

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE



3 1761 07096555 3

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





FEB 20 1954

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

JANUARY, 1887.

DR. MIVART'S DEFENCE OF THEISM.

IT occurs to me that there has not yet appeared in the RECORD any sufficient notice of Dr. Mivart's latest work,¹ which is now going through a second edition. And yet it is a notable book,—notable both for the importance of the questions which it treats, and for the conspicuous ability with which they are treated. It belongs, however, to the third rather than to either the first or second of Bacon's classes; if lightly tasted or hastily swallowed, it is a rather disagreeable pill of little utility; but when chewed and digested it will be found to give out juices of sweetest savour, as well as of greatest efficacy both for the correction of philosophic thought and for the sustainment of intellectual life.

Many priests who are fairly read in the philosophy of the Schools, feel a want somewhere;—as if the old principles would not harmonize with modern progress; as if the peripatetic philosophy were brushed aside by the rapid rush of physical science in these latter days. Chemistry seems to many to have done away with substantial forms in inorganic matter; and evolution threatens to be equally destructive to the old notions which prevailed about living things. We are taught to believe more in gases and molecules, in forces and modes of motion. Dr. Mivart has done noble work for those who feel the difficulty here suggested; without prejudice to others one may be allowed to link with his name that of Fr. Harper.²

¹ "Nature and Thought." London: Burns & Oates.

² "Metaphysics of the School." London: Macmillan & Co.

Dr. Mivart is too well known to need any introduction to the readers of these pages. Without, however, committing myself in any way to all his views, it may not be out of place to remark how exceptionally well his life-training has fitted him for the defence of Theism. For he knows what few know,—both sides of the question. Having struggled, as he himself tells us, out of the philosophy of ‘nescience,’ he has taken a foremost part in the controversies which are connected with Darwin’s theories; he is therefore well qualified to tell us what materialists mean. He knows their books as well as they do themselves; many of their ablest men in England he has met; he has discussed the leading questions with them personally; in private intercourse and in the press they have combated his opinions. And he is no less a master of the old than of the new philosophy.

It is not my purpose to review here all the questions which Dr. Mivart has treated; such a task would demand extensive knowledge of biology and physiology, not to mention other natural sciences,—knowledge to which I have no claim. As a rule, however, his books culminate in a defence of Theism. He is a student of nature, but only to feel the insufficiency of the study; he is not content with observation and experiment, he is a philosopher and must know the *why*. Every harmony of force, every new process of development, every shade of beauty, serves but as a link in the great chain of causes by which he, as every true philosopher, is led up to God.

In explaining Dr. Mivart’s defence of Theism, I should like, as far as possible, to make use of his own words and his own form of argument; but they are not such as some readers may be accustomed to. I will claim the indulgence of putting the case in my own way, drawing occasionally on other sources for arguments which, perhaps, Dr. Mivart may think of little worth. The chain of reasoning and many of its links shall be supplied by him; here and there I shall venture to make additions from other sources.

The doctrine of Theism is based on the following theses.

(1) There was always something. (2) There is and must

always have been underneath, behind, and distinct from matter, an agent which ever works in and through matter, and which created it, if it ever was created. (3) This hidden agent is itself without cause. (4) It is a substance complete and rational, and therefore a person. (5) The Personal First Cause is such that all created intelligences and wills are bound to submit to Him; nay more, He is such that all possible wills and intelligences should, if created, be bound so to submit themselves. Let us consider these theses in order.

THESES I.

“There was always something.”

Reasonable minds will have no difficulty in admitting this; it is a truth based on a well-known principle,—nothing can come into existence without a sufficient cause. If ever there was nothing, no thing could ever begin to be. Hence materialists, when off their guard, contend that matter was always in existence; this is an admission of our first thesis.

The foregoing argument is based on two suppositions;—(1) that there *is* something; (2) that the principle of causation is necessarily true,—that is, true for all space and all time, nay independently of both space and time. No sane man, at least out of Germany, seems disposed to deny the first of these propositions; and indeed who can assert that at least he himself does not exist?

Around the second proposition, however, a fierce controversy rages, the leader of our opponents being Mr. Mill.

Our adversaries would have us believe that no principle can be said to be necessarily true; the most they admit is that, owing to our associations, we cannot imagine how certain propositions can be false. Thus, for instance, we cannot see how parallel straight lines can ever anywhere enclose a space; but they may do so elsewhere or at another time. Nay it is contended that if a reasoning being were brought up between two railway tracks, and if it could see them extend ever so far and apparently approach to a point, and if it could never advance to that point to test the reality of the meeting,—it is contended that such a being should conclude that parallel straight lines must enclose spaces.

I had occasion before¹ to refer to this question; and as it will crop up again further on in this argument, I shall not now delay to discuss it further. If the Association teaching were true, it would follow that in some of the stars the shortest way from point to point might be round a curve, triangles might each have angles equal to ten or a thousand right angles, there might even be such things as square circles. More curious still, if the same doctrine were true, it might be at the same time false: for how can an Associationist know that in Aldebaran his own philosophy *must* hold good, and that the teaching of the Schoolmen, though false here, may not be necessarily true in Sirius? ²

THESIS II.

“There is and must always have been underneath, behind, and distinct from matter, an agent which ever works in and through matter, and which created it, if it ever was created.”

In explanation of the conditional clause at the end of the thesis, I may premise that I wish as far as possible to keep clear of disputed points; and it is disputed whether we could ever know from reason alone that the world was created. St. Thomas and a great body of the Schoolmen held that it could not be known.

The proof of the thesis is based on the following propositions: (1) Matter of itself is unable to produce all the substantial changes which are continually taking place around us. (2) Our intellect forces us to acknowledge that certain judgments are necessarily true; but if there were nothing but matter, there could be no necessary truth. (3) Our reason tells us that we are free and subject to a moral law; but if there were nothing but matter, there could be no free will and consequently no moral order.

It may bring out the force of this line of argument if I remark, before proceeding to deal with the propositions, that they are all denied by materialists. These philosophers hold

¹ RECORD, August, 1884.

² See Ward's "Philosophy of Theism," vol. i., Essays i-vi.; Mivart, "Lessons from Nature," chap. ii.

(1) that matter contains in itself the promise and potency of all the phenomena of nature; (2) that there are no such things as necessary truths; and (3) that free will and the moral law are a delusion. Let us now examine our propositions in order.

PROPOSITION I.

“Matter of itself is unable to produce all the substantial changes which are continually taking place around us.”

It would very much simplify the controversy about the potency of matter, if we knew thoroughly what matter is. But we do not know it thoroughly;—not we certainly, much less the materialists.

We can reduce solids to the liquid state, and from that again to the gaseous; but there we stand still; apply what further force we may, the gas will remain gas. We can subdivide matter almost indefinitely, into molecules, monads, atoms,—call them what you will; but we never reach the ultimate indivisible atom, if such there be; microscope and spectroscope are equally of no avail.

It is so also with regard to chemical analysis. The number of simple elements set down in modern treatises, is sixty-five or sixty-six. We know, however, that this is but a formula; we count them so many because we cannot further simplify these substances with the power at our disposal. We have a shrewd suspicion, however, that greater power would reduce many of our so-called simple elements to others more simple still. It is not long since some were so resolved, which up to that were considered elemental; and what happened in some cases would in all likelihood occur again. This point should be carefully impressed in the mind,—that experiment stops short of revealing the inmost chambers of material natures.

It will be found, I think, to be the most commonly received opinion among materialists, that what we call “matter” is only a form of force. But how many *kinds* of force are there? Is there one to correspond with each of the elements, and if so how many are the elements? Or is matter altogether made up of one, or two, or at most a few kinds of force, the particles of which are bound up together in ever varying forms? Who knows?

If there is any one thing certain about matter it is this,—that it cannot create a new force; neither can it annihilate. It can produce *accidents*; it can vary the *direction* of forces already existing; but it is quite unable to reduce to nothing, or to produce from nothing either a new kind of force or an increase in quantity of a kind already in existence. This principle is essential to the argument which is about to be advanced.

Dr. Mivart explains with his usual fairness the materialistic view of the genesis of the universe; whoever has read Mr. Spencer's "First Principles" will admit that the following extracts are not a bad summary of his views:

"When the first womb of things was pregnant with all the future, there existed probably but one of the formulæ we call 'natural laws'—namely, the law of gravitation. Here we may take our stand. It does not signify whether there ever was a time when gravitation was not (*i.e.* when matter, as we know it, did not exist): for if there ever was such a time, there is no reason to doubt, but every reason to conclude, that the evolution of matter, as we know it, was accomplished in accordance with law. Similarly, it is overwhelmingly probable, from analogy, that if our knowledge of molecular physics were sufficiently great, the existence of gravitation would be found to follow as a necessary deduction from the primary qualities of matter and force. Starting, then, with matter, force, and gravitation, what must happen? Diffused nebular matter must begin to concentrate, and, being opposed by atomic repulsions, must evolve heat,—*i.e.* a new form of matter and force. Then radiation and further approximation and new combinations will ever result in new effects; and with heat and pressure chemical combinations will suddenly arise, and so on and on. Thus new natural laws will be self-generated, till we get to the present marvellous complexity with life and mind; and thus science—by establishing the doctrine of the persistence of force and the indestructibility of matter—has effectually disproved the hypothesis that the presence of law and order in nature implies an intelligent law-giver."¹

Dr. Mivart then asks his materialistic opponent whether he can "point to any natural indications of the physical

¹ "Lessons from Nature," p. 177.

causation which has produced the cosmic harmony we see." The answer is :

" Yes ; the universal tendency of motion to become rhythmic—itself a necessary consequence of the persistence of force—is a sort of conservative action. Moreover, as every newly evolved law came into existence, it must have been, as it were, grafted on the stock of all pre-existing laws, and so would not enter into the cosmic system as an element of confusion, but rather as an element of further progress. Natural laws then arising by way of necessary consequence from the persistence of a single self-existing substance, it becomes a matter of scientific demonstration that the fair and orderly universe which now exists, is the one and only universe that, in the nature of things, could exist. The persistence of force and the principle of natural selection together explain everything. The various solar systems which rotate in stability are the rare chance survivors of the many worlds which happened to be cast off in less propitious orbs and surroundings. As the general laws of the universe may separately be shown to be the necessary outcome of the primary data of science, it follows that the whole collection must be for a certainty similarly explicable. Your assumption, then, of an absolute cause for the universe is a wholly gratuitous one. We cannot of course, prove a negative, and if you choose to imagine a demon, a dragon, or an angel, I cannot disprove its existence. But reasonable men will, in all cases, be guided as to their beliefs by such positive evidence as they can get."¹

The foregoing exposition will be more intelligible if I quote another paragraph from Dr. Mivart's supposed materialist :

" Why may not the whole myriad suns and systems have pulsed rhythmically through an eternal past, to and fro from a state of nebula to a state such as that in which they now exist ; or (as is perhaps more probable) why may they not so alternate bit by bit, first one and then another system of worlds collapsing into nebula, to be again slowly recharged into suns and planets ? I see no reason why such a process should ever cease or ever not have been, or why life may not be ever reappearing and creeping, as it were, over the face of the cosmos, as one cosmical body after another happens, here and there, to get into a state fit to give origin to and sustain it, a state in which it may continue for a passing moment of a few billion years."²

" Lessons from Nature," p. 178.

² *Ibid.*, p. 164.

I think it will be found that the explanation just given is a very fair statement of the materialistic view. We join issue: we contend that there are many things in the universe which could never spring from matter, however long or in whatever manner it might pulsate.

Let me be allowed to make three remarks by way of preface. (1) It will be noticed that the foregoing exposition supposes "a starting point," "when the first womb of things was pregnant with all the future." It "starts with matter, force, and gravitation;" it begs certain "primary data of science," certain "primary qualities of matter." But how could *eternal* matter "start"? If it always existed, it must have always had each one of the forces which it now has; for remember it may change the direction of a force, but it cannot create. How could it *begin* to evolve forces?

(2) Materialists invariably suppose that natural laws were "self-generated" by the process known as "natural selection," or as it has also been well-termed, "the survival of the fittest." Now though, no doubt, Mr. Darwin proved that "natural selection" is one of the many causes that contribute to the evolution of things; yet it is to my mind equally beyond doubt that selection is not the only nor even the principal cause. But granting, for the present, that natural selection is the one cause of the development of species, we may nevertheless ask: How could an eternal universe have been "selected"?

For if selected at all, it must have been selected *as a whole*. Natural laws, of which alone there is question, could not spring up in pieces, as it were; one part here and now, another part there and afterwards. If they are at all what they are named, they must come from the *nature* of matter or force; so that wherever and whenever there are matter and force, there and then must the natural law flow from them. We cannot suppose a stone to be subject to gravitation here but not in Saturn; now but not millions of years since. The law of gravitation, if natural, must have been always and everywhere, whenever and wherever matter existed.

If therefore natural laws have been self-generated by natural selection, they must have been selected throughout

the universe as a whole. But selection supposes competition and survival of the fittest: How could the universe as a whole ever have been submitted to any such struggle for existence?

(3) The explanation just given "takes its stand" on "the law of gravitation." "It does not signify whether there ever was a time when . . . matter, as we know it, did not exist; for if there was, . . . there is . . . every reason to conclude that the evolution of matter, as we know it, was accomplished in accordance with law."

Remark the words, "matter, as we know it"; they are intended as a loophole of escape in time of extremity. Now "matter, as we know it," could never have existed except there was always in existence a *force* sufficient to call it into being. Hence even materialists *must* suppose "primary qualities of matter and force," as well as "primary data of science."

This much being premised we continue our argument. Matter is either inorganic or organic; and living organisms are again subdivided into vegetables, irrational animals and men. Accordingly there are four classes of beings in the world. Our argument, however, shall be more brief and equally strong, if we discuss two of these classes—vegetables and irrational animals—under the one head of irrational organisms: thus we shall have three classes instead of four. We contend that matter of itself is unable to account for what we know of any one of the three;—that the foregoing and every other system of materialism is quite unsatisfactory. We will take up these classes in order; and we will begin with that which materialists should find easiest to explain,—inorganic matter.

SECTION I.—INORGANIC MATTER.

Materialists ask us to allow them to "start with matter, force, and gravitation." Not bad for a "start"; it is one of the ways our opponents have,—to assume their whole case and then show how everything runs smooth. They would easily uplift the earth, if only they were allowed sufficient leverage; and then,—they start with the lever.

I. We cannot be content to start with matter, force, and gravitation, without a distinct admission that *there must be something behind force*. Force alone could never form the world. I ask you to attend carefully to this point; it is the first link in the chain of argument which follows. It is proved mainly by two reasons.

1°. In the first place it is impossible that force could subsist without a subject of inhesion. "What is a force? If we consult our dictionaries we shall find a force described as being 'an active power, power that may be exerted.' It is, therefore, an active potentiality. But a potentiality must belong to *something*. It is a property, that is to say, a species of accident, and accordingly requires a subject of inhesion."¹ Hence the tendency implanted in our intellectual nature to look for the *thing* which energizes, whenever we feel that force is being exerted.

2°. Besides, the ultimate constituents of matter must be physically indivisible; if they were divisible, they could not be *ultimate*, since their component parts should be more elemental still. But indivisible units of force, without any subject of inhesion, could never form matter such as it is.

For such indivisible units must be either altogether attractive or altogether repulsive; if they were both attractive and repulsive, they should be not *one* indivisible force but *two*. They must be, then, either purely attractive or purely repulsive. Hence, to form the world one of three things should occur: either (1) purely repulsive forces should unite; or (2) purely attractive forces; or (3) attractions and repulsions should combine. Now each of these suppositions is either impossible or useless.

(1) Purely repulsive forces could not unite; if they did, they could not be purely repulsive.

(2) A combination of pure attractions would be useless for the formation of matter; since it could never cause impenetrability, extension, and other properties which can only spring from repulsion.

(3) The third hypothesis remains—that attractions and repulsions should combine. But let me ask: Are the units of equal or of unequal force?

¹ Harper, vol. ii., p. 238.

(a) If equal, they must hold each other in check, and result in pure inaction. And as there is no subject of inhesion behind the forces, this result would be a *nothing*; for where there is no activity, there is no force, and consequently nothing.

(b) Let the units, therefore, be supposed to be unequal. A question immediately arises: If they are unequal how can they both be indivisible units? For when they unite, the greater is in excess of the less. The greater, therefore, is not only divisible but divided, for the result of the union is the greater force minus the less.

Besides, such a result would not give the least help out of the difficulty; since the forces, in so far as they balance each other, are inactive and therefore nothing, having no subject of inhesion. The result, then, of the union of two unequal forces, in so far as it could be anything, must be one smaller force of the same kind as the greater of the two,—something less than was before the union.

Accordingly, since force cannot exist without a subject of inhesion, and since, even if it could, its indivisible units could never combine to form matter such as we see it,—for these two reasons we contend that force must come from a root, a something behind it in which it inheres.

But then this “force-root” must be suspiciously like the *forma substantialis*, which Schoolmen used to define as a *radix ex qua pullulat vis*. Has it, therefore, come to this, for all our phenomenism and negation of substance, that before we can understand how even one molecule is formed, we must give up Locke and turn for light to the Schools? And is it these very followers of Locke, who are wont so to ridicule the old philosophy, who, when it comes to first principles, must fall back on the very system they profess to despise? Let them, however, take care: St. Thomas is not wont to allow strangers to borrow any of his garments, without compelling them to don the whole suit. Meanwhile a principle has been established of the greatest importance,—that *behind force* there must be *something*; this something the Scholastics and the whole world call *substance*.

II. I grant now that you may form a molecule, if you renounce the phenomenism of Locke, and admit a root which becomes manifest only by its forces. Next question: How will you join molecules to form inorganic matter such as we see it? And this suggests ever so many other questions.

Shall the constituent molecules be all of the same or of different *kinds*? Shall there be but one primary element, or shall there be more than one? It will be found necessary to adopt the system of plurality.

For if the molecules were all of the same kind, it would be quite impossible for them to result in the various chemical compounds which we find in nature. Treat gold as you will, short of chemical combination with another substance, and it will remain gold. It cannot be made copper, or oak, or oxygen, or wine. Nor will it suffice to say that, if we had sufficient chemical power, we might resolve gold into simpler elements, which we might again so compound as to form one of the substances just mentioned. For that may or may not be true of gold; but it *could not* be true of *the one* primary element. Treat *it* as you will, short of chemical combination, and you can never form compounds such as we see.

This is the common teaching not of the Schoolmen only but of most modern scientists, even materialists. Mr. Spencer,¹ however, is of a different opinion,—that all substances may be homogeneous; that there may be only one element. The following facts are the only proof he gives:

“The semi-transparent, colourless, extremely active substance commonly called phosphorus, may be so changed as to become opaque, dark-red, and inert. Like changes are known to occur in some gaseous and metallic elements, as antimony. These total changes of properties, brought about without any changes to be called chemical, are interpretable only as due to molecular re-arrangements; and by showing that difference of property is producible by difference of arrangement, they support the inference otherwise to be drawn, that the properties of different elements result from difference of arrangement, arising by the compounding and recompounding of ultimate homogeneous units.”

¹ *Contemporary Review*, 1872, p. 143.

It is easy to see where the fallacy lies in Mr. Spencer's argument. We are first told of a *certain number* of changes in the phenomena of phosphorus; it may become "opaque, dark-red, inert"; and then we are asked to conclude to a "total change of properties." Why total? Colour and inertia are not the only "properties" of bodies. If the activities be changed totally, we contend that it can result naturally only from a corresponding change in "force-root," call the change chemical combination, analysis, or what you will.

Let us, therefore, take two or more different elements. And permit me to ask a question: *Why* do they differ? Let us say the primary elements are iron and gold; why is one iron and the other gold? Materialistic phenomenists consider it a sufficient explanation to suppose that both metals are made up of precisely the same constituent forces arranged in different orders. But this explanation is quite unsatisfactory.

For in all the various forms through which either gold or iron may be made to pass, the constituent forces must be differently arranged; else there could be no difference of form. Heat them to the liquid or even to the gaseous state, colour them, mould them into innumerable shapes; yet through all changes one is gold, the other is iron. If difference of arrangement of forces must result in different substances, why does it not always so result? No explanation is or can be sufficient which does not suppose a different constitution in what I have called the "force-root." We must only don another of the garments of St. Thomas.

Here, again, I contend, that a principle of the greatest importance has been established,—that there is not only a *something* underlying phenomena, but a *something different* in different objects. Let us proceed.

III. In place of gold and iron we will substitute water, which may easily be made to pass through two very different series of changes. It may, on the one hand, be heated, coloured, mixed with other substances, formed into innumerable shapes of all possible sizes; *but through all changes it remains water*;

the common sense of the world witnesses that. We will call this series of changes, series number one.

On the other hand, if water be subjected to chemical analysis, it will resolve itself into two distinct elements, oxygen and hydrogen. *It is no longer water*; the common sense of the world equally testifies to that. Let this be series number two. Now for a question: Why this identity and diversity? Why does it remain water after one series of changes and not after the other?

Materialists answer by supposing that chemical action changes the constituent forces. But then a further question arises: Is it merely that the *direction is changed*, or has a *new force been produced*? We have seen that no new force can be produced by electricity of itself, since electricity of itself cannot *create*. Hence it must be only a change of direction, it must be that the resultant of the united force has changed its line of action.

This is undoubtedly what happens in the case of mechanical mixtures; but the explanation is quite unsatisfactory when applied to chemical compounds; it leaves a further question quite unanswered.

For, throughout the first series mentioned above,—series number one, of accidental changes,—there must be a similar variation of the *direction* of the force-constituents; and, yet the *substance* remains the same. *It is water*, whether hot or cold, clear or muddy, in this vessel or in that, most unquestionably *it is not water* in oxygen or hydrogen. We see this as clearly and as surely as we see that underneath all force and phenomena there must be *something*, and *something different* for the different elements. If you have already appropriated two of the ideas of St. Thomas, you must now in very consistency take a third.

It is water, then, through series number one; it is not water, but oxygen and hydrogen, after series number two. Why? There must be some change of "force-root" or of substantial form,— of the *something* which lies behind.

Here our other principle comes in; electricity of itself cannot create or annihilate, neither can all the force of the material universe. What produces the new "force-root"?

What destroys the old? And remember always, it is not a mere *change of direction* or causing an *accident*; it is producing from nothing something which underlies accidents and remains permanent through them—*substance*. What produces and annihilates it? Not matter; therefore something stronger and better, outside matter and distinct from it.

IV. There are two other points which will not escape the attention of a philosophical observer, and which strongly confirm the scholastic doctrine of substantial forms: the first is the phenomena of crystallization.

When liquid is solidified it usually takes certain regular geometrical forms; it is said to crystallize.

“The crystalline forms of solids are most numerous. There are above two hundred to be found in carbonate of lime alone. Quartz has hexagonal prisms terminated with hexagonal pyramids. The crystals of alum are octohedral; those of Iceland-spar, rhombohedral; those of sulphur, partly long prismatic needles, partly oblique octohedra; those of common salt and sugar, cubical. How are we to account for these varieties of form in simple as in compound bodies? An answer has been attempted to this question, by attributing these various forms to the supposed diversity of form in the atom. But this only throws the question further back, for it occurs at once to ask: Whence arises this diversity of form in the constituent atoms? [And why must there be a *similarity* of diversity?] Moreover, the answer seems very difficult of application to the case of compound substances. For if the atoms of the different elements that constitute compound substance remain, each in its state of isolation; whence comes it that the composite has a new crystalline form of its own? How is it, too, that the atoms, in complex structures more particularly, appear to lose altogether the crystalline form they at first possessed? [And why do they *all* assume *similar* shapes in the new forms?]¹”

The Schoolmen would explain this diversity of unity by supposing a kind of initial substance to pervade the whole mass whether of fluid or of solid. This all-pervading initial substance is called the *forma substantialis*; it is different for

¹ Harper, p. 247.

each different mass ; it is indivisible in itself like the human soul ; it is the root from which spring all the forces by which the body energizes in any direction ; it is to the whole mass what our "force-root" is to the molecule.

What is the materialist theory ? " An answer has been attempted by attributing these various forms to the supposed diversity of form in the atom." True, no doubt, as far as it goes ; but it does not go nearly far enough, like all the answers of materialists. It "starts" with "supposing" that the atoms have different forms. But what gave these different forms to atoms ? Why is the form of the element changed in the compound ? And why is the change so uniform through all the atoms ? You see there is *something* under the phenomena.

The second point which demands attention is the unity of substance which is discernible in bodies. A metal plate, an iron rivet, a block of stone, a beam of wood,—each is *one*. An ironclad, St. Peter's at Rome, the Menai Bridge,—each also is *one*. But how different the unity ! The iron plate is *one substance* ; the Menai Bridge is *one bridge*, formed of ever so many substances. A block of stone is *one substance* ; St. Peter's is *one Church*, made up of ever so many blocks of stone and other things.

The common sense of mankind proclaims that the unity of the Church or of the bridge is very different from that of the plate or of the block. We see this as clearly and as surely as we see that there is *something* behind phenomena and force ; *something different* for the different elements ; *something different* underneath the phenomena of water from that which underlies those of oxygen and hydrogen. We shall have to appropriate another of the doctrines of St. Thomas.

Well, the bridge is one and the plate is one ; but the unity is plainly different. Whence comes the difference ? The Schoolmen rely on the substantial form ; indivisible in itself it pervades the whole plate, and is the one root of all the energies which the plate displays.

Materialists contend that the substantial unity of the iron plate or block of stone arises from the fact that all the

atoms or molecules of the mass are bound by cohesion ; whereas in the bridge or church the atoms are bound together by adhesion, gravity, and other forces. But surely this explanation, though quite true, is far from complete or satisfactory. It starts with the lever ; it supposes the very question at issue. It is the fashion to ridicule the Schoolmen for playing with words and reasoning from mere names ; surely, when it comes to first principles, they may retort on their traducers.

What is cohesion more than adhesion that it should cause substantial unity ? If being bound together into a mass is the one fundamental reason of unity, one would think that the stronger the bond, the greater should the unity be. And yet we are told that the Menai bridge is much stronger in its present form than if it were all one substantially united mass of iron ; and we know that the dome of St. Peter's is more strongly bound together than a lump of butter. The weaker bond, however, forms *one substance*, though the stronger does not : yet we should be content it seems, because, forsooth, the weaker bond is called cohesion.

Cohesion, therefore, no matter how true, affords no complete and satisfactory explanation. I see no explanation except to admit that behind cohesion there is *something* from which it springs, something which pervades the whole mass of iron or stone and binds it into one :—this *something*, call it what you will, is the substantial form.

Here again our other principle comes in : whence comes this *something* ? Take two plates of iron and fuse them into one : the mass which results is no longer two but one ; common sense tells us that quite plainly. There were two *somethings* before, there is now but one : What became of the two, and whence came the one ? They cannot have fused together ; for forms are indivisible, else they would be incapable of causing *unity* ; and as they are indivisible, so they cannot result from fusion. Whence do they come ? Whither do they go ? From nothing to nothing. And as matter cannot create, it follows again that there must be something nobler and better, outside matter and distinct from it.

V. It remains only to answer certain obvious difficulties. I do not profess to answer all, for that would be an almost interminable task; whoever wishes to see the question fully discussed may consult Fr. Harper. It will be seen from the foregoing argument, that a modern disciple of the Scholastics is not obliged to denounce the study of chemistry as a fraud. He need not suppose matter to be indivisible, and its very divisibility must always raise the question of atoms and their nature. He will not object to most that is said about atoms, but he will deny that atoms explain everything. He will taunt materialists with shirking the very question at issue; and he will assert that, when the physicists have said their last word, further questions suggest themselves clamouring for an answer. To reply to these further questions is the business of the *metaphysician*,—that is the meaning of his very name.

Now it may not unreasonably be said (1) that the Schoolmen start with their *forma*. What is it? Why should it explain everything? Does it leave behind no further question clamouring for solution?

Certainly it does, plenty of questions; and it would be most desirable if we could find time and ability to discuss them adequately. But it is not necessary for our purpose. It has been shown that atoms and force are not sufficient of themselves to make the world; that underneath them, behind them, and distinct from them, there must be *something*, whatever it is. What care we what it is, if it is? I have shown that it is and must be; that it begins and ceases; that it is not an accident or new direction of force, but something more. We argue that it must have a cause; and we contend that matter of itself could not produce it.

(2) It may be urged that creation or annihilation is not required; even the Schoolmen suppose merely that *formae educantur e potentia materiae*, and in like manner that *relabantur in potentiam materiae*. They distinctly deny the creation and annihilation of substantial forms.

We answer, it is true that the Scholastics denied the creation of forms; but consider the reason they give. They

denied it, not because forms are not substantial realities which begin *de novo*, or because they are mere accidents or variations of forces already in being; but because they are not independent, self-existing entities,—because they *co-exist* with *materia prima*. Now if there be substantial forms at all, that is, not mere accidents or directions of forces already in being, but substantial realities, “force-root,”—few will deny that matter of itself *cannot cause them* to begin to be; call the causing of them creation, production, “*eduction*” from primordial matter, or what you please. Certainly any such denial would not be in conformity with scholastic teaching.

It will be remarked that I say “matter, *of itself*, cannot cause them.” For there can be no doubt that secondary causes contribute positively to their “*eduction*.” Hence there is a great difference between the generation of water and the generation of man; for the substantial form of water is “*educed*” from primordial matter by physical agencies acting under established laws; whereas the soul of man, being a substance capable of independent existence, is created immediately by God himself. But as natural agencies could not *create* a human soul even by divinely given power, as is commonly held; neither can they “*educer*” substantial forms of lower beings, except in virtue of divinely established laws.

(3) One might object further that the foregoing line of argument is based on the common sense of mankind; but common sense is poor philosophy. Who would depend on common sense for the compounding of a prescription? And is the further and more abstruse question to be decided by counting the heads of the uneducated?

We deny that common sense is in every case bad philosophy. There is, of course, a great difference between immediate perceptions and conclusions drawn from elaborate chains of reasoning or practical knowledge which depends on experience. Every one will admit that, in these latter cases, common sense would be a very bad guide. Not so, however, with regard to immediate perceptions, such is the trustworthiness of consciousness, of memory, of reason, of the senses. Here common sense is the one and only test of truth; and the

same reason for which we trust our consciousness, our memory, our reason, our senses, forces us to believe that there is something behind force,—that water is a distinct substance from either oxygen or hydrogen, that a block of stone has a unity which is absent from St. Peter's. The reason is, because our intellect as clearly, as surely, as immediately, perceives these things.

One should not allow one's self to be influenced in these matters by considering that numerous and learned treatises have been written to prove the contrary of what has been here asserted; or by any reminder that what we teach to be the immediate testimony of common sense or reason, is emphatically denied by many of our foremost experimental scientists,—men who surely have not lost their common sense. One should remember that they are for the most part the same men who dispute the existence of bodies, of free-will, of necessary truths. Prejudice obscures their reason in treating these questions; and what they deny in theory, they uniformly assert in practice; for it is only in their speculations that they give their prejudice control. In their ordinary life they show that they believe certain things to be always and necessarily true; they show also a decided opinion that things are often what they seem, and that they themselves are quite free to act or not to act, to make this or that use of the world around them.

W. McDONALD.

(To be continued.)

VACATION IN 1886.

MAN proposes but the doctor disposes, if not always at least but too frequently; and as this seems to be a kind of law we yield to it, though perhaps ungraciously, and accept it as one among the many inevitables which fall to the lot of man, especially when formulating plans for vacation.

We are full of Norway; Sweden is in the near future, and Russia itself looms in the dim distance. We read up

Murray and Baedeker, study maps, and revive old memories, and to make assurance doubly sure, we call upon our doctor to get our exeat or, perhaps we should say, his permit. We, in short, propose, and he disposes—alike of ourself and our plans, dismissing one into light air and the other into an English Spa. Christiania, no; Stockholm, no, no; Moscow, no, no, no; but Harrogate. Oh! what a fall is there. But our M.D. as musical as medical, and so doubly M.D. soothes our perturbed spirit with sweet sounds, drags us up from the depths of despair into which he has just thrown us, and whispers that the Yorkshire Spa is but for a time, and that its invigorating *elements* of bracing air and mineral waters will make earth more charming than ever and the very fire of health the outcome of the other three. So our Almaviva warbles a bright and brilliant strain, welcomes us with *Ecco ridente il cielo*, we reply with Rosina *Io sono docile*, and he dismisses us with *retirati*. So to Harrogate we go, and find it all that we were led to expect and profit by the elemental war within us.

But what can we say of Harrogate? Which of our reverend and revered readers does not know it by personal experience, or by the report of venerable pastors who have been made young again by its healing influences? What new thing can be said about its hotels—grand, comfortable or homely, for there is every grade: its baths and pump room where even its unsavoury waters are made almost tolerable by the resources of civilization, or what in our eyes is the greatest and most inexplicable wonder of all, its Bog-field where upwards of twenty wells bubble up, each with its own peculiar perfume; realizing all that Coleridge once said of Cologne and its natural waters, which his critical nose could detect and distinguish by their—smell let us say. There is High Harrogate, some four hundred feet above sea level, but here, inland where it stands, that height involves no toiling; for those who live on the heights find themselves almost on a dead level, so that indeed it necessitates a descent into Low Harrogate to have an opportunity of climbing at all. Thus the dwellers down below are the real mountaineers and we above are the dwellers in the plain.

But what a plain it is! with its wide stretches of inalienable commons, commanding broad views on all sides; its broad well-kept roads with their wooded hedges and grassy margins; its footpaths of cleanly asphalt, its cross paths with gates that proclaim their publicity and invite to country rambles, with comfortable seats that suggest repose, at spots where special shade or prospect makes them more than ever welcome. Commons we call them to translate into our language their local name Strays, with all the beauty and suggestive wanderings which that name suggests; yet are they fringed with civilization in the form of fine mansions encompassed with beautiful flower-full gardens, and that not churlishly shut in by grim walls, but open, at least to the eye, that they may be in one sense ours while we linger near them. Certainly Harrogate is a pleasant place in which to play the invalid on a moderate scale. But man, even when under the doctor's regimen, is a restless animal. Whether the early rising which the custom of the place supposes, seeing how much drinking and perhaps bathing precede breakfast, or whether it is that the elements, which here are so potent, war in the inner man and stir him up to action in their work of restoration, or whether it is that the wide view that stretches around on every side calls imperatively for investigation—some, or all of these combined, turn the visitors into perambulating groups, and carry them off in the aristocratic four-in-hand, or in the less assuming wagonettes to what they call "places of interest" in the neighbourhood. So to Ripon they go and to Fountains Abbey; to Knaresborough with its charms and curiosities of which we shall have to say a word; to Bolton Abbey and its magnificent woods, which indeed form but a feature in the glories of the river Wharfe; or to those varied groups of intermingled wood and rocks which at Brimham and Plumpton stand in all their natural grandeur and owe little or nothing to man, who, either by a wise discretion, or an overruling necessity, has let them alone as beyond and above his power, and devoted himself and his skill to raising mansions like Harewood. To one or another of these famous spots the real or so-called invalids betake themselves day after day and never seem to weary of this

mild round of dissipation, which indeed seems pleasantly to harmonize with the medical treatment of the place, and no doubt has its full share by fresh air and the natural restorative power of pleasant society amid the beauties of nature, in sending home to their parishes or secular occupations, the delapidated humanity that was trained off to these wells of health.

Society is doubtless pleasant, especially when of our own choosing, and often amusing when we are thrown into a promiscuous gathering: but many of us at times prefer a solitary ramble, or a walk with a congenial friend. In both these ways we visited Knaresborough, and found the second visit a pleasant supplement to the first solitary one. Knaresborough is an ancient market town; so ancient indeed that we cannot imagine the time when it was anything else. It climbs up the bold cliff with a boldness equal to its own, and from its height looks down complacently upon the really beautiful Nidd that flows beneath it. But market town as it is, in right of its market place and town hall its toll bridges and the life that lives within its long business streets, it is something more, for was it not dominated over and doubtless in rough old times protected by a Saxon fortress, which in the Conqueror's reign gave place to a more noble building, which the Norman Baron of Tonsburg erected upon this his share of the invader's spoil. From father to son has it passed, at least from the time of Henry the Third, and is now held by the Clanricarde De Burghs their lineal descendants.

Of course the old story occurs once more here. It stood for King and Crown, until Fairfax battered it down for Cromwell, and then commenced the decay which leaves it but a ruin now.

Perhaps it is this grand old ruin that domineers over the town, as that in its turn does over the beautiful river below, which gives a feudal character to the narrow and tortuous streets, which climb in steep sweeps from the bridges below, and work their way, when up, in such irregular curves. The military aspect is the characteristic of the place even in what is now, but seems incapable of showing itself to be, a simple market town. The railway of course has thrust itself into

the heights, but spans the river with a grand mediæval bridge which harmonizes well with its surroundings.

The old castle has of course its tale to tell. Many a queer scene passed within its walls, in its grim chambers and still more grim cells. But we must not now dwell upon these. Hither it was that Hugh De Morville came with his three companions in guilt after their murder of St. Thomas of Canterbury. As Butler says they "retired to Knaresborough where, shunned by all men and distracted with the remorse of their own conscience, they lived alone without so much as a servant that would attend them. Some time after they travelled into Italy to receive absolution from the Pope. His Holiness enjoined them a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, when three of them shut themselves up in a place called Montenegro as a prison of penance, as the Pope had ordered them, and lived and died true penitents. They were buried before the gate of the Church (of the Templars) of Jerusalem, with this inscription (*Hic jacent miseri qui martyremaverunt beatum Archiepiscopum Cantuariensem*) 'Here lie the wretches who martyred blessed Thomas Archbishop of Canterbury.'" "The other murderer Tracy, who gave the first wound, deferred his penance, and died of a terrible disease at Cosenza at Calabria. Two hundred years later, in 1370, the castle belonged to "great John of Gaunt, time-honoured Lancaster," as Shakespeare calls him, and here doubtless he entertained the greatest poet of his age, his kinsman Geoffrey Chaucer, for they had married two sisters; and so the old castle may have echoed to the Canterbury tales, which record the sayings and doings of those pious pilgrims who visited St. Thomas's Shrine, as it had once done to the remorseful cries of those who were the foul instruments of that martyrdom.

Another two hundred years pass, and Leland in the time of Henry VIII. stands as we are doing before the Castle, and thus he records what he saw.

"The castle stoudeth magnificently and strongly on a roc, and hath a very depe dicke hewen out of the roc, wher it is not defended by the ryverr of Nidde, that there renneth in a deade stony bottom. I nombered a 11 or 12 Towres in the wall of the castelle, and one very faire beside in the second area."

There is a pleasant walk along the river side shut in by well-wooded cliffs; indeed the trees fill nearly the whole of the valley and cast pleasant fleckered shade, which the murmuring waters make still more pleasant. A cave we pass has a rude figure sculptured at its entrance, within are the evident remains of a small chapel dedicated to St. Robert. Can this be the St. Robert, who lived in these parts and was one of the founders of Fountains Abbey? Then further on we are brought to a standstill, by a notice that close beside and down some rude steps we shall find St. Robert's Cave: as of course we do, and a guide to tell us all about the spot which we find has a modern as well as a mediæval legend, that brings Saint and Sinner together in somewhat jarring concord. For not only did St. Robert dwell in this dismal and gloomy recess, but Eugene Aram here perpetrated the murder which Hood and Bulwer have recorded in their own individual styles. It was worth enduring the shock which such varying scenes suggested to listen to the guide's narrations. St. Robert with his devotion and austerities, and Eugene Aram with his villainies "flowed from her tongue," if not as "eloquence" at least with certain declamatory effort, and she closed her lengthened legends with the advice that we should confirm the mental pictures she had painted by a visit to St. Robert's Chapel, and a look from the cliffs above in a certain direction to the spot where Eugene Aram was hanged. Perhaps we ought to record another distinguished personage for whom we are told Knaresborough is "celebrated," and that is the witch, Mother Shipton. Another person of great local renown is Blind Jack who, in spite of his affliction, erected bridges and made roads in various parts of the country, and whom we desire to connect in our record with St. Robert as a real benefactor, and not with the murderer or the witch.

We did not fail to return by the heights to Knaresborough which open up fresh scenery by extending the view far beyond the valley of the Nidd.

Ripon and Fountains Abbey combine to make of all the most interesting excursion. Ripon of course stands *ad Ripam* on the Ure, which river claims special notice in virtue of its noble bridge of seventeen arches, and raises its

bank lordly above two smaller streams that flow into it at the meeting of the waters; Ripon, that first, a thousand years ago, gained its royal charter of incorporation for its gallant fight against and victory over the ubiquitous and unquiet Danes, a victory whose tenth centenary it duly commemorated a few weeks past. Ripon, which fought its way in many a ready encounter with harrying Robert Bruce and his hungry countrymen, and which even now keeps up old customs of guard and good fellowship, sounding, as in good old Saxon times, its three notes of the horn at nine every evening at the mayor's door, to put his worship in mind of his responsibility for good watch and ward: for, as the old law says "if any house on the gate syd within the towne be robbed after that hour, the mayor or 'wakeman' of the towne is bound to make up the loss, if it be proved that he and his servants had not done their duties at the time." Not of course that the mayor had to defray the expenses of such watch out of his own magisterial pocket, seeing that every citizen with a one-door house paid two pence annually, while the wealthier, and therefore more inviting to plunderers, who lived in the splendour of a house with two doors, 'a gate dore and a back dore' paid fourpence by the year of duties. In proof of the "survival," among old customs of what perhaps many considered to be "the fittest," so late as 1828, we are told, "on St. John's Eve, every householder who had changed his residence, and every new comer, spread a table with bread, and cheese and ale before his door, or gave a supper as a sign of giving and desiring welcome."

So Ripon necessarily invites and repays a visit: for it looks a place for such customs to localize themselves in, and has it not, besides, its old Minster which of late has become a Cathedral; and a beautiful Catholic Church which is one of those glorious houses for God which the revival of religion has in these last few years sown broadcast through the land, to supply the places of the old Minster and other sacred edifices which have been taken away, or, it may be, to minister to the wants for which they were originally raised, until the happy day when they will be once more applied to their proper use.

From Ripon one goes to Studley Royal, as Lord Ripon's

place is called. But nobody cares about the mansion, which, indeed, modestly conceals itself, and thus preserves the family from the intrusion of tourists and the latter from the unpleasant feeling of being intruders. The grounds are magnificent and are kept in a wonderfully perfect and almost painful order. It seems as though each group of trees, each wall of foliage, every undulation of the land worked into irreproachable lawn, was made to order, yet nature is too grand to be completely tyrannized over. So what we get is a compromise which throws its trammels where it can and admits under protest a power which it cannot gainsay. It seems hard to complain of what is really a labour of love; but the love must be very sincere and earnest which can excuse such manifestation of labour.

The little river Skell that flows through the park is in places converted into ponds, on whose margin arise sundry classic temples and occasional groups of statues equally classic, and these are not out of place in the midst of the scenery which surrounds them. They are the decorations of noble grounds and were the mansion here it would not be out of place either. Thus far all is Studley Royal neither more nor less. But beyond and quite apart from this rises up the crowning glory which brings wanderers hither: for here is Fountains Abbey in its own grounds, where there is nothing to tell of Studley but the reverential care which keeps the sacred ruins and their glorious surroundings in exquisite preservation.

For a time we linger around the glorious ruins of Fountains. Yet it is no unmixed pleasure to wander amid broken columns and dismantled shrines. Fortunately there are no longer guides to weary the visitor with foolish explanations of what they do not understand; he is left to his own reflections, which to a Catholic cannot but be sad. Perhaps he recognizes the reverent hand which preserves every relict of the good old times so lovingly; or perhaps he is perverse enough to fret under this primness of walks, this order among ruins, and almost to wish that the destruction had been complete, and that this token of the shame which falls on England for the destruction she wrought so sacrilegiously in Henry's day, had been buried with that terrible past and

swept away from the eyes of men, rather than, as here, framed and glazed as a picture and kept as a show for holiday folks to take their pleasure in. Such are our thoughts at the time of the visit, but memory looks back on Fountains in a different way. Some places have their passing interest, and leave no lasting impression on the mind; while others somehow seem to fix themselves more deeply and grow upon us afterwards. So it has been with Fountains Abbey. The ruins in their magnificence have a tale to tell which surely, we think, will well repay inquiry: the outcome of this has been the unearthing of a contemporary account of its foundation by one who was a sharer in the work, and whose narrative is confirmed, in its chief feature, by no less a person than St. Bernard himself.

HENRY BEDFORD.

(To be continued.)

THE LIFE OF JEAN JACQUES OLIER, FOUNDER OF THE SULPICIAN^s.

THE twenty-third session of the Council of Trent was held in July, 1563, during the pontificate of Pius IV. In this session the doctrine of the Catholic Church on the Sacrament of Holy Orders, in all its grades, was discussed at great length and finally formulated. After defining the true doctrine on the relation between priest and Sacrifice and the different grades by which the priesthood is reached, the Council tells us that it is clear from Sacred Scripture, from tradition, and from the uniform teaching of the Fathers, that this Sacrament of Orders is of divine institution and is to be numbered among the Seven Sacraments of the Church. Having briefly laid down for the instruction of the faithful what they are to believe about the Sacrament of Holy

¹The Life of Jean Jacques Olier, Founder of the Sulpicians. By Edward Healy Thompson, M.A.

Orders, the Fathers of the Council formulated eight canons condemning, with the usual forms, the erroneous tenets of the innovators, which were contrary to the teaching of the Church. And then, following up the work of reformation as at previous sessions, they passed what we may regard as one of the most remarkable of the decrees *de Reformatione*.

This decree treats of "residence," of the obligation of the clergy to personally look after their flock, of the obligation of bishops regarding the conferring of orders, the qualifications required in those who present themselves for ordination, the intervals that should elapse between the reception of the different orders, the necessity of episcopal approbation for hearing confessions, and the necessity of a priest showing his *Litterae commendatoriae sui ordinarii* before being allowed to celebrate Mass or administer the Sacraments. Finally in chapter eighteenth of this most important work the Fathers resolved to adopt the best, and in fact the only means to give practical effect to the wishes of the Council, for the reformation of the clergy and the re-establishment of ecclesiastical discipline. They then enacted a law for the opening of diocesan seminaries, for the education of the clergy throughout the Church in accordance with the wants and means of the various dioceses. The Council wished that those who were to join the ecclesiastical state should be trained and jealously watched from a very early age, because youth is inclined to follow worldly pleasure, and unless vicious habits are shunned and habits of virtue and religion are formed, it is vain to expect perseverance in the true ecclesiastical spirit without singular and special help from the Almighty. The seminary was to be founded in connection with the cathedral as far as possible, and all cathedral and metropolitan churches were bound to establish seminaries for supporting, educating, and training for the ecclesiastical state such a number of youths as would suffice for the supply of priests to the diocese. Into these seminaries were to be received youths, born in lawful wedlock, not less than twelve years of age, able to read and write, whose dispositions, as far as could be ascertained at that early age, gave solid grounds to hope that they would become efficient husbandmen

in the Lord's vineyard. On entering the seminary they were to receive tonsure and put on the clerical dress, study grammar, sacred music, the Scripture, homilies of the Saints and Fathers, ceremonies and rubrics. The Ordinary should provide for their going to confession at least once a month and to holy communion according to the advice of their confessors. They were to hear Mass daily and assist at the Sacred Functions on Sundays and Festivals in the cathedral and local churches.

At previous Councils recommendations had been made to provide for the better training and education of ecclesiastics, and schools for young clerics were founded in connection with metropolitan and cathedral churches. Many clerics also got part of their education in the universities, which were very numerous on the continent then as now, but, however excellent for a literary education these universities may have been, they certainly did not give to clerics that training which would enable them to cope successfully with the abuses and disorders that were so prevalent throughout Europe in the period between the Councils of Lateran and Trent. And hence it was that the Tridentine Fathers at the close of their great labours resolved to take efficacious means of providing for the Church a race of priests trained from early youth in sacred studies, formed to habits of self-control and possessing the ecclesiastical spirit that would urge them to master the *corpus doctrinae* of the Council, to suitably teach its truths to the faithful and to reduce to practice both in themselves and their flock the decrees *de Reformatione*. As the Bishop of Nazeanzum said in his address at the close of the Council when speaking "de labenti ac prope cadenti disciplina," "eligentur in posterum ad ecclesiastica munera obeunda qui virtute non ambitione praesent, qui populi commodis non suis inserviant, et prosint potius quam praesint. Enuntiabitur et explanabitur frequentius et studiosius verbum Domini omni gladio ancipiti penetrantius. Aderunt suis gregibus, et invigilabunt episcopi ceterique quibus animarum cura commissa est, neque extra creditam sibi custodiam vagabuntur."

Pallavicini in his History of the Council assures us that

nothing was done by the Fathers which gave more satisfaction than this decree regarding the establishment of diocesan seminaries, and many learned and zealous ecclesiastics at the Council affirmed that if it had done nothing else than provide for the establishing of clerical seminaries, this would in itself be ample compensation for all the labours and hardships the members had to endure, “*quippe (ut aiebant) unicum ad-jumentum quod efficacis esset ad reparandam collapsam disciplinam cum certa sit regula in omni republica tales haberi cives quales educantur.*”

This 18th chapter of decree *de Reformatione*, Sess. xxiii., contains very interesting reading for all who are engaged in establishing and governing ecclesiastical seminaries. It is, indeed, interesting for all clerics as it treats of a subject that so directly and immediately concerns them personally, containing, as it does, full and detailed instructions for providing for the maintenance, literary education, and religious training of young Levites. This decree regarding the opening of diocesan seminaries was passed in Session xxiii., held July, 1563, but unhappily nearly four score years elapsed before it produced any fruit. Indeed for nearly a century very little had been done to give effect to this decree, except what had been done by St. Charles Borromeo, and long after him by St. Vincent de Paul. St. Charles had taken an active part in bringing the Council to a happy termination, and as might be expected from his burning zeal, he laboured to give effect to its enactments in his own diocese and wherever else his influence extended. He established a seminary for his own diocese, and laboured by word and example to provide for the service of the altar, a race of clerics such as he knew the Fathers of the Council yearned to see within the sanctuary. His example, however, did not produce such results as might be expected from one of such high ecclesiastical rank and personal sanctity, and in the first half of the eighteenth century the Supreme Pontiffs, Benedict XIII. and Benedict XIV. had to remonstrate with the Bishops of Italy about their non-observance of this decree of the Council, and ordered them to take the necessary steps to comply with the wishes of the Fathers as expressed in it.

Looking at the history of the French Church in the times of St. Vincent de Paul and M. Olier, we are compelled to regard them as the instruments destined by God, to give effect to this grave and prudent decree of Trent. These two great servants of God were contemporaries, but M. Olier was much the younger, and always regarded St. Vincent de Paul as his spiritual father and director. St. Vincent founded the Congregation of the Priests of the Mission, whose principal end is to secure, first, their own personal sanctification; secondly, the sanctification of the faithful among whom they labour; and thirdly, to train in priestly virtue and knowledge young Levites for the service of the Altar.

M. Olier founded "La Compagnie des Prêtres de Saint Sulpice," the members of which have for nearly two centuries and a half devoted their energies almost exclusively to the work of the schools and colleges of clerics. Their success during that period shows that the blessing of Heaven was on M. Olier's undertaking, and that he was chosen in the decrees of God, to provide permanent means for educating and sanctifying the secular clergy of his native country, and indirectly of many other countries also.

M. Olier was born in Paris in 1608. His father was a wealthy and influential gentleman, holding high office under the government, and he used his influence to obtain for his son even in his infancy, various valuable benefices in different parts of France. When young Olier was about seven years old, he went one day to the Church to hear Mass, and on seeing the priest come out to celebrate, the thought arose in his mind that is so well expressed by Thomas a Kempis:

"Oh quam mundae debent esse manus illae, quam purum os, quam sanctum corpus, sacerdotis ad quem toties ingreditur Auctor puritatis."

This thought, we are told by his biographers, made such a deep impression on his mind that it never left him, but always had a powerful influence over him, and urged him, sometimes consciously, often unconsciously, to keep before his eyes the great idea of providing for the Church of France, a clergy learned and zealous, thoroughly imbued with the spirit of the sacred calling and thoroughly detached from the spirit of the

world and its false maxims. M. Olier spent part of his early days at Lyons, there receiving the best education the city could then afford to a youth of his high social rank. Afterwards at the age of seventeen, he returned to Paris and entered the famous university of that city. Here he displayed most brilliant abilities, and went through a course of Philosophy with great success, winning the admiration and applause of his fellow students and masters. After quitting the university he went to study Theology in the Sorbonne, and had for his masters some of the most gifted men that ever gained renown for its halls. His father now obtained for him still further and richer ecclesiastical preferment, and being made an Abbé he commenced to preach, and preached with great applause, but with very little fruit. As he says himself, "he was all the fashion, preaching beautiful sermons abounding in rhetorical tropes and vain conceits, but in which not a word was uttered against the manners of the world, its pride and covetousness." For a short time he associated very much with a number of gay young semi-clerical friends, leading a life free from care and labour, spending their ill-got ecclesiastical revenues in providing for themselves idle and dangerous amusements. But he was destined not to continue long in this course. Midst all the gaiety and amusements of Parisian life, he never entirely slackened in his devotion to the Blessed Mother of God, and she secured his conversion in a most miraculous manner. He went to Rome about the twentieth year of his age, to perfect his knowledge of the Hebrew language, with the view of attaining to some high place in the Sorbonne, but in Rome his eyes became so weak that he was threatened with a total loss of sight, and the most skilful oculists in the city could afford him no relief. In this affliction he thought of his holy patroness, and set out from Rome to the Shrine of Loreto, a journey of one hundred miles. This long and painful journey he performed on foot, and near its end he was seized with a dangerous fever. He managed however to drag himself to the holy house, and no sooner did he throw himself on his knees before the image of her who is the "*Auxilium Infirmorum*" than two great miracles were wrought by her intercession

He was completely cured of the fever, and recovered the use of his eyes so fully, that he was never again troubled with the disease. At the same time his conversion to God naturally followed these two great miracles, and there and then he received the gift of prayer, which the Lord poured out most abundantly on his soul. At first he intended to become a Carthusian monk, but after much prayer and fasting and many visits to various shrines of our Lady to ascertain God's will in his regard, it was clearly manifested to him that it was his vocation to become a secular priest. Most happily for himself and the Church, he now took St. Vincent de Paul for his confessor and spiritual guide. The Saint sent him to accompany the Vincentian Fathers on many missions, which they were giving in various dioceses of France, and he laboured as zealously as any of the missionary fathers then in their first fervour. As he possessed ample means of his own, he contributed largely towards defraying the expense of the missions, and took care to secure for those districts that had claims on him all the spiritual benefits those missions could confer. With the advice of St. Vincent de Paul he was raised to the priesthood in May 1633, when he was just twenty-five years old. The better to prepare his soul for worthily celebrating his first Mass, he made a retreat of one whole month after his ordination, interrupting during that time all his studies and works of charity.

And it was only after this month's retreat following his ordination that he ventured to offer the great Sacrifice of the Mass for the first time. From that day his devotion to our Lord in the Holy Sacrament of the Altar, and to His Blessed Mother, seems to have possession of his whole soul. St. Alphonsus Liguori may be regarded as a new Apostle of devotion to the Blessed Eucharist and to Our Lady. By his sermons and writings he laboured indefatigably to kindle these devotions in the hearts of his countrymen and indeed of all the faithful. What St. Liguori did in Italy M. Olier laboured, and with great success, to effect in France nearly a century earlier. In many respects these two great servants of God strongly resembled each other, but in devotion to the Holy Sacrament and the Virgin Mother, the resemblance is

most striking. In this respect, and indeed in all others, the life of M. Olier is a most edifying and instructive lesson to secular priests to whom, secular priest as he was, he affords in all his works the best model for imitation. Had he lived after the days of St. Liguori we would say that he took that great Saint for his model especially in regard to devotion to the hidden God and the Blessed Virgin; we could say too that he imitated very closely his spirit of unceasing toil, his humility, and zeal for souls.

These virtues he laboured with great success to inspire into the Seminarists whose happy lot it was to be trained by him specially called as he was by God to lay the first foundation of ecclesiastical Seminaries in France. There is no reason to doubt that M. Olier had a miraculous vision from which he was given to understand that he was destined by God to begin successfully the founding of these Seminaries in France. This we know on the authority of a statement made about this vision at a meeting of the Sacred Congregation of Rites by the Sub-promoter of the Faith. His words are "Dubitari nequaquam poterit quin vera fuerit apparitio."

Père de Condren and St. Vincent de Paul were his faithful friends and advisers in every step he took towards accomplishing the work to which he was divinely called. They were both animated with the Spirit of God and both sighed after the time when the Church should possess a priesthood worthy of their sacred calling. They both believed that in M. Olier they could see the graces and gifts necessary to make a successful effort towards attaining so desirable a consummation. He had been on missions in various dioceses of France, he saw the deplorable condition of the people, the inefficiency and want of zeal of the clergy and they knew he longed to remedy these very widespread evils. They all knew that these evils could be remedied only by carrying out the wishes of the council of Trent and training for the Service of the Church from their earliest years an entirely new generation of priests. Besides Père de Condren and St. Vincent de Paul, M. Olier had a few other select friends among the priests of Paris, who were equally anxious to bring about the reform so sorely needed. They willingly lent him their aid for his

great work. "At this time," says M. Olier's biographer, "so secularised both in spirit and manner had the clergy become that they were not distinguishable in dress or demeanour from ordinary laymen, going about in moustaches and boots like mere men of the world, indeed it would seem that on occasions they did not take the trouble to put on the ecclesiastical attire when performing the sacred duty of their calling." The Bishop of Chalons-sur-Marne wished to have M. Olier appointed as his coadjutor, "being appalled at the total loss of discipline in his diocese and at seeing so many souls perishing through the neglect of their pastors who were ignorant, and more than ignorant, but whom it was impossible to remove from their benefices." In one diocese we are told, and this is a sample, that the gentry who had the right to present to parishes, gave them by a fictitious presentation to vicars removable at their pleasure and gave the revenues to their own children. In this, such was the ignorance of the clergy and their utter disregard of the essential duties of their office that one of them writing to a clerical friend of M. Olier's said that all that was required to be a good ecclesiastic was "to be able to read and not be guilty of any heinous crime." In the large diocese of ——— there were from 6,000 to 7,000 ecclesiastics who had no competent knowledge of their state. But all this was now to be changed in good time. Père de Condren and St. Vincent de Paul impressed on M. Olier the important truth that the missions given by himself and his confrères did not produce lasting effects as they were not continued after them by the local clergy. They showed that no mission could produce lasting results until the Church of France was provided with a new race of priests full of the spirit that the missionaries themselves had. M. Olier realises this fully from the exhortations of his holy friends, and his own personal observation and experience. Accordingly, in 1642 with two confrères only, M. de Foix and M. du Ferrier, he opened a Seminary at Vaugirard, then a small village near Paris. Soon the numbers increased to twenty, and in a very brief period the new institution produced glorious results. After some time spent at Vaugirard, M. Olier was appointed curé of the parish of St. Sulpice, and he there renewed the

resolution to devote all the energies of his life to instruct and reform, and to use his influential position as curé of this most important parish for the establishment of Seminaries throughout France. Many of his friends ridiculed him for what they were pleased to call his folly in regard to the Seminaries, seeing that so many previous similar projects had come to nought. "At this time," as we are reminded by his biographer, "no one was obliged to reside in an ecclesiastical Seminary for however limited a period, in order to obtain a benefice, or receive Holy Orders." How strange and almost incredible this appears to us now, but it is nevertheless too true. On M. Olier's appointment to the parish of St. Sulpice the Seminary was transferred from Vaugirard to that parish, and took its name therefrom. And very soon from all parts of the kingdom, ecclesiastics of all grades, including abbots, priors, canons, doctors, and bachelors in theology, came to prepare themselves by a life of prayer and study for worthily receiving Holy Orders, or to imbue themselves with the spirit of their vocation, and within ten years from this time M. Olier was able to inform the Sovereign Pontiff that the Seminary had given many bishops and dignitaries to the Church of France, a thing which it continues to do up to the present day. The accommodation hastily provided for the ever increasing numbers that flocked to the new institute proved inadequate, and after a few years, a new and splendid building was begun, and completed about 1650. M. Olier's twofold object in building this Seminary was, first to send on the French Mission with all possible speed, a race of priests thoroughly trained in piety and learning, and secondly to institute a company of learned and holy priests who would continue and extend this work of training the younger clergy. His biographer tells us that he frequently impressed on his students that a priest without knowledge can never do much good in the Church. Hence, he took particular pains that the students, trained under his care should be thoroughly grounded in philosophy and theology. He used frequently tell them when urging them to close study, "that the Church is a body in which priests are the eyes, a ship in which they are pilots, a school where they are masters. In the confessional they sit

to render judgment, prompt and decisive, with none to aid, on matters of the greatest moment, in the pulpit they have to speak to both learned and ignorant to maintain the truths of the Gospel, all which supposes a knowledge higher, deeper, and more extensive, than could be acquired by private study, but the great object must always be to make priests interior men, which alone was the life-spring of virtue, and the uniform means of attaining Sacerdotal perfection." In season and out of season he was constantly placing before their eyes his own lofty ideal of perfection, and urging them to use all the means in their power to realise it. We can readily understand how he strove to kindle in their souls his own great and rare devotion to the Most Holy Sacrament and the Blessed Virgin Mother.

It is also useful to know that he laboured to inspire his Seminarists with a special love for the Holy Bible. "The study of Scripture," he declared "to be one of God's express commands to the house," and it was well known that he always read the Scriptures himself on his knees, with his head uncovered, and also, that he kept his Bible on a sort of throne, and when leaving or entering his rooms, cast his eyes towards it, to venerate the Spirit of God residing therein.

To the colleagues who shared his arduous labours and who numbered between thirty and forty, remarkable for rare intellectual gifts no less than genuine piety, he was wont to say that "to honour God, to love Jesus and Mary, to bear with patience and love the share He gives them in His own crosses, to lay himself at the feet of all, and especially of the ecclesiastics for whose santification he labours, to live for the sanctification of priests and the salvation of souls, to live without vows, but to be more pliant and submissive than those who are bound by vows, this is something of what is required to be a priest of the Seminary of St. Sulpice." Such was the spirit M. Olier strove to make predominant among the masters and students of the newly-founded seminary, and we can easily realise how "the seminary thus guided, resembled a religious community in the glow of its first fervour." As his work was manifestly blessed by

Heaven he was asked by several bishops in France to extend to their dioceses the benefits of his institution. At the General Assembly of the bishops and clergy of France, held in Paris in 1651, a memorial was presented by one of M. Olier's priests explaining the object of the institution, its rules and constitution. This memorial was entitled "Projet de l'Établissement d'un Séminaire dans un diocèse." It was carefully examined by the bishops, got their blessing and approval, and at their next general meeting, effectual steps were taken for availing of it by founding diocesan seminaries throughout France. M. Olier's biographer gives a most interesting history of the part taken by the college of St. Sulpice in furthering this object. His colleagues and himself took the work in hand with a right good will, and devoted themselves to it with such untiring zeal, so much patience and disinterestedness, that the French clergy rejoiced to help and imitate them. The applications made to M. Olier by bishops anxious to establish diocesan seminaries were so numerous, that he could entertain but a small proportion of them. The bishops who were unable to secure the services of himself or of some of his colleagues, got from him a model of what these institutions should be, and they were not slow to make use of it.

The work thus inaugurated nearly 250 years ago continues to produce most happy results up to the present day. In our own time the Sulpicians retain their hold on the respect and love of the French Church, and have their colleges established in Paris, Lyons, Toulouse, Bordeaux, Autun, Avignon, Orleans, Limoges, Dijon, Clermont, Aix, and numerous other cities. It is well also to bear in mind what M. Olier and the Sulpicians did for religion and civilisation in Canada by establishing the College at Montreal. A goodly and most interesting volume might be written about the services rendered to Catholicism during the past two hundred years by the Sulpicians of Montreal alone. This work is sure to be extended and continued in the United States by their two colleges, one at Baltimore and one newly-founded at Boston by Archbishop Williams, himself a distinguished student of St. Sulpice. This latter college is governed by Father Hogan an eminent theologian who was brought to Boston from Paris

where he filled the chair of moral theology in succession to the well-known Carrière.

The Venerable Joseph Liberman, Père Lacordaire, and the eloquent and fearless Dupanloup owed much of their greatness to St. Sulpice. France at present owes to it some of its most distinguished ecclesiastics, witness the Cardinal Archbishop of Lyons, Cardinal Archbishop of Tunis, Cardinal Archbishop of Rheims, Cardinal Archbishop of Sens, the Archbishops of Paris and Rouen. It has also provided the present occupants for the Sees of Annecy, Bayeux, Blois, Toulon, Meaux, Montpellier, Metz, Poitiers, and others too numerous to mention. Bishops educated in St. Sulpice occupy sees in Ireland, Canada, the United States, South America and Australia. The priests of St. Sulpice have won eminence in every branch of Ecclesiastical Science. They have produced great works in Dogmatic and Moral Theology, Canon Law, Ascetic Theology, Biblical and Oriental Literature, Ecclesiastical History, Sacred Biography and Philosophy. We may name Carrière, Icard, Bruyere, Vallet, Mamier, Gosselin, Le Hir, Vigouroux, Bacuez, Tronson and others equally distinguished. This is a goodly array of great names to reflect glory on M. Olier's work. He sketched out vast and far reaching plans for his Society but it may be doubted whether he ever anticipated such great results as it has produced. We have not spoken of him as curé of the parish of St. Sulpice, or of the great reforms he effected in that large and disorderly quarter of the city. We earnestly recommend this portion of his biography to all those who desire to know what was the condition of religion in Paris in his day and what he did to make men respect and practise it.

Mr. Healy Thompson with all the love and enthusiasm of a biographer gives us a vivid picture of M. Olier's labours as curé of this parish. The entire work is written in the biographer's best style, but we think this part of it is particularly well done. The author of M. Olier's life requires no praise from us, or indeed from any one else. He is now too well known as a writer of religious biography and editor of works of that class. However, we may say that he was very happy in this selection of a subject for



a biography and he set about his labour of love with all the energy of M. Olier himself. It is not too much to say that he has succeeded in giving us a work edifying and instructive in the highest degree. He shows us what was the religious, political and social condition of France, and of Paris especially, in M. Olier's life-time. We catch glimpses of Louis XIII. and Louis XIV., Anne of Austria, Richelieu, Mazarin and De Retz; we do not find these exalted characters to improve on a close inspection. We also get a glimpse at M. Olier in what perhaps we may fairly call misguided zeal trying to impress some religious views on the mind of that worthless and faithless Stuart, Charles II.; we also get a good succinct account of the war of Paris in 1649 when the Parliament and citizens made a miserable attempt to wring from the crown some of those constitutional rights which the English Parliament and people won at the same time in so emphatic and characteristic a fashion.

The history of Jansenism necessarily comes into this work and we see what efforts its abettors made to introduce its poisonous doctrines among M. Olier's Seminarists. How completely they failed we may judge from language used by Fénelon to Clement XI. in the year 1705. "*Soli sunt Sانسulpitiani Seminaristae quibus cordi sit hanc labem a se depellere. Unde a Cardinale Archiepiscopo viles et invisibabentur.*" These words were written fifty years after M. Olier had breathed his last in the arms of St. Vincent de Paul. He died at the early age of forty-eight, but being made perfect in a short space, he fulfilled a long time, once having pleased God, he was beloved, and speedily translated to receive the great rewards of his zeal and labour for God and his holy Church.

For proof of the high esteem in which the Sulpicians are held at present by the Holy See, we refer to the letter of His Holiness Leo XIII., sent to their present rector M. Icard, and published in the October number of the RECORD, (Vol. vii., p. 947).

This paper was suggested to us by Mr. H. Thompson's new and enlarged edition of M. Olier's life, and we wish to conclude it by quoting a paragraph from Dr. Vaughan's

letter to the learned author. "M. Olier's life is a perfect mine of ecclesiastical thought and suggestions. I wish all our ecclesiastical colleges possessed many copies of it, so that it might be a kind of text-book both for superiors and students."

ANDREW BOYLAN.

THE GERMAN AND GALLIC MUSES.

A FEW months ago we had to listen with all patience and seeming unconcern to the apotheosis from press and platform of one, who had passed more than the years usually allotted to the span of human life; and who, after various vicissitudes of pain and strife, terror and triumph, had come to be regarded as the great national poet of France, and the prophet of that recent development of man's eccentricity—the religion of humanity. Poet and essayist, novelist and historian, he left no department of letters untried; and the praises of him were so persistent, and his personality of such influence in these latter days, that even those who were not of his household or country came to join in the universal chorus of unstinted worship, and unconditional admiration. "Foremost man of this our century," "Apostle of Freedom and Humanity," the "latest seer vouchsafed to us," and in lower tones, "the greatest lyric poet of France and the world," "the best dramatic novelist of our century"—this is the chime that has been swinging its adulations in our ears, and whose music is rather marred by its monotony.

But even when the glory of the man had reached its height, when his mortal elements were carried in funeral procession, and the steps of the sacred temple which was to be his mausoleum, were piled with floral tributes from France and the world, a question would force itself upon us. Outside the ranks of newspaper critics, a few dreamy enthusiasts in his own country, and an exceedingly limited number of poetasters and littérateurs in these islands, how many are

there who have read Victor Hugo's poems? to how many are his verses familiar? who can quote one single line from them? who can even tell the titles of his works? In the whole wide realm of English literature, he appears to have had but one admirer and advocate, an eccentric but strong genius whose rapturous enthusiasm, however, would scarcely have compensated the vain dead poet for the studied indifference of the English literary world. Master of the English language as he undoubtedly is, Swinburne can scarcely find words to express his admiration of Victor Hugo. He calls him—

“The mightiest soul
That came forth singing ever in men's ears,
Of all souls with us, and thro' all these years,
Rings yet the lordliest, waxen yet more strong.”

And again,

“That one, whose name gives glory
One man, whose life makes light.

* * * *

Our lord, our light, our master,
Whose word sums up all song.”

And so on through the whole litany of adulation. But what do the masses of the people think? Is Hugo even in his own France as familiar to educated people, as Tennyson is in these islands? Will literary men in his own country form learned societies to explain and apply the meaning of his verses, like the Shakspearean societies that are numberless amongst ourselves? Will there be a club in Paris, half a century after his death, to meet every year in worship of him, as the admirers of Wordsworth do in London? Will his sentences be quoted in books and speeches, to strengthen them by apposite illustration, or adorn them, so that they shall not easily slip from the memories of men?

But the question takes a wider range. It must have occurred to many readers that French poetry is absolutely unknown beyond the geographical boundaries of the Republic. Since the time of Frederick the Great who patronised Voltaire, and made French literature, manners, language, fashionable amongst the Teutons, there has been a steady decline in the popularity of French poetry amongst educated foreigners; and on the other hand, there has been a steady

increase of admiration for that wonderful galaxy of thinkers and singers which the Fatherland, to make up for past apathy, has produced. In England, every educated person has acquired, or thinks it necessary to affect, a taste for foreign literature. The wild poet, who saw the fiery snow fall upon the backs of the tormented, who felt the breath of the hurricane that swept round in fierce gusts the sad souls of Paolo and Francesca, who lingered amongst the sealed tombs that held lost souls, and tore bleeding limbs when he touched the branches of the gloomy trees, must be as familiar as Shakspeare or Byron to the cultured English intellect. Calderon, too, and Lope de Vega, must be recognised; and even the far off poets of the East, with their strange mythical philosophies, have found honourable places in our magazines, and more than one learned commentator; and above all, German philosophy, German romance, and German poetry must be known, if one desires not to be classed amongst those, who sit in exterior darkness, and have no place in the circles, where familiarity with the works of genius is the only passport of admission. But it is no literary crime to be quite ignorant of French poetry. You may know that Racine and Molière existed, and wrote certain tragedies and comedies, but no one is expected to spend much time on these poets of the past, or to waste midnight oil in seeking to discover or remember their beauties. And so, for one who has heard the names of Alain Chartier or Villon, a hundred have by heart the songs of Schiller and Herder; for one who cares about the Napoleonic songs of Béranger, a hundred admire the glaive-song of Körner.

The study of the causes which have made French poetry a drug in the market, whilst French literature in every other department holds a foremost place amongst its contemporaries in every country in Europe, is a very curious, and perhaps, instructive one. It has been said that the French language is not well adapted to the higher forms of poetry. With its fondness for light dental syllables,¹ the almost total absence of strong guttural sounds, and its numberless particles, whose

¹ With what delight did I hear the woman who conducted us to see the triumphal arch of Augustus at Susa, speak the clear and complete language of Italy, though half unintelligible to me, after that nasal and abbreviated cacophony of the French. *Shelley's Letters from Italy.*

tenuity is not relieved as in Greek and German, with deep sonorous syllables, it remains for ever the language of the drawing-room or cabinet, of pastoral loves and sweet simplicities, but can never be made the vehicle of the stormy outpourings of love or terror, of the stern passion and solemn feeling which the tragic muse demands; nor in lyric poetry can it ever convey the pathos and the tenderness and the sublimity, that belong to the subjects, which in our times poetic geniuses have almost universally adopted. French writers admit this inferiority of their language to those of the ancient classics, and seek every pretext for maintaining that, notwithstanding this weakness French dramatic poetry deserves to take a place on the high level of the immortal works which Greek genius has left to humanity. They hold that the rhythm of their language can never be understood by foreigners; and that, owing to the peculiar possession by French artists of an organic power over the sounds and syllables in poetry, which they call the tonic accent, the full meaning of their great dramatists can be interpreted to an audience in strong, but harmonious rhetoric—melodious, yet as passionate and striking as the harshest threnodies of Æschylus; and that the weakness of the perpetual rhyming, which is so painful to readers of French tragedy, is altogether removed, when by attention to meaning and by gesture, every passionate speech is uttered, accentuated by oratorical inflexion. This, they say, was the secret of the power of Talma, the greatest of French tragedians.

However correct this strong defence may be, the fact remains that for the majority of readers, who are entertained by their poets, not in the auditorium of a theatre, but in the silence of their studies, the French language is absolutely effeminate—we might almost say exasperating, in its inadequacy to express what are often great and splendid ideas. And, unfortunately, the three great tragic poets of France, Corneille, Voltaire, and Racine, have challenged comparison with the masterpieces of antiquity by selecting for treatment, characters, scenes and episodes, that belong to the mythology of Greece and Rome. To any one familiar with Greek tragedy, whose ears have been accustomed to the long rich roll of the Epic hexameter, to the iambics of the Attic stage, and

to the high heroic style of the chief actors in the immortal dramas of Greece, nothing can appear more paltry and weak than the mock heroics of their modern French imitators. Here for example, is a part of a dialogue between Agamemnon and Achilles, on an occasion of unusual solemnity, when the former had determined to sacrifice his daughter Iphigenia, and Achilles, her betrothed, has just heard the terrible report.

ACHILLE.

Un bruit assez étrange est venu jusqu'à moi
Seigneur ; je l'ai jugé trop peu digne de foi.
On dit, et sans horreur, je ne puis le redire,
Qu'aujourd'hui, par votre ordre Iphigénie expire.

AGAMEMNON.

Seigneur, je ne rends point compte de mes desseins,
Ma fille ignore encore mes ordres souverains,
Et, quand il sera temps quelle en soit informée,
Vous apprendrez son sort, j'en instruirai l'armée.

ACHILLE.

Ah ! je sais trop le sort, que vous lui réservez.

AGAMEMNON.

Pourquoi le demander, puisque vous le savez.¹

Instead of an excited prologue to a tragedy, this reads like a cautious and diplomatic exchange of question and retort between the clever plenipotentiaries of two rival States. But turn to the *Iphigenias* of Euripides, or the *Iphigenia in Tauris* of Goethe, and the vast inferiority of the Gallic to the Greek and German dialects will be apparent. Or take any part of the *Iliad*, or a single page of *Paradise Lost* and then hear Voltaire in the only epic poem which France has produced—the *Henriade*. Here is the opening description of the massacre of St. Bartholomew:—

Cependant tout s'apprête, et l'heure est arrivée
Qu'au fatal dénoûment la reine a réservée.
Le signal est donné sans tumulte et sans bruit ;
C'était à la faveur des ombres de la nuit.
De ce mois malheureux l'inégale courrière
Semblait cacher d'effroi sa tremblante lumière.
Coligny languissait dans les bras du repos,
Et le sommeil trompeur lui versait ses pavots.
Soudain de mille cris le bruit épouvantable
Vient arracher ses sens à ce calme agréable.

¹ Iphigénie—Racine.

It is as "moonlight unto sunlight, and as water unto wine." But the German language, so broad, and deep, and resonant lends itself easily to metrical romance, historical epic, or the stately drama. Very strong, rough elements went to compose it — the dialects of the East Goths who occupied the low alluvial lands of the Danube and the Elbe—and whilst still crude and unformed, Ovid, the earliest poet who wrote in German, discovered its adaptability to Greek and Roman rhythm, and invented the German hexameter, the same metre, in which Wieland and Klopstock wrote their immortal epics. And there cannot be a doubt but that this language is peculiarly fitted for heroic and dramatic poetry. The long compound words, each of which is a metaphor, like the compound Greek adjectives, the preponderance of consonants, sometimes linked and riveted together as if to reduplicate their strength, and the distinct pronunciation of every letter, gives a tone of masculine vigour to the language, which makes it peculiarly the language of the tragedian. But even in softer lyric verses, the words fit in, when used with skill as easily as the liquid Italian. We quote two stanzas from Uhland's *Das Schloss am Meer*:—

“Sahest du oben gehen
Den König und sein Gemahl?
Der rothen Mäntel wehen?
Der goldnen Kronen Strahl?
Führten sie nicht mit Wonne
Eine schöne Jungfrau dar
Herrlich wie eine sonne
Strahlend in goldnen Haar?”

and these few lines of Mignon's song, which are familiar.

Kennst du das Land? wo die Citronen blühn
Im dunkeln Laub die Gold-Orangen glühn
Ein sanfter Wind vom blauen Himmel weht
Die Myrte still und hoch der Lorbeer steht
Kennst du es wohl?
Dahin! Dahin!
Möcht' ich mit dir, o mein Geliebter, ziehn.

But the distinct inferiority of French to German poetry is rather to be sought in two yet more powerful causes—the configuration of the countries, and their histories, legendary

or otherwise. It may seem a bold assertion that the poetry of a country takes its tone from its scenery, and that the divine dreams of bards and singers are coloured by associations of mountains and rivers, the level beauties or rich undulations of a landscape, or the many wonders of the sea. Yet, if a poet is above all things a child of nature—if she is his mother, his mistress, his teacher, who keeps her secrets for him alone, and shows him pictures, to which other men are blind, and whispers music which the unfavoured shall not hear, assuredly his writings must bear some strong impress of his fancies, and, according to Nature's teachings, be rich or poor, tame or spirited, the rapt utterance of an oracle that is inspired, or the stammering of a voice, which has never been lifted above the low levels of human knowledge and utterance. Hence, Mount Parnassus was the home of the Muses in the Greek mythology, and from the mystic fountain their clients drew their inspiration; and every poet that has sung since these distant times has walked with Nature first and then with man, to learn the myriad moods in which she strives to captivate and educate her wayward child. True to her teachings was the Irish bard, who returned from the ends of the earth to see once more the "purple mountains of Innisfail," and if there be any special charm in the works of an artist who is always delightful, it is the sombre tone in which he envelops the mournful chant of "In Memoriam," or the twilight atmosphere in which he exhibits the spectral forms of Arthur and his knights.

Now, Nature has been particularly unkind to France. She has given her splendid facilities for commerce and agriculture; but her dowry of broad, tame, fertile plains, unbroken by the barrenness of shaggy mountains, and unrelieved by the desolation of moorland or mere, has never qualified her to be "meet nurse for a poetic child." Smooth, bare levels, dotted with poplars, arranged with the mathematical precision which Nature detests, and shallow rivers flowing by dull towns, yield not a spot which Melpomene could haunt, and lift the soul of native child or gifted stranger to that mood of inspiration when the spirit of man breaks forth in song. But in Germany everything favours

the poetic and philosophic spirit. Its broad majestic rivers, castle-crowned, and jewelled with green islets, its giant forests, dark and gloomy, as if still haunted by the spirit of Druidical worship, its mountains, with their brockens and witches, its historic cities, that were swept by the storms of political strife, and rent with the rage of battles, all combine to give a tinge of the weird and supernatural to German poetry, and to eliminate whatever is merely formal, prosaic, or utilitarian. Every mountain has its legend, every forest its grim history, every river its associations; and brooding over all, and colouring legend, history, and association is the dark spirit of Scandinavian mythology. Across the dawn of French poetry we see a gay procession of jongleurs and troubadours daintily dressed, swinging their guitars, and singing of love and flowers and perfumes, "Vous estes belle en bonne foye," and "Si jamais fust un Paradis en terre." Across the dawn of German poetry are the dark figures of the scalds, who sang of Thor and Odin, and the mad Beresarks, and the Valkyres, who, forgetting their sex, went out on the battle-field by night, and slew the wounded. The former sang in quaint old Breton, or the half-Spanish French of the south, and the eternal subject in lay, virelay, and rondelay, is the silly nonsense that for ever attaches to purely erotic poetry. The latter sang in rough gutturals¹ of war, and the gods, and the fountains of being, and the origin of men, and the three sisters Urda, Verandi and Skulda, of the twilight, and the windswells, and the old man of the mountain and the old man of the sea. The earliest monuments of Gothic intellect are these rough old rhymes on subjects, which though clothed in uncouth language and darkened in the twilight of mythology must still be considered the beginnings of those modern schools of poetry which have produced masterpieces which will bear to be read or represented by the side of the masterpieces which Greece produced in the zenith of its

¹Sunt illis haec quoque carmina, quorum relatu, quem Barditum vocant, accendunt animos, futuraeque pugnae fortunam ipso cantu augurantur: terrent enim trepidantve prout sonuit acies. Nec tam voces illae quam virtutis concentus videntur: adfectatur praecipue asperitas soni, et fractum murmur, objectis ad os scutis quo plenior ac gravior vox repercussu intumescat.—*Tacitus.*

intellectual power. But the love songs of the *trouveres* and *troubadours* are the beginnings of an effeminate school which never in its earlier days thought of the philosophy of nature as a subject for poetry, and never in its later days touched that great subject without reducing it to ridicule. And so even to this day we have *rondeaux*, *triolet*s and *huitains* with "les parfums," "les fleurs," "les oiseaux," and "le printemps" well sprinkled through them; but not a word that is worth remembering of a past, that may be lingered over with regret, of a present rich in fruitful philosophy, or a future that is fraught with buoyant hopes and cheerful presages for humanity.

