he used, he did really intend a trust after all.

A lie, is it, to say ‘no trust or condition whatever,’ when a trust or condition is meant all the same? Well, no; there is no ‘legal’ trust or condition whatever, though there is a trust and condition ‘in conscience’—and it is with ‘legal’ matters we are dealing. None but the worshippers of State omnipotence would equiparate ‘law’ and ‘conscience’ everywhere. This particular law does not trouble about conscience—it would be a gross presumption anyhow, for it has nothing whatever to do with conscience (Canon 1513, § 2)—and conscience need not trouble about *it*. The best English exponents of the law seem to find difficulty in recognizing any ‘obligation’ that the ‘law’ cannot enforce.² We take them at their word: as *they* put things, there is, in cases of the kind, *no* obligation of any kind whatever.

Now, in the case before us, the testator took exactly the course that ought to be taken by an intelligent man who knows the ‘law’ and is anxious to prevent its harming a deserving charity. We cannot, therefore, agree with ‘Leo’ that the course adopted proves the very opposite. To construct a major and a minor premiss: ‘If a man is very anxious that his property go to charity, he will comply with certain conditions. X has complied with them all.’ From this the laws of logic prevent our concluding that ‘X was very anxious, etc.’ But they do not force us to conclude that he was anxious *not* to.

And the broad facts carry us a little further. The device is so well known, and is recommended so strongly by the men who know how to do things, that its adoption establishes a *prima facie* case in favour of the charity. When the devisee admits, as ‘Leo’ does, that he has no claims whatever on the deceased, the case is proved—for all practical purposes. So we are afraid, ‘Leo,’ that the charity holds the field. But, though the land has gone, you have one consolation. You were evidently selected by the deceased as *the* honourable man who would not ‘turn the gift to his own use,’ the man who would stand for a dead confrère’s wishes against the purely penal clauses of a law void before God and in conscience.

¹ And indeed whether he is afraid or not. No one knows when his time is coming.

² Cf. Slater, *Questions of Moral Theology*, pp. 282-8.

FASTS. RESERVED SINS AND CENSURES

REV. DEAR SIR,—Would you kindly give me your view on the following points:—

1°: Is the opinion any longer tenable that women are excused from fasting at the age of 50?

2°: What is the meaning of 'nec pervigilia anticipantur' of Canon 1252, § 4?

3°: Why does Canon 900, 2°, allow the confessor power when 'the Superior has refused to give it to him'? Is it not strange to make grant and refusal synonymous?

4°: Does the faculty conferred in Canon 2254, § 1, for absolution from censures in urgent cases, extend to the case of 'attempted absolution of an accomplice'?

L. K.

Taking the queries in order:

1°. No longer tenable, we think. The canons on fasting (1250-4) 'arrange the whole matter anew' (22), and the 'omnes' of 1254, § 2, would seem comprehensive enough to include all women within the ages specified. That, we note, is the view of Vermeersch,¹ and of the editor of the *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*.² But, of course, in each particular case the circumstances will have to be taken into account: and a liberal decision may be much better grounded than if *men* of the same age were concerned.

2°. It means that if, for instance, the Feast of the Assumption falls on a Monday, the fast—which is prevented by the same canon from falling on the Sunday—is not imposed on the Saturday either.

3°. The purpose of imposing an obligation to have recourse to the Superior, even when his refusal of faculties will be counteracted by the Code itself, is apparently to make the penitent's course a little more difficult—he will have to come *twice*—and so, perhaps, to encourage him to submit his case in the first instance to the more experienced men who are provided with faculties. And the purpose in supplying the power which the Superior refuses is, we presume, to carry out in practice the milder principles now sanctioned by the Church in dealing with reserved cases. Refusal and grant are *not* made synonymous: but the *Code* may grant what the *Superior* refuses.

4°. It does—there is no exception made. The fact that this very exception is made in the third section of the same canon only confirms our conviction.

M. J. O'DONNELL.

¹ *Summa Novi Jur. Can.*, n. 494: 'Mirum privilegium, quod quidam pro mulieribus quinquagenariis, sine ratione, addere solebant, ipso Codicis silentio reicitur.'

² June, 1920, p. 378—reviewing and approving an article by P. del Castillo, S.J., in *Sal Terrae*, March, 1920, pp. 226 sqq.

CANON LAW

THE TENURE AND ALIENATION OF ECCLESIASTICAL PROPERTY

REV. DEAR SIR,—I have read your answers *re* alienation of Church property; and as answers to the particular queries, or assuming our parochial houses and lands to be *bona ecclesiastica*, no other answers could be given. But, may I ask you at your leisure to go to the root of the subject and to deal with it *funditus* and exhaustively. There is the fundamental question: Are our glebes (parochial houses and lands) *bona ecclesiastica*? and then there are questions about *bona immobilia* and *bona mobilia*.

1. Are our glebes *bona ecclesiastica*? *Bona ecclesiastica* are defined to be: *bona 'quae vel ad Ecclesiam universam et ad Apostolicam Sedem vel ad aliam in Ecclesia personam moralem pertineant'* (Canon 1497, § 1). With us neither the church in the diocese nor the Bishop nor the parish priest is a *persona moralis* in civil law. A house or lands conveyed, say, by lease to N.N. (Bishop or P.P.) and his successors would be a true conveyance to N.N., but would pass to next of kin on his death, by civil law, unless provision were made otherwise, by conveyance during life or by will. The usual mode of tenure in order to safeguard the property is this: the glebe (house and land) is held in a number of names. It may be stated in the deed of conveyance that they hold in trust for the parish or for the P.P.; but lawyers do not favour the mentioning of a trust on the face of the deed. Usually, then, the house and land is conveyed to a number of persons without any expression of a trust; they hold, in civil law, as joint tenants; when one dies the survivors hold; the only precaution necessary being that before all the joint tenants disappear new ones should be appointed, or, failing that, by the executors of last survivor. According to the tenure of civil law, therefore, our glebes do not appear to be *bona ecclesiastica*, as they do not belong to a *persona moralis* in the Church. It might be said that, distinct from the civil tenure, there is a canonical tenure, that the P.P. (in case of parochial houses), as a *persona moralis*, is the owner of the parochial houses and lands, of the P.P.'s house and the C.C.'s house. But I don't know if this double tenure of property can be established. And if the P.P. owns merely as one of several joint tenants (and possibly the P.P. may not be one of the joint tenants at all) it would appear that parochial houses and lands are not *bona ecclesiastica* at all. And, if so, the law against alienation would not apply.

2. If our houses and lands (including church or chapel yards) are *bona ecclesiastica*, a number of questions arise:—

(a) In order to be bound to invest the price of alienated property should not the property sold have been capital producing revenue for parish and intended as such? The question is suggested by an answer of Bargilliat (under n. 972 (a)): 'aliter vero dicendum esset si ad tempus commodata sit [pecunia], ad usum repetenda quando necessitas postulaverit.' Suppose a P.P. has a sum of money destined for building a new church, that he cannot commence to build for some time, that he invests

the money in house or land property in the meantime ; surely when the time for building comes and the property (house or land) is sold, the money realized can be applied to the building of the new church, and need not and cannot be re-invested for parish.

(b) Trees are classed with immoveable property. What is the canonical position in regard to trees on glebe lands or on church yards ? I speak of what might be called ornamental trees or trees intended to protect house or church from storms. Can they be cut and sold or used without permission of the Bishop ? If sold, should the price be invested for the parish ? They do not seem to be capital intended for producing revenue for parish as a fruit garden let to a tenant would be ; and hence it does not seem necessary that the price should be invested. Then, about the alienation of the trees : might not the trees on a glebe be regarded as the produce of the land, as hay, fruit, vegetables, etc., and be sold by P.P. or used for firing without permission ? Might the trees on church yard be sold without permission and the price used for church ? Might they be sold without permission in case they are not of much value and are doing injury to enclosing wall ?

(c) May capital investments be changed without permission ; may a person sell one kind of stock and invest the money realized (*bona ecclesiastica*) in another stock without Bishop's sanction ?

3. A difficulty arises about *bona mobilia*. It sometimes happens that Stations of the Cross, confessionals, altars, remonstrances, church seats, brass or bronze articles, are sold by a P.P. who has got new articles to a P.P. who is glad to get the old stations, altar, confessional, etc. I see it stated that before the New Code alienation between churches was not subject to censure ; but Capello says this does not hold under the New Code. So I suppose such articles cannot be sold without Bishop's permission, and that the Bishop must have the consent of the Chapter and of the Administrative Council, or the opinion of the Administrative Council according to the value of the articles to be sold (Can. 1532, §§ 2, 3).

4. 'Locatio' is included under alienation as well as 'venditio.' Now some priests, who have no taste for farming, let their glebe lands from year to year. They do not seem to think that permission is necessary for letting. If glebe lands are *bona ecclesiastica* is it not forbidden to let them without permission under Canon 1541 ? And even if these church lands and houses are not *bona ecclesiastica* would it not be well to administer them according to the discipline of the New Code ?

ADMINISTRATOR.

Our first duty to our correspondent is to thank him very sincerely, not only for the very enlightening communication here published on the vexed question of the tenure and alienation of ecclesiastical property, but also for a supplementary letter on the same subject which we have received from him. We feel that any pains which we have taken to find a solution for the difficulties which he has raised have been amply compensated by the valuable practical information which he has given us in regard to the civil tenure of ecclesiastical property in this country.

With these few prefatory remarks we shall now address ourselves directly to various points upon which our views have been asked.

1°. There is no need to insist that not merely the universal Church, but also the different institutions upon which she has conferred juridical

personality have the right to hold property. What is of importance in this connexion is that this right arises fundamentally from the fact that the Church is a perfect and independent society, and that therefore she contains within herself, and independently of any other society, all the means necessary or even useful for the attainment of her end. Consequently, the right of the Church to hold property is quite independent of the State, and the refusal of the latter to recognize it is an injustice and leaves the abstract right itself unaffected.¹ But the right is one thing and its practical exercise quite another. It is easy to see that the non-recognition on the part of any particular State of the Church's right to hold property may cause considerable inconvenience in practice, and that to obviate these, and to safeguard her temporal possessions from those who would not be deterred from usurping them by the natural and ecclesiastical laws alone, the Church may be compelled to adopt such forms and expedients as will enable her to invoke the aid of the civil authority also. Amongst these expedients the most common is that of vesting ecclesiastical property in a trustee or trustees. When property is vested in this way, the trustees are regarded by the civil law as its owners; in the eyes of the Church, however, and in objective fact, the owners are the moral persons in the Church to whom, in accordance with ecclesiastical law, the property really belongs. Personally we cannot see any impossibility or contradiction in this two-fold tenure: the one is real, the other is merely a fiction to surmount the difficulties which arise from the failure of the State to observe the relations which should naturally subsist between it and the Church. Canonists, too, find no insuperable difficulty in this twofold tenure; in fact, they take it as a matter of course in circumstances such as those contemplated. Thus Wernz, in his historical notes on the acquisition of ecclesiastical property, makes the following very pertinent statement:—

But it cannot be doubted that in the beginning the property of the Church consisted for the most part in moveable things collected from the pious offerings of the faithful. For the Church as an unlawful society in accordance with Roman Laws could not acquire and possess property, and the dreadful persecutions themselves were unfavourable to the acquisition of immoveable property. As in our day the Catholic Church, in those places in which in accordance with civil law it cannot possess property as a juridical person, under other forms approved of by the civil laws, truly acquires and possesses temporal goods, so the first pastors of the Church, prudently using the Roman laws, established colleges and sodalities, e.g., of grave diggers, and under the name of another, e.g., that of a sodality of grave diggers, over which the Bishop presided, they acquired and conserved in safety property for the Church.²

Clearly Wernz does not advert even to the possibility of difficulties in the situation; and his position is typical.

But more important still, various decrees regarding ecclesiastical property adopt the same attitude. For our purpose it will suffice to

¹ Cf. c. 1495.

² *Jus Decret.*, tom. iii. n. 134.

refer to one, that issued by the Propaganda for the United States in 1840.¹ In that country the conditions in regard to the tenure of ecclesiastical property seem to be much the same as in our own: dioceses, parishes, and, in many cases, religious institutes are not regarded by civil law as juridical persons capable of acquiring and holding property. It would seem from the decree that most of the ecclesiastical property of the diocese, apart from that belonging to religious institutes, was vested civilly in the name of the Bishop. In regard to property vested in this way, substantially the regulation of the decree was that each Bishop should immediately make a will, and appoint one of his co-Bishops as the heir to all the ecclesiastical property. We shall quote just one rather significant sentence:—

Illud autem duplicato, et aequè authentico chirographo seu exemplari omnino efficient, atque heredem bonorum omnium ecclesiasticorum ad pios usus sibi vel praedecessoribus suis, vel quibusvis aliis sive laicis sive clericis donatis quae ipsi actu possideant vel jus ad possidendum habeant, illum ex Coepiscopis suis Americanis, quem magis in Domino expeditè judicaverint, constituent.