But did not the Germans actually adopt not only the versification, but even the subjects of French poetry? True; after the conquests of Charlemagne, a strong imitative spirit grew up in Germany for everything French; and the romances of chivalry which took their rise in Brittany, which celebrated the glories of the Round Table, and the bravery of Charlemagne, and the exploits of Amadis of Gaul, became the ruling subjects of literature not only in Germany, but all over Europe. The Italians had no vernacular poetry prior to the fourteenth century. The earliest of their poems which have come down to us are simply imitations, both in dialect and subject, of the ancient Provençal poets. The Spaniards invited their singers from beyond the Pyrenees. All the early English romances are avowedly taken from Norman sources, and the German romances are simply translations of the fame of Sir Percivale, or the loves of Lancelot of the Lake, or the fate of Sir Tristram. But we cannot say that any works of native Germans, written in this humble, imitative style, deserve to be remembered now. Just as the Italian copyists have passed away, and are forgotten, whilst the figure of Dante, huge, colossal, original, stands enshrined in the Temple of Immortality; and as the Spanish copyists have passed away, and leave Calderon and Lope de Vega, the sole representatives of Spanish and Portuguese art, so the servile imitators of Breton or Provençal romance in Germany have barely recorded of them in musty indices of the Vatican or elsewhere, that they wrote such and such a work in "merrie

rime," but that is all the hold they have on the attention of our age to be rescued from absolute oblivion. Even during this dull period, the only works of any importance that have challenged the notice of posterity are the original metrical romances, that have for subject some national or mythological legend derived from purely Gothic sources—such as the expedition of the Ecken, or the Lay of the Nibelungs. In truth, Frankish influence appears to have paralysed every effort of native Germans to establish and consecrate to national purposes a truly original school of poetry. The traditionary ballads of the trouveres had a host of servile imitators, who, when tired of extravaganzas in amatory verse introduced the same silly sentimentality—the same profane and farfetched imagery—the same indelicacy and coarseness into the miracle plays, which during this period, were tolerated over the whole continent of Europe. In fact, Germany had ceased to be a nation, and had become merely a collection of principalities, and German poetry had come to be represented by a few ballad writers, who were welcome in the halls of the feudal barons, but who neither caught inspiration from the people, their history and their traditions, nor, in turn, communicated those passionate feelings to the masses, which in later times stirred them to the deepest depths of their being, and created the high ambition, which has placed Germany foremost amongst the nations in all kinds of intellectual culture. In fact, in Germany as in all other nations, nationality and literature acted and reacted on each other. So long as Germany remained under Frankish influence, political or literary, so long it remained in a condition of intellectual debility. When emancipated from foreign influence, it at once produced masters in every branch of intellectual enterprise. When again it passed under the dominance of Frankish customs, it relapsed into sluggish barrenness. It has been said that it was the Reformation which quickened the intellectual pulse of Germany, and by introducing freedom of opinion, philanthropic liberality, &c., stimulated the minds of men to those contests on religion, science, and the humanities, by which the intellect is always invigorated, and the

imagination has scope for broad and liberal speculations in every department of human knowledge. But that this is not so, is evidenced by the facts that for 150 years after the Reformation, the countries of Europe, which embraced Protestantism sank back into a condition of almost primitive barbarism ; and that long before the Reformation, and in the very centre of Catholicism, a revival of taste for all the arts that can elevate and refine humanity, for the sciences which contribute to man's comfort, and for the literature which broadens and beautifies his mind, had already taken place. "If the three hundred years," says an English writer¹—"which elapsed between 1500 and 1800, be divided into equal parts, the spirit of the Reformation will be allowed to have been most operative during the first hundred and fifty years. But the diffusion of general welfare and illumination will be found most conspicuous during the last hundred and fifty years. This progress, both of populousness and refinement, resulted chiefly from the increase of wealth ; and the increase of wealth resulted chiefly from the extension of commerce, which grew out of the conquest of Hindostan, and the Colonization of America ; events independent of the Reformation. If the European territories shaken by this revolution be distinguished into Protestant and Catholic countries, and the respective masses be compared with each other, the Protestant will uniformly be found the more barbarous during the three first half-centuries of the Reformation ; as if the victory of the new opinions had occasioned a retrogression of civility. The Catholic provinces seem barely to have retained their anterior refinement ; but the Protestant provinces to have receded towards rudeness ; and these only began to recover their natural rank, in the competition of national culture, when the religious zeal of their ruling classes began to abate. Valuing thus in gross the effects of the Reformation, it is surely not easy to perceive its merits." We quote another sentence from the same Protestant author, just to show that the opinion of Carlyle and others, that modern civilisation is directly traceable to the Reformation is not shared by all thinkers. "When it is considered that,

¹ W. Taylor. *Survey of German Poetry.*

of the evil, which for one hundred and fifty years accompanied the Reformation along its progress, much inheres in the very nature and essence of the change ; that, of the good, which for one hundred and fifty years has been enjoyed in the seats of the Reformation, much might equally have been expected without any alteration at all ; and that a purer reformation from the bosom of Italy itself, was probably intercepted by the premature violence of Luther and his followers—surely they may not hastily, or decidedly, be classed among the benefactors of the human race. The northern Reformers made tempests and bloody showers ; and now that the sunshine is restored to their fields, they boast of the storm as the cause of the fertility.”

We see therefore that the change in the religious opinions of Germany was not the prelude to the golden epoch of its poetry and literature. That the spirit of independence of foreign influences, and the popularisation of German manners, language, &c., had an immediate and vivifying effect on German genius is evidenced by the fact that it was in the year 1748, the first German grammar was published by Gottsched,¹ and writing in German became popular, and from that year for a long century, Germany produced with a rapidity which astonished herself and the world, a galaxy of poetic and other geniuses, more numerous, and of more transcendent ability than all the modern nations of Europe have together produced. We do not say that she therefore bears the palm of intellectual superiority, or that she is the cradle of the world's greatest men. We do not say that Goethe is a greater poet than Shakspere or Dante, or that Klopstock is equal to Milton. But we do say that in the short space of a single century, and that century bounding the only national life which Germany has enjoyed, it has given to the world a school of poets and philosophers of more unique, original, and varied talent, of higher and more transcendent aims and ideas, and of greater perfection of artistic workmanship, than can be found on the rolls of honour of any other nation. Here are names, every one of which is mentioned with enthusiasm, not only at home, but in every academy and university in

¹ Up to that date, the learned wrote in Latin.

Europe, Goethe, Schiller, Herder, Werner, Heine, Novalis Bürger, Freiligrath, Klopstock, Körner, Lessing, Tieck, Uhland, Wieland, Hoffmann, &c., &c., of whom Carlyle says: "We have no hesitation in stating, that we see in certain of the best German poets, and those, too, of our own time, something which associates them, remotely or nearly we say not, but which does associate them with the Masters of Art, the Saints of Poetry, long since departed, and as we thought, without successors, from the earth, but canonised in the hearts of all generations, and yet living to all by the memory of what they did and were. Glances we do seem to find of that ethereal glory which looks upon us in its full brightness from the *Transfiguration* of Raffaele, from the *Tempest* of Shakspeare; and, in broken, but still purest, and heart-piercing beams, struggling through the gloom of long ages, from the tragedies of Sophocles, and the weather-worn sculpture of the Parthenon. This is that heavenly spirit which, best seen in the aerial embodiment of poetry, but spreading likewise over all the thoughts and actions of an age, has given us Surreys, Sidneys, Raleighs in court and camp, Cecils in policy, Hookers in divinity, Bacons in philosophy, and Shakspeares and Spensers in song. In affirming that any vestige, however feeble, of this divine spirit is discernible in German poetry, we are aware that we place it above the existing poetry of any other nation."

We might say in conclusion, that the whole spirit of Germany is in alliance with the lofty ideas and emotions which find their embodiment in poetry: the whole spirit of France is in direct opposition and antipathy. There are two very exquisite passages from two of our most eminent English poets, which clearly exemplify this statement. Robert Browning speaking of subjective poets and taking Shelley as a type, says: "Not what man sees, but what God sees—the *ideas* of Plato—seeds of creation lying burningly on the Divine Hand—it is towards these that he struggles. Not with the combination of humanity in action, but with the primal elements of humanity he has to do; and he digs where he stands,—preferring to seek them in his own soul as the nearest reflex of that absolute Mind, according to the inten-

tions of which he desires to perceive and speak." To the spiritual, introspective character of German genius, these remarks would admirably apply; and although there appears to have been no correspondence either of imitation or praise between Shelley and his German contemporaries, he derived his undoubted inspirations from sources to which they had access and recourse, and his poetry, which has long since passed into the region of the deathless classics, has an indisputable affinity with the legendary and lyrical poetry of the Fatherland. For if the German poets were metaphysicians before they broke through forms and sang in clear resonant rhythm emotions and ideas that were unintelligible in mere prose, Shelley, too, had his mind formed on the teachings of Plato,¹ and his immortal verse is but the disburthening of a great philosophical mind, which laboured under the doubts and difficulties of existence to the end. And his vain ineffectual straining after an excellence and beauty, which he ended by declaring it to be visionary and ideal, what is it but that perpetual balancing of reason and fancy, which is so remarkable amongst the German poets, and which is unknown to French versifiers? For these latter, unable to maintain an equipoise between the two great powers of the intellect, decided to dethrone imagination, and deify reason. Whence it is easy to understand that saying of Shelley's: "Rousseau was essentially a poet—the others (meaning Voltaire and his school of sceptics), were mere reasoners."

The other sentence we take from Shelley himself: "Poetry is indeed something divine, it is at once the centre and circumference of all knowledge; it is that which comprehends all science, and that to which all science must be referred. It is the perfect and consummate surface and bloom of all things; it is as the odour and colour of the rose to the texture of the elements which compose it, as the form and splendour of unfaded beauty to the secrets of anatomy and corruption." It is the brilliant surface then of men and things, and not the hidden mechanism of nature that comes under the domain of poetry; or if the divine art will penetrate beneath the surface and seek to understand secret operations that issue in such

¹Introductory note to "Essays" and "Letters" by Ernest Rhys.

splendours of form and colour, it is with a view to understand their mystery and meaning, and not to reduce them to the commonplaces of science. Here the analyst and theorist have no place. The subtle essence of poetic thought can no more be sifted and solved than the scent of a rose in summer, or the odours that are wafted from the sea. Its secret charm, which appeals to our highest senses, and gives us some idea of pre-existence as it certainly gives a hope of immortality, is undefinable; and human speech, that is wrought into such mysterious and beautiful texture under its influence, has no power to declare the nature of the spell that enfolds it. And as in the sister art of music, the ethereal harmonies which sway human emotions are altogether beyond the grasp of the geometer, who can tell the exact value of notes and intervals, or the surgeon who knows exactly the physiology of the vocal chords, so poetry in its highest forms is far beyond the reach of critical or analytical intellects, who understand the science of the skeleton, but are blind to the beauty and perfection of the living form. Yet, France has always had a dread of the ideal; and her painters and novelists, her sculptors and poets, have driven realism to extremes. Battle-scenes and historical episodes cover their canvasses; the *Morgue* and the *Salpêtrière* furnish the heroes and heroines of romance, and their poets have either taken the classic legends, and deprived them of the life and charm they possessed for the ancients, or affected those historical subjects, which even in the hands of Shakspeare are only redeemed from dulness by the highest efforts of genius and art. The result is this. The spirit of our age is totally opposed to dry verse, which the soul of poetry never animated. A solitary poet, like Austin Dobson, may try to revive in our magazines some taste for French forms of versification, with comparatively little success, but the unerring instincts of great geniuses like Coleridge and Carlyle force them to direct the full searching light of intellect and taste on German poems and German mysticism, with the result that a radiance is reflected upon themselves which will keep bright their names and memories so long as the world retains its appreciation for thoughts that are imperishable and art that is immortal.

FREQUENT COMMUNION.

I HAVE not read any book on the subject of Frequent Communion that was of greater assistance to me, in the guidance of souls, than that of Monseigneur de Ségur. My first acquaintance with it was formed in consequence of the high encomiums bestowed upon it by the late Right Reverend Dr. Furlong, Bishop of Ferns, at a Conference of his Clergy. My practice, before I read it, was much more strict; but from the force of its arguments, and more especially from the positive approval of His Holiness Pius IX., I hold the book in the highest esteem.¹

From my experience of very many years, I can say that we do not require to use arguments with people to restrain them from frequent Communion; on the other hand it is often difficult to induce them by any amount of reasoning to practise frequent Communion. And all the reasons which are brought forward to decline frequent Communion, such as not being sufficiently worthy, or sufficiently holy, or not having time to go to Confession, or make sufficient preparation or thanksgiving, are answered most satisfactorily in Monseigneur de Ségur's book on Holy Communion. It is not that I merely admire the theory of Monseigneur de Ségur, but I found that the application of it, in the case of persons who could not be induced to give up venial sin (when the excluding system was adopted), gradually led them to break off the habit of venial sin, and to acquire such an amount of perfection as could reasonably be expected from people engaged in worldly pursuits.

The principle on which Monseigneur de Ségur particularly dwells is, that we are not to regard the Holy Communion

¹ Extract from Monseigneur de Ségur's preface to his work:—"Our Holy Father, Pope Pius IX., to whom I took the liberty of presenting this little work, has honoured it with his gracious sanction. The following is an extract of the Apostolic Brief, by which His Holiness has deigned to confirm the doctrine:

"Beloved son, we have received with happiness the homage of your book, and we congratulate you greatly on the laudable and religious zeal with which you have endeavoured to excite the faithful to approach more frequently the Holy Communion. . . ."

"Given at St. Peter's, Rome, the 29th September, 1860."

only as a recompense of acquired sanctity, so much as a means of obtaining it.

What does the Council of Trent teach on the matter, when it wishes that the faithful would communicate, not only spiritually, but also sacramentally, every day at Mass, in order to reap more abundant fruit from the Holy Sacrifice? (*Con. Trid. Sessione 22, ch. 6.*) People may be easily induced to stay away who, when left without strength, will fall into more frequent and greater venial sins, and thus be easily led on to commit mortal sins, and lose their souls; but these same persons, had they been encouraged to go to Communion frequently, might have held on, diminished the number of venial sins, and ultimately saved their souls.

The devil, as Luther himself says, induced him to abolish private Masses; and what may we conceive to be the reason? Not only to deprive God of the honour of the repetition in substance of the Sacrifice of Calvary, but also to hinder the possibility of daily Communion. The devil, because he hates us, would keep us away with Jansenistic fear from the true source of life and strength. But Our Blessed Lord tells us: "Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, you cannot have life in you."

No one doubts the teaching of Innocent XI., that all suspicion of irreverence or scandal should be removed in the reception of this Sacrament. When we have to deal with persons who deliberately fall into venial sins, particularly where scandal may be given, as in cases of intemperance, detraction, &c., and make no effort to amend, reason itself dictates that we should defer Communion. But if they are struggling against the habit, especially where there is mere frailty—and even when in certain cases mortal sin is committed—no more powerful remedy than frequent and even daily Communion can be adopted. Witness St. Philip Neri, who found a young man committing a solitary sin, and yet brought him for eleven continuous days, though there were relapses each day, to Confession and Communion, and thus ultimately cured him.

My own experience on the matter is, that for a length of time I had a great deal of trouble and labour in striving to make penitents give up, by many means, the commission

of venial sins; and I have found no remedy better than frequent, and ultimately daily, Communion. In the course of time, habits that at first appeared incorrigible were totally removed, and a great love of virtue and of Jesus, the Source of virtue, implanted.

I sin daily. I daily stand in need of the remedy (St. Augustine). St. Thomas teaches that the augmentation of grace produced by this Sacrament is not impeded by venial sins, unless they are actually committed in receiving Communion, and that, though these latter are an obstacle to a part of the fruit of the Sacrament, they do not hinder its entire effect.

In the Catechism of the Council of Trent (Euch. n. 52,) we read that the Eucharist certainly remits venial sin. And, in washing away these lesser faults, it helps to restore whatever the soul has lost by the ardour of passion.

In the decree of Innocent XI., bishops were commanded to encourage among the faithful the practice of daily communion. Some rigorists admit that for those who have the necessary dispositions daily communion is lawful. But what do they understand by the necessary dispositions? If they mean that the soul should be *worthy* of receiving the Holy Eucharist, then who should ever communicate? Christ alone communicates *worthily*. For a God alone is worthy of receiving a God. St. Alphonsus might have added the Virgin Mother as in some degree worthy, since the Church prays thus:—"O God, who by the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin didst prepare a worthy dwelling for thy Son." But our worthiness is not deserving in this sense of the name.

If they mean the *proper dispositions*, then it has been already said, that they whose conscience is burdened with actual venial sins, and who have an affection for them, should not be allowed to communicate every day. But St. Francis de Sales says in his "Devout Life," ch. 20, that they who have no affection for venial sins, who have conquered the greater part of their corrupt inclinations, and have a great desire of Communion, may receive the Holy Communion every day. St. Thomas teaches, that when any person knows from experience, that by daily Communion his love of

God is increased, and his reverence not diminished, he ought to communicate every day. And here it may be said, that it is not for the penitent alone to judge, but rather for the confessor. Sometimes the penitent does not feel that love, though the confessor may see that it exists; when, for instance, he finds from experience that daily faults are being diminished, when his penitent communicates in order to strengthen his soul against temptation, when he becomes more fervent in prayer, more courageous in the combats of every-day life. And, as Monseigneur de Ségur says, we are not to attach too great a value to a devotion more or less sensible, but to consider piety from a more elevated point of view. The sensible devotion he describes as a spiritual sweetmeat, but by Communion we are to labour to acquire the knowledge and practice of the Christian virtues and not to be anxious for sensible consolations.

St. Alphonsus, a most powerful advocate for frequent Communion, who, when in Rome, on the occasion of his being raised to the dignity of Bishop, wrote his treatise on this subject by command of the Pope,¹ teaches that even persons who have an affection for venial sin ought to be made to communicate every week. Therefore, I say, if they have no affection for it, though through frailty they fall into venial sin, as the just do daily (I sin daily, I daily require the remedy, says a Holy Father), they ought to communicate frequently.

St. Alphonsus, it is true, teaches that those who have contracted habits of venial sin, and make no effort to amend ought to have absolution, and consequently Communion deferred; but when persons make an effort, they ought to get every possible help; and what help can be greater than frequent Communion? "Come to me all you that labour and are heavily burdened and I will refresh you." The Holy Communion preserves from mortal and effaces venial sin. (*Council of Trent, Sess. 13, ch. 2.*)

¹ Having learned from St. Alphonsus that there were men endeavouring to prevent frequent communion, the Holy Father asked him who those innovators were; he then commanded him to write his treatise on Holy Communion.—See *St. Alphonsus' Life*, edited by the Oratorians.

After condemning those who are too indulgent and those who are too rigid in this matter, St. Alphonsus, in the treatise just mentioned, says that they act in opposition to the spirit of the Church by refusing without any regard to the necessity or profit of their penitents frequent Communion, for no other reason than because it is frequent. In explaining the desire of the Holy Council of Trent that all who assist at Mass should communicate, the Roman Catechism says it is the duty of the pastor to exhort the faithful not only to frequent, but even to daily, Communion, and to teach them that the soul as well as the body stands in need of daily food. After excusing himself from producing quotations from the Holy Fathers and other authors, he says, it is enough to know that the Roman Catechism, No. 60, and the decree of Innocent XI. teach that frequent and even daily Communion has been always approved by the Church and by the Holy Fathers, who, as a learned author has shown, when they saw the practice of daily Communion given up, adopted every means in their power to re-establish it.

In the Third Council of Milan, at which St. Charles Borromeo presided, parish priests were commanded to exhort the people to daily Communion; and it was ordained that they who dared to teach the contrary in any diocese in the Province should be forbidden to preach, and should be severely chastised by the Bishop as disseminators of scandal, and declared enemies of the spirit of the Church.

A categorical list of answers to the objections even of good Christians against frequent and daily Communion may be found in the work of Monseigneur de Ségur. Against the one most commonly urged, namely the impossibility of going to confession every time one communicates, it may be enough to consider that the Church ought to be the best judge; and she has clearly expressed her decision by allowing one confession every seven days to suffice for gaining the many indulgences occurring within the week for which Confession and Communion are laid down as conditions. In some dioceses which are specially privileged, even fortnightly confession is sufficient. The Holy Communion itself is an antidote whereby we are delivered

from venial and preserved from mortal sin. (*Con. Trid. Sess. 13, ch. 2.*)

“It is Jansenism that has given rise to another anti-catholic fear, which under the pretext of greater sanctity praises confession, and alienates from communion. It staggers us with scruples, throws the conscience into a false faith, and is infinitely agreeable to the devil, in keeping us respectfully away from the adorable Eucharist, the true centre of all sanctity. Communicate boldly and joyfully. In going often to your confessor you might fear to tire him, but in communicating often, and even every day, you will never tire God Almighty.”—SEGUR.

In giving expression to the desire that this little golden treatise of Monseigneur de Ségur were in the hands of every preacher and confessor, I may safely appeal to the experience of those who are engaged in the arduous duties of the confessional—that the mere science of scholastic and moral theology is not altogether sufficient for leading souls to spend good lives, and aim at perfection. The ascetic authors must be studied, and especially those who dwell most on mercy and confidence in God. St. Alphonsus justly remarks that people will not abstain long from mortal sin through the mere fear of God, but will do it through love, and therefore every possible means towards this end should be adopted, and especially frequent communion. His own invaluable treatises “on directions for spiritual souls,” and especially “on Holy Communion and frequent Communion,” leave nothing more to be said on the subject.

I will now conclude by a quotation from the Doctor of Asceticism, St. Francis de Sales:

“Two classes of persons ought to communicate frequently—the imperfect, that they may become perfect; the perfect that they may remain and become more so.”

With regard to the frequency of administering Holy Viaticum to the dying, I think any priest who will read attentively the controversy about the administration of the Holy Viaticum in O’Kane’s work on the Roman Ritual, will not, *generatim loquendo*, have much scruple in concluding that in many circumstances of time and place, the Holy Viaticum may be administered to persons who are not fasting several times in the week, and even in some instances daily.

JOHN J. ROCHE.

THEOLOGICAL QUESTIONS.

MIXED MARRIAGES AND THEIR CONSEQUENCES—IMPORTANT CASES.

“X.Y.Z. is a priest in one of the largest towns in the North of England. It has a Catholic population of 100,000. He finds after several years’ experience that mixed marriages are causing great havoc in his flock. In the whole town, he knows from an official report, that 2,130 children are lost to the faith through mixed marriages. In the face of this appalling figure, he determines to refuse absolution in future to all Catholics, who are, what is euphemistically termed, keeping company with Protestants, and accordingly refuses it in the two following cases:

I. Paul, a Catholic young man, is very much attached to a Protestant woman, and this attachment has lasted for several years. There is no other reason whatsoever for granting a dispensation except that the parties are strongly attached to each other. He can easily get a good Catholic wife of his own rank in the town. Paul in a happy moment goes to confession to X.Y.Z., who attempts in vain to dissuade him from the marriage. Paul at last holds out a threat, that if the dispensation be refused, he will get married in the Protestant Church. X.Y.Z. nothing daunted, still persists in refusing absolution as there seems to him no earthly reason for granting the dispensation; and for this he is censured by some of his brother priests. Who is right?

II. Bridget, a Catholic servant, is acquainted with a Protestant man for four years. He would make her a good husband from a worldly point of view. He is very bigoted, but at the same time willing that all the children of the marriage should be brought up in the Catholic Faith, that his wife shall have full liberty of conscience, and that the marriage ceremony shall take place in the Catholic Church. There is no reason whatsoever for granting a dispensation in the case, beyond the fact that the acquaintanceship has lasted a long time, and that she is very much attached to the man. She can get a good Catholic husband, of her own rank, in the town. Our friend X.Y.Z. fears in his own mind that if the dispensation be refused, Bridget will get married in the Protestant Church, and that thereby all the children of the marriage will be lost to the Faith. She holds out no threat however. What is X.Y.Z. to do?

Absolution is refused for the following reasons. I.—There is no cause for granting a dispensation, as a Catholic wife or husband may easily be had. If there was present any of the causes ordinarily assigned such as *angustia loci, atas superadulta, &c.*, a dispensation would be asked for, and absolution given. II.—Experience has shown X.Y.Z., that in the vast majority of mixed marriage cases, the results are the total loss of the family to the Faith, and that, too, in very many cases, where a dispensation has been granted and the usual triple promise given. The loss of the children is one *ex ordinariis contingentibus* of a mixed marriage. How can it be lawful therefore for Bridget to expose herself to a danger that ordinarily occurs. She, herself, may be in good faith in the matter and think she will be an exception to a very general rule, but Catholics in very many cases, as the loss of 2,130 children show, allow their children to be brought up in heresy. III.—Refusing absolution will raise the tone of Catholic opinion on the matter.”

Our respected Correspondent's opening statement will be a surprise to some. That mixed marriages are fraught with the worst results no priest on the mission in these countries need be told. But that out of the children of a town so many as 2,130 should be lost to Catholicity, from this cause alone, is truly appalling. Yet, judging by what is heard from all sides, the return marks a proportion not much above the average for places similarly situated.

For this sad state of things there are causes with which it is difficult to cope. In large cities the evil is not measurable by the danger that is intrinsic to such unions even after due attention has been paid to canonical safeguards. Neither will the hostility of English law to the conditions, on which Catholics insist, account for its extent; although nowhere have we a more striking illustration of the inevitable conflict of indifferentism with the doctrine of one saving church. What is specially dangerous, we are informed, in large centres of population beyond the Channel, is that the dominant moral tone is un-Catholic, if not pagan among certain classes, and that as a consequence Catholic parents are at once less able and less willing to insist on and carry out the antenuptial conditions than elsewhere happens.

Our Correspondent gives as the outcome of experience,

“that in the vast majority of mixed marriages the result is the total loss of the family to the Faith.” This he goes on to say occurs “in many cases where dispensations have been granted.” Nay, he adds “the loss of the children is one *ex ordinariis contingentibus* of mixed marriages.” In such circumstances then, would it not be right to refuse absolution to all who do not abstain from “company-keeping” with non-Catholics?

To answer this question and discuss the other points proposed for comment, it becomes necessary to view separately the prerequisites for absolution on the one hand, and for a dispensation to marry on the other. Even for the class of persons under consideration the two sacraments need not go together in a priest’s decision. He will attach due weight to prospect of a mixed marriage; but its futurity does not fix for him a standard or rule of judgment in the tribunal of penance.

At all times it has been a solemn duty incumbent on bishops, pastors, preachers and confessors to earnestly warn the faithful against contracting mixed marriages. The evils inherent in such unions should be pointed out so often as to keep a lively sense of them ever present to the community at large. Every clergyman whose ministry brings him in contact with the people, can help in this good work, and surely no effort which wisdom will sanction, should be spared to stop the havoc described by our correspondent. What means are best? The recent Synod of Baltimore lays down four excellent rules.

“Ad hunc finem assequendum maxime conducit; 1° frequens parochorum instructio qua fideles edoceantur de Ecclesie prohibitionem mixtorum matrimoniorum. 2° Praxis uniformis eorundem parochorum in casibus occurrentibus impediendi totis viribus, hortationibus, suasionibus necnon increpationibus ne hujusmodi conjugia ineanant. 3° Examen accuratum de canonicis et gravibus causis quae requiruntur pro dispensatione super hoc mixtae communionis impedimento concedendae. 4° Post celebratas autem mixtas nuptias, parochi, gravi conscientiae onere se gravari sciunt invigilandi ut promissae a conjugibus conditiones observentur et effectum sortiantur.”

Thus pastors should labour to communicate to their people that feeling of detestation in regard to mixed marriages

which animates the Church herself. They are to use every lawful remonstrance to keep the faithful from contracting such alliances ; and in this vigorous stand there should be *uniformity* of action. They are bound to sift the causes for dispensations carefully, and see that those alleged are grave and canonical. And lastly, whilst an individual marriage for which a dispensation has been duly procured, is not to be condemned as unlawful, they are under a weighty obligation in every case to guard by special vigilance the observance of the canonical conditions in a home where either parent is a non-Catholic.

In the Confessional, too, there is room for much zeal in this matter. But it is a work which makes large demands on prudence as well as on charity, patience and sympathy. In our effort against a mixed marriage we must be careful to neither prejudice the spiritual interests of the penitent, nor make the sacred tribunal repulsive to sinners.

One of the reasons suggested for refusing absolution in certain cases is that this course "would raise the tone of Catholic public opinion on the matter." The end is good. We cannot commend the means. Public opinion should be formed according to the congenial methods pointed out in the Synod of Baltimore. These, reinforced by prudent effort in the tribunal of penance, comprise the whole remedy. But the work of the Confessional should be directly for the individual sinner. A Confessor's great concern is for his penitent's spiritual welfare ; and this thought rather than a wider anxiety for his whole flock should influence his judgment of the particular case. In short public opinion on this point is not to be improved through the confessional, except by doing what is best for each person who seeks absolution at our hands. His interest is the hinge on which our decision must turn, provided he be sufficiently disposed.

It would be a different matter if grave public scandal or injustice were sure to spring from certain conduct as from a *cause*. When a sinful project of this nature comes before a Confessor, he will consider it his duty to admonish an ignorant penitent at the risk of the latter's dispositions, if there be any fair hope of success, unless the person be dying. But in the case before us the penitent purposes nothing with this kind

of *tractus successivus*. Why then should he be deprived of absolution for the public benefit, whether fancied or real?

But we have yet to discuss X.Y.Z.'s main reasons for refusing absolution. Who would absolve one rushing headlong to spiritual destruction? See the danger! Before and after a mixed marriage, is not a Catholic in the proximate occasion of grave sin, if the facts alleged be true?

We have now at length got to the difficulty as it comes before the confessor. It is a question of dispositions in the penitent, and of occasions of sin. X.Y.Z. does not dwell on the occasion before marriage. Indeed, it is in no way peculiar except in its great danger. If certain company be a proximate occasion of grave sin, it must be given up at least by serious promise, or turned into a remote occasion, before one can be said to have the proper dispositions. Hence in some cases absolution must be refused even when the non-Catholic party promises to join the Catholic Church. But even where no such intention exists, each case must be considered on its individual merits, notwithstanding that the existence of a proximate occasion is so often verified. A penitent may be sufficiently disposed although unwilling to abandon certain companionship. Accordingly, a confessor before sending him away unabsolved should be certain that he is acting for the person's spiritual advantage; and unless the latter be a *recidivus* he will generally decide in these circumstances that the better course is to strengthen him with the graces of absolution, after giving suitable monitions. This weak soul once sent away may never return.

But X.Y.Z. grounds his uniform practice chiefly on the dangers that follow mixed marriages. If those who "keep company" with non-Catholics are not all to be denied the Sacrament of Penance before ceasing to belong to that class, by reason of antenuptial dangers to faith or morals, does not the fact of a penitent intending a union, the ordinary consequences of which are truly disastrous, imply want of the proper dispositions for absolution? We must distinguish between three classes of persons in this connection.

In the first place, a penitent who fails to give fair indication of a sincere resolve to insist on observance of the

conditions accepted by the other party, and required by the law of God and His Church, is not a fit subject for absolution. Hence if, disregarding every entreaty, such a one rushes into a mixed marriage, reckless of consequences, the priest can only pray ; he may not absolve.

Secondly, if the person be thoroughly in earnest with regard to the conditions, and the confessor have no ground for fear beyond the general danger in his locality, we do not think it would be right to deny absolution. To do so would be to act contrary to what has always been done in these cases. Such a course would result in depriving of the Sacraments a class of people who stand in bitter need of their help. If generally adopted, instead of promoting the ultimate spiritual good of souls, it could scarcely fail to turn not a few penitents into worse Christians than they otherwise might be.

By all means let everything lawful be done to avert the evil of a mixed marriage. But when it is inevitable let not the further danger, involved in sending such a penitent away without absolution, be added, without necessity or the prospect of some compensating good result. As a preliminary condition the Holy See insists on certain agreements. These do not eliminate all danger ; but they remove it sufficiently far away to enable the Church to withdraw her prohibition in the presence of grave reasons. Now when this is done we are not to look upon the Catholic party as about to do something illicit in contracting the union. However dangerous the system in general we must not condemn the individual. Is it not then going too far to refuse absolution generally, by arguing to the probable result in a particular case from what we see around us in our own district? The special danger for the individual is not certain nor very near, and is scarcely apprehended by him as serious at all. Hence, after dissuading as far as possible, we do not think it would be wise to go further and refuse absolution on the ground that the average result of mixed marriages in a particular town is deplorably bad.

Thirdly, let us suppose that, notwithstanding a penitent's *bona fides* at the present time, a confessor has reasonable grounds for doubting fidelity to antenuptial engagements in his particular case. The person, it is assumed, is

determined to seek a dispensation, or has already secured one. After every effort to dissuade has been exhausted, is such a one to be necessarily deemed unworthy of absolution? We do not think so. With his good intentions he has the requisite disposition for absolution; and as he purposes living a good life, it is better to absolve him and try afterwards to help him as best we can in his difficulties.

But in all these cases may not the cause a penitent relies on for a dispensation be plainly insufficient? If so, there is an additional reason for urging him to abandon the proposed marriage. However, in the tribunal of penance, insufficiency of cause to dispense need not always stay the power of loosing sins. It is chiefly of importance in this place so far as it influences the dispositions for absolution. If a penitent is resolved to abide by the Church's decision, want of cause does not of itself unfit him for penance. But if on the other hand, he has made up his mind to go through the ceremony in some form, come what may, and knows the malice of such intention, he cannot be deemed a fit subject for the sacrament.

The granting of a dispensation is an independent question. Altogether apart from any consideration of the person's spiritual state a true canonical cause should be present and the required conditions duly stipulated. It is not every acceptance of the Church's conditions that will suffice. As was declared in 1842, there must be—"talis promissio quae, in pactum deducta praebeat morale fundamentum de veritate executionis ita ut prudenter ejusmodi executio expectari possit." Thus it does not follow by any means that a dispensation should be granted whenever absolution is given. It is obviously the duty of a priest who applies for a dispensation, or who is asked about *causes* and *guarantees*, to examine the state of things most carefully and describe accurately the result of his investigation.

We come at length to our correspondent's special questions. The fact that Paul threatens to get married in a Protestant Church is of itself a cause for dispensing, provided it be considered that he is likely to give effect to the threat. In some countries, to avoid greater evils, Catholic priests are allowed to assist *passively* at mixed marriages, where either

dispensations have not been procured or the cautions not sufficiently guaranteed, lest the parties should contract before a Protestant minister. To act in this way a special declaration is needed from the Holy See. But the fact that it is sometimes given, even for countries where the laws are fearfully hostile to Catholic practices, is enough to show how important the Church considers the avoidance of marriage according to a non-Catholic rite.

Hence it is better, *propter duritiam cordis Pauli*, to procure the *toleration* of the Church for his marriage before a Catholic priest. We think the same with reference to Bridget's case if every effort to dissuade her from the union has been fruitless. It is in her favour that she does not use a *threat*. But if there were no danger of either going to the Protestant Church for marriage, and if no other grave cause for dispensing existed, the application should be refused.

With regard to absolution, we do not think it should be denied to Bridget. The same holds for Paul, unless his conditional intention of going before a Protestant Minister be apprehended by him as something gravely sinful. Of this the Confessor must judge. Possibly the threat only expressed his opinion of what he might be strongly tempted to do in such circumstances.

In conclusion, we think the best means for counteracting the evils mentioned by our correspondent are those pointed out in the Synod of Baltimore coupled with earnest advice in the Confessional.

THE USE OF BUTTER ON CERTAIN VIGILS.

“Would you kindly say in next issue of ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD, if according to the Rescript of January 31st, 1883, the use of Butter is allowed on the Vigils of the Nativity, the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, the Feasts of Saints Peter and Paul, and of All Saints? Some say that it is only when the Vigil happens to fall on a Friday that its use is prohibited; others assert that it is always prohibited on the Vigils of these days. What say you?”

When any of these Vigils happens on a Friday the use of eggs is prohibited. The circumstance makes no change in the use of butter.

P. O'D.

LITURGICAL QUESTIONS.

THE CALENDAR OF SAINTS FOR THE IRISH CHURCH AS IT IS NOW ARRANGED, AND THE *ORDO DIVINI OFFICII*.

WHAT office is to be recited, or what Saint's feast is kept, are some of the practical questions which many will propose, and wish to have solved? The answer can in every case be:--the feast or Saint whose office is to be celebrated, is that given in the Calendar, unless in the few cases in which a change is caused owing to the occurrence of some movable feasts, or when a transferred feast is celebrated on a vacant day. Thus for the month of January, if we except the insertion of the four Sundays, the offices are all as they are given down in the Calendar. The same holds true for each of the months.

There may be some little trouble caused by the lessons of the scripture occurring. Even this is very simple. All feasts of double major and higher rite have the lessons of the 1st Nocturn either proper or from the "Common." The "Incipits" are to be said on the feast day during the week. Thus on the 9th January, the Dom. 1^{ma} post Epiphaniam, Incipit 1 Cor. ; on the 17th Jan. fer. 2^{da}, Incipit 2 Cor. ; on the 24th January, fer. 2^{da}, Incipit 2 Cor. ; on the 24th Jan. fer. 2^{da}, Incipit ad Galatas ; on the 26th fer. 4^{ta}, Incipit ad Ephesios ; and on the 30th Dom. IV. Epiph., Incipit ad Philippenses. In those dioceses in which the Dom. V. Epiph. is anticipated and placed on the 3rd Feb. there are four Incipits of the Dom. V. to be recited during the week.

In the Dioceses of Kildare and Ferns, the three Incipits of the hebdomada quarta post Epiphaniam can be very easily arranged. The Incipits do not trouble us once Septuagesima comes until the fer. 2^{da} after Dom. in Albis.

In the following few pages the Calendar for the months of May and June with the occurring movable feasts is given. During the period covered by these months, including as it does the whole of Paschal time, and containing the Octaves of Ascension, Pentecost and Corpus Christi, the changes are necessarily numerous, but still not very perplexing.

For the remaining months the arrangements could not be simpler:—

Litt. Dom.	Dies mensis	M A I I
b	1	PHILIPPI ET JACOBI, Apost., d. 2 cl. <small>In D. Elphin. Nil de Oct.</small>
c	2	Athanasii, Ep. et Doct., duplex <small>In D. Elphin. Com. Oct.</small>
d	3	INVENTIO SANCTÆ CRUCIS, d. 2 cl., Com. Alexandri, etc., MM. <small>In D. Elphin. Nil de Oct. In D. Kildar., CONLETHI, E. C., Patroni, d. 1 cl., cum. Oct.</small>
e	4	Monicæ, Vid., duplex <small>In D. Elphin. de die Octava, S. Patroni, duplex In D. Kildar. Com. Oct. (et fit de oct. com. usque ad 9 inclusive)</small>
f	5	Pii V., Papæ et Conf., duplex
g	6	Joannis ante Portam Latinam, dupl. maj.
A	7	Stanislai, Ep. et Mart., duplex
b	8	Apparatio S. Michaelis, Archangeli, duplex maj.
c	9	Gregorii Nazianzeni, Ep. et Doct., duplex
d	10	Congalli, Abb., duplex, Com. SS. Gordiani, etc., MM. <small>In D. Kildar. Octava dies S. Patroni, duplex, Com. SS. MM.</small>
e	11	Antonini, Ep. et Conf., duplex (10 Maii) <small>In D. Kildar. INVENTIO SANCTÆ CRUCIS, d. 2 cl. (3 Maii) In D. Elphin. Monicæ, Vid., duplex (4 Maii)</small>
f	12	Nerei Achillei, etc., Virg. et Pancratii. M., semid.
g	13	Conlethi, E. C., duplex maj. (3 Maii) <small>In DD. Kildar. et Elphin., Antonini, E. C., duplex (10 Maii)</small>
A	14	Carthagi, E. C.; duplex maj., Com. Bonifacii, Mart. <small>In D. Lismor. CARTHAGI, E. C., Patroni, dupl. 1 cl., cum. Oct.</small>
b	15	Dympnæ, Virg. et Mart., dupl. maj. <small>In D. Lismor. Com. Oct. (et fit Com. Oct. usque ad 21 inclusive)</small>
c	16	Brendani, Abb., duplex maj. <small>In DD. Clonfert. et Kerrien., BRENDANI, Patroni, d. 1 cl., cum Oct.</small>
d	17	Paschalis Baylon, Conf., duplex <small>In DD. Clonfert. et Kerr., Com. Oct. (et fit Com. Oct. usque ad 22 inclusive)</small>
e	18	Venantii, Mart., duplex
f	19	Petri Celestini, Papæ et Conf., dupl., Com. S. Pudentianæ, V.
g	20	Bernardini, Senensis, Conf., semid.
A	21	Ubaldi, Ep. et Conf., semid. (16 Maii) <small>In D. Lismor., de die Octava, S. Patroni, duplex</small>
b	22	Joannis Nepomuceni, Mart. dupl. (16 Maii) <small>In D. Elphin., Conlethi, E. C., duplex maj. (3 Maii) In D. Kildar., Congall. E. C., duplex maj. (10 Maii) In D. Lismor., Ubaldi, E. C., semid, (16 Maii)</small>
c	23	Joannis Baptistæ de Rossi, Conf., duplex <small>In DD. Clonfert. et Kerrien., de die Octava, S. Patroni, duplex</small>
d	24	B.V.M., Auxil. Christianorum, duplex maj.
e	25	Gregorii VII., Papæ et Conf., duplex, Com. Urbani, M.
f	26	Phillippi Nerei, Conf., duplex, Com. Eleutherii, P.M.
g	27	Mariæ Magdalænæ de Pazzi, V., semid., Com. Joannis, P.M.
A	28	Augustini, Ep. Cantuar. et Conf., duplex
b	29	Cleti et Marcellini, MM. (26 April), semid <small>In DD. Lismor., Kildar. et Elphin., Joannis Nepomuceni, M., duplex (16 Maii) In DD. Clonfert. et Kerrien., Joannis Baptistæ de Rossi, Conf., duplex (23 Maii)</small>
c	30	Felicit, P.M. <small>In DD. Clonfert., Elphin., Kerrien., Kildar. et Lismor., Cleti et Marcellini, MM., semid. (26 April)</small>
d	31	Angelæ Mericiæ, Virg., dupl., Com. Petronillæ, Virg. <small>Dom. III. post Pascha FESTUM PATROCINII S. JOSEPH, duplex, 2 cl. Dom. Ima. post Calendas Maii (non impedita festo duplici) Puritatis B.V.M. duplex maj,</small>

Litt. Dom.	Dies mensis	JUNII
e	1	De ea
f	2	Marcellini, etc., MM.
g	3	Coemgeni, Abb., dupl. maj. In D. Dublin. COEMGENI, Abb., Patroni, d. 1 cl., cum Oct.
A	4	Francisci Carracciolo, Conf., duplex In D. Dublin., Com. Oct. (et fit com. usque ad 9 inclusive)
b	5	Bonifacii, Ep. et Mart., duplex
c	6	Jarlathii, Ep. et Conf., duplex maj. In D. Tuam., JARLATHII, Ep., Conf. et Patroni, d. 1 cl., cum Oct.
d	7	Colmani, E. C., duplex maj. In D. Dromor. COLMANI, E. C., Patroni, d. 1 cl., cum Oct. In D. Tuam. Com. Oct. (et fit com. usque ad 12 inclusive)
e	8	Norberti, E. C., duplex (6 Jun.) In D. Dromor. Com. Oct (et fit com. usque ad 15 inclusive)
f	9	Columbæ, Abb., duplex maj., Com. Primi, etc., MM. In D. Derrien. COLUMBÆ, Abb., et Patroni. d. 1 cl., cum Oct
g	10	Margaritæ Reginae Scotiae. semid. In D. Dublin. de die Octava, S. Patroni, duplex In D. Derr. Com. Oct. (et fit de ea com. usque ad 16 inclusive)
A	11	Barnabæ, Apost., duplex maj.
b	12	Joannis a S. Facundo, Conf., duplex
c	13	Antonii de Padua, Conf., duplex In D. Tuam. de Octava die S. Patroni, duplex
d	14	Basilii, Ep. et Doct., duplex In D. Dromor. de die Octava S. Patroni, duplex
e	15	Viti, etc., MM. In D. Dublin. Margaritæ, Vid., semid. (10 Jun.) Com. SS. MM. In D. Tuam. Antonii de Padua, C. dupl. (13 Jun.) Com. SS. MM. In D. Dromor. S. Basilii. E.D. dupl. (14 Jun.) Com. SS. MM. In E. Derr. de Oct., Patroni, Com. SS. MM.
f	16	Joannis Francisci Regis, C. duplex In D. Derrien. de die octava, S. Patroni, duplex
g	17	De ea In D. Derrien. Joannis Francisci Regis, C. duplex (16 Jun.)
A	18	Marci et Marcelliani, MM.
b	19	Julianæ de Falconer., V., duplex, Com. Gervasii, etc., MM.
c	20	Silverii, M.
d	21	Aloysii Gonzagæ, Conf., duplex
e	22	Paulini, E. C.
f	23	Vigilia
g	24	NATIVITAS JOANNIS BAPTISTÆ, d. 1 cl., cum Oct.
A	25	Gulielmi, Abb., duplex, Com. Oct.
b	26	Joannis et Pauli, Mart., duplex, Com. Oct.
c	27	De Oct. Nativ. Joannis Bapt.
d	28	Leonis, Papæ et Conf. semid., Com. Oct. et Vig.
e	29	PETRI ET PAULI, Apostoli, d. 1 cl., cum Oct.
f	30	Commem. S. Pauli, Apostoli, d. maj., Com. Oct. S. Joannis Fer. VI, post Oct. Corp. Christi, Festum SS. Cordis, D.N.J.C. dupl. maj. Dom. Ima post. Fest. SS. Cordis, D.N.J.C. (non impedita festo duplici) Festum SS. Cordis, B.V.M., dupl. maj. In DD. Ardac. et Cluacen. FESTUM SS. CORDIS, D.N.J.C. d. 2 cl.

The following is the list of movable feasts which will occur in the months of May and June, 1837.

1 Maii, Dom. 1^a post Calendas Maii (non impedita festo duplici)
Festum Puritatis B.V.M. duplex maj.

Dom. III^{ia} Paschæ Festum Patrocini St. Joseph, d. 2 cl.

8 Maii, Dom. IV. Paschæ semid.

- 15 Maii, Dom. V. Paschæ semid.
 16, 17, 18 Maii, Rogationes et Vigilia Ascensionis.
 19 Maii, Ascensio Domini, d. cl., cum Oct.
 22 Maii, Dom. infra Oct. Ascens. semid.
 26 Maii, Octava dies Ascensionis duplex.
 27 Maii, fer. 6^{ta} post Oct. Ascens.
 28 Maii, Vigilia Pentecostes.

“Ab hac die usque ad Festum SS. Trinitatis inclusive si occurrat Festum duplex ex majoribus vel alicujus Doct. Eccl. transfertur post prædictum Festum SS. Trinitatis. De aliis vero duplicibus et de semiduplicibus fit tantum commem. excepto triduo Pentecostes.” *Rubr.*

- 29 Maii, Dominica Pentecostes, dupl. 1 cl.

Tota hac hebdomada fit de Pentecostes.
 Fer. Quatuor Temporum.

- 5 Junii, Dom. SSmæ. Trinitatis, dupl. 2 cl.

- 9 Junii, Festum Corp. Christi, d. 1 cl. cum Oct.

“Infra hanc Octav. non fit de Festo (occurrenti) nisi fuerit duplex; Semiduplicia tantum commemorantur in utrisque Vesp. et Laud sine 9 lect: nec fit de Festo duplici majori vel alicujus Doct. Eccles. translato, nisi sit 1 vel 2 classis.”—*Rubr. Brev. ante Festum*

- 12 Junii, Dom. infra, Oct. Corp. Christi semid.

- 16 „ Dies Octava Corp. Christi, semid.

- 17 „ Festum SS. Cordis, D.N.J.C. duplex maj.

In DD. Ardac. et Cluacen. Festum SS. Cordis, D.N.J.C. d. 2 cl.

- 19 Junii, Dom. III., post Pent. semid.

Dom. 1^{ma} post Festum SS. Cordis, D.N.J.C. (duplici festo non impedita) Festum SS. Cordis, B.V.M. duplex maj.

- 26 „ Dom. IV. post Pentecost semid.

These occurring feasts cause the following changes:—

1 May. The 3rd Sunday after Easter. The Feast of SS. Philip and James, Apostles, is celebrated, and a com. is made of the 3rd Sunday after Easter.

The Feast of the Patronage of St. Joseph, and that of the Purity of the B.V.M. are transferred further on.

8 May. The office is of the occurring Feast, The Apparition of the Archangel Michael, with a com. of the Sunday.

“In aliis Dominicis per annum fit de Dominica, quando in eis non occurrit Festum duplex; quia tunc fit de duplici cum commemoratione Dom. in utrisque Vesp. et Laud et ad Matutinum legitur 9 lect. de homelia Dominica.” *Rubr. Gen Brev. tit IV.*

15 May. The V. Sunday after Easter. The office is of the occurring Saint Dymphna, with a commem. of the Sunday. On the 16, 17 and 18 May, the office is of the occurring Saints. The Litanies are recited. A commemoration of the feria of Rogation is made on the 16th, also a commemoration of the Vigil of the Ascension on the 18th.

19 May. The Feast of the Ascension. There is no commemoration of the occurring Saints.

“*Infra Octavam Ascensionis fit de festis semiduplicibus, et de festis duplicibus sive occurrentibus sive translatis.*”

22 May. The Sunday within the Octave of the Ascension. The office is thus arranged. The Feast of St. John Nepomucene is celebrated in nearly all the dioceses, and a commemoration is made of the Sunday and Octave,

In the Diocese of Elphin, the office is of St. Conleth.

In the Diocese of Kildare, the office is of St. Congall.

In the Diocese of Lismore, the office is of the Purity of the B.V.M., with a commemoration of the Sunday, the occurring semidouble St. Ubaldus (16th) and the octave.

In the Dioceses of Clonfert and Kerry, a commemoration is made of the Octave of their patron, St. Brendan.

26 May. The octave day of Ascension, a commemoration is made of the occurring double and simple feasts.

27 May. In the office of Mary Magdalen of Pazzi, a commemoration is made of the *Feria Sexta post Octavam Ascensionis*.

28 May. The Vigil of Pentecost. The office is of the Vigil, and a commemoration is made in the office of the occurring saint.

In the coming week until 5th June, the office is of the Feast of Pentecost. Of the occurring double, semi-double or simple feasts, a commemoration can be made from the *fer. 4ta*.

The Feast of St. Kevin is transferred. This feast in the Diocese of Dublin will be celebrated on its octave day, the 10th of June.

29 May. Pentecost Sunday.

5 June. Feast of the Most Holy Trinity.

9 June. The Feast of Corpus Christi, double 1st class with an Octave.

The Feast of St. Columba is transferred. In the Diocese of Derry it is transferred to the 10th the following day, and its octave is celebrated as usual.

10 June. The office for this day is thus arranged. The Feast of the Patronage of St. Joseph is celebrated in all the dioceses except in Dublin and Derry. In these the Feasts of their holy patrons are celebrated as doubles of the 1st class.

12 June. The Sunday within the Octave of Corpus Christi. The office is of the occurring Saint John a Facundo, with a commemoration of the Sunday and of the Octave.

In the Diocese of Derry a commemoration is made of the Octave of St. Columba.

15 June. The office is generally of the Octave of Corpus Christi.

In the Diocese of Derry the Feast of the Patronage of St. Joseph is celebrated.

In the Diocese of Dublin, the Feast of the Patronage of St.

Joseph and a commemoration of the occurring Saint Margaret, semi-double (10th).

In the Diocese of Tuam the Feast of St. Anthony is celebrated. In the Diocese of Dromore the Feast of St. Basil, Doctor—with a commemoration of Octave and of Holy Martyrs.

16 June. The Octave Day of Corpus Christi, a commemoration is made of the occurring double, St. John Francis Regis.

In the Diocese of Derry a commemoration is made of the Octave day of St. Columba.

17 June. The Feast of the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus; this Feast is celebrated under D. 2 Cl. rite in the Diocese of Ardagh and Clonmacnoise.

In the Diocese of Derry a commemoration is made of the occurring St. John Francis Regis.

18 June. The Feast of St. Kevin (3rd June), a commemoration of Holy Martyrs.

In the Diocese of Dublin, the Office is of St. Columba (9th).

19 June. The III. Pent., St. Julianæ Virg. double; commemoration of the Sunday and of Holy Martyrs

The Feast of the Sacred Heart of Mary is transferred.

20 June. The Feast of St. Columba (9 June), commemoration of Holy Martyr.

In the DD. of Dublin and Derry, St. Leo., Doct., dupl. (11th April).

22 June. St. Leo., Doct., dupl. (11th April) commemoration of St. Paulinus. In the Dioceses of Dublin and Derry, the office is of the simple feast, or of the Votive Office of St. Joseph.

23 June. Of the Vigil or Votive Office. This Votive Office de Sacramento is ad libitum Cleri.

26 June. IV. Sunday after Pentecost, the Office is of the occurring Feast SS. John and Paul, with a commemoration of the Sunday and Octave.

The Feast of the Purity of the Blessed Virgin, except for the Diocese of Lismore, and the Feast of the Sacred Heart of Mary have yet to be celebrated on some Sunday not occupied by a double Feast.

PETER J. M'PHILPIN.

LAST WEDNESDAY IN ADVENT, 1886.

“ Was Wednesday, the 22nd of December, a fasting day?”

Yes. See I. E. RECORD (New Series), vol. i., page 748, December, 1880.

THE CHURCH ABROAD,

POPE LEO XIII. will celebrate the Golden Jubilee or fiftieth anniversary of his priesthood towards the end of the present year, and already preparations are being made for such a demonstration of love and devotion to the head of the Church as has seldom been witnessed in the Christian world. A committee has been formed at Rome under the presidency of Cardinal Schiaffino, to receive offerings for the great jubilee. The Professor of Paleography at the Propaganda has asked his students to write verses in every known language. They will be collected in a magnificent album and presented as one of the tributes of the great centre of learning. Naples, which in 1877 sent the beautiful "Sedia Gestatoria," and the fan of ostrich and peacock's feathers, studded with jewels to Pius IX. intends to send a golden throne to Pope Leo. The old officers of the Papal Army have ordered an elaborate inkstand from the firm of the goldsmiths Pierret, in the Piazza di Spagna. It will be in gold and silver, in the renaissance style, surmounted by a statue of St. Michael the Archangel. In front will be chiselled medallions representing St. Joachim and St. Leo, the Holy Father's patrons, and St. Francis of Assisi, and St. Thomas of Aquin, both of whom he has specially glorified in his encyclicals. In France the movement is making rapid progress. The Bishop of Orleans has issued a pastoral directing the formation of two committees, one of men, the other of women, in his Cathedral city, and authorizing them to receive donations for the same object. In Austria, Belgium, Holland, and Canada similar committees are being formed, and are preparing to celebrate the event with due pomp, and to offer to the Holy Father what no power in the world can take from him, the homage of loyal hearts and of devoted spiritual subjects, which will be a consolation to him in his captivity, and a crown of recompense for what he has had to suffer at the hands of his enemies. Few of the countries in his vast spiritual domain have so much reason to be grateful to Pope Leo as Ireland, and there can be no doubt but that in this joyful demonstration of his children all the world over, the Irish people will take their accustomed place, ever cleaving to the Rock and that in these comparatively bright days of hope and faith in the liberty that is near at hand, the "Gens Hibernica" will be as conspicuous as ever for its filial devotion to St. Peter's successor. Any share in this great manifestation will be at once a token of loyalty and a protest against the persecution to which

the Pope personally and the Church of Italy are subjected. Italian Catholic journals are, with reason, protesting more loudly every day against the intolerable situation of the Pope. His enemies have the audacity to assert that he is a voluntary prisoner, and that there is nothing to prevent him from coming forth into the broad light of day, that he will be guarded from outrage and insult by the soldiers of United Italy ; but besides the arguments of right and principle, which weigh as strongly with Leo as they did with Pius, he reminds them that when the remains of his illustrious predecessor were being transferred to their last resting place at the dead of night, through the streets of the Eternal City, they were made the subject of ribald impiety and of outrageous insult, and the power that speaks of the Pope's voluntary exile and promises illusory guarantees, rather encouraged than checked that blasphemous demonstration. The populace is urged on in its wicked path by responsible Ministers of the Crown. Signor Depretis is ready to accept any law that is proposed against the Church. The Minister Tajani, haranguing an excited mob, tells them that the Pope is the greatest enemy of the country ; two other Ministers Grimaldi and Bonghi proclaim that the Papacy is the canker of the nation, and at the meetings which they attend the Pope is burned in effigy amid the riotous mirth of the assemblies. The heart of the hardest would be moved at the bare recital of the sufferings of the poor nuns who are everywhere being expelled from the convents confiscated by the self-styled *Liberal* Government. And what is most astonishing the once chivalrous and polished Count di Robilant acquiesces in this wretched persecution of helpless women. It is to such authorities and to their deluded followers that the Pope is asked to come forth and confide himself. The Head of the Christian World, the Vicar of Christ, the Ruler revered above all others, and to protect whom thousands and millions of Catholics in these countries alone would be ready to shed their blood, who, even in this Nineteenth Century, has been recognized as the fittest Arbiter between the nations of Europe, is asked to come forth and submit to the insults of a section of Italians, led on to fury by such wicked men. Surely this is the time for his faithful children in other countries to make loud protests against such a state of things, and to proclaim more unmistakably than ever their sympathy with the Pope, and their anxiety to see him surrounded once more with that temporal dignity of which he has been plundered and which he cannot renounce. It must not be understood that Italian Catholics are not alive to the situation, nor allowing things to go by default. The

demonstration held not long ago in the Church of St. Paul, at Milan, is only one of a series that have stirred up the Catholic spirit through the country. This great meeting was addressed by Count Moiana and by Sig. David Albertario, Director of the *Osservatore Cattolico* of Milan, and a number of resolutions were passed amid great enthusiasm. We give the last one which is a summary of the whole.

“That Italian Catholics, in the name of God, of Christ, of the Catholic Religion, of science, of civilization and conscience will defend, according to the glorious traditions of Italy, their inviolable rights by books, newspapers, associations, conferences, public demonstrations and by irreproachable conduct and the constant practice of religion in the church, at home, in the schools, the military camps, in the streets, in the shops, in the fields, at study and at labour, in both public and private life.”

Notwithstanding the rumours of impiety we hear from France, and the many things occurring on the old Gallic soil, calculated to damp the spirits of Catholics, two such demonstrations have occurred within the past month, as remind the world from time to time, that, withal, the country is not so far gone as people imagine. One of these took place at Nantes, in Brittany, the other at Lille, in the north. Both were Catholic Congresses assembled for the discussion of social and religious questions. Great enthusiasm prevailed at their meetings. The Congress of Bretons, was addressed by Count de Mun, by M. de Cazenove de Pradines, M. Chesnelong (senator), and by M. Hervé Bazin, the distinguished professor of political economy at the Catholic University of Angers. The northern assembly heard eloquent addresses from the Count de Caulaincourt, Baron D'Avril, Count de Nicolai, Mgr. d'Hulst and Mgr. Baunard. The wants of the Holy Father, the carrying on of the works of the Church of the Sacred Heart on Mont Martre which the nation vowed after the war with Prussia, the manner in which the new law on education is to be met by the people, the duties of landed proprietors in country places, the progress of the Catholic circles of workmen, the canonization of Joan of Arc, resistance to the infidel press; such were the leading questions discussed. Mgr. d'Hulst, announced the formation of a committee to prepare for a Catholic scientific international congress soon to be held in Paris, to discuss difficult questions of Biblical exegesis and Biological objections to the teachings of Holy Scripture. The sittings of the Congress in each case concluded with Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, given by the Bishop of the

diocese. Indeed anyone who witnesses the unbounded confidence of French Catholics in the Blessed Eucharist, and the Mother of God, can never despair of their final triumph over infidelity. Of course there is a wrong side to the picture. The deputy Michelin was recently defeated in the Chamber only by the small majority of forty-nine in his proposal to abolish altogether the embassy to the Vatican and M. de Freycinet is replaced in the high office of Premier by the rabid anti-clerical Goblet. Nothing but mischief can be expected by Catholics, from the arrival to power of the man, who, as Minister of Worship and Instruction, has led the campaign against the Church for the last couple of years.

There can be no better proof of the happy condition of the Church under the Austrian Crown, than the enthusiasm with which all parties recently celebrated the golden jubilees of Cardinals Furstenberg and Simor. These eminent prelates were the happy recipients of complimentary letters from the Pope, of personal visits of congratulation from the Emperor Francis Joseph, and of the most spontaneous expressions of devotion from their own flocks.

Bishops Ireland, of St. Paul's, and Keane, of Richmond, U.S.A., are at present in Rome, having been commissioned by their colleagues in the American episcopate, to submit for the approval of the Propaganda and of the Holy Father, the plan of the buildings, and the plan of studies of the new university, to be erected at Washington. One million dollars will be required for the whole installation. Of this sum 600,000 have already been subscribed, and the material work will be commenced as soon as the plans are approved in Rome.

On the 5th of December, M. Léon de Lantsheere, eldest son of the President of the Belgian Chambers of Deputies, received the cap and ring of doctor in philosophy, in the university of Louvain. The young graduate was obliged to sustain twenty theses in general Metaphysics, in Psychology, in Ontology and Ethics, and to defend his published dissertation "De Bono" against all attacks. The scholastic exercises took place in presence of the Papal Nuncio, the Rector Magnificus, and all the professors of the various faculties besides many distinguished strangers, and the objections were put by Fathers Deran, a Jesuit, Rolin, Dominican, Van Ingelghen, curate of

St. Gudule, at Brussels, and Canon Bossu, Professor of Metaphysics. For upwards of two hours the candidate held his own against all disputants, and after having taken the oath of submission and fealty to the Councils of Trent and of the Vatican, was duly invested with the Doctor's cap and ring.

A book has recently been published on "Old Catholicism," by an old Catholic Professor at the University of Bonn. It contains many curious details of the intrigues that were at work during the Vatican Council, and amongst other documents a letter addressed to Dr. Döllinger, by the unfortunate King of Bavaria, who lately drowned himself in the Lake of Starnberg.

"It is unnecessary for me to tell you," writes the King, "what pleasure your firm and decided attitude on the Question of the Infallibility gives me. On the other hand, I was greatly pained to hear of the blind submission of Father Hahnberg (afterwards Bishop of Spiers). I have reason to believe that this submission is the result of his humility. In my opinion this humility is badly understood, and is at bottom only base hypocrisy, as he affects to hold a conviction which certainly is not in his heart. I am glad at least not to be deceived in yourself, for you are my Bossuet, and he is only my Fénelon. The attitude of the Archbishop of Munich is pitiable and miserable in the extreme. He has bowed down at the first notice, but in you I am proud to possess a true rock of the church."

The Sacred Congregation of Rites, has consented to the introduction of the cases of beatification of Cardinal Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, Sir Thomas More, Margaret, Countess of Salisbury, mother of Cardinal Pole, and several other martyrs put to death for the Faith in the reign of Henry VIII. Amongst them are the following:—Forost, a Carthusian, Powell, Gardiner, Stone, Cuthbert, Woodhouse, Nelson, Plumtree, Moyne, Campion, Johnson, &c., &c.

A letter has been addressed by Cardinal Jacobini, at the Pope's direction, to M. Henri Lasserre to congratulate him on his new translation of the gospels into French. In his young days M. Lasserre was the intimate friend of M. de Freycinet, the late Prime Minister. Lasserre, as a young man, was not very remarkable for his piety, but at the age of twenty-five he had almost completely lost his sight. He was practically stone-blind when his friend

de Freycinet, though a Protestant, advised him to go to Lourdes. He was cured at the Great Shrine of Our Lady, and has since devoted his life to religious works and literature. It was hoped that this uncontested miracle would make some impression on his comrade, but though de Freycinet always refrained from using the violent language of his colleagues, and was sometimes moved by generous impulses towards the Church and the religious orders, his desire of rule was too great to do anything distasteful to his anti-clerical followers.

The following books have recently appeared :—

Les Saints Livres et la Critique Rationaliste. Histoire et Réfutation des Objections des Incrédules contre les Saintes Ecritures, par F. Vigouroux, Prêtre de Saint Sulpice. Paris: Roger et Chernovitz, 7 Rue des Grands Augustins.

This is, undoubtedly, the most important book that has been published in the Ecclesiastical literature of France for the past couple of years. It is the outcome of the industry of the Abbé Vigouroux, who with frail and delicate health, with only one lung and barely able to speak above his breath, has yet energy enough to work for seven hours a day continuously in the National Library of Paris. The author is recognised as one of the first Hebrew scholars in France at the present time, and his well versed knowledge of the natural sciences, as well as of the English, German and Italian languages, specially qualified him for the work he has so successfully completed. Those who followed M. Vigouroux's course of Scripture at St. Sulpice will find much in the new work which they carried away in their notebooks, but a great deal more besides. The author commences with the early rationalists—the Gnostics, Celsus, Porphyry, Lucian of Samosata, Hierocles and Philostratus, Julian the Apostate, the Manicheans, the Averroists, Luther, the Socinians, the Anabaptists; the Italian Infidels of the Middle Ages, Spinoza and the Arminians; this exhausts the first volume. The second volume commences with the rationalist movement in England. Most interesting and vivid sketches are given of Hobbes, Herbert of Cherbury, and Charles Blount. Their influence on the minds of Englishmen is traced, and the more important passages of their works bearing on the subject quoted in full. Still more complete and interesting sketches are given of Toland, Shaftesbury, Collins, Woolston, Tindal, Thomas Morgan, Lord Bolingbroke, and Chubb. The author also discusses the defence made against these writers by Ray, Boyle, Barrow, Berkeley, Warburton, Bentley, Locke, Addison, Swift, and Richardson.

“The professors of irreligion,” he says, “Toland, Tindal, Man-

deville and Bolingbroke are met by adversaries much stronger than themselves. The chiefs of the experimental philosophy, the more learned and trusted among the erudite of the century, writers full of wit, the most beloved, and the ablest of the time, carrying with them all the weight of science and genius, take the field in defence of the Bible. Refutations abound on all sides. Every year, according to the foundation of Robert Boyle, men celebrated for their talent and learning came to London to preach eight sermons to establish the Christian religion against Atheists, Theists, Pagans, Mohammedans and Jews, and these apologies are solid, capable of convincing a liberal mind, infallible to convince a moral mind. The ecclesiastics who write them, Clarke, Bentley, Law, Watt, Warburton, Butler are well up to the level of the lay mind. Moreover, they are aided by laymen. Addison composes a "Defence of Christianity," Locke, the "Conformity of Christianity and Reason," Ray, the "Wisdom of God manifested in the works of Creation." Above this grave concert of defence pierces the strident voice of Swift. In his terrible irony he compliments "the elegant ruffians who have the salutary idea of abolishing Christianity. If they were ten times more numerous they will not succeed for they have no doctrine to lay down in its place." The defence all round was solid and brilliant. "We must confess," says the Abbé Guenéé, "that if it is beyond question that religion was never more vehemently attacked, never at the same time was it more learnedly and ably defended." To be sure the apologists of Great Britain did not all sustain the cause of revelation with the same success. "Most of them," says Tholuck, "are like the mad father of a family who cries out at the highest pitch of his voice, 'Death to the robber,' and at the same time throws the most precious things he possesses out through the window; to save the shell they abandoned its contents." A great number of them made deplorable concessions to rationalism, and these concessions became in the long run more dangerous than the attacks themselves. However, several defended Christianity with so much force and success that for the time being error was struck to the ground beyond the Channel."

From England, M. Vigouroux traces his enemy on to France, through Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, the Abbé Reynal, the Encyclopedists down to Taine, Comte and Renan, and passes again to Germany, where he meets Hermann von der Hardt, and the formidable Wolf, of whom Goethe, wrote :

Gott sprach ; die Sonne sei, die Welt fiel in's Gesicht
Gott sprach ; Wolf sei, as ward in allen Seelen Licht.

He sketches the errors of Semler and Baumgarten and their influence on German thought. He devotes a chapter to Lessing and Reimarus, and dwells at length on the influence of the "Fragments of Wolfenbuttel." Eichorn and Paulus come next, and several chapters treating of the mythical interpretation of the Bible. In these chapters we find a review more or less extended, of the works of Strauss, Bauer, Gottfried, de Wette, Schliermacher, Grierbach, Ewald, Shrader, Dillmann, Wallhausen, Volkmar and Hupfeld. The work concludes with a very able and learned refutation of the errors of Darwin and Haeckel.

L'Idée Chrétienne dans l' Education, par l' Abbé G. Roger. Orleans : H. Herluison.

THIS book which was highly praised by the "Académie des Jeux Floraux," of Toulouse, and which is written by the brother of the author of "Nos Eglises," enumerates in forcible language, the dangers of a godless education, and points out all the advantages to society, and to the individual, of a good Christian training.

La Sovranità temporale del Papa e l'Unità Nazionale d'Italia, per Giambattista Casoni. Bologna ; Società Tipografica.

THIS work goes through all the arguments which prove that the temporal sovereignty of the Pope, far from being an obstacle to the just and patriotic aspirations of the Italian people, is on the contrary the natural and historical basis of real Italian unity.

Alcune Osservazioni sul testo e sulla interpretazione della Divina Commedia di Dante Alighieri. Parma : Ferrà and Pellegrini.

THE students of the great Italian poet will find this a useful commentary and interpreter of difficult passages in the "Divina Commedia."

Trionfo della Chiesa Cattolica sul Liberalismo moderno, per Girolamo di Biagio, Parroco di Villaricca. Napoli : Ferrantè, Vico Tiratoio.

THIS sixth volume of the great work of Father di Biagio treats of the practical questions relating to the Sacraments of Baptism and of Confirmation, and refutes all the objections that have been raised against them by so-called liberals.

J. F. HOGAN.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE ROSMINIAN PHILOSOPHY.

A Cistercian Father, in the last number of the RECORD, denies the facts and inferences of my article in the October number. I reaffirm them. I think I have fully answered all the questions raised by my critic (for I have read them often before in the *Civiltà Cattolica*) in my *Life of Rosmini* just published. I hope those who wish to hear more on the subject will buy my book and read it.

Meantime I will ask to be allowed to say, very briefly :

1. It is not true that it "was an open secret in Rome, that the Consultors, who examined Rosmini's Works, were unanimous in condemning them." The precise contrary is true, as I stated in my last article. I have read the written opinions of many of the Consultors, which have been published of late years, and they are all most favourable. The text of the Decree pronounced in 1854 was not published until 1876. Before all these facts became known, it was very natural that those who did not know but only conjectured (for beyond this fact of the acquittal of the works, all else was a secret of the Congregation), "should make open secrets" according to their inclination. Of late years I have never heard any opinion contrary to the one I stated, viz., that "the Consultors (one only excepted), were unanimous in their several opinions, that there was nothing deserving ecclesiastical censure in any of the inculcated works."

2. My critic says "the errors of Rosmini are justly called Pantheism." If works that are *manifestly* impious and pantheistic (as the works of Rosmini would be, if they were at all like what this writer describes), can be taught freely, and read largely in the vernacular with the *tolerance* of the Holy See, and this for the space of half-a-century, without a single proposition being condemned by authority, what becomes of the well-known theological *adage*, "Contra fidem et bonos mores nec facit nec tacet Ecclesia"? I do not think our Cistercian's Roman instructors will thank him for his advocacy on this point.

3. What a palpable absurdity it is to talk of "Rosmini's meriting well of the Church," and "having led a spotless, not to say saintly life" and of his Order, as being "an excellent and deserving Society" if the system followed by Rosmini and his disciples is "justly called Pantheism," that is to say, is not Christianity nor

even Deism; not even "the worshipping of stocks and stones." For if we hold, as our Cistercian says we do, that "all being is one, infinite, eternal, unchangeable, and uncreated;" therefore "stocks and stones," man's soul and body are all one and the same thing with God; in other words, there is no God, and no morality. But as he tells us that in the Rosminian system "the spirituality of the human soul is lost as well as its immortality," if there is no God and no morality, this last is comparatively a small matter!

If our Cistercian Doctor in Philosophy had not written all these surprising things in black and white, one would have thought it incredible, that a priest who says Mass every day should have accused a set of priests, well known as the Fathers of Charity are in England, Ireland and Scotland, of "worshipping they know not what," when they profess every day in the Mass to worship the Incarnate Lamb of God, and the Three Persons of "the Adorable Divinity, our God and Creator."

4. It will not avail to say that we are *pious fools*. The Catholic public know that we are *no fools*; the other alternative is that we are *hypocrites*. I venture to say that bishops, priests and people who have known us for the half century that we have been before the public, preaching missions to the people, retreats to clergy and religious, and in our various other works, will not endorse this charge on the authority of our Cistercian Doctor in Philosophy. I doubt much if his philosophical studies led him to read any thing of Rosmini, except through text books of opponents; certainly his account of our doctrines is about as accurate, as the statements of Anti-Popery writers and lecturers as to doctrines of the Catholic Church: the result of the same kind of one-sided process of study.

5. It will not do to distinguish between Rosminians as religious, and Rosminians as disciples of Rosmini's Philosophy. Although we of the Order are perfectly free to follow Rosmini's Philosophy or not, as a fact, we are all Rosminians in the latter sense by conviction; and such we shall remain, unless the Holy See shall ever declare that Rosmini's philosophical system, or theological opinions clash with any principles of Catholic Doctrine.

6. With regard to the force and value of the sentence *Dimittantur opera*, I have said in my last article, and more fully in the *Life of Rosmini*, that none of us claims that the above sentence means in itself more than *non prohibentur*, which is an express statement that *after examination*, nothing has been found meriting theological censure. I have also said that it was expressly stated by the Congregation of

the Index that "it was lawful to impugn in the schools and in books, doctrines taught on the works that had been acquitted," but that it was also expressly "*forbidden to affix on them by private authority any theological censure.*" How the charge of *Pantheism*, which denies *all theology*, is not a theological censure, I must leave casuists to explain.

7. The history of controversies within the Church shows that the Holy See has sometimes seen fit to tolerate, even for centuries, opposite schools of opinion on matters which in its judgment do not touch the faith; witness the controversies on Grace between Augustinians, Dominicans and Jesuits. For the last fifty years there has been a Rosminian and Anti-Rosminian School. The latter has doubtless far greater prestige as regards learning and extension, arising in great part from the fact that it has had the chairs in the Roman College in its possession, has thus been the educator of a large number of cardinals, bishops and clergy of Italy, and also of other countries, and has had the power at its disposal of the *Civiltà Cattolica* and its echoes in the Clerical Press, by which it has been able to make known its arguments against us, while we have had no such advantages, so that for the most part one side only of the question has been heard, and no doubt a public opinion, so created, condemns us. Still I need not remind my critic, that this prestige and influence is only at most that of a dominant School in the Church, and does not in itself express the mind of the Church. This is expressed only by the infallible magisterium of the Vicar of Jesus Christ in all things that belong to doctrine, and to science in so far as it may come into collision with doctrine.

8. On the question of censures by theologians on schools of opinion within the Church different from their own, Pope Benedict XIV. thus wrote, 'on the occasion of the controversy about the doctrines taught by the great Augustinian, Cardinal Noris, whom the Jesuits accused of Jansenism. His works had been examined and acquitted, like those of Rosmini, by the Roman authorities, yet still the Jesuits continued to urge their own opinions, and the Spanish Inquisition was induced to condemn his writings. Benedict XIV. declares in a most important letter, that it is not lawful, after the charges against Cardinal Noris had been dismissed by the authority of the Roman tribunal, for the Spanish Inquisition to re-open the question, still less to proscribe his works. He says that until the Holy See pronounces, no private doctors have a right to pronounce judgment, and that there is no need to attend to the censures of private doctors, but

only to what has been decided, or shall be decided by the Holy See. He concludes—"We ourselves, as private doctor, may incline to one opinion or another on Theological questions, but as Supreme Pontiff we do not reprobate the opposite opinion, neither will we suffer another to do so."¹

In my *Life of Rosmini* I have said "What therefore is the present position of the Rosminian question at the latter end of the year 1886? It is like that of an armour-clad vessel that has passed and repassed the Dardanelies, under the heaviest fire that the Turks could bring to bear upon her, without damage to her armour-plating. This does not prove that the vessel is absolutely invulnerable, but it need cause no wonder if the crew feel great confidence that no projectile that can be forged is likely to do the good ship serious damage."

WILLIAM LOCKHART, O.C.

Rome, Dec. 10, 1886.

[ERRATUM.—In Dr. Campbell's letter on the Rosminian Philosophy, (I. E. RECORD, Third Series, Vol. vii., No. 12, December, 1886, page 1124, line 17) for *entering*, read *intuing*.]

We beg to acknowledge our obligations to the learned contributors who have written on this subject of the Rosminian Philosophy in the I. E. RECORD, but we believe that no useful purpose would be served by prolonging the discussion.—ED. I. E. R.

DOCUMENTS.

INTERESTING CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE MOST REV. DR. WOODLOCK, BISHOP OF ARDAGH, AND THE MOST REV. THE BISHOP OF RATISBON, REGARDING SAINT ERHARD, BISHOP OF ARDAGH AND SECONDARY PATRON OF THE DIOCESE OF RATISBON.

Illūne et Rīne Domine, uti Frater,

Paucis abhinc diebus mihi in notitiam venit, cuidam, uti dicunt, in hac sede Episcopali Ardacadensi in Hibernia antecessori meo, nomine Erardo, in inelyta tua civitate Ratisbonensi inter coelites

¹ Opus miscell. Bened. XIV. Bassani 1767.—Apud Hist. Pelagian. Card. Noris. Ed. 1766, page vii. This Epistola Apolog. Bened. XIV. was reprinted in Rome by order of Pius IX. during the examination of Rosmini's works, 1851, typis *Camerae Apostolicæ*.

cultum exhiberi, eumque, uti Sanctum, clerum et fidelem populum maxima devotione prosequi. Sanctum Leonem Papam IX. eum inter Sanctos dinumerasse fertur. Venerabilis tamen Ipsius memoria, eheu! minime in ista dioecesi perseverat; maximopere autem mihi in votis esset tanti viri honorem instaurare, ipsumque dignis laudibus debitoque cultu in patria cumulare. Igitur Amplitudinem Tuam, Illmē. et Rmē. Domine, humillime rogo, quatenus mihi indicare digneris modum, quo aliqua saltem ex parte veniam in cognitionem vitae et meritorum hujus Sancti viri, ut, si ita Sanctae sedi Apostolicae expedire videatur, Erardi nostri cultum inter Sanctos nostros Hibernicos renovare ad majorem Dei gloriam Sanctorumque honorem liceat.

Si historicae Lectiones 2^{di} Nocturni extent, vel si alio quocumque modo ipsius vita typis demandata sit, dignetur Amplitudo Tua, oro, exemplar per Secretarium Tuum mihi mittere, vel alio, quo credas, meliori modo facere ut vita et actus hujus Sancti viri mihi innotescant.

Interea me gregemque mihi commissum enixe precibus et SS. Sacrificiis Amplitudinis Tuae commendo, rogans ut me ob incommodum per istas litteras Tibi illatum excusatum habeas.

Amplitudinis Tuae

humillimus et devotiss. Frater

et Servus in J. C.,

✠ BARTHOLOMAEUS WOODLOCK,

Epis. Ardacadensis et Cluanensis.

Datum Longfordi in Hibernia,

hac die 21^{ma} Octobris 1886.

Illño et Rño Domino,

Domino Episcopo Ratisbonensi

in Germania.

Illmē et Rmē Domine, uti Frater,

Hodie tandem mihi licet respondere litteris quas Amplitudo Tua Illma. et Rma. die 21 mensis proxime elapsi de Sancto Erardo seu Erardo Episcopo Confessore amice ad me dedit.

1. Votis tuis, Illme et Rme Domine ut pro posse satisfaciam, imprimis proponere velim unum exemplar impressum tunc Officii Sacri in hac dioecesi usitati, tum Missae quae de eodem Sancto per universam dioecesim Ratisbonen. juxta Kalendarium a Summo Pontifice adprobatum die 19 mensis Januarii celebratur, et quidem sub ritu dupl. maj. quia tanquam Patronus Secundarius ejusdem dioecesis honoratur.

2. Die vero octavo mensis Januarii, natali suo, in Ecclesia quondam monialium "Niedermünster," sive "Monasterii inferioris," hujus civitatis in qua Ecclesia Sacrum ipsius corpus habetur, ab Ordinario Ratisbonen. una Missa Solemnis de eodem Sancto quotannis celebratur; Sacrae Reliquiae, quae anno 1862 recognitae, novo splendore vestitae et in aeneo sarcophago deaurato reconditae fuere, in proprio Altari exponuntur, per Octiduum sequens supplicatio quotidiana fit, sub cujus finem Caput Sancti Separatum fidelium capiti devotionis causa superimponitur eorumque dein labiis pie osculandum traditur.

3. Extant in dioecesi Altaria fixa, imo et Ecclesiae ipsius St. Erhardi titulo Deo dedicata.

4. Etiam aliae dioeceses regni Bavarici Sⁱ Erhardi cultum tum in Missa tum in Officio exercent, e.g., Augustana et Eystetten, illa quidem plurimo tempore, haec ex nova concessione ab Apostolica Sede Anno 1845 facta.

5. Anno 1873 (die 2 Octobr.) cum nova Editio Martyrologii Romani esset curanda, apud S. Rit. Congregationem illud egi et obtinui, ut nomen et elogium S. Erhardi, licet breve, ad diem Octavum mensis Januarii inter elogium S. Patientis Ep., et S. Severini Abb. in Martyrologio Romano hunc in modum insereretur:

Ratisbonae Sancti Erhardi Episcopi.

6. Quod Sanctus Leo PP. IX. Anno 1052, dum in hac civitate morabatur, Venerabilem Wolfgangum, ejusdem urbis Episcopum, de tumulo levavit, et corpus transtulit Venerabilis *Erhardi*, quodque idem Summus Pontifex extra Concilium *sanctificavit* Sanctos Wolfgangum et *Erhardum*, sa. mem. Benedictus PP. XIV. in opere suo celeberrimo de servorum Dei Beatificatione et Canonizatione Liber I., Cap. vii., n. 9, et Cap. x., n. 1, testatur.

7. Qua in re consentit constans et certissima Ecclesiae Ratisbonen. traditio et *Acta Bollandiana*, quae ad diem 8 mensis Januarii plura afferunt solerter atque prudenter.

Certum esse videtur S. Erhardum vertente saeculo septimo, et octavo ineunte floruisse, et Ratisbonae circa Annum 720 vixisse.

Bollandistae l. c. in prooemio suo n. 6 asserunt, probabilius videri, ipsum Erhardum et fratrem ejus Albertum *ex Hibernia* (sive Scotia veteri) oriundos: ib. No. 7 refertur, juxta Hundium, Raderum, &c., *Ardakadensem* Episcopum fuisse *Erhardum*—Albertum Casselensem in Hibernia); additur: "An vero earum Sedium hi Sancti viri fuerint Antistites, an solum consecrati, ut exteris populis, ad quos convertendos profecturi erant, praesentius auxilium afferrent, haud

habemus pronuntiare. Si antequam S. Bonifacius in Bajoariam veniret, c. a. 739, hi vixere, non esset abs re suspicari, Erardum munia episcopalia Reginoburgi (Ratisbonae) exercuisse veluti *adventitium*, non proprium ejus Sedis Episcopum.”

Haec sunt, quae Amplitudini Tuae Rmae. libenti animo de Sancto nostro Patrono scribenda duxi.

Faxit Deus O. M. intercedente S. Erhardo Episcopo, ut duae dioeceses quibus ipsum aliquo modo praefuisse documenta historica narrant insinuunt, in fide Catholica stabiles permaneant, et mutuo precum caritatisque vinculo etiam in posterum jungantur.

Quod ut fiat ex S. reliquiis ejusdem Sancti dentem unum additis litteris authentizationis, Amplitudini Tuae Rmae. pro dioecesi Ardac. offerre et huic apponere animum induxi.

Omni qua par est observantia et verae aestimationis signis interim persisto.

Amplitudinis Tuae Illmae. et Rmae.

Devotissimus Confrater,

✠ IGNATIUS, *Epus. Ratisbonen.*

Ratisbonae (in Bavaria) die 4 Novembris 1886.

Illmo et Rmo Domino,

Domino BARTHOLOMAEO WOODLOCK,

Episcopo Ardacadensi et Cluanensi,

Longford in Hibernia.

THE FOLLOWING ARE THE PROPER LESSONS OF THE OFFICE OF ST. ERHARD, AS CELEBRATED IN THE DIOCESE OF RATISBON.

In secundo Nocturno. Lectio IV.

Erhardus gente Scotus, nobili familia natus, a puero pietatem cum literis conjunxit: lubricae aetatis lasciviam bonorum operum exercitiis, coelestisque gratiae armis subegit, indesque salutaris vitae cursu progrediens plurimum, susceptis sacrorum ordinum gradibus Episcopi dignitate honoratur. Qui in munere, tanquam lucerna candelabro imposita, ita fulsit et eluxit, ut splendore sanctitatis, virtutumque claritudine caeca multorum pectora irradiarit. Quin et noctu contemplationi coelestium, interdiu sacris concionibus vacabat: tum spiritualis perfectionis studio unice intentus, virginitatem ad extremum usque spiritum retinuit illibatam.

R. Inveni David.

Lectio V.

Caeterum Hiddulpho Trevirorum Episcopo prae monasticae vitae desiderio se magistratu abdicante, Erhardus, ne fratri sufficeretur, relictis antea cum natali solo perampli patrimonii censibus, Ratisbonam aufugit. Hic et alibi per Germaniam cum Alberto item fratre paris sanctimoniae et status adjutus piorum beneficentia, quam insignis vitae morumque probitas conciliabat. quatuordecim monasteria excitavit. Devios a Catholicae religionis tramite tam miraculis quam salutaribus monitis et exemplis ad viam salutis reduxit. De quo illud memorabile, quod Ratisbona, praenobili Bavariae civitate, divino instinctu in Alsatiam digressus, Aetichonis ducis gentis ejus filiam a nativitate captam oculis post catechesin unda salutari (Othiliae nomine indito) perfusam simul fidei et corporis lumine collustravit. Quam et postmodum velo sanctimonialium ornatum Christo dicavit.

R. Posui adjutorium.

Lectio VI.

Regressus Ratisbonam, Bavaros et Noricos praeceptis christiana fidei imbutos, paternae hortationis stimulis confirmare non cessavit: tum utrinque divini cultus et humanae salutis promovendae zelo accensus, uberem Ecclesiae horreo messem intulit. Ubi demum, cum pro Ecclesiae ac religionis dignitate molestias et acerbitates plurimas sustinisset, cursu vitae laudabiliter consummato, ad coeli praemia evolavit sexto Idus Januarii. Quem dono prophetiae ac miraculis clarum Leo nonus Pontifex celebriter Sanctorum numero adscripsit anno salutis millesimo quinquagesimo secundo. Ejus corpus in celebri ejusdem urbis monasterio (inferius appellant), quod vivo tanquam advenae latibulum praebuit, humatum est.

R. Iste est.

The Mass of St. Erhard is de Communi Conf. Pont. Statuit with the Gospel de Communi non Pontificis.

II.

DECISIONS OF THE S. PENITENTIARY REGARDING THE INTERROGATIONS TO BE MADE IN CERTAIN CASES IN FORO POENITENTIAE.

I. Quando adest fundata suspicio poenitentem, qui de onanismo omnino silet, huic crimini esse addictum, num confessario liceat a prudenti et discreta interrogatione abstinere, eo quod praevideat plures a bona fide exturbandos multosque sacramenta deserturos? An non potius teneatur confessarius prudenter ac discrete interrogare?

Respond.: Regulariter negative ad primam partem; affirmative ad secundam.

II. An confessarius, qui sive ex spontanea confessione, sive ex prudenti interrogatione cognoscit poenitentem esse onanistam, teneatur illum de hujus peccati gravitate, aequae ac de aliorum peccatorum, monere eumque (uti ait Rit. Romanum) paterna charitate reprehendere, eique absolutionem tunc solum impertiri, cum sufficientibus signis constet, eundem dolere de praeterito, et habere propositum non amplius onanistice agendi?

Resp. : Affirmative, juxta doctrinas probatorum auctorum.

S. Poenitent. Die 10^a Martii 1886.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

CIVILIZATION OF THE EASTERN IRANIANS IN ANCIENT TIMES.

By Dr. Wilhelm Geiger. Translated by Dārāb Dastur Peshotān Sanjānā, B.A. London: Henry Frowde.

THE modern Persia is called by the natives Iran; but the Ancient Iranians dwelt farther eastward, in the territory now known as Turkestan, on both sides of the river Amoo Daria (Oxus). The great antiquity of their sacred books, Avesta, or Zendavesta, as they are perhaps more commonly designated, cannot be questioned, but the date of their compilation it is quite impossible to determine even approximately. Critics, ancient and modern, assign the life of the great prophet of the Avesta, and founder of the religion set forth therein, to widely different periods of the world's history. Aristotle and Niebuhr hold extreme views on this subject, the former contending that Zarathustra (Zoroaster) flourished about 6,000 years before the death of Plato (347, B.C.), while the latter maintains that the whole story about Zarathustra is an undiluted myth, and that no such individual ever existed. Plato himself is the first classical writer, who mentions the name and theology of Zoroaster, where he says: *μαγεία ἡ Ζοροάστρου τοῦ Ὁρμαζου ἔστι θεῶν θεραπεία τῶν Περσῶν.* "The Magian religion of Zoroaster, son of Hormazus, is the mode of worship of the Gods among the Persians." The name given by Plato to the theological code of the Iranians, brings at once and vividly before our memory the statement of the evangelist "Ecce Magi ab oriente venerunt Jerosolymam." The Magi were most probably Iranian priests; and this is an additional reason why we ought to take an interest in the religious history of that people.

In the Avesta system of religion, Ahura Mazda is the creator and

ruler of everything, material, spiritual, or abstract, in which goodness, truth, and beauty, predominate; Angra Manyu is the author of all moral and physical evil. Accordingly we see it commonly laid down in books dealing with this subject, that Zoroaster was the first who invented and inculcated the doctrine of the dualistic principle. This statement the author of the above work shows very plainly not to be quite accurate, for though the evil spirit exists from the beginning like the good one, and is equally powerful in his own sphere, yet he will succumb to him, and be annihilated in the great final engagement between them at the end of the world. Angra Manyu is therefore not eternal, for though he had no beginning of existence, he will have an end; and, rigorously speaking, we may regard Ahura Mazda as superior to him, and in fact as the one supreme being. But it requires no great keenness of intellect, to detect the silliness of the following observation of West, quoted and apparently approved by the translator: "The reader will search in vain for any confirmation of the foreign notion, that Mazda-worship is decidedly more dualistic than Christianity is usually shown to be by orthodox writers." In page 70 of the Introduction, a passage of the Avesta is thus rendered into English: "The two spirits who first of all existed, the twins proclaimed to me of themselves
The good and the bad in thoughts, words, and works.

When the two spirits came first together in order to create
Life and death, and (to order) how the world should be at the end."

Mr. West is not overburdened with either knowledge or love of Christianity, if he fancies that the merest child or neophyte, who has got the most elementary instruction in the Christian religion, would not repudiate with horror this doctrine as destructive of the very first idea we form of *one* Creator and *one* Lord.

It is difficult to divine the motive, that influenced the translator in introducing this Mr. West into his book, in places where his ravings are perfectly irrelevant. One sample of his antiquated rubbish will suffice:—"What life is we do not know, but even in its common acceptation, it seems to be some spiritual property that becomes manifest in the body; whether it begins and ends with the body we do not yet know, as hitherto we have found no means of maintaining the sensible existence of the one without the other, but we can conceive that such is possible. These, however, are matters of speculation in which I do not often indulge; but I am fully persuaded, that if mankind ever discover anything certain about the spiritual world by means of their own researches, they will have to change all their past notions regarding psychology and philosophy."

The author is totally ignorant of Catholic practices and belief, but that does not prevent him from instituting comparisons between our religion and that of the Zoroastrians. "Even a kind of indulgence" he says "is not unheard of. To certain meritorious works is attributed the effect of removing all guilt and sin from him who performs them." He could hardly have made such a statement, had he known that indulgences, in the Catholic belief, have not for their object the remission of guilt, but the remission, partial or total, of the temporal punishment due to sin after the guilt has been already wiped out by the sacrament of penance. Nor had he known that "unity of doctrine" is the first and most essential characteristic of our church, would he, in all probability, speak of a certain doctrine of the Iranians as being "remarkably analogous to the Catholic belief in saints, in many countries."

The book contains an immense deal of minute and interesting information on agricultural, domestic, and social, as well as on religious matters, and presents it in a very readable form. However, we would recommend our readers to seek such information from a safer and a purer source. There are two insuperable barriers to its circulation, in its present form, among our Catholic youth either in these countries, or in India where it is chiefly intended to be read—the infidel ideas that are here and there reflected in its pages, as shown by the extracts given above, and the indelicate expressions that occur in it, few no doubt, but shockingly gross.—E. M.

GOLDEN SANDS. Translated by Miss E. M'Mahon.

TO-DAY'S GEM FOR THE CASKET OF MARY. Compiled by a Member of the Ursuline Convent, Thurles.

MAXIMS AND COUNSELS OF ST. IGNATIUS LOYOLA. Translated by A. W. Chetwode. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

It is only recently that little pocket-books containing the maxims and counsels of the saints have become so common. These little books supply a want that has been felt by many good people who either have not much time for formal meditation, or who find it in practice extremely difficult to preserve fresh during the day the spiritual bouquet gathered in the early morning prayer. To such people it is compensation to have always with them ever so small a book in which the sayings and maxims of the saints are recorded. And which of us is not struck by the wisdom of those sayings and does not feel himself the better for every peep into his little *Vade-mecum*?

The little books mentioned above are admirable specimens of such compilations.

THE SCHOOL OF DIVINE LOVE, OR ELEVATIONS OF THE SOUL TO GOD. By Fr. Vincent Caraffa, Seventh General of the Society of Jesus. Translated from the French of Marcel Bouix, S.J. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

THE love which men should entertain for God is presented under every one of its aspects in "The School of Divine Love." The treatment of the subject is not, however, disconnected and vague, as one might at first sight imagine. The author seems to have had constantly before his mind the theological definition of sanctity; and this it is which gives unity to the whole work. It is well suited for Meditations, Visits to the Blessed Sacrament, and for Confessors on whom devolves the direction of souls that aim at a high degree of perfection.

The nuns of the Perpetual Adoration in Wexford are deserving of the warmest praise for having presented English readers with a version of "The School of Divine Love," worthy of the original.—

T. E. J.

THE CASTLE OF COËTQUEN OR PATIRA. Translated from the French of Raoul de Navery. By A. W. Chetwode. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

THIS is an interesting work by Raoul de Navery, and its translation will be a welcome addition to the department of fiction in our Catholic libraries, for the English-speaking public.

The chief interest of the work centres round the imprisonment of the wife of Tanguy, the Lord of Coëtquen, by her two brothers-in-law, and her release, brought about principally by Patira, a blacksmith's apprentice.

The style is vivid and picturesque, and the characters are delineated with much skill. John Anvil, the blacksmith, and his wife, Claudia, are examples of the power of the author in character-painting. The descriptions give a good idea of the manners of the French before the Revolution, and of their reverence for the Madonna.

It would add to the perfection of the plot, and to the satisfaction of the reader, if it were told what became of Tanguy, what of Patira, and what of the child. There is an improbability about Patira's delaying to file down the bars of the window, in order to provide a means of escape for the prisoner and her child. Would not Tanguy have released his wife and child, had he been informed even privately of their imprisonment?

The work is brought out with great taste and style by the publishers, and is very suitable for presents.—J. C.

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

FEBRUARY, 1887.

DR. MIVART'S DEFENCE OF THEISM.—II.

THESIS II.—(CONTINUED).

“There is and always must have been underneath, behind, and distinct from matter, an agent which is ever working in and through matter, and which created it, if it ever was created.”

PROPOSITION I.—(CONTINUED).

“Matter of itself is unable to produce all the substantial changes which are continually taking place around us.”

SECTION II.—IRRATIONAL LIVING ORGANISMS.

EVERY one has some vague notion of what is meant by life and death. We ask about a man, is he dead? about a plant, is it living? We know that after death organisms become dissolved into dust and gases, to be assumed again, perhaps, into other organisms. But when we look closer, when we probe the question to the innermost, we find that notions are not always so correct or clear.

I. The Schoolmen defined living things to be those which are capable of motion from within themselves. A man understands, feels, and grows by his own activity; brutes feel and grow by virtue of their own powers; plants increase in size and sustain their bulk by means of some internal force whereby they assimilate food.

This, however, needs further elucidation. Magnets act from within, draw to themselves iron filings, and thereby grow larger in bulk. The earth attracts to itself meteors, and grows larger by their mass. Chemicals have often an almost fierce attraction for one another. Are these things alive? And if not, why not?

There is a conceivable distinction between the vital action of a plant or of the stomach of an animal, and the non-vital activity of magnets and chemicals. A magnet draws iron filings, but as surely do the filings proportionately attract the magnet. An object which is being electroplated attracts the particles of gold or silver, but these in turn as surely draw the object to them in proportion to their mass. The earth is increased in bulk by every meteor that falls; but as surely as the meteor was drawn out of its orbit, so surely did it attract the earth some little way out of its course.

On the other hand, vital acts may be conceived to be one-sided in their inception. Moisture is necessary for the life of plants; yet it is more true to say that the plant of its own activity draws its food from the moisture, than that the moisture stimulates the plant to action. Similarly an animal puts food into its stomach; the food acts mechanically on the stomach in a variety of ways. Every such mechanical activity on the part of the food calls forth a response from the stomach, but these mechanical responses are not vital acts. Similar activities would call forth like responses from the stomach of a dead animal. The living organ energizes in a totally different way; it not only responds mechanically to mechanical impressions, but it puts forth an *additional* activity to which no mechanical impression corresponds.

These examples serve to explain higher energies. A man may *walk*, or he may *fall* from a height. In either case he puts forth mechanical force to correspond with the force that draws him to the earth. But when he walks he is putting forth *additional energy*.

For he is attracted to the earth, and attracts it in turn, as well when he rests as when he walks. He cannot, therefore, by the *same* energy rise and walk; hence a *new* force is required. This additional force is not *dragged* from him, else he should be *pushed* or *pulled*; it must arise spontaneously from himself.

So, too, in sensation, we distinguish between the *mechanical impression* made on the organ and the *perception*. When an object is seen, it acts on the optic nerves by means, it is supposed, of ether waves. This action is purely mechanical,

and calls forth from the nerve a purely mechanical response. But this purely mechanical response is not vision, which consists rather in the putting forth afterwards of *another* energy,—an energy which, after the mechanical response, arises spontaneously from the organ itself. This is true not only of sight but of the other senses.

To test the validity of this second spontaneous activity you may make the very same impression on dead organs, on a dead eye, or ear, or nerve; but no active sensation follows. The dead eye sees not; the dead ear hears not. Now if seeing and hearing were but mechanical responses to external impressions, dead eyes and dead ears should see and hear. For a dead eye must give such a mechanical response; it must be provoked into resistance by a force acting from without; just as a magnet, or a piece of iron which is struck with a hammer. Action of matter on matter must cause reaction. Hence the dead eye must mechanically respond. But it cannot *see*. Why? Because it has no longer its former power of initiative.

It is said in reply that the reason why a dead eye cannot see is because, owing to some rupture, communication is cut off with the brain, as in the case of a blind eye in a living animal. And it is true, no doubt, that such a rupture will cause blindness; but the suggestion does not get rid of the difficulty; it only removes the difficulty further back. For we may then ask: How is it that a dead *brain* cannot act vitally?

One might answer, of course, by supposing the vital force to exist in one brain-cell only, which becomes ruptured at death. Even this supposition but pushes the difficulty back further still. For again we ask: What is the nature of the rupture? What bond is broken? It cannot be cohesion, or adhesion, or any other of the mechanical forces of matter; for we find innumerable cells in which these forces have full play, which cells, however, are not endowed with vitality. If the presence of these forces does not confer vital energy, how can their absence or rupture destroy it? Hence, even in the one living brain-cell there must be a different source of energy.

Besides, it does not seem to be at all true that vitality is confined to the brain, not to say to one cell of the brain.

Every man's experience tells him that he is alive all over and can act vitally in every organ; nay, we are told that Dr. Vulpian has shown by experiment at the Academy of Medicine in Paris, that the brain may be quite extracted from the bodies of certain fishes without causing any change in their habits or appearance.

Moreover, if the foregoing reasons be not sufficient to convince any one that absence of vital energy or death does not come finally from any rupture of communication with the brain, he may convince himself by making an experiment on a living subject in whom the communication with the brain is in perfect order. Move your own muscles, whether by mechanical pressure or by an electric current, and you will perceive at once that the motion is not vital; if any one else moves them, the motion is not even, properly speaking, yours. And yet the motion is exactly the same in itself as when produced by vital energy; it differs not except in cause. Hence the cause must be different; or vital energy is a very different thing from mere dead mechanical force.

We have heard the scholastic view; let us now call the other side. According to materialists, plants are acted on by water, and do nothing more than react,—they have no power of initiative. So, too, the stomach of an animal: the eye, ear, and brain of a man. The external object gives out certain forces; these forces act on the organs either immediately, as when food is placed in the stomach, or through ether and air waves, as in the case of seeing and hearing. Action causes corresponding reaction, and this reaction is sensation.

Now this system is intelligible, and better still, it is capable of experimental proof,—down to the last proposition. Reaction is not sensation or life, it makes animals mere dead machines. You can make a bell respond to your stroke, but its voice is not a living voice. You can make a marionette dance to your music, but it is still a marionette. You may pass an electric current through the muscles of a dead body; it will move and quiver and writhe; but all the same we know that the motion is non-vital, that the body is dead. Nay, you may apply the electric battery to your own muscles;

when the current passes, your flesh will move, but not vitally. It will *be moved* from without, it will not *move itself*. The current to which it responds is very different from that "electric force which keeps our thousand pulses dancing." Living things are no mere "magnetic mockeries," not "only cunning casts in clay."

We freely confess that one is bound in very consistency to adopt the latter of these explanations, if one adheres to the philosophy of Locke. If we know nothing beyond what sense tells us, we know nothing of vital action. For our senses tell us only of rest, motion, and kinds of motion;—that filings are drawn to a magnet and adhere, that stones fall to the earth and remain, that a muscle is moved in such or such a manner. No sense ever yet saw or felt a cause as such; we see and feel motion, and we intue the cause. It is by such intuition that we come to a knowledge of our "force-root." Hence Hume was consistent in his phenomenism when he denied causality, and so too are Hume's modern disciples.

Here, then, we take our stand. We contend that reason can see through phenomena, that behind force we can discern its root, a cause behind motion. Our reason tells us that there is an immense difference between living and dead things, between vital and non-vital action; that "cunning casts," no matter how perfect or active, are not alive; that however you may galvanize dead muscles into motion, they are dead all the while; that when an external force compels our own members to move in a certain direction, we do not *go*, we are *pushed* and *made to go*. Whence comes the difference?

The Schoolmen saw the origin of difference in the activity of the substantial form; let me endeavour to harmonize this with what has been said about the activity of inorganic matter.

It has been proved (1) that behind force there must be a subject of inhesion, a "force-root"; (2) that this root must be different in kind for different substances; (3) that it is the only thing capable of binding different molecules into one substance; (4) that so to bind, it must be in itself one indivisible unity, else it should require a further principle of union, and so on *ad infinitum*.

Accordingly, (5) this indivisible unity is the one agent which energizes through the whole substance.

Now remark ; this root of activity is different in different bodies—in gold, iron, hydrogen, oxygen, water. Gold is not iron ; neither is water oxygen and hydrogen ; we see that quite clearly. These roots are not only different in themselves, but they energize differently ; and that is how we come to know that in their natures they are different. Gold does what iron cannot do ; and what is done by water cannot be done by either oxygen or hydrogen or by both combined, except they adopt the peculiar form of water. Why may they not only be *different*, but be one *superior* to another ? Why may not one be able not only to do what another cannot do, but also to act where another cannot act at all ?

This is precisely the scholastic position. Living bodies are one in substance. An animal is as much one as an iron plate ; a tree is as much one substance as the beam into which it may be fashioned. Hence living bodies must have one "force-root," one substantial form. The forms of living things are not only *different* from those of dead brute matter, but *superior* to them. Forms of dead matter energize, but only in response to external activity ; living forms *begin* to act of themselves.

Here then is our argument. We see quite plainly that living things are not like iron, wood, or stone ; that they have a peculiar power of initiative. This can be explained only by supposing that underneath the phenomena of force there is a "force-root" capable of such initiative energy. When life begins, whence does this "force-root" come ? What becomes of it when life ceases ? It comes from nothing to pass again in most cases into nothing. But mere matter cannot either create or annihilate a force, not to say a "force-root." Hence there must be something behind matter, working in it and through it, distinct from it and of a higher order.

II. When discussing the constitution of inorganic bodies I drew attention to the phenomena of crystallization. When liquids settle into the solid state, their particles usually take peculiar similar geometrical forms, called crystals. These

crystals not only are of different shapes in different simple elements, and in various compounds, but they are shaped differently in the compound from what they were in the constituents. And yet through all this diversity there is a steady uniformity; the same substance always crystallizes in the same way, so much so that substances may be known by the mere shape of their crystals.

Now what crystals are to inorganic bodies *cells* are to organisms. In these, accordingly, may be traced a somewhat similar diversity of uniformity.

Living beings are divided into kingdoms; these kingdoms are very much sub-divided, ever narrowing down to the individual. Thus we have the vegetable and the animal kingdoms. Plants are either phanerogamic or cryptogamic, and each sub-kingdom is reduced to various classes, divisions, orders, genera, species, and varieties. Similarly we have five great sub-kingdoms of animals:—(1) *back-boned*, such as horses, birds, most fishes; (2) *soft-bodied* such as snails and oysters; (3) *ringed*, such as worms, spiders, crabs; (4) *rayed*, such as starfish; (5) and *plant-like*, such as sponges. Some of these sub-kingdoms are in their turn very much sub-divided into classes, orders, sections, groups, &c. But every individual of both kingdoms is made up of cells arranged differently.

It is important to remark that these various subdivisions are not made at random; they are due to a uniform diversity of arrangement by which the cells are so linked together as to give rise to a uniform diversity of vital power. How very uniformly oaks are made, and rose-trees, and grasses! How like each other cows are, and sparrows, and salmon! Yet how wonderfully different they are. Who would take an oak for a cow, or a sparrow for a salmon?

There are two things to be specially noted about this uniformity of diversity. (1) The germ-cells are exceedingly like. If you were to mix a number of the germ-cells of different species and give them so mixed to the ablest of our naturalists, and if you were to furnish him with all the testing apparatus that human ingenuity can invent, you might feel quite confident that, by merely examining the cells, he could

never tell which is which;—which will grow into a horse, which into a cow; which will become an oak, which a beech.

And yet (2) one cell will surely develop into a horse, the other into a cow; one will become a beech, the other an oak; and this though the nourishment be the same. Plant fertilized oak-germs and beech-germs side by side, and if you can preserve them and supply them with the same food, they will develop differently; every oak-germ will become an oak, every beech-germ a beech. Treat salmon and trout spawn in exactly the same way; every egg of the one will become a salmon, of the other, a trout. The same grass that feeds horses feeds sheep; they breathe the same air and drink the same water; yet they crystallize into different forms. On the other hand you may vary the food or conditions; plant your oak-germs one here another there, one in this soil another in that, one in a hot-house another on a stormy mountain-top; if they grow at all, they will all grow into the same form. The same is true of the germ-cells of horses, salmon, sparrows. Why is this? What causes this uniformity of diversity?

Mr. Darwin felt the urgency of these questions and endeavoured to answer them by his theory of *Pangenesis*. According to this hypothesis "each living organism is ultimately made up of an almost infinite number of minute particles or organic atoms, termed 'gemmules,' each of which has the power of producing its kind. Moreover, these particles are supposed to circulate freely about the organism (which is made up of them) and to be derived from all parts of all the organs of the less remote ancestors of each such organism during all the stages and stages of such several ancestors' existence, and therefore of the several states of each of the ancestors' organs. It is further supposed that such a complete collection of gemmules is aggregated in each ovum and spermatozoon in most animals, and in each part capable of producing by gemmation (budding) in the lowest animals and plants."¹

It would be most interesting to examine this theory and show its various anomalies; it would be particularly interesting to show how utterly it sets at defiance the philosophy of

¹ "Mivart: Genesis of Species," chap. x.

Locke, which is the basis of materialism. But we must confine ourselves to the question now at issue. If the gemmules be what materialists say they are, mere collections of forces, how could they ever build up organisms such as we see them?

For the whole argument which was advanced to prove the necessity of "force-root" in inorganic matter, is of even greater strength when applied to the constitution of organisms. (1) The unit of force must have a subject of inhesion or root. (2) There must be different *kinds* of gemmules or of elements, and this difference can only come from difference of "force-root."¹ (3) Not only must the gemmules be different in kind, but there must be a something pervading the whole organism, energizing throughout the whole on the same yet different lines, building this into an oak, that into a beech, this into a horse, that into a sparrow or a salmon. Naturalists tell us that every cell of an oak may by gemmation become a distinct tree. According to Pangenesis every such cell must contain within itself all the gemmules of the almost infinite oaks which may be produced from it. Who can believe it? Is it not much simpler and less mysterious to admit a "force-root" for the tree as for the gemmule,—a permeating under principle which is uniform in each species though different in any two; and which, accordingly, will develop both uniformly and differently, no matter in what conditions, provided only they are sufficient?

But if you admit this, the question arises: Whence does the permeating principle come? Whither does it go at death? From nothing, to nothing. Hence matter is not of itself sufficient to produce it or to cause it to cease.

III. It will be remembered that when treating inorganic matter we relied for proof of substantial forms on unity of substance. A plate of iron, a block of stone, are each one substance; the Menai Bridge, St. Peter's at Rome, are not one substance; but the former is one bridge, the latter one church. Let us see can we trace a parallelism in organisms.

And to begin with our own bodies,—for what is true of them is true of other animals,—we know we are each *one*;

¹ See RECORD, January, 1887, pp. 10-13.

not merely a welded mass of atoms, but each *peculiarly* one, with a union which we call *substantial*. Now organised bodies are not bound up together like iron plates, so that it is not so easy to illustrate the different kind of unity in the present case as it was in the case of inorganic matter; but still we will try.

If a tyrant were to bind two persons together with strong chains passing tight round their bodies in many parts, they should be in a certain sense *one mass*, but should remain *two distinct persons*. If you touch one of them on the foot, he will feel the touch; the other will not feel except you push. And yet that foot is less firmly bound to its own body than the two bodies are bound together. The limbs may be torn asunder, but the bodies are inseparable; yet each person's limbs are parts of *one* body, though each body is not part of one substantial whole. Our reason tells us this quite clearly and forcibly.

Moreover, we are aware that these are *the very same* bodies we had twenty years ago. We distinguish between moral and substantial permanence. A fountain is the same as it was last year, but the substance of the water is not the same. Our bodies, on the contrary, are in substance what they always were. When we clasp the hand of a friend, we know that it is the same hand that we clasped in youth. A soldier cares for an old charger, because he feels that it is the same in substance as the noble animal that bore him through many a dangerous field. And yet we are told on authority which we can trust, that the molecules of which those bodies are composed are continually passing away.

What is the cause of this substantial unity? Why is the foot one with its body, though two bodies bound together much more firmly are not one substance? Why is a man the same and the fountain not the same, though the atoms of each are constantly passing away? It can be only because there is a binding principle underneath phenomena, which is the same in the whole body but not the same in two, which abides in the man but not in the fountain.¹

Further, consider what happens at death. You look on

¹ See "Nature and Thought," p. 166.

the corpse of a deceased friend; everything is the same to all appearance as it was a few minutes ago; yet it is not your friend, it is "the ruined chrysalis." The same is true of horses, plants, birds, &c.;—after death the matter seems the same, but it energizes in a different fashion. Why is this?

Materialists will tell you it is all because the heart-action has ceased, or because a cell has been ruptured in the brain. True; but how unsatisfactory. Limbs may be cut from animals, the brain may be extracted from fishes, plants may be cut into ever so many slips, worms may be divided,—yet they live. In a swoon a man's heart may cease to beat, he lives however; we know that he is dead not by its ceasing to beat, but by its remaining inactive *long*. How then can change of heart-action be the sole cause of this great change of death? Or how can death be entirely due to the rupture of a cell, when we know that the whole brain may be extracted and cast to the winds, nay plants and even worms may be cut in two, and yet death will not follow?

Let me sum up this portion of my argument. When a friend dies, we notice a diversity. He was the same from infancy till old age, though the atoms of his body had often changed; but now what remains of him is a different substance. All this is true of animals and plants. Whence came the identity? From cohesion or other union of atoms or gemmules? But the atoms do not cohere; they pass away. Besides you can bind atoms with a stronger bond, and yet they will not form one body. Whence came the diversity? From a rupture of the cells of the brain or a stoppage of the heart? But you may cut a plant or worm in two, or you may extract the brain, and the organisms will not die; the heart may stop and the man may live. Whence do they come, this identity and diversity? Only from the presence or absence of something behind,—of a "force-root" or substantial form, which comes when life begins, remains while the vital conditions last, and departs when they cease.¹

But further: Whence comes the form? From nothing; and it goes to nothing, except in the case of man. Hence matter of itself is unable to account for life.

¹ Compare Dr. Mivart's argument which I have modified: *Ibid.* pp.169-174.

Here again we freely confess that our argument is of no value when addressed to one who admits no power of intuition,—to a thorough phenomenist. But there is no such; they say they are, but they are not. The most pronounced materialist admits in his heart and in his ordinary actions that he sees *something* underneath phenomena. To Mr. Tyndall it is “the mysterious thing,” to Mr. Spencer “the Unknowable,” to Mr. Bain “a double-faced somewhat,” to Mr. Huxley “the abyss of the Eternal and Unknowable.” And so too Mr. Darwin was forced to have recourse to his gemmules and Pangenesis.

IV. I now come to solve a difficulty which must often have struck the reader,—about the unity of substantial forms. One of the main arguments advanced in this and the preceding paper has been that organisms are one; that they cannot be unified by mere force; that, accordingly, their unity must come from a “force-root.” Hence it follows, of course, that this root must itself be one and indivisible; else it should require another binding principle, and so on *ad infinitum*. Now experience seems to tell against this. For we can divide one stone, one plant, one worm, into two or more. The substance does not cease, else the parts should be different in substance, as parts, from what they were in the whole. Who believes that they are? Cut an apple in two; it is the very same substance in two distinct parts, the very same force and “force-root;” and so with regard to plants and worms. If, therefore, the form makes the body, the form must itself be capable of division; and the whole scholastic position is turned.

The objection says fairly, “if the form makes the body.” We admit that if there was nothing underneath force but “force-root,” “force-root” should be in itself divisible. Our way out of the difficulty lies in denying that forms are the only underlying entities. This needs explanation.

When oxygen and hydrogen are changed into water, and the water then converted back again into oxygen and

hydrogen, a question arises: Are these gases the very same individual substances that were transformed into water? Everyone says so. Hence the original process was not *annihilation* of gas and *creation* of water, but *change* of gas into water. So too in the second transformation the water is not *annihilated* nor is the gas *created*, but the former is *changed* in the latter. Now *change*, as distinguished from *annihilation* and *creation*, supposes the *permanence* of something which is common to both terms. Water changes from hot to cold; the substance remains the same. A friend changes into an enemy; the person continues unchanged. What is permanent and common to oxygen and hydrogen on the one hand, and to water on the other? Not the form; for I have proved ever so often that "force-roots" begin and end; it is not any longer force of water, but of oxygen and of hydrogen. What is permanent? Clearly *something*; therefore there must be something besides forms behind phenomena.

Now it is curious that the *quantity* of water produced depends on the *quantity* of the constituent gases: a larger or smaller supply of gas will yield a proportionately large or small amount of water. Here then are two facts: (1) *something* of the constituent elements remains after the change; (2) the *quantity* of the new substance depends on the *quantity* of the elements. Is it not natural to conclude that quantity springs from the permanent something,—in other words, that *materia prima* is the root of extension as forms are the roots of force?

Quality is the category which is, perhaps, oftenest associated in our minds with *quantity*; the former tells *what kind*, the latter *how much*, the substance is. A little reflection will convince any one that diversity of *kind* springs from diversity of *activity*. Take from your purse two kinds of coin, one gold, the other silver: why do they differ in kind? Because the substance energizes differently; so that the coins are not of the same colour, weight, &c. *Quality*, therefore, depends on force; force comes from the substantial form; hence quality is due to the form, as quantity springs from the primordial matter.

Further, when we speak of divisibility or indivisibility we

refer immediately to *quantity*. Given a certain *amount* of anything, one can separate it into parts; but who can divide a *quality*, a *kind*? Gold is as much that kind of metal in one sovereign as in a thousand; water is as much itself in a wine-glass as in the Pacific. Hence quality is indivisible in itself, whereas quantity is divisible; that which springs from the *materia prima* may be parcelled out, but what results from the *substantialis forma* is in itself incapable of partition. Is it not natural to refer these diverse characteristics to similar diversity of characteristic in the roots from which they spring? Accordingly, this is another reason for holding that substantial forms are in themselves indivisible.

Remark the words "in themselves;" for the Schoolmen further teach that, though "in themselves" indivisible, forms become divisible in the matter.

It has been shown that bodies must be composed of two elements,—a transitory root of force and a permanent root of extension. These two elements, though in themselves most real, are incapable of independent existence; they must co-exist. The permanent something should be nothing if it were not united to force; and on the other hand, force, at least in bodies, must naturally be extended. They perfect each other, one element contributing what the other lacks. The matter gives rise to divisibility, the form to unity. But this supposes that the compound is not so divisible as not to be one substance, nor so much one substance as not to be divisible. There must be give and take; the divisible matter must become unified by the indivisible form; and the indivisible form must in turn become divisible in the divisible matter. The various atoms of which an iron plate or a human body is composed, become one substance by means of the indivisible "force-root;" and similarly the force which the plate or body exercises, becomes capable of division because exercised throughout a something which is in itself divisible.

Accordingly, the following is the scholastic principle: substantial forces are indivisible *per se*, but divisible *per accidens*, i.e. in *matter*. Hence when you break a stone or a bar of iron, the block or bar is no longer one but two or

more. It is not two, however, in the same sense as if the stone were resolved into its chemical components. In this latter case, as has been so often shown, the "force-root" ceases and other "force-roots" begin to be,—the *substance* is changed. But when you break a block in two, the *same substance* remains; it is only *divided*. The "force-root," though in itself indivisible, is no longer one but two, because the extended something in which it energized is divided.

Something similar happens in the case of the lower organisms, such as plants and worms. These organisms are like inorganic matter in this, that the one indivisible form is able to exercise its various energies throughout the whole body; its activities are not restricted to special parts. Hence the great difference which everyone must have noticed between the higher and the lower organisms,—that in the higher kinds the activities of the form are limited to special places, heart, brains, eyes, ears, &c.; whereas the lower we descend in the scale of life, the fewer of these specially adapted organs do we discern. Worms are very like all through; and buds and seeds of plants are now known to be only different forms of the leaf. As, therefore, the forms of inorganic bodies, though in themselves indivisible, may be divided in matter, so may we divide the forms of these lower organisms, which like the forms of inorganic substances, energize equally throughout the whole mass.

The explanation given is that of St. Thomas, whose view is commonly accepted in the Schools. Any reader, who may wish to examine more minutely how wonderfully the details of this teaching harmonize with modern science, may consult Fr. Harper.¹

Materialism, in so far as it ventures to touch these questions at all, falls back on Pangenesis. A bud or cutting will develop to the same form as its parent plant, because every cell is made up of an almost infinite number of gemmules corresponding to every organ in the parent, and to every peculiar organ in the less remote ancestors. In other words,

¹ "Metaphysics of the School," vols. ii. and iii. passim.

every cell has a substantial form which is not indeed like that of the Schoolmen indivisible, but almost infinitely divisible.

I have already pointed out some of the many difficulties of this theory; here I may call attention to two others. (1) What binds the gemmules into *one cell*? For the cells not only are each one in substance, but also have uniform tendencies to diversity of growth. (2) How can gemmules of dead matter make the cell capable of vital acts?¹

Now it may strike the reader that if the scholastic view be correct, there is little more in the genesis of plants and the lower animals than in the breaking of a stone into parts. This would seem to enervate the argument which has been urged in this paper from the generation of living organisms: For why should not matter be able to break stones?

We answer that the reasoning in the foregoing paper is drawn *immediately* from the *generation*, not from the *division* of organisms. That there are organisms which do not owe their origin to division, is indubitable. Take the well-known case of the generation of most fishes. Both the egg of the female and the milt of the male are quite separated from the bodies of the parents before generation has begun. For the egg is not the salmon; neither is the milt; they could never of themselves grow into a fish. Hence the life of the new organism commences at the time of union. And as the egg and milt are then separated from the parents, the new form cannot result from a division of the old.

This is equally true of those generations in which the germ-cell remains enclosed in the body of the mother. That the sperm-cell must then be separated from the substantial form of the male parent, is plain. But, except in the case of mammals, we are told by the highest modern authorities on embryology, that the germ-cell is not *substantially united* with the mother's body, but only *enclosed*. Nay, Professor Haeckel supplies data which prove that even in the case of mammals, about which there was more reason to doubt, there is no *substantial union* between the mother and the *foetus* even in

¹ See Mivart, "Genesis of Species," chap. x.; "Nature and Thought," p. 173.

conception.¹ Hence in cases of real generation the new organism begins to live—to be *informed*—only after the germ-cell and the sperm-cell have been separated from the substantial form of the parents. Accordingly the new form cannot result from mere division, as in the case of stones, but must begin *de novo*. How could matter of itself produce it?

I have said at the commencement of the answer to this objection, that the “reasoning in the foregoing paper is drawn *immediately* from the *generation*, not from the division of organisms,” such as occurs in the case of some worms which are propagated by budding. Even from these, however, we may draw an argument. For just as mere matter can *divide* a chemical compound, if it once existed, though of itself it could never produce such a compound; so the form of a living organism might be divided, if it were once in being. But how does it get into being? No materialist of the present day ever thinks of maintaining that there was an infinite series of worms. It is held rather that the first worm was evolved by natural selection. On the contrary, we contend that the substantial form of the first real worm must have been distinct in its nature from the forms of all preceding organisms, just as the substantial form of the first real water must have been distinct in its nature from those of oxygen and hydrogen. The *first* form could never arise by division; hence either *it* must have been *generated*, or the *whole organism* must have been *created*. Previously existing matter was of itself incapable of doing either. Hence even in these cases our argument applies.

V. The explanation just given throws light on the two very vexed questions of spontaneous generation and the origin of species.

1° The schoolmen applied the term “generation” to denote the production or “eduction” of all kinds of forms whether of inorganic bodies or of organisms. By “spontaneous generation” we understand the eduction of forms of *living* things from *inorganic* matter.

¹ See the extracts quoted from Professors Sachs and Haeckel by Fr. Harper, vol. iii., pp. 145, &c.

It has been my argument all through, that, though brute matter can educe forms, it cannot do so *of itself*. Reason tells us not only that oxygen and hydrogen are got from water, but also that electricity *finds* them. Hence matter *causes* the generation of the substantial form of inorganic bodies; it is, however, unable to do this of itself, but only by virtue of the concurrent activity of a Higher Power which energizes according to established general laws.

Now, if brute matter can be enabled to be the immediate cause of the generation of a lower kind of form, why should it be impossible to enable it to produce forms of a higher kind? It does bring into being the "force-root" of crystals; why should it not be likewise possible to make it capable of generating the source of activity in a lichen or in a sponge?

The Schoolmen discussed these questions both as to possibility and as to fact. With regard to possibility they held different opinions. The explanation of this difference must be sought still further back. (1) They held commonly that a creature cannot be endowed with power to *create* a being capable of existing of itself, such as the human soul; for such an act was thought to require infinite power, and no creature is capable of receiving the infinite. Hence no finite being can be enabled to do more than "educe" from matter forms which may "co-exist" with matter. (2) The Scholastics discussed whether the forms of plants and of irrational animals are capable of independent existence, or whether they are "immersed in matter," and must co-exist with it. The common opinion was that they are so immersed, that they are capable, not of *existence*, but only of *co-existence*. Hence (3) the common opinion also was that inorganic bodies could be enabled to "educe" them;—that, if God saw fit, He could so arrange that they might be spontaneously generated.

With regard to the fact, of course, the Schoolmen argued mostly from experiences which modern scientific instruments have shown to be capable of an explanation then unthought of. Hence many modern scientists, particularly owing to the researches of Pasteur and Tyndall, believe that there is now

in nature no such thing as a power of spontaneous generation, but that all life comes from germs. This is the opinion of many unbelievers, such as Mr. Huxley; it is denied, however, by others, as well as by many eminent scientists who believe in Revelation. I think that Dr. Mivart¹ and others, among Catholics, incline to the latter opinion. Moreover, Mr. Huxley contends that, though matter in its present state is unable to produce germs, yet we have reason to think it was not always so, but that all the germs in existence came from matter alone originally,—that is millions of years ago, “beyond the abyss of geologically recorded time.”²

This seems to me the least consistent of all opinions on this matter. If there is any one thing which materialists and all men of science insist on more than another, it is the persistence of force. Hence if matter ever produced life, the same energy must be in it still. Why does it not produce life now? For remember Mr. Huxley holds it does not. Why? For want of favourable conditions? But surely with all our scientific appliances we are able to reduce masses of matter to the chaos which the earth was when life began. Is it not even likely that present conditions, which are so favourable for the growth of organisms from germs, could easily be made more favourable than the primal chaos for the work of spontaneous generation? But in particular I would ask Mr. Huxley how he, a phenomenist, can consistently believe in an energy which no one ever experienced or can experience; how he, an associationist, can expect that matter *must* have produced life billions of years ago.

I shall, perhaps, at another time have occasion to discuss the question whether the substantial forms of plants and of irrational animals can exist independently or must co-exist with matter. It depends on the nature of their powers, which are so different from those of man. Meanwhile enough has been said to show that our argument is independent of this as well as of the further question,—whether life may be spontaneously generated. Whether spontaneous generation be possible or impossible, whether it be a fact or otherwise,

¹ *Cont. Rev.*, July, 1879.

² *Critiques and Addresses*, p. 239.

our position is safe. Life can never be generated,—no substantial form can ever be generated by matter of itself, without the assistance of a Higher Power.

2° The same is true of that other vexed question,—the origin of species. Were the various kinds of living beings produced from the beginning by a special act of creation? Or rather, were there some few kinds originally created, from which the others were developed according to law? I do not undertake to answer. But if it has been or ever will be proved that species may be so developed, I should consider the conclusion to be in perfect harmony with the scholastic philosophy and with the argument which has been advanced in this paper.

For it is all a question of the generation of substantial forms. Now there can be no doubt that in case of inorganic bodies distinct species of forms may be and are developed day by day. Every new chemical compound is proof of this. Why should we restrict God's power to inorganic matter? He is able to confer on creatures the capacity to develop distinct species of substantial forms of a lower order: Why should He not be able to do the same when the forms are of a barely superior grade?

If, indeed, one were to admit that the substantial forms of all living things were, like the human soul, not "immersed in matter," but capable of independent existence, then it might be necessary to deny the possibility of a creature being endowed with power to *create* such. For to produce them would then be an act of *creation*, nothing less; and creation may suppose infinite power, of which creatures are incapable. But there is no evidence that the souls of irrational organisms are capable of any such independent existence; on the contrary all the evidence points the other way. Hence I do not see why God could not confer on creatures the power to develop ever new forms of irrational organisms.

Supposing He can do so, the further question remains: Has He done it? This is a question of fact, to be determined altogether by evidence. I see nothing in Revelation decisive

one way or the other. St. Thomas follows St. Augustine in teaching that He did. If experimentalists supply proof that species were so developed, we will gladly accept both the proof and the conclusion.

Remember this applies only to *irrational* organisms, not to the human soul. Reason and Revelation combine to teach that it is immediately created by God. It is capable of independent existence; hence it is not merely "educated," but created; and creation is thought by many to require infinite power. Accordingly we are taught in the Book of Genesis that, when man first appeared on the earth, the living soul was breathed into him by God Himself.

Let me remind the reader once again that the questions we have been discussing lie altogether behind the domain of experimental science. Physicists tell us of different forms of activity; the more they tell the better pleased we are. The boldest of them, however, will not venture to assert that he can explain everything. They see something more behind, "a mysterious thing," "a double-faced somewhat," "an inexplicable first principle," "the Unknowable," "the Infinite," "the abyss of the Eternal."

Now it is into this depth the Angel of the Schools wings his flight. He and his disciples have nothing to fear from physical research fairly conducted; in truth we stand in need of facts, more facts. When science has exhausted the powers of experimental research, then the time is ripe for intellect to penetrate within the veil; when physics ceases, metaphysics begins. It is only intellect that can resolve this "double-faced somewhat," and it has resolved it, as we have seen, into its two elements,—one something the permanent root of extension, another the transient root of force.

W. McDONALD.

(*To be continued.*)

ARRAN OF THE SAINTS.

DURING the fifth century, when the barbarian hordes of Northern Europe came forth like a torrent from their frozen homes and forest fastnesses, inundating the fair plains of Italy, Gaul and Spain, and sweeping away in their desolating course every vestige of ancient culture, history tells us that the highest forms of learning and Christian perfection found a refuge in an obscure island of the Mediterranean. This was Lerins. From a haunt of serpents it became a nursery of saints, and a centre of civilization, purer and more powerful than the famous "Isles of Greece" immortalized in song.

Even distant Erin, then the "Ultima Thule" of the earth, felt its influence. Saint Patrick spent nine years within its sacred shores, and was there trained in those habits of sanctity which made him in the hands of Divine Providence a fit instrument to be the apostle of the Irish nation.

When afterwards, during his forty days' retreat on Croagh Patrick, as he looked from his lofty eminence over the islands of Clew Bay, which lay like a picture before him, we can fancy to ourselves the vision of another island further south rising up before his prophetic mind—a vision which was calculated to fill the heart of the grand old saint with joy and forcibly remind him of the loved paradise of his earlier days.

At the mouth of Lough Lurgan—now Galway Bay—he sees three foam-washed islands. The largest is known as Arran. Bleak and inexpressibly wild, they are inhabited only by the sea-fowl and the pagan priests and warriors, who, driven from the mainland, there, as on a congenial soil, enjoy the undisturbed exercise of their idolatrous rites.

Crowning the cliffs which stand like bulwarks to repel the invasions of the ocean, are huge fortresses from which savage war songs and druidical incantations are heard mingling with the roar of the ocean. It is a land of darkness. Man and nature seem to have combined to invest it with every feature of repulsiveness. But lo, there is a transformation!

The gloom vanishes and the place is robed in a vesture of golden light.

As the prophet of old beheld in wonder the arid plain suddenly swarm with living beings, so the aged Apostle is lost in astonishment as he sees this home of desolation and idolatry changed into an abode of light and sanctity. The prophecy is verified, and the ocean leading to its shores literally becomes "a path and a way." Its rocky heights teem with men whose virtues make them more like angels in human form. Churches, schools and monasteries rise up on every side as if by a touch of magic. Pilgrims flock from distant lands. The tongues of the Gael, the Pict, the Cumbri, the Saxon, the Frank, and the Roman, mingle with the mysterious murmurs of the waves. And from this island sanctuary he sees go forth like a swarm of bees, legions of holy missionaries, trained in virtue and learning, to diffuse the "good odour of Christ," and to carry the blessed tidings of the Gospel to lands still sitting in the "shadow of death."

Arran has been well styled the Lerins of the Northern Seas. What one was to France in the fifth, the other was to all Western Europe from the fifth to the eighth century. Two great centres of monastic and intellectual life, they exercised a more refining and a more lasting influence on the progress of humanity than the codes of all the law-givers, and the systems of all the philosophers.

But if both were great sanctuaries of learning and virtue this was almost the only point of resemblance between them. In every other respect they were totally dissimilar. One was a land of sunshine; the other of clouds and tempests. One was washed by a halcyon sea, and planted with groves of myrtle, palm and orange trees; the other, swept by a tempestuous ocean, was almost destitute of vegetation. One, in fine, seemed destined by nature to be an earthly paradise, the other an earthly purgatory.

Saint Eucherius, in his famous work in praise of the eremetical life, has described Lerins as a country bordered with deep woods, watered by beneficent streams rich with verdure, enamelled with flowers, embalmed with their perfumes. What a contrast between this picture and the grey

rocks, scanty soil, and cold Atlantic blasts of the sister island.

Reader, have you ever seen Arran? If not, you can scarcely form an idea of a landscape which is unique in its kind. Nowhere in the world, perhaps, can there be found a more varied combination of fertility and barrenness, of bleakness and picturesqueness, of tameness and sublimity. Placed at the entrance to Galway Bay, like a natural breakwater sprung from the deep, the Islands seem to enjoy a sort of amphibious existence. Land and water commingle and unite in the most fantastic shapes it is possible to image. Here are flat headlands running far into the sea; there echoing caverns through which the waves rush with a roar like distant thunder. Here is a beach covered with sand of pearly whiteness; there a tremendous precipice rising up in a vertical line 300 feet from the water's edge.

Stand on the ruins of Dun Aengus and look around. The fortress itself is in keeping with the surroundings. Its black and weather-worn walls tell the story of a persecuted race, who, first conquered by the wonder-working Tuatha de Dananns, were driven westward inch by inch, until at length, after the battle of Moytura a remnant of the brave but unfortunate warriors, completely broken and dispirited, took refuge in Arran. Here on the verge of the inaccessible ocean they made their final stand, and built those massive barriers which even at the present day excite our wonder and curiosity.

Looking inland, a picture of strange fascination is presented to the view. Off in the distance the "Twelve Pins of Benbola" rise up like clustered pyramids in bold relief against the sky. Winding in and out by a thousand creeks, bays and inlets, is Galway Bay, like a huge river, widening as it advances, and at length emptying itself by three capacious mouths into the ocean. In the immediate foreground the eye wanders over a scene which is the weirdest it is possible to conceive. It is a little world of stone. Of the nearly twelve thousand acres which constitute the area of the Islands only eight hundred are fit for cultivation. The remainder is stone, pure and simple. It seems to revel in its supremacy. There are hills and valleys of stone; plains and

castles of stone, and even whole cities of that element fantastically piled together as if formed by human hands. Lying by the northern sea-coast, and in the valleys around the monasteries are rich lands and verdant meadows, but these being concealed from view, the only impression left upon the mind of the spectator is that everywhere are

“Rocks at random thrown
Bleak waves, bare crags, and banks of stone.”

The bleakness of the inland landscape is relieved by the grandeur of the ocean view. It is simply sublime. Tourists who have visited all lands and seen nature in its varied aspects, have pronounced this the most magnificent scene in the world. To the east are seen the Cliffs of Moher and the headlands of Clare and Kerry; while, lying to the north and west, in a boundless plain, is a watery waste whose vastness fills the mind with awe. There it lies—“the deep and dark blue ocean, unchangeable save to its wild waves’ play, dark heaving, boundless, endless, dread, fathomless and alone; the Mirror of the Omnipotent; the Image of Eternity; the Throne of the Invisible.”

Such is Arran at the present day, and such it was, at least in all its main features, fourteen hundred years ago, when a young man of princely bearing, dressed in the garb of a monk, landed from his *curroch* and knelt in prayer on the beach near where stands the present village of Eochill. This was Enda, the founder of the school of “Arran of the Saints.” Although still in the bloom of early manhood his life was full of exciting incidents. Descended on the paternal side from Colla-da-Croich, seventh in a direct line from the famous Conn of the Hundred Battles, and claiming the royal Dalaradian race as his maternal relations, the blood which flowed in his veins from this two-fold fountain was the oldest and noblest in Ireland. Conal Dearg, King of Oriel, was his father, and his mother, Briga, surnamed Aibfinnia, or the Fair, was the daughter of Ainmaire, son of the prince of Ferrard. The ancestral territory of Oriel comprised the present counties of Monaghan, Armagh, Fermanagh and Louth. Enda was born in the latter county about the middle

of the fifth century. Remarkable for his manly beauty, and bravery in battle, he won the hearts of his fierce clansmen, and on the death of his father succeeded to the chieftaincy amidst the universal acclamations of his people.

St. Patrick was about this time at the zenith of his career. He had scattered the gospel seed far and near, and a golden harvest was springing up. Among the first fruits of his labours were the family of Conal Dearg. The sisters of St. Enda, named respectively Fanchea, Lochinia, Carecha and Darenia, had early embraced Christianity, and three of them are said to have received the veil from the hands of St. Patrick. The fourth became the wife of Aengus, King of Munster.

If Enda received baptism with his sisters, it is evident that the teachings of the Gospel made little or no impression on his heart. Although his naturally chivalrous disposition preserved him from the grosser vices of paganism, still the constantly recurring rivalries and barbarous warfare of the age found in him an ardent participator. On one occasion while returning from a victorious battle-field at the head of his clan, his sister Fanchea went forth to meet him, and addressed him as follows:—

“O wretched man, why do you provoke the Lord to anger? And why do you plunge your soul into the depths of sin by your various crimes?”

Her exhortations were however unavailing. The time of grace had not yet arrived. In the meantime the prayers of the holy sisters on behalf of their erring brother were unceasing. They besieged heaven with their sighs and tears. So efficacious were their petitions in the sight of God, that He interposed a miracle to effect their brother's conversion.

Fanchea had founded a nunnery at Ross-Oerther, a charming spot on the banks of Lough Erne. Among the members of her community was a young maiden, the daughter of one of the reigning chieftains of Ulster, receiving her education. She was a princess of extraordinary beauty. Enda became enamoured of her, and demanded the lady in

marriage. Fanchea communicated his designs to her royal pupil, adding :—

“Make now thy choice. Whether wilt thou have Him whom I love or an earthly bridegroom?”

The reply was :—

“I, also, love Him whom thou lovest.”

The death of this princess was miraculous and the occasion of Enda's conversion.

Fanchea, having conducted her into a chamber, placed her on a bed, where, without any previous illness, she calmly expired. She went to the nuptials of the Heavenly Spouse whom her young heart loved.

After her death Fanchea covered the face of the deceased princess with a veil, and then going to Enda, she asked him to come and see her whom he loved. When they entered the chamber of death, Fanchea removed the veil and begged him to gaze upon the face of his beloved. Struck with horror he exclaimed :—

“Alas ! she is no longer beautiful but ghastly pale.”

“And so shalt thou be,” was the sister's prompt reply. Seeing her opportunity she spoke to him so feelingly of the shortness of life and the length of eternity, of the joys of heaven and the pains of hell, that his heart was touched, and he shed tears. He wept and believed. His conversion was as complete as it was instantaneous. Like Paul of Tarsus, he was in a moment changed into a fervent disciple of Him who was “meek and humble of heart.” His Celtic nature knew no half measures. He hastened to put his life in harmony with his convictions. He resolved to repair the past by devoting himself altogether to God. Despite the threats of his friends, he resigned his chieftaincy and assumed the habit of a monk, “and what the tonsure signified he fulfilled by his actions.” From a monk to a priest was a natural transition. We, therefore, find Enda preparing to perfect his sacrifice by a most rigorous preparation for the reception of Holy Orders. Having built a monastery in his native territory of Oriel, he directed his steps to Rossina in Wales, where he placed himself under the tutelage of St. Manchan, one of those heroic Irish Missionaries who went

forth from their native land to carry the blessings of religion and civilisation to the Britons, then little better than painted savages. How long he remained under the direction of his sainted fellow-countryman is not known, but we find him in the course of time, accompanied, it is said, by two compatriots and disciples named Pupeus and Heleus, setting out for Rome, then as now the centre of Christianity. After a long and rigorous preparation he was promoted to Holy Orders. Such good use had he made of his time and opportunities in the "Holy City," that he became a model of every virtue. Filled with zeal, he gathered round him a number of disciples whom he placed in the Monastery of Latinum, a place whose etymology is doubtful, and whose history has unfortunately perished with its ruins.

So great was the reputation for sanctity and learning acquired by Enda and his two fellow-countrymen, that on the death of the reigning Pope, it is said, the Roman clergy and people offered the tiara to one of the holy exiles. Their humility could only see danger in so great a dignity, and the proffered honour was persistently declined. St. Hilarius was accordingly selected to fill the vacant throne.

The fame of her brother's holy life reached St. Fanchea in distant Erin, and it filled her heart with joy. She resolved to travel to Rome to visit Enda, and exhort him to return to his native land. Guided, we are told, by angels, she performed the difficult voyage in safety. The interview between the brother and sister was characteristic of the extraordinary spirit of mortification which was a distinguishing virtue of St. Enda. Having caused a tent to be erected in the grounds of the monastery, there concealed from her view, he allowed Fanchea to explain the object of her visit. There was no unnecessary waste of time or sentiment between them.

Fanchea spoke first, and said :—

"Since God has gifted you with talents, you ought to exercise them for the benefit of the people of your native land."

Enda's reply was equally prompt and definite :

"When a year shall have elapsed after your return to Ireland," he said, "I hope God will permit me to follow you."

Fanchea added :—

“When you come to Ireland seek out a certain island called Arran, which is situated off the western coast.”

The interview ended, she received her brother's benediction, and set out for Ireland, where she arrived in safety.

Enda was not unmindful of his promise. In due time we find him landing at Drogheda, accompanied by a numerous retinue of disciples. Having indulged his passion for building to the extent of erecting several churches on both banks of the Boyne, he travelled southwards to visit his brother-in-law, Aengus, King of Munster. It may be easily conjectured that the object of his visit was not a mere ceremonial one. Insignificant in itself its issue was fraught with one of the most glorious chapters in the history of Ireland.

He came to demand the Island of Arran, then included in the province of Munster, as a place of residence for himself and his monks. Aengus at first refused the request of his saintly relative, but the grounds of his refusal while being altogether different from what might be at first anticipated, give us a glimpse of the character of a prince who is one of the noblest figures in early Irish history.

The Tripartite Life tells us that when St. Patrick visited Munster, Aengus, son of Nadfracch, and his people, went out to meet and welcome him. He was conducted with every mark of respect to the Rock of Cashel, where the king, his children, and many of the men of Munster received Baptism. The same authority relates an incident which is worthy of record, as characteristic of the Prince's chivalrous and self-sacrificing disposition. While St. Patrick was administering the sacrament of Baptism to the royal neophyte, he unconsciously transfixed his foot with the point of the episcopal crozier, which ended in a sharp spike. Considering it part of the ceremony, the brave king bore the pain without a murmur, until the saint seeing the streams of blood which flowed from the wound, asked in astonishment :—

“Why was it that you did not tell me?” “Because,” was the simple reply, “I thought it was the rule of faith.”

According to the best authorities, Aengus commenced to

reign about the year 453. After ruling his province with wisdom and ability for the space of thirty-six years, he was killed in the battle of Cill Omadh, A.D. 489. Naturally of a generous and virtuous disposition, after his conversion to Christianity, these qualities were elevated by the most child-like faith, and a practical zeal for the interests of religion. He was espoused to St. Enda's youngest sister. In early life, we are told, that, attracted by the great beauty of Fanchea, he sought her in marriage. The latter, however, having resolved to consecrate her virginity to God, with great tact directed her suitor's attention to her younger sister, Darenia, who afterwards became his wife, and the mother of a numerous and saintly family.

To the end of his life Aengus continued to be the devoted friend of St. Patrick and the generous benefactor of the Christian religion. Among other things, he settled a fixed revenue on the clergy, founded numerous churches and monasteries, and encouraged his own children, male and female, to embrace the religious life.

Such being his character, it is not surprising that he refused to grant Enda's request. St. Patrick had counselled him not to offer any lands to God except such as were fertile and easy of access. Arran was almost unknown to him, and such accounts of it as he had received represented the island as little better than a barren rock, surrounded by a tempestuous ocean. The importunities of St. Enda, seconded by the entreaties of St. Albeus, Bishop of Cashel, however, prevailed. Arran was granted "to God and St. Enda," and the latter having imparted his blessing to his royal relative, set out for his destination.

Having arrived at Medraighe, now Maree, a peninsula near Ardfry, he met some fishermen plying their avocation. He asked a few fishes for himself and his companions. They churlishly replied:—

"The fish have come to us from the sea around Arran. We give thee leave to catch and keep those you may find there. We shall keep our own."

One boy, however, said:—

"I have but one fish and I will give it to thee."

This boy, we are told, was born near the mouth of the river, where the waters of the Orbsen, now the Corrib, flow into the sea. He was a Claddagh fisherman. When the saint arrived at that portion of the harbour, he blessed it, and while declaring that the waters of the opposite coast would be cursed with perpetual barrenness, he prayed that this side as a reward for the young Claddagh man's hospitality might ever abound in fish. The prediction was verified.

On a beautiful summer's morning, in the year 480, St. Enda and his little colony set sail for Arranmore. As the flotilla of *currochs*, rounded *Cean Borna*, and the glorious panorama of mountains, cliffs and ocean, which meets the traveller's gaze, burst upon their view, great must have been their joy. But we can fancy their ecstasies of delight when as they approached nearer, the object of their destination covered with masses of clouds rose up before them as if just emerging from the ocean. This was their land of promise. As Moses gazed from the Mount of Nebo, so these holymen looked long and wistfully on the spot which they had chosen for their home and the place of their resurrection.

Nearer and nearer the little fleet approaches, and now, instead of the fairyland conjured up by their imagination, they gaze upon three islands so bleak and desolate that they present the appearance of extinct volcanoes. Are the pilgrims dismayed? On the contrary the very bleakness of the place is to them its highest recommendation. They had found what they sought for, a veritable *eremum in oceano*. They sought not earthly comfort or earthly pleasure. All their hopes of peace and happiness lay beyond the grave. They sought to find a refuge from the turmoil of the world, and here they found that refuge. The very sea served as a veil to hide from mortal eyes their angelical virtues. No sound would mar the harmony of their songs of praise, but the waves gently murmuring along the pebbly strand, or the roar of the billows proclaiming the majesty of the Creator.

It is no wonder, then, that the pilgrims rejoiced, and gave voice to their gladness in a loud "Te Deum," which echoed through the resounding cliffs, and proclaimed that the

chain of idolatry which had hitherto bound that barren land was now forever broken, and that "the verdure of the reed and the bulrush should flourish in the dens where dragons dwelt before."

Arran was at the time of St. Enda's arrival inhabited by pagans, descendants of the Firbolgs, or *refugees*, from the neighbouring territory of Corcomroe. We can fancy these looking out with wondering eyes from their huge embattlements on this strange invasion of their island home. What were the intruders who came clad in the garb of peace, and with a mysterious battle cry to usurp their territory? Were they the magic working Tuatha de Dananns still upon their track, or were they inhabitants of the spirit world robed in mortal apparel? Filled with dread and superstitious forebodings they fled to their *currochs*, and never rested upon their oars until they arrived, panic-stricken, on the adjoining coasts of Clare and Connemara.

Left in the undisputed possession of this coveted land, St. Enda and his companions commenced those marvels of penance, prayer, and contemplation which made the world wonder, and, by the universal voice of history, gained for the place of their abode the immortal title of "Arran of the Saints."

WILLIAM GANLY.

THE CONTROVERSY ON UNIVERSALS.

THE Schoolmen of the Middle Ages have been frequently assailed for wasting time in the discussion of frivolous questions. The prejudice of some and the malice of others have joined in misrepresenting both them and their teaching. "Ignorance," we are told, "was the smallest defect of the writers of these dark ages;"¹ while the system of philosophy taught by them is represented as nothing better than a tissue

¹ Hallam; "Middle Ages," vol. iii., p. 291.

of "repulsive technical barbarisms."¹ Men like Hallam, who ingenuously confesses that the works of the Schoolmen are known to him only by repute,² nevertheless sit in judgment on them and on their authors; and, as was to be expected, "give us," to use Hallam's own words when speaking of the *best guide* to a knowledge of Scholastic Philosophy whom he could find, "rather a verbose declamation against their philosophy than a clear view of its character."³ But that neither the Schoolmen nor their philosophical teachings deserve the censure so freely bestowed on them by such writers, has been frequently and satisfactorily shown by those, who, having laid aside prejudice, and having brought the requisite abilities to the task, have examined for themselves the works so much abused, and so little known. The words of the profound Leibnitz, though well known, will still bear to be quoted. "Nec vereor dicere," he says,⁴ "Scholasticos vetustiores nonnullis hodiernis et acumine, et soliditate et ab inutilibus quæstionibus circumspectiore abstinentia longe præstare."

The controversy mentioned at the head of this paper has been constantly urged by writers entirely ignorant of its real issues as a clear proof of the folly and unprofitableness of mediæval speculation. It is represented as a mere war of words, having its origin with the disputatious monks of the Middle Ages, fiercely fought by them in their barbarous jargon, but long since brought to a close by the enlightened philosophy to which the so-called Reformation gave the first great impetus.

Nothing could be more false than this view of the Controversy on Universals. It cannot, indeed, be denied that very extreme, and as we now view them, very absurd opinions were held by some of the disputants. Neither can it be denied that these opinions were sometimes defended with greater warmth, and with perhaps less regard for philosophical

¹ Hallam, "Middle Ages," p. 428.

² p. 427.

³ *Ibid*, p. 427, note *g*. Here Hallam makes this astonishing admission; "I have found no better guide than Brucker. *But he confesses himself not to have read the original writings of the Scholastics.*" *Cæcus autem si caecoducatum præstet ambo in foveam cadunt!*

⁴ *De Stylo Phil. Nizolii*, n. 27.

gravity than we could wish. But it is only sheer unacquaintance with the subject that induces anyone to say that the Controversy on Universals is a useless logomachy, or that it has never been waged outside the period, which modern writers love to call the Dark Ages. Of this controversy a learned historian thus writes:—"The principles in question in this controversy, instead of involving, as has been asserted, no more than a mere quibble about words, lie at the very foundation of human science, inasmuch as on its issue depends the possibility or impossibility of any demonstration whatever within the scope of knowledge accessible to man."¹ Another equally eminent writer, whose testimony cannot be open to a suspicion of partiality towards the Scholastics, says:—"The controversy between the Nominalists and Realists, treated by some modern writers as an example of barbarous wrangling, was in truth an anticipation of that modern dispute, which still divides metaphysicians."²

The question at issue in this memorable controversy—"more memorable," says Sir William Hamilton³ "perhaps than any other in the history of philosophy"—is this:—Are Universals or general terms mere names without any corresponding objects whether ideal or real, or do they denote not only subjective concepts, but also objective realities outside and independent of the human mind?

What is meant by general terms? "A general name," writes Mill, "is familiarly defined, a name which is capable of being truly affirmed, in the same sense, of an indefinite number of things."⁴ Thus the term *animal* can be truly affirmed of man, horse, ox, elephant, lion, &c.; the term *man* of individuals, black and white, tall and short, male and female, of Irishmen, Dutchmen, and Africans. The term colour is equally applicable to white, red, yellow, brown, blue, and scarlet. Now when we use a general term, do we (*a*) designate something which has a real existence outside of our own mind, or (*b*) a mere creation of the mind, or (*c*) only a sound,

¹ Alzog, "Church History," sect. 253.

² Sir J. Mackintosh, "Miscell. Works," vol. i., p. 47.

³ "Lectures on Metaphysics," lect. 35.

⁴ "System of Logic," Book i., chap. 2, sect. 3.

a *status vocis*, which neither in the mind, nor outside it, has any corresponding object? When we speak of *man* without referring to any particular individual, do we speak of a being really existing, yet neither white nor black, neither tall nor short, neither an Irishman nor an Englishman, but nevertheless representing men of all possible sizes, shapes, colours and nationalities? Can we even form a notion of such a being, or is the word *man*, when uttered by a rational creature, as soulless as when uttered by a parrot?

On these and similar questions the Controversy on Universals hinges. Neither are these frivolous and unmeaning questions as might at first seem. They are "so far from frivolous," says a writer already quoted, "that they deeply concern both the nature of reasoning and the structure of language."¹ For in the first place nearly all the names or *nouns* of language, except the proper names of individuals, are general terms;² and in the next place the general or universal constitutes the object of all science.³ If, then, general terms are mere names, our knowledge is concerned not about things but about words, about mere sounds of the voice, and our speech is a mere agglomeration of such sounds incapable alike of expressing any idea of our own, or of exciting any idea in the minds of those to whom we speak. A similar difficulty arises if it be contended that general terms represent merely mental concepts; while if it be admitted that they represent real entities existing outside the mind, we are told that it must be further admitted either that a thing can be, at the same time, individual and universal, one and many, or that it can exist apart without individuality, that it can have subsistence and be communicable to many, in a word that two contraries can at the same time exist.

It cannot be matter of surprise, then, that widely different views were held regarding the manner in which Universals exist. Some philosophers held—and their opinion at first seems the simplest and most natural—that Universals are mere words, neither more nor less. They were called

¹ Sir J. Mackintosh, *loc. cit.*

² Hill, "Logic," p. 116.

³ Tongiorgi, vol. i., n. 318. *Scientia omnis de universalibus tantum est, non de singularibus.*

Nominalists, and their teaching Nominalism, or *sententia vocum*. Others took the directly opposite view, and contended that Universals have a real existence outside the mind. These were the Realists. The Conceptualists held a modified form of Nominalism, admitting that Universals exhibit mental concepts, and are therefore something higher than they were regarded by the extreme Nominalists, but denying, on the other hand, that these concepts were referable to any extra-mental object. The Realists were also split into two parties. One party taught that Universals exist apart from and entirely independent of individuals. This opinion was in the Middle Ages expressed by the formula *Universalia ante rem*. The other party contented itself with holding that Universals exist in individuals. Their opinion was embodied in the phrase *Universalia in re*. The formula by which the Nominalistic theory was expressed was *Universalia post rem*.

These different opinions can be traced back to the philosophical schools of Greece, and to the renowned philosophers who have rendered these schools so illustrious. Plato is credited with the doctrine of extreme Realism, Aristotle with that of moderate Realism; while to Zeno and the Stoic School is attributed the introduction into philosophy of the doctrine of Nominalism.

Plato's connection with Realism, however, has never been clearly and satisfactorily established. If we accept the explanation of his theory of *ideas* given by Aristotle, we must at once admit that he was an extreme Realist. According to Aristotle, Plato taught that there exist and from all eternity have existed *ideas* which are the archetypal essences of all created things. These *ideas* or essences are at once the object of the concept, and the elements of scientific research. They are not essences conceived as immanent or existing in the individual, but rather essences conceived to be immutable, perfect, eternal and subsisting independent of the inferior realities, which latter exist only inasmuch as they partake of the existence of the corresponding Universals.¹ Thus is Plato's system of universal ideas explained by Aristotle, and

¹ Ueberweg, "Hist of Phil.," Engl. Trans., vol. i., sect. 41.

from this explanation of it, was derived the extreme Realism of the Middle Ages, which, as taught by Scotus Erigena led straight to Pantheism, and which, in more recent times formed the foundation of the Pantheism of Spinoza.¹

But this explanation of the teaching of Plato is not accepted by all. By many, indeed, it is rejected as being wholly unworthy of Plato, and one admirer of the great philosopher declares, that he would find it easier to believe that Plato never existed, than that he could have propounded a theory so manifestly absurd.² By some of these writers Aristotle is blamed with wilfully misrepresenting³ the opinions of his master, while others say⁴ that the explanation he gives was not intended by him to represent the actual teaching of Plato, but only the interpretation of this teaching given by some of Plato's disciples.

These writers, following St. Augustine, declare that Plato meant nothing more by *ideas* than the resemblances pre-existing in the mind of God of the things He was about to call into existence. These ideas were, it is true, eternal and immutable, but no more formed the essence of created things, no more entered into their constitution than the plan of a building in the mind of the architect forms the essence, or enters into the material structure of the building when completed.

Aristotle is, as has been said, regarded as a moderate Realist. But he has not always, nor by all writers been so regarded. "Different philosophers," says Sir Wm. Hamilton, "have maintained that Aristotle was a Realist, a Conceptualist, and a Nominalist, in the strictest sense."⁵ According to the interpretation of his teaching, which prevailed in the Middle Ages, and which is now generally accepted, he taught that the universal is immanent in the individual, and exists

¹ Migne, "Encyclo. Théolog.," vol. xlix., art. *Réalisme*.

² Hujus igitur opinionis absurditas est adeo manifesta ut facilius crediderim nunquam extitisse Platonem, quam ejusmodi somniis fuisse deceptum. Tongiorgi, vol. i., n. 533.

³ Zighera, "Summa Phil.," vol. i., p. 321.

⁴ Tongiorgi, *loc. cit.*

⁵ Edition of Reid's works, p. 405.

only by reason of this immanence. He is a Realist, therefore, inasmuch as he admits the existence of Universals outside and independent of the mind, but he rejects that extreme form of Realism which would give Universals subsistence distinct from individuals. In the philosophy of Aristotle everything is composed of matter and form. The matter is the same in all, the form alone is different, nor are there as many forms as individuals, but only as many as there are species. All men, for example, have the same form—namely, humanity. These forms are the Universals; they exist in individuals, and cannot have a real existence outside individuals.¹

Zeno rejected both the transcendental ideas of Plato and the immanent forms of Aristotle, and contended that Universals are mere mental creations. The individual alone exists according to Zeno. It alone forms the object of cognition, and our senses are the only mediums to a knowledge of it. If, then, we use universal terms, we do so only because custom has sanctioned them, not because they represent anything existing objectively, or of which even a distinct subjective concept can be formed. Humanity, for instance, is neither a real objective entity, nor has it even a corresponding mental representation, but is simply and solely a word, by which we express the relation of resemblance, which we find to exist among individual men.

The coming of Christianity found philosophers still divided on this question. Their opinions were as far apart as ever, and it seemed impossible to find any means of uniting them, or of coming at the true solution. The knowledge of Revelation compelled those philosophers who accepted it to reject the theory of *ideas* ascribed to Plato. Still Plato's teaching had a great charm even for Christian philosophers. Indeed it is sometimes, though as a rule falsely, asserted that their regard for it carried them too far in their endeavours to harmonise it with the teachings of Christianity.² At any rate they accepted as the true interpretation of Plato's doctrine of *ideas*, that most in agreement with Revelation.

¹ Laromiguière. "Leçons de Philos." Leçon xii.

² Alzog. "Church Hist.," sect. 81.

But manifestly no advance was made by this step towards a solution of the vexed question how Universals exist. For Plato's teaching, so interpreted, regards not things as they exist, but only as they are in the mind of God. The question among philosophers, however, regarded actually existing things, and how, and where the *genera* and *species* to which existing things belong, are placed in the universe of created beings.¹

The history of the controversy on Universals—or, rather, of the opinions of philosophers on that question, for controversy it could hardly then be called—during the first ten centuries of the Christian era can be very briefly told. Yet this period is interesting to us for two reasons. First, because during it Scotus Erigena gave to Realism its most extreme development, resulting, as has been said, in pure Pantheism. And, secondly, because it was during this period also that the foundations of the controversy which so disturbed the mediaeval schools, and which is still keenly waged, were laid.

Porphyry, a Neo-Platonist, who flourished during the latter half of the third century, wrote an *Isagoge*, or introduction to the work of Aristotle on Categories. In it he remarks, that in order to understand the doctrine of Aristotle it is necessary to know something about genus, species, differences, etc. These subjects, he says, he will lightly touch upon, but will abstain from all difficult questions concerning them. Among the questions thus declined, he places that about the existence of Universals.² This passage is regarded as the historical occasion of the mediaeval controversy.³ Boëthius, in his commentary on this work of Porphyry, if he does not satisfactorily solve the questions mentioned by the latter, at least gives us a concise summary of the teaching of

¹ Il s'agissait de rendre raison de l'intelligence de l'homme et Platon nous parle de l'intelligence divine. (Laromiguière, *loc. cit.*)

² Mox de generibus et speciebus illud quidem sive subsistant sive in solis nudis intellectibus posita sint sive subsistentia corporalia sint an incorporalia et utrum separata a sensibilibus an in sensibilibus posita et circa hæc consistentia dicere recusabo, altissimum enim negotium est et majoris egens inquisitionis.—Porphyry's *Isagoge*, apud Ueberweg, *loc. cit.*

³ Ueberweg, *loc. cit.*

Plato and Aristotle regarding them. "Plato," he says, "genera et species caeteraque non modo intelligi universalia verum etiam esse atque *praeter corpora* subsistere putat. Aristoteles vero intelligi quidem incorporalia atque universalia sed subsistere *in sensibilibus* putat."¹ Boëthius himself inclines to Aristotle's opinion, and it may be said with substantial accuracy that this opinion prevailed until towards the end of the eleventh century.²

Scotus Erigena, however, must be excepted. The Platonic doctrine of *ideas*, as explained by Aristotle, was the foundation of his speculations. This doctrine he followed to its ultimate conclusions, teaching that God alone is the one being possessing real existence in whom—not in the sense of St. Paul's words—(*Acts*, 17, 28)—but in a strictly material sense—all things exist, from whom all things proceed by emanation, and into whose immensity all things shall return, when, in his own words, "*omnia quieta erunt et unum individuum atque immutabile manebunt.*"³ The Divine Substance according to Erigena, is the one true and perfect Universal, the first emanation from which is the *summum genus* of creatures. From this first emanation a second proceeds which constitutes the next genus or subaltern species in a descending scale, and so on to individuals. Individuals, therefore, are immanent in the Universal, and the Universal exists in the individual, as in its natural parts.

We have now arrived at that period in the history of the question concerning Universals, when the controversy really broke out. Another paper will be necessary to give even an outline of that controversy and its issues.

D. O'LOAN.

¹ Apud Ueberweg, *loc. cit.*

² Brucker, "Hist. Phil.," vol. iii., p. 906. Laromiguière, *loc. cit.* Ueberweg, *loc. cit.*

³ De Divisione Naturae, apud Ueberweg.

VACATION IN 1886.—II.

WE can but briefly glance at what has been to us a pleasant study, and must refer those of our readers who wish to carry out for themselves a complete investigation of the interesting narrative of the foundation and early history of Fountains Abbey, to our two sources of information, which are the fifth volume of Dugdale's *Monasticon Anglicanum*, and the volume (*S. Bernardi Epistolæ*) which is to be found in the complete works of S. Bernard. As for the letters, every scholar knows how interesting they are, in that they bring before us the great Saint, the last of the Fathers of the Church, as no other pen could delineate him. His profound knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, which came of prayerful meditation, his courteous style, his consummate prudence and his fervent zeal, give life to these letters and excite an interest even in matters long past and gone, which becomes so much greater when they bear upon a matter in which we take a present interest; and tell us how he brought about the foundation of the Cistercian house of Fountains. And then the old chronicle, taken down from the aged lips of one who played his part in that great work, and had his share in the anxieties and bodily sufferings which were to eventuate in so noble a result, this quaint old record has a character of its own and a power of narration which attract us, even without St. Bernard's warranty.

St. Bernard founded his first Cistercian house in England at Waverley in Surrey in 1128 by transplanting thither twelve monks from the Abbey of Aumone in Normandy; and about the same time Furness in Lancashire was established. It was in 1131 that the first house in Yorkshire was constituted and under these peculiar circumstances.