In regard to religious communities the decree distinguishes between those that were incorporated by the State and those that were not. In regard to the former, of course, no difficulties would be experienced from the civil law; in the case of the latter, however, it prescribed the appointment of three or four members of the community in whom the property was to be vested, but at the same time clearly insinuated that it still remained really the property of the community itself and ecclesiastical.²

From what has been said we think it must be clear that our glebes are ecclesiastical property, and that the fact of their being vested civilly in persons distinct from the *persona moralis*—diocese, parish, etc.—to which they really belong, is no argument to the contrary. Of course the persons in whom ecclesiastical property is vested may also have possessions of their own; and hence, in particular cases, it may be difficult to determine whether certain property is ecclesiastical or not. It is clear that trouble of this kind may much more easily arise when there is only a single trustee; and this is one of the reasons on account of which several are usually employed. A more fundamental reason for this precaution, however, is to safeguard the property from usurpation by the civil heirs. Whenever a question arises as to whether certain property is really ecclesiastical or not, recourse must be had to various indications. Of course, if there is a trust specified on the deed of conveyance, there is no doubt about the matter. If there is not, the intention of the donors, the purpose for which the property has been used, the money by which it has been procured, and similar points must be considered.

In connexion with the civil tenure of ecclesiastical property in this country there are a few further points to which we should like to call attention; not, indeed, so much for our correspondent's benefit, as for that of our readers generally.

¹ Coll. de Pop., vide n. 1627.

² *Decret.*, n. 12.

Statute 422 of the last Synod of Maynooth describes the manner in which ecclesiastical property is to be civilly vested :—

Ne ob legis defectum bona ecclesiastica in alienas manus transeant, curae erit Episcopo ut eorum tituli aut instrumenta accurate juxta legem civilem et in nomine trium aut quattuor Curatorum conficiantur. Hi vero Curatores sint Episcopus dioeceseos, Parochus aut alius sacerdos cui bona commissa fuerint, Vicarius Generalis aut alius vir prudens et vitae integritate conspicuus et in hujusmodi rebus versatus. Hi Curatores semel in anno convenire debent ut securitatis bonorum praedictorum providere possint. Et si quis ex eorum numero e vivis discesserit, alium in ejus locum superstitis subrogare teneantur.¹

It will be noted that the Fathers of the Synod have no difficulty in describing property vested in the way indicated as ecclesiastical, and consequently in admitting the possibility of the twofold tenure.

Although this statute of itself imposes on Bishops no strict obligation, yet the natural law itself requires them and other administrators to safeguard the ecclesiastical property committed to their care, and therefore to adopt the measures suggested or others of a similar nature.

Statute 336 also deserves to be noted :—‘Latifundium alicui parociae ex usu adnexum ne emat parochus, neque alio modo in usus quosvis privatos convertat.’²

This regulation is regarded as covering land or other property which is held in the following way : A parish priest or curate on appointment enters into a contract with the landlord at a yearly rent, pays the rent until the date of death or departure, and then the tenancy ceases ; similarly each successor in office enters into a contract of the same kind. In the eyes of the Church it is the parish that is really the tenant in a case of this kind, and hence the prohibition. Really, unless we regard property held in this way as an endowment of the parish, no sufficient reason can be assigned for admitting each successive parish priest or curate to its enjoyment ; the purpose of those who were originally concerned with the contract was to endow the parish, but, of course, it was impossible to have the parish as such formally recognized as tenant in civil law. When the possibility of the twofold tenure is recognized there seems to be no special difficulty in applying it to this particular case. The importance of this statute has diminished very considerably nowadays. It is to be presumed that the requirements of Statute 422 have been for the most part complied with, and, consequently, that at present ecclesiastical property is in very few cases held in the name of a single individual. Apart altogether from this consideration, the working of the Land Purchase Acts would have very considerably lessened the number of such tenancies.

As our correspondent points out, when ecclesiastical property is held civilly in the names of three or four trustees, lawyers do not usually favour the mention of any trust on the face of the deed, in order to avoid difficulties in connexion with the granting of a title, should alienation

¹ *Acta et Decreta*, p. 126.

² *l.c.*, p. 111.

afterwards become necessary. This reason ceases in the case of property which is likely to be permanently desirable, and hence, in such circumstances, it would seem better that a trust should be formally declared.

In cases in which the regulations of the Maynooth Synod have not been complied with, and in which the property is vested in a single person, e.g., the parish priest, without any declaration of trust, it may be still possible to defeat any attempt of the holder or his heirs to divert the property to their private uses by falling back on an implied trust. The courts will certainly recognize the existence of such a trust, when churches are in question. In the case of land its proof will be much more difficult. The fact that land has been purchased by parochial money, that it has been held by several of the present occupant's predecessors in office, or considerations of a similar nature, usually suffice to secure the admission of a trust.

Another difficulty which arises in connexion with the civil tenure of ecclesiastical property is that in some cases there are no title deeds, or the title deeds have lapsed. In circumstances of this kind lawyers recommend ecclesiastical superiors to fall back on prescription. If, for example, a parish priest or curate has been in uninterrupted possession of such property for a period of twelve years, this will be sufficient to constitute him its civil owner, and he may then convey it to a number of trustees in accordance with the requirements of the Maynooth Statute already referred to.

There is a small point, finally, to which we should like to call our correspondent's attention. In Canon Law it is not the parish priest and the Bishop who are *personae morales*, but the parish and the diocese; the parish priest and the Bishop are merely the administrators of the juridical persons committed to their care.

2°. (a) In interpreting the laws of the Code on alienation and on other matters also, it is most important to keep in mind the principle set forth in Canon 6—that the new legislation, in so far as it agrees with the old, must be explained in accordance with the received interpretations of the latter. Now, authors who discussed this point, held that money temporarily lent or invested, for example, in an industrial or commercial society, with a view to be recalled or realized when the special need for which it was primarily intended arose, did not come within the scope of the laws governing the alienation of ecclesiastical property, and that, consequently, its recall or realization did not require the consent of the Holy See nor the other usual formalities.¹ The idea underlying this

¹ Icard, *Prael. Juris Canonici*, vol. ii, p. 585: 'Alii casus saepe eveniunt de quibus dubitari potest, scilicet; . . . 2° si pecunia collocata sit apud bancarios, vel in societatibus commercialibus, ut possit exinde retrahi venditione titulorum, si forte opus sit, et interea fructus annuos referat . . . In posteriori casu arbitramur pecuniam alienari posse, si reipsa reposita sit ad tempus in societate commerciali, non intentione illam servandi ut bonum stabile, sed ad usum, quando postulaverit necessitas. Omnes id certo admitterent si pecunia ad usum destinata collocata fuerit in arca donec accidat occasio ea utendi, cur non pari ratione admittatur, si eadem pecunia fuerit ad tempus utiliter rep. sita in commercio, ut fructus interea producat.' Cf. Bargilliat, *Prael. Jur. Can.*, n. 972.

teaching was that the money in such cases was not really converted into other forms of property at all, that there was really no essential difference between it and money kept in hand to meet specific needs. We have never, indeed, seen in this connexion any mention of temporary investments in house property or land, but the same reason holds for them as for investments in industrial and commercial societies. Unless this theory be true, money donated for a specific purpose, as in the example mentioned by our correspondent, cannot be temporarily invested at all: such investment would divert it from the purpose for which the donors intended it. This really is another argument in its favour. From all this we consider that, when money is collected by a parish priest for the building of a church, and temporarily invested, even in house property or land, its realization is not subject to the regulations on alienation.

We can see no reason for the general conclusion which our correspondent seems inclined to deduce from this view—that it is only the alienation of capital bearing interest which requires all the formalities prescribed by the Code. As a matter of fact, there is no doubt that property which can scarcely be regarded as coming under this description, for example, churches, is subject to all the regulations governing alienation. Practically the only kinds of property excepted under the old legislation—and consequently under the new legislation also—are the fruits of the soil and perishable goods (*quae servando servari non possunt*); the disposal of these was regarded as an act of ordinary administration, and therefore within the competence of the ordinary administrator.

(b) The distinction drawn by our correspondent between the two classes of trees is quite correct; it is well known to canonists. The cutting and disposal of trees which are not fruit-bearing is quite within the competence of the ordinary administrator—the parish priest in the case of a parish. Ferraris explains very aptly why this is so in the following paragraph:—

Quando arbores sunt primario destinatae ad caesionem, ut fructificae in ratione ligni, ut sunt arbores silvae caeduae, nemoris et hujusmodi, quae renascuntur et per incisionem sunt in fructu, et per earum incisionem fundus non deterioratur, sed melioratur, adeoque earum incisio et venditio non est prohibita, cum fructus non prohibeantur alienari, ex cit. Extravagant. *Ambitosae* ipsos expresse excipiente his verbis. *Praeterquam de fructibus*.¹

(c) The only express regulation of the Code regarding change of investment is that of Canon 1539, § 2, which states that:—

Administrators can change *bonds to bearer*, as they are called, into other bonds more or at least equally safe and fruitful; every kind of commerce or trading, however, must be excluded, and the consent of the Ordinary, the Diocesan Council of Administration, and of others who may have an interest in the matter should be obtained.

¹ *Bibliotheca*, vol. i. 'Alienatio,' art. iv. n. 17.

From the fact that this is the only species of investment specifically dealt with, it follows that, where other forms are concerned, a change must be governed by the ordinary rules regarding alienation of ecclesiastical property; change of investment of course involves alienation. As a matter of fact, Canon 1532, § 2, modifies the pre-existing discipline: the Congregation of the Council, in February, 1906, declared that, even when *bonds to bearer* were in question, the consent of the Holy See was necessary for a change of investment.¹

3°. There is no doubt that alienation between churches is governed by the ordinary rules. The same was true in pre-Code days too, the only thing exceptional being that neglect of the necessary formalities did not involve censure. The consent, therefore, of the Holy See, of the Ordinary, of the Diocesan Council of Administration, etc., would be required in accordance with the value of the property, as determined in Canon 1532.

4°. These priests are mistaken: it is forbidden to let glebe lands from year to year, as our correspondent correctly holds, without the permission prescribed in Canon 1541. The mistake has probably arisen from the fact that the old discipline required no special formalities for letting unless it was for a period exceeding three years.

J. KINANE.

LITURGY

THE CONFRATERNITY OF THE CHILDREN OF MARY. THE BLESSING OF PICTURES AND ENTHRONEMENT OF THE SACRED HEART. THE CONFRATERNITY OF THE HOLY ROSARY

REV. DEAR SIR,—Kindly answer the following queries in the next issue of the I. E. RECORD:

I. To establish a 'Children of Mary' Confraternity in a parish what permission is required?

II. To bless or consecrate a private house with pictures of the Sacred Heart is episcopal permission required?

III. In the case of a Sodality of the Holy Rosary, must the names of the members be enrolled with any house, i.e., of the Dominicans?

P.P.

I. A priest about to erect a Confraternity of the Children of Mary should first of all procure from his Bishop, *in writing*, permission to erect it. In the case of a new, or of a little known Confraternity, it would be necessary to submit to the Bishop for his approval the statutes of the Confraternity, but the Confraternity of the Children of Mary is now so well known that

¹ *Jus Pium*, p. 332: 'Pro alienatione et permutatione titulorum verurarum publicarum vulgo *titoli publici di crediti al portatore* requiruntur solemnitates juris.'

this formality may, we think, be dispensed with. The permission in writing should come from the Bishop himself; the permission or approval of the Vicar-General is not sufficient unless he has received special delegation for this purpose from the Bishop.¹ *Sede vacante* a Vicar-Capitular cannot, unless in virtue of special powers granted by the Holy See, give valid permission for the erection of a Confraternity.² In granting the necessary faculty for the canonical erection of the Confraternity the Bishop will nominate the Director of the proposed Confraternity, whose duty it will be to procure the requisite affiliation with the Arch-Confraternity of the same name at Rome. Through this affiliation, validly effected, the Confraternity becomes capable of obtaining the spiritual favours and indulgences granted by the Holy See. The Arch-Confraternity, or *Prima Primaria*, is attached to the Jesuit Church at Rome, and with the General of the Jesuits, or his representative, rests the privilege of aggregating or affiliating all similar Confraternities throughout the world. The petition for affiliation should, therefore, be addressed to the General of the Society of Jesus, or to his Secretary at Rome.³ In this petition it will be well to specify: (1) the class of persons composing the Confraternity—for example, whether it is of both sexes, or of men only, or women or young persons; (2) the titular name or Feast of the Confraternity; each Confraternity is of necessity dedicated to some mystery or title of the Blessed Virgin—it may also have a secondary Patron or Title, as of the Angels or St. Joseph; (3) the particular church or chapel, and the parish and diocese, where it is established.