A great warrior, great in heart as in stature, Sir Walter D'Espée lost his only son by an accident. The distressed parents being left childless chose God as heir to their estates: and while the localities and rules of the three Abbeys they determined to found were yet under consideration, it

happened, by God's good providence, that some Cistercians arrived at York with a letter from St. Bernard, begging the King's protection and aid that they may settle in Yorkshire. So Sir Walter assigned to them what grew into the famous Abbey of Rievaulx, and there they made for themselves a home and a religious reputation which spread far and wide.

Now the monks of St. Mary's, York, were moved by what they heard of the lives of the new Order at Rievaulx, and some were stirred up to desire this more spiritual life. The Old Chronicler speaks gently of the rule at St. Mary's but still looks at it from a Cistercian point of view. They lived, he says "pro more et consuetudine traditionum paternarum, honestè quidem, sub regula et Abbate, sed longè tamen citra praeceptum regulæ, citra votum professionis suæ, longè citra perfectionem Cisterciensis disciplinæ. Horum, autem nonnulli cœpit eos teporis suæ tædere, erubescere, imperfectionem damnare, delicias et consuetas fastidire. Pudet consedissee tamdiu in finibus Moab et trans Jordanem accepisse hæreditatem."

So those who yearned after the higher life and the discipline which nourished it, laid their heads together and looked around for a leader who could take the bold route across the spiritual Jordan. Of course they had no hope of their Abbot Gaufridus, his age was against it for he was "vir grandævus et senio paene confectus," and indeed the news overwhelmed him when it afterwards came to his ears: but Richard the Prior proved to be on their side, and with the sub-prior joined the courageous band. But steps like these cannot be taken without authority, and so they apply to Turstin the Archbishop of York who comes to sanction the change, and to lead off the aspirants after a higher rule. Then the rough manners of the times show themselves. The Abbot closes his gates, refuses to recognize the higher authority, and so the Archbishop exercises his spiritual power and puts him and his church under an interdict saying, "Vos debitam nobis hodie subtrahitis, nos vere auctore Deo quo a nobis habetis subtrahentes, ecclesiam hanc interdicimus, et monachos in ea commorantes auctoritate qua fungimus a sacris suspendimus:" and with this sentence the

Archbishop departs. He takes with him the twelve monks, and maintains them until he can find a fitting place where they can carry out their holy resolution. This he does when in 1131 he comes to his manor at Ripon and gives them the little valley of the Skell, which is now Studley, out of which Fountains Abbey is to grow. But how different was the spot in those days from what generations of Cistercians have made it, and what modern refinement has crowned with such grace and beauty. The old chronicler seems to shudder at what it was originally when he tells us of the Archbishop's gift. "Assignat locum a cunctis retro seculis non habitatum, spinis consitum, et inter convexa montium et scopulos hinc inde prominentes, ferarum latebris quam humanis usibus magis accommodatum." There was no food for them but the leaves of the trees which they seasoned with salt. They elect Richard the Prior of St. Mary's as first Abbot of their houseless band; "monachos habet sed mansionem non habet." They sleep under the elms and yews—some of which remain to this day—and cut down wood to build an oratory, to be dedicated of course like all Cistercian churches to Our Lady, the winter comes and "hieme acta sub pellibus;" and while they are struggling for bare life they relieve a poor wanderer, whereupon a cartload of food providentially arrives from the Lord of Knaresborough, and their sore-tried charity is rewarded. But as yet they have not the Cistercian rule, so they write to St. Bernard to be admitted into the order, and their good friend Archbishop Turstin seconds their appeal with a full statement of their case. However, St. Bernard had another correspondent with whom it was more difficult to deal and one who tried severely his patience and diplomatic skill. The Abbot of St. Mary's at York had his complaints to make, and seems to have charged St. Bernard with encouraging, if not with originating the movement which had robbed his abbey of its best members.

To the former the Saint's letters breathe the spirit of love and admiration. That (Epistola, xcvi.) to Archbishop Turstin is exquisite in its refined laudation. He had heard before of his works of corporal mercy towards the poor, and he had rejoiced, but now the good deeds are of a higher order

for the souls of the spiritually oppressed. In similar tone is the other (Epist. xcvi.)¹ to the Abbot and his monks, who name their convent Fountains, doubtless in honor of St. Bernard's birthplace, the castle of Fontaines near Dijon in Burgundy.

His two letters to the Abbot of St. Mary's are necessarily of a different character. He has to soothe his wounded feelings, and at the same time to show he believes the work was right, being of God rather than of man. (Epist. xciv.)

He has been asked for advice; what advice can he give without displeasing the Abbot, or without withholding from him what he really believes?

"Let us consult a more worthy authority the great St. Gregory himself, and accept his judgment:" which of course condemns the Abbot and justifies the Monks. Subsequently another letter comes from the Abbot, for one at least of the seceders returned, and now St. Bernard is asked if such a course is not justifiable, seeing that the life at St. Mary's is at least religious: this (Epist. cccxiii.) is very striking, and like all the rest well worth studying. He points out fully and clearly how the going back even to what is good in itself is a falling off; he will not judge another, but he knows how herein he would judge himself, and says grandly "De se

¹ Ad Ricardum Fontanensem abbatem et socios ejus. Quanta audivimus et cognovimus ea, et fratres nostri uterque Gaufridus annuntiaverunt nobis, quemadmodum noviter recalcuistis igne Dei; convaluistis de infirmitate, refluistis in novitate sancta. Digitus Dei est iste, subtiliter operans, suaviter renovans, salubriter mutans, non quidem de malis bonos, sed de bonis faciens meliores. Quis dabit mihi ut transeam, et videam visionem hanc magnam! Nec enim minus mira minusve jucunda ista promotio est, quam illa mutatio: nisi quod **MULTO FACILIS** reperias multos seculares converti ad bonum, quam unum quempiam de religiosis transire ad melius. **RARISSIMA** avis in terris est, qui de gradu, quem forte in religione semel attigerit, vel parum ascendat. Vestrum proinde, dilectissimi, tam insigne, quam salubre factum non solum nos, qui servi vestre sanctitatis esse precupimus, sed et universam merito lætificat civitatem Dei: quippe quo rarius, eo et clarius. Erat autem et necessarium ad cautelam, proximam defectui mediocritatem transcendere, et declinare teporem, qui Deo vomitum provocat; sed et sic oportebat propter conscientiam. **PROFESSIS** siquidem **SANCTAM REGULAM**, an citra ejus puritatem sistere gradum tutum sit, ipsi sensistis. Dolens doleo, quod urgente diei malitia, et nuntio festinante, plenum affectum exili cogor designare stylo, et brevi chartula latam comprehendere caritatem. Si quid deest, frater Gaufridus viva voce supplebit.

quippe quod sibi bonum est, quisquis sentiat; ego de me dicam, quod sentio. *Ego Bernardus*, si de bonis ad meliora, vel de periculosis ad securiora voto et opere libere pertransissem, et illicita voluntate ad ea quae mutavi, denuo recurrere præsumpsissem; non solum Apostata, verum etiam regno Dei non idoneus fieri pertimescerem."

So the poor Abbot of St. Mary's got no consolation nor encouragement from the Saint of Clairvaux; and in less than five years had temporal losses to add to these spiritual ones, for the terrible fire which played such havoc with the city and Cathedral, laid the Church of St. Mary's in ruins, out of which it did not rise for very many years after poor old Abbot Gaufridus had gone to his rest.

But we must return to the poor half-starved monks at Fountains. Their condition continues so bad that their Abbot goes to St. Bernard, and tells him the state of their affairs. St. Bernard at once offers to receive them until better times. But God so moves the hearts of men, that these better times come quickly. First we hear of Hugh the Dean of the Cathedral of York, who dying leaves the poor Cistercians his books and possessions, and these are both great for the times. We may be sure that the heart of the Abbot is cheered, when such good news greets him on his return from Clairvaux. Next comes Serlo, a rich Canon of York, weak and dying, but rich in gold and silver; and with him comes a brother Canon, Tosti "cum omni substantia." They come full-handed, and, let us hope, with hearts as rich in holy resolutions. Tosti is a gain in more senses than one, for the Chronicler tells us he is "homo jucundus et sociabilis in conversatione," a kind of holy Canon Sydney Smith we may suppose, but with the Cistercian character upon him. So now prosperity attends the new home, but it is long ere the wealth which in coming ages excites the cupidity of king and nobles is to be found in Fountains. Yet so great is the change from this recent condition of absolute want, that the chronicler rejoices in that "Deus benedixit, multiplicans fratres, adjiciens possessiones, dilatans vineam, et dans ei pluvias benedictionis." And then he introduces himself, for now he comes among them, among the good things given them. "Per idem tempus

Ego, Serlo, valedicens sæculo, Fontes me contuli sanctæ religionis habiturum suscepturus."

And now the house is strong enough to send out branches. With Richard's death Serlo's narration comes to an end.

But troubles were in store for this young foundation from an unexpected quarter: and thus it came about.

St. Bernard had moved the heart of a certain Henry of Murdach (Epist. cvi.) "a man of great learning and a zealous preacher," (as Alban Butler says), to embrace the religious life. Then he made him Abbot of Vauclere, and subsequently sent him to England to be the third Abbot of Fountains. Soon afterwards Archbishop Turstin resigned his See, and retired to Pontefract to end his days in the Cluniac house there. The Chapter of York met and by a majority of votes elected St. William, nephew of King Stephen; another uncle the Bishop of Winchester consecrated him. Objections were raised as to the canonicity of the election by the Archdeacon of York which St. Bernard seconded, the Abbot of Fountains was put forward, and the case sent to Rome. St. Bernard writes a very important letter to the Abbot (Epist. cccxxi.)¹ urging him to hasten to King Stephen, to tell him how they have been deceived, to obtain from him most efficacious letters to the Pope, that he may confirm what his faithful children have done, "quia et sibi gratissimum et Ecclesiæ necessarium est." The Pope is the second Bernard of Clairvaux, Eugenius III. and when the King urges and St. Bernard, his old superior, advises we need not wonder that St. William is deprived and Henry Murdach reigns at York in his stead. St. William

¹ Oportet ut ex instanti festinetis ad dominum Regem, et totam confusionem nostram, et quomodo prodiiti sumus, ei tanquam benigno domino nostro plenissime indicetis. Et quia gaudemus ex parte, quod negotium ejus in causa nobis fuit hujus anxietatis, pro eo siquidem quod Domino Senonensi consulimus; de die statuenda, quod nobis bene ante promiserat, ita confudit, sic in nos vindicans Regis amorem. Petite et ab eo litteras efficacissimas super hoc negotio, ut dominus Papa omnimodis confirmet, quod fecerunt filii obedientes, duo scilicet Episcopi: quia et sibi gratissimum, et Ecclesiæ necessarium est. Nec noceat quod ita tertius se subtraxit, inobediens mandato apostolico, et regalium contemptor monitorum: qui si ad eum venerit, sentiat nostram injuriam et singularem injuriam, Regi non placere. Salutate carissimum nostrum Cancellarium, et rogate, ut tales super hoc litteras scribat, quæ et suum probent et regium erga nos redolere inveniatur affectum, sicut præsumimus de utroque.

retires readily enough, we may be sure, to the solitude and silence that he loves; and so the Abbey loses its Abbot, and not only so but suffers material loss; for some fiery soldiers, calling themselves partizans of St. William and, as such, enemies of Henry, search the Abbey and not finding him there burn down the house and half the Chapel. Time works its revenge in the Diocese of York; for when Henry dies, by which time Pope and King and St. Bernard himself have also passed away, St. William is not allowed to rest in the quiet retirement of his choice, but is urged to go to Rome where Anastatius IV. is now Pope: and the outcome of it all is that he returns wearing the Pallium. His old enemies, the Dean and the Archdeacon of York, meet him on the road and forbid him to enter the city or diocese, but the Norman Prince calmly pursued his journey and was received in York with such demonstrations of affection, that the vast multitude broke down the bridge over the Ouse in their tumultuous gathering, and the Saint had to work a miracle to save the numbers who fell into the river. However his reign was short, for within a few weeks he sickened and died of a fever. His friends said he had been poisoned at Mass, but there seems to be no foundation for this horrible suggestion. These were troublous days when Saxons and Normans were as yet unreconciled. The time came when they wisely laid aside their jealousies and became one English nation. The poor monks who suffered were left to rebuild their ruined home, and this time in grander architecture, and indeed after half a century's delay, completed it in forty years. The subsequent history need not detain us. Times prospered, estate after estate was bequeathed by pious souls, but in the end the usual record comes, and we read that the Abbey "was surrendered by deed enrolled 26 November, 1539 by Marmaduke Bradley the thirty third Abbot." Then the grand old Abbey was left to decay; for it does not appear that any violent hands were laid upon it: no possessor built a mansion upon the site, so the trees, the original inhabitants, grew up again and took the little valley of the Skell as their own once more; until in 1767 William Aislabie purchased the estate for eighteen thousand pounds, carted away the accumulated rubbish down

to the floor and laid out the present lawns ; and of him it is honorably recorded that nothing was pulled down and nothing added.

So after this long digression let us return once more to Harrogate though it is only to bid it farewell. But before we leave this pleasant place we must say just one word in admiration of its beautiful Catholic church, and of the noteworthy picture with which Lord Bute has adorned it, for it is the portrait of its patron saint, who is none other than that St. Robert of Knaresborough, whom we had almost confounded with another St. Robert who went forth from Fountains to establish its first offshoot at Newminster. If we had not saved ourselves by a query we should have erred in good company, for so general has been this confusion that a learned Cistercian when writing the life of the one saint added a memoir of the other to distinguish between them. Well ; after all we should not have gone far astray ; for the Hermit Saint was for a short time an inmate of the Cistercian house at Newminster, and so ardently did the monks of Fountains yearn after him and regard him as a revival of their own St. Robert that when he drew near his end they came and tried to prevail upon him to be invested with the habit of their order, and though he humbly refused this token of their veneration, when he died they came and vested him, and made a claim for his relics, and would have carried them off to treasure them with those at home, had not " a band of men from the castle resisted them, and they were compelled to retire in sorrow at losing so great a treasure."¹

Somehow Norway dies out of our plans for vacation wanderings, and we leave Harrogate for London with no very definite conception of what will come next.

¹ Our paper was in type before we saw Father Collins' charming little book, which, as its title shows, traverses the same ground we have hurried over. "The Spirit and Mission of the Cistercian Order; comprising the Life of St. Robert of Newminster, and the Life of St. Robert of Knaresborough; with an account of the foundation of Fountains Abbey," (London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co., 1886.) We recommend his book to all who wish to carry their inquiries further than our rapid sketch can lead them, and who would understand the spirit of the great Order as unfolded by one who lives its inner life.

We have inflicted year after year upon our courteous readers some notice of the doings at South Kensington, but we mercifully spare them on this occasion when India and the Colonies combine in forming a new name, the Colinderies and an exhibition which far surpasses all its predecessors. Formerly it was a musical promenade with an exhibition of some kind; now it is an exhibition with a musical promenade, and this of course makes all the difference and keeps us silent about its many attractions. Formerly everybody (including ourselves) hurried into the gardens through the courts and galleries, and saw but little of what was stored therein, now it is no longer so. Why? because one cannot shut one's eyes to the wonders that the East has poured out with true Oriental munificence; because the young and vigorous life of our Colonies refuses to be slighted, and forces its claims upon our attention: and so it is that music is now only for an occasional interval of repose, and that a visit to the Colinderies is anything but a lounge and an idleness. A visit! do we say; how many visits would be needed, we wonder, to form anything like an idea of what is here to be seen.

Our planless plans of wandering brought us several times to London, and every opportunity we used to repeat our visits, and yet each time it seemed like a new exhibition, and proved to us how little we had hitherto seen, and how much we must have missed after all.

This is why we say nothing, simply because we have too much to say. We have heard often enough of the embarrassment of riches, but here we realize it, if not for the first time, at least more fully than we have ever done before. India alone is quite an Arabian Nights' Entertainment, and would need at least a thousand and one tales to recount what has to be told; while as for the Colonies, each one puts in a claim, which cannot be denied, for a whole history of its dream-like growth, its natural productions and its physical development. We can but shake our head as significantly as my Lord Burleigh in Sheridan's Critic, and hope that there is something in it which is too deep for words.

This contrast and combination of East and West is very

significant and full of suggestive thought. The old world with its long stored treasures, the outcome of ages of self-indulgent luxury, which time alone could bring to such maturity of form and colour; its bold use of richest materials and most brilliant tints which perfected education of hand and eye could alone save from barbaric tawdriness; its powers of imagination which can devise so grandly and yet control itself on this side of extravagance; its playful fancy which yet stops short of burlesque; all show to what the grand East has grown and what it can do in its maturity if not in its old age. Then close upon this, as though treading upon its heels and struggling to take a place beside it, comes the New World, with powers that have achieved wonders in so short a time and with energy which speaks volumes for its future; claiming our admiration in quite another way and warming our hearts with honest pride at the doings of those who also are our own. Here is youth beside age; both bringing of their best to their common Throne and laying so appropriately at the feet of the Empress of them all, in this the fiftieth year of her reign, their tokens of affection alike in this though so different in the forms in which they are displayed.

A week in London somehow suffices, for there is no Opera worthy of the name, and German music is as though it had never been.

And now we are recommended to try seabathing, and the bracing air of the Eastern Coast, and so we once more turn our faces—for we are now two—northwards and make for Cromer in Norfolk.

HENRY BEDFORD.

(To be continued.)

THE ALPHABET.

AS plain as A.B.C. is a common saying, and like many other similar expressions it assumes a good deal that could not be very easily proved. For, what is there plain about it? If we except the shape of the letters, both large and small, now in use in all our printed books, which is so perfect in its clearness and legibility, far beyond that of other letters of any age or country whatsoever, there is nothing plain in it.

By means of some twenty-six signs of about as many sounds, an average boy learns in a couple of years or less to read with ease and certainty, any English book, and nothing seems more natural. Yes, but were that boy a Chinese he would need to master some five thousand different signs to accomplish the same thing; and there is little room to doubt that the Chinese system represents a mode of expressing words by signs or a method of writing, not more cumbersome or difficult than that from which our own few and simple, yet perfectly adequate, signs are derived.

The progress from early writing, when each object had its own sign, usually a rough image of itself, to our modern letters is surely a wonderful thing in itself; and viewed in connection with the results obtained by the rapid and easy communication of knowledge, it may be regarded as one of the greatest achievements of man's intellect; for what discovery can compare with the Alphabet in influence on the progress of our race, of which it is both the instrument and the register?

It can scarcely fail to interest our readers to watch the growth of this wonderful invention as it travels down to us, gaining in perfection from the remotest past, forming in each stage of its development a focus for the intelligence of the most highly gifted races of antiquity to labour round, each in its turn; for Egypt and Babylon, the Semite, the Phœnician, and the Greek, have contributed to give us the A.B.C. The purpose of the article is to show this, leaving out unnecessary details, and dwelling on those points only the interest of which may be assumed to be general if not universal.

To treat fully the subject of the Alphabet would lead to two kinds of inquiry quite distinct from each other, for the Alphabet is a series of sounds as well as a collection of signs denoting these sounds. But a full treatment is not intended here. The study of the letters as sounds belongs to the science of language, and touches on Physiology and Anatomy, departments of knowledge, the writer's acquaintance with which is very slight indeed. And even were it otherwise the subject is far too vast to be compressed within the limits allowed by the RECORD. We shall then confine ourselves to the external form of the Alphabet, the signs used to preserve the record of memorable events and personages, which, sufficiently clumsy in the beginning, and for many centuries, became in course of time more simple and expeditious, until at length they attain such perfection, that some twenty-six easily recognised characters suffice to convey with accuracy all the words of nearly all the languages spoken over the globe. For although it is quite true that the number of letters varies in the different Alphabets—some admitting forty-eight letters, others as few as eleven—the various sounds of the longer Alphabets are almost invariably reducible to our own, which, we may remark, is shortened by giving two sounds to some of the letters, as, for instance, to C and G in the words “cat” and “city” “gin” and “gimlet.”

What then is the history of our present Alphabet?

It is now pretty generally admitted that all systems of writing began with rude pictures of objects, grouped so as to tell their own story. Afterwards pictures of single objects became the representatives of words, and then symbols of parts of words or more or less elementary sounds. They began with ideograms or sign pictures, and grew into phonograms or sound-pictures, as they are technically called. These again are of three kinds, verbal signs which stand for entire words, as £ s. d. in our ledgers; syllabic signs standing for parts of words, to which class belong most of the signs in shorthand; and Alphabetic signs or letters representing the elementary sounds into which the word or syllable may be resolved. It is a curious instance of survival that we have still in use representatives of the earliest and rudest form of

writing. Ideograms or picture writings still find a place in Heraldry, in a good many trade marks, and a few shop signs still found in some places. We don't often see more than one now, the three golden balls, emblematic of the triple bolus, which denoted the ancestral calling of the Florentine Medici, and became the sign of traffic in money at one time so successfully carried on by their fellow-countrymen the Lombard Merchants, who gave the name to Lombard-street, in London; but many of our readers will remember when the barber's pole, streaked in red and white, was a common object. Long after the higher branch of the tonsorial art had separated itself from the original trunk and was absorbed into surgery, the red streak winding round the pole was still there to tell us of a time when bleeding was joined to shaving in more enduring fashion than operator or subject would be willing now, the one to admit, the other to tolerate.

The letters of the Alphabet, however, are not ideograms but phonograms, which, by long continued wearing away, have reached an extreme degree of simplicity, both as regards form and value. If the history of any one of our letters be traced back, it will be found to resolve itself ultimately into the conventionalized picture of some object, and in spite of long continued usage during so many centuries, it retains in nearly every instance some features of the primitive picture from which it has descended. The letter "m" is a case in point. It is the figure of an owl conventionalised. In the old Egyptian language the name of the owl was "Mulak." The picture was first used to represent the word itself; it then became a syllabic sign, having the value of "mu" and finally it stood for the initial sound of the word. So long as the representation was monumental or carved on stone, the figure of the bird remained unchanged; but when the hieroglyphs were written on papyrus with ink and pen or reed, the old picture assumed a cursive form as favouring a more rapid production, and we have therefore an outline instead of a complete picture. In the Hieratic writing the outline is still found, but so conventionalised that there seems to be little or no consciousness of the original. The back and legs are omitted, and we obtain a character not unlike our small "m"

reversed, with the final stroke drawn down to form an irregular curve to the left. We shall see later on that the Semitic letters must have been taken from the Hieratic forms of the Egyptian characters. The earliest known specimen of Semitic writing is that found on the Moabite stone (about B.C. 900). On it the letter "m" appears very much in the form we have just described as Hieratic, the chief difference being a certain uprightness and a tendency to straighten out the curve which brings it very close indeed to the most ancient Greek " μ ", in which the prolonged stroke was originally the last to the right exactly as in the old Semitic. The only difficulty in identifying the Greek " μ " with the conventionalized owl is the position of the long stroke corresponding to the curve in the Hieratic; but that obstacle disappears when we reflect that Greek was at first written from right to left as the Semitic languages, and of course with the change in the the manner of writing came the change in the position of the long stroke. The passage from early to later Greek can be followed clearly, as inscriptions abound, and so we reach the large or uncial and then the Roman capital "M" from which we get ours, which has preserved during its long history of four thousand years certain features by which it may be recognised as the conventionalized picture of an owl. In our capital "M" the two peaks which are the lineal descendants of the ears of the owl, still retain between them an indication of the beak!

This we give as an instance of development that is at least possible, without for the present going farther. The history of our own Alphabet naturally begins nearer to us, and we must trace it out a certain distance, to clear the ground for the problem, a much more troublesome one, of the origin of its ancestors. Its immediate parentage is easily determined. The letters you see before you run back twenty-five centuries without any considerable variation. Their forms are slight improvements on the types used at Rome and Venice by the Italian printers of the fifteenth century, which types were taken from the "Minuscule" or small lettered MS. of the tenth and eleventh. These latter again are cursive forms of the earlier uncial or large lettered MS., some few of which

belong to the fourth and fifth century of our era; the letters found in them are those of the Augustan age, and are identical almost with the characters found in ancient Roman inscriptions, and in the earliest specimens of Latin writing, which may probably be referred to the fifth century B.C.

Twenty-five centuries is a good distance to have travelled back, and this we have done with our Alphabet, finding a home for it in Central Italy, in the heart of the great Republic, the source of Western civilization. But when Rome was yet in her childhood, Greece possessed a large measure of culture with a spirit of enterprise in proportion. She was sending out colonies along the whole coast of the Mediterranean, and some of these we know were planted in Italy eight or even nine centuries B.C. They brought with them a form of Greek Alphabet with which the earliest Latin or Italian can be identified.

If, going a step farther, we inquire into the source from which the primitive Greek Alphabet was derived, we find that classical writers agree in attributing the invention of letters to the Phœnicians, from whose trading ports in the Ægean they were obtained by the Greeks. This is the statement of Herodotus, followed by other ancient writers, both Greek and Latin, a statement which is corroborated by the internal evidence of the Alphabets themselves. In the absence of other proof, the word Alphabet would suffice to disclose the secret of its origin. It is made up of the names of the two letters Alpha and Beta, which stand at the head of the Greek Alphabet, and are clearly the same as Aleph and Beth, the corresponding Semitic characters. These names, which have no meaning in Greek, are significant Semitic words, Aleph denoting an ox, and Beth, a house. Not only the names, but the order, number, and form of the letters attest the Semitic origin of the Alphabet as a whole, and prove that it was handed on in a complete form from the Semitic to the Greeks.

We must not, however, pass over a very obvious difficulty suggested by the dissimilarity in shape of many of the letters. Thus the first letter (α) scarcely exhibits any resemblance to the Greek α, with which it is identified. Nor do we find in

the forms of the second and third (α, β) any closer approximation to their Greek equivalents (β, γ). The difficulty admits of a satisfactory explanation. The cursive Greek and the square Hebrew characters are both of comparatively recent origin, and they can be connected with their archaic prototypes by a complete series of intermediate forms. Hence for the present purpose the modern characters must be set aside, and the Old Greek and Semitic compared in the forms which are given in very early inscriptions.

So far progress has been comparatively rapid. We have traced the origin of our Alphabet and connected it with its remote ancestor, the Phœnician, or early Semitic, as it is found in an inscription engraved probably nine centuries B.C. and taking into account the long period of twenty-seven centuries, the vast changes that have passed over the world, we may wonder surely not so much at the difference that may be found, as at the striking similarity there is in Alphabets removed from each other by such an enormous interval of time.

And now we have to take another step backwards and follow our Alphabet to its cradle, the cradle of the earliest civilization of which we have any knowledge, to the land of the Sphynx and the Pyramids, the mysteries of which, after having excited the imagination of inquiring minds for nearly two thousand years, are being at last slowly revealed in our own days.

But before entering upon the last and most difficult stage of the present inquiry, it may be well to say something of the data on which we have to go, the more so as some of these have an interest of their own of a very high order for all who care for such matters. The process we are engaged in is one of identification. We go back from well-known to less familiar forms of letters, following them from country to country, reversing the march of progress as it is shown in History. Naturally, materials for comparison, abundant enough at first, grow scarce as we move farther back, owing, no doubt, to the ravages of time, but owing also to the imperfection of the primitive methods of recording events. At the point we have reached, we should be compelled to remain

for ever, but for some very recent discoveries in the East, chief of which are the Moabite Stone, and the Prisse Papyrus, so called from the discoverer, M. Prisse d'Avennes.

In the summer of 1869 a German Savant, Dr. Klein, travelling in what was once the land of Moab, came upon a curious relic of antiquity among the ruins of Dhiban. This was a stone of black basalt, two feet broad by nearly four feet high, and rounded at the top. There was an inscription on it of thirty-four lines in the letters of the Phœnician Alphabet. Dr. Klein did not realise the importance of his discovery ; he contented himself with copying part of the inscription, and endeavoured to secure the monument for the British Museum. Things move slowly in the East, so that it was fully a year afterwards that a bargain was made for £80. At this moment, unfortunately, a member of the French Consulate at Jerusalem sent to have casts taken of the writing, and worse still, offered over £300 for the stone itself. At once the cupidity of both Pasha and Arabs was aroused ; the Governor of the place demanded the treasure for himself, and the Arabs fearing to lose it, put fire under it, poured water over it, broke it to pieces, and distributed the fragments as charms among the different families. But the energy and determination of Archaeologists are proverbial ; no difficulty daunts them, and so M. Clermont Ganneau, the French Explorer, set to work, and did not rest until he had recovered nearly all the fragments, pieced them together, and placed the precious relic where it now is, in the Museum of the Louvre at Paris. The inscription when deciphered proved to be a record of Mesha, King of Moab, the same who is mentioned in the Fourth Book of Kings. The interest for us lies in this, that the Moabite Stone gives us a very early form of Phœnician or Old Semitic character and we may see in those venerable letters the precise form employed by the earlier Prophets of the Old Testament.

In a line with the Moabite Stone as regards the present investigation, but far surpassing it in antiquity, are three very old Egyptian MS. or "Papyri," as they are called, the most perfect of which is that found in the ruins of Thebes by M. Prisse d'Avennes. It is a copy of an original

work by an Egyptian prince, Ptah Hoteph, who lived during the 5th dynasty or age of the Pyramids. The date of the copy cannot be fixed positively; but as it was found enclosed in a tomb of the eleventh dynasty, it must be anterior to the invasion of the Hyksos or Shepherd Kings, and therefore older by some centuries than the time of Moses, older probably than the date usually assigned to Abraham; while the work itself must be regarded as the oldest of existing books. It is curious that this stray waif floating down to us on the ocean of time from the period of the world's childhood, should have for its subject, the moralising of an aged sage, who deplores modern degeneracy, and mourns over the loss of the good old times when youth was brave and maiden virtuous, and all things better and more wisely ordered than in the present time of decay! The theme has been treated pretty frequently since, and probably will be to the end. As each generation descends the hill of life, it utters the same complaint, and no doubt, with just the same amount of reason for it.

However, not the contents but the writing concerns our purpose. That belongs to the Hieratic form of Egyptian character which exhibits a wide divergence from the more elaborate monumental or pure Hieroglyphic type. These characters and those of the earliest Phœnician inscriptions enable us to bridge over a chasm in the history of the Alphabet which a few years ago seemed to destroy all hope of further progress. Without their aid it would be scarcely possible to connect the Phœnician Alphabet with Egypt.

The verdict of antiquity, which gave in no doubtful terms to the Phœnicians the glory of the invention of letters, declared also with less confidence, however, that it was from Egypt the Phœnicians derived the knowledge of the art of writing; which they afterwards carried into Greece. Tacitus says in the eleventh book of his *Annals*—"First of all the Egyptians expressed their thoughts by figures of animals; and exhibit themselves as the inventors of letters. Then the Phœnicians, as a maritime people, brought them to Greece, gaining renown as discoverers of what they really had received." But when the value of the ancient belief came to be tested by the aid of the resources of modern scientific

investigation, it became evident that the transition from the Phœnicians to the Egyptians was by no means so clear or so easy as from the Alphabet of Greece to the primitive Alphabet of the Semitic nations. In truth the difficulties in the way of accepting the opinion given by Tacitus are formidable and numerous. In the first place it is easily seen that the Egyptian hieroglyphic writing was alphabetic only in a restricted sense. The signs on Egyptian monuments are very numerous; most of them ideographic or picture signs, others syllabic only; and putting these aside and taking into account symbols purely alphabetic, we do not find, as in the parallel case of Greek and Semitic Alphabets, any notable correspondence in the number, order, names, and forms of those characters which possess like values in the two systems of writing. Comparison shows that the general appearance is wholly dissimilar—one (the Semitic) being geometrical, the other (Egyptian) pictorial; and it shows also that it is difficult, even on close scrutiny, to discern among the Semitic letters a single one that has a strong resemblance to an Egyptian symbol of corresponding value. The difficulty would not be fatal perhaps, did the other tests hold good. But it is not so. We have seen already how the names of the Greek letters furnish a proof of their Semitic birth. With the Egyptian this test fails. The names of the letters, so far as they are known, do not agree with those of the corresponding Semitic characters, save in one or two instances; and it is beyond question that the Semitic names originated among a Semitic people, for they have a meaning in their language. The order, too, of the letters identical or nearly so, in the Greek or Phœnician, is different in the Egyptian Alphabet, so that every proof of relationship between the former, fails us, when we come to the last.

As a consequence the old tradition was, up to a few years ago, discarded completely by writers of the highest authority in these subjects, like Gesenius for instance, who, in his work on Semitic Palæography, published in 1837, concludes, that the Phœnician letters originated in an independent system of Semitic picture writings. The state of opinion not so long ago may be gathered from the eighth edition of the

Encyclopædia Britannica. The passage will be interesting even if it only serve to show how quickly views and opinions become antiquated when discovery is progressive, as it is in all matters touching the ancient History of the East. "The Egyptian hieroglyphs, the Chinese characters, and the supposed Syllabic Alphabets have been examined, and they do not afford, as is commonly asserted, any clue to lead us to the invention of the Alphabet. Since we are unable either in history or imagination to trace its origin, we must ascribe it with the Rabbins to the first man; or we must say, with Pliny, 'ex quo apparet æternus literarum usus'!" And so in very recent times the old classical theory was abandoned, and the problem regarded as insoluble by writers most conversant with these subjects. But here, too, as in many other instances, subsequent investigation has tended to restore to the place of honour the old opinion too hastily given up; and we find scholars at present pretty generally agreed, not only as to the source from which the Semitic Alphabet was obtained, but also as to the special place, manner, and period in which it must have originated.

It is creditable in the highest degree to Celtic genius, that the most remarkable discoveries in Eastern Archæology should be due to it. To France the chief honour belongs. We owe our understanding of the Egyptian hieroglyphs to a young Frenchman of the beginning of this century; and the merit of finding out, and placing on record the last stage in the history of the Alphabet, belongs to another, M. de Rougé, who put forth the results of his researches in a paper read before the Académie des Inscriptions, in the year 1859; and this essay, enlarged and completed, was given to the world fifteen years later by his son.

Rigorous demonstration is scarcely to be expected in a question of this nature, when the materials are so scanty, but it may be said without fear of rashness that M. de Rougé's theory offers not only a possible, but a highly probable, solution of the problem; and it holds the field, for no other hypothesis has as yet been put forward which demands even serious discussion. That theory, however, and the proofs advanced in its favour, we must reserve for another paper.

L. J. HICKEY.

LITURGICAL QUESTIONS.

WEEKLY CONFESSION FOR CURRENT INDULGENCES.

What is the correct meaning of the words, "semel saltem in hebdomada," or "infra unam hebdomadam," with reference to Frequent Confession as a condition for gaining all the current Indulgences?

"Confessors are often called upon to answer a question like the following, from pious people who go to Confession, as a rule, every week: 'Can I gain all the occurring Indulgences, provided I go every week to Confession, even though *more than seven days* intervene between two Confessions—for instance, during one week I may go to Confession on Monday, the next week not before Friday or Saturday (hence, twelve or thirteen days intervening)—or am I obliged to go always *within the seven days* to enjoy this privilege?' As this is a very practical question, and one to which there should be no hesitancy in replying, I beg to ask, in next month's RECORD, whether I correctly interpret the Decrees of the Sacred Congregation on this important subject?

"I. Amongst the authentic Decrees of the Sacred Congregation (*Ratisbon Edition*, approved by the Holy See), I read that, on December 9th, 1763, the Sacred Congregation granted to all the faithful the *privilege* of gaining all occurring Indulgences, provided they are in the habit of going to Confession weekly:—'Sanctitas Sua (Papa) benigne annuit omnibus Christifidelibus, qui frequenti peccatorum confessione *semel saltem in hebdomada* ad Sacramentum Poenitentiae accedunt, ut omnes et quascumque Indulgentias consequi possint, etc.'—(*Dec. authen.*, No. 231.)

"II. This concession meets with confirmation in another Decree, nearly a century later (March 12th, 1855), when the Sacred Congregation answered in the *affirmative* to the following question asked by the Bishop of Verona:—'Utrum privilegium Clementis XIII., quod qui assolent confiteri *semel saltem in hebdomada*, possint lucrari Indulgentias plenarias infra hebdomadam occurrentes, cum sola Communionem, quamvis in Brevi Apostolico Confessio praescripta sit, valeat et extendatur etiam pro lucranda Indulgentia vulgo de Portiuncula die 2 Augusti?'—(*Dec. authen.*, 364.)

"III. Nevertheless, confusion or doubt was apparently sprung upon

us by a much more recent Decree, namely, of November 23rd, 1878, in the following question and reply to the Bishop of Fribourg:— ‘*Utrum Confessio præscripta per singulas hebdomadas peragi debeat infra septem vel potius infra octo dies?*’ Resp. ‘Affirmative ad primam partem, id est, præscriptam Confessionem peragi debere *quolibet decurrente septem dierum spatio*; Negative ad secundam partem.’—(*Dec. authen.*, No. 439.)

“Considering this answer strictly as it stands, one would think that the Holy See now required (whatever she permitted before) that not more than *seven days* should intervene between the Confessions, in order to denominate them as ‘weekly,’ and consequently to carry with them the privilege.

“Let us now see what the authors say, and try to explain away the seeming incongruity.

“IV. Father Comerford, in his admirable little treatise on Holy Indulgences, says:—“They who are accustomed to confess, at least, *once a week* can gain all the Indulgences occurring between their Confessions, and for which actual Confession would be otherwise required. . . . Authors, whose works have received the formal approval of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences, call attention to the expression, ‘*semel in hebdomada,*’ as distinct from *once in the eight days*, and hold that the condition requiring Weekly Confession is sufficiently complied with by a person who confesses, for instance, on the Monday of one week, *and not again until the end of the week following.*’—(*Holy Indulgences*, Part i., 1, Confession.)

“V. Maurel, in his standard work on Indulgences, is even more explicit. After making a similar statement, he writes in a note:— ‘Observe the expression *once a week*; it is not said once in every eight days. In February, 1868, I again submitted this note to the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences. The reply was, that it gives the true sense of the clause, ‘*saltem semel in hebdomada,*’ and that those who interpret it otherwise, *confining it solely to an interval of eight days are quite mistaken.*’—*Maurel*, vii., 3rd English Edition, page 69.

“VI. Again, in one of the most recently published prayer-books, with the Imprimatur of the Archbishop of Dublin, and of the late Bishop of Cork, a book which seems to have been most carefully compiled, we read much the same. ‘Those who are accustomed to confess weekly can gain all the indulgences occurring during the week, and the Communion, as a rule, need not be necessarily made in the Church to which an indulgence is attached. . . . In the case

of a person going to Confession on the Monday of one week, and not until the Saturday of the following week, *he could still gain all the indulgences occurring within those twelve days.*—*Augustinian Manual*, pages 341 and 30, note.

“VII. Hence we seem to have quite a consensus of opinion, that provided Confession is made, as a rule, every week (*semel in hebdomada*), it matters not on what day of each week it is made; and, consequently, even should twelve or thirteen days intervene.

“What, then, about the late Decree of Nov., 1878? (See iii. *supra*.) It seems to refuse to extend the intervening time *even to eight days*. By an *a fortiori* argument, it would not permit the extension to twelve or thirteen days, or, indeed, to any number above seven. Are then the above authors all wrong? And must penitents actually go to Confession within every seven days (*quotibet decurrente septem dierum spatio*, as the Decree has it), in order to gain all current indulgences?

“I may remark here, *en passant*, that a priest lately told me he had seen some still later Decree, even of only last year, which as far as he remembered, directly confirmed the opinion of the above authors. If so, it has not appeared in the RECORD, and, sureiy, of all places (since it is for this the RECORD was especially intended for the clergy), *there* we should expect to find it.

“VIII. I can now only offer my solution of the seeming incongruity, and then respectfully ask our esteemed Editor of the I. E. RECORD, to tell us in the next issue whether it be correct.

“I interpret the reply of the Sacred Congregation on November 23rd, 1878, when it says that the Confession must be ‘*per singulas hebdomadas vel infra septem et non octo dies*,’ to mean that, reckoning a week to be from Sunday to Saturday (inclusive), the ‘weekly’ Confession must be made with only one Sunday intervening; for instance, a penitent, in the first week of a month, might go to Confession on Monday; in the second week, on Wednesday; in the third week, on Friday or Saturday. Now, though we have actually ten or more days intervening, still the Confession is always made every week (*per singulas hebdomadas*); because only one Sunday intervenes, or, in other words, the penitent always confesses within a Sunday and the Saturday following, inclusive. And the reason why the Sacred Congregation declared it did not mean ‘*infra octo dies*,’ was, because it did not want to restrict the Confession to *every eight days*.

“IX. But I can well imagine some one insisting: ‘The language

of the reply seems to preclude this explanation; for, why did the Sacred Congregation, which is generally so exact in the selection of its phraseology, say, ‘*praescriptam Confessionem peragi debere quolibet decurrente septem dierum spatio?*’ ”

“A very reasonable objection, surely. Were it not so, I would not be now troubling you, Very Rev. Mr. Editor. U. E. U.”

We are obliged to our respected correspondent for his lucid statement of the practical question he raises. But we beg to correct a mistake into which he has fallen in supposing that the RECORD has not published the recent Decree of the 25th of February, 1886, to which he has heard reference made. It is most likely his friend read it in the July number of the RECORD, 1886, in which it was published. (See I. E. RECORD, vol. vii., No. 7, p. 655, July, 1886).

The question proposed to the Congregation and answered on the 25th of February, 1886, was intended to explain the meaning of the Decree of the 23rd November, 1878. From this latest answer it is plain that the weekly Confession need not be made within seven days from the date of the last Confession; for it decides that one who goes to Confession, for instance, every eight days is a hebdomadarius or weekly penitent.

We have no doubt that our correspondent’s interpretation is a safe one to act on.

It is our own opinion that the object of the Decree of the 23rd November, 1878, was not to alter in any restrictive sense the common opinion and teaching regarding what constituted a weekly penitent, but rather to declare that a week for the purposes of Confession was a space of seven, and not of eight days, so that the eighth day from the Confession counts as first day of the next week.

As the late Decree of the 25th of February contains also the Decree of November 23rd, 1878, and as it is so important, we print it again for convenience of reference:—

URBIS ET ORBIS.

QUOAD CONFENSIONEM FACIENDAM PER SINGULAS HEBDOMADAS ET ACQUIRENDAS INDULGENTIAS PLENARIAS.

Ad dubia quae proposuit R. D. D. Episcopus Leucensis et Vicarius Capitularis Friburgensis, quod attinet ad sacramentalem

Confessionem quae necessaria est ad acquirendas Indulgentias plenarias intra hebdomadam, aut binas continuas hebdomadas occurrentes, nimirum: I. Utrum Confessio praescripta *per singulas hebdomadas* peragi debeat infra septem, vel potius infra octo dies? II. An verba *infra duas hebdomadas* stricte interpretanda sint, ita ut Confessio peragi debeat infra quatuordecim dies, vel potius sufficiat bina confessio in mense? Sacra Congregatio Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praeposita respondit die 23 Novembris 1878: Ad I. Affirmative ad primam partem id est praescriptam Confessionem peragi debere quolibet decurrente septem dierum spatio; Negative ad secundam partem. Ad II. Affirmative ad primam partem, id est praescriptam Confessionem peragi debere quolibet decurrente quatuordecim dierum spatio; Negative ad secundam partem.

Ad majorem hujus rei declarationem quaeritur modo:

I. Utrum Christifidelis, qui singulis hebdomadis et stato die, ex. gr. Sabbato confessionem peragere solet, satisfaciat oneri praescriptae Confessionis?

II. Utrum oneri praescriptae confessionis satisfaciat Christifidelis, qui iis in locis pro quibus viget Indultum, alternis hebdomadis et stato die, ex. gr. Sabbato, Confessionem peragere solet?

Sacra Congregatio Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praeposita die 25 Februarii, 1886, ad supra relata dubia respondit:

Ad I^m. *Affirmative.*

Ad II^m. *Affirmative.*

Datum Romae ex secretaria ejusdem S. Congregationis die 25 Februarii, 1886.

I. B. Card. FRANZELIN, *Praefectus.*

F. DELLA VOLPE, *Secretarius.*

THE MARRIAGE CEREMONY.

“You will kindly oblige many priests by giving the common practice of Rubricists in the following:—

“At a Nuptial Mass where should the *contrahentes* kneel? Inside or outside of the sanctuary? When they approach the Altar to receive the blessing, where should they kneel? De Herdt and O’Kane do not seem to be sufficiently explicit in regard to the matter.—“J. B.”

Martinucci (Lib. iv., pp. 64-6) gives the following minute directions:—

At the marriage ceremony which precedes the Mass, the Sponsi kneel inside the balustrade, at the steps in front of the altar, or on the predella.

This ceremony over, they retire to the balustrade or rails

where they kneel during Mass up to the blessing which is given after the *Pater Noster*.

The Sponsi come again to the steps of the altar to receive the blessing after the *Pater Noster*. Then the Sponsi again retire to the balustrade.

A third time the Sponsi come to the steps, when the celebrant, having said the *Ite Missa est*, prays over them "*Deus Abraham &c.*," and sprinkles them with Holy Water.

The Sponsi then withdraw finally to the balustrade to assist at the *Placeat* and the rest of the Mass.

THE CHURCH ABROAD.

ADDRESS OF THE HOLY FATHER TO THE SACRED COLLEGE ON THE PERSECUTION TO WHICH THE CHURCH IN ITALY AND THE HOLY SEE ARE SUBJECTED—PROTEST OF THE HIERARCHY OF SPAIN—SIMILAR PROTESTS FROM THE EPISCOPATE OF BELGIUM—PROJECT OF A CATHOLIC INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC CONGRESS IN PARIS IN APRIL, 1888—THE ENGLISH MARTYRS.

No words can better explain the intolerable position of the Pope in his own capital than the indignant protest to which his Holiness gave utterance on a recent occasion in reply to an address of the Sacred College. After speaking of the attacks made upon the Church in other parts of the world the Holy Father continues:

"But we are more deeply concerned and afflicted at what happens in Italy and in Rome, the centre of Catholicity, and the privileged seat of the Vicar of Christ. Here the assaults of our enemies are all the more injurious as they are directed against that supreme power in which are so intimately bound up the good, the life, and the social action of the Church in the world. Now the designs of which we frequently had to complain bitterly have increased for some time past beyond all measure: for it is easy to discover what are the real designs entertained against the Church under cover of vain pretexts and invented distinctions. Her most beneficent institutions, her dogmas, her ministers, her rights, nothing is spared. We are threatened with new laws which, according to public rumour, would lay violent hands on the last resources of property left to the Church, and which would bring about the interference of laymen in ecclesiastical affairs with all the disastrous effects that follow from such intrusions. Her enemies

are sharpening every weapon against the Christian education of our youth. Other effects of their increased hostility are the odious measures recently taken against the poor and inoffensive nuns who are worthy of all compassion. But the most furious attacks and the most implacable hatred of the sects are directed against the Supreme Pontiff, the corner-stone on which the sublime edifice of the Church is built. It is enough to say that they have dared to denounce him publicly as the enemy of Italy at all times, and to mark him with such names of opprobrium and contempt as the tongue refuses to repeat.

“How can we be astonished if after this in popular reunions, at public meetings and in the press they have hurled against the Pope the most vile and the most unbecoming insults, and that in the principal cities of Italy the most horrible affronts should be offered to the Pontifical Office and Dignity? And coming still to more ferocious designs they have threatened to resort to the last limits of violence against ourselves and against our peaceful residence. The worst is that these manifestations of hatred and of violence are allowed to be freely indulged in and no efficacious means employed to hinder them.

“In such a condition of things everyone knows in what manner the dignity is respected and the honour of our person guarded in Rome. All must understand what security we enjoy and what sort of liberty is left to us in the exercise of our Apostolic Ministry.

“It is therefore impossible for us to be satisfied with the present state of things, and as our enemies, strengthened by the aid of human power, are leaving nothing undone to perpetuate the present situation of the Pope, we feel it on our side a pressing duty to renew against these usurpations, be they old or new, the most formal protests and to claim for the safe-guard of our independence, the sacred rights of the Church and of the Apostolic See. Our confidence is placed in God who holds in His divine hands the course of human events. May He bountifully hear our humble prayers and those of the whole Church, particularly during these days of grace and mercy.”

Against these horrible outrages on the dignity and person of the Pope we may also cite a few extracts of the protest recently made by the Hierarchy of Spain.

“In the varied course of centuries we never witnessed the spectacle of a Pope ruling the world according to the salutary principles of wisdom and of policy, having apostolic representatives in every country in the world, and who was at the same time insulted and maltreated by the multitudes that dwelt around him. It has been reserved for this nineteenth century to despise those sentiments of justice and of chivalry and to lose even the most commonplace notions of public dignity.

“They are only too well known, those unheard-of outrages of which Leo XIII. has recently been made the object and which are being aggravated in an unspeakable manner in the sad epoch in which we live. It was not sufficient to have dispossessed him unjustly of his temporal sovereignty and of the independence and liberty which follows from it; they have gone to the length of censuring the very acts of his ministry; they have distorted his intentions; they have insulted his sacred person and have trampled under foot his high and incomparable dignity, and this has been done with the complicity and connivance of the authorities that are pledged in the face of the world to protect him from injury or insult.

“At the sight of such a dark and horrible picture the Spanish Bishops have felt moved in the very depth of their heart and conscience, and believe that they would not be faithful to the glorious traditions of their Catholic forefathers if they did not protest in the most formal and solemn manner against these attacks on the person of the Head of that Church to which their nation has and ever will remain unswervingly attached.

“They firmly hope that the peoples and governments of the world will work unanimously in the name of their common interests and of the institutions which uphold society itself, in order to obtain with the peace of Italy, that the Head of the Church should be restored to that position of independence and liberty which he requires for the perfect accomplishment of his sublime mission, thus putting an end to the situation which is founded on brute force and the most wicked instincts of fallen nature.”

Then follow the signatures of the Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo with the seven suffragans of his province, of the Cardinal Archbishop of Sarragossa with six suffragans, of the Cardinal Archbishop of Valencia with five suffragans, of the Cardinal Archbishop of Seville with five suffragans, of the Archbishop of Burgos with six suffragans, of the Archbishop of Compostella with five suffragans, of the Archbishop of Granada with five suffragans, of the Archbishop of Tarragona with seven suffragans, and of the Archbishop of Valladolid with six suffragans.

Similar protests have been made by the episcopate of Belgium who are specially astir in the preparations to celebrate in a manner worthy of the occasion, and of the circumstances, the jubilee year of the present Pontiff.

The Catholic men of letters of Belgium have the happy idea of collecting all the Catholic works that have been published in their country within the last hundred years, and presenting them to the Pope on this joyous occasion.

The project of Mgr. d'Hulst and his learned associates in France of holding a Catholic international scientific congress in Paris in the month of April, 1888, has now assumed definite shape, and is sure to become of world-wide interest and importance. A central commission has been formed in Paris with assistant members in the French provinces and in foreign countries to initiate the work.

"The object of this commission," says Mgr. d'Hulst, "is to obtain from Catholic scientists the composition of memoirs or reports destined to be presented to the congress, and the special object of which will be to determine the actual state of science regarding different questions which are closely connected with Christian faith, and are on that account of particular interest to Catholics. The memoirs which shall be accepted by the commission will form the matter of the work of the congress, and will furnish the theme of verbal discussions which may take place at the sittings of the sections.

"The congress will also discuss the 'impulse' or direction which it is expedient to give to scientific researches among Catholics at the present day, the method to be followed in order that these researches may turn out profitable to the Christian cause, without sacrificing anything of the purest and safest orthodoxy.

"It is agreed that the congress will be only the medium for an exchange of ideas, and that no vote will be taken in the sense of consecrating the conclusions, or formulating the doctrine of the assembly."

The Congress will comprise three classes, divided each into several sections. The following is the Table of Subjects:—

1ST CLASS.

- 1st Section—Theodicaea.
- 2nd Section—General Metaphysics and Cosmology.
- 3rd Section—Psychology and Psycho-physiology.
- 4th Section—Natural Right.
- 5th Section—Political and Social Economy.

2ND CLASS.

- 1st Section—Mathematics, Mechanics, and Astronomy
- 2nd Section—Physics and Chemistry,
- 3rd Section—Zoology, Biology, and Physiology.
- 4th Section—Geology and Paleontology.
- 5th Section—Anthropology, Ethnography and Philology.

3RD CLASS.

- 1st Section—Biblical History.
- 2nd Section—Origin of Christianity.
- 3rd Section—History of the Church: Her Social Duties.
- 4th Section—Comparative History of Religions.
- 5th Section—Christian Archeology.

Such is the programme to which the men of Science and Letters in the Catholic world are asked to contribute. The Commission has already secured the adhesion of several Cardinals and Bishops, and has been promised the most hearty co-operation of some of the ablest men outside of France. But, even if the Congress were confined to France alone it could not fail to be of great interest: for amongst its leading organisers we notice the names of the Abbé de Broglie, M. de Lapparent, (who is one of the ablest geologists in France), the Abbé Martin, M. Claudio Jannet, (author of several works on social economy), the Abbé Vigouroux of St. Sulpice, M. Paul Allard of Rouen, (well known for his works on Archeology, and the early history of the Church), Admiral de Jonquieres, member of the Institute of France, the Abbé Fouard of Rouen, principally known in these countries for his "Life of Christ," M. Paul Fournier, who visited us in Ireland a few years ago, and wrote an interesting book on the land question, the Abbé Guieu, Editor of "Les Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne," the Abbé Duchesne of the Catholic University of Paris, Comte de l'Épinois, M. de Vorges, vice-president of the Society of St. Thomas of Aquin, Père de Smedt, S.J., etc., etc.



We are glad to notice that the cause of beatification of the English martyrs has fully succeeded, and that at the end of last month, His Eminence Cardinal Manning, was able to announce the joyful news to his priests and faithful. The following is a full and accurate list of the blessed martyrs. The list which we gave in our last "chronique," and which we took from the *Moniteur de Rome*, and the *Osservatore Romano*, was incomplete.

Those who suffered death under King Henry VIII.—John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church; Thomas More, Chancellor of England; Margaret Pole, Countess of Salisbury, mother of Cardinal Pole; Richard Reynolds of the order of Saint Bridget; John Haile, priest; Eighteen Carthusians, viz.—John Houghton, Augustine Webster, Robert Laurence, William Exmew, Humphrey Middlemore, Sebastian Newdigate, John Rochester, James Walworth, William Greenwood, John Davy, Robert Salt, Walter Pierson, Thomas Green, Thomas Scryven, Thomas Redyng, Thomas Johnson, Richard Bere, and William Horne: John Forest, priest of the Order of Saint Francis; John Stone, of the Order of Saint Augustine; four secular priests:—Thomas Abel, Edward Powel, Richard Fetherston, John Larke, and German Gardiner, a layman.

Those who suffered under Elizabeth: Priests—Cuthbert Mayne, John Nelson, Everard Hanse, Rodolf Sherwin, John Payne, Thomas Ford, John Skert, Robert Johnson, William Fylby, Luke Kirby, Laurence Richardson, William Lacy, Richard Kirkman, James Hudson or Tomson, William Hart, Richard Thirkeld, Thomas Woodhouse, and — Plumtree. Three priests of the Society of Jesus, Edmund Campion, Alexander Briant and Thomas Cottam. Lastly, John Storey, Doctor of Laws, John Felton, and Thomas Sherwood, laymen.

J. F. HOGAN.

CORRESPONDENCE.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE ORAL SYSTEM OF TEACHING THE DEAF AND DUMB.

Would you obligingly find place in the pages of the RECORD for some observations I desire to convey to your numerous readers on a system of teaching the Deaf and Dumb, which, of late years, has become very popular under the title of the ORAL SYSTEM. It proposes to teach these poor children of affliction to speak by the use of the natural organs of speech, as also to understand others, as they speak, by observing the motion of their lips, which is called lip-reading. The observations I wish to make have been suggested by the perusal of a periodical, edited and published in Paris, bearing the title of the *International Review on the Instruction of the Deaf and Dumb*. It is entirely devoted to the ORAL SYSTEM, and seeks to promote it under very distinguished patronage by collecting and disseminating the opinions and views of its advocates, as also the reports of its working in the various institutions, that have adopted it in different countries throughout the world. No doubt such a system should be hailed as a blessing beyond all appreciation, if it attain the end at which it aims, but, at the same time, establishments, that yet retain the original and time-honoured system of teaching by methodic signs have reason to examine and see how far the modern system has realised, or is realising, the results it proposes to itself before they be called upon to adopt it. It was with this idea I carefully perused the *International Review* for the past year with the result of taking from it the following observations.

I can claim for them, therefore, no authority on the ground of originality, but I venture to think they are entitled to much consideration as being the testimony the system bears to its own work, as well as to the views and opinions of its advocates in several countries. The subject interests the Catholic public here in Ireland exceedingly, as it concerns the operation of our great National Institution for the Deaf and Dumb, the largest single Institution in the world affording an education, as it does, to the school-age children of a deaf-mute population exceeding 4,000 souls within our shores. Without further preface may I venture to offer you Very Rev. and dear Mr. Editor, my observations in the hope you will deem them worthy of publicity as affecting so large a number of our fellow-mortals, whose sad privations claim our deepest sympathy. They are as follows:—

All the authorities agree in considering that the course of instruction should commence at from 7 to 9 years of age, and be continued for 8 years.

During the early stages, that is for two years more, or less, until the pupil will have acquired in some degree the use of language by lip-reading and speaking, all intercommunication by signs, either amongst the pupils themselves, or with their teachers, is rigidly prohibited, even in time of recreation. The pupils are thereby deprived, at that early age, of all the advantages they would have by interchanging their thoughts and feelings, such as they are, and thus cultivating each other's intelligence and affections at a period when the mind is so tender and susceptible.

Several writers in the *Review*, however, consider this suspension of intellectual work, as well on the part of the master in respect of his pupils, as also of the pupils among themselves as impossible, especially at recreation, and they freely acknowledge the endeavours resorted to in order to enforce it to be harassing and vexatious in the extreme.

The advocates of this course would seem to overlook the fact that sign-language was the first language of the child whether deaf and dumb, or as yet only dumb, the language he interchanged with his mother, as she caressed him in her arms, or held him at her knee: and when the child, who is to speak, began to give articulate forms to mere vocal sounds, it was still by signs that he learned from her to attach meaning to his words, she pointing out to him by signs what she expressed with her lips, enlarging by degrees, according to the development of his mind, the range of this mixed mode of teaching until the use of signs became unnecessary. But where now do we

find the poor deaf and dumb child? The sign-teaching must still go on for him, and it does go on in family life within the limited extent of objects and acts that come within the range of his sight-seeing, and are pointed out to him for his observation. Must it not, therefore, be unnatural to interdict, all at once, this cultivation of mind, and consign the poor creature to absolute isolation as to the interchange of mind with mind, in order to subject him to the mere mechanical labour of acquiring the art of lip-reading, and attaining in some degree the use of the organs of speech? As to recreation, what can it be for a poor child, standing face to face with another poor child, and both looking at each other with intense gaze, and trying to catch some meaning from each other's lips? Recreation of this kind is a cruel mockery, which, carried out with any degree of strictness, must be ruinous to the health of children at an age when recreation is as necessary for them as their daily food. Nevertheless, it is insisted that the use of signs is incompatible with the oral system, and the advocates of it would silence all opposition by the divine maxim which they are not afraid to apply: "No man can serve two masters."—*Matt.* vi. 24.

The number of pupils for each teacher should not exceed 8, or, at most 10, and, in the first stage of instruction, there should be a second or an assistant teacher for even that number. This limitation of pupils taken together with 8 years, as constituting the full course, would have a serious effect on the total work of a public school, which, on that account, would require a proportionate increase of funds, or a proportionate diminution of pupils as compared with the sign-system school, which allows a much larger number of pupils to each master, and works out its results within the compass of 6 years.

The advocates of the system regret the diversity of views and practice not only in different countries, but in different schools of the same country, which shows that the system leaves yet much to be desired both in principle and method, and it was to bring about some uniformity in the system, so far as such a result can be attained by such an agency, that the *International Review* has been projected. It is, however, felt that a normal school or normal schools, working in harmony with each other, are indispensable to realise any approach to a uniform system. Just here the *Review* comes to the root of the system, but just here also it has an enormous difficulty to encounter. There are afloat widely different principles, and methods equally divergent in operation. What set of principles will be adopted for a uniform basis? What methods will prevail, omitting altogether

the question of expense for the establishment of such schools in different countries, or, as might be, of several of them in larger countries, such as those on the continent?

In a normal school having uniformity of system for object, it is laid down by the most accredited authorities that the aspirant teacher should be taught the physiological structure and respective functions of the several organs of speech, beginning with the lungs, and comprising in succession the bronchial and tracheal arteries, the larynx, the pharynx, the buccal and nasal cavities, together with the action of the tongue, teeth, and lips, and tracing the voice from being a mere sound to its becoming articulate for syllabic pronunciation, whence it is formed into words, and from words into sentences, and thence into continuous language.

The future teacher has to make himself acquainted with the etymology and application of a large and varied vocabulary of technical terms not to be found in any existing dictionary or lexicon, being specially invented from Greek roots, and so applied to what is sought to be the profession of deaf-mute education, in order to invest it, as it would appear, with technical importance.

Practice must go on concurrently with the learning of principles, and the future teacher has the double task on hands of teaching the pupils, who are confided to him, the practice of lip-reading, from his own lips, and tracing the emission of voice, as it proceeds through its various organs in his own person. For this latter task he has to expose his entire chest and neck to the view of his pupils, so that the latter, partly by sight-seeing, and partly by manual feeling, may observe how the various vocal organs of their teacher are exerted from the lungs upwards for the ultimate production of articulate sounds: and when groping along they have found their way up to his mouth, he has to open it wide, so that they may see, as best they can, the process of modification gone through in the buccal and nasal cavities, as also by the action of the tongue, after all which they are to hang on his teeth and lips to take from them the articulate sounds and words he desires to address to them.

In this feeling of the chest and neck of their teacher the pupils, each in turn, employ both hands first, in order to notice the function of the bronchial arteries, as they emanate respectively from the lungs and unite in the trachea. Thenceforward one hand is sufficient to pursue the action of the trachea, larynx and pharynx, whilst, at the same time, the pupil employs the other on corresponding organs in himself, in order that imitating, what he feels in his master, he may succeed in the effects both are endeavouring to accomplish.

What place are female teachers to have in this elaborate practice? It is enough to ask the question. It carries with it its own answer, and in point of fact they are not spoken of at all except in so far as they may be employed in teaching the female pupils various kinds of manual work; and the poor female mutes are doomed, it would seem, to undergo the same process as males, whether in separate schools by themselves, or in mixed schools with the other sex, since no distinction of treatment is pointed out.

It is not expressly said that the oral system is unsuited to the general run of deaf-mutes, but this may be well inferred from all that is said about *backward pupils*, whose numbers are spoken of as being so considerable as to require separate establishments, or separate treatment, if received into the same establishment with the others.

And after this labour continued for eight entire years with so numerous a staff of teachers and superintendents to preside over the recreations in order to restrain the poor children from the use of signs and gestures, what is the result in the end? The object in view throughout is to impart speech to these speechless creatures, opening to them thereby the door to human society, so that hearing in a manner with their eyes by means of lip-reading, and speaking with their tongues like the rest of mankind, the system may accomplish in them the miracle of making the deaf to hear, and the dumb to speak. This is the result so much spoken of, so much boasted of, and which has attracted so much of popular sympathy. But expectation and hope must ask the question, has this result been realized, and, if not fully, how far has the system succeeded? Here we are all on the same footing, and have access to the same test, the test of experience. "By their fruits you shall know them." This maxim of Divine Wisdom applies universally, and as we apply it to the oral system of teaching the deaf and dumb, its verdict is unfavourable as to that system being suited as a general system of education to be adopted in schools for the deaf and dumb in preference to the system of sign-teaching.

When we venture thus to speak of it as a *general system*, we are by all means ready to admit that it may succeed in particular cases, where special aptitude on the part of the pupils, long and earnest labour on the part of a teacher of exceptional ability and zeal, with the earnest co-operation of the family, may realise the wished-for success. But it is with a system, as being suitable, or unsuitable, for general adoption in schools we are concerned, and in this view of the oral system it must be said that experience so far affords it but scant advocacy.

Some few years ago, at a congress in London of directors and head-masters of various countries, the two systems were brought face to face, and, applying the test of experience, the supporters of the sign-system asked for the fruits of the opposite system. There were no fruits to exhibit. There were indeed various excuses advanced, all of which looked to the future, and explanations submitted, which insisted on the success of the system as indubitable and unquestionable; but as to actual results—there were none worth producing.

And now that the future has come, are we assured that the result test has proved satisfactory? The *Review*, which has been undertaken on behalf of the system, speaks here and there of its working.

It quotes, page 18, a passage from the *Rappel* of the previous 14th March to the following effect: “The deaf mute, who, during six years’ education, has learned to speak with his fellow pupils, or with his masters, and to read words on the methodic movement of their lips, will find himself on leaving the institution in a situation similar to that of a man, who, by great grammatical labour, having learned the mechanism of a language, goes into the city where it is spoken, and understands not a word of it. At this moment a project is under consideration in the Ministry of the Interior to remedy this inconvenience, and it is proposed to place the *new speaker*, on leaving the institution, in a trade, or agricultural school. A disciplined association of this sort, in which special superintendence can be afforded to the deaf and dumb, will enable them by degrees to understand the public.”

The *Review*, page 198, gives a report of a conference delivered to a numerous assembly at Limoges, by a M. Goguillot, Professor in the National Institution of Paris, at the close of which the Professor produced successively four pupils brought up for the occasion, and made them speak, with the applause of the entire assembly. It may well be supposed that these four pupils were specially selected, and made up by an elaborate preparation to display the fruits of the great National Institution. Nevertheless, the report, after mentioning the applause of the meeting, adds immediately that this display of feeling was accompanied by a marked sentiment of distress and pain on account of the difficulty the pupils showed in expressing themselves.

At page 27, the *Review* presents an article headed “Accent of the Deaf and Dumb,” which had been communicated to the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences, in Paris; and amongst the authorities quoted, Emile Blanchard, of the Academy, is

mentioned as having made a particular study of the human voice; and, speaking of the deaf and dumb, he remarked that their voice, so husky, so metallic, so guttural, without inflexion or modulation, has no place in the classification of accents that distinguish the human voice.

In another article, page 51, entitled *Review of Journals*, the paper called *l'Eclair*, a Belgian production of the city of Liege, which furnishes an article every week in its columns under the heading *Deaf Mutes*, gives an account, in its issue of the 12th April, 1885, of a pilgrimage to the Institution of St. Lambert for the Deaf and Dumb, near Brussels, and, after having spoken of the pilgrimage, the Editor observes with regard to the education of the deaf and dumb: "There is one thing that occasions reflection whenever we find ourselves amongst the deaf and dumb. We will permit ourselves to communicate it to the *International Review on the Teaching of the Deaf and Dumb*, requesting the Editor to be good enough to answer the following question:—How is it, that the instructed (*sic*) deaf-mutes, according to the method of articulation exclusively practised in our schools of Belgium since about 1865, DO NOT SPEAK amongst themselves, and are not even IN ANY DEGREE in a state to express themselves so as to be understood by speaking people? These PRACTICAL results are attested by all our boarding and day schools alike."

Having observed these very remarkable testimonies in the *Review*, I may be permitted to say something from myself of a visit I made some years ago to a private school for the deaf and dumb in the city of Lyons. The establishment had acquired a great reputation, being conducted on the oral system; and having but a few, some eight or ten, pupils, the master lavished all his energies upon them. Amongst the other lessons they were taught to repeat on the occasion of visits, they were specially trained, as the visitor entered, to rise and salute him with the words, "Bon jour, Monsieur." I can never forget the impression the salutation made upon me, as the poor creatures arose, and stretching their necks forward, laboured to force the words from, shall I say their lips, or mouth? Their lips and mouth had of course some share in the sounds emitted by simply allowing them free and open passage; but the sounds came from the throat with scarcely any modification by the organs immediately within the mouth. Strange sights give a strange impulse at times to the imagination, and I hope to be pardoned if I acknowledge, that hearing the poor creatures, and looking at them as they reached

forward their necks, and observing, moreover, their distressing effort to bring forth their voices, such as they were, the comparison came vividly before my mind of young cocks making their first essays to crow in imitation of the clear, loud-sounding notes of their parents of the poultry yard.

As for lip-reading, its use is circumscribed within very narrow limits indeed. It is confined, whilst the pupil is at school, to his teachers, and those he is in immediate communication with; and when leaving school, the lip-language, as understood in the system, is of as little use to him almost as Greek, or any foreign language would be for social intercourse to a student, who had learned these languages by mere grammatical study. This results necessarily from the different conformation of men's lips, which in no two individuals is precisely alike. Various expedients are under consideration to meet this most serious defect, which otherwise must prove fatal to the entire system, and it is confessed in the *Review*, that so far no effective remedy has been discovered.

I recollect I had to render some service several years ago to a man who, after having arrived at mature life, had completely lost his hearing, but yet retained the free use of speech. He was brought to me by his wife. He understood her perfectly, as she moved her lips in a mere whisper, and at any distance that allowed him a view of her face, and they conversed with each other in that manner with the utmost freedom. I sought to imitate her, but in vain. He did not understand a word from me, and she explained it was the same case with every one else outside the family. I transacted my business with him in his several visits by writing, he reading, and answering distinctly without the least impediment in the use of his tongue. I have often thought what a phenomenon a deaf and dumb pupil would appear in a public school who could read his master's lips in the same way as this good man understood his wife; but, at the same time, what a deceptive specimen it would be, should a general inference in favour of the system be taken from such a particular instance as between master and pupil only.

It is to be regretted that this oral system was not put forward in competition merely with the time-honoured system of signs. It aims at its complete suppression. Very many schools on the Continent have absolutely discontinued the one, and substituted the other, and when new schools are undertaken, the oral system is universally adopted. Popular sentiment is easily captivated in the cause of benevolence, and sympathy is only too prone to overlook the means,

in its desire to realise its purpose. Hence outside influence has put pressure on institutions, and enthusiastic essayists have not been wanting to experimentalize courageously under popular favour in what appeared to them a hopeful region for the discovery of important results. These results, however, it must be confessed, are as yet far away, and the system is already losing much of the hopefulness, with which it was commenced.

Just lately a friend has sent me a copy of the October number of a periodical entitled, *Quarterly Review of the Deaf-Mute Education* edited and issued in London under the auspices of a distinguished committee in the interests of the oral system; and in turning over its pages I find a very remarkable passage from a correspondent, in introducing which the *Review* observes under the heading:—

A WEIGHTY AUTHORITY.

The following passage will strike every one who reads it as being far too valuable to be kept within the confined limits of a private letter. As it occurs in the course of friendly correspondence, we are precluded from mentioning names, but not, we hope, from stating that the writer is a teacher of large experience, whose work has been done in different places, under diverse circumstances, at home and abroad, within her Majesty's dominions and out of them, that he has been brought face to face with both systems, having knowledge of both and working on both; seeing clearly, comprehending fully, and describing forcibly. The passage in his letter is as follows:—

“The oral system is capable of doing much more for the deaf, and much less for the deaf, than the sign system. It demands severe conditions for success—care, zeal, and EFFICIENCY on the part of the teacher, and if these be wanting the results will be simply disastrous—the pupils shall have neither speech nor language. I should not be at all surprised that in some years there will be a reaction, for I do not think that, in many of the French, Italian, or even English schools, the conditions for success exist. I have seen schools in France and *elsewhere*, and it was sad to see how very backward were the poor children in every branch of instruction. There must be superior teaching power, else there can be little or no progress; it was difficult enough to secure results under the former method—it is infinitely more so under the present.”

This testimony from one so competent is very discouraging as regards the oral system in public schools, and he has no hesitation in predicting that in some years there will be a reaction against it. This reaction may be slow in coming, for the enthusiasm enlisted, and honestly enlisted, in the cause will hope against hope to the last. Besides, it is more than humiliating to acknowledge failure, when the avowal would involve the reproach of having disappointed a benevolent public, who, relying on the pretensions so confidently put forth on behalf of the system, were induced to hope for successful results.

Let us turn now to say something of the sign-system, on which the new system has been set up to cast so much discredit, and what I purpose saying will not be according to theoretic views or pretensions,

for in dealing with popular matters it is always more satisfactory to have the actual fruits to look at than to gaze on mere prospects, however dazzling they may appear. I happen to be intimately acquainted with two schools, one for males, and the other for females, counting between them somewhere about 500 pupils, and, with that number, the largest deaf-mute institution in the world. It was founded some forty years ago, and in its foundation it adopted the sign-system, which it has all along steadfastly adhered to. They teach a course of primary education as extensive and as varied as is pursued under the National Board of Education in ordinary schools of children possessing all their faculties; and to test the working of these schools the public are freely admitted, not to admire *show-pupils* specially put forward for such occasions, but to visit the several classes at lesson hours, and witness the actual teaching and answering at leisure in each class, to be convinced of the fact that age for age, class for class, department for department, the schools can bear favourable comparison with the best conducted schools of speaking children in the country. There is no suspension of the intellectual faculties, as in the oral-system schools. The teacher takes hold of the child, mind and body, from the beginning, and teaching it very soon to write, he is in a position to employ the two agencies of methodic manual signs, and written language, for the advancement of the pupil. Likewise the pupils amongst themselves, having been regularly taught the language of methodic signs, converse freely with each other in recreation, and whenever the order and discipline of the school permit, and by so doing cultivate each other's minds, a most important advantage, of which the oral system robs its pupils in its earlier stages.

These two schools, situated at a short distance from each other at Cabra, in the neighbourhood of Dublin, are respectively under male and female communities, the Christian Brothers for the boys, and the Sisters of St. Dominic for the girls, both communities possessing within themselves an ample range of choice for teachers in sufficient numbers, and of special aptitudes for their work. And here is a notable advantage which the oral system deprives itself of in the contemplation of normal schools, which, of course, religious communities could not avail themselves of, the consequence of which must be especially disastrous as regards female deaf mutes. We have already pointed out that females, neither teachers nor pupils, could have any part in the physiological training proposed to be adopted in these establishments, and actually in operation in some particular schools.

As regards the teaching and practice of religion, it is found in both the schools under consideration that the pupils can be prepared for Confirmation, Confession, and Holy Communion, at the same ages as in ordinary schools of speaking children.

The oral system does not pretend to concern itself much about the religion of its pupils. The *Review*, feeling, as it would appear, this sad void, gladly parades in its pages an allocution addressed to the Bishop of Vannes upon the occasion of the first Communion and Confirmation of a female deaf-mute Institution by the chaplain, the Institution being under the direction of a female community, and conducted professedly according to the oral system.

With regard to the religious welfare of their pupils, the Cabra communities keep them in view after they have passed from under their care, and afford them the inestimable advantage of a spiritual retreat every year, and it is more than interesting to observe with what religious avidity they flock from every part of the country to avail themselves of these pious exercises. About 120 of each sex come together at a time, in their respective Institutions, and go through, in the most orderly and edifying manner, the course of observances traced out for the order of the retreat; and besides the consolation which their religious deportment affords to their former teachers, it is gratifying in the highest degree to notice by their dress and personal appearance that they generally occupy respectable positions in life, in the various careers Providence has opened to them. They come in succession as they are invited, and by that means all the former pupils are afforded in rotation the benefit of these annual retreats. But it may be said that this advantage is quite special, and presents no argument for or against either system. This may, indeed, be; but it must, at all events, be observed, that lip-reading affords no advantage to female deaf-mutes for the tribunal of penance. The very idea of such a licence is too revolting to dwell on it for a single moment.

It is alleged by the oralists that the other system is elliptical in expression, vague in signification, and irregular in collocation. These charges are most unfounded. Of course, education must ever be progressive, and in every department of life we learn by being corrected, and by correcting ourselves. But the schools at Cabra come every year before the public, not with a few select individuals specially prepared for exhibition, but in their full numbers. And, class after class, from the lowest to the highest, they are put through a course of exercises affording the most distinct evidence of knowledge as

extensive and varied as would do credit to any school of speaking children, and expressed, at least in the higher classes, with all grammatical correctness, whilst their sign-language amongst themselves, and with their teachers, is even more rapid than the language of speech as ordinarily spoken. These displays bring the public together in thousands, and all go away admiring what they could not believe, if they had not actually witnessed it. The *Review* gives us no account of the oral system being subjected to such a test of an entire school before the public, nor have we heard of it otherwise.

It is now time to consider the oral system in its final result. The Prince of Philosophers has laid down the maxim, and it is universally accepted that in every undertaking we are to keep the end in view, and that the end must be the rule of everything else. (*Respice finem. Finis regula ceterorum.*) In applying this test we are to bear in mind that the oral system proposes to itself as its end to deliver the deaf-mute from the misery of his condition by giving him speech to speak like the rest of mankind, and substituting sight-seeing for hearing by means of lip-reading. Let us see how this two-fold end is attained, and what advantage it presents in comparison with the system of methodic manual signs. For this purpose we will place in juxtaposition the pupils of both systems, as they have left their respective Institutions; and we are to suppose that, for the most part, trades or labour is their allotment in after-life. In the comparison, we are to recollect that the oralist has had a longer, a more expensive, and more laborious course of training, and that he must have had special aptitudes, leaving behind him so many others, who were considered as belonging to a backward class, for whom the system is not suitable.

We will first take account of lip-reading. It can be available, at best, only to a very limited extent. Let us suppose two of these oralists going along a street together. As walking together they can hold no conversation with each other upon anything that comes under their notice, or any other subject, for the obvious reason that they cannot see each other's lips. In so far the sign-taught pupil has a great advantage when walking with a fellow pupil. They converse freely, and understand each other perfectly.

If we suppose the oralist has for companion, not a fellow pupil, but an ordinary speaking person, his case is somewhat, but very little, better. He can speak to the latter, but the latter cannot reply to him, for the same reason as before, that neither can see the lips of the other, since both are walking along together.

Let us make another supposition, and imagine the oralist in

company with a number of ordinary people holding conversation with each other. What share can he have by his lip-reading in their conversation? In the first place he may not be accustomed to them, and, therefore, he cannot, as we have already seen, understand them in the current of their conversation. In the next place, not hearing them, how is he to know by looking with rapid glances on the right and left, who is speaking in the constant interchanges of one with another in the company? And in the third place, since the lips of the speakers are to him as a reading-book, how is it to be expected that on his account the company will hold themselves in a state of immobility, in order that he may read their lips as they speak, for this condition is insisted upon by the advocates of the system, and is obviously necessary from the nature of the case.

Let us shift the scene, and view him in the workshop, or at some employment, in company with others. His lip-reading can be of very little use to him. How can it be supposed that his companions will, at every moment, interrupt their work in order to afford him the advantage of looking into their faces and seeing too the motion of their lips? And to engage his attention, as their joint work may require, must they not have recourse in the first instance to signs of some sort for the purpose before attempting to speak to him? His lip-reading gives him in such circumstances very little advantage over the sign-taught deaf-mute, inasmuch as people at trade or labour employments have very little time or occasion to speak to each other, and for the limited range of their work they all understand the signs of their silent companion, and he theirs, in a few days. In fact, it may be said that their joint work is a medium of interpretation between them; and if it happen that there is any number of so taught deaf mutes together at the same employment, they understand each other as well by their signs as speaking people by their speech, an advantage they have over a number of oralists, who have no methodic signs for inter-communication. In family life, too, the sign-taught deaf mute has a similar advantage over the other, in case, as it so often unhappily occurs, there be several members of the family similarly affected.

We come now to speak of the oralist as having been taught to speak. This is the boasted triumph of the system, that it gives speech to the dumb, and therefore is to be hailed as infinitely transcending the old sign-system. But we must not allow ourselves to be unfairly hurried to a conclusion. Here we stand on level ground with the advocates and promoters of this system, and understanding the full meaning of our question, we venture to inquire what sort of

speech, and what sort of voice do they impart to the deaf and dumb? Is it not a husky, metallic, guttural voice, a voice without inflexion or modulation, a voice destitute of the accents distinguishing the voice of mankind? In so describing the sort of voice the oralist pupil acquires after eight years of incessant labour on his own part, and equally incessant labour on the part of his master, we only use the words elsewhere quoted of a distinguished member of the French Academy, who has made the human voice a special study. And have we not seen at Limoges, how an assembly, whilst applauding the exhibition of four pupils taught the oral system in the National Institution of Paris, and particularly selected for the occasion, were painfully impressed at witnessing the distressing efforts of the pupils to fetch up their poor voices from the depths of their throat? But what becomes of this voice, this husky, this guttural, this metallic voice—what becomes of it? The poor objects themselves are distressed in using it, and they see others distressed in listening to them. As a consequence both speakers and listeners become tired and dissatisfied with each other, and the speaking soon comes to an end, whereas the sign-taught deaf mute retains his signs, and uses them as a complete language with his deaf mute companions, at the same time that he finds them sufficient to indicate his wants and wishes in family life, as also in the limited circle of his workmates in the same trade and employment in which he earns his daily bread.

To sum up, therefore, what we have learned from the *International Review*, we think ourselves warranted in setting down the following conclusions respecting the oral system:—

1st. That it is not suitable to a general school, requiring, as it does, special aptitudes in its pupils, and rejecting large numbers who are capable of being taught the sign-system.

2ndly. That it requires a longer time, eight years instead of six, and, therefore, is so much more expensive.

3rdly. That to be uniform, which is an object universally called for, training schools are necessary for the teachers.

4thly. Religious communities are thereby excluded, and it is not seen how female teachers can avail themselves at all of such training.

5thly. If female teachers are excluded, how can female deaf mutes be taught, considering the process of teaching laid down.

6thly. The system requires a much larger number of teachers, not only on account of the longer course of training, but because of the small number of pupils each teacher can have charge of, and on this account, too, it is so much more expensive.

7thly. Intellectual work is for a considerable time interdicted, in order to make the child speak, as far as the effort is possible, and for the same reason the use of signs is prohibited during recreation to the great detriment of health at that tender age, whilst, at the same time, the pupils are deprived of the advantage of cultivating each other's minds by interchange of ideas and sentiments, at a time when the young mind is susceptible of most valuable culture by association with children of the same ages.

8thly. And as the pupils after eight years in the institution pass into the world at large, they cannot understand the lip-movements of others, their case being pretty much like that of those who have learned a foreign language theoretically, but cannot understand it, as they hear it spoken.

9thly. And whilst they do not understand others in looking at their lips, so others have great difficulty, and feel great pain, in endeavouring to understand them.

10thly. As a consequence both lip-reading and speaking come soon to an end, and, as a final result, the pupils have neither signs nor speech, and are, therefore, more destitute than the pupils of the methodic sign-system,

11thly. To prevent such a result the friends of the oral system are endeavouring to find out some plan, according to which the pupils, in their transition from school to the world at large, may be accustomed by degrees under special superintendence to associate with others, and maintain, at the same time, their lip-reading and speech. But it may be said, "*hoc opus, hic labor est,*" and, so far, no such expedient has been discovered.

12thly.—On the whole, applying the philosopher's text, "*Respice finem—finis regula ceterorum,*" the oral system is by no means a success, nor does it appear likely to succeed for the end to which it aspires, and apart from every other reason, the wide divergences and opposite views and methods of its advocates and promoters should appear to force upon us this conclusion as irresistible.

THE AUTHOR OF "CLAIMS OF THE UNINSTRUCTED DEAF-MUTE TO BE ADMITTED TO THE SACRAMENTS," AND OF "THE VINDICATION OF THE SAID CLAIMS."

POSTSCRIPT.—Since the preceding pages have been written, I have had a communication from the respected Chaplain of Cabra Institution, who, speaking of the oral system, says:—"Two children, with much more than ordinary intelligence, came to us after having spent seven years in an oral system school in Belgium, not only

unable to speak, or read the lips of anyone, but quite unable to write or understand the simplest words, knowing nothing of their prayers or catechism. Why were these children sent to Belgium? Their father, who is still living, told me it was a Priest that recommended him to send them to a school, where they would be taught to speak."

My reverend correspondent further speaks of another case, respecting which he says:—"It is only three weeks ago since I got the address of a Catholic boy, who had been recently sent to the Belfast Presbyterian School, solely because the father, having heard of the oral system, wished to have his boy learn to speak."

Such, naturally, is the great desire of parents to have these poor objects taught to speak, and in a manner to hear by lip-reading; but how sad to consider their delusion and the disappointment of their fond wishes, as their poor children return almost as destitute of instruction as when leaving them for the Institution!

* * * We have received from Rev. Dr. Campbell, O. Cist., a reply to Fr. Lockhart's letter on the Rosminian Philosophy, but as we announced the closing of the discussion, we would ask Dr. Campbell not to urge us to re-open it at present.—Ed. I. E. R.

DOCUMENTS.

BEATIFICATION OF THE FIFTY-FOUR ENGLISH MARTYRS.¹

DECREE OF THE CONGREGATION OF SACRED RITES, CONFIRMING THE HONOUR GIVEN TO THE BLESSED MARTYRS JOHN CARDINAL FISHER, THOMAS MORE, AND OTHERS, PUT TO DEATH IN ENGLAND FOR THE FAITH, FROM THE YEAR 1535 TO 1583.

Anglia, Sanctorum insula ac Deiparae Virginis dos olim appellata, quemadmodum a primis usque Ecclesiae saeculis plurimorum Martyrum Passionibus illustrata fuerat, ita etiam cum diro schismate a Romanae Sedis obedientia et communione saeculo XVI. avulsa est, eorum testimonio non caruit, qui *pro hujus Sedis dignitate et orthodoxae Fidei veritate vitas suas cum sanguine ponere non dubitarunt* (Gregorius XIII., Constit. *Quoniam divinae bonitati*. Kalendis Maii, 1579). Huic praeclarissimae catervae nihil penitus deest quod eam tum compleat, tum ornet: non purpurae romanae majestas, non venerabilis Episcoporum honor, non Cleri utriusque fortitudo, non

¹ We are indebted to the kindness of the Very Rev. Canon Johnson, Secretary to His Eminence Cardinal Manning, for an authenticated copy of this important document.

sexus infirmioris inexpugnabilis firmitas. Hos inter eminent JOANNES FISHER Episcopus Roffensis, et S. R. E. Cardinalis, quem in suis Litteris Paulus III. appellat *sanctitate conspicuum, doctrina celebrem, aetate venerabilem, illius regni ac totius ubique Cleri decus et ornamentum*. A quo sejungi nequit vir saecularis THOMAS MORE Angliae Cancellarius, quem idem Pontifex meritis extollit laudibus, utpote *doctrina litterarum sacrarum excellentem, et veritatem adserere ausum*. Idecirco praeclarissimi quique rerum ecclesiasticarum scriptores unanimi censent calculo eos omnes pro tuenda, restituenda, et conservanda Catholica Fide sanguinem fudisse. Quin etiam Gregorius XIII. plura in eorum honorem indulsit, quae ad publicum ecclesiasticumque cultum pertinent; atque illud praecipuum, ut potestatem fecerit horum lipsana in consecrandis altaribus adhibendi, quando illa veterum Sanctorum Martyrum non suppeterent. Praeterea postquam in Templo S. Stephani ad Coelium montem Christi Martyrum Passiones per Nicolaum Circinianum udo tectorio pingi fecisset; permisit etiam, ut in Templo Sanctissimae Trinitatis Anglorum de Urbe, ab eodem auctore, eademque ratione Anglicanae Ecclesiae Martyres antiqui recentiorisque aevi pariter exhiberentur, quos inter illi etiam qui ab anno 1535 ad 1583 sub Henrico Rege et Elisabetha pro Catholica Fide ac Romani Pontificis Primatu mortem obierant. Quae martyriorum repraesentationes eo in Templo depictae, videntibus ac probantibus Romanis Pontificibus Gregorii Successoribus, ad duo saecula permanserunt, donec nefariorum hominum injuria sub finem elapsi saeculi perierunt. Mansere tamen illarum ectypa: quippe anno 1584 Romae cum privilegio ejusdem Gregorii XIII. aere cusa fuerant, hoc apposito titulo: *Sanctorum Martyrum, qui pro Christo, Catholicaeque Fidei veritate asserenda antiquo recentiorique persecutionum tempore mortem in Anglia subierunt, Passiones*. Ex quo monumento, sive ob subjectum elogium, sive ob alia indubia indicia, plures ejusmodi Martyres suo nomine comperti sunt, nempe quinquaginta quatuor. Sunt autem,—

Passi sub Henrico Rege: *Joannes Fisher*, Episcopus Roffensis, S. R. E. Cardinalis; *Thomas More*, Angliae Cancellarius; *Margarita Pole*, Comitissa Salisburiensis, Cardinalis Poli mater; *Ricardus Reynolds*, Ordinis S. Birgittae; *Joannes Haile*, Sacerdos; octodecim Carthusiani,—nimirum, *Joannes Houghton*, *Augustinus Webster*, *Robertus Laurence*, *Gulielmus Exmew*, *Humphredus Middlemore*, *Sebastianus Newdigate*, *Joannes Rochester*, *Jacobus Walworth*, *Gulielmus Greenwood*, *Joannes Davy*, *Robertus Salt*, *Gualterus Pierson*, *Thomas Green*, *Thomas Scryven*, *Thomas Redyng*, *Thomas Johnson*,

Ricardus Bere, et Gulielmus Horne; Joannes Forest, Sacerdos Ordinis S. Francisci; Joannes Stone, Ordinis S. Augustini; quatuor Sacerdotes Saeculares,—Thomas Abel, Eduardus Powel, Ricardus Fetherston, Joannes Larke; Germanus Gardiner, laicus.

Sub Elisabetha vero: Sacerdotes,—*Cuthbertus Mayne, Joannes Nelson, Everardus Hanse, Rodulphus Sherwin, Joannes Payne, Thomas Ford, Joannes Skert, Robertus Johnson, Gulielmus Fyllby, Lucas Kirby, Laurentius Richardson, Gulielmus Lacy, Ricardus Kirkman, Jacobus Hudson, seu Tompson, Gulielmus Hart, Ricardus Thirkeld, Thomas Woodhouse, et — Plumtree. Item tres Sacerdotes e Societate Jesu. Edmundus Campion, Alexander Briant, et Thomas Cottam. Denique, Joannes Storey, Juris utriusque Doctor; Joannes Felton, et Thomas Sherwood, laici.*

Horum tamen Martyrum causa ad haec usque tempora nunquam agitari coeperat. Olim quidem, 1860, cl. me. Cardinalis Nicolaus Wiseman Archiepiscopus Westmonasteriensis, aliique Angliae Episcopi, sa. me. Pio IX. Pontifici Maximo preces obtulerant, ut per totam Angliam Festum institueretur in honorem omnium Sanctorum Martyrum, nempe illorum etiam, *qui licet nondum vindicati, recentioribus temporibus pro Catholica Religione tuenda, et praesertim pro auctoritate Sedis Apostolicae asserenda, per nefariorum hominum manus occubuerunt, et ad sanguinem usque restiterunt.* Verumtamen cum, juxta vigentem Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis praxim, Festum nonnisi de illis Dei Famulis institui possit, quibus ecclesiasticus cultus a Sede Apostolica jam delatus, et rite recognitus fuerit, preces illae nullum effectum sortitae sunt. Quapropter postremis hisce annis novae preces per Emum. ac Rmum. Dnum. Cardinalem Henricum Manning, hodiernum Archiepiscopum Westmonasteriensem, et alios Angliae Episcopos, ad Sanctissimum Dominum Nostrum LEONEM XIII. Pontificem Maximum delatae sunt, una cum Ordinario Processu in Anglia confecto, aliisque authenticis documentis, in quibus tum probationes Martyrii pro iis qui ab anno 1535 ad 1583 passi sunt, tum etiam praedieta indulta Romanorum Pontificum pro prioribus illis nuper memoratis continentur.

Placuit Sanctissimo Domino Nostro totius negotii cognitionem Peculiari Coetui aliquot S. R. E. Cardinalium, et Officialium Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis committere; praevia Exegesi per R. P. D. Augustinum Caprara S. Fidei Promotorem conficienda. Qua in Particulari Congregatione die 4 Decembris labentis anni ad Vaticanum coadunata, infrascriptus Cardinalis Dominicus Bartolini eidem S. Congregationi Praefectus, et Causae Relator, sequens proposuit Dubium:

“*An propter peculiaria Romanorum Pontificum indulta, relate ad antiquiores Angliae Martyres, qui ab anno 1535 ad 1583, pro Fide Catholica, et pro Romani Pontificis in Ecclesia Primatu mortem obierunt, et quorum Passiones, auctoritate Gregorii XIII. Pont. Max., in Templo SSmae. Trinitatis Anglorum de Urbe olim depictae, et Romae anno 1584, cum privilegio ejusdem Pontificis, aere cusae sunt, constet de indulto publico ecclesiastico cultu, sive de casu excepto a Decretis sa. me. Urbani Papae VIII., in casu et ad effectum de quo agitur.*”
 Emi. porro ac Rmi. Patres, et Praelati Officiales, audito scripto et voce praefato S. Fidei Promotore, reque mature discussa quoad recensitos quinquaginta quatuor Martyres, respondendum consuerunt: “*Affirmative, seu Constare de casu excepto.*”

Super quibus omnibus facta Sanctissimo Domino Nostro LEONI PAPAE XIII. per me subscriptum Secretarium fideli relatione, idem Sanctissimus Dominus Noster sententiam Sacrae Congregationis Particularis approbare dignatus est. Die 9 Decembris 1886.

Praesens autem Decretum expeditum fuit hac die 29 Decembris sacra Thomae Episcopo Cantuariensi Martyri, cujus fidem et constantiam hi Beati Martyres tam strenue imitati sunt.

D. CARDINALIS BARTOLINIUS,
S. R. C. Praefectus.

L. ✠ S.

LAURENTIUS SALVATI,
S. R. C. Secretarius.

DECREES OF THE S. CONGREGATION OF INDULGENCES.

SUMMARY.

An Indulgence of 300 days, which may be gained *semel tantum in die*, has been granted to the recitation of the Litany of the Sacred Name of Jesus.

Heretofore it was necessary for each Bishop to apply for this Indulgence for the people of his diocese; now the grant is made absolute and general. The Litany indulgenced, is that which was approved by Pius IX. in June, 1862, and is printed in our ordinary prayer books.

EX S. CONGREGATIONE INDULGENTIARUM.

DECRETUM URBIS ET ORBIS.

Sanctissimum Jesu Nomen semper et ubique terrarum praecipua veneratione et singulari prorsus honore Christifideles prosequuti sunt; non enim aliud nomen est sub coelo datum hominibus, in quo oporteat

nos salvos fieri (Actor. IV., 12). Ad hanc venerationis et honoris significationem, plurima religionis obsequia plurimasque laudes pietas christiana excogitavit, quibus Nomen augustissimum digne et sancte celebraretur.

Hisce profecto accensendae sunt plures Litaniae in honorem SSmi. Nominis Jesu compositae, quae, licet non omnes probabiles, late tamen per orbem diffusae sunt. In quorum praeconiorum genere ne varietas haberetur haud undequaque laudabilis, sa. mem. Summus Pontifex Pius IX. *Litaniae Sanctissimi Nominis Jesu*, quae unice in posterum retinerentur ab omnibus Christifidelibus, per Sacrum Consilium legitimis ritibus tuendis, die 8 Junii 1862, approbavit, fecitque eidem Sacro Consilio facultatem declarandi, Christifidelibus, qui eas devote recitaverint, Indulgentiam trecentorum dierum in forma Ecclesiae consueta concessum iri, quando SS. Antistites pro sua quisque dioecesi hanc gratiam speciatim petissent.

Quum autem nuperrime a pluribus Episcopis SSmo. D. N. Leoni divina providentia Papae XIII. preces exhibitae fuerint, ut suarum dioecesium Christifidelibus praefatas *Litaniae* recitantibus ipsam hanc Indulgentiam elargiri dignaretur, Sanctitas Sua desiderans, ut christiani populi pietas erga laudabile Jesu Nomen magis magisque foveatur et augeatur devotio, hisce potissimum temporibus, quibus Nomen illud augustissimum tam audacter tamque frequenter impiorum injuriis impetitur, in Audientia habita die 16 Januarii 1886 ab infra-scripto Secretario Sac. Congregationis Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praepositae, ad omnes utriusque sexus Christifideles, qui corde saltem contrito ac devote recitaverint *Litaniae Sanctissimi Nominis Jesu*, prouti praesenti Decreto subnectuntur et non aliter, praefatam Indulgentiam *tercentum dierum*, animabus quoque Purgatorii applicabilem et semel tantum in die lucrandam, benigne extendit. Quam gratiam Sanctitas Sua *in perpetuum* suffragari voluit et absque ulla Brevis expeditione. Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria S. Congregationis Indulgentiarum et SS. Reliquiarum die 16 mensis Januarii anni 1886.

I. B. CARD. FRANZELIN, *Praefectus*.

FRANCISCUS DELLA VOLPE, *Secretarius*.

INDULGENCED FORM OF DAILY OFFERING.

SUMMARY.

Indulgence of 100 days, *semel in die*, granted to the recital of the following form of daily offering in honour of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, and the Holy Heart of Mary.

FORMULA RECTAE INTENTIONIS.

“Domine Jesu Christe, in unione illius divinae intentionis, qua Ipse in terris per sacratissimum Cor tuum laudes Deo persolvisti, et nunc continenter in Sanctissimo Eucharistiae Sacramento ubique terrarum persolvis usque ad consummationem saeculi, ego per hanc diem integram, nulla minima parte excepta, ad imitationem Sacratissimi Cordis B. Mariae semper Virginis Immaculatae, tibi offero omnes meas intentiones et cogitationes, omnes meos affectus et desideria, omnia mea opera et verba.”

SSmus. Dnus. Noster Leo Papa XIII. in audientia habita die 19 Decembris 1885 ab infrascripto Secretario S. Congregationis Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praepositae, benigne concessit Indulgentiam centum dierum, semel in die lucranda ab omnibus utriusque sexus Christifidelibus, qui, corde saltem contrito, exhibitam precem devote recitaverint. Praesenti in perpetuum valituro absque ulla Brevis expeditione. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Datum ex Secretaria ejusdem S. Congregationis die 19 Decembris 1885.

I. B. CARD. FRANZELIN, *Praefectus*.

FRANCISCUS DELLA VOLPE, *Secretarius*.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

THE BATTLE OF THE FAITH IN IRELAND. By Canon O'Rourke, P.P., M.R.I.A. Dublin: Duffy & Sons. 1887.

IF it be true that false history, no less than false swearing should be stigmatized as a conspiracy against truth, it must also be acknowledged that, for detecting and exposing so base a purpose, no means is more effective than the sacred character of an oath, invested with the required conditions of truth, justice, and judgment, or the evidence of trustworthy history, as the faithful guardian of the records of the past. To discriminate between the truth and falsehood of historical statements, and ascertain what is certain, or doubtful, or groundless in a narrative that passes for history, especially when statements are conflicting, and great issues are involved, is the grave and solemn duty of a writer whose characteristic qualifications should be candour, honesty, and fidelity. Not unmoved by these, or somewhat similar reflections, and knowing the value of a Nation's history, without which as Mr. Sexton lately observed, there could be no National aspirations,

the author of "The Battle of the Faith in Ireland," on finding in the records of the political and religious relations of Ireland with England, from the reign of Henry VIII. to the present day, much that is not sufficiently known, and much that is not truly stated, carefully reviewed the story of that long and eventful period.

In the performance of this arduous task he has corrected many errors, exhibited important events in a clearer light, and presented in an attractive form the results of wide and careful research. Nor can the reader fail to be convinced that the learned Canon's investigations have been conducted with evident impartiality, judicial calmness, and critical acumen.

"The Battle of the Faith in Ireland" is not designed as a complete history of Ireland for the period of which it treats. "His object," writes the author in the preface, "was to cull from the materials before him, such historical facts as, on the one hand, would serve to show the wily astuteness and unflagging energy with which the enemies of the Catholic Faith carried on their work, and on the other, the continuous battle that was waged against them—a battle sometimes well planned and successful—often desultory, ill-directed, and ending in disaster, but never abandoned." Though the scope of the author does not embrace the history of the period in its completeness, he has contrived to introduce, in subordination to his plan, most of the instructive and interesting materials which make up the staple of such a history. The great events of the period, such as the Plantation of Munster and Ulster, the War of 1641, Cromwell's career in Ireland, the two sieges of Limerick—and battles, whether in a military sense, such as Benburb and Rathmines, or of a different kind—the battles of Legislation, Education, and Proselytism—are treated with great fulness, and a thoroughness which bespeaks the most searching inquiry.

In a brief notice of a work of 600 pages, dealing with the more important events, and numerous minor incidents of the history of Ireland during four hundred years, all that can be aimed at is to invite attention to the character of the work, and to the claims of the writer to be heard in the cause he so ably pleads, with some analysis of the various and complex subjects it comprises. The character of the work has been defined in the text of the preface already cited. Of the claims of the author we must not presume to speak, leaving to the reader to form the only judgment at which he can arrive by resting on the evidence which the work itself so abundantly affords. We pass, then, to a brief analysis of some of the contents.

The work is divided into twenty-five chapters, with valuable foot-notes, and three appendices. In the earlier chapters is contained an account of the measures taken by Henry VIII. and Elizabeth to uproot

Catholicity in Ireland, of the failure of George Browne's episcopate, of the persecuting laws of Elizabeth of the terrible enactments of the Irish Parliament of 1559-60, and of the "Plantation of Munster." The sketch of the career of Miler Magrath and the description of the reception of the young Earl of Desmond in Munster, are sure to be read with a lively interest. The third chapter in which the savage cruelty of the persecutors, and the appalling sufferings of the Martyrs who cheerfully died for the Faith, are vividly depicted, whilst inspiring us with horror of the guilt and brutality of the subtle and bloodthirsty enemies of the true Church, must awaken in us a feeling of love and veneration for the heroic fortitude of the victims, and of deep thankfulness to God in having supported with his grace, for their benefit and ours, those noble sons of St. Patrick in the fearful ordeal to which they were subjected.

The author proceeds to describe the condition of Catholics under James I., the Confiscation and Plantation of Ulster, and the Irish Court of Wards. The episode relating to the Geraldines is full of interest, and is, indeed, a good specimen of the care and skill of the writer in investigating facts, and weighing the evidence bearing upon them. The condition of the Catholics under Charles I., and an account of the "Graces" and of the Galway Grand Jury are given in chapter vii.

We regret that our limits do not admit of more than a mere reference to the greatest events with which the author had to deal: the War of 1641, the Confederation of Kilkenny, Cromwell's Campaign in Ireland, and the Cromwellian Settlement. Our regret is the greater by reason of the importance of these subjects, and on account of the impress of the master-hand with which the labour, the learning, and the ability of the author have enabled him to set them forth. New light shed on several obscure points, important links supplied, misstatements corrected and exposed, and a just interpretation of significant facts are some of the features which we cannot fail to observe in the vivid picture he has given us of a period when the Faith of Ireland was cruelly persecuted and all hopes of National life well nigh extinguished.

For the important events relating to the Catholics of Ireland during the Restoration, and in the reigns of the Sovereigns of England since the death of Charles II., we must refer the reader to the work under notice.

Before bringing our remarks to a close we desire to direct attention to the exposure, coming so opportunely, of "Souperism," and of sham discussions and other honourable courses of proselytism, derived by the author from sources which are beyond suspicion.

Were we to refer to the style of the writer and find a place for a

specimen of his powers in word-painting, we should not hesitate about culling extracts from chapter xvii., where the character of Cromwell is drawn with touches that bring us into the living presence of the man—hero, or hypocrite, as he is variously estimated by friend and foe.

From one purport of the author we withhold assent—that of his leaving to others the “interesting field of Irish History and Catholic effort which surrounds Emancipation.” For may it not be permitted to us to hope that the good Providence that has restored the health of the gifted author of “The Battle of the Faith in Ireland” will preserve him for the accomplishment of the task he has assigned to others?

The Battle of the Faith in Ireland still continues. The weapons are altered in some respects, but the warfare is still carried on and will continue to the end. In the conflict between truth and error we are furnished with a new equipment for the combat in the records of the heroic defence of Catholic Faith in Ireland, and of the baffled attempts to crush it. For this acquisition we owe a deep debt of gratitude to the accomplished author, and we feel assured that “The Battle of the Faith in Ireland” will be welcomed as a great boon, not only by every one who loves Ireland and the Faith of St. Patrick, but also by every scholar who is anxious to know the true story of Ireland in some of its gravest aspects, or may care to interpret the present condition of the country by the indispensable aid of a retrospect of its condition in the past.

D. G.

THE LIFE OF ANTONIO ROSMINI SERBATI, FOUNDER OF THE INSTITUTE OF CHARITY. Edited by William Lockhart, Graduate of Oxford, Exeter College. Second Edition, in two volumes. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1886. 8vo.

THIS Life of the celebrated and holy Founder of the Order of Charity had been originally undertaken by another compiler, who lived only to complete and publish a first volume. It soon got into circulation, and a new edition was required by the reading public. It then devolved on the distinguished Procurator of the Order in Rome and Rector of St. Etheldreda's, London, to supply the want; accordingly the Life, as already issued, has been recast, while the first volume was reprinted and republished together with the second volume, in a type elegant and clear, as also in a smaller and less expensive form.

The subject of this biography was truly a great and a good man, born towards the close of the last century, and the scion of a noble family that lived at Rovereto, among the Tyrolese Alps. The period of his birth was marked by the first invasion of the French under

Napoleon Bonaparte. Already has appeared in the Italian language the work of Don Paoli, "Della Vita di Antonio Rosmini Serbati," published at Rome in 1830, while Tomaseo and various other writers have issued different memoirs treating about his career, writings and acts. From these and from independent sources of information, Father Lockhart has been enabled to prepare a more exhaustive biography in the English language, cast in a methodical shape, and graced with a style of composition to be expected from his literary training and cultivated mind. He labours, indeed, under the disadvantage of not having known the subject of his memoir personally, although living contemporaneously with him; however, the biographer has had not only the trustworthy testimonies and traditions of those intimately acquainted with the Founder of his Order, but even he has gleaned those anecdotal reminiscences of Rosmini, which were communicated by familiars and confidants. The hidden life and the life of action are both clearly portrayed, and the result furnishes a finished portrait of a noble and most interesting character.

From early youth to the close of his eventful days, Rosmini loved to labour with thorough self-devotedness for his own sanctification and for the welfare of his fellow-man. Ardent and persevering, he was always engaged on some project to promote God's greater glory, the extension of His kingdom on earth, and the triumph of religion over the insidious and unscrupulous efforts of the enemies of Holy Church. Truth he honestly and fearlessly loved for her own sake, while his philosophical and theological studies were directed to render her form more attractive and useful in an age when scepticism and cynicism so generally abound, and when pedantic opinion or conceited dogmatisms seems to suffice for the acceptance even of educated men.

Rosmini has written many learned works which have given rise to criticisms and controversies in the schools and in public journals, but we do not think that this is the place for the discussion of so profound and large a subject. If discussed at all it should be treated with a completeness, which must be impossible in the short space ordinarily allowed for a notice of a book. It may be well to state, moreover, that Our Holy Father, Pope Leo XIII., in a Letter addressed to the Archbishops of Lombardy and Piedmont, dated January, 1882, and referring to Rosmini, urges them to influence Catholic journals "from discussing questions which endanger peace among Catholics concerning the doctrines of an illustrious philosopher, one of the most renowned among modern writers." This is indeed a glowing tribute of admiration from the Sovereign Pontiff.

Not the least important section of the biography refers to the conception and establishment of that Religious Order in the Church, with which the name of Rosmini is inseparably connected. Trials and persecutions were borne with patience and fortitude, until the Rules and Constitutions framed with judgment and prudence were accepted and approved by the Holy See. Again, the course of public affairs during the exciting Revolutions of 1848 and 1849 in Italy, obliged him to occupy a prominent position; and the details contained in Father Lockhart's work have added a chapter to the history of the Papal States and of the Church hitherto, we believe, unwritten. Antonio Rosmini departed this life on the 1st of July, 1855. Having lived in a singularly holy manner, his charity and humility were most conspicuous during his last illness, and at his dying moments. His remains now repose at Stessa, in the College Chapel, where at present may be seen that beautiful marble statue, depicted in a frontispiece to the second volume, a fine steel engraved portrait and an autograph of Rosmini adorning the first volume. The history of his foundations, and especially that recording the English Mission of the Fathers of Charity, abounds in matters of incident and edification. We in Ireland have profited by the labours of the Fathers of Charity, and the saintly Gentili gave his life for us in the cause of charity. His remains repose in Glasnevin Cemetery, where, after a lapse of forty years, the Catholic people of Dublin look with deep veneration on his tomb.

Nor must we omit to mention, what his own humility would feign conceal, that Father Lockhart himself conducted most successful missions in Ireland, after Father Gentili had passed to his eternal reward. A truer friend to the Irish poor and to the cause of Ireland in London does not exist, while his large-hearted sympathies and efforts are ever exercised most actively in every good work, tending to promote education, morality, and religion. His eloquence and his writings need no encomium. And while we close with these words, we can heartily congratulate him on this latest literary labour of love. It is a valuable addition to the very best works of Catholic biography, well designed and well ordered, clear in statement as in style, accurate in dates and historical incidents, intuitive of motives and appreciative of intellectual development. The author presents the results of his research and discrimination, with the generous sensibility and veneration for his eminent and saintly founder, so becoming and expected from him, while justly due to his illustrious subject.

J. O'HANLON.

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

MARCH, 1887.

SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.—II.

DIFFICULTIES, as we have seen, which seemed to render the assembling of a General Council impossible, rapidly sprang up. To all appearances the Church in one of the greatest conflicts of her eventful history, was to be deprived through the temper and condition of the age, of the assistance and guidance of the assemblage of her pastors. Nor was the Council of Trent singular in this respect, it only exhibited a striking similarity with the other great œcumenical gatherings of the Church of Christ. Difficulties in every century stood in the way of councils. The persecutions of the first three centuries rendered it impossible for the collective body of bishops to meet, and their assemblages in after ages were possible only when the obstacles that thronged their path had been surmounted. One may wonder at this, yet when he considers the immense advantages that accrue to the Church from her Councils; when he looks back on the peace and tranquility which they have produced, his wonder must cease; he cannot be surprised that the Church has experienced bitter opposition in combating and defeating the defiant enemies to whom age after age has given birth.

When, however, the peculiar state of the Christian world in the middle of the sixteenth century is taken into account, we must expect to see obstacles of a peculiar nature, to be surmounted only by untiring and well-directed zeal. We

must expect to find protracted negotiations, often interrupted, often failing. We cannot trace in detail the varying phases of these endeavours to assemble the Council; nor can we attempt to touch upon, except lightly, the rivalries of princes, the wars, public calamities, and other events which had a more or less intimate relation with the convocation of the Council. For the fuller treatment of these, and other matters to be noticed hereafter, we can only refer the reader to the standard accounts of Pallavicino, or to the excellent Work of the Rev. J. Waterworth. Indeed we almost feel that some apology is due for having introduced in our former paper so many details of negotiations connected with the first preparatory stages of the Council. To omit such details altogether might lead the uninitiated to suppose that the work of assembling the body of bishops was one of no great difficulty. Yet, having given a specimen of the protracted and multiplied forms which the preliminaries of the Council inevitably assumed, we must in future pass lightly over many particulars which could be introduced with advantage only in a formal history of the Council, and would assuredly be out of place in such a sketch as we have undertaken.

The new Pontiff, Paul III., was long favourably disposed towards the convocation of a General Council, and this disposition had no small influence in his election. Now that he had ascended the Papal throne, he was in a position to further a project upon which he had for many years looked with favour. In promoting the convocation of the Council, he had to meet with difficulties which proved that Clement had not exaggerated the obstacles to such an assembly. Paul treated these obstacles with such caution, that some writers charge him, without reason, with having created the difficulties which arose. His wishes for the Council are unwarrantably stigmatised as simulated; he consented, hostile writers tell us, to the convocation of a Council which he hoped would never be held. Yet from the beginning of his Pontificate his efforts for the convocation of the Council were unwearied. Though fresh obstacles sprung up year after year he was not discouraged. He persevered in his efforts, and after many years of anxious labour he had the

happiness of seeing these efforts crowned with the success they deserved.

Elected on the 13th of October, 1534, he held his first Consistory the 13th of November following. Here he declared his intention of convoking a Council, and of reforming discipline. Sure of the co-operation of the cardinals, he exhorted them to prepare by a reformation of themselves and of the entire Roman Court. He appointed a commission to draw up a scheme of reformation, and to the prelates composing this commission he gave power over every tribunal in Rome.

Anxious to secure the concurrence of the Princes of Europe, he sent nuncios to them. He summoned Vergerius¹ to Rome, and sent him on a special mission to Germany. His instructions were, to deliver the briefs to all the princes of the country, Protestant as well as Catholic, to invite them to the Council, yet not to mention those conditions of its convocation, which might be a source of unpleasantness. He was to treat only of the place where the Council was to be held.

The proposal of Mantua as the most convenient place for the Assembly of the Council was accepted by the Catholics, but rejected by the Protestants. The Protestant princes were upheld in their opposition to the Council by the kings of England and France. Henry refused to acknowledge any Council summoned by the Pope. Francis contended that, if Mantua were selected, Papal and Imperial interests would unduly prevail in a town situated in that part of Italy.

Paul was not discouraged in his enterprise, either by the ill success of the mission of Vergerius, or by the hostile disposition of the Protestants. Vergerius returns to Rome. About this time (April, 1536) the emperor arrived in Rome from Tunis. Vergerius made a verbal report of the state of Germany to the Emperor and to the Pope. Charles had many interviews with Paul, and the result of these meetings was soon made known. At a consistory, Paul proposed the convocation of the Council for Mantua, a fief of the empire;

¹ Peter Paul Vergerius, Bishop of Capo d'Istria. He and his brother, J. B. Vergerius, Bishop of Pola, in Istria, fell away from the Faith. Peter Paul died at Tübingen, 1565. *Vide Feller.*

a city against which no reasonable objections could be made by the German princes. The cardinals assented to the proposal. The Bull of convocation was prepared and approved, and published in the beginning of June, 1536, summoning the Council to meet on the 23rd of May, 1537, at Mantua, for the extirpation of heresy, for the establishment of peace in the Church, and for devising means to resist the encroachments of the infidels.

The Pope sent Nuncios to the various countries of Europe, to make known the glad tidings of the convocation of the Council. Everywhere the news of the coming Council was received with manifestations of unbounded joy, but nowhere was the convocation of the long-wished-for Council received with sentiments of deeper gratitude than in Germany. Long a prey to religious troubles, the Catholics of Germany saw at length a prospect of peace for their Church. But the Protestants were far from joining in the manifestations of gratitude of their Catholic fellow-countrymen. Assembling at Smalkald, in February, 1537, they drew up the pretexts upon which they rejected the proposed Council. The Papal Nuncio and the Envoy of the Emperor endeavoured to persuade them to accept the Council. Yet, though the weakness of their pretexts was clearly demonstrated, they persevered in their opposition. With these princes the King of England made common cause. Having broken away from the centre of unity, he soon persuaded himself that to princes alone pertained the right of summoning Councils and that the claims of the Holy See to that power were completely groundless.

These difficulties, long foreseen by Paul, had no effect on the preparations for the Council. The obstinacy of the Protestants surprised no one. Not so, however, the action of the Duke of Mantua. He demanded that the Pope should maintain in Mantua, at the expense of the Holy See, a guard of one hundred and fifty infantry and one hundred cavalry to prevent any disorder arising from the gathering of strangers to the Council. The Pontiff, for many reasons, rejected this unexpected demand, and broke off the arrangement for Mantua. New difficulties arose in the choice of another city, and Paul

compelled by the force of circumstances, prorogued the Council until November, 1537. To select a suitable city had become a matter of the greatest difficulty. Whilst Ferdinand wished that a city within the limits of the empire should be selected, Francis declared, that neither he nor his representatives would attend a Council held in a feudatory city of the Empire. The Christian Princes of Europe, though recognizing the power of the Pope to convoke a Council, rendered that power of little avail by their objections to proposals of the Holy See. The difficulties thrown by them in the choice of a place would have rendered the Council impossible, had not Paul laboured to overcome all obstacles, with a perseverance that deserved to triumph.

Passing over the bloody war into which the rivalry of Charles and Francis plunged the half of Europe; the efforts, crowned with partial success, of the Queens of Hungary and France, to procure a peace; the negotiations which resulted in the choice of Vicenza, a city in Venetian territory; the preparations for the holding of the Council there; we come to the efforts which the aged Pontiff made to procure the blessing of a permanent peace, so necessary for the proposed Council. When his Nuncios failed, he determined to take upon himself the entire burden of negotiating a treaty. He had hopes that he would be more successful than his representatives had been. It was arranged that Charles should come to Savona, and that Francis should remain in the neighbourhood of Nice. Paul set out from Rome on his pacific mission. When he arrived at Piacenza, he was informed that, as yet, not a single bishop had come to Vicenza, and, as only a few days remained before the time appointed for the opening of the Council, a new prorogation was necessary. Paul continued on his mission, opened negotiations between the rival monarchs, but was unable to remove the obstacles that stood in the way of a permanent peace. After a month of unwearied efforts he prevailed on the two sovereigns to sign a truce for ten years, and, desiring to reap the fruit of this temporary peace, he summoned the Council for the Feast of Easter, 1539.

Fresh obstacles soon arose. Charles, lately so anxious for

the Council, saw that there was no hope that the Protestants would recognize it. The Council by condemning them, might embroil his empire in civil war. The Protestant Princes were united and determined. The foreign enemies of the empire were anxiously watching the course of events in Germany. Charles now wished to postpone the holding of the Council, and to make another effort to reconcile the Lutherans. At his request Paul sent a Legate to Germany. The mission, as the Pontiff had foreseen, proved a failure. All hopes of a conciliation were groundless; truth could not, without at once ceasing to be truth, concede anything to error. Negotiations, however, follow; but they did not bring the assembling of the long-wished-for Council nearer. Again and again is the opening postponed. At length, Paul, wearied with the opposition, resolved to make known to the Christian world the obstacles that lay in his way. He published a Bull declaring that the difficulties of the times, compelled him to prorogue the Council indefinitely, yet adding that he was most anxious to convoke it at the earliest possible opportunity.

Charles, having put down the rising in Ghent, again turned his attention to the reconciliation of the Lutherans. He summoned a diet to assemble at Spires in the month of May, 1540. As an epidemic broke out at Spires, he transferred the Diet to Haguenau, fifteen miles north of Strasburg. A colloquy began here, was continued at Worms and Ratisbon, during 1541 and 1542, and ended, as might be expected, in disappointment. The Diet opened at Spires, in February, 1542. In the next month the Nuncio of the Holy See arrived at Spires, and was introduced to the Diet. He laid before the assembly the offer of aid from Paul against the Turks, and the proposal of Ferrara, Mantua, Bologna, Cambrai and Trent, as places suitable for the Council. The Diet gratefully accepted the offer of aid against the Turks, and with regard to the Council, Ferdinand and the Catholic members of the Diet accepted Trent. The Lutherans at once protested against the selection of Trent, and against a Council presided over by the Pope.

Meanwhile active preparations were going on at Rome,

and, after long and mature deliberation, the Bull of Indiction for Trent was finally agreed upon. It was published on the feast of SS. Peter and Paul, convoking the Council for the 1st of November, 1542. It was now twenty-five years since Luther raised the standard of revolt, by affixing his famous ninety-five propositions to the door of the church attached to the Castle of Wittenberg.

The Sovereign Pontiff nominated three Legates to represent him at the Council and preside in his name. These were Cardinals Morone, Parisi and Pole. They received their commissions in October, and were instructed to make known to the Christian Princes their arrival in Trent; to affix to the doors of the cathedral the usual intimation of the convocation of the Council; but not to proceed with the Council until bishops had arrived from Spain, Italy, Germany and France.

The Legates received the Cross at Rome, the 20th of October, departed for Trent, and arrived there towards the close of November. Few bishops arrived before the Legates. Even after the Legates had arrived, only the bishops from Italy and some from Germany came up. The Nuncios in the various countries were repeatedly urged to send on the bishops; and a special Nuncio was sent to Germany for the same purpose. But neither the commands of the Pope, nor the exertions of the Nuncios could assemble the bishops of the Christian world. War had again broken out and the bishops could not travel.

The Emperor sent representatives to Trent; but soon recalled two of them, whom he sent to the Diet of Nuremberg. At this assembly the Catholic members entreated the Nuncio to beg of the Pope, in their name, to persevere in his purpose of assembling the Council. But the Protestants, faithful to their traditions, protested; blinded by prejudice, they would not listen to the convincing reasons of their Catholic colleagues.

For seven months the Legates waited in vain at Trent, expecting the return of the Emperor's representatives and the arrival of the bishops. None, however, came; even the bishops who had already arrived, not wishing further to

prolong a stay which appeared to them at least useless, returned to their dioceses. This state of things at Trent, the war bitterly raging between Charles and Francis, and the invasion of the Italian coasts by the Turkish fleet, made the further postponement of the Council inevitable. Paul brings to the memory of the Christian world the many efforts he had made to assemble the Council and suspends the convocation until happier times would permit the bishops to assemble.

Europe is plunged in deadly strife. The German Protestant Princes, bound together by a common purpose, compel Charles to suspend the Edicts of Worms and Augsburg. The Pontiff protests against this action; but to no avail. Political exigencies wrung from Charles concessions to these princes, which in times of peace he would never grant. War continues with ever varying fortune. All thoughts of a Council are now banished from Charles' mind in the prosecution of the war. But away in Rome, the Pontiff, ever anxious to guide safely the destinies committed to his care, is silently, yet energetically, working to procure a permanent peace—a peace which he rightly considers indispensable for the assembly of the Council. Yet his endeavours are long without fruit. Ill success does not daunt him; he perseveres, and soon found unexpected aid in his negotiations: Eleanor, sister of Charles and wife of Francis, trusting to the affectionate esteem in which she was held by the rival monarchs, interposed. Her efforts are successful. She succeeds in inducing the monarchs to consent to a peace, when all believed peace to be impossible. The conditions are soon arranged; and the peace for which Europe, whether Catholic or heretic, had so long prayed, was finally concluded at Crespy, September 18th, 1544.

The news of an event so unexpected and so anxiously desired, filled the aged Pontiff with joy. He ordered a solemn thanksgiving for so auspicious a peace, and sent messengers to congratulate the reconciled sovereigns. At length the Council was possible; peace would permit the bishops to travel, and Europe, secure in its long-awaited peace, could turn its attention to the evils that were

harassing the Church. The Council is summoned anew, with every prospect of a successful issue, to meet at Trent on the 25th of March, 1545.

Paul was now sensible that the real work of the coming Council was to begin. He confided to three of the most distinguished members of the Sacred College the duty of presiding. They were men in every way well fitted for an office so important: Giovanni Maria dal Monte, Bishop of Palestrina, devoted without reserve to the interests of his master, whom later on he succeeded on the Papal throne; Marcello Cervini, a learned theologian, who afterwards wore the tiara as Marcellus II.; and Reginald Pole, who in the last Conclave had been well-nigh elected Pope. The two former left in February for Trent, where they arrived on the 13th of the following month; Cardinal Pole, delayed through fear of meeting with violence from the emissaries of Henry VIII., did not reach Trent till the close of the month of May. Few bishops, besides the assessors to the Legates, arrived; and the Legates deemed it wise to wait for the arrival of the Spanish and Italian bishops. Further delays were soon rendered necessary. The action of the Viceroy of Naples, and the opposition of the Emperor to the assembling of a Council at the present time, delayed the opening. The Feast of the Exaltation of the Cross, the 3rd of May, was designated; but the Legates were unable to open on that day. The smallness of the number of bishops at Trent made a further delay necessary.

Negotiations ensue between Charles and Paul. Paul not yielding to the desire of Charles for further delay, remained steadfast in his purpose that the Council should open as soon as possible. Lest the bishops who were in Trent might be tempted to depart, he had them employed in preparing the business for the Council. Whilst they were thus engaged, the number of bishops, and theologians, and canonists, increased day by day; and soon the Legates report that a speedy opening of the Council is at length possible. Paul received this glad announcement with unbounded joy, assembled his cardinals in Consistory, the 18th of November, and there arranged that the Council should open on the 13th of December, the third Sunday of Advent. Paul, at this

time, granted to the German bishops power of being represented by proxy at the Council, lest in their absence their flocks should fall a prey to the disseminators of error.

Various instructions regarding the course of business were forwarded to the Legates in reply to their inquiries. They were directed to treat of matters of faith first; then to proceed to matters of discipline; and, in reference to suggested reforms of the Roman Court, all the proposed changes were to be reported to the Supreme Pontiff, who alone had the power to apply a suitable remedy. All documents issued in the name of the Council were to bear the signatures of the Legates, as Presidents, and that of the Pope, whom they represented, and to have the seal of at least the first Legate. To bring down the blessings of Heaven on an undertaking of such moment in the history of the Church, the Legates were empowered to grant indulgences; but these indulgences were not to be given in the name of the Council.

The King of France by his action in reference to the French bishops present in Trent caused some embarrassment. After some time the difficulty was arranged, and the French bishops came to Trent. Difficulty after difficulty had given way. Everything was ready to open a Council whose work and whose name will ever live. Final instructions have come from Rome; the 12th of December, the eve of the opening, is spent in public prayers and processions to implore the protection of God's guiding spirit on the labours of the assembled Fathers, and on the 13th of December, "Gaudete" Sunday, the Council, for which the Church through years of trouble, of anxiety, and of bitter strife, had prayed, and often seemingly in vain, was opened, and Cardinal Pole was able in terms of exulting joy to write to Paul: "The doors of the Council are flung open, the reproach of barrenness is removed from the Church as of old from Rachel."

Before we proceed with the description of the sessions, we must take a glance at the scene of the labours of the Council. Trent, chief city of a Principality of the same name, and one of the most considerable towns in the Lower Tyrol, is situated on the confines of Germany and Italy in a small delightful valley surrounded by lofty mountains. This

valley is entered by a gorge that serves as a bed for the river Adige, which, flowing past Trent, waters the valley and pursues its course towards the States of Venice.

Approaching the city by the left bank, one must be struck by the scene that meets the eye. The dark, square towers, bringing the mind back to the feudal times, the numerous spires that shoot upwards to the skies, the marble palaces and ruined castles, the old embattled walls, the old wooden bridge, the stately marble cathedral, lofty snow-capped mountains whose feet are clothed with verdure, here and there relieved by the Tyrolese peasants' homes in the background, and the river bank with the waters rushing past, in the foreground, form a scene of wild and imposing grandeur; and when the sun is sinking behind the western ridges, flooding before he sets the beautiful valley with the glory of the Italian sunset, and the waters of the deep rapid river are reflecting all the splendours of the scene, the view is one not to be forgotten.

The city is of great antiquity, and rose to high importance and prosperity under the rule of its prince-bishops, from the time that Conrad the Salic bestowed on them and their successors the sovereignty over the valley of the Adige. The city contains at present about 17,000 inhabitants. The chief industries are the manufacture of silks, wines, and sugar. The vine is cultivated in the valley of the Adige. The Church of Santa Maria Maggiore, built entirely of red marble, possesses for us a peculiar interest, from its connexion with the sittings of the Fathers assembled at Trent. A curious painting of the assembly, containing portraits of seven cardinals, three patriarchs, thirty-three archbishops, two hundred and thirty-five bishops, seven abbots, seven generals of Religious Orders, and one hundred and forty-six professors of theology, is shown within its walls.

Such was the city happily chosen after long discussion as the meeting place of the prelates convoked to assemble in General Council. It was central; not in Italy—which would offend the Germans; not in Germany—where the safety of the prelates might be endangered. It was a free city, with its prince-bishop, a feudatory of Charles V. The climate was

genial, for though from the walls might be seen the dark slopes and snow-capped summits of the surrounding Alps, the mulberry tree, and silk worm, and the rich vineyards of the valley were sure indications of comforts and resources hardly to be expected in a country not less rugged and mountainous than Switzerland itself.

It will, perhaps, be convenient in treating of the celebration of that Council, which has ever been deservedly regarded as the greatest crisis in the anxious contest between the old Church of Rome and the recent sectaries who spurned her authority, to divide the history of the sessions into three sections. The first will contain the history of ten sessions of the Council, under Paul III. eight at Trent and two at Bologna, from December the 13th, 1545, to June the 2nd, 1547. The second will treat of the six sessions at Trent held during the reign of Julius III., and will comprise the course of events from the 1st of May, 1561, to 28th of April, 1562. The third section will deal with the Council under Pius IV., and its nine sessions at Trent, from the 18th of January, 1562, to the 4th of December, 1563. Thus, only three Pontiffs were practically connected with the actual celebration of the Council. Its twenty-five sessions were spread over eighteen years, though the time occupied by the Council during the eighteen years was somewhat less than four years and a half, viz. :—one year and six months under Paul III. ; one year under Julius III. ; and a year and eleven months under Pius IV. Attention may be drawn here to a useful distinction between *working* and *formal* sessions. By *working* sessions are meant those sessions in which Decrees on Faith and Discipline were adopted and announced. By *formal* sessions are to be understood those sessions in which the work was preparatory for the sessions in which Dogmatic and Disciplinary Decrees were adopted. In the *formal* sessions matters of grave importance occupied the time and thoughts of the assembled Fathers, but were not embodied and announced as decisions of a dogmatic or reformatory kind. On this account the distinction may be made. It has this advantage to recommend it, by reducing the twenty-five sessions to eleven *working* sessions, viz. :—four, from the

fourth to the seventh, in the first section; two, the thirteenth and fourteenth, in the second section, and five, from the twenty-first to the twenty-fifth, in the third section, it becomes much less difficult to fix in the memory the Decrees of each *working* session, and to recur with readiness to the authority of a Council so constantly cited.

C. DAILEY.

SOME REASONS WHY CATHOLICS LOSE THE FAITH IN NEW ZEALAND.

THE object of the present paper is, to give a simple statement of facts as they have come under the writer's observations during a brief Missionary career in a part of New Zealand. I claim no originality and assume no critical airs. My labours, confined as they have been, to two localities, may strip my opinions of that weight, to which experience in a more extensive area can usually lay claim. But this much without arrogance, I think I may allege in my favour. First, it is not always admissible that all knowledge is the result of experience, nor do they who travel farthest, and bustle most through the busy scenes of varying life, always glean the vastest and most accurate information. They may saunter carelessly and think superficially. But in addition to this, I am not singular or alone in the statements and conclusions that will be found through this paper. They are shared to a considerable extent by those, whose venerable forms bend under the weight of years, and the pressure of Missionary labours undertaken in many districts of the country far apart from each other, and whose capacity for judgment is enlarged, by their practical, religious, and pensive lives. I am then but penning down a few coincident reflections, stamped with the approbation of those who are competent to judge of how much truth or error they may contain.

What shall be said of the religious education of our people

before leaving Ireland, will be written in no hostile spirit to my brethren of the clergy in the old land. No one can appreciate more, the zeal and fidelity of the Irish priests in Ireland, than I do. I know their worth and their learning, but I know too that they can gather, by reading or otherwise, only very scant and imperfect knowledge of the religious situation, and the dreadful assaults that are made upon the Faith of the simple Irish people in distant lands, like New Zealand. One must be here and see for himself, to understand the trials, temptations, heartburnings, and struggles, that are daily endured by thousands of Catholics to keep from being extinguished amidst the mists and clouds of heterodoxy and infidelity, that torch of holy Faith which they brought burning brightly from Ireland.

As in America and Australia, so also in New Zealand the mass of our Catholic people are "exiles of Erin." The vast majority of them are the sons and daughters of the small farmer and the labourer. They left their homes without wealth and with only the rudiments of knowledge. They are merged in the different nationalities scattered through this vast country, where Catholics are in a miserable minority. We are here not a nation but isolated individuals. In country parts the young men are labourers and shepherds. In the towns the girls are the slaves of English, Scotch, and Colonial mistresses. The greater number of these young men and women have come from the country districts of Ireland. Educated in National schools, many of them received only that minimum of religious instruction sufficient for admission to the sacraments. Beyond this they have little knowledge of the groundwork of their faith. In Ireland the priests as a rule preach every Sunday, but their discourses, beautiful no doubt as they are, nevertheless, are, I venture to say, more exhortatory and paraphrastical, than didactic and catechetical. This is glorious for the old-land, while the people remain at home, but it does not do for here. Landing on these shores, our young men and women have a simple, lively faith, but a faith founded on a weak substratum of knowledge. It is practical but not theoretical. The belief is there, but the why and the wherefore are not. Here, working amongst Protestants,

stified with vice and inhaling an atmosphere tainted with unbelief, they are asked a reason for this article of their faith, and for that, and most of them are unable to give any, or at best, but a feeble reply. Nay, very often they have only a vague, sometimes, an incorrect knowledge of what they precisely do believe; but this faith they were prepared, when entering the emigrant ships, to resign only with their lives. The grace of God was still abiding in their young hearts when they left their homes of innocence with a father's blessing and a mother's tearful entreaties. They had little suspicion of the character of the enemies or the nature of the dangers that awaited them. They came armed with the sword of faith but had not on the breastplate of knowledge, and soon the poisoned arrows of unbelief find entrance to their innocent hearts. The grace of God, it is true, cherished and increased in the beginning by frequent recourse to the sacraments, shields them for a time, but when the intellect at first embarrassed, then discomfited, is led astray, the demon of perversity, indifference, and finally unbelief, takes possession of the heart. They are confronted on these shores by two classes of people—one who feel no sympathy with their national feeling and religious instincts,—the other, the avowed enemies of all Christianity. The staunch Presbyterian, the gloomy Wesleyan, and the loyal, honest Church of England Protestant, meet them with objections against “popish superstition;” the professed Atheist and the disciples of the free-thought lecturer challenge them with proofs against every dogma of Christian belief. To face such an array of enemies there is need of great moral courage, much prudence, and deep-rooted convictions.

Moral courage the Irish race at home and abroad may fairly boast of, prudence we have not in very great measure, and religious convictions with a large proportion of our unfortunate emigrants are more the result, I think, of what I will call *training* than of religious education. They have imbibed their beliefs with their mother's milk. Born in the bosom of a Catholic land, associated in early life with Catholic companions, taught in Catholic schools, they had little to tax their faith or call into requisition that necessity for a knowledge

of the groundwork of their beliefs so necessary in a foreign land. When such emigrants, young men and young women in their daily toil, and toil they must, come in contact with those whose morals are corrupt, whose hearts are poisoned with a hatred of Catholicity, and whose minds are stored with a specious reasoning against it, the religious antagonism is very unequal indeed. On the one side you have an unsophisticated, innocent, guileless heart, and an untutored intellect; on the other an astute selfish unbeliever, or, what in the case is sometimes worse, a vain, tenacious Bible-reader armed with weapons against Catholic doctrine, forged by the perverse ingenuity of minds more logical and deeply read even than the assailant's own. Human nature is human nature, and in a conflict like this the consequences as known to Missionary priests are much to be dreaded. Our people are thus questioned and embarrassed oftentimes for an answer. If they decline to give any, they will be told they believe without, or against reason, that their Faith is a pile of superstition founded on ignorance and sustained by the influence of priestcraft. Should they be imperfectly instructed in the groundwork of their Faith while attempting to give a rational account for their beliefs and practices, the probability is, they will expose themselves to ridicule and their Church to greater contempt. Not unfrequently indeed does it happen that, in circumstances like these, a mind hitherto artless, full of simplicity and trust, will be led to think more seriously, and through thinking to doubt, or question the wisdom of believing what, till lately it had not thought of examining, and which when put before it, dressed in a false costume by an unbelieving caviller, seems to it, in the light of its rustic logic and scant instruction, absolutely inexplicable or altogether untrue. Here lies the danger to many an Irish emigrant having no scientific knowledge of the groundwork of his holy Faith when leaving the old land. Here is the rock upon which many a soul is shipwrecked and lost. I would respectfully suggest to the priests in Ireland to forewarn the people against these dangers and to equip them to meet their opponents by regular serial courses of catechetical instructions. While they live at home breathing

an atmosphere of purity and innocence, surrounded by their priests, having every opportunity of approaching the sacraments as often as they wish, a homely exhortation, a pathetic effusion, which may touch the heart while it leaves the intellect barren, will pilot them smoothly along over a peaceful life to a happy death. But when they have left far behind the calm skies of holy Ireland, and have "to rough" against the billows of unbelief that are fast flooding this country, when they have to meet the sneer of the bitter sectarian with his inherited prejudices, when they have to work with corrupted and captious men in stations and sheep-runs twenty and thirty miles away from the nearest church or priest, when they can hear mass only once in two or three months, and can approach the sacraments not so often, when unfortunately they find their temporal interests to clash too frequently with their spiritual, then those discourses of other days which moved the heart and generated short-lived sympathies, vanish into oblivion or are remembered only as hollow-sounding and unsubstantial vanities. No longer will an implicit uninformed Faith be found sufficient amid the practical indifferentism which now surrounds them. Absence from Sunday's mass, neglect of approaching the sacraments of confession and communion, want of due reverence for the priestly authority, all which in other days would suffuse the countenance with shame, or merit the disapprobation of others, will here be a temptation to gain popular applause or a coin to purchase the patronage of those whose will it is their temporal welfare to serve. But the evil does not stop here; it is not linked merely with the individual himself. His firm adherence to the Faith or his practical renunciation of it becomes an inheritance which is sure to descend to his offspring. If virtues flow from parent to child, much more do vicious inclinations. We have in this country two classes of Catholic parents, the agriculturists and farm-labourers, and those who reside in the towns. In nearly all the districts the country families live far apart, being outnumbered by those of other denominations to a great proportion. The priests are few and far between. They reside only in the principal or central towns. Struggling against immense odds they find it impossible from the

revenues of their parishes to maintain more than one, at most two, Catholic schools in every mission.

Let the indulgent reader remember that some of these missions are four, some five, thousand square miles in area, that the Catholic families are scattered throughout them, and he will at once conclude that the children of such parents must attend the godless State-schools, where religion is entirely ignored, where numbers of teachers are practical unbelievers, where the associates of our Catholic youths are the sons and daughters of those, whose religion is filthy lucre, and whose strongest article of belief is, that "popery" is a lie and a fraud. To be more clearly understood let me enter a little into details. I have before me as I write, a letter from a priest in charge of one of these parishes. He tells me that on an average it is one hundred miles long, fifty at the narrowest point, and in one direction, runs two hundred miles in extent. There are in it four churches distant apart from fifty miles to twelve. In this immense district there is only one Catholic school, and that in the town where the priest usually resides. The number of children attending it is sixty. There are about one hundred others in that district, attending the various State-institutions, and not more than eight or nine attending any one same school. Again, in the parish where I minister, there are about one hundred and eighty Catholic children attending thirteen different State-schools, that is to say, on an average about thirteen children to each school. There is not one Catholic teacher in the whole district. The reader will easily perceive it is impracticable there could be, since owing to the great distances apart you cannot gather together a sufficient number of children to form a school, and give anything like due support to a master or mistress. Then let us remember, it can be fairly said, that, all the Government teachers are Protestants, freemasons many of them, and Atheists many more. Nor let it be said that districts so circumstanced are few; few they are not, but many. It is to be hoped indeed that, as time goes on the evils will diminish, but what a havoc may not be made among souls before then. What will meantime become of our poor children if parents are incapacitated, by

their own ignorance, of well grounding them in the faith? Let us remember what a power of assimilation there is in the associations of early life, how mind draws to mind, and heart to heart. If this influence of early life be good, great will be the blessings garnered in riper years, if it be bad no one can divine the chain of disastrous consequences which may follow. "Youth is the spring time of life," and "evil communications corrupt good morals." And can the children of indifferentism, of Atheists, and Freethinkers, be faithful to God, or to the laws of morality? Will they be so quickened with an impulse of good breeding, as to be unwilling to tamper with the feelings, or to contaminate the virtues of others? And the State-school children of Protestant parents are not taught to love their Catholic companions. Moreover they are armed to the teeth with insinuating, though fallacious arguments against Catholic doctrines and practices. These are derived either directly from the parents, or from bad books and lectures scattered abundantly in every home. But how, it may be asked, are those books found in every country family? The rising generation of this colony is a reading people. There is hardly a district here corresponding in extent to an ordinary parish at home, that has not its two or three public libraries supplied with a variety of the current literature of the day. On every shelf stand prominent lectures and works, not only against "Romanism," but, in many instances, even against Christianity itself. These are the sources whence Protestant fathers and mothers derive that knowledge of Catholicity which they faithfully impart to their own offspring, and which these in turn communicate to their Catholic companions. Let us suppose for instance, two boys, one Catholic, and the other Protestant, waxing into years, attending the same school, living in the same locality, and firmly rooted in each other's friendship. The Catholic boy, as a rule, will be found little acquainted with the texts of Protestantism; he will have few objections to make against it. On the other hand, his Protestant friend will inform him, that he and his parents, and all Protestants, have faith, read the Bible, believe in the sacrifice of Calvary, are taught to keep the commandments, and to

love and serve God, as well as Catholics. But in addition to this, he will have many knotty difficulties to propose about Catholicity. To whom will the Catholic boy have recourse for the solution of his doubts and the clearing of his fears? Will he seek a priest and thus extricate himself from the net woven around him by a friendly but a subtle companion. It is not usual for boys in such circumstances to go to a priest, and moreover a priest there is not in the district. In many localities the pastor is seen, and a sermon heard only once a month, and there is not much likelihood that the perplexing difficulty will meet with a solution in the current discourse. Must not a boy in such straits if he have recourse to any one at all, seek from his parents that truth which shall free his mind from embarrassment and place at his command a weapon to suit his assailant? But what if the parents are unable to give a satisfactory answer? An impression is made but not effaced. It lingers in his memory from year to year, increased most probably by many others. School-days are over; he merges into manhood, leaves his parents' home, goes forth to earn a livelihood working amongst all classes and creeds. After a time he marries a Protestant wife, fixes his abode in a Protestant locality. Parental restraint there is now none, sufficient religious instruction he did not acquire, the blandishments of a bigoted woman are powerful. What will become of such a man and what of his children? Will it be said the priest must look to them. The priest will and does exercise all his influence, but it is impossible for him to gain any satisfactory results in cases like this. When the father himself has already fallen away or grown indifferent and the mother is a Protestant, experience teaches that the children as a rule are entirely lost. And all this is largely traceable not so much to wayward circumstances, as to want of a fairly accurate knowledge of their religion on the part of our Irish emigrants, young men and young women who are becoming the fathers and mothers of the rising Church, the sowers of Catholicity in the growing colony. If they are well ground in an intelligent knowledge of their creed, their children will have able and willing instructors, and thus the absence of the priest and the want of Catholic

schools will in a great measure be counteracted. It is sad but not less a truth that, in many isolated districts in this country where Irish parents are settled on the land and living in comfortable affluence, the visiting pastor in some instances can hardly find one father or one mother with sufficiently accurate knowledge of his religion to take charge of explaining the Sunday's catechism to the children. A simple practical faith those Irish parents have, but this in its purity and integrity cannot, in the circumstances be so transmitted to their colonial-born children. These will not believe simply because they are told to do so. They require something more substantial. They must know accurately what is demanded from them and must understand that between Faith and reason there is no contradiction. They have to answer the objections of others and must smooth the way by solving difficulties for themselves. Passive credulity is not a gift of colonial youth; prying inquisitiveness is a marked characteristic.

Impart to them sound religious knowledge, and you make them staunch sons of Mother Church, let them be deprived of it for one cause or another, and you open a way to any conventicle where fortune will soonest fall to their lot. And how could it be otherwise? They look around them in the localities where they live, and see Catholic congregations composed for the most part of the poor and the feeble and the illiterate. They have no wider range for their ideas than that afforded by colonial observation, and no more extensive knowledge of their Church than what is gathered from the narrow social spheres within which they move. They see Catholicity here making rapid strides, it is true, but still deficient in numbers, in wealth, in influence. Their temporal interests are not promoted by being practical Catholics, yea, rather are often contravened, and their spiritual welfare weighs not so much with colonial minds as with the home people. In such circumstances they must imbibe a love of their religion and Church from their parents, and this love, infused in early life must in later years, be cherished and shielded from the absorbing dangers which surround it, by an accurate and thorough knowledge of their faith. Without encouraging any polemical spirit, I think, they will find it practically

useful to have a knowledge sufficient for private controversy, but above all they must be Catechists for the sake of the souls of their children. This is the main idea intended to be conveyed through this paper.

Another danger to the faith of the Irish in these colonies is that unhappily many of them seem to forget their native land and to harbour no love for the memories of other days. It is a hard thing for an Irish priest to write of his Irish people, but there are instances not a few, where it is perfectly true. I have never here yet met a bad Irishman who was not a bad Catholic too, and on the other hand I do not know a single practical Irish Catholic whose love for his country is not intensified by time and distance. When they forget the land of their fathers, the faith of their fathers vanishes too. When they cease to remember that they are the descendants of heroes they begin to forget that they are the children of martyrs also. And as it is with the fathers and mothers, so is it with the children. Go into the house of a faithful Irish couple and you at once see love for a land which they never saw, burning in the hearts of their colonial offspring, and with it devotion to their Church and creed. But find a father or mother whose heart is chilled towards the home where he first saw the light, his faith is dying as an expiring spark and his children despise the isle which St. Patrick loved and the creed which St. Patrick worshipped. Let the Irish emigrant be warned of this, and let him be exhorted never to forget in a foreign land the home where his youth was nursed.

P. E. HURLEY.

THE ROSMINIAN PHILOSOPHY.

FATHER Lockhart is very indignant because I have said that the philosophical system of Rosmini is justly called Pantheism. If I have erred in this, I have at least erred in good company. His Eminence Cardinal Zigliara in his *Propaedeutica ad sacram Theologiam*, published in 1884, writes, lib. 2, cap. xii, p. 58.—

“The *ens Rosminianum* is, in the proper sense of the word, an intrinsic element of contingent beings, and is predicated of them

when we say *the creature is ens*; is predicated, I say, not extrinsically and as an exemplar (*exemplariter*), as when we say of a statue that it is Peter, because made after the exemplar Peter (*exemplata a Petro*), but formally and intrinsically, as when it is said of Peter that he is a man. Therefore God, though under the formal concept of being, is in very truth the *esse intrinsecum*, the *esse formale* of all things. This conclusion is Pantheism and consequently the denial of the supernatural order I know indeed that many things (I wish they were true) are adduced by Rosminians in order to free the doctrine of their master from the note of Pantheism, but since they admit with Rosmini the principle of the divine nature of being, I in no way see how they can logically escape the Pantheistic conclusion."¹

Here His Eminence states that the Rosminian *ens* is God under the formal concept of being, a thing no true Rosminian denies. 2°. That this *ens* is the intrinsic and formal esse of contingent things as all true Rosminians hold with Rosmini. 3°. That this is Pantheism. The position Cardinal Zigliara holds among orthodox philosophers is well known to every one who is at all conversant with the philosophical literature of the day. It is sufficiently proved by the fact that he has been appointed by His Holiness one of the three Commissioners to bring out a perfect edition of all the works of St. Thomas. The other two are Cardinal Pecci (in succession to Cardinal De Luca) and Cardinal Simeoni.

The next authority is the veteran philosopher Liberatore whose name is known and revered wherever Catholic philosophy is studied. In the Second Volume of his *Institutiones philosophicæ*, p. 420, of the edition of 1883, after having described the system of Rosmini, he thus concludes:—

“Wherefore the Rosminian system, whatever way it be considered, is nothing but the transcendentalism of Germany clothed in an Italian

¹ *Ens Rosminianum est elementum proprie intrinsecum entium contingentium et de ipsis prædicatur cum dicitur creatura est ens; prædicatur, inquam, non ab extrinseco et exemplariter, sicut cum dicitur de statua quod sit Petrus quia exemplata a Petro extrinseco, sed formaliter et intrinsece, sicut cum de Petro dicitur quod sit homo. Ergo Deus, esto sub conceptu formali entis, est revera esse intrinsecum, hoc est esse formale omnium. Quæ illatio est Pantheismus, et consequenter negatio ordinis supernaturalis Scio a Rosminianis plura (quæ cuperem esse vera) adduci ad absolvendam a Pantheismi nota doctrinam magistri; sed cum doctrinam de natura divina entis cum Rosminio amplectuntur, plane non video, quæ ratione possint logice effugere conclusionem Pantheisticam.*

dress. In this however its Pantheism seems to differ from the German, that the latter places the *ens primum* in a something impersonal and undetermined which certainly cannot be God. Rosmini on the contrary places the *ens primum* in the true God, whose esse afterwards determines itself, after a finite manner in creatures, and is not distinguished from them as to what is positive in them but only as to what is negative. For in his doctrine there is one *esse*, uncreated and eternal, whose three essential terms are constituted by the three Divine Persons, and its accidental terms or as he calls them *formae impropriae*, or *limits*, are constituted by creatures. Wherefore the German pantheism is rather *atheism*, the Rosminian on the contrary is true *pantheism*, in *rigore sermonis*."

Liberatore then as well as Cardinal Zigliara has understood Rosmini's system as I have, and called it by the same name.

Let us quote another authority. His Excellency, the Bishop of Concordia, the Most Rev. Dominick Pius Rossi, O.P., last year published a Pastoral letter in condemnation of a small work published and disseminated without his authority in his diocese in defence of the Rosminian system ; in it he says :—

"Venerable brethren ! it cannot be told what a grief this pamphlet is to me, who am, thanks be to God, so attached to the true teaching of the Church, *so respectfully obedient to the word and the authority of the Supreme Pontiff, the Vicar of Jesus Christ*, and so devoted to the true doctrine of the Angelic Doctor, St. Thomas."

The italics here are my own ; I wish by them to call attention to the fact, that Monsignor Rossi considers that obedience to the Holy See is involved in the matter. After having described the teaching of St. Thomas he goes on :—

"I proceed to explain the system of Rosmini ; he excludes the Intellectus agens, but admits the universal idea of being communicated immediately by God to our soul. And see in what manner. He considers the universal being in itself, and in relation to our minds. Considered in itself, it contains virtually all entities existent and possible, to which it is common ; moreover, the *ens in universali* is a something of the necessary being, that is, of God ; nay, more, it has the same essence as the Divine being. Wherefore, the Rosminian esse is not something created, as it has the Divine nature, although it is not looked at by us under the formal concept of God. Nevertheless Rosmini's ens if not formally, is yet really God. Besides, this universal being is, according to Rosmini, in the proper sense of the word, an intrinsic element of contingent beings, and is predicated univocally of God, and of creatures. This little is enough to make

us see that Rosmini, without perceiving it, has fallen into most grievous error. In spite of his good intentions which were to combat German sensism, he has fallen into the opposite extreme, I mean into pantheism."

These words are express. The eminent prelate goes on:—

"The thing is very clear; to Rosmini the ens is really God, and it is an element of the creature, therefore the creature has the same being as God, which would mean that the possible esse is the same as the esse which is most pure act; contingent being the same as necessary being; created being the same as uncreated being, which proposition is plainly pantheistic."

These words, as the others I have quoted, are very clear. I hope then Fr. Lockhart will have some compassion on the Cistercian Doctor in Philosophy who has fallen into error, if he have fallen into it, in such good company. But has he fallen into it?

It might possibly be excepted against the evidence I have hitherto brought forward that it is the evidence of enemies, or at least, of opponents. Let us see, then, what the defenders of the system have to say. I am sure Fr. Lockhart will himself admit that Monsignor Ferré, whose work in ten books, *Degli Universali*, he himself quoted in his former letter, is a fair exponent of his master's doctrine. As a matter of fact he was by far the ablest and most respectable defender of the system. What does he say? Here are his words in the Seventh Volume, *Degli Universali*, p. 245: "L'essere comunissimo, l'essere formale di tutte quante le cose finite e di tutte quante le forme non é stato né poteva essere creato," i.e., "The esse communissimum, the FORMAL esse of all finite things, and of all forms, has not been, and could not be created."

Yet this *esse* common to all things without exception, this formal *esse* of all finite things is, as Rosmini himself tells us, all that there is of positive in creatures. Rosmini's *esse* then, according to Monsignor Ferré, is a real positive thing, and neither was, nor could be created. Therefore it is "one, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable." Monsignor Ferré a little further on continues: "The consequence of this theory (Rosmini's) is clear, 1° that creatures are composed of two elements, of which one is identical in all, and it is the most

universal esse, the initial esse, the formal esse and the other is proper to each, and it is the real; 2° that in finite things that which is properly created, or drawn out of nothingness, is not the most universal esse, but is the real, which is different according as it differently participates of the most universal esse." "La conseguenza di questa teoria rimane chiara, 1° che le creature sono composte di due elementi dei quali uno é identico in tutte, ed é l'essere universalissimo, l'essere iniziale, l'essere formale, e l'altro é proprio di ciascuna ed é il reale; 2° che nelle cose finite cio che é propriamente creato, ossia cavato dal nulla, non é l'essere universalissimo, má é il reale, il quale é diverso secondo che diversamente partecipa dell'essere universalissimo." These words too are clear. We might cite others, *ad infinitum*, from the defenders of the system, but it is unnecessary as, except Fr. Lockhart, no Rosminian has had the hardihood to deny what is the basis of the whole system; on the contrary, they (the Rosminians) reproach and endeavour to cast ridicule upon their opponents for *carving up* (sboconcellando) *the esse, splitting it into fragments, and wishing to give to each entity a piece of its own to carry on its back.*

But let us see what Rosmini himself says. In the *Theosophy*, vol. i., p. 188, he writes:—"There exists in the human intelligence the need of reducing everything to unity. If one considers whence this necessity arises, one will easily see, that its origin comes from this, that the human mind understands all that it understands *with* being (*esse*), and that that which is not being, it cannot understand: this was called the principle of cognition. Now the *esse* is a nature simple and one, and in consequence human nature cannot persuade itself that there is anything outside of *esse*; for this would be an open contradiction; it incessantly tends therefore, and aspires to reduce all things to *esse* as to a simple and unique nature. It does not tend to obtain this unity merely in the order of cognition, BUT ALSO IN THAT OF REAL THINGS because in these it does not see in the end anything but being." It is in these terms that Rosmini proposes what he calls *the problem of the unity of being, and of the plurality of entities.* The words I have put in small capitals show that there is question

of the real order, and not merely that of thought, and this becomes more evident from what follows.

After telling us that this question was first among western philosophers proposed by Parmenides, and having given a glance at Plato, who also (he says) attempted the solution of the problem, and at Aristotle who spoiled it, he passes at a bound to the German Transcendentalists, Fichte and "*his two illustrious successors*" Schelling and Hegel. To Rosmini, the Pantheists Schelling and Hegel were *illustrious* philosophers. At page 209 he gives us his own solution of the problem.

"It is clear," he says, "that the unity we seek cannot be found in the terms [terminations] of being, because its first terms are the categorical forms; and these are three and not one, and they are irreducible; the terms posterior to the Categories are much more numerous. The unity therefore is to be sought in the being itself. But the esse (being) is conceived in several manners which are reduced to three. Since 1°. Either, being is conceived united to its terms, and in that case it is no longer one, but we have only a plurality of *entia*, or of entities; 2°. Or, we conceive the abstract esse with precision from all relation to its terms, and this abstract being is not the principle of anything whatever, by the very hypothesis of the abstraction, and the multiplicity of things cannot be reduced to it as to unity; 3°. Or finally, we conceive the esse unseparated indeed from its terms, but in relation to them, and in this aspect it can be considered by the mind in two different relations, either as what contains virtually its terms, and thus we call it *virtual esse*; or as beginning and first actuality of the terms, antecedent to them, and thus we call it *initial esse*. With the first of these two concepts we think the virtue or possibility that the nature of being has, to terminate itself [or to be terminated] in all the modes that do not involve contradiction; we think being without other consideration than the susceptibility it has of ultimating itself [or being ultimated] in any way soever. In this being, therefore, we think all the terms, but in potentiality and not distinct. And this is a first unification of the entity in the essences, an unification of all the entities, but in their first and sole potentiality, not of the entities in act. With the second of these two concepts of being, that is, with initial being, we think being as the beginning of all its terms in act. The beginning is divided by abstraction from its terms; but we do not prescind from its relation with them, nay, it is precisely this relation that is considered in that concept. This relation is precisely that of *beginning* and of *ultimation*. The terms being innumerable, the being (esse) can ultimate itself in all of them, but it is always ONE, SIMPLE, and THE SAME; it is not its terms but it is their common principle. This is therefore a second unification or, to speak more correctly, a second reduction to unity of all the terms in act."

Here then, Rosmini says that being, not merely in the order of cognition, but in that of reality, is *one, simple, and the same*, in all things, in all its terms in act; and he tells us that its first terms are the three categorical forms. Now what are these three categorical forms? He himself tells us vol. i., p. 112 :—

“The esse itself although whole and entire is [exists] in several modes essential to it. Are there therefore these forms? The esse by the proper nature of esse is it in one mode alone, or in more than one? And if in more modes, is it in each mode all the esse? . . . There *are* these forms and they are three; that is, the esse, as such, is indetical in three different modes essential to it. We call these forms subjective, objective and moral.”

He tells us moreover, that, “the absolute esse in its subjective form is called the Father, in its objective form is called the Son,” and consequently that the absolute esse in its moral form is called the Holy Ghost. And p. 114: “the unlimited ens dwells essentially in the three forms.”

The one *being*, then, according to Rosmini, exists *essentially* in the three categorical or necessary forms, subjective, objective and moral, or Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and *non essentially*, but freely, in the innumerable post-categorical forms that he elsewhere calls *improper forms* of being. If this be not Pantheism I would like to know what is.

Again vol. i, p. 450, he writes :—

“God is pure esse, the absolute esse itself; this is his nature. The finite being is not the esse, although the esse is necessary to it, since otherwise it would be nothing; it participates of it, the esse is present to it. If the finite being is not *esse*, but depends continually on *esse*, which is called also participating of *esse*, what is it then? We have distinguished the esse from its forms, and we have said that the real of the universe is a form, or a term of esse, the form of reality. This is the subjective form, and the universe in itself is nothing but this subjective form. The esse is joined to it in order that it may subsist, but is not it, nor is it confounded with it, it, *the form*, being individual, and the esse being universal and equal for all the finite individuals.”

Although Rosmini here says that the finite is not the esse, at page 221, he says :—“Why, therefore, is it said absolutely,

the stone is esse, the man is esse, &c. Because I cannot in any way find in the stone or the man anything that is not esse, howmuch soever and in whatsoever way I decompose it in thought: even all the differences of things are esse: therefore it is said things are esse." On the one hand, then, Rosmini says that things are not esse, but that esse is necessary to them, is joined to them in order that they may exist; on the other he says that all that exists is esse. The apparent contradiction is removed by his explanation of what the finite real is. "The finite ens" he says, "is the esse terminated," (*Theosophy* v. i., p. 109.) Therefore every entity is composed of two elements the one positive—the esse, the other negative—the limitation, and p. 396 he says:—"The quiddity of the infinite ens is constituted by reality, and is positive. The quiddity of the finite ens is constituted by the limits of entity, and is negative."

For this reason, considering the real finite in its quiddity as the limits of entity, he can say that it is not being, but being is *joined to it to make it subsist*, that it is *appended to being*, or as it were *suspended in being*, (they are all expressions of Rosmini). While on the other hand, looking to what is positive in the finite real, he can say:—"The stone is being," "all things are being." At p. 398, he says:—"The finite entia that compose the world result from two elements, that is from the finite real (*the limit*) and from the *initial esse* that gives to this term the form of entity." And that we may have no doubt about what the *initial esse* is he goes on:—"But the initial esse is a something of the absolute esse, and the absolute esse alone can dispose of that which appertains to it, therefore only the absolute Being, God, can be the Creator of the World." Rosmini here uses the word Creator, but his creation is very different from the Christian and scholastic, which is the drawing of the whole ens from nothing *sui et subjecti*. It is very evident that God does not and cannot create anything that is a part (so to speak) of Himself, something that belongs to Him and cannot belong to the creature. Now the initial esse, which according to Rosmini is one of the two elements of which the finite contingent being is composed, belongs, as Rosmini expressly says,

to God and cannot belong to the creature. In the same vol. i, p. 239, he tells us yet more explicitly:—

“The virtual and initial esse is absolutely *necessary* in such way that one cannot think that it is not, since to think that it is not is already to admit it. If therefore the initial and virtual esse is necessary, it cannot be any part of the contingent, but must be an appurtenance [something appertaining to, *un' appartenenza*] of the necessary being. It belongs to theology to demonstrate that there can be only one necessary being as also to explain how the virtual and initial esse is something of the one only necessary being, that is, of God.”

Consequently he makes the limits the effect of creation: at p. 305 he says:—“These real limits, or forms, are the effect of the creative act;” and p. 350, “the finite reality *is not*, but he makes it *be* by joining to THE INFINITE REALITY the limitation.”

I think I have quoted enough to prove beyond the possibility of doubt that for Rosmini there was only one being, and that this being, considered as initial, was an element of every thing that is. To guard against possible cavil I must remark that Rosmini calls the initial being a dialectical esse. But by this he only means that it does not exist outside the mind *in the way* in which it is considered by the mind. By the mind it is considered with abstraction from its forms, though in relation to them, while outside the mind it exists with its forms, necessarily with the Categorical absolute forms—the essential forms of being, which are the real, the ideal and the holy, or as he also calls them, the subjective, objective and moral—Father, Son and Holy Ghost; not necessarily, except in the supposition of their existence, with the post-categorical forms—finite realities. That this is the doctrine of Rosmini is evident, not only because he speaks of the real elements of real things, and a mere abstraction of the mind cannot be such an element, unless we are prepared to admit that according to Rosmini the real things that compose the world are made up of two elements, the one a mental abstraction, the other a pure negative, and that all that there is of positive in them is this mental abstraction; not only I say for this reason, but also because he himself tells us so expressly. “The finite reality *is not*,” he says in the passage already quoted, “but he makes it *be* by joining to the

infinite reality the limitation." The infinite reality is certainly no mere abstraction of the mind.

Rosmini says also that finite things are outside of God, which at first sight seems to remove the charge of pantheism; but he himself tells us what he means by outside of God, (*fuori di Dio*).—"By the expression it is outside of God" he says, vol. i., p. 430, "nothing else is meant but that the real finite, so far forth as its subjective existence is concerned, does not constitute the divine essence or any part of this essence." In the same way a man's thoughts or affections, or any other modification of his soul, might be said to be outside of his soul, because they do not constitute the essence of the soul, or any part of its essence, but pre-suppose it, as finite things—the improper forms of being according to Rosmini, pre-suppose God. This is sufficient regarding my first assertion, that for Rosmini all being is one.

We pass to the second point. In his *Psychology*, book v., c. 4, he says:—

"But what is the condition on which the subject besides being animal becomes intelligent? For this we have said it is necessary that the animal sentiment acquire its greatest specific perfection, the greatest unity and harmony by means of most opportune organization."

—And developing this principle he goes on—

"That an animal principle cannot intue the idea, unless when it has attained the greatest power of animality, may be conjectured by supposing, that all the capacity of the sensitive principle, until it has attained its greatest specific perfection, is spent and absorbed in the tendency to acquire the state of organic perfection that is wanting to it, and consequently cannot rise to look at the ideal being of itself essentially intelligible and everywhere present—since if it is not seen, it is through defect of the subject to which there does not remain capacity to turn to it. In fact, if we suppose that the capacity (*virtù*) of a sensitive principle is all exhausted in organizing the matter, nothing remains to it by which it could actuate itself towards the *ens*. But after the specific perfection of the organism and of the sentiment has been fully attained, the principle no longer uses that capacity and force which it employed in the work of organization, and then it meets the *esse* present everywhere as I said, and taking it for the term of its act, renders itself intelligent."