II. According to the Roman Ritual Bishops only and priests specially authorized have the right to use publicly and solemnly the formula 'Benedictio Imaginum—Jesu Christi D. Nostri—B. Virginis Mariae—et aliorum Sanctorum' given in the Ritual. It is well to note, however, that the Congregation of Rites declared (12th July, 1704)⁴ that altar crosses or processional crosses may be blessed by a simple priest 'private et non solemniter,' from which the editor of the *Ephemerides Liturgicæ* concludes, 'Itaque benedictio imaginum non est vetita simplici sacerdoti, nisi ratione solemnitatis.' To bless pictures of the Sacred Heart with this formula and erect them in a private house is, therefore, within the competency of a simple priest and does not need episcopal permission.

We have a suspicion, however, that our correspondent would not be quite satisfied with this reply and that we should take his query in a wider sense, viz., as soliciting information regarding the ceremony which is technically known as 'The Enthronement of the Sacred Heart of Jesus in the Home, by the solemn consecration of the Family to the Divine Heart.' The Founder of this devotion is Father Mathew Crawley-

¹ S.C.C. November 23, 1878; S.C.I., August 2, 1888.

² S.C.C. November 23, 1878; August 18, 1861; vide I. E. RECORD, Fifth Series, vol. xiv. p. 498.

³ Priests in this country who do not find it convenient to write to Rome may communicate with the Editor of the *Irish Messenger*, Dublin, by whom their petition will be duly executed.

⁴ Decree 2143.

Boevey of the Congregation of the Sacred Heart of Jesus and Mary, the son of an English convert father, and born in Peru. Begun in 1905, the devotion has rapidly spread throughout the world, and in April 27, 1915, the apostolate of the work was expressly blessed and encouraged by Benedict XV. In a letter of April 26, 1914, Cardinal Billot set forth the reason and aims of the Association, 'which,' he says, 'two hundred and fifty Cardinals, Archbishops, and Bishops have already approved throughout the world'; and in a letter dated November 10, 1916, Cardinal Logue says: 'I am sure the devotion of the Consecration of Families to the Sacred Heart, so zealously promoted by Father Mathew Crawley, would be most acceptable to our people; and hence I approve and bless every effort made to spread this devotion among them.' The ceremony consists of two parts: (1) 'An image of the Sacred Heart shall be set up in the *place of honour* in the home; (2) the family shall *consecrate* itself solemnly to the Sacred Heart.' As the devotion is a private one, and, in any case, has the express approval of the Holy Father, no episcopal permission is needed for the blessing of the picture or its erection in the place of honour in the home. The formula of blessing is that given in the Ritual and should be performed by a priest; the formal act of consecration (given in the ceremonial of the Association ¹), the installation of the picture, and the recitation of the Prayer which follows, may be performed either by the priest or, in his absence, by the head of the family. The indulgences ² attaching to the devotion are: (a) An indulgence of seven years and seven quarantines to all the members of the family who, at least contrite of heart, assist at the ceremony of the enthronement; (b) a plenary indulgence to the same if, having confessed and communicated on that day, they visit a church or public oratory and there pray for the intentions of the Holy Father; (c) an indulgence of three hundred days, if, on the anniversary of the Enthronement, they renew the consecration before the picture of the Sacred Heart.

III. For valid membership of the Confraternity of the Holy Rosary the one essential condition is to have one's name inscribed in the register of a canonically erected Confraternity, but in order to share in the indulgences and privileges attaching to membership it is, of course, necessary to fulfil the prescribed conditions for gaining them. Unlike other confraternities, however, to have a canonically erected Confraternity of the Rosary in a parish the mere written permission of the Bishop does not suffice. The Confraternity of the Rosary belongs so exclusively to the Order of St. Dominic that no one but the General of the Order, or a person delegated by

¹ The Headquarters of the Association in England are at the Convent of the Sacred Heart, Carlton Road, Weymouth. Any further information or literature connected with the Association may be obtained from the Rev. Mother Superior. At the present moment Father Crawley is in England and will shortly be in Ireland pursuing the commission given him by Benedict XV—'make of each home a sanctuary of the Heart of Jesus. Address yourself to each family individually, so that the throne of the King of Love may be erected there.'

² Letter of Benedict XV, April 27, 1915.

him, is empowered to erect such a Confraternity. The petition, with a copy of the Bishop's letter sanctioning the erection of the Confraternity, may be sent either directly to Rome or preferably to some house of the Dominicans in the province, who will see that it reaches its proper destination. In his reply the Father-General, in authorizing the erection of the Confraternity, will forward to the Director the necessary faculties to enrol members and to bless beads, together with a summary of the indulgences attaching to the Confraternity. The diploma of erection, with the summary of indulgences thus obtained, is again forwarded to the Bishop, whose approval is awaited before the indulgences are promulgated. In the case of a Confraternity thus formally established the enrolment of the members in the register of the Confraternity suffices, and there need be no further communication with a house of the Dominicans.

But in parishes where for any reason it is impossible or inconvenient to establish a Confraternity of the Rosary, priests sometimes obtain faculties from the General of the Order enabling them to enrol the faithful into the Confraternity, to bless beads and to give to the members a plenary indulgence at the hour of death. Priests who have received and who exercise these powers should, from time to time, forward the names of the members they have admitted, to be inscribed in the register of the Confraternity kept in some house of the Dominicans or to some secular Church in which the Confraternity has been canonically erected.¹

**CASE OF THE EXSEQUIAL SERVICE IMPEDED BY THE RUBRICS.
THE INDULGENCES OF THE WAY OF THE CROSS. RE
PAINTING OF THE CROSSES IN A CONSECRATED CHURCH.
LIGENCE OF MASS IN A HOSPITAL WARD**

REV. DEAR SIR,—Kindly give your opinion on the following questions in the coming number of the I. E. RECORD :

I. A priest died on Holy Thursday and was buried on Holy Saturday afternoon. The funeral Office was held on Monday at 11 o'clock and after its recitation the celebrant of the Mass, in white vestments, said the Mass of the octave exactly as prescribed in the *Ordo* of that date, the choir being silent throughout. After the conclusion of the Mass, the chanters proceeded with the singing of the *Libera*, the celebrant, in black cope, giving the Absolution and finishing the function in the ordinary way. It was considered that the corpse was interred 'ultra biduum' (*Ordo*, xii. 2°), and, not being morally present, that it would be unlawful to have a Requiem Mass on the occasion. Was the service, as described, in accordance with the rubrics?

II. Is there any authority for the statement I heard recently that the indulgences of the Way of the Cross could be gained only when a person performed the devotion before Stations that, together with their crosses, were embedded in the walls of the edifice in which they were canonically erected?

III. In a consecrated church may the crosses on the walls be repainted from time to time?

IV. At a certain hospital there is a custom of celebrating Mass in the

¹ *Vid.* Beringer, vol. ii. p. 183.

wards, now in one ward, now in another, to give invalids an opportunity of being present at the Holy Sacrifice. Is this custom against Canon 822, § 4. which forbids celebration 'in cubiculo' ?

C.C.

I. The query is a practical one, and we have no doubt the solution of it in the circumstances gave rise to an animated discussion. The case is interesting from the rubrical point of view, and calculated to suggest difficulties not easily surmountable, and it may be some satisfaction to our correspondent to know that until the publication of the new Missal even authoritative liturgists were not quite agreed on the proper solution. With the appearance of the new Missal, however, ambiguities disappear, and there is no longer room for discussion as to the rubrical mode of procedure in these and similar circumstances. According to the new '*Missae Defunctorum*' (Tit. III. § 4), whenever the exsequial Mass for the day of death or burial is impeded by the rubrics, it may be transferred to the nearest day not similarly impeded.¹ In the old and the new legislation Easter Monday allows an exsequial Mass *in die obitus*, and as in this particular case it was the first available day, the Office, Requiem Mass and Absolution might have taken place in strict accordance with the rubrics. But apart from the rubrics of the new Missal—with which, we presume our correspondent, through no fault of his, was not at the time acquainted—(a) what would have been a strictly rubrical course in the circumstances and (b) what verdict must be passed on the solution actually adopted? Before offering an opinion on either question we shall submit a few replies of the Congregation of Rites which are pertinent to the points at issue.

(a) Q. In duplicibus in quibus non permittitur Missa privata de Requiem licitumne erit canere Nocturnum pro defunctis et postea Missam de die celebrare ?

R. 'In casu posse.'²

(b) Q. Moris fuit in dicta ecclesia . . . Missas de Requiem cum Nocturno defunctorum celebrare pro adimplenda voluntate testatorum vel fundatorum. Sed quoniam praedictae Missae prohibitae sunt tam ex Rubricis quam ex Summorum Pontificum et S.R.C. decretis; asserunt aliqui debere cantari Missam de Festo et nocturnum defunctorum, nam dictum Nocturnum non intelligitur prohibitum sed Missae defunctorum dumtaxat.

R. 'Praedicta nullo modo licere et ab Ordinario prohibenda.'³

(c) Q. Utrum absolutio pro defunctis finita Missa fieri possit tantummodo quando dicta fuit Missa de Requiem vel fieri etiam possit in paramentis tamen nigris post Missam de festo duplici cujus fructus defunctis applicatur ?

R. Affirmative ad primam partem; negative ad Secundam?⁴

(d) Quod si ex civili vetito aut morbo contagioso aut alia gravi

¹ 'Quoties autem a Rubricis, ut supra haec: Missa impeditur, transferre potest in proximam sequentem diem similiter non impeditam.'

² Decr. 2981 ad 5.

³ Decr. 1736.

⁴ Decr. 3014. Vid. etiam Decr. 1736 ad I.; 3780; 2186; 3112.

causa, cadaver in ecclesia praesens esse nequeat, imo etsi jam terrae mandatum fuerit, praefata Missa celebrari quoque poterit in altero ex immediate sequentibus duobus ab obitu diebus, eodem prorsus modo ac si cadaver esset praesens? ¹

A cursory glance at these decrees will at once indicate that the service as described by our correspondent was not strictly rubrical. The reasons are: (1) The Absolution, with the singing of the *Libera*, after the Mass of the day, is condemned by the decree (c) quoted, and by several other decrees of the Sacred Congregation. (2) The chanting of the Requiem Office in the case, though, as we see in (a) it is tolerated before a low Mass (de Festo) and prohibited in (b) before a High Mass (de Festo), was a liturgical anomaly which, though it might be justified in law, we should not like to commend in practice. If, however, the Office and Mass were separated by such an interval, that, morally speaking, they could not be regarded as forming one liturgical junction, our misgivings on this head would disappear.

The other question, *viz.*, without a knowledge of the new Rubrics, what would have been the strictly liturgical course in the circumstances, is not so easily answered. Did the privilege of the '*ultra biduum*' apply to such a case, and, if so, was there anything in the circumstances to prevent the availing of it? The original decree,² dated February 13, 1892, undoubtedly restricted the application of the privilege to cases of exsequal services impeded '*ob civile vetitum vel morbum contagiosum,*' but the subsequent decree (quoted above), dated December 2, 1891, contained the additional clause—'*aut alia gravi causa*'—which was sufficiently vague to call forth different interpretations. Some understood the clause as extending the privilege to cases of exsequal services impeded by the rubrics, others were strongly of opinion that cases of liturgical impediment were not contemplated in this portion ³ of the decree. Van der Stappen,⁴ who inclines to the latter view, cites the interesting anomaly arising from the opposite contention, that a man who dies on Good Friday would thereby be entitled to the full exsequal service on Easter Monday, whereas the man who died on Spy Wednesday would not be entitled to it until the following Wednesday. The friends of the latter would, he says, certainly have grounds for complaint against the Church. We think, however, that the advocates of the former opinion were sufficiently authoritative to make it safe in practice, and a confirmation of their view is the unambiguous statement of the new Rubrics. In the particular case Easter Monday was one ⁵ of the two days

¹ Decr. 3755. *Vid.* etiam Decr 3767 ad xxvi.

² Decr. 3767 ad 26.

³ They maintain that such cases are provided for in the following section of the same decree, which, however, excludes their celebration on doubles of the 1st and 2nd class. (See Decr. 3755 ad 3.)

⁴ Tom. ii. p. 329. Cf. *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, xiv. 1900.

⁵ The '*dies obitus*' is ordinarily interpreted as including the whole time between the death and burial, and the opinions of those who hold that in this instance it should be taken strictly as the '*day of death*' may be ignored. (See Van der Stappen, tom. ii. p. 325.)

‘immediate sequentibus ab obitu,’ and hence, even according to the old Rubrics, the full exsequial service might have taken place on that day ‘eodem prorsus modo ac si cadaver esset praesens.’

II. No authority as far as we know. The indulgences are attached not to the Stations but to the wooden crosses, which may be either imbedded in the walls of the edifice or hang from them.

III. Yes. The following reply of the Congregation of Rites is a sufficient answer to the query:—

Q. Utrum ecclesia e cujus parietibus vel partim vel integre disjicitur simul incrustatio, vulgo *intonaco*, ut renovetur, consecrata maneat; An execrata?

R. ‘Ecclesia consecrata remanet, quamvis in ejus parietibus opus tectorium sit renovatum?’¹

IV. The custom would seem to be decidedly against the prescription of Canon 822, § 4—‘nunquam autem in cubiculo’—yet if it is immemorial and tolerated we would not be prepared to condemn it. The canon does not expressly reprobate such a custom.

M. EATON.

¹ Decr. 3907 ad 2. Vid Decr. 3907; 3962; 3545.

DOCUMENTS

DOUBTS REGARDING THE OBLIGATION OF THE EXSEQUIAL RITE AS PRESCRIBED IN THE ROMAN RITUAL IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES

(February 28, 1920)

S. SEBASTIANI FLUMINIS IANUARIII IN BRASILIA

CIRCA RITUUM EXEQUIARUM

Eñus et Rñus Dñus Cardinalis Ioachim Arcoverde de Albuquerque Cavalcanti, archiepiscopus S. Sebastiani Fluminis Ianuarii, in Brasilia, Sacrae Rituum Congregationi haec quae sequuntur exposuit, nimirum:

'Ritus exequiarum, ut in *Rituale romano* praescribitur, in hac Archidiecesi non est servatus, quia cadavera ad ecclesiam non ducentur, ob leges civiles, quae obligant ut sepulturae tradantur vigintiquatuor horis post obitum; et etiam quia coemeteria, quae sunt sub lege civili, satis distant a paroecia. Parochi vocantur domi et hic cadavera comandantur.

'Hinc quaeritur: *Quaenam rubricae et normae in casu servandae?*'

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, audito etiam specialis Commissionis suffragio, praepositae quaestioni ita respondendum censuit:

'1. Servandum, quantum fieri potest, *Rituale romanum* (tit. VI, c. IV, *Exequiarum Ordo*) et can. 215 *Cod. I. C.*'

'2. Familia defuncti certior fiat funus cum Missa exequiali peragi posse, etiam praesente *moraliter* cadavere, iuxta Rubricas et Decreta.'

'3. Pro casibus autem extraordinariis dabitur Instructio S. R. C.'

Atque ita rescripsit et declaravit. Die 28 februarii 1920.

✠ A. CARD. VICO, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae,
S. R. C. Praefectus.

L. ✠ S.

ALEXANDER VERDE, *Secretarius.*

THE HOLY OFFICE DECIDES THAT THE WORK ENTITLED 'LES FAITS DE LOUBLANDE' CANNOT BE APPROVED

(March 20, 1920)

SUPREMA SACRA CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII

DECRETUM

CIRCA 'LES FAITS DE LOUBLANDE'

In generali consessu habito feria IV, die 10 martii 1920, facta relatione de praetensis visionibus, revelationibus, prophetiis, etc., quae sub

appellatione *Les faits de Loublande* evulgantur, et examinatis scriptis quae ad eadem referuntur, Eñi ac Rñi Dñi Cardinales in rebus fidei et morum Inquisitores Generales, prae habito DD. Consultorum voto, decreverunt: 'Mature perpensis omnibus, S. Congregatio declarat praetensas visiones, revelationes, prophetias, etc., quae sub appellatione *Les faits de Loublande* vulgo designari solent, nec non scripta quae ad eadem referuntur, non posse probari.'

Et insequenti feria v, die 11 eiusdem mensis et anni, Sanctissimus D. N. Benedictus divina Providentia Papa XV, in solita audientia R. P. D. Assessori S. Officii impertita, resolutionem Eñorum ac Rñorum Patrum approbavit, confirmavit et in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* referri praecepit.

Datum Romae, ex aedibus S. Officii, die 12 martii 1920.

A. CASTELLANO, *Supremae S. C. S. Off. Notarius.*

THE DIOCESE OF TRENT IS SEPARATED FROM THE ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCE OF SALSBURG, AND IMMEDIATELY SUBJECTED TO THE HOLY SEE

(February 24, 1920)

SACRA CONGREGATIO CONSISTORIALIS

TRIDENTINA

DECRETUM QUO TRIDENTINA DIOECESIS S. SEDI IMMEDIATE SUBIICITUR

Sedes episcopalis Tridentina, quae, primum Patriarchatui Aquileiensi subdita, dein Sanctae Sedi immediate subiecta erat, anno 1825 suffraganea reddita est Metropolitanae ecclesiae Salisburgensi. Mutatis vero in praesenti conditionibus at adiunctis, quorum causa Tridentina Sedes obnoxia facta fuerat metropolitanae iurisdictioni Salisburgensi, visum est expedire, ut praecedens memoratae dioecesis status redintegretur: idque Ssmus Dominus Noster Benedictus Pp. XV, rebus omnibus rite perpensis, fieri iussit.

Quapropter, in executionem Apostolici mandati, Sacra haec Congregatio, auditis Archiepiscopo Salisburgensi et Episcopo Tridentino, suppleto, quatenus opus sit, quorum intersit vel sua interesse praesumant consensu, hoc Consistoriali decreto dioecesim Tridentinam a provincia ecclesiastica Salisburgensi separat ac seiungit, eamque denuo immediate Sanctae Sedi subiectam declarat et constituit ad tramitem iuris, contrariis quibuslibet minime obstantibus.

Datum Romae, ex aedibus Sacrae Congregationis Consistorialis, die 24 februarii 1920.

L. ✠ S.

✠ C. CARD. DE LAI, Ep. Sabinen., *Secretarius.*
✠ V. SARDI, Archiep. Caesarien., *Assessor.*

DECISION OF THE HOLY ROMAN ROTA IN A CASE CONNECTED
WITH THE ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC FUNDS

(February 23, 1919)

[This decree was published in March, 1920]

SACRA ROMANA ROTA

S. ANGELI DE LOMBARDIS

IURIUM

Benedicto Pp. XV feliciter regnante, Pontificatus Dominationis Suae anno quinto, die 28 februarii anno 1919, RR. PP. DD. Fridericus Cattani Amadori, Ponens, Petrus Rossetti et Maximus Massimi, Auditores de turno, in causa S. Angeli de Lombardis—Iurium, inter archipresbyterum Victorium Novia, actorem, repraesentatum per legitimum procuratorem Thomam Ambrosetti, advocatum, et Clerum Ecclesiae receptitiae, oppidi 'Vallata', repraesentatum per legitimum procuratorem Vincentium Sacconi, advocatum, interveniente et disceptante in causa Promotore iustitiae huius S. Tribunalis, sequentem tulerunt definitivam sententiam.

In oppido quod *Vallata* vocant, dioecesis S. Angeli de Lombardis, exstat ecclesia parochialis S. Bartholomaei, in qua animarum cura habitualis ad clerum receptitium pertinet, actualis vero ad archipresbyterum. Lege autem italica, anni 1867, clerus receptitius suppressioni obnoxius fuit eiusque bona omnia fiscus sibi attribuit, excepta tantum archipresbyteri portione, quae *in natura*, ut aiunt, ratione curae animarum, illi concessa est. Qui tunc clerus receptitium efficiebant, pensionem a fisco perceperunt, eorum successoribus non persolvendam. Cum bona omnia, archipresbyteri portione excepta, fiscus arripuisset, non amplius pecunia praesto erat pro ecclesiae manutentione, et ideo, decursu temporis, gravibus refectionis operibus aedificium indigere coepit; eoque res pervenit, ut cum, paullo post, sacerdos Victorius Novia, in causa actor, archipresbyteratum consecutus sit, civilis auctoritas, ad periculum a fidelibus avertendum, ecclesiam claudi mandaverit. Tunc archipresbyter consilium iniit eam reficiendi, ne *Vallatae* populus sua parochiali ecclesia careret. Quod, partim collatitia pecunia, partim venum dando aliquid ex suppellectili ecclesiae, partim pecunia a se mutuo comparata, perficere tandem potuit. Tunc archipresbyter, pro operibus perfectis, necnon pro cultus expensis a se toleratis et in futuro tolerandis, civilem administrationem, quam *Fondo per il culto* appellant, in iudicium rapuit, sententiamque obtinuit, qua definitive iudicatum fuit, civilem administrationem solvere debere ipsi Victorio Novia, utpote loci *Vallatae* parochi, annuas libellas 1482,75 pro ecclesiae cultu; annuas libellas 300 pro ecclesia manutenenda atque reparanda, et hoc etiam in posterum. Ad rependendas vero eidem expensas pro divino cultu quotannis factas (a die 6 mensis maii anni 1895, qua laudatus Novia in possessionem immisus fuit sui beneficii) libellae assignatae sunt 25,809,80, libellae insuper 2000 pro sacra suppellectili ab ipso comparata. Victoria ab archipresbytero adeptam, clerus receptitius apud Episcopum instituit, ut summae vindicatae, pro retroacto tempore, pars sibi traderetur, vel quia et ipse quasdam pro

sacris faciendis expensas sustinuerat, vel quia, etsi quovis reditu destitutus, absque ullo emolumento, plures quotannis sacras celebraverat functiones, vel quia ea pecunia, ex bonis sibi a fisco abreptis, proveniebat. Petiit insuper, ut summa libellarum 2000, quae pro sacra supellectili vindicata fuerat, inter se et archipresbyterum, ex iisdem ipsis rationibus, dispertiretur, iuxta impensas toleratas. Insuper ius sibi vindicavit administrandi, una cum archipresbytero, summam libellarum 1782,77 quotannis pro cultus expensis et pro ecclesiae reparatione percipiendarum. Archipresbyter tamen acerrime restitit, opponens se ex libellis 27,809,80 dimidiam partem advocato, qui causae patrocinator est, ex pacto solvere debuisse; alteram autem dimidiam partem in pecunia, pro ecclesiae refectione mutuo acceptas, restitutionem erogasse, nec aes alienum in totum restituere potuisse. Ad libellas vero 2000 quod attinet, contendit eas a se percipiendas esse, quia pecuniae summam longe maiorem impenderat pro sacra supellectili. Ceterum tuitus est quod etsi quid, ex pecunia a *Fondo per il culto* soluta, et unoquoque anno solvenda, superesset, id ad se spectaret, quia expensas pro cultu ipse tot annis sustinuerat, ita ut clero non aliud adiudicandum esset, nisi summa libellarum 435, pro expensis quas ipse fecerat. Episcopus, ut lis de bono et aequo componeretur, suum Provicarium generalem Vallatam misit, qui, contententibus auditis, attentis iis quae a partibus allata atque probata fuerant, detractis vero litis expensis (quas in summam 25% computavit), necnon pecunia soluta pro taxa cathedralici, seminarii et Ss. Visitationum, hanc proposuit conclusionem: 'Libellas 27,809,80, a *Fondo per il culto* solutas, ita dispertiendas esse, ut archipresbytero libellae 8244,55, clero libellae 4248 adiudicarentur. Hae summae ad expensas, ab uno alterove factas, respondebant. Cum vero superessent libellae 7208,74, harum partem, nempe libellas 1752, clero, partem aliam, nempe libellas 2850, archipresbytero attribuit; reliquum iudicio Episcopi erogandum esse arbitratus est.' Huic divisioni, a Provicario Generali propositae, consentire noluit archipresbyter Novia. Ideo Episcopus, die 21 iulii 1912, decretum edidit, quo (demptis libellis 1000 titulo cathedralici et taxae pro seminario) libellae 6000 clero, reliquae libellae 20,809,80 archipresbytero adiudicatae sunt; et insuper statuit quod circa libellarum 1482,75 erogationem, quotannis pro cultus expensis a *Fondo per il culto* archipresbytero solvendarum, ipse archipresbyter, simul cum duobus sacerdotibus e clero receptitio et Vicario foraneo, sibi intra mensem exhiberent consilium. At archipresbyter contra decretum Episcopi ad Summum Pontificem recursum habuit, obtinuitque ut lis a Nostro Sacro Tribunali in prima instantia dirimeretur.