Here we see it expressly stated that the human animal principle, which in the Third Book, c. 23, he says is derived from

the parents by generation, renders itself intelligent by taking the *esse* as the term of its act, and this it can do in man, because the organization being complete the sensitive principle can now use the power it previously employed in developing the organism to pay attention to the *esse* everywhere present. A few lines lower down he goes on:—

“To understand this fact it is sufficient to suppose that the *virtù* or sensitive principle which we call subject, can take anything present to it as the term of its act, but that this virtue (sensitive principle) being limited, it is sometimes arrested in its act by exhaustion of force, and sometimes there remains to it vigour to *feel the intelligible being.*”

The only difference then between the brute soul of animals and the soul of man is that in the former all the power of the sensitive principle is exhausted in the development of the organism, while in man the organism having arrived at perfection, the sensitive principle can employ the same force in looking at the *esse* equally present to both.

Nor does Rosmini shrink from the consequences of this doctrine, for book v., c. 8, he says:—

“The condition on which the soul passes from the act by which it feels the body as sensible, to the act by which it feels the body as *ens*, and hence first intues being is that the corporeal sentiment have attained its *specific* perfection. Now with the breaking up of the organization, the perfect and human sentiment is broken up into a plurality of imperfect sentiments, none of which can have a principle fit to intue the *ens*. There ceases, therefore, in these new sensitive principles, born of the destruction of the human body, the aptitude to see the *ens*; and consequently none of them is the human soul; they have lost identity with this soul. On the other hand the act which intues being, when it has been once placed, has no longer need of the animal sentiment to subsist, because it is altogether independent of it; and this is the human soul which first was *identical* with the sensitive principle.”

The consequences of this doctrine are 1° the human soul that *posited* the act of intelligence ceases to exist on the death of the body. 2° The act it *posited* continues to exist, and having been before the dissolution of the body only an act of the human soul it becomes by that dissolution the human soul itself. 3° Either then (*a*) a vital act subsists without the living principle or (*b*) the animal soul has, by its act, called

into being a subsistent intellectual soul. Which of the two consequences is the less absurd I do not pretend to determine.

I think I have proved my assertions concerning the doctrine contained in Rosmini's works. I may be allowed to add that the conclusion I have drawn from Monsignor Ferré's statement, that "the formal esse of all things was not, and could not have been created," viz., that therefore it is one, infinite, eternal and unchangeable, is in no way affected by what the Rev. W. McDonald says in his interesting and suggestive article on Dr. Mivart's Defence of Theism. He there states that St. Thomas and a great body of the Schoolmen held that it could not be known from reason alone that the world had been created. But here the reverend writer, if there be no misprint, must be speaking of the creation *in time*, in other words, of the temporality of the world, not of its creation absolutely, for all the Schoolmen held that we could know with certainty, from reason alone, that it had been drawn out of nothing *sui et subjecti*, that is, created. But St. Thomas and many scholastics held that it could not be proved, by reason alone, that it had a temporal beginning. I said if there be no misprint, because it seems to me that *world* may have been printed in mistake for *matter*. For the thesis speaks of *matter*, and in it by *matter* is evidently meant the *materia prima* of the Schoolmen which St. Thomas held could not be created *as such*, because it could not exist *as such*, though of course St. Thomas and all the Schoolmen held that *matter was* created, but as *materia secunda*, not as *materia prima*. The Schoolmen based the metaphysical proof of the existence of God precisely on the absolute necessity of creation to explain the origin of finite things, as on the other hand they deduced the infinite perfections of God from the fact that He is the *ens a se*, i.e. uncreated.

Now a few words on the other portions of Fr. Lockhart's letter. He says I accused Rosmini and his followers of "worshipping they know not what." In this Fr. Lockhart is, to use the mildest term, inaccurate. I never said so, never for a moment thought so. Even if I had said that they were Pantheists, this would not follow. For in the Rosminian

system the being that is common to all finite things is the Christian God, not as God, but as the being underlying the Divine Personality. But moreover I never said that they were Pantheists. I said that the *doctrine* was Pantheism. But to guard against the possibility of any one drawing the illogical conclusion, that therefore *they* were Pantheists, I said that they "preserve their faith at the expense of their logical consistency." Rosmini held, expressly, doctrines, which involve and include Pantheism, but he never professed it. He said *two and two*, but he steadily refused to say *four*; nay, he employed all the resources of his great mind, to persuade us that in the particular instance, two and two did not mean four, but something very different, three, or five, or what you please, but not four. Those who are true Rosminians do precisely say the same. I must admit that in as far as Fr. Lockhart might be included in those who "preserve their faith at the expense of their logical consistency" there was an error; in his case, there is no logical inconsistency inasmuch as he does not admit the unity of being. I made the mistake, a very natural, and not unpardonable one I hope, of supposing that he was a true disciple of the master he professed to follow.

Fr. Lockhart argues that if Rosminians hold their master's doctrine, and yet profess Catholic doctrine, they must be either "pious fools" or "hypocrites." I hope he will excuse me if I venture to remind him that from a disjunctive no conclusion can be drawn unless the division is complete. Here the division is incomplete. A man may be neither fool nor hypocrite and yet hold doctrines that are mutually destructive: a man through honest prejudice may fail to see that the one doctrine or set of doctrines is destructive of the other, or by mere verbal distinctions he may succeed in persuading himself that all opposition between them has been removed. Does Fr. Lockhart hold that all the great men who maintained the Gallican doctrines were hypocrites or fools?

But in reality this reasoning of Fr. Lockhart is an indirect appeal to our old friend the *ipse dixit* argument. It amounts to this:—

Rosmini was an able, learned, and pious man, his followers

too are able, learned, and pious. Therefore the one cannot have propounded and the other cannot maintain philosophical doctrines that clash with the teachings of Faith; any philosophical doctrines they teach or hold must be orthodox. I most willingly grant the antecedent of this argument. Rosmini was unquestionably a very able, very learned, and most pious man, the ability, learning and piety of the members of his Institute are also unquestioned. But to the conclusion I must say *non sequitur*. Does Fr. Lockhart not know the character of Nestorius for ability, learning, and piety at the time he broached his heresy? Or does he forget all the instances, church history supplies us with, of able, learned, and pious men, who maintained doctrines subversive of the faith, until such doctrines were expressly condemned? Really he shows but scant respect for the intelligence of the readers of the I. E. RECORD when he brings forward such an argument. Yet even if respect for his readers had no weight with him respect at least for himself, should have saved him from putting his name to such sophistry. When he says that I have charged him and his brethren with being fools or hypocrites he is again inaccurate. I have too much respect for his ability to attribute these inaccuracies to slovenly thought, or confusion of ideas, yet I know not to what else they can be attributed.

Fr. Lockhart reiterates that the sentence *Dimittantur* "is an express statement, that *after examination* nothing has been found *meriting* theological censure." I do not dispute that Fr. Lockhart is qualified to give a *doctrinal* interpretation of the decree; but every theologian and canonist knows that all doctrinal interpretations of a law or decree are of no value in face of an *authoritative* interpretation. Now in this case we have the authoritative interpretation. After the decree of June 1880, which declared that the *Dimittantur* meant merely *non prohibentur*, there was issued another decree in form of an answer to doubts proposed. Here it is:—
 "1° *Utrum libri ad Sac. Congregationem Indicis delati et ab eadem dimissi seu non prohibiti censeri debeant immunes ab omni errore contra fidem et mores?* 2° *Et quatenus negative, utrum libri dimissi, seu non prohibiti a Sacra Indicis Congregatione, possint tum philosophice tum theologice citra temeritatis*

notam impugnari? Eadem Sacra Congregatio respondit ad primum : negative. Ad secundum : affirmative." This decree approved by the Sovereign Pontiff was issued on the 5th of December, 1881. This is the authoritative interpretation, and it is the negation of that of Fr. Lockhart. For clearly a sentence, that does not declare works free from all error against faith and morals, does not declare that there is nothing in them meriting theological censure.

When I claim to be an ecclesiastical tribunal, and as such sit in judgment on the works of Rosmini, and put on the Index those that have been dismissed by the Sacred Congregation (the *Theosophia* was never either examined or dismissed) Fr. Lockhart may urge against me Benedict XIV. in condemnation of the Spanish Inquisition ; but not till then. When he tells me what doctrine of Rosmini has been declared by the Holy See to be an open question among Catholics I will recognise it as such.

I might complain of the tone of Fr. Lockhart's letter ; but much allowance must be made for a man bravely struggling in a hopeless cause—fighting a battle already lost, and I do not complain ; yet I beg him in any future controversies he may be engaged in, to endeavour to persuade himself that his opponent, even if he be only a Cistercian, may possibly know something of the subject he writes on. Fr. Lockhart repeats the words—Cistercian Doctor in Philosophy, in such a way as to lead one to think that he regards them as a term of derision. I do not know why. The Order of Citeaux is no more closed, now than in past ages, against Doctors in Philosophy, or Theology, or any other branch of science. I trust the sons of St. Bernard, after the example of their father, will ever be found ready to do battle, to the best of whatever little ability God has given them, against the disseminators of unsound doctrine, no matter how much they may personally esteem their opponents, and no matter how firmly they may be convinced, as I am in the present case, of their good faith.

In conclusion I thank the Very Rev. Editor of the RECORD most sincerely for yielding to my request. I have urged with him my claim to a reply. I wished to put an end to the discussion, once for all. As far as I am concerned, it is ended now.

ANDREW CAMPBELL, D.Ph., D.D.

PATRICIAN DOCUMENTS.

1. *Adfet.*

SIR SAMUEL FERGUSON, in his *Patrician Documents*, p. 104, thus translates the first line of St. Fiacc's Hymn:

“Born in Nemthur was Patrick, *as histories tell us.*”

He remarks, that “as histories tell us” is not a mere *cheville* or metrical make-weight—it indicates that written material then existed, and that the writer did not, as Colgan was inclined to believe, “relate contemporaneous events.” This is also the opinion of the Bollandists, who say: “Hymnum libenter nos quoque hic daremur; sed fatemur ingenue, vereri nos ne non ipsius Fiaci sit . . . nam quomodo talis hoc modo ordiretur ‘Natus est Patricius Nemthuri, *ut refertur in Historiis.*’”¹ Hence Lanigan writes²: “The Bollandists and some other judicious critics doubt of his having been the author of it; but it does not follow that it is not very ancient.” Dr. Benjamin Robert,³ a Protestant clergyman of Paris, is of the same opinion and for the same reason.

Now, all this is based on Colgan's translation, “*ut fertur in Historiis,*” which I believe to be wrong, and for which I substitute: “*ut (ipse) dixit in exgallüs,*”⁴ *i.e.*, “in ‘Confessione sua,’ in ‘Scriptura’ sua,” or, as the *Book of Armagh*⁵ puts it: “in commemoratione laborum.”

St. Fiacc's words are:—

“Genair Patraicc innemthur ised adfet hiscelaib.”

“Genair Patraicc innemthur issed adfet hiscelaib.”

The first line is in the Trinity College copy, from which Dr. Windisch⁶ prints “in Nemthur” and “Genair”; the

¹ “In Vita S. Patricii,” p. 515.

² Vol. i. p. 58.

³ “Etude Historique sur la vie de S. Patrick, présentée à la Faculté de Théologie Protestante de Paris, 19 Nov., 1883.” This admirable *étude*, and the last work of Sir S. Ferguson, appear to have been prompted by the *Documenta* published by Fathers de Smedt, de Backer, and myself.

⁴ St. Patrick calls his writing, *Scriptura, confessio, exgallias* or *exagallias, i.e.* his “Account of Himself.”

⁵ Fol. 9ab. Docum. p. 58.

⁶ “Irische Texte,” p. 11.

second is in the Franciscan MS., from which Dr. Zimmer gives "ised."

I consider my transcripts more correct.

The translations of this passage have been many—"bátar ile"; but few, if any of them, are faithful to the text. They are: "ut refertur in historiis" (Colgan); "hoc relatum est in historiis" (Zeuss-Ebel);² "it is this that has been declared in histories" (Stokes);³ "as is told (erzählt wird) in histories" (Zimmer);⁴ "as is ascertained in stories" (P. Lynch);⁵ "is the meaning of what is recorded in stories" (O'Brennan);⁶ "this is what is disclosed in histories" (Gilbert's National MSS.);⁷ "this it is that history relates to us" (I. E. RECORD, 1868);⁸ "quod narrant (?) in historiis" (Windisch);⁹ "as histories tell us" (Ferguson).

Colgan's "ut fertur in historiis" would be a correct translation of "Feib adfiadar i scélaib" (*L. na hUidre*, fo. 37), of "Is amlaid sin atfiadar i senchasaib" (*Ir. Nennius*, p. 32); and Windisch's "ut narrant in historiis" would fairly render "Is amlaid seo atfiadait na heolaid" of *Ir. Nennius*, p. 52, and "atfidat in eolaig" of the *Vita S. Patricii Oxon.*¹⁰

But adfet = dixit, narravit, as I thus prove: "Luid Patrice ocus adfet do uictor omnia verba domini sui";¹¹ "Eoin roscrib . . . is é adfét in gnim-nuasal";¹² "Tig Loeg ocus atfet a scéla";¹³ "Petair adfet ecnai .l. dorigne a chét procept";¹⁴ "amail ro ordaig Bénen amail arfed Lebor Glinne da Locha";¹⁵ "nech adfet a scela dé";¹⁶ "O Christ, adfet orrdan mo Maedoc";¹⁷ "adfet doib uile amail atchonnaire, atfet

¹ "Celtische Studien," ii., p. 165, circiter.

² "Gramm. Celt.," pp. 478; 1000.

³ Goidelica.

⁴ "Celtische Studien," ii., p. 165, circiter.

⁵ "Edition and Translation of the Hymn," in Life of St. Patrick.

⁶ Antiquities I. 485.

⁷ Part I., No. xxxii.

⁸ "Edition and Translation of the Hymn." ⁹ "Irische Texte," p. 347.

¹⁰ O'Donovan, in "Suppl.," quotes this *Vita*, but does not give the page. The translations of the RECORD and of Ferguson = "Mar do silad in seancasa" of *Hy-Fiachrach*, p. 425.

¹¹ Gloss on the *Hymn of Fiacc*, Franciscan copy.

¹² *L. Brecc*, fo. 84 or, p. 194.

¹³ "L. na hUidre," fo. 45.

¹⁴ Féliire, Feb. 22. ¹⁵ "L. na gCeart," p. 28. ¹⁶ *L. Brecc*, fo. 111.

¹⁷ Féliire, March 23, Stokes renders "received" in the Translation, but "naírabát" in Glossarial Index; perhaps it means retulit, i.e. obtinuit.

scéla do Coinchulainn, adfet amail boi Cuchulainn;"¹ " *ut dixit Lucas, amail atfét Lucas in Actáib Aspal;*"² "Amail (adfed, adféd, adfeat, rochét, rothead, rochan, rochachain, dochachain, adbert, atbert, asbert, rosfíg) Bénen."³ These words in No. 10 are used to introduce extracts from Bénen; and adfed is no doubt of the same voice and tense as the words with which it is bracketed. "Amail adfed in file . . . conad rochan in senchaid . . . amail adbert int eolach."⁴

Zeuss gives "Is airi adfet dé hic = ideo relatum est; is do béstaid infét, ad moralitatem prolatus est;"⁵ but I think dixit, protulit would suit the sense as well, the latter sentence being a gloss on 'est moralis sensus.'

O'Donovan translates adfet scéla, "news were heard," in the verses:

"Am Buach
Ferus an tonn fri buach,
Atfet scéla, cia fa scith,
Aodh Mac Ainmireach fo bith."⁶

"At Buach the wave buffets the brink, news were heard, who, in weariness, slew Aedh, son of Ainmire." But I would suggest "the wave broke (ferais) against the brink, brought the tidings, etc." O'Beirne Crowe makes adfet = it is related, in "Bui cuithe isin dún lasin ríg, adfet,"⁷ but, "narravit," would suit the sense here, and at l. 30 of Fiacc's Hymn.

From this evidence I conclude that "adfét" means "dixit, narravit." I will now consider the meaning of "hi scélaib."

2.—*Hi scélaib* and *Ergallias*.

Scél means sometimes an oral statement or account—"d'facbus sgéala aig an gcaillin" = I left word with the maid-servant; "adfiadat scéla," they tell their tidings (Togáil Troi, l. or p. 22). It also means a written account, as "Scéla na

¹ "Sick-bed of Cuchulainn," pp. 379, 385, 390, where O'Curry translates "told," "narrated."

² *L. Brecc*, fo. 85, p. 195.

³ "L. na gCeart, pp. 42, 70, 32; 88, 112, 70, 136; 62, 92, 144.

⁴ "Book of Lecan," fo. 286bb.

⁵ Pp. 478; 1,000.

⁶ "Four Masters." An. 594.

⁷ "Siabar Charpat Conchulainn," p. 385; at pp. 381 and 383 he treats adfet as a future, but the praes. secundarium, *diceret*, would suit in those places.

hÉséirgi," Tidings of the Resurrection, edited by O'B. Crowe; and this I take to be its meaning in our hymn, where scéla = "exgallia" of the *Confessio*. If I were asked to give the descent or pedigree of *Exgallia*,¹ I should say it is "out of 'Εξαγγελία" by "Scéla, or Sgéala, as we write it at present, and as perhaps it was pronounced in the olden time. I will add that it derives its meaning from these words. It denotes here St. Patrick's account of himself, his "confessio," of which word ἑξαγγελία is a Greek equivalent in the works of St. Chrysostome.² My view is this—St. Patrick, being at loss for a Latin word to express the full meaning of scéla, was forced or betrayed into using that word with a classic dress. I believe, moreover, that he was led to the use of it by a passage of St. Peter, with which his whole "Scriptura" seems saturated and coloured. Let us compare their words:—

ST. PETER.

Vos autem genus electum, regale sacerdotium, gens sancta, populus acquisitionis; ut virtutes, annuntietis (ἑξαγγείλητε) ejus qui de tenebris vos vocavit in admirabile lumen suum, qui *aliquando* non *populus*, nunc autem misericordiam consecuti (1 *Peter*, ii., 9, 10).

ST. PATRICK.

Oportet . . . notum facere donum Dei, et consolationem aeternam. . . Dei *nomen* ubique *expandere*, et, etiam post obitum meum *exagallias* relinquere fratribus meis, quos ego in Domino baptizavi tot millia hominum; et non eram dignus, neque talis ut hoc Dominus servo suo concederet, et in *gentem* illam tantam gratiam donaret, quod *aliquando* in juventute mea nunquam speravi, neque cogitavi.

From the collation of these words, and much more from the tone and tenor of the whole context, I gather that the passage of St. Peter was floating in the memory of our Apostle, that he got his inspiration and that particular expression there; and that of the various readings of a word, which has puzzled so many learned men, the best is *exagallias* of the *B. of Armagh*, which comes nearest to ἑξαγγελίας a

¹ *Exgallias* in the *St. Waast MS.*, but the Bollandists unfortunately omitted it; *ex gallias* in *Fél.* fo. 8a, *exagallias* in the *Book of Armagh*, fo. 23aa. The first approaches *iscelaib*, the second more resembles the Greek.

² See ἑξαγγελία in Stephanus' *Thesaurus Ling. Graec.*

Greek noun suggested by the verb of St. Peter, and found in the genitive plural in the *Cyropaedia*. I propose as an emendation *exaggelias* or *exangelias*.¹

The scribe of Armagh did not understand the word, and wrote in the margin, "incertus liber"; the Bollandists, though it was in their St. Waast MS.,² omit it; Mr. Gilbert prints *ex [tra] gallias*; Canon MacIlwaine suggests *euangelia*; Sir Samuel Ferguson equates it with *exagallias*, bequests, which he says is in Ducange; but *exagella* is the word in Ducange, as well as I can judge from D'Arnis' Lexicon Med. Latinitatis.

Leaving the reader to judge of Ferguson's view and my own, I pass to another obscure word of the hymn.

3. *aeua*.

Ised tuargaib aeua suas de sechtreba dóine.

This verse has been variously rendered, as follows:—

- "Et hinc ejus merita exaltata sunt supra nationes hominum,"³
- "This is what extended his fame up to each tribe of people,"⁴
- "This is what spread his praise (worth) up to every nation of mankind."⁵
- "It is this that raised his goodness upwards . . . (?) beyond men's tribes,"⁶
- "He raised his hands in blessing upon the tribes of men,"⁷
- "That exalted his name high over it (the evil) over the generations of men."⁸

For "eua" O'Brennan suggests "lua," worth; but he must have meant "luach," as "lua," in O'Reilly, is a foot, kick, heap, water, oath, while in the St. Gall MS. "lua liath gl. lien," and in the *Book of Armagh* "inna lua gl. juncturas gubernaculorum." In the RECORD of 1868, it seems to be taken for "lama," hands. It is glossed *amathe*, his goodness, in the *Book of Hymns*; it is set down as a scribal error for *aainm* by Dr. Zimmer, whose view I find borne out by these words of Fiacc's master, Dubthach, "Dorochair and Eithne

¹ It may be objected that St. Patrick was not familiar with the Greek Testament. Was he not? The early Irish Church certainly was so. I think Mr. Steele Nicholson has given some proofs that our Apostle read the Greek Testament, but I have not his book within reach.

² I know this from a collation lately made for me by the Bollandists.

³ Colgan. ⁴ Patrick Lynch. ⁵ O'Brennan. ⁶ Whitley Stokes.

⁷ I. E. RECORD, 1868. ⁸ Dr. Zimmer's "Celtische Studien," 2nd Heft.

Uathach, ainm dar treba," which reminds us of "sechtreba dóine." Dr. Zimmer sets forth his view as follows:—¹

" 'X' writes a *eua* without asterisks, as if all were quite clear. In his dictionary, which we consult with great expectations, we find a *eua* gl. *amathe*; that is, the middle Irish glossarist is simply transcribed. What, then, is this nowhere-else-occurring, very-slightly-trust-awaking word, *eua*? 'Y' translates, according to the gloss. 'It is that raised his goodness.' Now I cannot see any meaning whatever here to suit the context, 'pious was Patrick till he died, he was a strong expeller of evil.' The context rather suggests this interpretation, 'That (viz. that he was a strong expeller of evil), exalted his name high over it (the evil), over the generations of men.

"The word *aeua* is then a scribal error for *ainm* with the sign for *m* over *n*, which may have easily occurred, as in old MSS., *a* looks like *u*, *eu* like *ai*. However, I do not assert this as fully established.

"It is strange that neither 'Y' nor 'X' has taken the trouble to enquire how the glossarist was led to write the gloss *amathe*, *ejus bonitas*. Well, *amathe*, as early as the eleventh century, was pronounced as at present *avahe*, which is in Manx *a vie*. and the glossarist, not understanding '*aeua*,' took it for the phonetic form of *amathe*. So, this gloss has the same value, as for example, when in our day 'Z' translates *fithisi*, weavings, he pronounces *fíis*, is thus reminded of *fighim*, 'I weave,' and translates accordingly.²

"'Y' abuses the modern Irish writers with the full measure of his ready vocabulary, but to the middle Irish he offers the willing homage of his intellect, yet I have hitherto been unable to discover, that nonsense possesses the property which we usually attribute to cigars."

I cannot pretend to be a judge between Dr. Zimmer and the great scholars whom he criticises, but I think he wrongs the middle Irish glossarist, and the middle Irish vocable *eua*, which I beg to introduce to him as a genuine Irish word. No wonder, indeed, he regards it with suspicion; it is not easily recognizable, since it has undergone "initial decapitation" or *dichned tosaig*, and is suffering from internal "infection," and "mortification"³ *immedonchaib*, after this fashion:—*a feba* = Δ $\text{f}\epsilon\text{b}\Delta$ = *a eua* = his good qualities, or, as the glossarist puts it, *a mathe*. *A*, "his" aspirates, and according to Zeuss,

¹ "Celtische Studien," Heft 2. For obvious reasons I put X, Y, Z, in place of the real names given by Dr. Zimmer.

² I have heard a boy translate "sur sa tête un morceau de chair" (LaFontaine), by "on his head a morsel of hair."—E. Hogan.

³ Cf. O'Donovan's Gram., p. 50.

“si *f* inchoans accipit infectionem, signatur puncto delente vel omittitur.” Thus we get *a eba*. Again O’Donovan¹ says. “In the beginning of words *b* between two short broad vowels sounds softly like *u* and becomes a vowel, as peabac . Hence *a eua* is phonetically for *a feba*, the accusative plural of *feb* or *feib*. We find *at mathi em na feba sin, rom altsa em la feba fene* (L. na hUidre);² *ar febas do crotha, ar ebas a erlabra* (Book of Hymns, folio 3), *a feib .l. a huaisiu; feibh .l. febhus; a feib .l. abfeabhus crotha ocus ceneoil; bes cutruma feibh ocus tochus*—O’Don. Suppl. In Z². 801, *ind febtad*=qualitatis. In the “L. na gCeart” we read *ar shinseri ocus comairle, fond ocus feib-sa; iar sochar a forba ocus a ceneoil, a feib dligid ocus duchusa; is amlaid sin midighear feb-sa ocus tuarist la rig*. In the Bible,⁴ *an uile duine dh’a eabhas da mbi a staid*=every man at his best estate, *ni bfuil a shamhail agam feabhas intinne*=I have a man like-minded ισοψυχον . The dialogues of Connellan and of Neilson give:—“*Bhuil leabhachaidhe maith e ann? Ta siad air fheabhas., Nach glan geal an coirce sin? Tá sé air fheabhas stól.*” If you ask an Irish groom or farmer “An coirce maith é sin?” he will say “Tá sé air fheabhas” and may add, as happened in an answer to me, “Ní thig leis a bheith níos fearr.”

Hence I gather that *eua* means wealth of money or merit, *eximia virtus, præstabilis dignitas, excellentia, præstantia* qua “*sublimis supra genus eminent ipsum*”—*suas de sech treba dóine*. I feel confident that the old glossarist understood the word, but understated its meaning by giving *a mathe* for its synonym—it could have no difficulty for him, as it was written phonetically. No doubt O’Donovan³ says it is “a great puzzle among grammarians, whether *b* was anciently pronounced as aspirated,” that is as *u*, but he does not attempt to solve that puzzle.

Windisch finds the first traces of this aspiration in the old Irish loanwords, *improm* from “*improbus*,” *mebuir* from “*memoria* ;” then in Middle Irish he finds *mebaid* and *mebdatar* for O. Irish *memaid*, *memdatar*. He refers to pp. 84, 109, 304 of his “*Irische Texte*,” and adds, that it is only in later MSS. we find this infection indicated in writing. So

¹ Gram., p. 47. ² In Windisch’s “*Woerterbuch*.” ³ Gram., p. 47.

⁴ Psal. 38; Philip ii., 20.

far Dr. Windisch ;¹ I will go a step further. In the *Book of Armagh* (A.D. 807), *Uertrige* = *Bertrige* ; *campus euoi* = *c. eboi* ² = Machaire ebha, now Magherow, near Binbulbin, which is called *Eba* in "Chronicon Scotorum," p. 47. In the *Book of Armagh* copy of the "Confessio" *imuerbis* = *imberbis* ; in the "Codex Bernensis" of the ninth century, *uuair* = *ubair* ; in a Cornish MS. of the twelfth century *treuedic* = *trebedic*, "colonus."³ In the *L. Brecc* (circ. 1400) *treue* = *trebe*, *Berua* = *Berba*, *Baluina* = *Balbina* ;⁴ *noemi* and *noimi* of *L. Brecc* and *Laud* = *noebi* of *Rawlinson*, *noemi L. B.* = *noebi R.* ; *noebi L. B.* = *noemiu L.* ; *noemdai L. B.* and *L.* = *noebdai R.* ; *noemat L.* = *noebat L. B.* ; *Dauith L.* = *Dabid R.* and *L. B.* *Claidem* and *claidim* of *L. B.* and *R.* = *claidib L.*—Fél. (Prolog. 5 ; Epil. 59, 484 ; Sept. 13, Aug. 5, March 1). *Forryuib* of *Fiacc* = *forruim* (*Book of Armagh*).

In the *Yellow Book of Lecan* (A.D. 1390), *ni uil* = *ni fil* ;⁵ *nir uo deas*, *ciar uo bioth* = *nir bo deas*, *ciar bo bioth* ;⁶ *De ui* = *De bi* ;⁷ in the MS. Egerton of the fifteenth century, *do ueth* = *do beth* ; *uhen* = *ben* (three times), and *laurad*, *faoura* = *labrad*, *faobra* ;⁸ in the Harleian MS. of 1560 *circa*, *nir uo* = *nir bo*. Halliday says that in old MSS. *uoi* = *ba*, and O'Donovan asserts that ancient writers often use *uoei* for *bhi*, but they do not give any instances.

I trust that I have here established that *u* was written phonetically for *b* from the early times, and that consequently no objection can be maintained against *a eua* as a phonetic form of *a eba* or *a feba*.

I venture to submit my views on another obscure word of *Fiacc's Hymn*, viz. :—

4.—*Nibronna*.

The T.C.D. copy of *Fiacc's Hymn* has *Maraiith aes ni bronna*, and the copy O.S.F., *Maraid diaes inbronna*. The translations are—"Ibique, exinde manent impressa vestigia ejus."—(Colgan). "His marks after him remained."—(P. Lynch).

¹ Gram., M'Swney's Translation, p. 21.

² "Zeuss," p. 1071.

³ "Battle of Magh Rath," p. 118.

⁴ "Yellow Book of Lecan," col. 224.

⁵ "Windisch's Texte," p. 145, *et alibi*.

⁶ And that *b* = *m* = *v* or *u* phonetically.

² "Documenta," p. 85.

⁴ See Féilire, p. 177 ; 149.

⁶ "Circuit of Ireland," p. 32.

“There remains after him the impression.”—(O’Brennan). “Its trace abides, it wears not away.”—(Stokes,¹ and, after him; the *National MSS.*, and the *IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD*). “Manet vestigium ejus, non est deletum.”—(Fr. McSwiney, S.J.). Bishop O’Brien and O’Reilly in their Dictionaries print *na bronna*, and translate “the marks.” Windisch follows Stokes, yet indicates his doubts by a note of interrogation—“*Ni bronna*, intrans. schwindet nicht?”

I think the word is a preterite passive, and a phonetic form of *ní bronnad*, as *soscélad* (T.C.D.) is of *soscéla* (O.S.F.) in verse 33 of this very Hymn; and as *senna*, *labra* are of *sennad*, *sennath*, *labrad*, in *Fél*, Prol. 46. l. We find the perf. pass. *ro bronnad* in “Fled Bricrend,” *bronnad* and *brondad*, in “O’Donovan’s Suppl.,” and there also, *brondaid*, he uses, “wears,” and “brontar,” “is injured, worn.” In Dr. Sullivan’s² edition of the “Crith Gablach,” we have “*Dia ma brondad*,” “should it (the mill) be damaged,” *cia brontar*, “though it (the bed) should be damaged,” *ro “brontar”* “(the kiln) is damaged,” *ní ro bronntair inni*, “whatever is damaged in it,” *conneoch ro bronntair ann*, “for every damage done to it.”

Therefore *bronnaim* is a transitive; and as there is no evidence, so far, that it was used intransitively, I suggest the emendation *ni bronnad*, and adopt Fr. McSwiney’s translation:³ “Non est deletum,” or, non est detritum.

No doubt, O’Donovan writes that *do* or *ro* is prefixed to the perfect passive; but then 1°, Windisch only says it is usually prefixed; 2°, it is not prefixed to *frith*, *fofrith*, *adchuas*, *dochuas*, *focress*, *adchess*, etc.

5.—*Sléchtid*.

I should like to ascertain from Celtic *savans* the meaning of *sléchtid* in the *Book of Armagh*, fo. 18ab., “*Sléchtid*

¹ “O’Beirne-Crowe, in *Tain Bo Fraich*, p. 168, translates “Its trace remains, it wears not.” As he was a very independent interpreter, his adhesion to Stokes’ version is significant.

² “Manners and Customs,” iii., 500.

³ In his MS. Dictionary and Translations, which he kindly lent me while I was working at the *Documenta Patriciana*.

Isserninus du Patraice for a manchi ocus a andôoit; ocus dubbeir Patrice du Epscop Fith; ocus dabeir side du maccaib Cathbath, ocus congaib lethu Ath Fithot.¹

This matter may be fully discussed without stirring a question already set to rest in the RECORD, as the persons, places, times and circumstances are different.

Does it mean, that Bishop Isserninus, *alias* Fith, prostrated himself before St. Patrick, or bent the knee, or bowed to his authority? I cannot tell, and in the words of a puzzled old glossarist, I say—"Is dorchá dom." O'Reilly, apud Betham, translates, "Isserninus and his monks *submitted* to Patrick and craved forgiveness;" Stokes, in *Goidelica*: "Isserninus *knelt* to Patrick for his *manche* and his *andvit*;" some Celtic scholar, in Gilbert's National MSS. has, "I. *knelt* to Patrick for his monks and his parent church."

The *Book of Armagh* seems to authorise this translation of *sléchtid* by the words, fol. 11*ba*, "Cum centenis oraculis, *flectenisque assiduis* Deum rogabat," where it may be said, kneeling is meant. Parallel passages have been thus rendered: Sléchtáis Loegaire do Patrice L.U. 118 (*Revue Celt.* 1884, pp. 164-6); Is hé ro slecht do Patraice (*Book of Fenagh*, p. 385, Ed. Hennessy and Kelly); ceta roslecht, i. is é cét duine rot-slechtastair (*Senchus M.* iii. 29, 30); slechtáis Oingus do, slechtáis, slecht do (*Stokes, Félire*, pp. 7; 129; Three M.I. Hom. pp, 18, 22).

By all these the verb is translated *knelt*.

In the *Book of Ballymote*, "inclinavit se" of Nennius = roslecht, which Dr. Todd, with the sanction of O'Curry and O'Donovan, renders by "knelt," as he does in *Irish Nennius*, p. 80, where we read ro slecht a fiadnaisi Gearmain. Again, *slécht*, *sléchtáin*, *sléchténaib*, are rendered "kneeling" or "genuflection," by O'Curry, O'Donovan, Reeves and Stokes.³

¹ "Documenta Patriciana," p. 104.

² A misprint for *kneels*, as *sléchtid* is present, *slechtáis* or *ro slécht*. preterite.

³ "MS. Mater," p. 101, and "Colton's Visitation," p. 112; "Four Masters," AN. 3656; "Mart. of Donegal," p. 94; "Félire," p. 103, and "Irish Homilies," p. 11.

On the other hand, *slechtais* = prostrates himself (Todd),¹ “Fleasga na mac uile do sléachtain do fleasg Joseph,” the sheaves of all the sons *bent themselves* before the sheaf of Joseph.”—(Bishop O’Brien).² Here kneeling is out of the question. Robadar na draoithe ocus anaighte fo lar ag proistreat ocus ag sleachtain do Mac Dé. “The Druids lay flat on their faces, prostrate and bowing themselves down to the Son of God.”—(O’Brien). O nár sleachd do Bháil, that bowed not to Baal; do sleachd fa na chosaibh, he fell at his feet, má shleachdann tu dhamh, if thou wilt fall down.—(O’Brien, *s.v.* sléacdam).³

I pass now to the translations into Irish. In the *Book of Common Prayer* (pp. 40, 65, 284, 314, 324, 408, Ed. 1861), the Minister shall kneel = sleuchfaidh, sleachtfaidh; the Priest kneeling down, ar sleuchdadh don tsagart; all kneeling down, ar sleachdadh don iomlán; all the congregation shall kneel, sleachdfaidh an pobul uile; she shall kneel down sleachfaidh sí.

In the Bible κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ, οὐκ κάμψαν γόνυ, κάμπτω τὰ γόνατα, γονυπετῶν αὐτῷ γονυπετήσας, sléchtfaidh gach uile ghlún, nár fhill an glúine, fillim mo glúine, ag sleachtain ar a ghlúinib dhó, do léig sé ar a nglúinib é (Rom. xiv., 11; *ibid.* xi., 4; Eph. iii., 14; Matt. xvii., 14; Mark x., 17).

If we look for light from the dictionaries we find sléachdam = kneel down, bow down, fall down or worship (O’Brien); kneel, stoop, adore (O’Reilly); worship, kneel, bow down, adore (Coneys); genuflectere, se prosternere (Dict. Scoto-Celticum).

From this evidence I conclude that *sléchtain* signifies, according to circumstances, all that is expressed in the Ninety-fourth Psalm “O thigidh, is sleuchdamaid, is déanam cromadh leinn, is air ar nglúinibh tuiteamaid,” another version of which is “O tagaidh déanam adhra, agus claonam, filliom ar nglúine.” And I am inclined to say of *sléchtid* what Schleusner writes of προσκυνεῖ: “Generatim significat se incurvare et inclinare, ita ut subaudiatur vel ἐπί γόνατα, quod addit Theophr., aut εἰς τὴν γῆν, ut habet Xiphilinus.” Hence

¹ *L. Hymnor*, p. 30; *recte*, he prostrated, τὰ γόνατα.

² O’Brien, *s.v.* “fleasg,” and “proistreat,” from the *L. Brecc.* ³ *Itid.*

I would translate *sléchtid do Pátricc* by *προσκυνεῖ Πατρικίον* or *Πατρικίω*. I hope some of the learned contributors to the RECORD will be able to determine the precise meaning of the passage.

6.—*Druimm hurchaille*.

In the Four Masters an. 837 is recorded the death of the Abbat *Droma Urchaille*, and O'Donovan says it may be Cnoc Urchoille or Spaniel Hill, Co. Clare. This is a mistake, and Spaniel is a misprint, I think, for Spancel. Dr. Matthew Kelly¹ quotes the Synod of Rath-Bressail, which says: "Cluanardensis Episcopatus inter Clochanum et Sinneum annem, Ulchultum et Cluanconiriam situs est;" and he remarks that Cluanconiria is Cloneurry on the boundary between Meath and Leinster; but "Urchoillte is now unknown." However, the place is not far from Maynooth and Cloneurry, as we shall see. I find the spot next mentioned in the RECORD of 1866, p. 468, in which the Litany of Aengus has "secht noem epscoip Dromma Archaille, hos omnes inuoco." Next in MacFirbis "De Quibusdam Episcopis"² I read "Druim Urchaille—ui nepscop Droma Urchaille," "the Seven Bishops of Druim-Urchaille. Thus it is in the History of the Saints of Erin, which begins with this number of Seven Bishops, viz., 'Seven Bishops of Druim-Urchaille, Seven Bishops of Cell-Dercedain.'" The Editor, Mr. Hennessy, adds a query "Drumurgill, Co. Kildare?"

In the *Book of Armagh*³ it is stated that St. Patrick "perrexit ad fines Lageniensium ad *Druimm hUrchaille*, et posuit ibi *domum martyrum quae sic vocatur, quae sita est super riam magnam in valle, et est ibi Petra Patricii* in via. Exiit ad campum Lifi, etc." From my knowledge of the northern fines Lageniensium I conjectured that this place was Dunmurril Hill, near Donadea, and I communicated my view three years ago to the Very Rev. Dr. Geoghegan of Kilcock, and to Father Shearman. Dr. Geoghegan coincided with me and drew up a map of the place, and sent me the traditions

¹ Cambrensis Ever, vol. ii., p. 787.

² Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy, vol. i., part i., p. 108.

³ See *Documenta*, p. 88.

of the people. Father Shearman referred me to his *Loca Patriciana*, where he says: "Druimm Urchaille = Dunmurrhill, the remains of the cemetery crowns its summit. On the northern side is a small dun or rath, from which the present denomination of the place is derived." To Father Shearman belongs, I believe, the credit of having first identified the place. I made it out independently, and from Dr. Geoghegan's map and my own examination of the spot, to which I have made many a pilgrimage, I am able to correct and supplement Father Shearman's account.

The cemetery is not on the summit, but low on the slope "super viam magnam," the dún is not on the north but nearly west, and it is not small, but a very large frontier hill fort, which commanded a fine view of the hostile borders of Meath. *But it will be very small before long*, unless some one says: "Road-maker, spare that rath." The "Green Hill," as it is called, is fast disappearing, and part of the vast rath which crowns its summit has already been cut away.

The "Domus Martyrum," called elsewhere in the *Book of Armagh* a *Martar-tech*, or Relic-house, is still called the *Relicín*. The "Via magna" is either Balloch (Bealach), close by, or ran inside the wall of Donadea, along the boundary of Dunmurril, where the people say there is or was a rock blessed by St. Patrick; others think it is the large stone on Mrs. Brierton's land. The "old people" have also told me that "Dunmurrill had seven Bishops buried in its sacred ground, and has seven hills like Rome." Interments took place there up to about the year 1832. Between that place and Naas in the Campus Lifi there are many *souvenirs* of our Saint's passage, such as *Sceach Phádrúig* at Donore, which an old man pointed out to me, though he could not tell what the name meant.

Druimm Urchaille means the Ridge of the Green Wood (Colgan, A.S.S., p. 59, and O'Donovan in *Four Masters*, an 837). The nominative is *Druimm Urchaille* (McFirbis, *Episcopi Domnách Urchaille* (Colgan A.S.S. p. 59); genitive *Dromma Urchaille* (Aengus' Litany), *Droma Urchaille* (*Four Masters* and *McFirbis*); dative or accusative *Druimm hurchaille* (*Book of Armagh*).

The proper Irish name for the ridge is *Druimm hUrchaille* and for the *Relicín, Donnach Urchaille*, while the dún or hill fort, at which St. Patrick stopped one night, is still called by the people *Dún mBróchaill*. The English name is correctly Drummerhill in the Eccles. Taxatio of 1302-6; Drummurghill in Seward's Topographical Dictionary, and in Sleator, p. 270, Ed. 1806. It is corruptly called Donmorkill in the "Taxatio," temp. Henry VIII., Dunmurghil or Dunmurraghil, in "Lewis' Topographical Dictionary," in "The Parliamentary Gazetteer of Ireland," in Thom's Directory, in the Ordnance Survey Map, and, I am sorry to say, in Father Comerford's "Collections," i., p. 98. Would it not be well to resume the correct spelling of the beginning of this century?

EDMUND HOGAN, S.J.

VACATION IN 1886.—III.

EVERYBODY knows that Norfolk, as a county, is one of the flattest; it might have been a piece of Holland washed over, or more properly phrased, plucked up from the depths of ocean by some Great Eastern of prehistoric times, and towed into this north-easternmost extremity of England. But Norfolk has an exception to its general rule of flatness, and Cromer is that exception. Indeed it may be called the Norfolk Switzerland; following herein a prevalent practice of calling every group of hills abroad a local Switzerland, and frequently with no greater claims than our own Cromer.

Cromer stands on cliffs "not less than sixty feet high," says the local guide, who, being of course a Norfolk man, swells with importance as a Dutchman might do, at such towering heights. Yes, there it stands boldly commanding the German Ocean. Boldly we say advisedly, for it requires no little courage in a pretty watering place, to perch itself on the verge of such treacherous cliffs as these, which have over and over again proved false, and toppled its outworks down into the stormy ocean. So "commanding"

the German Ocean is not exactly correct, seeing that the waters have proved too much in their fury for the little town, which confided in their summer smiles. But in truth Cromer can hardly be said to have planted itself on the cliff, it is the ocean which is the intruder : which marching for centuries in its destructive way, at the rate of a yard a year, has swept off the Lordship and Parish of Shipden with its St. Peter's, which in Doomsday Book was a place of importance, and swallowed all up as far as Cromer about the time of Henry IV. But passing over the rough ocean-doing of these earlier days, it is enough to reach the Cromer of the present day, to record that from time to time great landslips have taken place, until the very lighthouse itself was swept away in 1866: and a new one was erected on the heights some two-hundred and eighty yards further inland, which, if the old rate of sea encroachments continue, will have to be shifted onward again about the year A.D. 2146. So Cromer is not a place to invest money in, at least in the purchase of coastland.

Needless to say that Cromer has a somewhat battered look amid all its modern smartness, somewhat like an old warrior who crowns his scars and wrinkles with a young wig. Its cliffs are wall-faced, as they have been often before : and the houses, which almost close its narrow streets, seem to stretch their necks seawards, as though, naturally enough, wondering when their day of sea bathing will come. Indeed, as we should expect, there is a look of temporary arrangement about the sloping paths and wooden staircases that do duty for permanent roads, which tells of anything but fixity of tenure, and the completion which that term implies.

So it is when we come to take up our residence at the charming little Bath Hotel, built boldly against the present cliff and almost level with the sea, the fly that has brought us from the adjacent high hills on the top of which the railway abruptly terminates, stops when it can go no lower, and we and our luggage descend by fragile steps, which are almost ladders, and find ourselves in a pleasant house which seems all the pleasanter for the strangeness of the approach.

Ordinary arrangements of course are altogether out of place in an hotel so situated. Upstairs means any storey, and

every storey is at a different stage, according as you make your ground floor section on one side of the house or another. The street door is on the first floor above the sands, the garden door is on the second, and past the windows of the third rises a path which climbs by two flights of steps to the public road high above. When these local difficulties are mastered, it is pleasant to go in and out where you please, and escape all internal staircases, and be, as it were upon the ground floor however high up in the house your room may be.

Capital bathing is there at Cromer; you seem to be at the end of the world, and indeed may see the sun both rise and set over its coastline. Then the walks over the breezy cliffs, which rise and fall so abruptly that people think twice before they make an abrupt descent scanning doubtfully the as rapid rise on the other side. Who can calculate what quantity of ozone gets into one's system in roaming over these heights and plunging into these ravines? The bright sunshine but adds to the pleasure of the ramble as it does to the beauty of the scenery, without making its presence unpleasantly felt: for there can be no depression of spirits where there is no oppression of heat, and here the sea-breezes mingle with its beams, and temper them till it becomes a part of themselves. A guide book is hardly needful, for go which way you will there are pleasant walks and drives with some grand old church, or noble mansion or wild demesne with pines and gigantic beeches not in solitary groups but in stretches of real forest in which it is a pleasure, not often denied, to be lost for an hour or more. For people who are methodical in their pleasures, and who wish to visit the chief points in the neighbourhood a guide is of course necessary, for where there are so many places inviting and well repaying a pilgrimage, some selection must be made unless time is unlimited.

We tried the plan but it utterly broke down with us. People following impulse and the leading whim of the moment will never be Methodists, and yet we, going anywhere and anyhow perhaps enjoy our vagabondry, and, it may be see as much of the things best worth seeing, as the most orderly of our brother visitors. There is a fine old church which towers above the little town, as much as the town itself towers above

the sea. Matter-of-fact people say, doubtless, that it is far too big for the place, but in the time of Henry IV. people judged otherwise. Like all churches in these parts it is built of flint and freestone, and consisted of a chancel with a nave and two aisles, and a grand square embattled tower upwards of one hundred and fifty feet high. The chancel was destroyed two hundred years ago, and of that only some lofty fragments remain, then the rest fell into decay and the population contented themselves and their devotional requirements with the accomodation which the tower afforded. But in the last few years all has been carefully restored at considerable cost; all except the chancel, which still raises its gaunt fragments as if in protest against this neglect of what was once the most sacred part of the church, and threatens its restored brother with its overhanging walls. This mixture of restoration, preservation and neglect is almost a characteristic of this part of the country. Very fine are most of the churches, and yet almost everywhere there are ruined arches and dismantled towers as though the people felt that they had more than they required; as indeed they have, seeing how different are the rites now in fashion from those for which their grand old churches were built. Some such feeling must unconsciously have influenced their minds for there is no mark of poverty or parsimony in their care of what they use.

The Catholic draw-back to a stay at Cromer is the want of a Catholic church. However a railway journey of twenty miles carries us to Norwich where there are two churches, and much to interest and fill up vacant intervals.

So after a fortnight at Harrogate and a week at Cromer, what with the water-drinking and bathing, combined with the fresh sea and land breezes, pleasant society and intercourse with nature at its brightest, we feel that we may venture upon a ramble abroad for a few weeks to test the strength we have so diligently acquired. But so planless are our wanderings, so undetermined our route, that on our way to London we absolutely pass Harwich which is the port we return to the very next day on our way to Antwerp.

And now once more we are on a Foreign Tour: but with

no ambitious designs or extensive range of mental vision. Indeed so little do we yearn after exciting novelties that we find ourselves at Brussels as a matter of course; as we had found ourselves at London when we were pondering over a new departure. And Brussels is in truth as charming as ever; as wonderful and ambitious in its growth as any of its neighbouring cities, as even the one which had milliards to play with, after its little game with France. There stands, now completed, a Palais de Justice, as high almost as St. Paul's and occupying an area larger than that of St. Peter's; there it stands at the end of a grand vista from the Place Royale, on a wide open space which has been cleared for it by the sweeping away of numberless houses; and towering high above the old city, to which it graciously condescends to make itself accessible by what the Belgians call *Le Fantastique Escalier*, perhaps the grandest staircase in Europe. Fifty millions of francs have been spent upon it, and so we need not wonder that not only the site itself was cleared out but a whole sweep was made of all that could be said to be near it, and encroaching upon its dignity. Fortunately it is not Gothic in its architecture, and so is fitted for the purpose for which it is built. Brussels has no need of modern Gothic, seeing how much it possesses of real mediæval work in its Hotel de Ville, and other ancient buildings. One cannot help comparing it with the heavy and gloomy new Law Courts in London, which are thrust into the Strand, and take their station, grimly and absurdly out of place, amid the shops and houses of that narrow thoroughfare.

We wander around the Grande Place, of which one can never tire, even when the Hotel de Ville has been exhausted; for are there not on all its sides those quaint and yet grand houses which were built after the bombardment in 1698? houses which Brussels has ruled are never to be pulled down to make room for modern constructions. A noble determination this of the city, which it has made still more effective by a resolution of its Municipal Council, as follows, which we chronicle for the edification and encouragement of similar bodies nearer home: "Whereas the Grande Place contains the most unique collection of"—no; let it stand in its own language,

which translation can hardly do justice to : “ Considérant que la Grande Place offre le plus admirable ensemble de constructions de tout le Pays, il a décidé de faire restaurer, aux frais de la Ville, toutes les maisons, sans destruction, dans leur style primitif.” All honour to the city that could so resolve, and carry out, as it has done, this patriotic work.

As we wander on, round the Place for a fresh point of view, and so obtain a fresh grouping of the quaint and fantastic houses, we stumble unwittingly upon a grand Boulevard which we do not remember to have seen before. On it stretches in noble dimensions and with accordant houses, on, on, we wonder where it will cease. Shall we say it is equal to any boulevard in Paris? No: for it has something which Paris wants. It has a character of its own, and scorns to borrow, even from a bigger neighbour.

We must leave Brussels, and, as usual, unwillingly: so on we go by Luxembourg to Strassburg, as we went last summer, and there we branch off and cross the Rhine into the Black Forest for a week of wandering. The bold engineering of its railway is familiar enough, being now the usual way to Shaffhausen or to Lake Constance (*Boden See*), but when we last hurried over it, we registered a vow in Murray that we would treat it with more respect and attention when next we came. And now here we are at its little capital, Triberg, in the very heart of the Black Forest, and perched up upon its toes, as it were, some 2,000 feet above sea level, that it may survey the Canton over which it bears rule, and keep an eye upon its mountains and valleys. But high as it stands, and even higher as we dwell, on a steep hill, and up in the very roof of the *Schwarz-Wald Hof* (Hotel of the Black Forest), hanging out in a veritable Swiss cottage, with street door and windows commanding our own lofty balcony, even here our view is closed by adjacent heights which hedge us in on every side; so that while we lie a-bed calmly contemplating at our ease the scenery immediately before us, we bridge over the heights beneath, and have the climbing forest on a level with our aerie, and lose it as it sweeps in noble undulations above our windows, to regain it only when outside on our own little balcony. For a time Triberg is our own also.

Its valleys grow familiar; its wandering paths, now up steeply into the all-encircling forest, now wending their way through cultivated meadows to picturesque farmhouses; ever onward but not necessarily carrying us very far from home; seeming themselves to grow tired of wandering, and so bringing us back again to the place they and we love so well. Often is it purposeless strolling, the very perfection of vacation, when nothing has to be done but to enjoy nature in its bountifulness.

Sometimes, however, what seems a sense of duty comes over us, and we feel that we ought to see something, to visit some place, and so to prepare ourselves to answer to those questionings which seem to have grown up for the most careless traveller in these days of incessant examination. But we sturdily resist, refuse to go in, and follow, not so much our own fancies as nature's leading. But, one day, as a kind of compromise, we walk along the high road from Triberg to Hornberg. How ordinary language misleads in such a walk as this! A high road from town to town suggests dust and heat, and all their attendant discomforts; whereas here it means a winding way between two lofty ranges of hills, now closing in upon us and darkening the road by the overhanging trees high above, which form a greensky through which the bright sun sends its tremulous rays and paints our path with dancing light. Now again one range draws back, and close beside us appear the bright, sparkling, and singing waters of the beautiful little river, Fallbach. It is our companion from Triberg to Hornberg, but like a faithful dog is now beside us, "fetching mad bounds," and then away off into the mountain, only to return once more, as full of sport as ever, and resting for a while in a broader expanse, to be up and off again as we draw near. Hornberg is a pretty village, and is dominated, or once was so, by a feudal castle which is now a ruin, or perhaps worse, at least from a picturesque point of view, for it is a *Pension* as a black inscription on a whitewashed wall, a very loud advertisement tells us. However it must be a home for the hardy mountaineer, for no ordinary pensionnaire would care to mount it often in the course of the day. The valley, however, has its hotel and there we find ourselves just in time for a table d'hôte.

We vary our return by means of the railway; and this is as much out of the common way as the Black Forest itself.

In our walk from Triberg, the railway, as well as the river, had been our companion, but here again ordinary language must not mislead us.

The railway, like the river, was here, there, and everywhere; and if it did not go bounding on its way, it seemed to play almost as mad tricks considering the decorum such a construction generally observes. But surely the spirit of the mountain is upon it, and like ourselves when out wandering, at one time it is climbing up a steep ascent, then suddenly turning on its path, it drops down again that it may take a flying leap across the road and retrace the very way it came, on the opposite range of hills, and work backwards and forwards in steep curves up again until it has climbed a certain height, and then, as though tired of this toil, it plunges into a tunnel which brings us out in a dazzling blaze of light, and pulls up—at least the train does, with a yell at a pretty station. Did we say a yell? no; it is with a lively whistle which awakens all the adjacent echoes, and so the grim mountain range bursts out into laughter and welcomes home its child. We had noticed all this eccentric action while on our pleasant walk, and indeed had a train as a companion more or less near for some time; not of course that it moved at our deliberate pace, but having so to double upon itself and to travel both sides of the way in both directions, it passed and repassed us without stopping, and at last only won by a neck.

The engineering on this line is excellent, and like most things of excellence it was costly. It is a Government work and so does not ruin shareholders. But it is a public necessity and opens up the trade of the Black Foresters, so it is worth its cost. The trade here is, strange to say, in Dutch toys and American clocks, Dutch of course meaning German (*Deutsch*), but why the well known cuckoo-clocks should be called American we do not pretend to know.

It is curious to note that the Germans call their toys from the place where they are made, *Nürnbergger Spielwaaren*, so Triberg had to use a word for itself which Germany never thus employs.

We need not dwell upon other expeditions, always made on foot, as to St. Georgen and Sommerau, but a word must be said about its celebrated waterfall before we pass on into Switzerland.

A guide book now before us—one of a series called "*Guides Conty*,"—seems to think indeed that the waterfall is almost the *raison d'être* of Triberg, and sends the guided to an hotel for immediate dinner, that he or she may devote what time remains to "sa ravissante cascade," and continue the journey onward in the afternoon. But the guide book perhaps is not to blame, seeing that French tourists soon weary of scenery, and are better pleased with a waterfall which can call forth the usual exclamations, let them pose for a few minutes, and off again. So we need not be hard upon an excellent guide-book which is compact, cheap, and abounding in clever, merry wood-cuts, illustrating incidents of travel.

Anyhow the waterfall is an attraction which stays even impatient travellers, and for their sake we suppose, is treated as quite a distinguished personage. The hotels flaunt its name on their advertisements, and even our magnificent Schwarz-Wald Hof calls itself, at one end of the omnibus, the Waterfall Hotel. For it, the waterfall as well as the omnibus, belongs to us, standing in our ground, or at any rate in the ravine adjoining. The river (Fallbach), our old friend who accompanied us from Triberg to Hornberg, winds somewhat lazily through a broad plain on the heights above, but wakes up to tumble over and amid the grand rocks that lead into the ravine, and to make amid sundry stumbles, three grand leaps into the depth below; then it hurries on down a rapid descent into the town, and, after doing a scientific work there, flows on, as we have said, through the Gutach valley to and beyond Hornberg.

The fall is of upwards of one hundred and fifty feet; and being hemmed in by pines that clothe the granite rocks, and spanned by two bridges, and commanded by paths which wind round every good point of view, it is a striking object from a distance and not less pleasing when examined close at hand. Murray says it is the finest in Germany, which after all is not saying much. Anyhow it is worth a visit even by a hurrying tourist, and forms an ever new object of pleasure

to the more sedate traveller. It is a kind of afternoon lounge and an evening stroll at least when the display is over, and the moon is left alone to illuminate it. For it is turned at a fixed hour into a show place to which the thoughtless swarm, and, like too many other falls, is made a victim to the electric light which degrades the beautiful work of nature down to the level of a scene in a play; as indeed many unconscious satirists pronounced it to be, when they mean only to express their admiration. And, as though to make the degradation lower and more keenly to wound its feelings, for waterfalls surely have not only a life, but a consciousness of beauty in the poetry of motion,—it is made to work this exhibition of itself and to provide by its own action the electricity that flaunts gaudy colours over its virgin waters. So the flash of light is turned on, the coloured glasses are shifted, and now red, and now green discolours the water, until the Black Forest seems to pass away and the Colinderies rises and usurps its place. However the electric light does more serviceable work, and so Triberg is made bright and gay, with a brilliancy few capitals can boast.

The mountain railway has opened up the Black Forest for tourists as well as for trade, and year by year are its quiet beauties more recognised.

So Triberg has grown into a place of much resort, and not only has good hotels, but has them crowded. Here in our Schwarz-Wald Hof the passages and public rooms do duty for dormitories; nay the very balconies themselves, which open on to the broad staircases, become sleeping places, at least in fine weather, while those who get rooms, and still more, we who get a real aerial cottage to ourselves, rank among the blessed. With fashion of course comes music in its train, and if, as must be confessed, the performances are rare and the times uncertain, there is at least the foundation upon which all may hereafter be built, in the shape of a tax upon visitors, the collection of which is at present the only portion of the scheme which is carried out with regularity.

So we bid farewell to dear little Triberg, and pray, with our courteous host, that our return may be speedy.

HENRY BEDFORD.

(*To be continued.*)

THEOLOGICAL QUESTIONS.

I. "Would you kindly give your decision on the following? A penitent who has made a general confession six years ago, comes now to confession, having made bad confessions during the six years. He does not know whether certain sins he has actually committed were before his general confession. He quite forgets. Here there would appear to be a "*dubium negativum de peccatis confessis*," and according to theological principles he would be bound to confess. So says a friend whom I consulted. But I think the case resolves itself into a '*dubium de commissis*.' For he cannot say whether he committed these sins after the general confession, so as to be bound to confess them. The *lex confessionis* is not certain, and must prove itself. Therefore he is not bound to confess them.

II. "The same solution would be given, where a baptised adult comes six years after his baptism to confess his sins for the first time. He is uncertain whether he committed certain sins before or after his baptism. He has only a negative doubt. But I hold that the *lex confessionis* must prove itself. For though he has certainly committed certain sins, he does not know whether he has committed sins that *must* be confessed. The '*dubium*' in this and the former case may be expressed—a '*dubium negativum de peccatis ita commissis ut necessario confiteri debeant*.' There is then a *dubium negativum* about the obligation of confession; and therefore one is not bound to confess.

III. "Another case is this—A penitent does not know whether he confessed certain circumstances that change the nature of the sin. He has nothing to rely upon but mere oblivion. His confessor who may supply the defect had been a mere listener and by no means a doctor. Here although there is a negative doubt about sins committed, viz.—circumstances that should be confessed, I think the axiom—'*Standum est pro valore actus*' will apply to this case in the sense—'*Quod factum est, presumitur rite factum*.' There is no doubt about the substantial confession of the sins, or what may be termed the '*corpus*.' Therefore the circumstances may be presumed as confessed. Hence no obligation to confess.

"By giving your decision, you will greatly oblige.

"A SUBSCRIBER."

I. By a process like that indicated in this question doubts with regard to confession of sins may be *indirectly* turned into

doubts with respect to *commission* itself. For in such cases the sinner "cannot say whether he committed these sins so as to be bound to confess them." But theologians, when distinguishing different classes of doubtful offences in relation to the integrity of confession, have in view what is *directly* doubtful. This latter may be *commission*, *time* of commission with respect to *baptism*, *gravity*, or *past confession*. In all these hypotheses the particular law is uncertain and cannot impose an obligation. In how many of them then does a reflex law enforcing the particular obligation, notwithstanding the direct doubt, *certainly* exist? Or rather, as we can scarcely hope to add, in a short space, anything to what is contained in such books as Lehmkuhl, Gury and Marc, how are our correspondent's difficulties to be classified with reference to the above division, and is the reflex law certain in these special cases?

Keeping to his first question for the present, as bad confessions count for nothing, the case seems to be one of doubtful confession. Now when a grave sin has certainly been committed, and a doubt arises with regard to its confession, it is not too much to say that the *sententia communis* requires at least a sound, probable and positive reason arising from the balance of presumptions if not directly adducible, for believing that the offence was confessed, before exonerating a penitent from the duty of declaring it in the tribunal of penance. Is there any ground to support such a belief in regard to this particular case? No doubt for conscientious penitents who examine their consciences with diligence before confession, and are always careful about its integrity, a favourable presumption exists, relying on which they are justified in holding themselves practically free from declaring this or that mortal sin, the confession of which they cannot now recall to mind. Such penitents have firm ground to go upon. We think it is otherwise in the case before us. The person has no direct reason for holding he confessed those sins in a good confession and his method of life does not seem to found a safe presumption on his behalf. Furthermore, if we turn from the thought of strict obligation to consider what is right and salutary for

such a penitent, assuredly, as he does not appear on this statement to be one harassed by scruples, it would be well for him to quiet his conscience by a full disclosure of the past, even if, without certainty, he should have solid reasons for thinking he had confessed his faults.

II. This last remark applies likewise to our correspondent's next question. For the penitent's sake a full confession should be asked. But is it of strict obligation? The offences are certain in themselves; yet it is doubtful whether they come within the sphere of absolution. The uncertainty about their place with regard to Baptism would seem equivalently an uncertainty with respect to their commission. Considered as sins which the Sacrament of Penance can wipe out their existence at any time is doubtful. It is doubtful whether the acts in question ever were *materia circa quam* of this sacrament. Hence they almost come under the class of doubtfully committed sins, and, as there is no strong positive ground for holding that they have been committed in the sense explained, it would appear that there is no certain obligation of confessing them. But, on the other hand, a like question has arisen in connection with conditional Baptism, and, as is well known, was decided in favour of the obligation to confess mortal sins occurring between the two ceremonies. Yet the above-mentioned reasons for exemption were pertinent to the latter case. Apart, however, from extrinsic differences, it may be replied that Baptism, when in possession, brings with it all the obligations of Christian life, until the baptismal rite is proved invalid, and that it would ill assort with the end of Penance, at the time of conversion and afterwards, if it were lawful to omit confessing the sins of youth and manhood whenever Baptism is sufficiently doubtful to require conditional repetition. These points are of considerable importance. Besides the precise reasons for the decision given to the English Bishops by the Holy Office in 1868, as well as its full significance, are subject to some controversy among theologians. Hence, pending a further decision from the Holy See on the issue here raised, we think our correspondent's conclusion as to the *strict obligation* is fairly

warranted by the difference which certainly exists between his case and that decided by the Sacred Congregation.

III. His reasoning on this third question also seems sound as far as it goes. But in practice the lax should be made repeat these circumstances, the scrupulous should not be allowed to do so, and penitents who observe the golden mean, are to be encouraged to state such doubts in their completeness.

P. O'D.

THE CHURCH ABROAD.

THE war that was to crush Catholicism in the German Empire was opened by Herr Falk in 1873, under a double pretext. The first was the definition of Papal Infallibility on the 18th of June, 1870, and the second was the subsequently hostile attitude taken up even in matters of pure politics by the Centrum or Catholic party against the Government of Prince Bismarck. The latter fact was, of itself, sufficient to draw out the anger of the Chancellor, and a widespread effort was made besides to lead the public to believe that it was the direct outcome of the Infallibility. It was, therefore, not to be tolerated that in a great and free country, a foreign sovereign, whoever he might be, should be allowed so to interfere as to rule the consciences and direct the political action of German citizens. According to the leading lights of this successful and victorious empire, Goethe and Schiller, as well as Hegel and Strauss, the State was the first object worthy of human worship. It could not allow the loyalty that it claimed to be shared by any individual or institution in the world. Hence an end was to be put once and for all to Papal interference, and the dupes who submitted to it were to be taught that such an outrage on the dignity of the German Empire would be borne no longer.

These were the ostensible grounds for the *Culturkampf*, or so-called battle of progress and culture against the blighting influence of Rome; but under the veil of such pretences, false and foolish in themselves, the real cause of alarm can be traced to Protestant bigotry and hatred of Catholicism.

The Church had long been persecuted in Germany, and it was

only in 1850 that after many years of struggle for existence it was allowed free and unfettered action in the State. The Council of Würzburg, held before 1848, had warned the Government of the coming dangers, and the Bishops proclaimed that they were powerless to stem the tide of anarchy and revolution as long as they were denied the common rights of citizenship, and particularly the free exercise of their ecclesiastical duties. Fortunately their voice was listened to, and for the first time in a long period the Church was set free, at least from the trammels of positive State oppression. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that her influence increased enormously. The conversions at an earlier period of Frederick Schlegel, of Goërres, and of Clement Brentano, had given an activity to Catholic study almost as great as that which followed the conversion of John Henry Newman in England. This intellectual movement was taken up afresh, and made rapid pace. Scientific associations were formed. Newspapers and reviews were founded, in which Catholic interests were ably defended. The influence of the priests with their people grew every day greater. Convents of men and women were established all over the country. Free communication was held with the Holy See. Papal Bulls and Briefs were published without any Royal Placet, and all the latent forces of the Church were drawn out and guided by a zealous and most enlightened episcopate.

This was the state of things which alarmed Protestantism and atheism alike and which gave a back in the country to the heroes of the *Culturkampf*. It is only necessary to summarize what followed. Professors in the Catholic and "half-Catholic" Universities of the empire who had broken off from the Church and joined the Old Catholic movement, were maintained and confirmed in their positions by the Government despite the withdrawal and suspension of their Bishops; the Jesuits were driven out their country and scattered over the world; those of them who presumed to remain in their native land were cast into prison; the Redemptorists and Lazarists were dissolved; the students of ecclesiastical seminaries were dispersed, and the missions that were being quietly conducted by members of religious orders in retired country places were broken up by the police. The existence of convents throughout the empire was decreed to be abolished, and this decree was unmercifully carried out with regard to the convents of the Sacred Heart, of the Sisters of Charity, of the Sisters of Notre Dame, and of the Sisters of St. Charles. Crushing fines were inflicted on bishops and priests for the

exercise of the most ordinary acts of administration, and when their stock of property was exhausted by fines they were arrested like malefactors and thrown into prison. Archbishops Ledochowski of Posen, and Melchers of Cologne, were among the first arrested and imprisoned. The dungeons of Coblenz and Manheim were crammed with priests. The Dominicans were expelled from Trèves, and their convent converted into a prison where Bishop Eberhard of that diocese, with sixty of his priests were confined and fed on "*schlicht*." The Sees of these Bishops were declared vacant by the Government, and the chapters were called upon to elect successors to them. On their refusal they were overwhelmed with fines, and many of them imprisoned. The Catholic laity were then invited to elect their own pastors, and the most dazzling bribes were held out if they would break off from their allegiance to Rome; but they indignantly repudiated any such conduct, adopting as their motto the words of St. Laurence the Martyr to Pope Sixtus: "*Quo sine filio, pater.*" Every possible device that could mislead or frighten the Catholics, every petty interference that could irritate or vex them was resorted to by their persecutors; but it was all in vain. There are few instances in history of a nobler stand against bigotry.

Providence raised up two leaders worthy of the occasion: Mallinckrodt and Windthorst. They organised the Catholic voters so well that at the elections of 1874 the number of Catholic representatives in the Prussian Landtag was increased from 52 to 89, and in the Reichstag the numbers grew from 63 to 105. Herr Windthorst was elected at Meppen in Hanover by a majority of nearly 15,000 over Falk the author of the May Laws. The firmness and spirit of utter self-sacrifice thus displayed by the Catholic population startled the Government, yet the struggle had grown too warm to allow them to withdraw. They had recourse for a time to still harsher measures, but at every step they met with irresistible courage, and soon began to perceive that they had undertaken an impossible task. Slowly and gradually they came to recognise the error of their ways and their last hope was to turn to that Papacy whose influence they had learned to treat with more respect. Encouraged by the conciliating spirit of Pope Leo, negotiations were opened. Mgr. Melchers of Cologne and Mgr. Ledochowski of Posen were invited to reside at Rome and were created Cardinals. Successors acceptable to the Government were then appointed to administer their former Sees. The Seminaries were opened up again. Free communications were allowed with Rome. A good way has

been travelled backwards on the road to the point from which Herr Falk set out.

Prince Bismarck makes his retreats by slow stages. For almost every piecemeal concession he expects a vote from the Centre in favor of some Government project. Holding out hopes of future favors to the Church in Germany and to the Papacy, he recently called upon them to support the proposal of Count Von Moltke to establish what is known as the military Septennate. When this proposal was first made and it became clear that the Catholic party would oppose it, the Papal Nuncio in Munich received a letter from Cardinal Jacobini of which we shall give the most important passages.

“You have learned from my telegram of the 1st inst. that the communication of the project of final revision of the ecclesiastical laws of Prussia is expected here from day to day. We have recently had a formal assurance of that important fact.

“You can therefore set Herr Windthorst at rest on that point and dissipate all the doubts he expressed in his last most esteemed communication. In view of this near, and as we have reason to believe, satisfactory revision of the ecclesiastical laws, the Holy Father desires that the Centre should favour the project of a military Septennate in every possible way.

“If in virtue of such action proximate danger of war can be averted, the Centre will have deserved well of the Empire, of humanity and of Europe. In the opposite hypothesis the hostile attitude of the Centre cannot fail to be looked on as unpatriotic, and the dissolution of the Reichstag may cause no small embarrassment and uncertainty to the same Centre.

“Besides, adhesion to the proposed Septennate would place the Government under obligations to the Catholics and to the Holy See, and the latter would attach great importance in future to a friendly and confidential understanding with the Government of Berlin

“You will therefore explain to the leaders of the Centre that they would act in a manner most pleasing to the Holy See, and in a way that would turn to the advantage of the Catholic cause by voting for the project of the Government.”

There is no doubt but that it was in deference to this wish expressed by the Pope that the Catholic party offered to vote the military subsidy for three years, and if necessary to renew it at the expiration of that term. Prince Bismarck would make no compromise and dissolved the Reichstag. The Holy Father's desire was

then conveyed to the Catholic electors that they should support the Septennate, but the peasants feel the military tax already a crushing burden and the Catholic leaders could not be certain of their support if the new bill formed part of the programme. One of the most eminent Catholics, Baron de Frankenstein, wrote to the Bavarian Nuncio desiring to know if it were required in Rome that the Catholic party should no longer exist in the Reichstag. In reply to this Cardinal Jacobini despatched a second note, from which we take the following:—

“Without entering into the motives by which the noble Baron de Frankenstein endeavours to justify the conduct of the Centre in voting against the Septennate, I consider it most urgent to attend to the second part of his letter.

“He asks to know if the Holy See believes the existence of the Centre any longer necessary in the Reichstag, as, if not, he would no longer accept any mandate from the electors, and that the same attitude would be assumed by the majority of his colleagues.

“He adds, besides, that which he had already declared in 1880, that the Centre could not obey any laws from Rome that were not ecclesiastical, and that did not concern the rights of the Church.

“You, Monsignore, will take care to inform the noble Baron that the Holy See constantly acknowledges all the titles of well deserved merit which the Centre and its chiefs have acquired in defence of Catholicism, but *that considered as a political party it enjoys full liberty of action, nor as such can it directly represent the interests of the Church.*

“If in the affair of the Septennate the Holy Father thought well to manifest his desire to the Centre, that step was to be attributed to reasons of a religious and moral order which were associated with the proposal in question. Above all, there were strong reasons to believe that the final revision of the May laws would be hastened by a Government satisfied with the conduct of the Centre on the question of the Septennate. In the second place, to have co-operated from the Vatican through the Centre in the maintaining of peace could not but have placed the Government of Berlin, under obligations to the Holy See, and as a result better disposed towards the Centre and the Catholics.

“Finally, the Holy See by the advice it has given, has taken advantage of the occasion to make itself more agreeable to the Emperor of Germany and to Prince Bismarck; for besides her own interests which are identical with those of the Catholics, the Holy

See cannot allow any opportunity to pass which might incline in favour of a better future for her, the powerful Empire of Germany."

We shall now give a last quotation from the speech delivered at Cologne, on the 7th February, by Herr Windthorst.

"The note of the Secretary of State contains the expression of the desire of the Holy Father, and for the Centre it is consoling at all times, but never more than to-day to hear the voice of the Father, particularly when he has for his children words of praise and encouragement, and that it is his desire that the Centre should continue at all hazards to defend the interests of the Church in the Reichstag of Germany, leaving them at the same time *full liberty of action in matters purely political*.

"If the Holy Father desired that the Septennate should be passed, his wish was based not on the material tenor of the project, but on motives of expediency from the point of view of diplomatic relations. There is no doubt but that his Holiness had good reasons for expressing that wish, and I believe that if *it were possible*, and without being constrained in any way, we would have freely adhered to the project; *but only if it were possible*. Now we could only have voted for the project at the extreme cost of our own existence. The Centre had at all times and in every possible manner held to the programme which would diminish the military burden. It was on that understanding it was elected to the Reichstag, and if for other motives we had not kept our promises, we would have broken faith with our electors. The Centre party derives all its power from the confidence of the people, and I believe that if the Holy Father could realise all the reasons which surround us on the ground of the struggle here, he would not be angry with his faithful children, who are ready to stand to the death in defence of all that is necessary. As for the war, one man alone can say whether there shall be war or no war, and that is, Prince Bismarck."

J. F. HOGAN.

CORRESPONDENCE.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE ORAL SYSTEM OF TEACHING THE DEAF AND DUMB.

VERY REV. AND DEAR MR. EDITOR:—You were good enough to afford me a considerable amount of space in the last number of the RECORD for some observations I ventured to present to you on the Oral System of teaching the Deaf and Dumb. Allow me to thank you, and as past favours are usually an encouragement for future hopes, may I trust you will kindly allow me a few pages in the March number for some additional observations I desire to place before your readers on this most important subject? I say most important, because when we speak of the Deaf and Dumb, we speak of a population of upwards of four thousand souls within our own shores, who till lately lay unheeded in darkness and the shadow of death, and whom we are endeavouring to rescue from that miserable state by means of our noble Institutions, which we have had the happiness in our day of seeing spring up amongst us through God's blessing and the generous bounty of a noble-hearted people.

To be consecutive, and maintain connection in what I am going to say with what I have already said, I desire to repeat the conclusions, with which I wound up my previous observations. They are:—

1st, That the Oral System of teaching the Deaf and Dumb is not suitable to a general school, requiring, as it does, special aptitudes in its pupils, and rejecting large numbers, who are capable of being taught by the sign-system.

2ndly, It requires a longer time, eight years, instead of six, and is therefore so much more expensive.

3rdly, To be uniform, an object universally called for, training schools are necessary for the teachers.

4thly, Religious communities are thereby excluded, and it is not seen how female teachers can avail themselves at all of such training.

5thly, If female teachers are excluded, how can female Deaf-mutes be taught considering the process of teaching laid down.

6thly, The System requires a much larger number of teachers not only on account of the longer course of training, but because of the small number of pupils each teacher can have charge of, and on this account too it is so much more expensive than the Sign System.

7thly, Intellectual work is interdicted for a considerable time in order to make the child speak, as far as the effort is possible, and for the same reason the use of signs is prohibited during recreation to the great detriment of health at that tender age, whilst, at the same time, the pupils are deprived of the advantage of cultivating each others' minds by interchange of ideas and sentiments, at a time when the young mind is susceptible of most valuable culture by association with children of the same age.

8thly, And as the pupils after eight years in the Institution pass into the world at large, they cannot understand the lip movements of others, their case being pretty much like that of persons, who have learned theoretically a foreign language but cannot understand it as they hear it spoken.

9thly, And whilst they do not understand others in looking at their lips, so others have great difficulty, and feel great pain, in endeavouring to understand them.

10thly, As a consequence both lip-reading and speaking soon come to an end, and as a final result the pupils have neither signs nor speech, and are, therefore, more destitute than the pupils of the methodic sign-system.

11thly, To prevent such a result the friends of the Oral System are endeavouring to find out some plan, according to which the pupils in their transition from school to the world at large may be accustomed by degrees under special superintendence to associate with others, and maintain, at the same time, their lip reading and speech, but it may be said "*Hoc opus, hic labor est,*" and so far no such expedient has been discovered.

12thly, On the whole, applying the philosopher's test, "*respice finem—finis regula ceterorum,*" the Oral System is by no means so far a success, nor does it at all appear likely to succeed for the end to which it aspires, and apart from every other reason, the wide divergences, and opposite views and methods of its advocates and promoters should appear to force this conclusion as irresistible.

From these conclusions will be seen the limit, to which I go in repudiating the Oral System. I reject it as a system for a general school, especially if the pupils be numerous. But, at the same time, I am ready to admit, as I intimated in my former paper, it has its advantages, even I would say superior advantages, as compared with the other system in its application to individual pupils under certain conditions. These conditions are: 1st, aptitude on the part of the pupil; 2nd, great zeal on the part of the teacher; 3rd, unremitting

labour on the part of both, not only at school work for a long series of years, but afterwards in conducting the pupil onward into common life with the speaking world, and finally, what would be essential above everything else, great encouragement with assiduous attention and painstaking efforts in family life to inspire him with confidence, and put him forward on all occasions with the other members of the family. The distinction to my mind lies here between the two Systems in their adaptability—one to the school, and the other to private tuition.

I do not by any means pretend to a technical or professorial experience with regard to either System. But without this advantage it is open to any observer in matters of education to form a judgment of a system by results, and applying this, the best of all criterions, to compare System with System as to their relative merits. It is on this ground I can claim a hearing. My sympathy for the Deaf and Dumb has led me for a long series of years to be an earnest observer of the working of the two Systems under consideration, and besides availing myself of what opportunities came in my way for personal observation, I sought information from those, whose position in connection with Institutions for these poor objects entitled them to speak with authority. Amongst others I consulted the distinguished Abbé Lambert, who was Chaplain for thirty years to the great Institution in Paris of the Abbé de l'Épée himself, the founder of the System that prevailed till quite lately in that establishment, and from it spread all over the world. When I say the Abbé Lambert was Chaplain to that Institution, let it not be thought, that he was a mere office-bearer in that capacity. What manner of man he is the following letter will show, with which he favoured me in reply to my inquiries. He enlisted abilities of the first order in the cultivation of his pupils whilst under his charge, and when they had passed out of his hands, he yet kept them in view, spending his vacations in visiting them, and collecting them together in different parts of the country to afford them the benefits of spiritual retreats, as our Irish Institution is in the habit of doing, year after year, for its former pupils, who are happy to come up from all parts of Ireland for the purpose. He established moreover, a periodical for circulation amongst his ex-pupils, and by that means continued to be their guide, let us say their Apostle, in their various positions through life. His zeal and services on behalf of the poor objects of his sympathy, together with his many eminent qualities in other respects, engaged the admiration of the late most venerable Cardinal Archbishop of Paris, who,

in recognition of his distinguished merits, raised him to the dignity of Canon of the diocese. The testimony of such an authority is undoubtedly of the highest importance, and it is therefore with much pleasure that I insert his letter, addressed to me under date so far back as the year 1883, more especially as he speaks with so much consideration of the Oral System.

TRANSLATION.

Paris, 10th March, 1883.

“MY VERY REV. FATHER—You do me an honour to ask my opinion on the subject of the System of articulation for the instruction of Deaf-mutes, a System, which some people are pleased to call new, although it is very old, since it was employed, as we are told by Venerable Bede, by St. John of Beverly, Archbishop of York in the seventh century, and although the Abbé de l’Epée himself made use of it with some of his pupils, and had by this System a success which they are far from obtaining now. They are pleased also to call the System German, though it has been used a little everywhere before our time. In fine they call it also “Periere” though Isaac Rodriguez Periere, who lived in the time of the Abbé de l’Epée, and made use of it also, had nothing to do with its invention.

The Abbé de l’Epée says “the Deaf-mute will be fully restored to society when he can speak distinctly, and read correctly from the lips of those, with whom he is in conversation,” which proves that, *a priori*, he has not condemned the System of articulation, and the Abbé Sicard, his disciple, said on this subject, “Give me a sufficient number of workers, and I will make all the Deaf-mutes speak.” This shows the essential condition for obtaining this difficult result—a sufficient number of masters or workers to teach articulation to all Deaf-mutes, not in groups of ten, fifteen or twenty pupils, as can be done by the language of signs, but, so to say, individually to each pupil in particular, according to the avowal of all sincere Professors of this articulating System.

When a single master has to himself three or four pupils at most, of ordinary intelligence and good will, or perhaps five or six of extraordinary intelligence and earnestness, it is all he can teach. Consequently, to speak only of the Institution of Paris, which has about 300 pupils, it would be necessary for good and genuine work to have at least 80 or 100 professors without counting superintendents, professors of Drawing, etc., etc., overwhelming conditions evidently for any Institution. And observe, to give thus to the pupils these lessons in articulation is, for the first years particularly, a work

much more laborious than teaching by signs, so that many of the professors cannot continue at the work, and, if I am to believe what I am told comes from the Paris Institution, the masters are already weary of it, and fear they cannot remain longer at it. They regret they are bound to the new mode, and give their preference to the language of signs.