Cum vero Episcopus in suo decreto statuisset ut libellae 1000, ab archipresbytero Novia iam Episcopo traditae, relinqui deberent pro taxa, partim seminario, partim cathedralico ab eo debita, archipresbyter autem pro seminario nihil se debere assereret, ideo a Nobis in causa vocatus est Promotor iustitiae apud N. S. T., qui Seminarii iura tueretur. Nobis igitur respondendum est dubiis, inter partes concordatis, scilicet:

(1) *an et quae repartitio facienda sit summae libellarum 27,809,80, quam archipresbyter Novia percepit ab administratione, vulgo 'Fondo*

per il culto ; (2) *quomodo erogari et a quo administrari debeat annua assignatio ab eadem administratione in posterum solvenda in casu.*

Ad ius quod attinet.—In ecclesiis receptitiis, leges italici gubernii aboleverunt collegium receptitium, tantummodo relinquentes parochum, qui animarum curam in eis habet ; at hae leges, utpote quae contrariae sunt legibus ecclesiasticis, coram ecclesia, auctoritate carent ; ideo adhuc collegium cleri receptitii, quamvis suis bonis expoliatum, exstare censetur. Hae receptitiae ecclesiae, quae tantum fere in provinciis, olim ad Neapolitanum regnum pertinentibus, inveniuntur, specialem in iure naturam habent, quam ita Salzano exponit : ‘ Le chiese recettizie, nel regno napoletano, dalla pietà dei fedeli sono arricchite di congrue rendite, da distribuirsi *pro rata* a coloro che sono addetti al loro servizio. Esse diconsi o numerate o non numerate, secondo che sono ammessi ad esercitarvi le sacre funzioni o un numero determinato di chierici o generalmente tutti i preti del luogo ; come pure alcune sono senza cura di anime, od anche con cura, come per lo più suole avvenire.’ (*Lezione di Diritto Canonico*, vol. II, lez. 25^a.) Receptitiae ecclesiae ordinationibus reguntur quae in Apostolico Brevi *Impensa*, Pii VII, diei 13 augusti, anni 1824, continentur, necnon singularum ecclesiarum statutis, confectis ad normam exemplaris, quod anno 1824, iussu regis Ferdinandi I ad Ordinarios omnes sui regni, ab Episcoporum quadam congregatione ad hoc constituta, redactum est (cf. Salzano, l. c.). Exemplaris capita, quae ad rem nostram faciunt, haec sunt : ‘ Art. II.—Il clero amministrerà in massa comune, e non già divisamente, le rendite di *qualunque natura* esse siano, per mezzo di un partecipante, eletto dal clero stesso, che eserciterà tutte le funzioni di procuratore e ne assumerà il titolo.—Art. V.—Se vi sarà accidentale *accrescimento di rendita*, anche per causa di porzioni vuote, alla fine dell’anno, secondo il reale rescritto 10 novembre 1823, *il procuratore ne darà piena cognizione all’Ordinario, il quale ordinerà un’eguale partizione fra tutti i partecipanti, oppure, richiedendolo il bisogno, disporrà che o tutti o parte degli avanzi si applichino a beneficio della chiesa o a riparazioni di fabbriche o migliorie di fondi, o sacri arredi o altro secondo il bisogno di essa.*—Art. VIII.—Per le spese di chiesa, coltivo di fondi, e di qualunque natura esse siano, come anche per l’introduzione delle liti, debba (il procuratore) *esserne autorizzato dal clero*, per mezzo di regolare conclusione.—Art. XIII.—Tutte le spese erogate, all’infuori dei pubblici pesi e delle porzioni ai partecipanti, *senza autorizzazione del clero*, andranno a carico del procuratore.’

Rebus sic stantibus, apparet quod archipresbyter, non independenter a clero receptitio potest bona ecclesiae libere administrare, sed tantum simul cum clero, ideoque neque, inaudito clero receptitio, se litibus cum gubernio implicare poterat, neque expensas, cum gravi ecclesiae onere, sustinere. Parochus ergo Novia in actione contra administrationem, quae dicitur *Fondo per il Culto*, promovenda, ecclesiae suae iura defensurus, receptitii cleri loci Vallatae assensum obtinere debebat, sive iure communi iuxta illud : ‘ Quod omnes attingit, ab omnibus debet ‘probari’, sive iure particulari ecclesiae receptitiae (cf. art. VIII, s.c.). Imo sui superioris ecclesiastici obtinere licentiam debuerat, nec poterat

expensas ingentes facere nisi servatis solemnitatibus iuris, eo magis quod propter has se debuerit debitis onerare. Pactum autem, quod cum suo advocato archipresbyter iniit (cuius vi, ei quinquaginta pro quoque centenariio solvere debuit), est contra iuris praescriptum; advocatis enim vel emere lites vel de immodica rei litigiosae parte sibi vindicanda pacisci, nefas est, tum in iure ecclesiastico tum in civili; quin imo tale pactum est omnino irritum (l. *Sumptus*, 55 ff., de *pactis* et l. *salarium ff. mandati*, ut habet Reiffenstuel, *Ius can. univ.*, lib. I; *Decret.*, tit. XXXVII, par. II, n. 43, cf. etiam *Cod. I. C.*, can. 1665, et *Cod. Civ. It.*, art. 1458). Unde opportune provicarius generalis dioecesis, can. Antonius Freda, emolumentum pro advocato archipresbyteri ad 25 libellas pro unoquoque centenariio reduxit. Hic de cetero, qui omnia accurate perpendit, clero libellas 4248 attribuit, maximam autem partem ipsi archipresbytero. Stricto enim iure erga illum uti nequimus, quia, quidquid sit de modo non legitime servato in facto, eius agendi ratio magnam ecclesiae receptitiae attulit utilitatem. Insuper quamvis Episcopus testetur: 'Il reverendo Vittorio Novia, arciprete di Vallata, nella causa sostenuta contro il *Fondo per culto*, non ha mai interpellato il clero' (Docum. nov., 18 mart. 1918), tamen verum est quod clerus receptitus optime sciebat quae archipresbyter pro sua ecclesia adversus administrationem vulgo *Fondo per il culto* agebat. Hoc manifeste constat ex literis eiusdem Episcopi ipsi archipresbytero missis, sub die 12 ianuarii 1912, in quibus legitur: 'Manifesterò intanto al reverendo clero lo stato delle cose, onde si mantenga calmo e tranquillo' (*Summ. pro Novia*, pag. 29, doc. VI). Quae autem ad lites sustinendas documenta necessaria essent, archipresbytero Episcopus suppeditabat, ut ipse concedit; adeo luculenter apparet quod ille non tantum sciebat, sed etiam rationem agendi archipresbyteri approbabat. Ad clerum ergo receptitium quod pertinet, in casu applicari possunt principia: 'Approbatur quod a sciente non reprobatur' (Leg. *Si ab initio*, 10 ff. *qui satis d. cogant*); 'Qui non contradicit et patitur, cum possit vetare, censetur consentire' (Leg. 5, *Cod. de nupt.*); 'Non videtur contradicere qui iustam causam contradicendi non habet' (Leg. *Dotem*, 38 ff. *solut. matrim.*). Ex alia parte archipresbyter Novia bene egit, quando litem contra publicum aerarium pro cultus expensis excitavit, cum bonum evidens suae ecclesiae id postulasset; imo si mandatum ad litem a clero receptitio petivisset, hic minime potuisset illud denegare, cum et ipse bonum ecclesiae procurare teneatur: unde aequitas non sinit quod receptitiae ecclesiae comparata utilitas sit cum gravi damno illius qui illam procuravit. At nullum ius archipresbytero favet relate ad taxam pro seminario solvendam, quod ille facere detrectat; eidem enim incumbere probandi, taxam illam, (quae anno 1749 constituta fuit in annua summa libellarum 76.56) a se non amplius deberi, quod non facit. Referre sufficiat quae de hac re habet Card. De Luca: 'Illud autem pro regula generali statuendum est, quod, ubi speciale indultum Sedis Apostolicae limitationem (seminaristici) non suadeat, nulla datur privilegiativa exemptio (*Adnot. ad Conc. Trid.*, Disc. 25, n. 12). Ceterum huiusmodi taxa non est sua natura perpetua; Concilium enim Trid. (Sess. 23, C. 18, de *Ref.*), uti

scribit idem auctor (Disc. 88, n. 7, *De Benef.*), 'eatenus mandavit huiusmodi contributionem beneficiorum pro sustentatione Seminarii, quatenus non posset aliunde consultum esse, et tanquam per remedium subsidiarium': proinde nihil iuvat opponere in casu, huiusmodi taxam ab anno 1822 non amplius Seminario fuisse persolutam; nam etiamsi hoc verum esset (quod probatum non est), cum seminaristici solutio a Seminarii pendeat inopia, Episcopus potest hanc taxam vel minuere vel augere, vel etiam auferre. Ad rem ergo nil probat id quod *de seminaristico* nulla mentio habeatur in schemate, quod archipresbyter in medium affert, vulgo *Piano per la numerazione per la chiesa recettizia di Val-lata, a norma delle istruzionie approvate da S. Maestà nel 18 novembre 1822*, quia istius schematis silentium argumentum mere negativum praebet, dum e contra ad seminaristici abolitionem demonstrandam, argumentum positivum atque directum debet afferri.

Quod vero secundum dubium respicit, in omnibus videtur probanda Episcopi dispositio in suo decreto statuta. Episcopi enim, utpote supremi administratoris bonorum ecclesiasticorum suae dioecesis, est condere leges, tam in synodo, quam extra synodum, pro aequa partitione vel administratione bonorum eorumdem (cf. Lucidi, *De Visit. Sacr. Lim.*, Cap. 7, n. 268); idque etiam ex iure communi (cf. etiam can. 1519, § 1, *I. C.*). In casu vero hoc potest Ep. S. Angeli de Lombardis etiam vi statutorum, de quibus supra (cf. art. V super relatum pro ecclesiis receptitiis).

Ad factum quod attinet.—Doctrinam quam supra exposuimus, casui nostro applicantes, decretum Episcopi S. Angeli de Lombardis sub die 21 mensis iulii anno 1912 ut normam pro repartitione faciendae sumimus, summae quam archipresbyter percepit ab administratione civili, et etiam pro norma erogandi atque administrandi annuam pecuniam ab eadem administratione in posterum solvendam. Iudex autem ecclesiasticus sententias ab auctoritate civili latas corrigere vel immutare nequit nisi in his quae iuri ecclesiastico contraria sunt vel evidenti iustitiae. Sententia vero quam archipresbyter Novia in sui favorem a foro civili obtinuit, in hoc tantum iuri ecclesiastico contradicit, quod expensas, a clero receptitio factas, minime spectat, nec iura recognoscit, quae in ipsa ecclesia, eiusque bonorum administratione ad clerum pertinent. In his ergo sententia fori civilis emendanda est, ita ut expensae omnes, quas ille pro cultu ecclesiae parochialis habuit, eidem sint reficiendae, eiusque iura sarcienda. Ideo libellae 4248, pro expensis quas clerus sustinuit, legitime eidem assignandae sunt, et probanda est computatio quam Provicarius generalis dioecesis, rebus omnibus perpensis, in sua condicione statuit atque Episcopus probavit. Ceterum hanc ipsam computationem recte factam esse, concessit patronus Cleri receptitii. Non possunt autem clero receptitio assignari libellae 1752 pro servitio ecclesiastico, seu, ut dicitur in decreto Episcopi, *per compenso delle funzioni*, quia nullam pecuniae partem propter hunc titulum, civilis administratio restituit. Standum insuper est decreto Episcopi relate ad libellas 1000 pro cathedratico et taxa seminarii, quamvis Provicarius generalis aliquanto plus assignaverit; ad Episcopum enim pertinet hanc rem definire. Reliqua omnis pecunia archipresbytero Novia est adiudicanda, qui, cum

satisfecerit Episcopo et clero, pro se retinere potest quae a gubernio ipse vindicavit.