Must this System then be rejected because it is full of difficulty? No, without doubt this System properly applied has its own advantages, which ought to encourage one to follow it, and these advantages I shall be glad to enumerate. 1st, The advantage of being able to communicate thought by the more generally understood channel of articulation, which without being perfect (a thing very rare) is, nevertheless sufficiently intelligible, and to be able also to read the lips of others. When the latter wish to make themselves understood, they must articulate distinctly, particularly when they are strangers, with whom the Deaf-mute has not been accustomed to read their articulated words. 2ndly, the advantage, of being able to take in, and develop his ideas in the construction of sentences in the phraseology of spoken or written language better than he can do in signs; for in these the construction is not always that of spoken or written language. This second advantage I appreciate more than the first.

I know that other advantages are spoken of, the preservation of health for instance, inasmuch as articulation is necessary for the functions of the lungs, &c. : but I attach no general importance to this, for I know myself many Deaf-mutes, who do not articulate, and yet enjoy good health, and if there be amongst them some consumptive individuals, it is rather the result of a scrofulous, defective, lymphatic, &c. constitution, than the want of articulation. Besides, Deaf-mutes give forth some sounds, which supply all that is necessary in the respect.

But this is not all. As I have often said, articulation is not natural in the first instance, for besides "*Nihil est in mente quod prius non fuerit in sensu,*" we were all instructed by signs before having been so by word. We all know that it is by our mother tongue, our first language, that we learn other languages, and as signs are the mother tongue of the Deaf-mute it is by that first language he must learn others. This is what appears to me unreasonable in the general and exclusive use of the system of articulation; for let us take a little savage, whose language is most imperfect and rude, and let us teach him French or English. What does common sense

suggest? It tells us to make use of the child's mother tongue to instruct him in these languages. But no; you are told first to teach him Chinese, then Arabic, in order that by Chinese and Arabic he may learn French. You answer that this System is a real folly, and, nevertheless, such exactly is the folly, which those are guilty of, who wish to apply the System of articulation to all Deaf-mutes. For learning articulation is as difficult as learning Chinese, and learning to read the lips is as difficult as Arabic. These reasons seem to me to justify perfectly that wish so just and sensible which the Abbé de l'Épée expressed:—"Let us then make use of natural signs to instruct Deaf-mutes, and develop their understanding, since they are his mother-tongue. All Deaf-mutes sent to school have before they come to it a language which is familiar to them, &c., &c."

Hence it necessarily follows that the language of signs is the most natural, the surest, the shortest, and the most indispensable means, by which ideas may be communicated to Deaf-mutes.

The most natural—this I have already proved.

The shortest—because it corresponds directly with the channel which the Deaf-mute uses to express his own ideas, and by which he learns those of others. Experience shows that the Deaf-mute, instructed by articulation pronounces or reads the words long before he knows their meaning, except when he uses such ordinary words as bread, wine, food, etc.

I asked M. Magnat, the director of the Periere school in Paris at what period he taught Catechism to his pupils. This gentleman is the most sincere, the most conscientious, and the most able Professor of articulation that I know. He told me 'towards the fourth or fifth year.' 'And,' replied I 'in my Institution I teach it in signs in the first year. In five years they make their First Communion.'

The surest and the most indispensable—because even in articulating classes it is by signs the Professor explains the word, and assures himself that the Deaf-mute understands it.

I believe myself sincere in what I advance, not from party-spirit or prejudice, but solely from love of truth, and from what I have learned from my experience of over thirty years. I ought to add that during these thirty years I have met with Deaf-mutes instructed by articulation in France and in foreign countries, and I have found few, very few, able to articulate in a manner sufficiently distinct to be understood, and above all, none are able to speak except in those guttural sounds, which resemble the cry of an animal rather than a human voice; a cry painful always to those who hear it, and

distressing even to a mother's heart. I speak here only of the real Deaf-mutes from birth.

These preliminaries laid down in principle, what ought I to conclude for practice from my point of view, which I sincerely believe to be true? It would be as follows:—

I distinguish three classes of Deaf-mutes.

1. Deaf-mutes from birth, who are rich.
2. Deaf-mutes from birth, who are poor.
3. Deaf-mutes, who have become such after having heard and spoken up to the age of four, five, or six years, and even some are found who became deaf at the age of seven or eight, having lost their hearing from typhus, or brain fever, a fall, excessive fright, or any other accident, and their speech not having been sufficiently cultivated, from simply deaf they have become also dumb.

For this last class the best advice is, that from the time deafness shows itself instead of placing them in an Institution for Deaf-mutes, they should be placed amongst ordinary speaking persons, in order that conversation, reading, and all other means may preserve their speech. Even the hearing itself would be improved by the efforts to hear. If these precautions have not been taken through culpable ignorance or negligence, then it is necessary to instruct these persons by articulation. *To make them recall what they have known is very easy.* And it is as well here to say, that we have frequently seen, that the pupils brought forward for exhibition in schools advertised as schools for congenital Deaf-mutes are those, who have not been taught to speak at school, but have merely recalled what they already knew.

With regard to rich Deaf-mutes, whose parents can keep them ten, fifteen or even twenty years at school, they might be instructed by articulation, especially if private tuition or special and personal teachers can be afforded them; but, if they be not very intelligent, they must content themselves with the language of signs.

Poor Deaf-mutes with rare exceptions, as where there is great intelligence with a great desire for articulation in the pupil, should be instructed by the language of signs, the shortest possible way to supply their real wants, that is to say to instil into their minds those principles of religion and morality, which they require to direct them through life, and a little literary knowledge sufficient to enable them to communicate with the small circle of their family, their acquaintances, employers, companions, &c. in fine to afford them means of earning their bread, that they may not be a burden on their friends, who but too often

seek to get rid of them. This want of affection together with the Deaf-mutes' independent temper makes them beggars, vagabonds, sellers of alphabets, &c. &c.

It would be desirable that in all Institutions there should be two divisions, one for the rich and the other for the poor, not through any contempt for the latter but for their good. I have seen in Paris, for instance, rich and poor on the same footing with regard to food, clothing, &c. The poor accustom themselves to this comfort, which is far above their position, and which they will not find when they return to their friends. Later on this privation will make them unhappy, and will lead to theft. Such are, Very Rev. Father, my convictions hastily penned. Your wisdom will extract from them what you deem most suitable.

Yours very respectfully and devotedly in 'Jesus Christ,

L'Abbé Lambert, Chan. de N. Dame

Ancien Aumonier De l'Ins. de S. M. de Paris."

Such a treatment of the subject, so simple, so detailed, and at the same time so calm and dispassionate, and from one so competent by his long experience and matured convictions to handle it, may be well accepted as definitively fixing the boundary line between the two Systems, reserving for the methodic Sign System the Public Institution with its school and simultaneous teaching, whilst allowing to the Oral System its special merit for exceptional instances with the various conditions laid down by the venerable ex-chaplain of the Paris National establishment, and so difficult to be realised, that we may hold ourselves prepared to hail the individual, in whom its advantages are fully illustrated according to its pretensions, very much as a "rara avis in terris, nigroque simillima cygno."

I desire to remain, Very Rev. and Dear Mr. Editor,

Yours very faithfully and respectfully,

THE AUTHOR OF "CLAIMS OF THE UNINSTRUCTED DEAF-MUTE TO BE ADMITTED TO THE SACRAMENTS."

THE EXAMINATION PAPERS UNDER THE INTERMEDIATE SYSTEM AND PUBLIC OPINION.

VERY REV. DEAR SIR—It is not perhaps easy to excuse one who is an absolute outsider, and who has no personal concern with the failure or success of the Intermediate System of Education in Ireland, when he ventures so far *ultra crepidam* as to criticise an

Educational System under which he never competed, and of many of the mysteries of which he has no personal knowledge. Nevertheless, since the working of this System is laid "open for the inspection of the public," in the carefully-compiled reports with which we are annually favoured; since the public largely avail themselves of the invitation to criticise, and their criticism is decidedly general and out-spoken—no apology is needed for one who fills the *role* of a mere *raconteur* of what men are commonly saying. At any rate, those charged with the management of the Intermediate cannot reasonably complain, since it is in compliance with their own implied challenge that the following observations are submitted.

The first charge which everybody makes is, that the method of compiling the Examination Papers, more particularly in the Greek and Algebra of the Middle and Senior Grades, disheartens and drives out of the competition a considerable number of very competent students. It is not alleged precisely that the Papers are too difficult in all their parts; but that they contain so preposterously large a proportion of puzzles *pur sang*, that no ordinary student can hope, in dealing with them, to acquit himself with satisfaction or apparent credit. The inevitable result is, that, whereas in the first year of the Intermediate nearly 1,200 students presented themselves for examination in Greek of all grades, the number dwindled down last year to 777. Judged by the ratio of increase in other subjects, the number should be now something like twice that figure.

If you ask masters or pupils how this falling off is to be accounted for, they will tell you, without hesitation or dissent, that the Examination Papers are invariably replete with a large number of questions that are (to borrow the words of a distinguished statesman) so many "*ugly tricks*," or that cannot be solved by even an intimately familiar and expedite acquaintance with such works as college libraries or city booksellers ordinarily supply. In illustration of this "*ugly trick*" scheme, they refer us to one of the Papers for 1886, which gravely bade the pupil to "write down the second aorist passive of $\beta\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omega$ "—the verb having no such form, according to Goodwin's Grammar and Liddell and Scott. It is not unreasonable to fear that many students, relying on the *bona fides* and proverbial seriousness of the Paper compilers—as well as on the silence of the ordinary authorities and the company in the midst of which that verb was placed—succeeded in discrediting their written pieces by improvising such a word as would have been in use had the ancient Greeks chosen to employ one. This is pronounced a genuine specimen of the "*ugly trick*" species, and it does not stand alone.

If we can rely on what experienced men generally say, and on the "bill of particulars" which they are at all times ready to produce in evidence, it would seem as if those who are charged with the setting of the questions devoted a considerable portion of the preparation to industriously selecting such words as are sure to bewilder the pupil—that their ambition is to evoke the largest possible number of errors and failures, instead of endeavouring to ascertain the amount of solid, substantial, and useful knowledge each pupil has succeeded in acquiring. Such a course naturally tells upon the preparation the student will make. He is conscious that the only method of study that "leads on to fortune," under the Intermediate, is grounded on an analysis of the Papers given in previous years; and, hence, if he take courage to compete at all, he engages almost all his time—not in an honest study of the ordinary and fundamental principles of even "higher grammar," nor in an honest effort so to master the language that he may unimpeachably read, construe, and expound such common works as Demosthenes, Longinus, or Sophocles—but in a forecasting of difficulties which he has not encountered in such works as these, but which may, nevertheless, be discovered in some single passage of some singularly rare work, or which the erudite ingenuity of his examiners may possibly invent. To establish this charge, they point to a passage from Thucydides—given to be "translated at sight," and, of course, without the aid of a dictionary—in which pupils are required to give the full meaning of a word that is found in this passage alone of all the Greek classics. Everybody rightly or wrongly believes that it was the presence of this word that recommended the paragraph for selection: however that may be, its selection was manifestly a trap. The words in the following sentence are perhaps as truly English as the curiosities in such high favour with the Examiners are Greek, and yet no sane man would dream of making it the test of a student's fitness for scholastic honours:—

Being hypnotized, he poured the contents of the anheidrohepseterion upon the kamptulicon, and also upon his neighbour's antegropelos, leaving upon all a ryphophonous stain.—("Specimens of Fine English:" *Cornhill Magazine*, vol. iii.)

It is commonly affirmed that the Examination Papers are not a standard by which to measure the pupil's proficiency in the Greek language *qua talis*: they are rather a standard by which his knowledge of its exceptional anomalies and idiosyncrasies is put to the test.

Perhaps the most damaging commentary yet written on the

eccentric character of the Examination Papers in Greek is found in the Report for 1885, as drawn up by R. Y. Tyrrell, Esq., one of the Examiners:—

“I found that in Greek, as a rule, the *more elementary* the question the *worse* was the answering. In the Senior Grade, the questions dealing with *rather higher grammar* and with *metre*, were *better* answered than the questions on *accidence* and *easy syntax*. . . . In the Middle Grade, in like manner, question six, *which I look on as not easy*, was answered *best*. . . . Again, in the Junior Grade, I was surprised to find a question turning on a somewhat *minute appreciation* of the difference between the usage of *οὐ* and of *μή* answered intelligently by a *large percentage*, while *very few* *hardly any*, did questions ‘that were easy and rudimentary.’”

The unavoidable impression made by an authoritative analysis such as this, is that the machinery which produces results so deformed and preposterous, must be lamentably out of gear; that examinations so prepared for, and so conducted, do not tend to promote a true knowledge of *the language*; and that the necessity of competing under such tests generates the necessity of practically abandoning such commonplace and vulgar trifles as “accidence” and “syntax,” and of devoting all one’s care and anxiety to questions of “higher grammar” and the differentiation of “particles.” Plainly this is the conviction unhappily created on the minds of both masters and pupils: and in what way soever we may view it, the result, as revealed on Table X. of Report for 1885, does not discredit the complaint so generally made—that this system of examination is killing out of our schools the study of the Greek language. From that table we learn that only 128 students of the entire Senior Grade (boys) presented themselves for examination in Greek; that out of this small number, 53 failed completely; that 35 “passed without Honours;” while 40, or under one-third of the original “forlorn hope,” attained success.

If you express concurrence in the views of the masters and pupils who object in this fashion, they will tell you that a lower depth of grievance has yet to be fathomed. It is bad enough that the united “Intermediate” intelligence of our schools cannot show more than 40 Prizemen in Senior Greek; but a deeper dishonour lies (somewhere) in the matter of “Algebra and Arithmetic.” The same Table X. of Report for 1885, gives us the following startling figures:—Of 235 pupils who competed in the Senior Grade, 209 presented themselves for examination in Algebra, with the dispiriting result that 153 were placed *hors de combat*, 44 “passed” somehow, and a round dozen, or one out of every 17, emerged from the conflict with

Honours, having scored an average of 408 marks, out of the 700 covenanted to symbolize true success! It is commonly believed that many truly "honourable" men came to grief even among the 153; and this belief is seemingly shared in by Francis A. Tarleton, Esq., (one of the Examiners) who, in his Report, pronounces over their remains the following touching tribute:—

"To my mind, amongst the candidates examined by me, many who did not pass in Algebra, showed more of true mathematical knowledge and ability, than several who obtained high honours in Euclid."

It is not denied that there was an approach to better judgment in the setting of the Examination Papers (Senior Grade) for 1886, when, out of a total of 235 presenting themselves in Algebra, 67 obtained Honours. It is, however, a significant commentary on the Papers of preceding years, that masters and pupils unanimously ascribe this larger measure of success solely to the more reasonable character of the questions; and, after the manner of politicians, give the credit of this partial improvement to the persistent protest and agitation of the head masters. But what guarantee has been given that there shall be no return to the (very) original system of 1885?

As this paper is, however incomplete and unauthorised, a *procès verbal* of complaints—it is right to add that words of strong disapproval are also frequently heard when reference is made to the Examination Papers for Latin and French, as well indeed as for "Deductions" from Euclid. But this is specially true of pieces selected for "translation at sight," in which, we are told, a strange contrast manifestly exists between the selections made in Hume-street and those which satisfy Examiners for Oxford and Cambridge. For the pointing of this contrast we are referred with confidence to the passages submitted for "translation at sight" in the "Local Examinations" and "Little-Go" of those and other Universities. We are assured that, whilst these latter are fairly easy, the Latin Poetry set for "translation at sight" in our Senior Grade is sometimes so difficult, that an expert, seeing it for the first time, could not hope to treat it satisfactorily within double the time accorded to his pupil. *Non meus hic sermo*: but it was stated freely by one of our most distinguished and successful masters. As a legitimate inference, the masters of many schools will tell, without surprising you, that in this, as in other sections, the Intermediate is made to overlap the University curriculum; and that the public money, voted for the attainment of necessarily distinct educational purposes, is diverted into one channel, contrary to the intentions of the Legislature. This:

deordination might perhaps be regarded as a harmless error of detail; but the error assumes grave proportions, and involves material for serious consideration, when we find masters unreservedly protesting that they usually reserve their *clever* boys for competition in the Intermediate, while sending on the average and under-average ones in quest of University honours. Complainants aver that, in instances not a few, marvellous success has attended the experiment.

Before dismissing the objections against Papers for "translation at sight," it would be a pity not to notice the selections in French. They are sometimes an amusing curiosity, especially in view of the purpose for which they are ostensibly intended. One of them—that given to last year's Junior Grade—was little better than a patch-work of tailoring technicalities, such as would probably be regarded as a stiff test in the engagement of a foreman in the *Belle Jardinière*. It recalled to many the story of the indignant father who "condemned his son to the plough" because, after six months at a classical school, he failed to give—right off—the Latin and Greek names of the various articles that make up a donkey's full-dress costume.

Over and above complaints like the foregoing, which may be regarded as affecting the Examination Papers only, we frequently hear others, of a more general character, discussed with equal warmth. Most people concur in saying that the "Pass" and "Honour" standards are *too high*, when we consider the end for which the Intermediate was presumably established. They seem to think that the questions for Examination should be so graduated as to afford inducements to moderate but capable pupils to compete for such distinctions as would be proportioned to their abilities and acquirements. It cannot be doubted that a large section of our students possess intelligence and attainments that raise them very considerably above the Primary stratum, who are nevertheless debarred from asserting and establishing their marked superiority by the difficulties that, under so many forms, exclude from the field of Intermediate competition all who are not adjudged unmistakably superior men. In other words, the gulf that hopelessly separates the Primary from the Intermediate is too broad. Subjects are sometimes grouped together, a necessary connection between which it is not always easy to see—as, for example, when the Rule prescribes that "to pass in the subject 'Mathematics,' *Junior Grade*, it will be necessary for boys to pass in the Section Arithmetic, *together with* the Section Euclid or Section Algebra." Why, it is asked, should not the Commissioners provide that all the Papers on every specific subject should contain a

reasonable number of moderately easy—yet practical—questions, with a value attached to each?

In the minds of many, a much more grave and urgent objection than any hitherto noticed, lies against the Intermediate system in the matter of what it euphemistically calls “the History of Great Britain and Ireland.” Granted that none of the questions it proposes in Examination are offensive or sectarian—and granting too that it disclaims all intention of “prescribing, or even recommending the text-books mentioned within brackets”—it is generally and justly felt as a galling grievance that the methods which the Commissioners suggest (with such marked success) for the study of English history, and still more of Irish, unmistakably betray that anti-Irish and anti-Catholic spirit which has, from the very beginning, signalised the progress of the “National” system in all its stages. The *very naming* of those text-books not unnaturally conveys a belief, which no exuberance of protestation can remove, that the Pupil or Master who assimilates the teaching of those text-books is far more likely to become familiar with the substance and form of the questions for future Examination, than the Pupil or Master who makes a different selection. Experience has abundantly proved that this belief is well-founded; and, considering the tone and character of the books so insinuatingly “mentioned within brackets,” we are not unjust in charging the Intermediate with insulting and aggressive intolerance in its dealings with English and with Irish history. The alternative is pitilessly cruel and despotic—than an Irish Catholic must elect between the risk of probable and irreparable failure, and the study of such works as the “Student’s Hume” and “Collier’s History of Ireland.” In many of their parts both one and the other are conceived in the same spirit and couched in the same language as the Tracts for Achill Island, and the Leaflets of the I. L. P. U. “Honours” in history are dearly paid for when secured by the study of a work which teaches a Catholic Irishman to regard it as a fairly “disputed point, whether St. Patrick came with a commission from the Pope or not;” and which represents St. Brigid—the “Mary of Erin”—as a “female disciple of St. Patrick,” who spent her life in endeavouring to perpetuate the fire-worship of the Druids! We should indeed have no reason for regret if the “failures” in history were as frequent as those in Greek or in Algebra; for, even where sectarian feeling does not interpose to suppress or distort, the author’s treatment of purely secular events is sometimes most insidiously misleading. One specimen, out of the many to hand, will be sufficient to establish this charge. The

history of the Great Famine is curtly given as follows: "Immense quantities of the potatoes, on which the Irish peasant mainly depended for food, rotted. This caused famine, and a pestilence of fever followed. Large quantities of corn and Indian meal were provided; but the poorhouses were overcrowded, and, *in spite of all that could be done*, great numbers of the people perished. Between famine and emigration, the population was reduced by 2,000,000." However students in their written pieces may affect to believe this, they must know in their hearts that the insinuation is glaringly false. We should not, however, censure this "writer of history" too unreservedly, for he wrought a decided improvement on the story of the Irish Famine, as recorded in the "Student's Hume"—a work, by the way, of which he seems rapturously enamoured. In that twin "text-book" we are told: "The potato-crop again failed; there was a famine in Ireland; and, *though the British Parliament voted several millions to buy food for the starving Irish*, they nevertheless rose in rebellion!" If this perversion of fact takes place in the green wood of modern history, what may we not expect in the dry wood of more remote times? Accordingly the "Student's Hume," describing the Battle of the Boyne, duly chronicles that "the Irish horse alone made *some* resistance; the foot fled without striking a blow . . . The Irish dispersed themselves in the night." The same truthful annalist, speaking of the attitude of the Irish Catholics in 1800, says: "During the debates on the Union they remained almost entirely neutral, and what little feeling they displayed was in its favour. This is attributable to their hatred of the Orangemen, the warmest opponents of Union." And so on through its exasperating pages. Nothing that Irish Catholics hold in reverence and love, regarding the history of their Faith or Country, escapes the sarcasm and vituperation of the text-books which candidates for Intermediate distinction must not refuse to digest, under the penalty of not improbable failure. It is no vindication to assert, that no stronger recommendation has been given to the "Student's Hume" than to "Burke's Lingard;" for all the world and Hume-street know that that the latter work, though admirable in many respects, is altogether unsuitable as a class-book. Nor will it be any apology to say that Collier's History is not mentioned in the Programme for 1887: it may, for all we know, be admitted to the Programme for 1888; and its having been placed "within brackets" in former years, justifies the fear that it will be regarded even now as *the* text-book for the Intermediate. One fact speaks more emphatically than a thousand

conjectures: and in all, or almost all our Catholic Schools, we find Masters and Pupils submitting to the shame and humiliation of employing those books, under the dissembled but effective pressure of the Intermediate.

Finally, there is a universal consensus of opinion that the Result Fees assigned for success under the Intermediate, are utterly out of proportion with the increased expenditure forced upon Irish Schools, in their effort to attain that success. This disproportionate recompense is especially a grievance to our Catholic Schools; it multiplies their difficulties, and renders more galling still the disadvantages under which Catholics are placed, in the matter of Education in all its branches. It is nothing short of heartless and unblushing mockery to challenge Catholic Schools, which possess no State endowment, to enter into competition for Intermediate, and indeed all other prizes, with non-Catholic Institutions, upon which the State has lavished, and to which she has hitherto secured a monopoly of all those monetary and other material resources by which success is rendered a comparatively easy task.

C. J. M.

DOCUMENTS.

I.

THE NUMBER OF FEAST DAYS OF OBLIGATION IN THE UNITED STATES REDUCED TO SIX.

SUMMARY.

The number of Feast Days varied in different provinces and dioceses of the United States. This was confusing, and caused a feeling of surprise and annoyance in the people that it should be so. The Catholic masses largely depended on non-Catholic masters for employment, and such masters would, for the most part, recognise only such Holidays as happened to fall on Sundays. Hence arose great difficulty on the part of the Catholic people in attending Mass, and abstaining from servile work on several Holidays.

In these circumstances the Fathers of the Third Council of Baltimore ask that the Holidays of Obligation be the same for all the United States of America, and reduced to the following six: Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Ascension Thursday, Immaculate

Conception, Assumption, All Saints' Day. They ask that the Solemnity of Corpus Christi be transferred to the following Sunday, as has been done already with the Solemnity of the Feast of SS. Peter and Paul.

The Holy Father grants the favour.

RESPONSUM DE FESTIS.

Romæ, die 31 Decembris 1885.

Illme. ac Rme. Domine.¹

Ab Amplitudine Tua nomine Patrum Concilii Tertii Plenarii Baltimorensis sequens supplicatio Summo Pontifici exhibita fuit, ut dies festi de præcepto ad quosdam determinato, in omnibus Diœcesibus Statuum Fœderatorum Americæ Septentrionalis servandos, reducerentur.

Beatissime Pater,

Intra fines Statuum Fœderatorum Americæ, Septentrionalis magna obtinet diversitas in observandis diebus festis de præcepto. In aliis enim locis quinque, in aliis vero novem, in aliis etiam plures servantur, adeo ut non tantum acatholici, sed et fideles hac de re jam commoveantur, non parum mirantes qua ratione id fiat, ut certis diebus obligatio audiendi missam et abstinendi ab operibus servilibus urgeat in una diœcesi vel provincia, in altera vero non. Præterea in hisce regionibus et fideles gravissimis premuntur difficultatibus quoad observantiam dierum festorum. Quum enim in parandis vitæ necessariis magna ex parte ab acatholicis pendeant, qui labores diebus festis, nisi in Dominicis incidant, intermittere non patiuntur, maxima fidelium pars non nisi cum gravissimis incommodis iisdem diebus ab operibus abstinere et SS. Missæ Sacrificio interesse possunt. Hinc Patres in Concilio Plenario Baltimorensi Tertio congregati, summopere in votis habentes ut uniformitas in servandis Festis inducatur, matureque perpendentes difficultates quibus fideles intra Fœderatas has Provincias laborant, Beatitudini Tuæ supplicandum duxerunt :

1^o Ut, attentis peculiaribus circumstantiis Catholicorum in hisce regionibus morantium, Apostolica Auctoritate dignetur declarare, per omnes diœceses Americæ Septentrionalis Fœderatæ, de præcepto audiendi Missam et abstinendi a servilibus, servandos esse dies festos omnes et solos qui sequuntur; Immaculata Conceptio B. M. V.—

¹ This document was addressed to the Most Rev. (now His Eminence, Cardinal) James Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore, who had been delegated by the Holy See to preside at the Council, and by whom the Petition of the Council was presented in the name of all the Fathers.

Nativitas D. N. J. C.—Circumcisio D. N. J. C.—Ascensio D. N. J. C.—Assumptio B. M. V.—Festum Omnium Sanctorum.—Per rerum enim temporumque rationes istorum sex dierum festorum observatio feliciter speratur.

2^o Quoad ceteros dies festos, qui præter sex supradictos quibusdam in locis adhuc de præcepto sunt, ut ex Apostolica benignitate eorumdem locorum fideles solvantur quidem ab obligatione Missam audiendi et ab operibus abstinendi : quin tamen iidem dies festi quoad devotionem et solemnitatem externam supprimantur.

3^o Ad festum S. Corporis Christi quod spectat, ut benigne indulgere velit, quod ejusdem Festi solemnitas in diem Dominicam proximè sequentem transferatur, ad normam indulti diocesis Statuum Fœderatorum Americae Septentrionalis concessi quoad festum SS. Apostolorum Petri et Pauli, ut habetur in litteris S. Congr. de Prop. Fide ad Archiepiscopum Baltimorem diei 19 Decembris, 1840.

Quibus humilibus precibus ut Beatitudo Tua velit annuere, obsequenti animo supplicant Patres Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis Tertii.

Baltimore, die 23 Decembris 1884.

Beatitudinis Tuæ

Servus humillimus,

JACOBUS GIBBONS, *Archiep. Balt., Deleg. Apost.*

II.

THE DECREE OF BENEDICT XIV. PUBLISHED FOR HOLLAND IN 1741, IS EXTENDED TO ALL THE DIOCESES OF THE UNITED STATES IN WHICH THE DECREE *TAMETSI* HAS BEEN PUBLISHED.

SUMMARY.

Enumeration of the dioceses of the United States (1), in which the Decree *Tametsi* has not been published ; (2), of the dioceses in which it has been published ; (3), of the dioceses to which the Declaration of Benedict XIV., published for the Church of Holland, has not been extended. Request that this Declaration be extended to all the dioceses in which the Decree *Tametsi* has been published.

The petition granted.

RESPONSUM DE DECLARATIONE BENEDICTINA.

Pariter expostulavit Amplitudo Tua, ut Declaratio Benedicti XIV. pro Hollandia edita a. 1741. ad ea loca Statuum Fœderatorum, ubi decretum *Tametsi* Concilii Tridentini viget, et de quibus non constat eandem fuisse extensam, extenderetur :

Supplicatio A. T. hoc modo se habet :

Beatissime Pater,

Archiepiscopi et Episcopi totius Americae Septentrionalis Foederatae, in Concilio Plenario Baltimorensi Tertio congregati, inter alias res, collatis consiliis, id etiam diligenter egerunt, ut ad liquidum deducerent, quibus in locis Statuum Foederatorum Americae Septentrionalis decretum Tridentinum *Tametsi* de matrimoniis clandestinis (Sess. xxiv, c. 1, de Ref.) vigeat, et in quibus non vigeat. Re studiose indagata ad hanc devenerunt sententiam :

Decretum *Tametsi* non vigeat in sequentibus Provinciis ecclesiasticis scilicet : 1. Baltimorensi ; 2. Philadelphensi ; 3. Neo-Hoboracensi ; 4. Bostoniensi ; 5. Oregonopolitana ; 6. Milwaukiensi ; 7. Cincinnatiensi, excepta dioecesi Vincennopolitana ; 8. S. Ludovici, exceptis ipsa civitate S. Ludovici et quibusdam aliis locis ejusdem Archidioecesis mox nominandis ; 9. Chicaginesi, exceptis aliquibus locis dioecesis Altonensis proxime citandis.

In caeteris vero locis eorundem Statuum Foederatorum decretum *Tametsi* vigere censetur, scilicet : 1. In tota Provincia Neo-Aurelianiensi ; 2. in Provincia S. Francisci cum territorio Utah, excepta ea parte ejusdem territorii quae jacet ad orientem fluminis Colorado ; 3. in Provincia S. Fidei, excepta parte septentrionali territorii Colorado ; 4. in dioecesi Vincennopolitana ; 5. in civitate S. Ludovici, necnon in locis dictis S. Genovefae, S. Ferdinandi et S. Caroli, Archidioecesis S. Ludovici ; 6. in locis dictis Kaskaskia, Cahokia, French Village et Prairie du Rocher, dioecesis Altonensis.

Ejusdem Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis Tertii Patres item consilia contulerunt ad determinandum, quasnam ad partes Americae Septentrionalis Foederatae, in quibus decretum *Tametsi* vigeat, extensa fuerit declaratio Benedicti XIV. a. 1741 pro Hollandia edita.

Ea de re Patres in hanc convenerunt sententiam :

Declaratio Benedictina extensa fuit 1. ad Provinciae Neo-Aurelianiensis sequentes dioeceses, scilicet, Archidioecesim Neo-Aurelianiensem ; dioeceses Natchitochensem, Natchetensem, Petriculanam, Mobiliensem ; 2. ad Provinciam S. Francisci cum territorio Utah ; 3. ad dioecesim Vincennopolitanam Provinciae Cincinnatiensis ; 4. ad Archidioecesim S. Ludovici quoad partes in quibus vigeat decretum *Tametsi* ; 5. ad loca dioecesis Altonensis in quibus idem decretum obtinet.

Declaratio Benedictina non extensa fuit ad Provinciam S. Fidei. Quoad dioeceses vero S. Antonii, Galvestonensem, Brownsvillensem, quae pertinent ad Provinciam Neo-Aurelianiensem, res est dubia, utrum necne declaratio Benedictina extensa fuerit.

Quae cum ita sint, quo uniformitas hae in re, omnibus in locis in quibus viget decretum *Tametsi* inducatur, nullusque relinquatur ambigendi locus, visum est Patribus Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis Tertii, Beatitudini Tuae supplicare, ut suprema sua auctoritate benigne dignetur Declarationem a Benedicto XIV pro Hollandia editam ad eas extendere partes Americae Septentrionalis Foederatae, in quibus viget decretum *Tametsi*, de quibusque constat eandem declarationem haecenus non fuisse extensam: uti et ad omnia alia loca, de quibus dubium movetur, aut in posterum moveri possit, utrum necne eadem Declaratio jam extensa fuerit.

Beatitudinis Tuae,

Servus humillimus,

JACOBUS GIBBONS, *Archiep. Balt. Deleg. Apost.*

THE PETITIONS GRANTED BY THE HOLY FATHER.

Porro hae petitiones ad Congregationem S. O. pro examine remissae sunt. Emi vero Universales Inquisitores re mature perpensa, die 25 Novembris 1885, reposuerunt:

Ad I. Supplicandum SSmo pro gratia juxta preces.

Ad II. Supplicandum SSmo pro extensione ad dioeceses S. Antonii, Galvestonensem, et ad Vicariatum Apostolicum Brownsvillensem tantum.

Sanctitas vero sua, cui haec omnia eadem die relata sunt, Patrum Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis Tertii precibus juxta S. Congregationis sententiam benigne annuere dignata est.

III.

REQUEST THAT A MERE RESIDENCE FOR A MONTH WOULD SUFFICE FOR A QUASI-DOMICILE FOR MATRIMONIAL PURPOSES IN THAT PLACE—REQUEST DEFERRED.

SUMMARY.

Petition that a mere residence for a month would suffice to establish a quasi-domicile for matrimonial purposes. This request deferred for more mature consideration.

PETITIO DE QUASI-DOMICILIO UNIUS MENSIS.

Cum in Concilio ageretur de nupturientibus qui, etsi per aliquot tempus in aliena dioecesi commorati sint, ibi tamen juxta leges modo vigentes ne quasi domicilium quidem acquisierunt, Patres hac de re

decretum tulerunt, Apostolica Auctoritate firmandum, cujus tenor in sequenti petitione ad S. Sedem exponitur.

Beatissime Pater,

In deliberationibus quas de quaestionibus matrimonialibus habuerunt Patres Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis Tertii, Beatitudinem Tuam censuerunt orandam, ut Apostolica Auctoritate pro Foederatis Americae Septentrionalis Provinciis dignetur decernere, eos qui e sua dioecesi ad aliam transeunt, modo in hac per spatium unius saltem mensis commorati sint, eo ipso, nulla facta inquisitione de animo manendi per majorem anni partem, censendos esse acquisiisse quasi domicilium quod sufficiat ad matrimonium contrahendum, eosque subditos constituendos Episcopi ejusdem dioecesis in ordine ad dispensationes ab impedimentis, si quae obstant, obtinendas.

Rationes hujus petitionis sunt : 1. Gravia incommoda et anxietates ac molestiae quae frequenter sacerdotibus oriuntur, si canonicae praescriptiones de quasi domicilio sint servandae. 2. Periculum ne secus nupturientes, scandalo fidelium, magistratum civilem aut praeconem sectae acatholicae adeant ad matrimonium contrahendum.

Beatitudinis Tuae,

Filius obedientissimus,

JACOBUS GIBBONS, *Archiep. Balt. Deleg. Apost.*

RESPONSUM DE QUASI-DOMICILIO UNIUS MENSIS.

Relate autem ad aliam petitionem, qua posebatur ut simplex factum commorationis unius mensis in aliquo loco sufficeret ad ibi acquirendum domicilium, et ad valide matrimonium contrahendum, Emi Patres, rem perpendere cupientes, responsionem differendam esse censuerunt.

.....
Amplitudinis Tuae,

Uti Frater addictissimus,

JOANNES CARD. SIMIEONI, *Praefectus.*

D. ARCHIEP. TYR., *Secret.*

IV.

THE OFFICES OF THE PASSION OF OUR LORD TAKE PRECEDENCE OF THE OFFICES, EVEN PRIMARY, OF FEASTS OF EQUAL RITE IN OCCURRENCE AND CONCURRENCE.

NAMURCEN.

Rmus. Dnus. Eduardus Josephus Belin, hodiernus Episcopus Namurcensis, a Sacra Rituum Congregatione, sequentium Dubiorum declarationem humiliter postulavit, videlicet :

Quum Sacra Rituum Congregatio, die 1 septembris 1855, decreverit: "In concurrentia, Festum Lanceæ et Clavorum aut Alterius cujuscumque Instrumenti Passionis Domini Nostri Jesu Christi præcedere debet Festum Cathedræ Antiochenæ sancti Petri, illi scilicet festo integras Vesperas tribuendo." Quæritur:

1° Utrum hæc resolutio vim obtineat tantum pro dicto Cathedræ sancti Petri Festo, vel applicari etiam debeat omni festo principali ejusdem ritus. Ex. gr., Sancti Benedicti Abbatis, Beati Caroli Boni?

2° Utrum in occursu Festi cathedræ sancti Petri aut festorum ejusdem ritus, cum dictis officiis Passionis Domini Nostri Jesu Christi, hæc locum primis cedere debeant?

Sacra porro eadem Congregatio, ad relationem infrascripti Secretarii, auditaque alterius ex Apostolicarum Cæremoniarum Magistris sententia. hisce Dubiis sic rescribere rata est:

Officia Dominicæ Passionis, tam in concurrentia quam in occurrentia cum quovis festo principali sive primario ejusdem ritus, præcedentiam obtinere.

Atquo ita declaravit ac servari mandavit die 11 Augusti 1886.

Pro Emo. ac Rmo. Dno. Card. D. BARTOLINI, S. R. C. Praef.

A. CARD. SERAFINI.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

THE LIFE OF FREDERICK LUCAS, M.P. By his brother,
Edward Lucas. London: Burns & Oates.

NEVER has a biography of a great public man been written, we believe, which contains so little matter of a purely private and personal character, as the Life of Frederick Lucas. Here the author had more than ordinary temptations to descant on the eminent virtues and noble qualities of mind, that adorned the subject of his interesting work. The bitterest adversary, political or religious, never denied to his illustrious brother those lovable traits of character, which made him the admiration of his literary associates, and the perfection of an upright, honest man; yet the writer despatches in a few brief pages the whole history of his private life. This omission, so far from being a matter for regret, is at once judicious and creditable. The honesty of purpose that characterised every act and utterance

of Frederick Lucas, and the immense sacrifices he made for conscience sake, leave no room for doubting that he was a man of unswerving moral rectitude. This side of his life is transparently untarnished and needs no defender. Besides, if any mist of obloquy clouded his revered memory—which is very far from being the case—a brother's pen would not be the weapon to dispel it most effectually. Mr. Riethmüller, a Protestant, and Fr. Amherst, S.J., both of whom enjoyed the intimate and prolonged acquaintance of Lucas, have written very full, impartial, and interesting memoirs, in which we have presented to us a faithful picture of his life in early boyhood, at the University College, in the *Tablet* office, in his devotional exercises at church, &c.

But though the deep interest the reader must feel in the eventful career of a gifted scholar and great politician, whose life was a veritable warfare, is not marred by stale anecdotes and interminable gossip, the portraiture of Lucas is for this very reason the more lifelike and faithful. He was essentially and pre-eminently an open, frank, practical man; a man of business and a man of sense. The depth and fervour of his religious feelings, and his horror of slavish obsequiousness, gave an incisiveness and an energy to his pen, which caused it to be as much dreaded by his less spirited co-religionists in England, as by those who were swayed by the bitterest feelings of sectarian bigotry. "We know," he says, "that a great deal of our language has given offence to what is called 'good society.' We heartily rejoice at it. 'Good society' owes us no gratitude and we owe it no allegiance. On the contrary, we regard it as a corrupt heap of religious indifference, of half faith, of cowardice, of selfishness, of unmanly impotence. If the *Tablet* were to sink to-morrow, our only regret would be that we have not found words adequate to express the indignation with which the conduct of 'good society' in these matters inflames and overwhelms us." Similarly, on the great political problems of his day, he thought fervidly and spoke strongly. He was a powerful and indefatigable advocate of the Catholic cause in the *Tablet*, on the public platform, and in the House of Commons. His unflinching attitude of friendship towards the persecuted Irish, in times when it was neither fashionable nor remunerative to raise one's voice even feebly in their cause, is emphatically implied in the following interesting narrative (page 75):—"In the Summer of 1841, the *Tablet* took a line distasteful alike to his partner, who was a Protestant Tory, to the Catholic Tories in general, and especially to certain Catholic Tory landlords At length the *mala fides*

of the conspirators became so unbearable, that Lucas's patience was exhausted, and on the 26th February, 1842, he brought out his paper under the name of the *True Tablet* leaving the old name to the printer. Early on the day before the publication, the enemy effected a violent entry into the premises, but by a neat stratagem the man in possession was ejected by the publisher, and an *Irish* garrison drafted in to stand a threatened siege. An attack was made in force, the shutters were torn down, and a re-entry was about to be effected when one of the defenders appeared on the roof with a loose coping-stone in his hands and shouted 'heads below.' The assailants fled and no further attempt was made to capture the stronghold."

Lucas was earnest in his aspirations, thoroughly unselfish in motives, indomitable in energy, and cared not who smiled or frowned upon him, once he had embarked on what he believed to be a just and honorable project. His life was cast amid scenes which frequently called forth these sterling qualities into energetic exercise. In 1837, when he was twenty-five years of age, and two years after he had been called to the English Bar, he read an article in the *Quarterly Review*, which to his acute intelligence suggested doubts as to the truth of Quakerism, the religion in which he had been born. He rested not in his search after the true and solid faith, that bore internal and external evidence that it rested on God's word, till he had succeeded in dissipating the clouds of uncertainty from his mind, and was received into the Catholic Church in the beginning of 1839. "As a child who has lost himself, he knows not where, far from home, returns weeping and weary to his mother's breast, so after long wandering in darkness, seeking after truth but finding no rest because I could find no certainty, I have at length come tired out with profitless labour, to find repose and consolation within that temple, whose eternal gates are ever open to invite the weary and erring pilgrim to enter in. I have accepted the invitation; I have entered in, and within I have found, not the mutilated limbs of truth, but the glorious Virgin herself in all her celestial radiance."¹

From this day forward, Lucas was, above and before everything else, a devoted child of the Catholic Church; inalienable in his attachment to all her teachings, prompt in his obedience to her voice, and unrivalled in his sincere reverence and veneration for her supreme head. He occasionally animadverted, no doubt, in strong language, on the political sympathies and antipathies of ecclesiastics; but he conscientiously believed that in so doing he was discharging a painful

¹ "Reasons for becoming a Roman Catholic."

but sacred duty, which he owed to God, to justice, and to religion. Countless other ecclesiastics of undoubted principle and great religious zeal, continued to regard him with approving admiration up to the moment of his early and lamented death, as the fearless but ill-treated champion of the poor and the oppressed, and the unpurchasable enemy of corruption and duplicity.

It was to his suggestions and efforts that the establishment of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul in England was mainly due; and his scathing exposure of the anti-religious principles and workings of Freemasonry opened the eyes of the English Catholics, even more widely than they wished, to the mischievous character of that most dangerous and most corrupting of all secret societies.

The *Tablet* had been founded by Lucas, in 1839, and conducted by him in London with varying degrees of success, under the most discouraging circumstances, for ten years. He then removed it to Dublin, where he knew he would find the tone of society more congenial, and where his paper would be made more directly and effectively the organ of those whose hearts beat in unison with the high-born principles it maintained. "English Catholicity formed too narrow a basis for the support of such a paper as the *Tablet* was or ought to be. The Irish who were the strength of the Catholic body in the empire were not content to be represented by a journal in London" (page 363). Henceforth his entire time and attention, and the greater part of the *Tablet's* space, were ungrudgingly devoted to well-meaning and unselfish efforts to assist the Irish in ameliorating their political and religious condition. It is only stating the truth in a very feeble way, to say that he became—indeed he had been for years before—more Irish than the Irish themselves. The names of his contemporary Irish patriots, around which the true history of the past generation of politicians sheds a lustre as bright as that which envelops the memory of Frederick Lucas, are lamentably few; while hardly any other age produced such a luxuriant crop of the vilest renegades and traitors—Keogh, Sadlier, &c. In number, as well as under less harmless aspects, did these latter resemble the unclean spirits that were driven into the swine—their name was legion.

In 1855 he went to Rome and was very cordially received by the Pope. Soon after returning, however, he was prostrated by a severe illness, which terminated his brilliant and useful but brief existence in the following year. "His was a Christian death," says his confessor, "cheerfully accepted from the hands of God at the early age of forty-four, and well prepared for. His career, short as it was, is one for which English and Irish Catholics may well feel grateful to God."

If we might be permitted to offer a suggestion to the gifted and distinguished author, it would be that Father Amherst's interesting article in the *Dublin Review* be embodied in the next edition.

The two handsome, medium-sized volumes before us are in every way worthy of him whose exemplary life of self-sacrifice and upright zeal, in promoting the cause of faith and justice, they pourtray in modest, unvarnished colours.

We cordially congratulate Mr. Edward Lucas on having performed his delicate task with great ability and rare taste.—E. M.

- (1) GLIMPSES OF A HIDDEN LIFE. Memories of Attie O'Brien, gathered by Mrs. Morgan John O'Connell. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.
- (2) THE LIFE OF BROTHER PAUL J. O'CONNOR. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

It is a difficult thing to write a good biography; and yet there is no life, which, if well written, may not be interesting, for it is true, and now more than ever, that the, "proper study of mankind is man."

The two books before us fall short of our ideal of what a fairly good biography ought to be. But they possess an interest, and will be productive of some good.

The first is dedicated to the Children of Mary—to the gladsome young maidens leaving the quiet shelter of their convent school, and by the reproduction of a journal, originally destined for, *The Irish Monthly Magazine*, gives us glimpses into the inner life of Attie O'Brien, her struggles with adverse fortune, her up-hill work in gaining admittance, and afterwards distinction, as a contributor of Poems and Stories to the *Irish Monthly*, and *Weekly Freeman*. The vigorous and original thought of the compiler of the "Glimpses," is an interesting feature of the book.

The second book purports to give the life of a very worthy man; a member of the order of St. Patrick, founded in 1807 by Dr. Delaney, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin. Brother Paul opened a house in Galway in 1826 and did good work there for many years. The great Dominican, Father Burke, attributed much of his success to the early teaching of Brother Paul: "He taught me," he says, "that next to the God that made me, I should love the old land of my birth, that dear old land, the mother home of the noblest race that ever dwelt on this earth." The Marquis D. J. Oliver, likewise a pupil of Brother Paul, bore like testimony, of whom in turn the Archbishop of Cashel said: "The truth is, that, in Church or State, I have never seen, or known a better man."—J. C.

A COMPANION TO THE CATECHISM : Designed chiefly for the use of Young Catechists and of Heads of Families. Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son.

THIS is a book which will prove to be very useful for those who are charged with the all-important work of forming the minds of the young in the solid principles of Christian Doctrine. It will be specially useful in this country, for it is a Companion to the Catechism which has been ordered by the National Synod of Maynooth, and approved by the Hierarchy of Ireland. That Catechism was formerly known as "Butler's," because it was composed by Dr. Butler, one of the Archbishops of Cashel. It is now known as the "Maynooth Catechism," because it was revised and improved by order of the Synod of Maynooth.

There are thirty chapters in the Catechism; there are fifty-two Instructions in the *Companion*. At the end of each instruction there is an Indulged Prayer taken from the English translation of the *Raccolta*, which has been authorised and approved by the Sacred Congregation of Holy Indulgences. The *Companion* also contains five "Addenda," comprising a short course of Instructions for young Children and Uninstructed Adults; the Christian's Daily Exercises, Things to be Remembered and Practised, Virtues and Vices, Practices of Piety, Order of the Books of the Old and New Testaments, and some other useful matters.

The Instructions are remarkably accurate and concise in the statement and exposition of Catholic Doctrine. There is an absence of that useless verbiage which disfigures so many books, even of instruction, whilst brevity and accuracy ought to be their characteristics. All available information is not, indeed, crammed into the pages of the *Companion*, yet quite enough to the purpose. Theologians are not largely quoted, nor is it necessary; yet occasionally we find references. For instance, speaking of the Sacrifice of the Mass, and following the opinion, which it is lawful to follow, that destruction of some kind is necessary to have a Sacrifice we have in a foot-note :—

"The destruction or change takes place in the Mass 'principally in the Consecration, and perhaps, also, in the Consumption, or its Completion' (C. Doctrine Manual). 'The essence of the Sacrifice is in the Consecration, or, according to another opinion, it consists in the Consecration, and the priest's Communion.'" (Schoupe.)

As we might expect, frequent use is made of texts of Scripture; sometimes they are quoted, sometimes merely reference is given; in all cases they are the texts that are usually adduced.

We should prefer in the composition of a book of this description that where texts are brought forward to prove anything some one conclusive text should be developed a little so that its application may be made plain; for to our mind at least the mere stringing together of texts is not satisfactory, and few texts are so clear as not to need a little explanation.

The form in which the book is written is a decided improvement, and will spare much time in mastering it. We cannot do better than give an extract. We shall take it from the Thirteenth Lesson :—

What is Purgatory ?

“Purgatory is a place or state of punishment in the next life where some souls suffer for a time before they go to heaven” (*Matt.* xii. 32).

Why is it called Purgatory ?

It is called “Purgatory” because souls are there purged or cleansed by a temporary punishment.

What does “Punishment” mean ?

“Punishment” means pain inflicted for an offence.

What does “Suffer for a time signify” ?

“Suffer for a time” here signifies to undergo pain until the justice of God is satisfied.

Is it an Article of Faith that there is a Middle State called Purgatory ?

That there is a Middle State called Purgatory is an Article of our Holy Faith, defined as such by the Council of Trent, the truth of which is founded on Scripture, which declares that “God will render to every man according to his works” (*Matt.* xvi. 27).

How do you prove the doctrine of Purgatory from the Scriptures ?

That nothing defiled shall enter heaven. (*Apoc.* xxi. 27); and that “some shall be saved, yet so as by fire.” (*1 Cor.* iii. 15.)

What does our Lord say concerning this subject ?

Our Lord says, “He that shall speak against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world nor in the world to come.” (*Matt.* xii. 32.)

What do St. Augustin and St. Gregory gather from these words of our Lord ?

From these words St. Augustin and St. Gregory gathered, that some sins may be remitted in the world to come, and consequently that there is a Purgatory, or middle state, in which the punishment due to some sins may be suffered.

J. C.

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

APRIL, 1887.

THE IRISH BISHOPS OF LINDISFARNE.

ABOUT eight miles to the south of Berwick, opposite the Fenham Flats on the coast of Northumberland, is Lindisfarne or Holy Island. It was called *Ynys Medcant* by the native British tribes, and by our Irish Annalists the name was slightly varied to *Inis-Medcoit*, in which form we find it in *Tighernach*, and the *Annals of Ulster*. The island is about four miles long by two broad, and is separated from the mainland by a channel about two miles wide, which is dry at low water, and affords a passage over the sands for foot passengers and even vehicles. The soil is fertile, supporting not only sheep and cattle, but especially in the north western corner of the island, great quantities of rabbits. No trace of the primitive buildings raised by the Irish monks now remains; but the stately arches and beautiful columns of the later Benedictine monastery still form a most interesting and picturesque group of ruins.

The island furnished an admirable site for a religious house. It was secluded, yet not inconveniently situated for holding the necessary intercourse with the mainland. Then as now, the soil and the fisheries were capable of maintaining a considerable population, if willing to labour with their own hands. The old monks, too, loved to contemplate the beauty of God in his works, and Lindisfarne can still show scenes both by land and sea of various and striking beauty. From the towers of Berwick to the cliffs of Bamborough the

coast-line is crowned with fertile fields and smiling woodlands revealing many a spire and town, while seaward the eye stretches over the far-reaching ocean brightened with ships, and steamers, and fishing craft.

The monastery of Lindisfarne was an off-shoot of the great Columbian establishment of Iona, and in many respects these two institutions were strikingly alike. They were both island monasteries, both were founded by Irishmen, and mostly recruited from Ireland; the work accomplished by both was very similar, and both were tenacious even to a fault of the discipline and traditions of their founders. As Iona was the nursery of the saints and scholars who evangelized the wild Pictish tribes of the Highlands of Scotland, so Lindisfarne was the home of those holy men who converted to Christianity the fierce Anglo-Saxon warriors of the vast kingdom of Northumbria. It is fortunate for us that Venerable Bede has left us a most interesting and authentic account of the labours of the four great Irishmen who were in succession Abbots and Bishops of Lindisfarne and Apostles of Northumbria. Mr. Skene too, in his excellent work on "Celtic Scotland," has done much to exhibit in a clear light the career of these holy and learned men, a short sketch of whose labours will, we hope, be acceptable to our readers.

The Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Northumbria extended from the Forth to the Humber, thus including the Lothians in Scotland as well as the north-east of England. It consisted of two great provinces—Deira, whose capital was York, and Bernicia, whose chief stronghold was the Royal Castle of Bamborough, built on a cliff overhanging the German Ocean, a few miles to the south of Lindisfarne, and directly opposite the small group known as the Farne Islands. The river Tees, rather than the Tyne, seems to have been the boundary line between these two provinces. The British kingdom of Cumbria or Strathclyde lay along the western border of Northumbria from the Clyde to the Derwent, but the boundary line varied with the valour and fortune of the rival princes on either side.

We hear of Angles first landing on the Northumbrian

shores so early as the year A.D. 364,¹ when they joined the Picts and Scots in their incursions on the Roman Province. After the final withdrawal of the Roman troops in 409 they appear to have made permanent settlements in those territories, and were of course in constant conflict with the native British tribes of the western shores and mountains. It was against these pagans of the north, rather than in Cornwall and Wales, that King Arthur fought those great battles that have been so celebrated in song and story. Ida, one of their chieftains, ruled over Bernicia in 547, and built his castle of Bamborough like an eyry over the ocean waves. His successor, Ella, added Deira to his dominions, but leaving, it seems, no children to succeed him, the kingdom passed in succession to six sons of the warlike Ida. The last of these brothers died in 594, and was succeeded by his son, the brave and ambitious Aedilfrid, or Ethelfred, as he is frequently called. He, as well as all his subjects, were still pagans, and during the twenty-four years of his reign, he was in constant warfare with the Christian Britons of Cumbria. In 603 he completely defeated Aidan, King of Dalriada, who had been crowned by St. Columba himself, and thereby extended his dominions across the country from sea to sea. He had already expelled Aeduin, or Edwin, the prince of Deira, from his dominions, thus adding that province also to his already wide domain. But the exiled Edwin was not idle during the years of Aedilfrid's victorious career. He was silently employed in gathering troops and seeking allies. When a suitable opportunity offered, in conjunction with Redwald, King of the East Angles, he attacked Aedilfrid, and completely defeated him in a pitched battle on the borders of Mercia in the year 617, depriving him at once both of his crown and his life.

This battle had other very important consequences. The sons of Aedilfrid who, like his subjects, were still pagans, fled for refuge to Scotland. The eldest, Eanfrid sought the protection of the Christian king of the Picts, and in course of time became himself a Christian. His two younger brothers

¹ Ammianus xxvi. 4; Claudian vii. 26.

Osuald and Osuin, more commonly known as Oswald and Oswy took refuge with the Scots of the kingdom of Dalriada, by whom the young princes were sent, both for security and instruction, to the great monastery of Iona. So these two boys, who were afterwards destined to become, in succession, kings of Northumbria, had the good fortune to be trained up in the Christian faith by the holy "Seniors of the Scots," as Bede says, that is by the Irish monks of Iona.

Meanwhile King Edwin having taken a Christian wife from Kent became himself a Christian, and was solemnly baptised with many of his subjects by Paulinus at York, on Easter Sunday in the year 627. This important step seems to have offended his pagan neighbours. Penda, the fierce pagan king of the Mercians, entered into an alliance with the half Christian king of North Wales commonly known as Ceadwalla, and with their united armies they advanced against King Edwin. A great and bloody battle was fought on the 12th of October in the year 633, at Hatfield in Yorkshire, in which Edwin was slain and his army utterly routed. Nor were the savage victors content with this victory, they ravaged all Northumbria, slaughtering the Christians, burning their few churches to the ground, and wasting all the land with fire and sword. When this storm blew over, Osric, a cousin of the late king, took possession of Deira, and Eanfrid, the eldest son of King Aedilfrid, who had fled from the conqueror of his father, returned from his exile amongst the Piets and assumed the Government of Bernicia. Then followed what Bede calls "a hateful year before God and men." These two princes, Osric and Eanfrid, were nominal Christians, but now openly renounced the faith and once more adopted the paganism of their ancestors. Like all apostates they were the bitterest enemies of the Christian name, and strove to root it out from amongst their subjects. They had almost succeeded, when fortunately a swift vengeance overtook them. The same Ceadwalla of North Wales again appeared upon the scene and made short work of the apostate princes of Northumbria. He first captured York and slew Osric, and then advancing towards Bamborough met the terrified Eanfrid with a few soldiers and disposed of him in like manner.

When this news reached young Oswald in Dalriada he collected a small army of Picts, Scots, and Angles, and advanced to meet the foe. St. Columba appeared to him in a vision the night before the battle and told him to be of good courage, for that God would give him the victory. Thus confident in God's protection the young prince marched through the Lothians to meet the enemies of his family.

The battle was fought at a place called Heavenfield, near Hexham, in the valley of the Tyne. Oswald completely defeated his enemies and thus mounted the throne of Northumbria in the year 634, which is an era in the history of that kingdom, for it marks the foundation of Lindisfarne and the real conversion of the pagan Angles of Northumbria.

Oswald's first care after ascending the throne was the conversion of his pagan subjects. He had himself been baptized and educated by the "Seniors of the Scots" at Iona. Accordingly instead of seeking Christian teachers from the newly formed churches of the south of England, he very naturally turned to these holy "Seniors of the Scots" in Iona, by whom he himself had been so carefully trained in the Christian faith, and requested that they would send him a bishop to preach to his people and administer the sacraments of the Christian faith. His pious request was readily granted by the community of Iona. At first it seems that a certain Corbanus was sent to preach to the Northumbrians. But his mission, like that of Palladius in Ireland before St. Patrick, was a failure. He found the people rude and untractable, and thereupon returned home in disgust to report his failure to the elders of the community of Iona. He told them that the Angles were untameable men of a stubborn and barbarous disposition, unwilling to profit by his words. The elders thereupon were grieved, but one of them, Aidan by name, addressing the unsuccessful missionary said, "I am of opinion, brother, that you were more severe towards your unlearned hearers than you ought to have been, and did not at first, in accordance with the apostolic discipline, give them the milk of more gentle doctrine, until being by degrees nourished with the Word of God, they

might become capable of greater perfection and able to practise God's higher precepts." The elders knowing Corban to be a man of austere disposition, felt the justice of these words, and came to the conclusion that Aidan himself was more fitting for the task, and that he ought to be made a bishop at once and sent to preach to the Northumbrians. Accordingly, as Bede informs us, Aidan was consecrated a bishop and sent from the aforesaid island, and from this college of monks to instruct the province of the Angles in Christ. It was in the end of 634 or the beginning of 635, and at that time Segine, abbot and priest, presided over the monastery of Iona, as the same authority expressly informs us. It is very likely King Oswald himself went on that occasion to Iona to urge his request.

Aidan was certainly an Irishman, for almost all the monks of Iona came from Ireland. It is very probable, too, that he came of the royal race of Conal Gulban, to which St. Columba himself and so many of the succeeding abbots belonged. Bede¹ gives us a most interesting account of his life and character. He neither sought nor loved any worldly goods, but gave to the poor all that he received from kings and other wealthy men. He nearly always travelled on foot, both through town and country, preaching to the infidels, whenever he met them, the mysteries of the faith. He and his companions, when not actually preaching, were always engaged either in holy meditation or reading the Scriptures, or learning the psalms by heart. Even when he dined with the king he made haste after leaving the table either to read or write. He and his disciples fasted on Wednesdays and Fridays during the year, except during Paschal time, until the ninth hour, and whatever money he received he either gave to the poor or spent in ransoming the wretched slaves whom he saw groaning in oppression. The king was not unworthy of the bishop; once on Easter Sunday when Oswald and Aidan were dining together the king ordered the meat set before them on a silver dish to be given to the poor at the gate, and the dish itself to be cut up and divided

¹ Liber iii. c. v.

amongst them. Thereupon the bishop took the king by the right hand and exclaimed, "May this hand never perish." And though the king was afterwards slain in battle, "that hand remains," says Bede, "to this day uncorrupted within a silver case in St. Peter's church in the royal city of Bamborough."

But though Aidan had a large diocese and led a very active life, he wished to have some place where he might retire for the practice of prayer and meditation, far from the world's disturbing influence. So he asked the king to give him the little island of Lindisfarne that he might establish there a monastery and make it his Episcopal See. The king readily granted his request, and so in 635 Lindisfarne was founded by St. Aidan. It was in many respects like his own beloved Iona—about the same size, and almost the same distance from the shore, but more fertile and more easy of access than the rocky islet of Columba. Here he built his little church and oratory in the simplest and most primitive style, probably of wattles, and roofed it with shingles or thatch.

It is not to be wondered at that such a man succeeded where his predecessor had failed. The people joyfully flocked to hear the Word of God from his lips; churches were built in many places; money and lands were given by the king and his nobles to build monasteries; and the "nations" over which Oswald reigned were all converted to the faith by Aidan and by the "Scottish" monks who daily came to help him in preaching the Word of God. "So the English, great and small, were by their Scottish masters instructed in the rules and observance of regular discipline." At first, ignorance of the Anglic tongue was an obstacle to Aidan's preaching, but Oswald himself during the long years of his exile in Iona had become familiar with the Irish language, and was thus enabled to become an interpreter of the sermons of the holy bishop for his people. A school too, was established at Lindisfarne, and Aidan selected twelve youths of the Anglic nation that they might be trained up, under his own guidance, to become worthy ministers of the Gospel for their countrymen. Amongst these was Wilfrid, afterwards Archbishop of York, the controversialist who

thirty years later was the means of driving Bishop Colman and the Irish monks from Lindisfarne.

Aidan's prelacy lasted sixteen years and some months, during which he laboured incessantly for the kingdom of God. He died in his oratory at one of the king's country houses, not far from Bamborough in 651. The holy remains were carried to his own island of Lindisfarne, and buried in the churchyard of the brethren. Afterwards when the large Church of St. Peter was built there, his sacred relics were transferred to the right side of the high altar and there interred with becoming honour, that is, the portion of the relics which Colman left when departing from Lindisfarne.

Bede narrates many miracles wrought by the holy prelate both during his life and after his death. He then adds that in what he wrote about Aidan he does not mean to approve of his method of calculating the Easter festival, but he wished to preserve for the benefit of the reader the memory of his virtues; "of his love of peace and charity, his continence and humility, his mind superior to anger and avarice, despising pride and vain glory; his industry in keeping and teaching God's commandments; his diligence in reading and watching; his authority becoming a priest in reproving the haughty and powerful; and at the same time his tenderness in comforting the afflicted and in relieving and defending the poor." Surely a noble testimony from such a pen to the Apostolic virtues of the Irish monk.

Bishop Aidan being dead, Finan was ordained and sent by the monks of Iona to succeed him in the Bishopric of Lindisfarne. It was in the beginning of 652. Like his predecessor he was an Irishman. It seems that the conversion of the Angles had left St. Aidan little time for church building on the island, for Bede expressly tells us that Finan's first work was "to build a church, not of stone but of hewn oak after the manner of the Scots, and he covered it with reeds." The reeds were afterwards taken off and replaced by plates of lead in the time of Bishop Eadburt, when the church was dedicated to St. Peter by Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury. It was there that the bones of Aidan were placed at the right hand side of the high altar,

as stated before. The Easter controversy seems to have embittered the brief episcopacy of Finan. Like all the monks of Iona at this time, he could not be convinced that the manner of celebrating Easter practised by their sainted founder and his successors, could by any possibility be wrong. He was, too, as Bede says, a man of a rather quick temper, whom argument or reproof only made still more inveterate in his prejudices. Perhaps he thought that Ronan, the Irishman, fresh from the schools of Italy, and the Kentish priests who came with Queen Eanfleda to the North, might have abstained from troubling his diocese with their new-fangled notions. They argued and remonstrated with him, but in vain; he only became more obstinate in adhering to his own ideas. The consequences of this diversity in the celebration of Easter soon became very inconvenient. The good king Oswald was slain in battle in 642, and Oswy, his brother and successor on the throne having been educated at Iona, adhered to the usages of the Bishop Finan. But the Queen Eanfled, and her chaplain Romanus were from Kent, and followed the Roman usage. The result was that on one occasion the king was celebrating Easter Sunday, and of course had given up fasting, whilst the Queen and her chaplain were keeping Palm Sunday preparatory to the rigorous fast of Holy Week. Nothing, however, was done during the ten years of Finan's episcopacy to effect a settlement of the question.

After his death, however, another Irishman coming, as Bede says, direct from Ireland (Scotia), one Colman by name, persisted in the same practice. It was now felt that something should be done to stop the scandal and secure uniformity. The king was, indeed, in favour of the Columban usage, but his son and heir, Prince Alfrid, had been a pupil of the celebrated Wilfrid, and adhered to the views of his own teacher. It was agreed, however, between the two kings, as Bede calls them, and all other parties concerned, to hold a synod or conference for the purpose of obtaining a final decision on the question. This famous assembly was held in the monastery of Streaneshalch, since called Whitby. The venerable abbess Hilda presided over

this great establishment, which was built on a cliff 300 feet above the sea and commanding a fine view of the "Bay of the Lighthouse," from which the place obtained its Saxon name. The rival parties at the conference were evenly matched. King Oswy favoured the Scots, but Alfrid was for the Southernns. Bishop Colman was the great champion of his own party, while on the other side was Agilbert, a Frenchman, who had studied the scriptures in Ireland, and afterwards became Bishop of the West Saxons. The learned and eloquent Wilfrid was at that time only an abbot, but he had much influence for he was known to have studied both at Rome and in Lyons under Archbishop Dalfin. The no less influential abbess Hilda was however on the side of Colman, for that royal maid received the veil from the saintly Bishop Aidan, and was trained in religious observance by him and his Irish successors. Bishop Cedd too, who had been long ago ordained by the Scots, although now a Southern prelate was inclined to their views. However he abstained from taking any decided part on either side, acting merely as an interpreter, for he was equally well acquainted with the Gaelic and the Saxon tongue.

Colman was called upon by the king to begin the discussion to which we can refer only very briefly. He justified his own usage by three arguments,—first, that he received that practice from the holy elders of the Scottish Church who had sent him there; secondly, that it was the practice of the holy Apostle Saint John; and thirdly, that this was the usage sanctioned by Anatolius, a holy and learned man of great authority in the Church.

Bishop Agilbert was then called on to reply to Colman, but not being a fluent speaker of the Anglo-Saxon tongue, he deputed Wilfrid to speak in his name. Wilfrid was an able and learned man who had travelled much abroad. His first argument against Colman was of itself quite conclusive. "The Easter which we observe we saw celebrated everywhere, in Africa, Asia, Egypt, and Greece—we saw it celebrated by all men at Rome, where the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul lived, taught, suffered and were buried." Apostolic authority and universal usage were against the few

Picts and Britons who adhered to the old Easter and the frontal tonsure. As to the authority of St. John, appealed to by Colman, it was not to the purpose. For St. John, according to Wilfrid, kept Easter on the 14th day of the first moon in the evening, no matter what day of the week it happened to be, in this respect following the Jewish Law, whilst it was yet lawful to judaize. "But you admit it may be not celebrated on a week day, and hence you do not follow the practice of St. John, nor of St. Peter either," he added, "for he kept Easter on the first Lord's day after the 14th of the moon in the evening, and therefore from the 15th to the 21st while you keep it from the 14th to the 20th moon, so that you often begin Easter on the 13th of the moon in the evening," and hence "sometimes keep it before the full of the moon."

As to Anatolius, whom Colman quoted in his favour, Wilfrid admitted that he was "a holy, learned, and commendable man;" "but you," he said, "do not observe his decrees, for he had a cycle of nineteen years which you know nothing of, or if you do, you despise it, though it is now kept by the whole Church." Besides, the 14th of the moon on which our Lord celebrated the Pasch, Anatolius, "according to the custom of the Egyptians, explained to be the 15th moon in the evening," so that like St. Peter he held that Easter was to be kept on the Sunday between the 15th and 21st day of the moon. How far Wilfrid was accurate in this exposition of the teaching of Anatolius we cannot undertake to say, because most of the writings of that learned prelate are lost, and we only know his teaching from some very obscure references in Eusebius.

As to Colman's appeal to the tradition of the Columban Church, Wilfrid admitted somewhat dubiously the sanctity and miracles of its founder, which, however, were quite consistent with his adopting an erroneous Easter from rustic simplicity, "but you," he says, "have no such excuse, the more perfect rule of the entire Church is brought home to your minds." Once more he appeals to the authority of the Apostolic See as conclusive, for it was to St. Peter our Lord said, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will

build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

"Colman," said the king, "is it true that these words were spoken to Peter by our Lord?" "It is true, O king," said Colman. "Then," said the king, "as Peter is the door-keeper, I will not contradict him in any thing lest there should be none to open to me if I made him my adversary." So the conference concluded, and Colman and his clerics were defeated. The Roman Easter was adopted in Northumbria, and the usage of the Columban Church formally repudiated.

This was a severe blow to the venerable old man, and he felt it keenly. "His doctrine," says Bede, "was rejected and his sect despised," and that, too, by men whom he must necessarily consider interlopers. Why should they put their sickles into his harvest? Why could not they leave him and his clergy and his people in peace? They were not there when the Northumbrians were to be converted, but they came now to regulate the date of their Easter, and to change the tonsure that he and his monks had worn from their boyhood. It was intolerable, and as King Oswy and his son, the young prince, had now joined Wilfrid and his party, Colman resolved to leave Northumbria to themselves. He would return whence he came, to some of the islands in the wild ocean on the far west of his native Connaught. There at least he could keep his Easter and his tonsure and serve the Lord in peace. But his beloved children in Lindisfarne would not stay behind. All the Irish and at least thirty of the English monks resolved to follow their master. And they would bring with them, too, at least a part of the relics of their sainted father Aidan that were buried outside in their little green churchyard. The grave was reverently opened, part of the sacred remains they carried with them, the only treasure they bore from the borders of Northumbria, and part they buried again in the sacristy for those who were to come after them.

So the exiled band set out on their journey. They stopped no doubt at old Mailros on the Tweed, where an Irish house was founded some time before, and where they

were sure to be hospitably received. Then they made their way to Iona, the mother house, to take counsel of the abbot and the community. They remained there for a considerable period preparing their currachs and provisions for the voyage, until after about three years delay they finally set out for Ireland in the summer of 667, according to our most accurate annalists.

It was a long and dangerous voyage from Iona to Inisboffin, but the Irish monk lived always under the protection of God his father, and had no fear of winds or waves, when doing what he thought was the will of God.

Still the king did not wish to break completely with his Irish teachers to whom he owed so much. Another Irishman named Tuda, from the South of Ireland, where the correct method of fixing Easter Day had been adopted thirty years before, was chosen to succeed Colman as Bishop of Lindisfarne. He was a good and religious man, but unfortunately governed his church only a very short time, for the same year he fell a victim to the great plague that carried off so many of the Saints and Scholars both of England and Ireland. Colman had, it seems, not finally departed when Tuda died, for it was at his special request that the king nominated Eata to succeed to the abbacy and afterwards to the Bishopric of Lindisfarne. Eata was of English race, being one of the twelve boys whom Saint Aidan had selected to be trained up for the sacred ministry in the monastery of Lindisfarne. And so after thirty years' duration the rule of the Irish prelates of Lindisfarne came to a close, when they had just converted the Anglo-Saxon race of Northumbria to the true faith of Christ.

Then Bede adds this beautiful paragraph which is a noble testimony to the worth and holiness of these Irish missionaries. "The place (Lindisfarne) which they governed shows how frugal he and his predecessors were, for there were very few houses besides the church left at their departure; indeed, only what was barely sufficient for their daily abode; neither had they any money but cattle; for if they received money

from the rich they immediately gave it to the poor. There was no need to gather money there, or provide houses of entertainment for the great ones of the world, for such persons never resorted there except to pray in the church and hear the word of God. The king himself when opportunity offered came with only five or six servants, and having performed his devotions in the church departed. But if any took a repast there they were content with the plain daily fare of the brotherhood, and required no more. The whole care of these teachers was to serve God not the world—to feed the soul and not the belly. For which reason the religious habit was at that time in great veneration so that wheresoever any priest or monk happened to come he was joyfully received by all persons as the servant of God, and if they chanced to meet him on the road they ran towards him, and bowing were glad to be signed with his hand or blessed with his mouth. Great attention was also paid to their exhortations, and on Sundays the people flocked eagerly to the church or to the monasteries, not to feed their bodies, but to hear the word of God, and if any priest happened to come into a village the inhabitants flocked together to hear from him the word of life, for the clergy went into the villages for no other purpose but to preach, baptize, visit the sick, in a word, to take care of souls; and they were so free from worldly avarice that none of them received lands or possessions for building monasteries unless they were compelled to do so by the temporal authorities, which custom was for some time after observed in all the churches of the Northumbrians.”

✠ JOHN HEALY.

DR. MIVART'S DEFENCE OF THEISM.

THESIS II.—(CONTINUED).

“There is and must always have been underneath, behind, and distinct from matter, an agent which is ever working in and through matter, and which created it, if it ever was created.”

PROPOSITION I.—(CONTINUED).

“Matter of itself is unable to produce all the substantial changes which are continually taking place around us.”

SECTION III.—MAN.

MY purpose all through the two preceding papers has been to show that underneath phenomena there are realities which come and go, and which owe their inception and cessation to an energy higher and better than any mere material force. The existence of these realities was first proved from the constitution of inorganic bodies; and the argument on which we relied was seen to grow in force when applied to organisms.

We might apply the same reasoning to the case of rational animals. In the wonderful uniformity of variety by which the human species is characterised; in the solid substantial unity that knits the individual together, not only binding his molecules into one substance at present, but conserving his substantial unity through four-score years of constant change in his constituent elements;—in these things we should find cogent evidence of the existence of an underlying principle of development, of an all-pervading and permanent bond of union;—of a substantial form.

But as this point has been touched upon already, and as the thoughtful reader will have no difficulty in applying the argument drawn from irrational organisms to the case of man, I will pass now to a consideration of what are called man's higher powers, and a review of some of the evidence which they supply in proof of the existence of the human soul. This consideration will be found to supply further testimony in favour of the existence of an all-pervading energy other than mere material force.

Men are said to be distinguished from lower animals by the possession of reason and of will. This is one of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, as indeed of every other system worthy of the name of religion. It is as fundamentally opposed to materialism.

We have seen that materialists are bound in sheer consistency to deny any *substantial* difference between inorganic matter and living organisms. Consistency to the same principles must force them to deny also any difference of substance between living organisms and man. So that man can never be to the materialistic mind anything more than "the cunningest of all nature's clocks."

I must beg to be allowed to insist on this point,—that the philosophy of Locke, faithfully adhered to, first results in scepticism, then develops into materialism, and finally ends in idealistic agnosticism and mental paralysis.

Hume was consistent in denying substance and external cause; and if there be no substance why should there be spirit? Nay, why should there be even matter? For we are supposed to know nothing except what sense tells us; and sense tells us only of present sensations. Accordingly, Berkeley was consistent in admitting present sensations only, and so he has never been refuted by any follower of Locke.

Thus at one stroke we should rid the world of science; geology, astronomy, and evolution, are mere dreams. Talk of "systems pulsating rhythmically to and fro from chaos to cosmos,"—before sensation began there could not have been even chaos. Shall we continue to extol Leverrier for predicting the existence of Neptune, whereas no such planet could have existed until it was first seen or at least imagined? We have been told that there are fossil treasures buried in the chalk-hills and coal-fields of England: how can there be when no one *feels* them? It has been dinned into our ears that all kinds of life must have come originally from all-potent matter: but how could there have been any matter before life and sensation began?

Thus in the light of Locke's philosophy the whole fabric

of physical science disappears ; and we ourselves are left, as so many bundles of sensations, face to face with Nothing.¹ Thus too our great physicists, who know everything and outside whose ranks no one else knows anything,—those very sapient guides cry out at last that all are equally ignorant, for as much as there is nothing to be known by any one ; and that the most perfect dreamer is the most learned man. What a sublime philosophy !

I. But to come to the questions at issue. The first is : Are men endowed with powers of knowing other than those of sense ? We answer, yes ; materialists, no. As these papers do not pretend to be a treatise on philosophy, we can give little more than a general outline of a portion of the reasoning by which the Schoolmen prove their teaching.

According to the Scholastics, men are endowed with a cognitive faculty of a higher order than sense,—intelligence. This higher faculty operates in different ways. (1) As *consciousness*, it reflects on what *sensus intimus* tells us ; (2) as *memory*, it recalls past ideas ; (3) as *reason*, it (*a*) abstracts new ideas from sensations ; (*b*) it judges,—that is, compares ideas so formed and pronounces them to agree or disagree ; (*c*) it infers,—that is, when it cannot pronounce immediately on the agreement or disagreement of two ideas compared with each other, it compares both with a third, and thus tests whether they really agree or disagree.

I will take the third of these operations,—reason. I undertake to show that we have knowledge of things without us, which knowledge is not mere sensation, and which accordingly can be acquired only by virtue of a faculty altogether different from that of sense. This will be seen best by examples.

1° We will take for our first example, *causality*. You see a man put out his hand and move a book from one part of the room to another. Ask yourself two questions:—(1) What do my senses tell me ? (2) Do I know anything more about what happens ?

¹ See "Nature and Thought," pp. 74-6.

(1) What do my senses tell me? (a) That the man's relations to surrounding objects are changed; (b) that the relations of the book are similarly changed. That is all.

(2) Do I know anything more about what happens? Yes, certainly; I know that force goes out from the man to change the relations both of himself and of the book. I could as easily persuade myself that the man is not there at all, nor the book, nor myself, as I could believe that the book was not moved by the man's force. Putting forth such a force we term causality.

Here then are two points: (a) we have knowledge of causality; (b) that knowledge is not mere sensation. Hence a third point follows: (c) there must be within us a cognitive power different from sense.

The materialistic view of the foregoing example may be stated as follows:—When we ourselves deliberately move ourselves or other things from place to place, we *feel* a force going out from us to effect the removal. This feeling is sensation. It recurs constantly and often. The effect of its frequent and constant recurrence is, that whenever we see any object being removed in a similar manner, we *associate* this constant oft-recurring feeling of our own with the remover. Owing to this association we cannot help imagining what may not be at all true, that force is exerted by one object to cause the removal of another.

This statement of the materialistic view, if it errs at all, errs on the side of liberality. For materialists write as if we knew nothing at all of *any* causality; whereas it might, perhaps, be maintained that, when we freely energize, we *feel* that we put forth force. So too we feel the influence of motives on the will. But to feel force or influence is to perceive causality.¹

Now it cannot be denied that constant and oft-recurring occasions for associating any two things beget a habit by virtue of which we are liable on other occasions, when we feel the presence of one of these things, to expect or imagine the presence of the other. This is the half-truth that underlies the Association Philosophy.

¹ See, however, "Nature and Thought," p. 132.

We contend, however, (1) that no amount of association will beget an *insuperable* propensity on *every* occasion to *believe most firmly* that where one of the two associates is, there also must the other be: and (2) that such irresistible tendencies do arise without *any* previous habit of association.

For the purpose of testing the truth of these two propositions, let us take the following examples:—

(1) We have had almost every day many occasions of feeling that fire causes heat; we have never yet met with fire that did not do so; nevertheless one finds it quite easy to believe that there may be somewhere, as there was once at Babylon, a fire that produces no heat. We have never known the relative positions of earth and sun to remain the same for any lengthened period; on the contrary we have had constant and oft-repeated occasions of seeing that their relations are changing continually; yet we have no difficulty in assenting to the proposition that the sun might be made to stand still to-morrow, as it was once before in the days of Josue.

Similarly the great mass of men have never seen any one raised from the dead; but they do not nevertheless think it impossible; they would not refuse to believe their eye-sight, if they saw it done for the first time. Most people have never seen a rod changed into a serpent, nor water into wine; but we cannot convince ourselves that it is as impossible that such changes should occur, as that something should begin to exist without cause.

Examples like these might be indefinitely multiplied. They prove our first proposition:—that no amount of associations, no matter how frequent and constant, can beget an insuperable tendency on every occasion to believe most firmly that where one of the associates is, there also must the other be.

(2) On the other hand it is equally certain that there are many truths which we never experienced, with regard to which we have had no associations, and which, notwithstanding, we could not bring ourselves to deny were we to consider them sufficiently. Such is for example, the *possibility* of being raised from the dead, of the sun standing

still, of a person emerging from a furnace uninjured. Such also are the truths of mathematics.

Let us take a proposition from the first book of Euclid: "If any side of a triangle be produced, the exterior angle is equal to the sum of the interior and remote angles." There was a time when you had no idea that this was true; you had never associated the terms of the proposition even once. At first the saying came upon you as a sort of revelation, the truth of which you were free and perhaps inclined to doubt or deny. But when you had examined the proof and appreciated its full force even for the first time, you could not withhold your assent.

In like manner there are certain formulæ in advanced Mathematics, with reference to which it is no offence to say that few educated people know them. If they were barely stated by some one of little authority, many would be inclined to doubt and could even deny them. But Professor Casey knows them and could not doubt them; nor could we either, if we were to examine fully the grounds on which they rest.

Now suppose that some one does examine the proofs: When will he become so convinced of the truth that he cannot refuse his assent? That he *will* become so convinced is as certain as that Professor Casey is convinced already; it is as certain as that we ourselves cannot refuse assent to the ordinary truths of geometry.

But when will our supposed inquirer first acquire this irresistible conviction with regard to the higher formulæ? Is it only when he has become so accustomed to associate the terms, that he cannot break off the old habit? So say the Associationists. We contend, on the contrary, that he will be convinced without any habit, the first moment he appreciates the force of the proof. Nay, we contend that no matter how long he had been accustomed to think the formula untrue, the very first moment he clearly sees proof of its truth, he will break through the tendency to dissent begotten by his previous habit of association.

This proves our second proposition:—that irresistible tendencies to assent do arise without, nay in spite of, any previous habit of association.

Now we have an irresistible tendency to believe in external causes; and if such a tendency can never arise from mere habit, but may spring up at first sight, as it were, it follows that the Association system cannot be admitted. It follows further that, as these irresistible tendencies do not result from mere habit, they must come from a cognitive faculty within us that *makes* us assent; just as there is a force within us that makes us see the objects around us, if we open our eyes at mid-day.