Circa vero pecuniae summam, quae singulis annis a civili administratione, vulgo *Fondo per il culto*, solvenda est, sive pro ecclesiae mantentione, sive pro cultus expensis, Episcopus ita in suo decreto statuit: 'Che una Commissione, composta dal Sig. Arciprete, da un sacerdote pensionato, da un sacerdote non pensionato e dal Vicario Foraneo, Nostro rappresentante, fra lo spazio di un mese, presenti in Curia un bilancio preventivo per la ripartizione della somma di L. 1482.75. Nel compilarlo si tenga presente che nulla deve mancare per la decenza e lo splendore del Culto, senza tralasciare di stanziare un fondo per un corso di esercizi annuali, di una missione quinquennale e per un equo compenso ai sacerdoti addetti al servizio della Chiesa.' Nihil in his praescriptis invenitur, quod iura archipresbyteri vel aliorum laedat, et Episcopus usus est iure suo; imo sui muneri satisfecit, cuius est advigilare administrationi et erogationi bonorum ecclesiasticorum, quae in suo territorio sunt et suae auctoritati sunt obnoxia, ut supra diximus.

Quibus omnibus in iure et in facto perpensis, Nos infrascripti auditores de Turno pro tribunali sedentes et solum Deum prae oculis habentes, decernimus, declaramus et definitive sententiamus, ita propositis dubiis esse respondendum, scilicet:

Ad I: *Affirmative, quoad primam partem.* Quoad alteram partem vero; *Repartitio fiat ut in decreto Episcopi diei 21 iulii 1912, detractis tamen, de parte assignata clero, libellis mille septingentis quinquaginta duabus (1752), Archipresbytero adiudicandis.*

Ad II: *Standum esse decreto Episcopi, cuius erit de administratione quoque statuere ad normam iuris.*

Expensae habebuntur inter partes compensatae.

Quare mandamus Ordinariis locorum et ministris Tribunalium ad quos spectat, ut executioni mandent hanc nostram definitivam sententiam, et adversus reluctantes procedant ad normam Sacrorum Canonum, et praesertim Codices Iuris Canonici, lib. IV, tit. XVII, iis adhibitis executivis et coercitivis mediis, quae magis efficacia et opportuna pro rerum adiunctis esse iudicaverint.

Romae, in Sede Tribunalis S. R. Rotae, die 28 februarii anno 1919.

FRIDERICUS CATTANI-AMADORI, *Ponens.*
 PETRUS ROSSETTI.
 MAXIMUS MASSIMI.

DECREE FOR THE BEATIFICATION AND DECLARATION OF
MARTYRDOM OF THE SERVANT OF GOD, ABBA GHEBRE
MICHAEL, PRIEST OF THE CONGREGATION OF THE MISSION
OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUL

(February 25, 1920)

ABYSSINEN.

BEATIFICATIONIS SEU DECLARATIONIS MARTYRII SERVI DEI ABBA GHEBRE
MICHAËLIS, SACERDOTIS, COOPTATI IN CONGREGATIONEM MISSIONIS
S. VINCENTII A. PAULO, IN ODIUM FIDEI, UTI FERTUR, INTEREMPTI.

Aethiopiae gentes, quas primis Ecclesiae saeculis divini verbi praecones, ab Aegypto advenientes, evangelizarunt, postea, everso potissimum imperio romano, paulatim segregatae, ab ipsa vera fide et Ecclesiae unitate, eiusque capitis Romani Pontificis communione seiunctae sunt. Aliqua quidem antiquae fidei legisque christianae observabant vestigia, sed pluribus arianorum, montanistarum, graecorum aliorumque dissidentium erroribus, magna in parte, commixta. Non defuerunt, maxime saeculis XIV et XVI, missionarii ex Ordine Franciscali et e Societate Iesu, qui, apostolico zelo et salutari doctrina, regiones illas excolere aggressi sunt. Attamen, alternis vicibus, propitia vel hostili dominatione imperante, missionis africanae opus magis vel minus attulit congruentes fructus. Schismaticorum enim opera, regumque potentia, in catholicos, praesertim in missionarios, saepe saepius excitatum fuit odium et bellum; multique Fidei assertores et vindices occubuerunt, quibus accensendi sunt illius regionis protomartyres beati Agathangelus et Cassianus ex inclyto capuccinorum Ordine. Postremis autem temporibus Fidei catholicae propagationem renovarunt sodales illustres, tum ex eodem Ordine Franciscali, inter quos clarissimus Gulielmus Massaia, postea S. R. E. Cardinalis, tum e Congregatione Missionis s. Vincentii a Paulo, ex quibus apostolatus et sanctitatis fama inclauerunt Ven. Iustinus de Iacobis, episcopus Nilopolitanus et Vicarius Apostolicus Abyssinen., eiusque praecipuus discipulus aethiops et sacerdos Abba Ghebre Michaël, de cuius vita at passione ad causam beatificationis seu declarationis martyrii ineundam, brevi sermone narratur. In aethiopica regione *Godjiam* nuncupata, saeculo XVIII, anno nempe 1788, apud oppidulum cui nomen *Mertoulé Mariam*, ortus est Dei Famulus Michaël Abba Ghebre. Ex historicis documentis et testium depositionibus iuridice constat quod eius pater fuit Akilo, et ipse, tum puer tum adolescens, virtutis amore et scientiae studio effulsit. In loco et tempore schismate et haeresi contaminatis, Michaël, licet in schismate natus et errorum tenebris, iuxta sectam *Kevat*, ad quam pertinebat, obscuratus, tamen, timens Deum, operibus et precibus Eum sibi propitium reddere satagebat. Anceps dubiisque agitatus circa suae vitae statum et religionem, magis incensus erat ad veritatem inquirendam et iustitiam sectandam. In quo discrimine versatus, omne studium adhibuit ad assequendum quod optabat et, factus iam adultus, unam Christi Fidem se profiteri ostendens, monasterium satis illustre ingressus est et

inter monachos adscitus. Quo suis autem verae doctrinae inquirendae satisfaceret votis, sodalium et superiorum consilio adhaerens, celebre monasterium *Debré-Motza* adivit, ea spe suffultus, ut ex veterum librorum lectione et monachorum conversatione et doctrina instrueretur. Verum nec studiis nec expectationi respondit optatus exitus. Neque melior exstitit scholasticus fructus sub duobus monachis doctisque magistris Haléka Oueldé Sellasié atque Azadi Lamieh, degentibus in urbe Gondar, ad quam ipse, eadem spe fretus, migraverat. Itaque, de monasterio in monasterium, de magistris in magistros transiens, suas anxietates et dubia nec enodare nec deponere poterat. Interim Michaëlem, eruditione et virtute praeditum, plures adolescentuli existimabant et, annuentibus parentibus, ad illum confluebant, ut Fide, litteris bonisque moribus imbuerenter. Ex discipulis habuit sibi carissimum ipsius regis filium Ioannem, eosque omnes affectu et labore docuit et erudivit in illustri monasterio *Goundé-Goundé*, quo ad finem sibi propositum consequendum se receperat. Contigit autem quod Oubié rex, Tigrensi regione potitus, unam eandemque volens suis subditis esse fidem et religionem, e medio sublata sectarum varietate, ad hoc opus suscipiendum et absolvendum legatos constituit, inter quos ipse Michaël, prudentia et zelo pollens, electus fuit, Paulo post ad aethiopum littora appulit Ven. Dei Famulus Iustinus de Iacobis, e Congregatione missionariorum sancti Vincentii a Paulo, qui, verbo et exemplo, illas regiones quaquaversus perustrabat ad catholicam religionem propagandam. Hic sacerdos europaeus a rege legatis praepositus, officium accepit sub conditionibus, nempe, post expletam legationem, cum ipsis legatis Romam adeundi; et catholici nominis communitatem et templum in illo regno constituendi. Voti compos factus, una cum sociis in Aegyptum profectus est Iustinus, qui, in ipso itinere, novit Michaëlem esse veritatis cupidum et bene dispositum ad veram Fidem rectamque disciplinam a novo praeceptore percipiendam: de quo idem Michaël amicis dixerat: 'Europaeum virum agnovi, qui bonam religionem docet; huic attente exaudiam. Legati quum pervenissent ad Petrum, Coptorum Patriarcham schismaticum, suam ibi missionem diligenter expleverunt. Mox, Iustino duce, Italiam per Tyrrenum mare petierunt, et Romam ingressi, hanc almam Urbem civilitatis et religionis fama celebrem consalutarunt. Iuvat hic referre quinam fuerint, Iustino de Iacobis praeside, praecipui huius legationis et peregrinationis socii; videlicet: Alleka Afté Selassié, Abba Ghebre Michaël, Reussé Debré Oueldon, Amaré Kénfou, Abba Scifou, Abba Ghebre Selassié, Deftéra Desta, Deftéra Ailou, Zacharias, etc. Legati omnes, stupore capti et admirantes vetera et nova, profana et sacra almae Urbis monumenta et templa, ineffabile solatium et gaudium experti sunt, magis auctum cum Pontifici Maximo Gregorio XVI se demisse ac humiliter sistiterunt. Magnificum urbis Romae spectaculum, solemnes functiones religiosas, viva et operosa civium Fides, quae, inde a primordiis christianae religionis, teste Paulo, annuntiabatur in universo mundo, et praesertim Romani Pontificis, Christi in terris Vicarii et Petro apostolorum principi successoris conspectus et eloquium, hoc totum ita illos foris intusque commovit, ut, divina opitulante gratia, ad veram

Fidem plures converterentur, et si non omnes, id humanis timoribus contigisse compertum est. In Aegyptum omnes reversi, ibique relicto Iustino sacerdote europaeo, legati rursus adeunt Petrum Patriarcham et coram ipso eiusque clero de vera religione strenue disputat Michaël eo felici successu, ut a Patriarcha litteras acciperet ad Episcopum schismaticum, vulgo *Abuna*, quibus universi aethiopes ad abiurandas haereses et sectas, et ad pacem et communionem cum Aegyptiorum ecclesia coptica vehementer excitabantur. Tunc Massauam urbem maritimo itinere omnes tenuerunt. Sed quum quidam presbyteri schismatici mentem et mandatum Michaëlis novissent, eidem insidias et necem moliuntur et parant, ut impedirent litterarum patriarchalium traditionem, et optatam conversionem in unam Fidem et communionem, cum sectarum detrimento et eversione. Frustra tamen : nam Michaël haec omnia declinavit, iter faciendo ad civitatem Aduam, ubi Iustinum de Iacobis libentissime revisit et alloquutus est. Inde ad urbem *Gondar* rediit, ubi coram suis presbyteris Episcopus schismaticus Salama Michaëlem excepit, sed epistolas patriarchales sibi traditas legere noluit, imo contempsit et seposuit ; Deique servum contra obstentem graviter percuti atque in vincula et carcerem conici iussit ; cognita deinde eius amicitia cum Rege, remissiori poena ipsum excommunicatione et exilio mulctavit. Michaël autem patria relicta, Aduam petiit, ibi cum Iustino de Iacobis de religione disserens, meruit a Deo accipere lumen Fidei et gratiae donum. Abiurata enim haeresi, in gremium Romanae Ecclesiae ab ipso Iustino susceptus est ; huiusque conversionis exemplum plures quoque aethiopes sequuti sunt. Inde ira et odio exarsit Episcopus haereticus contra catholicos et missionarios, et Michaëlem eiusque comitem Abba Téklé Gorghis tormentis, catenis et durissimo carcere damnavit. Quod quum addidisset Iustinus, obsequentibus litteris ad regem Oubié missis, utriusque viri libertatem postulavit et obtinuit. Tunc ambo, vinculis soluti et ad libertatem restituti, descenderunt Alitienam et ab ipso Iustino de Iacobis, qui, Massauam secedere coactus, illic consecrationem episcopalem per manus Episcopi Massaia iam receperat, quique tunc Alitienae morabatur, atque ab universo populo gratulatione ac laetitia excepti et ad templum deducti, gratias Deo optimo maximo tum passionis tum liberationis reddiderunt. Paulo post Michaël, virtute et merito dignus, ab eodem Episcopo Nilopolitano Iustino, per omnes et singulos Ordinum gradus promotus, sacerdotio est auctus, eiusque adiutor et comes assiduus, etiam in Congregationem Missionis cooptatus, maxime adlaboravit in ministerio verbi Dei, in sacris libris amarico sermone vulgandis ad popularium usum et utilitatem, indefessus ad conversionem civium et confutationem haereticorum, fulgens catholicae doctrinae vindex et propugnator atque christianae virtutis exemplar. Hoc decurrente tempore, Theodorus rex Abyssinae, inito foedere cum amico Salama episcopo, decretum edidit iussitque aethiopes universos unam eandemque Fidem profiteri oportere, sancita poena mortis contradicentibus. Nova fidei formula, ab ipso schismatico episcopo composita et proclamata asserebat : ‘ Christum Salvatorem in ipsa sua humanitate esse Deum, atque uti hominem habere unam eandemque

scientiam Dei Patris et Spiritus Sancti.' Quare, instante Salama, decreto regio Iustinus europaeus in exilium pulsus est, aethiopes vero catholici tormentis subiecti, nisi suam religionem desererent et propositam fidei formulam unice profiterentur. Michaël, constanter respuens formulam haereticam firmiterque profitens catholicam suae Fidei confessionem, pluries tormentis cruciatus et flagellis caesus, in horridum carcerem detrusus est, catenis onustus. Tandem decimoquarto captivitatis mense, laboribus et vexationibus debilitatus et fractus, strenuus Christi Athleta spiritum Deo reddidit, exeunte mense augusto, in calendario aethiopum anno 1847 (1855), aetatis suae sexagesimo quarto. Eius corpus ab amico et comite Deftéra Desta elatum et sepultum prope domum cuiusdam Sedik Abroyé, in provincia *Ovaré*, regni Gallensis, fertur fidelium pietate et frequentia necnon quibusdam signis et prodigiis fuisse statim illustratum. Super fama autem sanctitatis et martyrii Servi Dei, ab eius obitu usque ad haec tempora, constructi sunt Processus Informativi, auctoritate ecclesiastica, Abyssinae anno 1904 et Eritreae anno 1909, atque Romam ad Sacram Rituum Congregationem delati, ex quibus superius descripta de vita et passione Abba Ghebre Michaëlis habentur desumpta. Quae quum ita sint, instante Rm̃o Dño Raphaële Ricciardelli, Congregationis Missionis procuratore generali et huius causae postulatore, servato iuris ordine, attentisque litteris postulatoriis quorundam Eñorum S. R. E. Cardinalium, plurium Archiepiscoporum et Episcoporum, rogantibus etiam Vicariis Apostolicis et Superioribus Abyssinae, Eritreae aliorumque missionum, praepositis generalibus Ordinum et Congregationum una cum superiore generali et visitoribus Congregationis missionis atque antistita generali Puellarum caritatis s. Vincentii a Paulo aliisque illustribus viris et mulieribus, infrascriptus Cardinalis Antonius Vico, Episcopus Portuen. et S. Rufinae, loco et vice Eñi ac Rm̃i Dñi Cardinalis Caietani Bisleti, eiusdem causae Ponentis seu Relatoris, in Ordinario sacrae Rituum Congregationis coetu, subsignata die ad Vaticanas aedes coadunato, sequens dubium discutiendum proposuit: *An signanda sit Commissio introductionis causae in casu et ad effectum de quo agitur?* Et Eñi ac Rm̃i Patres sacris tuendis ritibus praepositi, post relationem ipsius Cardinalis proponentis, audito voce et scripto R. P. D. Angelo Mariani, Fidei promotore generali, omnibus sedulo perpensis, rescribendum censuerunt: *Affirmative seu signandam esse Commissionem introductionis causae, si Sanctissimo placuerit.* Die 24 februarii 1920.

Facta postmodum Sanctissimo Domino nostro Benedicto Papae XV per infrascriptum Cardinalem Sacrae Rituum Congregationi Praefectum relatione, Sanctitas Sua Rescriptum eiusdem Sacrae Congregationis ratum habens, propria manu signare dignata est Commissionem Introductionis Causae beatificationis seu declarationis martyrii Servi Dei Abba Ghebre Michaëlis, sacerdotis, cooptati in Congregationem Missionis s. Vincentii a Paulo, die 25 eisdem mense et anno.

✠ A. CARD. VICO, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae,
S. R. C. Praefectus.

L. ✠ S.

ALEXANDER VERDE, Secretarius.

DOUBTS REGARDING CERTAIN PRIVILEGES, INSIGNIA AND
FUNCTIONS OF BISHOPS SOLVED BY THE CONGREGATION
OF RITES

(November 26, 1919)

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM

DUBIA

DE QUIBUSDAM EPISCOPORUM PRIVILEGIIS, INSIGNIBUS AC FUNCTIONIBUS

Sacra Rituum Congregatio enixe rogata est, ut opportune insequentia, de quibusdam Episcoporum privilegiis, insignibus ac functionibus, dubia enodare dignaretur, nimirum :

I. De quolibet Episcopo, quaeritur :

1. Num Episcopale biretum rubro torulo exornari queat ?

2. Num cuivis Episcopo liberum sit uti cappa ceterisque vestibus e panno serico et undulato (vulgo *amoerro*), aut saltem serico ?

3. Utrum violacei coloris esse possint, an potius nigri coloris esse debeant, vestis talaris, mantelletum et forte mozzeta et biretum Episcopi, in iis functionibus quae poenitentiae temporibus, vel pro defunctis fiunt ?

4. Num unquam Episcopus, stante praesertim consuetudine, v. g. ad Confirmationem sive publice sive privatim ministrandam, aut in processionibus, gestare possit stolam et mitram et pastoralementum cum habitu praelatitio uti supra ?

5. Num usus mitrae argenteae cum laciniis item argenteis, pro simplici mitra damascena vel linea cum rubeis laciniis, sicubi invecus fuerit, tolerandus sit ?

II. De Episcopo in propria dioecesi, petitur :

1. Praesente S. R. E. purpurato Patre non Legato, utrum mozzetam, an satius mantelletum, Episcopus Ordinarius induat ?

2. Praesente item Cardinali vel Metropolitano, debeatne Episcopus Ordinarius cappam, si induerit, reflexam sustinere, et a privatis benedictionibus abstinere ?

3. Possitne Episcopus Ordinarius, post Missam de *Requiem*, cui mozzeta indutus in Choro adfuit, stolam super amictum, et pluviale assumere, et, recedente Celebrante, absolutionem ad tumultum ritu consueto peragere ?

4. Utrum Episcopo Missam lectam (sive privatam, sive Ordinationis) celebranti assistere valeant ad altare, ubi saltem id iam moris est, duo Canonici quibusvis insignibus vestiti ; an tantum adhibito superpelliceo super rochetum, si huius usu gaudeant ?

III. De Episcopo extra propriam dioecesim, inquiritur :

1. Num, attenda consuetudine, tolerari possit ut Episcopus extraneus, sive praesente, sive absente Episcopo Ordinario, non mantelletum, sed mozzeta super rochetum utatur ?

2. Num et quando extraneo Episcopo fas sit, praesente vel absente Episcopo Ordinario, cappam adhibere ?

3. Quomodo Episcopus extraneus, si, functione id requirente, aut annuente Episcopo Ordinario, pastorali baculo utatur, superiorem huiusce baculi partem vertere debeat ?

4. Praesente Episcopo Ordinario, qui extraneo Episcopo solemniter celebranti throni usum concessit, utrum hic thronus esse possit thronus ipsius Episcopi Ordinarii ab Evangelii parte positus ; an erigi debeat a parte Epistolae thronus alter, Episcopo quidem Ordinario proprium thronum retinente ?

5. Possitne Episcopus Ordinarius assistere in proprio throno, dum Metropolitanus in altero throno, ab Epistolae parte posito, solemniter celebrat ?

6. Si Metropolitanus, vel Episcopus extraneus, utens Episcopi Ordinarii throno, pontificaliter celebret :

(a) num septimum candelabrum adhibendum sit ?

(b) possintne, praeter presbyterum assistentem et diaconum et subdiaconum, duo etiam diaconi parati Episcopo celebranti adsistere ?

7. Assistente Episcopo Ordinario in proprio throno, dum alter Episcopus solemniter ad faldistorium celebrat, si, cantato Evangelio, fiat concio :

(a) utri Episcopo concionatorem ante sermonem benedicere competat ?

(b) coram utro, in fine, diaconus confessionem decantare debeat ?

(c) utrius sit solemnem tunc benedictionem impertiri ?

8. Si forte eiusmodi concio ab alio Episcopo praesente, ut supra, vel celebrante Episcopo Ordinario, habita sit, quis indulgentias post publicam confessionem nuntiare debeat ?

9. Assistente autem in Choro, vel absente, Episcopo Ordinario, dum extraneus Episcopus pontificaliter in eius throno celebrat, si fiat post Evangelium concio, numquid hac conclusa, solemnis quoque benedictio dari debeat, aut possit ?

IV. De pluribus Episcopis simul praesentibus, dubitatur :

1. Fierine debeat Episcoporum, Missae solemnii pontificali adsistentium, thurificatio statim ante incensationem presbyteri et diaconorum paratorum, qui Episcopi celebranti adsistunt ?

2. Num probanda sit consuetudo instituendi, solemnitatum quarumdam occasione, processiones, in quibus omnes, qui eisdem intersunt, Episcopi stola et pluviali et mitra parati sunt, ac baculum pastorem gestant ?

3. In eiusmodi processionibus :

(a) quonam ordine incedere debeant tum Episcopus qui processioni praest, tum ceteri Episcopi ?

(b) num debeatur, an saltem concedi possit, singulis Episcopis non celebrantibus duorum canonicorum adsistentia ?

4. Num probari possit ut populo, piae cuiusdam peregrinationis aut festivitatis occasione congregato, omnes simul Episcopi praesentes

consuetam benedictionem, verba una voce decantantes, solemniter imperiantur ?

V. De Episcopo Ordinario et de Vicario Generali, qui est Episcopus titularis Auxiliaris.

1. Potestne Episcopus Ordinarius permittere suo Vicario Generali, qui est etiam Episcopus titularis Auxiliaris, induere solam mozzetam loco mantelleti ?

2. Idem Vicarius Episcopus etiam Auxiliaris potestne benedicere populo intra et extra Ecclesiam ?

3. Attento can. 337 § 3, *Codicis I. C.*, manetne in suo robore Decretum S. R. C., n. 4023, diei 12 iunii 1899, super iure Episcoporum Dioecesanorum cedendi thronum alteri Episcopo ?

Sacra porro Rituum Congregatio, audito specialis Commissionis suffragio, omnibus et singulis propositis quaestionibus maturo examine perpensis, ita rescribendum censuit ; nimirum :

I.—Ad 1. Negative.

Ad 2. Negative, iuxta *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* (lib. I, cap. III, nn. 1, 3), adhibito nempe rudiori vel leviori panno ex lana pro opportunitate : textili enim serico (non undulato) legitime utuntur qui sunt de Cappella, Domo, Familia Summi Pontificis.

Ad 3. Romae, semper esse debent violacei coloris, excepta Sede vacante ; extra Urbem, laudabiliter coloris nigri, exceptis bireto ac pileolo, quae semper erunt violacei coloris.

Ad 4. Negative, et servantur : *Pontificale Romanum* (edit. typ., 3 augusti 1888), *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* (edit typ., 21 augusti 1886), et Decreta.

Ad 5. Negative, quum mitra ex tela argentea sit propria Summi Pontificis in luctuosis ; sed neque damascena, quae vel Cardinalium (specialis) vel Protonotariorum Apostolicorum ad instar est propria.

II. Ad 1. Servetur *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* (lib. I, cap. IV, n. 7).

Ad 2. Ad primam partem, affirmative. Attamen illam explicabit pontificalia peractus, inserviente de ea caudatario, illos actus excipiendo, quos immediate cum Cardinali vel Metropolitano aut versus eos exhibeat. Ad secundam affirmative, iuxta *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* (lib. I, cap. IV).

Ad 3. Affirmative.

Ad 4. Negative ad primam partem ; affirmative ad secundam.

III.—Ad 1. Imo convenit, *domi*, invitante Episcopo Ordinario, aut ex praesumpto ipsius beneplacito ; *extra*, negative, nisi iuxta *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* (lib. I, cap. IV, nn. 4 et 7) et Decreta (praesertim Decr. n. 388, *Ianuen.*, 20 iulii 1621), cum mozzeta habeatur simul mantelletum : paulatim amota, iuxta prudens arbitrium Ordinarii, consuetudine, ubi adsit.

Ad 2. Rite utitur cappa, quando Pontificalia solemnia ad solium legitime peragit ; si tamen sit Ordinarii Coadiutor seu Auxiliaris, uti

poterit iis in adiunctis, in quibus licet iuxta leges liturgicas, de licentia Ordinarii, ad mentem Decretorum S. R. C. nn. 2010, *Veliterna*, 6 septembris 1698, ad 1 et 2; 2011, *Veliterna*, item 6 septembris 1698, ad 1, et 4023, 12 iunii 1899.

Ad 3. Semper cum parte reflexa ab se; scilicet, versus personas vel res quas proscribit.

Ad 4. Affirmative ad primam partem; imo Missae pontificalis ad thronum celebratio ad tramitem *Caeremonialis Episcoporum* habenda est, etiam quoad situm throni Celebrantis, qui sit in abside, seu in centro Chori, aut e cornu Evangelii. Negative ad secundam salvo iure Metropolitani et Legati Apostolici Episcopali characterе insigniti, quoad assistentiam in throno a latere Epistolae, celebrante Episcopo, etiam Ordinario, ad faldistorium, iuxta *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* (lib. I, cap. XXIII, n. 24, et lib. II, cap. IX, nn. 5-7); quod assistentiae ius non competit cuilibet Episcopo Ordinario, nisi ad tramitem *Caeremonialis Episcoporum*, loco secundo citato, scilicet in propria sede, celebrante alio Episcopo ad faldistorium.

Ad 5. Negative.

Ad 6. Ad (a): Negative; ad (b): Affirmative.

Ad 7. Ad a, b, c. Servetur *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* (lib. II, cap. IX, nn. 5-7), delata Episcopo Ordinario etiam benedictione concionatoris.

Ad 8. Servetur *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* (lib. II, cap. VIII, n. 51).

Ad 9. Negative, quum benedictio, ex *Caeremoniali* et *Pontificali*, secumferat Indulgentiarum concessione, quam omittere irregulare esset; verumtamen Episcopus celebrans, neque ex Ordinarii delegatione, valeret Indulgentias concedere; Ordinarius autem non posset benedictionem impertiri, quippe quae a celebratione nequit separari.

IV.—Ad 1. Servetur *Caeremoniale Episcoporum*.

Ad 2. Nihil obstat; abstineant tamen a stola et baculo pastoralis gerendis.

Ad 3. Ad (a): Servetur consuetus in processionebus ordo; ad (b): Negative in casu.

Ad 4. Negative, non obstante, sicubi inoleverit, istiusmodi consuetudine, quae prudenter eliminanda est.

V.—Ad 1. Negative.

Ad 2. Episcopus auxiliaris, qui simul sit Vicarius Generalis, potest in Dioecesi ubique benedicere populo, tum in Ecclesia tum extra Ecclesiam, idque iure, quin opus sit specialem concessione obtinere ab Episcopo Ordinario; ad normam can. 370 § 2, collati cum can. 349 § 1 et 239 § 1, n. 12.

Ad 3. Affirmative.

Atque ita rescripsit, declaravit et servari mandavit.

Die 26 novembris 1919.

✠ A. CARD. VICO, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae,
S. R. C. Praefectus.

L. ✠ S.

ALEXANDER VERDE, Secretarius.

REVIEWS AND NOTES

ST. BERNARD'S SERMONS ON THE CANTICLE OF CANTICLES. Translated by A Priest of Mount Melleray. Vol. I. Dublin : Browne and Nolan, Ltd.

THE Canticle of Canticles, one of the three books of Solomon, contained in the Hebrew, the Greek, and the Christian Canon of the Scriptures, according to the general interpretation of the name, signifies 'most excellent, best song.' The book describes the love for each other of Solomon and the Sulamitess in lyrico-dramatic scenes and reciprocal songs. Before the 16th century tradition gave an allegorical or symbolical meaning to this love, the love of Christ for His Church. At the present day most non-Catholics are strongly opposed to the higher interpretation; on the other hand most Catholics accept the allegorical interpretation of the book, which is found not only in the tradition and the decision of the Church but also in the song itself.

The spiritual interpretation of the song has proved a rich source for mystical theology and asceticism. Gregory of Nyssa, Theodoret, Ambrose, Gregory the Great, Venerable Bede have all written commentaries on it. The greatest of the saints enkindled their love for God on the tender expressions of affection of Christ and his bride, the Church, in the Canticle of Canticles. Perhaps no one bestowed such care on and devoted so much time to the interpretation of the Canticle as St. Bernard, the Doctor of Love and Prince of Mystics. The Sermons containing this interpretation were begun in the Advent of 1135 and continued until his death in 1153. Interruptions were frequent and long, for the preacher was often called away to bring to an end a dangerous schism, to make peace between princes, to put an end to scandals, or to marshal the forces of Europe for another mighty effort against the powers of the Saracen. In all he delivered 86 homilies. The text of the 'Song of Solomon' serves him but as a framework whereon to weave the wondrously beautiful fabrics of an extraordinarily fertile imagination, and as a medium to contemplate all things in heaven, on earth, and under the earth. Thus, these homilies, instead of being dry as dust, are as varied and many-coloured as is the spiritual life, every aspect of which they discuss with equal solidity and elegance. They exhibit the same independence of thought and treatment which characterises all the other works of St. Bernard. No other writer is so full of Holy Scripture, from which he borrows something in nearly every sentence. Death overtook him when engaged on the first verse of the third chapter, that is when he had completed a fourth of his task. Gilbert of Hoyland took up the work

where St. Bernard had left off, and added 48 homilies, which, in the judgment of Mabillon, are almost worthy of the Saint himself. According to the same eminent authority, this Gilbert was an Irishman, and Abbot of St. Mary's, Dublin.

These homilies of St. Bernard contain whatever the holy Doctor has said in his other works on the virtues and vices and on the spiritual life, but with greater solidity and elevation of style. The questions so beautifully treated are precisely those which appear in St. Thomas's *Summa*. In this immortal code of divine love, St. Bernard celebrates the nuptials of the soul with God. Human tenderness, no matter how eloquent, has never inspired accents more passionate or more profound. Besides possessing in an extraordinary degree the gifts of devotion and sanctity, genius and learning, he was gifted with a sublime eloquence. 'His mouth,' said St. Thomas Aquinas, 'was a chalice of purest gold, all studded with jewels, making the whole world drunk with the wine of its sweetness.' He enkindles in the hearts of his readers the same sweet flame of love which consumes his own. 'Next to the Sacred Scriptures,' says Mabillon, 'no works should be more prized by the religious-minded, for none are more profitable, than those of St. Bernard.' His influence is clearly discernible in the *Imitation of Christ*, in the *Summa* of St. Thomas, and in the *Divina Commedia* of Dante.

And yet, the writings of the Mellifluous Doctor, those grandest of prose-poems, those sweetest of love-songs, which have been for ages the delight of religious souls and have nourished the piety of saints unnumbered, have been of late neglected, and chiefly by Catholics, with great loss to spirituality. Non-Catholic writers have shown themselves, if not more appreciative, at any rate more zealous and enterprising. Elegant translations of some of the Saint's more celebrated treatises have been published in our own times by such Protestant scholars as Drs. Eales and Gardner. The present translation of the homilies on the Cantic of Canticles is the first attempt on the part of a Catholic to render them available for English readers. The translator has endeavoured to be faithful to the original, and to represent the author's thought simply and clearly without any effort after ornament or eloquence. It has been an arduous task. Some consider St. Bernard's sermons almost untranslatable. That, however, is an exaggeration. But this at least is true, that there is scarcely another writer whose thought is so difficult to detach from his language, because there is scarcely another whose language is so closely wedded to his thought. That makes the translation all the more praise-worthy, for it reads as an original work in excellent, graceful English. We sincerely congratulate the Priest of Mount Melleray not only on the success he has achieved but also on the selection for his translation. Vol. I contains the first 48 Homilies, and Vol. II will contain the remainder. Vol. III will include, with selected treatises, the Saint's 27 Homilies on Psalm xc. These have never before appeared in English.

THE GRAY NUNS IN THE FAR NORTH (1867-1917). By Rev. P. Duchaussois, O.M.I. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart; London: Burns and Oates, Washbourne.

WHEN we opened this book we expected to find a dry narrative of the foundation of Convents and Schools. We expected it to be one of local interest, a kind of pious tribute to a particular order of nuns. We were agreeably surprised. The book turns out to be one of absorbing interest. It is a narrative as thrilling as any tale of travel and adventure written by the great explorers. It is as full of incidents of extraordinary human interest and appeal as the best Canadian novel. It is all the more interesting as it tells of real people and real adventures in the service of Christ. It is a record of heroism, self-denial, and sacrifice in the lone Northland, one of the grandest examples of self-devotion which the Church of Christ has ever inspired in the course of ages. It is the story of a great mission, of 'those women who have laboured with us in the Gospel,' to heal not only the souls but the bodies of the Indians of this wild region, to bring religious instruction and education to the snow-bound natives of the Arctic Ocean.

The opening chapters of this volume give the story of the founding of the Order of the Gray Nuns at Montreal by Madame d'Youville, and the extension of their work later to Manitoba. It was a work that was beset with difficulties brought about by poverty and calumny. All manner of charitable work for the infirm, the leprous, the fallen, and for foundlings was undertaken generously and willingly by the little band. Their only resources were derived from the work of their hands, which were only a third of what they were able to gain before the English came. The branch houses now spread abroad from the Atlantic to the Arctic Ocean, and the nuns actually number over 4,000. The Cause of Beatification of the Venerable Foundress was introduced before the Roman Tribunals on March 27, 1890, and the formal document of preparation was signed by Leo XIII.

Mgr. Provencher, the first missionary of the North-west, and the first Bishop of the Red River, or St. Boniface, had been seeking in vain for motherly hands to break the bread of instruction for the little ones of his diocese. He was told to try the Gray Nuns; "they never refuse." Accordingly, on April 24, 1844, four of them set out on their great journey into the Great Lone Land. The modern tourist covers in four days the 2,200 miles, which took four months in the olden times. Travelling into the North-west in primitive fashion means a frail and inconvenient canoe, with a crew not over-civilized, shooting some rapids, endless portages elsewhere, rude carts on rough roads, slow and stubborn oxen, forced marches, treacherous quagmires, nights in the open air, piercing wind and rain, ice that comes too soon, and thaw that comes too late, snow-storm and wreck, unbearable cold, and then millions of mosquitoes, with heat as if of the dog-days. Such was the itinerary of these kind, delicately-reared nuns going to live among savages. They would be thankful if they had a hut for shelter from the ice and snow, and food that a criminal in penal servitude would not be offered. Since 1844, hundreds of

other Gray Nuns have followed to take up the work of the various missions established even up to the Arctic Ocean.

The book tells of the perilous travels, the difficulty of obtaining food, and of storing it, the marvellous work of Christianising and educating the Indian tribes who were given over to pagan practices. When we consider that the nuns had to build convents and schools, feed and clothe the native children and nurse and doctor the sick in their homes and hospitals, and that they received practically no help from the Indians themselves, and all this in a land ice-bound most of the year, we can realize what super-human efforts were required. And yet, to day, these convents and schools, as shown in excellent photographs contained in the book, show that they are most up-to-date. The groups of the native children show how happy they are with the nuns, well-fed and clothed. Many of the native children have turned out to be veritable saints. The book abounds in excellent photographs of great variety and interest, dealing with the habits of life and the dangers and vicissitudes to be overcome. The missions have been nobly helped by the Oblate Brothers, who devote their lives to fishing (fish is the daily bread), wood-cutting, building, etc.

The book is admirably written in fluent English, is printed on superfine paper, and is beautifully illustrated throughout. It will provide interesting and edifying reading, and will be a welcome addition to parochial, college, and convent libraries.

M. R.

BOOKS, ETC., RECEIVED.

- America* : A Catholic Review (May).
The Ecclesiastical Review (May). U.S.A.
The Rosary Magazine (May). Somerset, Ohio.
The Catholic World (May). New York.
The Austral Light (April). Melbourne.
The Ave Maria (April). Notre Dame, Indiana.
The Irish Monthly (May). Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.
The Catholic Bulletin (May). Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.
The Month (May). London : Longmans.
Études (May). Paris : 12 Rue Oudinot (VII^e).
Revue Pratique d'Apologétique (May). Paris : Beauchesne.
Revue du Clergé Français (May). Paris : Letouzey et Ané.
The Fortnightly Review (May). St. Louis, Mo.
The Lamp (May). Garrison, N.Y.
Revue des Jeunes (May). Paris : 3 Rue de Luynes.
The Homiletic Monthly (June). London : Burns & Oates.
A Garland for Our Lady. By A Member of the Ursuline Community, Sligo. London : Burns & Oates.
The Catholic Student. By Rev. M. Hickey, D.D., D.Ph. Dublin : Browne & Nolan.



BX 801 .I68 1920 SMC
The Irish ecclesiastical
record 47085658

r.15 •

Does Not Circulate