Further, it has been already proved that our knowledge of external causes is not sensation. Sense tells us of antecedent and consequent, but not of cause. Hence it follows that there is within us a cognitive faculty altogether different from that of sense.

2° So much for causality; let us take the idea of *substance*. In the first of these papers it was proved (1) that behind force there is a subject of inhesion; (2) that there is a different subject for the different simple elements; (3) that the subject of inhesion is different in chemical compounds from what it was in the constituent. How do we come to a knowledge of all this?

Not from sense; for sense tells of phenomena, and this subject of inhesion is something underneath and behind phenomena, abiding through all phenomenal changes. It must accordingly be revealed by means of another faculty distinct from sense, a faculty which begins to operate when sense ceases, which sees clearly what to sense is hidden and invisible.

3° The same is true of *vitality*. In the second paper it was shown that there is a very marked difference between live and dead things. How is this difference known to us? Not from sense; for sense tells merely of motion, and we know that the very same movements might be produced in dead as in living organisms. Vitality is behind motion. By what is it revealed? Not by sense; therefore by another cognitive faculty.

4° We find another example in our knowledge of *mortality*. There are certain actions which we know to be good, others

which we know to be bad. We are as convinced that they are so, as we can be of anything,—of our own existence, or that two and two are four. How do we get this knowledge?

Not from sense alone. Sense tells whether an act is *pleasant* or *unpleasant*; it says nothing of goodness or badness. We are convinced that some acts are bad, which, however, we know to be most pleasant and agreeable to sense. Many men are so convinced of the wickedness of these pleasant actions, that they are prepared to die rather than do them. We cannot but believe that it would be evil to offend a good God, no matter how such an offence might be rewarded by some powerful principle of wickedness.

So also we are convinced that other acts are good, though most disagreeable to flesh and blood; nay, the more disagreeable they are, the better we think them; whereas to do good for pleasure lessens somewhat the moral value of the act. Thus we admire self-denial in any one,—the asceticism of the saints, the fortitude of the martyrs. So, too, we cannot but admit that Mill enunciates a lofty principle of morality, when he says that rather than call a bad God good, it would be better to burn in hell for all eternity.

Good and evil, therefore, are very different from pleasure and pain. Sense tells us of the latter, but certainly not of the former. How then do we come to a knowledge of good and evil? It must be by a faculty other than that of sense.¹

5° Many other examples might be given; we must content ourselves with one,—our knowledge of *universals*. We are not confined to the individual for the exercise of our cognitive powers. We know not only John Smith, Thomas Brown, James Thomson; but merchant in general, student, soldier, man. We can tell what *merchant* means, what *man* means. When we read or hear these words, we are aware of a something—an image—within us corresponding to the word without. The word *man* does not call up to the mind the image of a horse, a fish, or a tree; nor even the image of *this* man or of *that*; but another image which is always the

¹ See "Nature and Thought," pp. 135, &c.

same whenever the word is perceived by any of the senses. And this is true of all universals.

How did we get this internal image? Not by sense; for sense never perceived any but the individual. Who ever saw or heard *man* or *student*? Who ever traded with *merchant*, or fought with *soldier*? We see and feel this man and that,—individuals, John, Thomas, James; but not *merchant*, *student*, *man*. Yet we know *merchant*, *student*, *man*. How? Not by sense; therefore by some other faculty.

This argument from universals may be confirmed by a further consideration. Man is distinguished from lower animals not only by his reason but by a consequent power of speech. Of course animals, too, have cries by which they express their *sensations*. The knowledge which is within is thus externated, but in language which corresponds to what is within;—else the expression should not be true. We ourselves, as animals, have sensations of pain, of pleasure, of other kinds; and we express these feelings by corresponding cries and gestures. A boy starts and cries out when he gets a sharp cut on the back; children shout and scream at play; mothers sing low and sweet to their slumbering infants; we laugh with joy and cry of sorrow. All this is the expression of sense.

But we have language of a higher kind, which conveys not sense but intelligence,—not the individual, concrete, present emotion; but universal, abstract concepts. A parrot may be trained to a habit of uttering similar sounds, but it does not *convey* from itself to us the corresponding concepts. It speaks, but *knows* not what it says; it does not *express ideas*. The reason is because it has no ideas and cannot form any. How very different the nature of its expression when it cries out for food, or from pleasure or pain. Then it *gives out* what is within. On the contrary when it utters universal terms we see that there is a void within,—that it has no corresponding idea. Man alone of all the animals makes use of language in this sense.

The illustrations just given prove conclusively what I undertook to show:—That we have a knowledge of things

which is not mere sensation, and which accordingly can be acquired only by virtue of a faculty altogether different from that of sense.¹

Here let me put a question. It is admitted by all that the human intellect had a beginning: How did it arise? Not certainly by evolution of mere material forces; for matter may produce a new arrangement, but not a new force. It has been proved that intellect is not sense, but *altogether* different. Accordingly, when this higher faculty first came into being, it must have been produced by something higher and stronger than material force.

II.—Let us proceed to examine *the difference* between these two cognitive faculties. A very little reflection will show that, whereas sense tells of what is extended and divisible, intellect reveals the indivisible.

Thus with regard to *causality*, sense tells of this man, of that book, of these changes in the relations of both to surrounding objects,—all extended and divisible, and as such capable of affecting the material organ of sight. Intelligence, however, penetrates behind matter and its phenomena, and reveals the *cause as such*. Now an external cause as such cannot affect material organs. Who ever saw or heard or touched an external cause as such? We see, hear, and touch, individual things, but not as causes.

So too with regard to *substance* and *vitality*. The sense perceives individual phenomena, ever-varying accidents and movements,—that figure, this weight, that sound, these motions. Underneath phenomena intelligence discovers substances and principles of vitality. What affects the eye, the ear, the touch, is extended. Eye or ear knows nothing of the substance or of the principle of vitality that lies underneath.

The same is true of *morality*. Sense perceives this pleasant, or that unpleasant sensation, but knows nothing of *duty* or of *wickedness*. Moral good and moral evil affect no organ; one cannot know a good from a bad action by sight, or

¹ See "Nature and Thought," ch. iv., also "Lessons from Nature," ch. iv.-vii.

by touch, or by taste, or by all senses combined. One discriminates between good and evil only by the other faculty, intelligence.

Why is this? Why can sense reveal antecedents but not causes, phenomena but not substance, the pleasant and the painful but not the good or the bad? Two answers are conceivable:—

1° We might suppose that the realities which correspond to our notion of cause, substance, morality, are unable to impress the organs of sense for want of extension; that they are insensible because, apart from their present phenomena, they are immaterial. I say, “apart from their present phenomena;” for substances and external causes, as such, are not seen by us in themselves, as it were; we know of them rather under general concepts as things underlying present phenomena.

All real knowledge is objectively true; its object is not created by the mind, but rather the mind is modified by objective realities. Such modification is manifestly impossible, unless the object be in some way united to the mind; hence the famous problem of the bridge.

Now sensation is the lowest kind of knowledge with which we are acquainted. It is the perception by a material organ of an object by which that organ has been impressed. This perception cannot, of course, be objectively truthful, unless the external object corresponds to the impression perceived. We have seen that sense tells nothing of substance, cause, morality; they are beyond its ken. Perhaps it is because, being immaterial, they are unable to impress themselves, so to speak, on material organs. This is the scholastic view.

2° Another explanation is conceivable. Why should not this inability result from grossness on the part not of the object but of the sense? Perhaps the truth is that our senses are not able to take impressions from the finer forms of matter? We cannot see sounds or hear colours; we require delicate instruments to detect the presence of

electricity; and this arises not from any want of extension in air, ether, or electric waves, but rather from want of capacity in eye and ear and every other sense.

This reasoning is fallacious. The most delicate instrument does not render electricity sensible. We can produce motion or heat, or light; and all these are sensible, of course; not so the electricity itself. It is true, indeed, that inability to perceive might arise from grossness in the part of the organ as well as of the object. But we have *some* sense capable of being impressed by air and other waves. Have we any *organ* wherewith to *feel* substance or cause, or whereby we may estimate the moral worth of an act? If so, where or what is it?

This line of argument begets at least, strong probability; but there are further considerations. Take the commonly received notion of spirit. Materialists do not admit objective reality to correspond; but the fact of the subjective concept cannot be denied. How could material organs form such? They form material images; and hence we *imagine* spirits under corporal forms. But we know, or what is the same for our purpose, we think we know, that the object is not corporal but utterly unimaginable, though most real and true. How could material organs form such a thought.

Or take some universal idea. Sense tells of this or that piece of matter,—this man, that house, tree, stone, &c. Intelligence reveals the universal,—man, house, tree, stone. Now individuals are divisible; this man, house, tree, stone, are all so much matter, and as such can impress themselves on material organs. But universals cannot impress themselves similarly. Who ever saw or heard or felt man, horse, tree, stone? We see, hear, and feel *this* man, *that* tree; but not the universal man, tree. Why is this? Why cannot *man* impress the organ as well as *this man*? The only conceivable answer is that *this man* is extended and divisible, and so can be, as it were, stamped on the organ; whereas the universal, *man*, cannot be similarly stamped on material organs, inasmuch as it is indivisible.

Here then are two sets of objects which we may know: (1) individual present phenomena, the objects of sense;

(2) realities underlying phenomena, the object of intellect. These underlying realities are not seen by sense, but only the phenomena by which they are manifested. The phenomena are divisible, the underlying realities indivisible. The two however, are never separated but exist in the concrete; hence the concrete is both divisible and indivisible, indivisible in one respect, divisible in another.

Is the concrete object—this book—really indivisible? This opens up the great controversy as to the nature of universals, which must ever be fundamental in philosophy. Nominalists and Conceptualists, or, as we call them, Materialists and Idealists, answer, no; Realists of all shades answer, yes. If there be any truth in knowledge, if common sense be not a lie, realism in some form must be adopted; there must be something indivisible in the object to correspond to the indivisible concept of the mind.

III. We have but little space to devote to the second endowment by which men are distinguished from brutes,—the will. In a subsequent paper, however, we shall have occasion to consider this faculty more fully. Our present contention is, that as we have knowledge other than what sense supplies, so we have appetites other than sensuous.

It has just been proved that truth and goodness are not material, that they affect no organ. Individualised matter alone can impress the senses; it alone can tickle the eye, the palate, or the ear.

But there are truths which are neither material nor individual; which existed before matter was, and would continue to exist even though the whole material universe were to cease; which rule not this case only or that, but all cases, or at least all of a certain class.

So too, though there are duties which are pleasant or painful enough, it is not because they are pleasant or painful that they are duties. So much is this true, that even Mill contends that it might be the duty of a man to bury himself in the fire of hell for ever, rather than deny the truth and soil his soul with guilt.¹ Actions are good or bad, not

¹ "On Hamilton," p. 129; see "Nature and Thought," pp. 144-146.

because they affect the senses in any way, but because they are or are not conformable to right order. And as this order is discerned by intellect and not by sense, so goodness and duty cannot affect the senses.

Now it cannot be doubted that the more man rises above the level of the brute, the more is he attracted by this super-sensible goodness and truth. The good are those who deny their senses for the sake of gratifying higher appetites; the best are they who deny themselves in the most heroic degree, who give up their very lives, and become martyrs to science and to duty. That there are such no one can deny. If, moreover, it be admitted, as it must be admitted, that truth and goodness are not able to impress the senses, it follows that we must have within us strong appetites which are quite different from those of sense.

IV. This brings us a step further. If it be true that the object of sense, owing to its extension, can impress itself on material organs, whereas the object of intellect and will, for the opposite reason, can make no such impression,—if this be true, it follows that intelligence and will cannot be acts of any material organ. The eye can see colours, the ear hear sounds, the touch feel resistance; but the substance underneath colour and behind sound and resistance, can be perceived by neither eye nor ear nor any sense, but only by an immaterial faculty behind sense.

Hence the distinction between man and brute. Brutes are endowed with sense but not with intellect or will. Moreover, sensitive power resides in an organ; whereas intelligence and will have their seat in an indivisible, immaterial subject.

Accordingly, as brutes have no powers higher than sense, there is no reason for admitting in their constitution any "force-root" other than such as, together with *materia prima*, is capable of forming a living material organism. But a living material organism would result from the union with *materia prima* of a form which is not in itself capable of independent existence; just as the form of a crystal is not capable of existing by itself. Hence the Schoolmen believed that,

though brutes have souls, just as plants, and as stones have substantial forms, yet these souls of brutes, just like the forms of inorganic matter and of plants, are incapable of existing separated from the *materia prima* to which they are joined. If this be true, it follows that the souls of brutes cannot survive after death, but are absorbed into the *materia prima*; just as the form of water does not survive the dissolution of that substance into oxygen and hydrogen.

It is quite different, however, with regard to the substantial form of man. We have seen that his energies are not tied down to any material organ, that he is capable of activities which are independent of matter. Now all the force which any being exerts comes from the "force-root" or form. Consequently there must be a form in man which energizes independently of *materia prima*, and of extension which arises from *materia prima*. Thought, as we have seen, is not an impression made on eye or brain or any other organ; it is an image formed in the soul itself independently of matter in any shape.

Whilst, therefore, the forms of the lower animals are immersed in matter, and cannot energize or even exist separated from matter, the human form energizes of itself. It depends on matter for the *conditions* of its energy; but these conditions being present the form acts of itself. As it can act without the co-operation of any material organ, it must be capable of existence when separated from matter. For the human substantial form, like all others, exists only to energize. As, therefore, its energies are not indissolubly linked with matter, so neither is its existence.

Hence whilst the union lasts the human soul co-exists with *materia prima*. During this time it is able to put forth two kinds of energy;—one, which comes from the compound, the living organism, and this energy is sensation, as well as vegetative and mechanical force; the other, to which matter does not contribute, and this is thought and will. When the bond is broken, the soul becomes unable to receive sensations for want of the essential material organ. It does not, however, merge in matter, but exists separately; because it was always capable of another kind of energy, of which it alone and not

any material organ was the source. And as the material organs did not immediately contribute to this second activity during life, so after death the soul remains capable of the same energy which it used to put forth from itself alone in its former state. In other words the human soul is capable of independent activity, and therefore of a separate existence.

V.—We come now to the last link in the proof from the constitution of man. When the first human soul began to exist, whence did it come? By evolution from matter? But matter cannot create spirit; it must have had a nobler cause.

What even of individuals? How did our own souls come into being?

Not by division from the souls of the parents; and this for two reasons.

In the first place, though certain substantial forms, as we saw, are divisible in matter, this is not true of such as are indivisible substances capable of separate existence.

For the parent form, when separated from its matter, must be in substance exactly what it was before the union took place; else it should be divided not only in matter but in itself. But how could it be in substance exactly what it was, if, during the time of union, slices had been taken off to form the souls of offspring?

Besides, it was shown in the last paper that generation of organisms, even of mammals and amongst them of man, takes place when the germ-cell and the sperm-cell are no longer substantially united to the bodies of the parents. Accordingly, the soul of the offspring cannot be cut off, as it were, from the soul of either parent; because when the soul of the offspring begins, the *foetus* is not substantially united to either parent.

Hence the human soul cannot arise by division from the souls of the parents. Few will now be got to maintain the theory that all souls were created from the beginning. And even though one were to maintain that view, without any reason, and contrary to the analogy of all that we know of other substantial forms, yet it would not materially weaken our

argument. For human souls are in existence; they cannot come from matter; therefore they must come from a higher and better principle, whether created all at once or at the moment of union of each with its own *materia prima*.

Our whole argument may be stated briefly as follows:— We have faculties distinct from those of sense. Those distinct faculties are independent of material organs for their activity. Hence the form from which they spring is not immersed in matter, but capable of independent self-existence. This form comes from somewhere; it cannot result from any special arrangement of the molecules of matter; hence there must be a higher power ever energizing to produce these spiritual substances.

VI.—We are now in a fair way to estimate the value of the Darwinian theory of development as applied to man.

It was stated in the second of these papers that a disciple of the Schoolmen would not be at all surprised to hear that spontaneous generation had been proved to be a fact. Nor would he be at all unprepared to believe that all species of living organisms, except man, were developed from a few elemental kinds. There are two reasons which contribute to make the case of man peculiar.

1° In the first place the substantial form of man is different from all other forms, in that it is a substance capable of independent self-existence, whereas other forms are immersed in matter. Hence the human soul can be produced only by an act strictly *creative*; other souls are not *created*, but only “*educed*” *e potentia materiae*.

Now there is a scholastic controversy touched on before in these papers, whether God can communicate to creatures His *creative* energy. The common opinion was and is that He cannot. Because, it is argued, infinite power is needed to bridge over the gulf from nothing to something, or to create; and no creature is capable of becoming the medium of an infinite energy. Various other reasons are assigned.

On the other hand there were men of eminence who maintained that creation of finite being does not suppose the exercise of infinite power. It is true, indeed, that no creature

can *of itself* call anything into being from nothingness ; but it is not so clear that power might not be communicated to creatures, whereby they might become, if not the agents, at least the instruments of creation. Forms of inorganic bodies and of the irrational organisms are produced by creatures beyond doubt ; why might not God communicate to His angels or to men, if He so willed, a somewhat similar though greater power, of creating substances capable of separate existence, such as the human soul ?

I have but touched the fringe of this controversy. As it is not the purpose of these papers to discuss points which Catholics are free to dispute, we will not pursue the question further. What has been said will serve to explain the first reason why most of the Scholastics denied that man was produced by evolution,—because the human soul is a substance capable of separate existence, and because the production from nothing of such a substance is an act of *creation* strictly so called,—that is, an act such as can only be performed by God Himself.

So much for the question of *possibility*. However one may be inclined to the common view, it must be admitted that Catholics are not bound in any way to accept that teaching.

2° We come now to the second reason for denying the evolution of man. This reason is based on the *facts* of revelation.

Evolution of man supposes two things : (1) That the *soul* of the first man was *created* by an energy residing in pre-existing creatures of a lower species ; (2) that the first human *body* owed its special perfection to a similar energy.

(1) With regard to the first of these points,—the creation of the first human *soul*,—whatever may be thought of the question of *possibility*, Catholics have no doubt as to the question of *fact* :

“Secundum fidem Catholicam ponimus quod omnes substantias spirituales et materiam corporalium Deus immediate creavit ; haereticum reputantes si dicatur per angelum vel aliquam creaturam aliquid esse creatum.”¹

¹ S. Thom. De Pot, q. 2 de creat. a. 4 ; cf. Suarez, de Metaph. D. 20, s. 2, 1.

(2) The second point, however remains: Was the first human *body* produced immediately by the divine action alone; or was it rather gradually perfected by natural agencies under divine guidance, so as to be fitted at length to receive a rational form?

It is stated in the Book of Genesis, (1) that "God formed man of the slime of the earth, and breathed into his face the breath of life, and man became a living soul;" (2) that "God cast a deep sleep upon Adam, and when he was fast asleep, He took one of his ribs and filled up flesh for it: and the Lord God built the rib which He took from Adam into a woman."¹

Independently of tradition the former of these texts and all similar passages might be interpreted so as to harmonize with the doctrine of evolution. But what about the formation of the woman? If the human species arose by evolution, the woman's body as well as that of the man must have been gradually perfected by natural causes. And if so, what is the meaning of Adam's sleep, of the abstraction of a rib, filling it up with flesh, and building it into a woman?

Cajetan long ago suggested that these words are not to be interpreted literally but allegorically. They denote, according to his view, the inception of the law of marriage, consequent upon the origin of reason and of morality. To impress this law more fixedly on carnal-minded and lascivious man, the allegorical form was used. We all know that there are certain truths which closest words fail to impress on our mortal powers; whereas the same truths being embodied in a tale will have force to engage the undivided attention of our minds. This is why our Divine Lord so often chose the parable as a means of communicating knowledge. According to Cajetan the story of the formation of Eve is a parable.

Against this view there is one great difficulty,—the authority of the Church. Not that there has been any individual dogmatic pronouncement; but there is the common, almost unanimous teaching of Theologians and of

¹ii. 7, 21.

Bishops. And though I would not at all convey that this teaching is of such a kind as to make it heresy to deny the immediate formation by God of Eve's body; yet it appears to me beyond doubt that (1) there has been for many centuries an almost unanimous *consensus* of Catholic opinion on this question; and (2) such a *consensus* is entitled to the respect not only of silence but of assent; unless, indeed, (3) there should be discovered proof that the bodies of our first parents were gradually perfected by the action of natural causes.

Now it does not appear that any such proof has been or ever can be submitted to the public. It has been shown that natural selection *alone* is not sufficient to account for the origin of even the lower organisms. Not only is selection *of itself* unable to account for the existence even of individual substantial forms, but it has been shown also that there are certain dead-points which selection could not get over without a *special* intervention of the divine activity. This is the irresistible conclusion from Dr. Mivart's argument in the "Genesis of Species." Variations of form may occur within certain limits but not beyond; to pass the line a new and very *special* energy is requisite.

If, therefore, we suppose organisms to have been perfected by evolution, with its ordinary and special forces, up to the point where the ape-form becomes proximately fit to receive a rational soul; and if we suppose further that God wished to pass the boundary line, and to produce the *animal rationale*; it is plain that two courses were open to Him.

(1) He might take a germ from an almost human ape-body; and then by two acts of special energy, (a) give it an additional degree of perfection, and (b) inform it with a spiritual substance capable of thought. Or (2) He might take another course. (a) He might form from the earth a body like the almost human ape-body, but with higher capacities as being destined to higher ends. (b) Then He might infuse into this body so formed, a specially created spiritual substance, which would serve as the form whereby for the future it should live and energize.

There is nothing impossible in this latter hypothesis, even on the principles of evolution. Nay more, if we take into account what we know from faith regarding the supernatural destiny of man, one might not unnaturally be inclined to expect some such immediate interference of the divine activity. There remains, of course, to be explained why God developed organisms up to the ape stage and then stopped. But who are we to ask God why? Why should He not do so, if He so willed? Why did he make man, or any other creature at all? And who was God's counsellor that he should be able to explain the motives of His will?

I do not advocate the foregoing or any other hypothesis of evolution; neither do I condemn. It is not my purpose to express opinions on questions with regard to which Catholics hold different views. For my own part I bow to the authority of Theologians, awaiting further proof of the evolution theory, and believing that such proof can never be forthcoming.

My purpose is to show how the doctrine of evolution bears on the existence of a First Cause, with regard to Whom we must all agree. I do not assert that irrational organisms have been developed through the agency of natural causes; much less that the human body has been so developed. I believe that both *might have been* so formed, if God had so willed. I do not think that the same can be said with regard to the soul of man. It *was* created immediately by God; and it is far from clear that He was free to create by intermediate agencies, and not by His own immediate act. But even though He could *create* as well as *evolve* through the intervention of natural causes, our argument retains all its force.

The only question for us is this: Could substantial forms, especially spiritual forms, be evolved by matter *alone*? We answer unhesitatingly, no. Matter cannot produce any force from nothing; it can but change the direction of force already in existence. Of itself it cannot bring into existence the "force-root" of inorganic bodies or of living organisms. It could not, therefore, of itself, develop the body of man. Above

all it could not, of itself, call into being from nothing his spiritual soul. Yet man's body must have been either developed or created; and a soul is created for every man that comes into the world. Therefore there must be in existence something superior to matter, always energizing underneath and behind material substances, and distinct from them.

W. McDONALD.

CLERICAL MINISTRY AND CIVIL LAW IN IRELAND.

THERE are few subjects of equal interest and importance in reference to which misconception so generally prevails in every section of the Catholic community in Ireland, as the one indicated at the head of this short paper. Owing probably to the long ages of oppression or legal ostracism to which the Church and its members were so cruelly subjected, it is perhaps not a matter of surprise that they should be slow in realizing, not merely that the laws which so long held their Church in bondage, have passed for ever away, but what is possibly of equal importance, that the ministers of that Church are, in the discharge of their sacred offices, guaranteed by the Civil Law many invaluable rights, exemptions, and privileges, to which, as ordinary citizens, they could have no claim. And yet it is so.

To indicate as briefly and concisely as may be what these guaranteed privileges are, is the purpose of this paper. But needless to say, in attempting so difficult a task I can only treat it in an elementary or superficial manner: merely laying down the principles which regulate the status of the Catholic Church in Ireland before the Law; while I take leave to supplement a few instances of their practical application, selecting those cases which I consider best suited to elucidate my meaning, and probably of more general interest to the clerical body.

What then is the legal status of the Catholic Church in Ireland? It is simply in the eyes of the Civil Law, a volun-

tary association of individuals, who freely and willingly unite together, for a purpose recognized as legitimate before the law; and who, in furtherance of that purpose, freely bind themselves, or consent to be bound by a code of laws, usages, and discipline, received and observed in the Catholic Church in Ireland; provided always that such laws or discipline be not opposed to natural justice, public policy, or special statute.

The members of this association, by voluntarily joining it or willingly remaining within its fold, are presumed by the Civil Law, by the fact of so joining, to enter into an implied compact with the executive authority of such association, faithfully to observe and fulfil two conditions; first, to obey all its laws and usages as received and observed in Ireland; and secondly, to consent to such an abatement and modification of their rights and privileges as ordinary citizens, as may be needed for the full compliance with such laws, usages, and discipline.

Now this voluntary surrender or curtailment of their civil rights is, in the eye of the law, the basis and foundation of all the civil privileges which the executive authority of the Catholic Church claims, and certainly possesses, in its relations with its members, whether lay or clerical. For, it is sufficiently manifest that the members of the Catholic Church, no more than those of any other voluntary association, cannot claim a right which they freely and willingly surrendered, nor refuse obedience or compliance with laws and usages which were, as it were, the terms of partnership willingly entered into, without accepting such consequences or penalties, as the association prescribed, and they willingly, by joining or remaining, consented to submit to.

It is further obvious, as an evident consequence of this partial abatement of their natural and civil rights, that no layman or cleric in the Catholic Church can allege as a grievance or cause of civil action that the authorities of the Catholic Church had, by enforcing against him its penal enactments, violated his rights as a man or a citizen, provided always, that such procedure was, in all particulars, in accordance with the terms of his implied contract, viz., the

laws and discipline of said Church, as received and prevailing in Ireland. And if under such supposed grievance, redress were sought before the civil tribunals, the question, and the only question such tribunal would enquire into or take cognisance of would be, not what were the rights of such layman or cleric, as man or as citizen; but what were his rights, as modified by the laws and usages of the Catholic Church of which he was a member, and were such rights, so modified, violated. Needless to add that it is simply untrue for priest or layman to say, that in becoming a priest, or a Catholic, he did not in any sense surrender his rights as a man and a citizen. For in undertaking to observe the Church's laws, both one and the other consented to such curtailment of their ordinary civil rights as such observance required and entailed. The sole remedy one, who is unwilling to observe the terms of his contract known to the Civil Law, has, is his severance from the association, whose rules he is no longer willing to observe. As long as he remains a member, he must either observe the prescribed rules, or submit to the penalties prescribed for their violation.

I will now proceed to apply those principles to a few cases of those more likely to occur in the exercise of the Sacred Ministry.

First—Altar Denunciations.—According to the ordinary Civil Law prevailing in these countries, any person who publishes of another defamatory matter calculated to bring such other into ridicule, contempt, or disrepute, exposes himself to a legal action for damages, either for oral slander or for libel: the one if the injurious matter were spoken only, the other if published by writing. By this law all, whether laymen or ecclesiastics, are strictly bound whenever they either speak or write merely in the capacity of ordinary citizens neither possessing nor claiming any special privilege or exemptions. But if an ecclesiastic, acting as an ecclesiastic and in the necessary discharge of his duties as such, utter language such as I have just described, then he can claim exemption from the application and enforcement of the ordinary Civil Law, only provided he has strictly observed two conditions in accordance with the terms of the

implied contract already referred to, viz.: first, that his language and action was not in any sense opposed to natural justice, and secondly, that he acted in strict accordance with the laws and discipline of his Church as in force in Ireland. And, therefore, if in any case such denunciation were not in itself justifiable, or even though justifiable had not previously been sanctioned or authorised by the Ordinary, as at present required by Ecclesiastical Law in Ireland, such denunciation would be a violation of the implied contract, involving a certain forfeiture of all privilege and exemption, and entailing a liability to an action for damages before the civil tribunals.

Secondly—Ecclesiastical Censures.—The very interesting judicial procedure in the remarkable case of *O’Keeffe v. Cullen*, has established beyond doubt or question, the fact, that the Civil Law recognises as vested in the Bishops and other competent authority of the Catholic Church, in accordance with and because of the implied stipulation or contract which all clergymen are supposed to enter into, when accepting their sacred office, not merely to inflict such censure as the justice of the case may demand and the law of the Church may sanction, but also, if needs be, to publish and proclaim said censure, regardless of the consequences to the individual; provided it can be shown to the satisfaction of the Civil tribunal, that the action and procedure of the ecclesiastical authority was, in all its stages, in complete accordance with the laws, usages, and discipline of the Catholic Church as received and in force in Ireland. For to that alone is the clergyman supposed by the Civil Law to have impliedly bound himself.

Thirdly—Ecclesiastical Property.—On no other branch of this important subject does so much misconception seem to prevail than as to the rights, before the Civil Law, of those who possess or retain ecclesiastical property such as churches, presbyteries, schools, &c. And yet the legal principles regulating such cases, are now established and determined beyond doubt or question. The principle is, that all ecclesiastical property is given or entrusted to clergymen, solely in their capacity of clergymen; that it is entrusted on the implied

condition, to which all clergymen by accepting it are supposed to assent, viz., the faithful discharge and fulfilment of the duties of the office to which such property is attached; and that failing such discharge of duty, or on being pronounced unfit for such discharge by competent ecclesiastical authority, they forfeit the sole title on which they possessed it; and consequently, may be ousted by an action for non-title before the Civil tribunal, exactly by the same process as any other person overholding property to which they had lost the title. The writer was present in the Irish Court of Queen's Bench when this was enunciated as the unquestioned law of the land, with the unanimous assent of the members of that court. The sole question of difficulty in the case is at whose suit the process should be initiated. If there are trustees to the disputed property, it is plain the proceedings should be taken by them. If there are no trustees it seems to me the suit should be instituted by the clergyman appointed to replace the one who is overholding; inasmuch as he is the one directly and immediately aggrieved, and also the one who claims what precisely is in dispute, viz., the possession of the property.

Fourthly—Mixed Marriages.—As the writer in his painful and protracted experience of Mixed Marriages has never been able to find any expedient so effective in preventing them as the public denunciation of such marriages before they are contracted, he feels that perhaps a few words on the civil right so to denounce them, may be of interest to others in a position similar to his own. They shall be but few. As an essential preliminary to its legality, every marriage before the Civil Registrar, and every Mixed Marriage in a Protestant church, must be preceded by an official notice of such intended marriage to the clergyman of the church the Catholic party usually frequented. Now this official notice to the clergyman was only recently substituted, by Act of Parliament, for a notice to the local Board of Guardians previously obligatory in all such cases. The sole and only object the Legislature had in view in prescribing one notice or the other was the same, and that was to secure before the Marriage such publicity as would be secured by

the usual publication of Banns, for which in fact this mode of publication is but a substitute. It will be, therefore, obvious that a clergyman is not merely within his legal rights, but is acting in full accordance with the object and intention of the Civil Law, by giving complete publicity in the most effectual form he can, to all and each of the particulars specified in the official notification, including the names and addresses of both contracting parties. I have no hesitation in adding that a clergyman is acting fully within his legal rights by supplementing this publication by a declaration of the law and discipline of the Church inflicting the penalty of excommunication on Catholics who thus offend against her laws. I am confirmed in this conviction by the fact, of which I was personally cognizant, that by the direction and authority of the late Cardinal Cullen, this was uniformly done in his Cathedral in Dublin. It must always however be borne in mind that the law recognises no claim, privilege, or authority, in reference to those who do not belong to the clergyman's fold. The priest would act more securely in announcing the excommunication, if he abstained, as he ought to do, from referring it to either of those whose names he has just announced from the official notice.

Fifthly—Sick Calls.—Fortunately for the great majority of the missionary clergy in Ireland the question of their legal right to free and unimpeded access to the members of their flocks, whenever their ministry is needed by them, is one of little practical importance. To those, however, who have largely to deal with families of mixed religions, as has been the lot of the writer, a few observations on the subject may perhaps be of some interest.

It is an undoubted principle of the Civil Law, that every citizen who professes a religion which the law tolerates, has not merely a civil right to practise his religion and comply with its observances at all reasonable times, but also has the further right that no one shall unreasonably impede or obstruct him in the exercise of his right. Any one who so impedes or obstructs will be held responsible before the civil tribunal, for acting in contravention to the law; and on appeal to its authority may, and will be, compelled to desist. Hence,

to take the example most likely in practise to arise, if, through ignorance or prejudice on the part of some member of a family of mixed religions, an effort is made to prevent the free access of a Pastor, to a member of his flock who is seriously ill and needs his ministry, then such Pastor is entirely within his legal right, in having recourse to every means in itself lawful, to force an entrance with or without the consent of the non-Catholic members of the household. The ordinary and more discreet course would be to make application to the nearest magistrate, on whose written order the police would be bound to assist him in effecting an entrance to his parishioner.

This principle of law has undoubted application to all who are, beyond doubt or question, of his flock and religion, and in need of his ministrations, quite irrespective of the age of the invalid or of their relations with or to the party who attempts to obstruct. The only exception to this rule would be boys under fourteen and girls under sixteen, in cases where the non-Catholic parents or responsible guardians have not forfeited the right which they certainly possess, to guide and control their religious opinions and practices, up to the specified ages respectively. It is well to remember that, as already explained in a former communication, this forfeiture may be either by "Waiver" or by the fact that the children had already acquired such fixed religious conviction and principles as may not be disturbed without danger to their spiritual interests. But as the parents' right is always presumed, the onus of proving the forfeiture will always rest with the pastor who seeks access to the children.

Sixthly—Wills.—In connection with the matter we have been discussing it may be useful to recall one or two well established principles of Civil Law bearing on the subject of Wills.

The first is, that a Will, whether of a father or of a mother, which deals exclusively with the appointment of testamentary guardians, and which in no way disposes of property, real or personal, does not require to be "proved" unless disputed by one having an interest in the case; and is operative immediately on the death of the Testator.

Secondly, in consequence of a recent change of the law, if the property disposed of by a Will is within a value or amount limited and specified in the act, then probate of such Will may now be obtained without any recourse to a civil tribunal, and without the employment of any officer or functionary of law by the simple and inexpensive expedient of writing to the officer of Excise, by whom, on payment of a merely nominal charge, probate or administration will be issued.

Such are the few and somewhat crude thoughts that have presented themselves to the writer on a subject of much importance, great complexity, and of some novelty. Needless to say that no authority is either claimed or desired for them, save in so far as they may approve themselves to the more matured judgment of those who may possibly have had wider experience and larger opportunities of becoming conversant with a very intricate subject.

P. CANON O'NEILL.

THE ROSMINIAN PHILOSOPHY.

DR. CAMPBELL has thought fit to make a statement of the grounds on which he had based his grave charge of Pantheism against the doctrines of Rosmini. Those who have followed the controversy in Italy will, I think, readily allow that he has made a fair exposé of the case for the plaintiff. But the lovers of fair play in this country, who now for the first time have heard the serious accusations, have a right to learn also how the charge has hitherto been successfully repelled, and why the defendant gained his case after four years' examination before the authoritative tribunal of Rome, where his works were formally acquitted of all the charges made against them, including that of Pantheism. It must be said in justice to Dr. Campbell, that his second paper in the ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD for March, 1887, re-affirming the assertions of the first has at least this merit, that it gives the defenders of Rosmini's doctrine a chance of making a specific

reply to a specific charge. Now, at least, we know what are the foundations on which his accusations are built up, and how the charge is made out. As we expected, the arguments are a reproduction of those, adduced and repeated, over and over again by Rosmini's opponents in Italy, and as often triumphantly refuted by a host of eminent Rosminian writers, among the foremost of whom we find Monsignor Ferré, Bishop of Casale, who defended Rosmini in eleven octavo volumes. As far as I myself am concerned it gives me no little satisfaction as a humble follower of Rosmini, to expose the too common method of attack in use among his opponents, who, in their strange anxiety to convict him of Pantheism, attribute to Rosmini doctrines, for which there is not a tittle of evidence in his writings. This may be inferred at least from their acquittal by the Holy See, as well as from the official report concerning them made in 1854 to the Sacred Congregation in which it is declared that the charges hitherto brought against this illustrious author are calumnious. But the readers of the ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD shall have evidence of another kind. For my part I gladly hail the occasion now offered to meet the specific charges brought forward by Dr. Campbell. For I think it just that those who have read the accusation should see how the accused is defended. I wish however to state, that my scope in replying to Dr. Campbell is not to open a controversy upon the *merits* of Rosmini's philosophy, for I see no advantage to science from disputing about a question which during the past fifty years has been thoroughly thrashed out. But my sole purpose is to make it clear from original sources what Rosmini actually teaches, and what he does not. For on no account can we accept as his the principles which Dr. Campbell so confidently tells the world "all true Rosminians hold with Rosmini." *We hold just the contrary of those principles*, as I am about to show. So that if I can establish that the two fundamental propositions upon which the charge brought against Rosmini is based, are not his, then the charge of itself falls to the ground. This, then, is what I propose to do.

The two propositions on which the principal opponents of Rosmini, under the shadow of whose authority Dr. Campbell

thinks he may safely cover himself, base their charge of Pantheism, are these:—

1st Proposition. “The Rosminian *ens* is God under the formal concept of *being*, a thing no true Rosminian denies.”

2nd Proposition. “This *ens* is the *intrinsic* and formal *esse* of contingent things, as all true Rosminians hold with Rosmini.” “This,” concludes Dr. Campbell, “is Pantheism.” Can it be possible? A thing no true Rosminian denies! Pray let me ask on what Rosminian authority, chapter and verse please, does Dr. Campbell make this truly astounding assertion? As a Rosminian myself, let me assure him, that no true Rosminian would ever dream of entertaining for one moment two such absurd propositions as the above, which are the exact *contrary* of the doctrine we hold. And I challenge Dr. Campbell to quote me any single Rosminian writer (and their works already fill a small sized library), who has ever taken either of those propositions into consideration, except to combat the same. Has the philosopher of Mount St. Bernard’s been napping all these years not to know, that true Rosminians have been multiplying pamphlets and books for years to demonstrate two distinctly contrary propositions, which might be formulated thus—1st, “The Rosminian *esse* or the concept of *being* is *not* God”—2nd, “This *esse* though formal is *not* an *intrinsic* element of contingent things,”—and yet Dr. Campbell coolly tells the Catholic public that “all true Rosminians hold with Rosmini”—the very contrary of what they here teach. But let us go to the fountain-head and see what Rosmini *does* teach, for I do not ask Dr. Campbell to take my authority for what I have stated.

To deal then with the first proposition attributed to Rosmini and his followers:—“The Rosminian *ens* is God under the formal concept of *being*.” Now the philosopher of Rovereto considers *esse* or *being* under a two-fold relation, viz., in relation to the human mind which it illumines, whence it is called *ideal being*, and in relation to finite things which it sustains,—whence it is called *initial being*; but for Rosmini it is the same *esse* considered from two different points of view.

Now as regards *ideal being*, the essential object of the human mind, Rosmini shows, that since it exists *not* under the

real and *subsistent*, but solely under the *ideal* or *objective* form of being, which is quite different from the *real*, it cannot possibly be God, who is essentially *real* and *subsistent*. These are his own words. "It cannot be said without inaccuracy, that we see God in the present life (natural order), because God is not merely ideal (objective), but inseparably Real-ideal (Real-objective)," (*Rinov.* c. 42). To explain this he devotes an entire chapter under the following title, "Being *per se* manifest, such as it is communicated to man, is *not* God" (*Theosoph.*, vol. iv., c. 6). And to prove that it is *not* God, he wrote his book entitled *Gioberti e il Panteismo*. Again he repeats the same doctrine: "If we take the same concept of *being* apart from creatures and from God, viz., *indeterminate being* such as, according to us, is the object of natural intuition, this is *not* God . . . but if to this *being* be added its own determinations belonging to it, then it has all that is required to be God . . . Wherefore we call *indeterminate being* divine, although we cannot call it God except when it is determined" (*Theosoph.*, *Essere Trino* n. 848). One more quotation on this point. "The idea, he says, is not the *Word*, for the latter only is *Subsistence*, while the former is *being*, with the Personality hidden, nothing being manifest but the *indeterminate* and *impersonal objectivity*. When the mind intues the *idea* neither the personality nor the subsistence of being is perceived, and so it does *not* see God, but whosoever sees the *Word*, although but as through a glass and indistinctly, sees God" (*Introd.* n. 8. See also *The Origin of Ideas*, n. 1033.)

Of *being* considered as *initial* in so far as from it the creature depends for its *esse* or *existence*, Rosmini again declares that it is not God, and he gives the reason which further explains what has been said above. "This *initial being*," says he, "seen by the *Absolute Subjective Being* (God) in *Absolute Objective Being* (the Divine Word), could not be this same *Absolute Object*, since it is an *abstraction*. The abstraction is a mental concept, a term which the mind has given to itself by the *limitation* it puts to its own glance, but it has no existence of itself, but only *in* the mind and *by* the mind . . . *Absolute Objective Being* (the Word) on the contrary,

is Being of itself" (*Theosoph.*, vol. i., n. 461). Thus Rosmini like St. Augustine and St. Thomas, while fully admitting the divine character of *esse communissimum* or *being*, teaches that it is a *divine abstraction*, in which abstract and purely objective form, considered by God apart from His reality or subsistence, it constitutes the *esse communissimum* or being which is united to the creature and sustains it. This, however, is clearly *not* God, although, since it is manifestly divine, it is called a divine appurtenance, as God's *abstraction* certainly is.

Lest, however, Dr. Campbell should fancy he can convict Rosmini of Pantheism on the admission that the *esse* of which we are here speaking is *necessary, divine and infinite* (for Rosmini admits all this), I would have him bear in mind, that this same *esse*, as the object of the mind, is called by St. Bonaventure "lumen veritatis aeternae" (*Itiner. ment. in Deum*, cap. v.), for St. Augustine had already written, "Mens ipsa, nulla interposita substantia, ab ipsa veritate formatur" (In lib. 83. q. 4.) And St. Thomas, who teaches that the object of the mind is *being*, calls this object "lux increata" (*De Verit.* q. 18), and speaking of *ideas* says that they are *eternal*—"Ipsae formatae non sunt ac per hoc aeternae (I. P., q. 15, a. 2)." He also writes: "Lumen naturale rationis participatio quaedam est divini luminis" (I. q. 12, n. 2, ad 3^m). But for Rosmini as for St. Thomas, all these terms, viz., the *light of reason*, the *object and form* of the mind, the *idea, truth*, and *esse communissimum* are one and the same thing. Whence it is seen that the divine character of *being* is no new notion of Rosmini's. From all this we gather that it is *not true* that Rosmini with his followers is ready to admit that the *esse* or formal concept of *being* is God. As we have seen he teaches just the contrary. It remains to be shown that the second proposition brought forward by Dr. Campbell is as opposed to Rosmini's express teaching as the first.

The second proposition attributed by Dr. Campbell to Rosmini runs thus: "This *ens* is the *intrinsic* and formal *esse* of contingent things, as all true Rosminians hold with Rosmini." Now this proposition is a monstrous absurdity, and, as Rosmini himself shows, is the very incarnation of Pantheism. For, holding as we do the Divine nature of *esse*

or being, it requires no great intelligence to see, that the identity between *being*, and the contingent creature would involve pantheism. Hence, combating this doctrine, he writes: "That the opinion of Suarez cannot be upheld, which teaches that *esse* is not distinct by nature from the inferior entities in which it is" (*Gioberti e il Panteismo*). Rosmini then insists with St. Thomas that *esse* is *not intrinsic* to the creature, that is to say it is not *identical* with it. He holds in fact that in the creature are to be found united two distinct elements, the one *intrinsic*, the other *extrinsic*, namely, *finite reality* or the creature, and *being* from which the reality depends for its existence, whence it is said to *have being*. The *finite reality* is indeed created out of nothing, and creation consists precisely in giving this reality *being*, which, however, remains essentially distinct from it. And the reason is, because *being* or *esse* is not only purely objective or mental, while the creature is a *reality*, but it is essentially divine and *infinite*, and the *infinite* cannot be identified with the *finite*. The finite reality in fact is essentially *contingent*, and carries with it no necessity, whereas *being* itself cannot be conceived as non-existing, since its very nature and essence is *to be*. Besides, *being* is common to all finite creatures, whence it is called *esse communissimum*; but precisely because it is *common* to all it cannot be identified with any one creature, although no individual creature can possibly exist without it.

The union therefore between these two elements is not one of *identity*, but of *relation*. Such is the doctrine to be found in a hundred places in Rosmini's *Theosophy*, as also in St. Thomas, who teaches that "no form or created nature is its own *esse* or *being*," "Nulla forma vel natura creata est suum esse" (*De Pot.*, ii., i.).

It remains for me to identify this doctrine with that of the Roveretan philosopher. "In the *finite being*," says Rosmini, "*esse* is not identified with the single forms as is the case with the Infinite Being (God); hence as regards *finite being*, the subject is *never being*, but only a form of it, so that while we predicate of *being* that it *is*, we predicate of the *finite being* (the subject), that it *has*." (*Theosoph.*, vol. i., n. 732.) Let me make another quotation. "*Being*," says he, "does *not* constitute

the nature of the *finite reality*; this nature consists in the *reality* alone, which is *not* being, but a form of being, yet a form which would not be but for *esse*. And this distinction is not merely the work of the human mind, it is founded in the nature of the things of which we are speaking; for *being* and *finite realities*, as we have seen, have contradictory characters, so that they *cannot be identified*, although the *finite realities* are so dependent from *being*, that without it they would not exist." (*Theosoph.* vol. 1, n. 837.)

But I am aware that Dr. Campbell, and the School to which he belongs is persuaded that being *is* intrinsic to the creature, so as to be identical with it, and no doubt he thinks that Rosmini and his school ought to be of one mind with himself on this matter. Indeed he is willing, as we have seen, to *suppose* that we actually *are* at one with him on this point. Without this supposition in fact it is impossible for him to draw his fatal conclusion. What a pity to undeceive him, and thus to deprive him of his *minor* as well as of his *major*! And yet we really cannot oblige Dr. Campbell in this matter. He is welcome to hold that *being is intrinsic* to the creature, and identical with it, but, as regards ourselves, with St. Thomas we utterly repudiate the proposition. We repeat with the Angelic Doctor: "nulla forma vel natura creata est suum esse" *loc. cit.* and again *c. Gentes* l. ii., c. 52 where he speaks of the "Compositio ex substantia et esse, ex *quod est et quo est.*"

And, indeed, from the doctrine of the school to which Dr. Campbell belongs, with reference to this most important point, it is not difficult to understand the origin of their charge against Rosmini. For taking it for *granted*, as they do, that *esse is intrinsic* to the creature, and one thing with it, it goes without saying, that Rosminianism is infected with Pantheism. We should be the first to admit it. But as we have seen from Rosmini's own showing, the *finite reality* of the creature, for reasons given above, cannot possibly be identified with *esse*, which is *not a reality* or *substance* but is purely *objective being*, whence it is called *ideal*. In any case the Rosminian school holds that *esse is not intrinsic* to the creature. This is not fair on the part of our opponents. If

they are willing to judge from a part of Rosmini's doctrines, his admission that *esse* is *divine*, they must also take with this the rest, namely, his teaching that *esse* is *extrinsic* to the creature, and distinct from it. But this they will not do, hence their unfair conclusions. But if the followers of Rosmini were to argue in the same way they would have to accuse Dr. Campbell and his friends of the very Pantheism which he thinks he is attacking. For starting from Rosminian principles, that *esse* or *being* is *divine* and *infinite*, inasmuch as it is an appurtenance of God, it follows that those who *identify* this *esse* with the creature, as Dr. Campbell's school certainly does, are themselves holding Pantheistic doctrines. This goes to show that it will not do to judge of another's doctrine by one's own principles when these have not been demonstrated with certainty to be true.

What, then, are the conclusions to be gathered from the facts I have established? 1st—That it is *not true* that “the Rosminian *ens* is God under the formal concept of being,” and it is *not true* “that no Rosminian denies this.” 2nd—That it is *not true* that “this *ens* is the *intrinsic* and formal *esse* of contingent things,” and it is *not true* that “all Rosminians hold this with Rosmini.” 3rd—That the premises not being Rosmini's, the consequence drawn therefrom does not affect his doctrines. As regards the authors from whom Dr. Campbell has gathered, as he admits, his two fundamental principles attributed to Rosmini and his disciples, I leave it to the lovers of fair play to judge whether they have not misrepresented in their compendiums the genuine teaching of the illustrious Italian philosopher. I am willing to believe that Dr. Campbell has been misled. Certainly he must be congratulated on not having quoted those now famous words of Card. Zigliara, where in his *Propedeutica*, his Eminence refers his readers to places of the *Theosophy*, where he says, that Rosmini “*apertis verbis*, teaches, that *esse* is properly an *intrinsic* element of contingent things.” For on turning to the places referred to, what is the student's utter amazement to find Rosmini on the contrary saying that it *cannot be said*, that *esse* is properly an *intrinsic* element of contingent

things. The little word *not* has been dropped from the quotation, that is all. And so Rosmini is made to say, *apertis verbis*, precisely the contrary to what he has written. This, it will be said, must be attributed to an oversight. But it is an oversight upon which unfortunately the eminent author bases his charge against Rosmini. It is an oversight which students of the *Propedeutica* never thought of verifying for themselves, and which is recognised only after incalculable injury has been done to Rosmini by the false quotation.

With regard to the passages quoted from Rosmini by Dr. Campbell, and the objections raised by him, these latter are for the most part a reproduction of old objections already answered a hundred times over. In most of these Dr. Campbell takes for granted one or other of the two principles he has sought to father upon Rosmini, while he constantly confounds the *purely ideal* with the *real* form of being. So long as our opponents refuse to recognise this most important distinction between these two *forms* of *being* they will never understand Rosmini; while the taking these as equivalent involves consequences the most serious, for which neither Rosmini nor his school can be answerable. This is precisely the error Dr. Campbell falls into in criticising Bishop Ferré's words. There is, however, one quotation which he makes from Rosmini, which, taken apart from the context, is most misleading, and as Dr. Campbell has interpreted the words in question in his own way without telling his readers how Rosmini a few lines above utterly cuts away the possibility of the inferences which he seeks to draw from the quotation, I must supply what Dr. Campbell has omitted. The quotation is the following:—"The finite reality *is* not, but He (God) makes it *be* by joining to THE INFINITE REALITY the limitation."—*Theos.*, vol. i. p. 658. Now these words as can be verified from the text, for which I see Dr. Campbell has given a wrong quotation, are indeed Rosmini's, and Dr. Campbell's interpretation of them is undeniably Pantheistic. But this interpretation is altogether contrary to the sense in which Rosmini uses them. This may be clearly seen by perusing pp. 656-712 of the first volume

of the *Theosophy*, where an entire chapter is devoted to the doctrine of Limits; as also pp. 399-456, containing a description of the Creation. From these pages it plainly appears that the infinite reality of which Rosmini here speaks is the infinite reality *not* in its own *absolute subsistence*, but in so far as it is a *mental concept* or *cognition* of the Divine mind; that is to say, in so far as it is known, and not as it is in itself. Speaking of THE INFINITE REALITY in itself, Rosmini himself says:—"The absolute reality in itself existent—*refuses every limitation.*"—*Theos.*, vol. i. p. 157. And again: "The absolute being known to man by means of reflection—*admits of no limit whatever.*"—*Ib.* p. 665. And once more:—"Every finite being differs infinitely from the infinite. Wherefore the finite cannot be found by *diminishing the infinite.*"—*Ib.* p. 693. From these passages it is quite plain that Rosmini does not teach that the infinite reality of God becomes the finite reality of creatures by the addition of limits. I think on this point also I have a right to complain of carelessness on the part of Dr. Campbell in verifying Rosmini's meaning, especially as he is bringing forward such serious charges against a Christian philosopher. Rosmini himself had to complain of the like injustice, when in 1845 he published the *Theodicea*, in the preface to which he declares solemnly that up till that time in no book of his adversaries was there to be found an exposition of his own doctrine. And what Rosmini said then of his opponents is too generally true even now.

Dr. Campbell tries to make out that Rosmini does not mean what he says, when he teaches that finite things are outside God; and he attempts to shew this by an example which has no analogy whatever with the case. I am satisfied that he will persuade no unprejudiced reader to believe what he has been endeavouring to prove on this point. He who would prove too much proves nothing. For the rest, what has already been said in this paper is more than is required to shew that Rosmini *does* mean what he says, when he teaches that the finite reality is essentially outside God. I suppose however, Dr. Campbell will be prepared to admit that the *exemplar* in which God knows the creature, is in the mind of

God. Concluding what he has to say about Pantheism, Dr. Campbell writes "This is sufficient regarding my first *assertion* that for Rosmini all being is one." The italics are mine. Considering how unwarranted his *many assertions* have proved to be, I certainly agree with him, that he has said sufficient.

With regard to the objections against Rosmini's doctrines on the human soul, for the sake of brevity I will only remark that Dr. Campbell draws three conclusions from premises not Rosmini's. The presumption contained in his premises is, that the animal soul posits the human soul; this is not Rosmini's doctrine, and there is no warrant for it in the quotation given.

According to Rosmini the human soul is one, simple, identical living principle, which substantially feels and understands. If Dr. Campbell studies the *Psychology* he will see what Rosmini actually teaches, and he will there find all his objections amply examined and disposed of. He will find also that he has not been fair in judging the Psychological doctrines of Rosmini.

With reference to the decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Index, to which Dr. Campbell triumphantly appeals as the very opposite of a former decree, I fail to see why the latter is to be regarded as an *authoritative* decree, and not the former. His distinction is simply gratuitous and "quod gratis asseritur gratis negatur." Still if such distinctions *are* to be made, Rosminians have a much better claim to assert that the former decree, which has reference to a *particular case* and which declares that it is not lawful after so "extraordinary an examination," for private doctors to censure theologically *Rosmini's doctrines*, is indeed an *authoritative* decree, while the latter decree is *general*, and does not touch this particular and special case. Thus the tables are turned on Dr. Campbell's argument!

As regards the first part of the Decree it does not touch the case, and no inference can be drawn from it contrary to our contention. The Sacred Congregation is not dogmatically *infallible*, and so in declaring that works examined and acquitted by it may still contain errors contrary to Faith and Morals, it simply asserts its own incompetence to pronounce an

infallible judgment, which belongs only to the prerogative of the supreme Pontiff. But while the Congregation rightly declares that such works may possibly contain errors of this kind, theoretically speaking, this by no means implies that they actually do. On the contrary, their solemn acquittal by this tribunal is an *authoritative* judgment, as far as its own competence goes, that, after a full and thorough examination, it has found no theological error against Faith and Morals, and that therefore the faithful are free to hold the doctrines they contain. Hence the temerity of unauthorised private doctors in presuming to stultify its solemn judgment. This is our contention, nothing more, and I am sure it is one most respectful to the Sacred Congregation of the Index. As regards the assertion that the volumes now attacked have never been thus examined, and that therefore we have no guarantee that these at least would not be found to contain Pantheism, anyone who has read Rosmini's *New Essay on the Origin of Ideas*, as well as those other works that were examined and acquitted knows that they contain all the principles of the *Theosophy*. And in fact among the original accusations brought against Rosmini's doctrines and pronounced by Rome to be groundless, was that of Pantheism. This may be seen from Fr. Trullet's official report to the Sacred Congregation of the Index in which he distinctly states that this charge is calumnious.

And now I have done; my object is accomplished. As I stated in the beginning, my purpose is not to open a controversy as to the *merits* of Rosmini's doctrines, but I have come forward to refute unfair accusations brought against them, by stating clearly what Rosmini teaches and what he does not. Having vindicated the truth, I have nothing more to say on the subject. Dr. Campbell tells us he has said his last word. He has now my last word which closes this discussion in the ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

STEPHEN EYRE JARVIS.

[This subject has been treated with great fulness in the I. E. RECORD. The distinguished writers for and against the Rosminian Philosophy have declared that they have said their last word on the controversy. We thank them cordially for their learned papers, and now close our pages to any further discussion on this topic.—ED. I. E. R.]

THE "LEAKAGE" IN THE CHURCH IN GREAT BRITAIN.

"Olim unus suffecit perducendis ad frugem pluribus oppidis et urbibus; nunc plures nec reducendo uni pago sufficiunt. In promptu causa est; multum declamant sed parum et tepide orant; hinc mores non emendant." "Hostis, dum oras, premitur; dum cessas, erigitur."—*St. J. Chrysost.*

ONE of the most appalling facts that the public have been invited to contemplate during the past few months is the prodigious loss sustained by the Church in her children. In England and Scotland, at all events, it has been shown beyond a doubt that the loss to the faith by neglect, indifference, and general apathy, is simply immense. It often even outnumbers the gain. So that, in many parts of Great Britain it becomes exceedingly difficult to say whether religion is really advancing or not.

Much has been said and written on the subject.¹ Great earnestness and considerable ability have been displayed in the attempts to get to the root of the evil. A multitude of causes, all of which bear more or less directly upon it have been pointed out and considered. Yet none seem sufficient to account for the magnitude of the evil, or to suggest any adequate remedy. Indeed all seem ready to admit that an adequate remedy has not yet been discovered.

The question may be stated thus:—How are we priests, living among a vast and most heterogeneous population, to regain such an influence over the poor Catholics constantly breathing the atmosphere of sin, as to secure their perseverance in the faith? How can we hinder the rising generation from being drawn off into some one or other of the thousand bye-ways of error that lie open before them? Various, not to say ingenious, have been the suggestions made. Some advocate an increase in the number of innocent amusements; others, a stricter supervision; others, again, a healthier neighbourhood and environment. One declares that the people should be visited more frequently; another that good books and tracts should be showered more liberally upon

¹ See the recent issues of *Dublin Review*, *The Month*, *The Tablet*, &c.

them; and that they should be more cared for and watched over. All these and many other means which have been suggested by zealous and most worthy men, will doubtlessly contribute something towards the solution of the difficulty: yet all these appear to us to be but mere trifles, incapable of effecting any serious or radical change in the state of affairs. They leave the essence and root of the difficulty untouched.

To our mind it is like proposing to spread out more sails on a sea-becalmed ship. Idly the vessel rises and falls with the regular swell of the ocean; but she does not progress. No advance is made. Days pass away, and she remains in the same spot. Then the officers meet. They consider the difficulty. They lament and complain, and begin to discuss various resolutions. One officer suggests yet more canvass. "Set sky-sails above the top-sails, and moon-sails above sky-sails," he says. Another proposes cleaning the keel and scraping the sides of the vessel below the water line, for he urges, "it will diminish friction." Then the third mate stands up and proposes to lighten the ship a little by throwing out superfluous ballast, "since it must be the water-displacement that is too great." And so they continue to hint at various courses and plans to be followed. All their suggestions are good in themselves. All tend in the right direction, but none of them are really adequate or efficacious, so that while they have spoken much they have moved little. What they really want, of course, is the co-operation of that great force which would at once make all their measures effective, but without which their best efforts will remain unavailing. What they want is—**THE WIND**. The steady pressure of a strong breeze would stretch every sheet, and turn to account every additional yard of canvass: the bright burnished sides of the vessel, now free from rust and clinging sea-weed would dart like a copper gurnet through the water; the ejection of the superfluous ballast would cause the bows to rise easily in the water and the ship to skim like a duck over each succeeding wave. Under the influence of the breath of heaven decided and marked progress would at once be made.

Now, may not we well compare with the anxious sailors

on their motionless sea-begirt ship? Our failure, we suspect, in dealing with the very serious question before us, is due to the want of the breath of heaven—the co-operation of God's inspiriting grace. We are far too much given to trust to human methods and contrivances, and plans of all kinds; and to our personal efforts, whether alone or in combination; and to money collected and spent, to outlays made, and trouble taken, and seem (to some extent at least) to forget in practice that "*nisi Dominus ædificaverit domum . . . et nisi Dominus custodierit civitatem,*" and the rest. At all events this is so true in the writer's case that it is not wholly impossible that it may be true in the case even of others. We do not mean to imply that God's co-operation is ignored, much less that it is disdained, but merely that it is not perhaps always made enough of. It is only a question of degree. Is it not possible that some of us do not sufficiently recognise that in it alone we must seek the real "*causa efficiens*" of any and every spiritual good that has to be accomplished? The result is that like St. Peter, though we fish all the night we catch nothing. It is not that we do not exert ourselves; it is not that we fail to throw our net with precision and dexterity, but simply because we do not make enough of the presence of the Great Master standing on the shore.

Let us try to trace the genesis of the appalling evil which confronts us and seems to demand the serious study of every man who has a soul to save and an eternity to win. Speaking generally—because we cannot now take into consideration exceptions and special cases—the irreligion, immorality, insubordination, general lawlessness, and low spiritual condition of the children is owing to the indifference, carelessness and want of practical faith among the parents. If the parents were what they ought to be, the children would also be in a better state and more amenable to discipline. But let us follow up the concatenation of causes and effects a step further. Why are the parents not more interested in the spiritual welfare of their children, and more careful in bringing them up in the ways of virtue? Well; if an opinion may be hazarded without giving offence, I would be inclined to attribute the fault chiefly to ourselves, to us priests. It

is not precisely because we do not exert ourselves enough, but because we do not sufficiently call into play the more directly supernatural means at our disposal. We may offer prizes and multiply awards for good conduct; we may invent new forms of amusement and recreation; we may establish boy clubs and girl guilds; and tea-parties and variety entertainments may be given in abundance. Or we may exhort and entreat, or scold and threaten, or visit and invite, but all this is but spreading out fresh canvas on the yard-arms of the becalmed ship—merely burnishing its copper sides and lightening its cargo. It is the powerful wind of heaven that we lack and which can alone give success to our efforts, and set the various engines we have devised in motion.

The conversion, christianizing and saving of the hosts of irreligious children in our dismal towns is not only a stupendous work but it is such an essentially supernatural work, that it does seem marvellous that we do not have a more direct and systematic recourse to supernatural aids to secure success. Yet, as a matter of fact, many of us seem to do precious little more to reclaim the myriad of children playing around the brink of hell, than the agents of any philanthropical society might do. That is to say, we make considerable use of natural means, but do nothing *commensurate with the gravity of the case* to secure a more liberal measure of the only assistance that can be in any sense efficacious, *i.e.*, the assistance of divine grace. We have not the excuse of sailors on a becalmed ship, who may whistle for the wind and yet whistle to no purpose. On the contrary every wind of heaven is at our service. We are given the control of them by Him who has said "*omnia quaecumque orantes petitis, credite quia accipietis, et evenient vobis.*"

An hour spent at the feet of Christ present on our altars in the Blessed Sacrament would do more to help us to reclaim our wandering sheep than many hours trudging along the narrow streets and dirty alleys of London, Liverpool, Manchester, or Birmingham, Glasgow, or Edinburgh; for the simple reason that it is grace that converts, touches hearts, kindles love, and awakens sorrow, and not words or phrases, nor promises nor threats. This of course is

so obvious that it merely needs stating, yet in practice is there not some danger of being guided rather by reason, than by such undoubted principles of faith? We do not wish to appear to cast any reflections on our brethren, far less to play the critic; but merely to get to the bottom of a very vital and momentous question, upon which the eternal salvation of souls may be hanging. Indeed we most cordially invite our brother priests to help us in this attempt, and to second our efforts in every way, and if we be wrong in our opinion, we shall be the first to welcome any correction and to show gratitude for further light, since we are fully conscious that we are led by a feeble and uncertain glimmer when following our own judgment. Yet, even should we be thought "censorious," or "impertinent," or "meddling," when attempting to discuss a vital question, we can bear that too, if only we may make the truth a little clearer. It is no time to be over sensitive to harsh words and accusations, when the fate of immortal souls may be quivering in the balance.

Let us then say openly that we suspect that sufficient recourse is not made to prayer. How many hours do we pass on our knees before Him who possesses all power over the hearts of men, and can communicate such power as He pleases, and when He pleases, and to whomsoever He pleases? How many priests, beginning with ourselves, can exclaim, "*nos vero orationi instantes?*" Is it because we are too avaricious of our time? Can it be that we are too much given up to gaiety and amusements? By no means. No! This certainly cannot be said. Many of our body are the most zealous and self-denying men in Christendom. Men who spend themselves and are spent in the service of the Church. Men who devote long hours to house to house visitation; to seeing after schools; building and decorating churches, and to the careful discharge of other duties far more arduous than seeking for help, strength and wisdom before the tabernacle. Why then is it? Presumably because we do not take sufficient account of the wholly incalculable part that grace plays in every divine work. It would seem that now at least, after so many brave, though not very successful efforts, we ought to arouse ourselves to a truer sense of the

paramount importance of God's grace, and the pressing necessity of struggling yet more persistently to secure a larger share of it. Are we right in our view? If not, we must ask the patient reader to express some other, as freely and as openly as we have expressed ours. No shadow of offence is intended, and we trust none will be given. But we admit that the necessity of more urgent appeals to the throne of grace is the lesson which the results of all the most recent and best intentioned efforts teach us. If, then, we are so much concerned about the loss of so many waifs and strays, why do we not besiege the throne of God by prayer? Why do we not, without relaxing our efforts in other directions, storm the citadel of grace, and knock at heaven's gate so long and so loud, as to force, as it were, a speedy answer? Surely we have precedent enough for this. Where is the saint, be he king or prophet, priest or bishop, who did not spend many hours every day in supplication? The busiest as well as the most leisured felt the necessity. Indeed the more one's duties accumulate the more urgent grows the necessity of securing that divine co-operation which lightens efforts while it multiplies results. One word from Christ filled St. Peter's net: surely, then, it will not be time ill-spent if we devote a more appreciable fraction of the day in urging our Lord to speak—just one short word for us. He will surely do so, if we will only prove, by our importunity, how earnestly we desire it. Our very importunity will at last prevail, and prayer will undoubtedly prove again, what it has so often proved already a remedy as simple as it is efficacious. If we cannot induce the faithful to join us, might not we at least apply ourselves a little more generously and a little more assiduously to this "*exercitium praeceptum vitae Sacerdotalis?*" We merely throw this out as a suggestion—as one suggestion more indeed to those already made by others far older and wiser than ourselves—and that is all.

To prayer might we not add penance and mortification, increasing it in proportion to our earnestness and strength. There are a thousand forms of penance of a disciplinary character, which even the most delicate amongst us might easily practise if we were really animated by the *spirit* of

penance; yet this spirit is perhaps as foreign to some among our brethren as we know it to be foreign to ourselves. Yet, we are persuaded (rightly or wrongly) that such means are more powerful than much labouring and toiling. In fact that evil now lifts up its head and stalks abroad, because this is no longer the favourite way of combating it. We are naturally inclined to prefer,—and who is not?—mere philanthropic schemes, and new-fangled methods to the means practised by the saints and laid down by the Gospel. Anything approaching prolonged prayer and personal penance is becoming just a trifle antiquated. It smacks of a bye-gone age. The nineteenth century has grown quite out of sympathy with such things. Yet some devils are not cast out but by prayer and fasting: and the devil that is now disporting himself in our mews and alleys and in the nooks and corners of our fog-crowned cities, and that blasphemes in our boys and curses in our girls, and sins in innumerable youths of both sexes, is, if we mistake not, one of these. Yet, we do not feel drawn to adopt such drastic measures. In sooth, we would have little of human nature left if we did. We much prefer to persuade ourselves that our want of success in combating the ghastly evil is owing to causes which are in reality only aggravating. No, we won't allow that we have very much to do with it. We put it all down to bad drains, or over-crowding, or want of ventilation—to the proximity of the pig-sty or the foulness of the dust-heap—to poverty, or dirt, or drink, or hereditary taint—to anything in a word, that may shift the fearful burthen from our own shoulders. Yet, however, much such conditions may increase the difficulty and aggravate the disorder, may not the chief cause of our failure be after all our want of the spirit of prayer and the spirit of mortification? Or shall we say that these disorders have now grown beyond the power and skill even of the great Physician of souls, and that sin has tied His hands so that He cannot aid? Rather let us each cry with Samuel "*absit autem a me hoc peccatum in Domino, ut cessem orare pro eis*" or with Our Lord himself "*Pater sancte, serva eos . . . quos dedisti mihi.*"

Even the apostles themselves found that they were unable to cast out certain devils, and on one occasion, we are told by

St. Matthew, they complained to our Lord of their impotency, as many of us are complaining now, and asked just as we might "Why can not we cast them out?" and our Lord answers:—"this kind is not cast out but by prayer and fasting." (Matt. xvii.) Now the question which we have been raising is, whether the particular variety of devil that is causing so much defection from the Church among the masses of our beloved poor in the huge centres of commerce, be such as our Lord spoke of or not. The importance of the the question cannot be over-estimated. Yet we do not take upon ourselves to answer, but merely to ventilate it. Let some one better able decide the point, for a solution is imperatively necessary.

JOHN S. VAUGHAN.

THE ALPHABET.—II.

THE secret of de Rougé's success in grappling with a difficulty which had baffled so many others, that of connecting the Semitic and Egyptian letters lies in his having perceived the fact, that the immediate prototypes of the earliest Semitic character, must be sought for, not as heretofore among the hieroglyphic pictures of the Egyptian monuments, but among the cursive characters which the Egyptians developed out of the hieroglyphics in common use, these latter being reserved for monumental or sacred purposes.

Of these cursive characters there are several kinds. That which has the least resemblance to the hieroglyphics is the Demotic or highly cursive form, which originated about the time of the twenty-second dynasty, that is B.C. 975 to 750, a period when the Semitic character was already in use. The Demotic was formed from the Hieratic of the New Empire, represented by numerous MSS. of the nineteenth dynasty, about B.C. 1400-1280. Up to recent years these were the only forms known to scholars. De Rougé rejected them, not only because they fail altogether in point of resemblance, but also because they are of an origin too recent to satisfy the conditions of the enquiry. But discovery did not stop; other types were subsequently brought to light, a considerably

older form of Hieratic writing, of which the Prisse Papyrus is a sample. This form arose in the early Empire, and was in use at the time of the Semitic invasion of Egypt, the remarkable event known as the domination of the Hyksos or Shepherd Kings; and so de Rougé with great reason refers the origin of the Semitic Alphabet to the period of five or four or perhaps two centuries, for chronology here is quite unmanageable, during which a race of Semitic conquerors ruled in the Delta of the Nile.

The conjecture would be nothing more than a brilliant guess, but for the skill and patience with which he followed up the clue thus discovered, and the scientific manner in which he applied the stores of his immense learning to working out every detail of the problem. He began by determining the oldest known forms of the Semitic letters. For comparison with these he selected such of the old Hieratic characters as were used alphabetically, confining himself to the most ancient, namely those used in the first Empire, prior to the Hyksos invasion, and of course to the subsequent expulsion of the invaders. He next proceeds to study the sounds which were represented by the several symbols, aided in this by the numerous Egyptian proper names that are to be met with in the Old Testament as well as in profane history, he examines with minute care the question of the sound-value in Egyptian and Semitic of each symbol. In this way all the possible Hieratic models of each of the Semitic characters are ascertained; and it is found that the primitive form of almost every Semitic letter can be easily and naturally deduced from the form of its Hieratic prototype.

An examination of the two Alphabets, the ancient Semitic from the Moabitè Stone, the Hieratic from the Prisse Papyrus, placed side by side, shows how close is the relationship between, and what solid grounds there are for the important conclusion drawn from them by de Rougé. It would be desirable to have the two Alphabets placed before our readers; but as this cannot be done, we must refer those who are anxious to satisfy themselves on this point to an interesting work on the Alphabets by Mr. Isaac Taylor, in which are to be found plates illustrating each step in the formation of the principal Alphabets known.

De Rouge's theory, solid as it is, and justified by the evidence collected by him, has not met with universal acceptance yet. It has had to encounter in some quarters opposition vigorous enough certainly, yet not surprising, taking into account the difficulties inevitable in an investigation like that conducted by him. It is right to take note of objections, if only to place the subject before the readers of the RECORD as fully as the limits of an article admit.

It is said in the first place that certain Semitic letters, as "teth," "tsade," "caph," and "ayin," denote sounds peculiar to the Semitic language, and, therefore, cannot have representatives in the Egyptian Alphabet. In reply to this it may be remarked that the history of Alphabets destroys whatever force appears in the objection. When Alphabets are transmitted from one nation to another, the characters are constantly used to indicate approximate, rather than identical sounds. Thus very different sounds are represented by the same Roman letters, in Italian, Spanish and English, not by all the letters of course, but by some. All agree on the descent of the Greek from the Semitic; if the objection were valid, that view also should be abandoned. The Semitic sounds represented by "teth" and "ayin" have no equivalents in any Aryan language, such as the Greek; and yet nothing is more certain than that the signs for these sounds are identical with the Greek, "theta" and "omicron."

Another apparently strong objection is taken from the names of the letters. We have already seen that the names of the Semitic letters do not refer to the objects represented by their prototypes, the Egyptian hieroglyphics. How is it for instance that "beth" should mean "house," if the character was obtained from the Egyptian picture of a crane? This difficulty vanishes also before the fact, which is unquestionable, that in the case of other Alphabetical transmissions the letters are constantly re-named. The Russian letters which were borrowed from the Greek in the ninth century, have lost the familiar Greek names, and adopted others having a meaning in Slavonic. B is no longer called "beta," but "buke," meaning a beech, while D has lost its old title

“delta,” and gained a new one, “dobro,” an oak. The Scandinavian Runes, taken from the Greek at an earlier period, have also been systematically renamed; and a similar liberty was taken with the Roman uncials or square letters by our own ancestors who gave Celtic tree names to them. It should be added, however, and it is much to their credit, that the Irish made reparation in another way. The grace and dexterity of their writing gave a more elegant form to the characters, so that travelling back once more to the Continent, these modified in part, and in part superseded the old script and became factors in developing later Lombardic forms, the immediate ancestors of the Venetian (Italic) and our present beautiful Roman type. This, however, by the way; our present purpose is to show how analogy goes to establish that the imposition of new names, significant to those borrowing an Alphabet is really more probable than the transmission of the original denominations.

The objection might have some weight if the Semitic Alphabet were derived immediately from the hieroglyphics, the pictorial character of which is unmistakable. But in the Hieratic writing these are so changed by what is technically called conventional rendering, as to have lost nearly all traces of the picture, so that, the Egyptian names conveying no meaning to a foreign race, it was easier for them to connect the forms and sounds of the letters by new titles. We may therefore dismiss the objection arising on that head.

Another difficulty urged against de Rougé, is the following:—The range of choice is so great among Egyptian hieroglyphics, there are so many alternative forms from which to select, that whatever the result obtained, it must be of necessity vague, and therefore unsatisfactory. This is, however, to measure out but scanty justice to the distinguished man, to whose ability we are indebted for the discovery. If like some who preceded him, from among the four hundred Egyptian symbols, he made an arbitrary selection of some only, his work would of course have little value, but this he did not do. Setting aside the whole chaos of signs he kept strictly to those representing the Egyptian Alphabet, as that

was handed down by tradition ; and it was from that list of twenty-five letters he started his investigation, succeeding finally in identifying the eighteen consonants of the Semitic Alphabet with their equivalent Egyptian symbols. There is, therefore, no ground whatsoever for looking on the results obtained as fanciful or arbitrary.

One only objection remains to be considered now, namely, the want of adequate resemblance between the Semitic letters, and their alleged Egyptian models. If this objection could be sustained it would, as a matter of course, be fatal to the theory ; we owe it therefore a good deal of consideration, and we must even risk a little trial of the patience of the reader, in order to make what we have to say on this, the crucial point of the whole investigation, as clear as the subject allows, and as convincing to others, as it is to ourselves.

If one were simply to glance at the two Alphabets placed side by side, there is no doubt the first impression would be how widely they differ from each other ; for it must be allowed, the dissimilarity is conspicuous. On closer examination, however, this first impression fades a little. It is seen that the differences are superficial rather than real. A national writing or script is, as a rule, prone to follow a method of its own, and tends to a distinct type. It becomes either upright or inclined, just as people's handwriting, minute or bold and striking, regular or irregular in the shape of the letters. It picks up, or, as the case may be, avoids hooks or tails, and shuns forms either curved or angular, preferring straight lines ; in short, it tends to become either geometrical or cursive. A mere glance at a printed page, without examining a single word, enables us to recognise, by their general character, Greek or Latin, Hebrew or German ; the features of these are widely different, yet they are most intimately related. In fact such is the decided tendency of all writing to assume a special national type, we ought to be rather surprised did not the Hieratic and Semitic exhibit, each of them, a distinct specific character.

Now, on examination of the two scripts, it is by no means difficult to specify the peculiar features of each. The Semitic

writing is marked by greater symmetry and greater simplicity of form. The letters have become more regular and more erect, as well as more angular and equal in size. These differences are precisely what we should expect, taking into account the nature of the writing materials used by the two races. The early Hieratic seems to have been traced with a thick glutinous ink on papyrus, a cheap and abundant material, by means of a pen, or more probably a brush, made of the soft stump of a reed. The characters consequently are free, bold and rounded. The Semitic on the other hand was laboriously carved on stone with a chisel, and the characters, therefore, are naturally more regular and delicate in outline. The rounded flowing older forms become stiff and angular, the curved sweeping tails re-appear on the stone as nearly straight and rigid lines. Simplicity of form is the aim, because elaborate forms tax too heavily the resources of those whose sole instruments for writing are the mallet and chisel.

It appears then that the differences between the Alphabets on which opponents of de Rouge's theory lay much stress, can be accounted for, and they are not too great. It is a matter of surprise rather that they should be in truth so trifling comparatively; for the interval of more than a thousand years separating the Prisse Papyrus from the Moabite Stone, gives ample time for the development of far greater variations in the forms of the letter than the most hostile scrutiny can discover. Greater changes by far have taken place within a much shorter period, as that, for example, between the Greek and Roman small letters, and the capitals from which they come. The Demotic script of the twenty-second dynasty differs more from the parent Hieratic than does the Semitic.

The only real obstacle to a conclusion satisfactory on all points is the paucity of the materials. So far as they go they are certainly in favour of de Rougé; but it must be acknowledged they are neither continuous nor numerous. It is not to be wondered at considering the remote period and the chances and accidents to which such monuments are exposed. History vouches for a Semitic rule in Egypt,

lasting from three hundred to five hundred years. They passed away and left no trace to mark their presence or their deeds, while the country abounds in memorials of the old Empire that preceded them and those that followed them. The same is true of a Phœnician settlement later on in the Delta. "They were, and that is all." It is by the merest accident the Prisse Papyrus was preserved; and yet without that fragment nothing could be known of the early Hieratic writing, which, nevertheless, must represent an extensive Hieratic literature—an idea of the sole surviving specimen, the Prisse Papyrus, has already been given in the article. Well! moral speculations on the decay of manners are not likely to be the first or the only effort of the intelligence of a people endowed with the power of writing. We must only hope that future discoveries may fill up the gaps. A single papyrus of the Hyksos period, or a Semitic inscription earlier than the Moabite Stone would for ever set the question at rest.

Considerable interest might be felt in determining the date of the Alphabet, so far at least as the nature of the case admits. The result must be to some extent indefinite as to the century, although it can be brought within definite limits, and there is a pleasure in noting how on independent evidence the use of letters by the Hebrews is traced up to the period and the country whence they went forth to establish their own kingdom under Moses. One of the old objections against Moses as the Author of the Pentateuch is finally disposed of.

M. Lenormant, who is among the very first Oriental scholars of the day, holds that the writing on the Moabite Stone bears signs of a script that was long in use; and the fact that letters in all respects similar are to be met with in inscriptions in places very remote from each other, is proof, according to him, that the Hebrews were in possession of the Alphabet long before the date of the Stone. There is, in fact, a catena of witnesses, admitting the inspired books, reaching back from the Moabite Stone to the Tables of the Law, which goes to prove that a knowledge of writing was the common possession of the Hebrews and other Semitics as early as the Exodus; and the inference is not unreasonable that it

was obtained through their kindred the whilom rulers of Egypt.

Long as these occupied the country which had made considerable progress before their invasion, they left behind them no great works to mark their occupation of it. They neither emulated the Pyramids, Titanic memorials of the people they supplanted, nor did they anticipate the graceful obelisks and magnificent temples of the new Empire. The history of the centuries their rule endured in Egypt is a blank. The one monument of their empire, that has survived, itself more imperishable than tables of brass or pyramids of stone is the Alphabet, which they held firmly, veritable spoil of the Egyptians, when they were driven back to the deserts out of which they came.

The date of the Alphabet is therefore brought within definite limits. It cannot have arisen before the arrival of the Semitic invaders, that is, not earlier than the twenty-second century, B.C. On the other hand it cannot have originated after the second type of the Hieratic writing, which came into use at the time of the eighteenth dynasty, that is, not later than the seventeenth century B.C. The limits lie between the twenty-third and seventeenth centuries, and there seems no reason why we should not accept de Rouge's date, at least provisionally, and place it about the nineteenth century or somewhat earlier, which would allow the ample period of ten centuries for the changes and developments which we notice when we first meet with it on the Moabite Stone.

A chart of the Alphabets named in the foregoing pages would enable the reader at a glance to trace the genealogy for close on four thousand years, and convince him by ocular demonstration that we owe the greatest of all boons to the interesting people who, in very remote times, had their home on the banks of the Nile.

In an article like this the outline only can be given of a subject so extensive as the present, which branches out in so many directions. Volumes have been written on the numerous Alphabets that exist, and it has been shown that wide as is the difference between many of them in appearance, they are capable of being connected, as we have connected the Latin

and Greek with the Semitic and Egyptian. On these subjects we cannot even touch. But there is one Alphabet that deserves notice, not only from the beauty of the letters, but still more because it is of special interest to us. That is the Irish Alphabet. In spite of a general resemblance to the Roman characters, to which family it belongs, there are differences enough in it to make its history somewhat of a puzzle. It suddenly appears in the sixth century as a perfect and fully formed book hand resembling the uncial or large scripts of the Continent, but differing from them in the form of many of the letters. Its history is obscure. There is no old Irish hand known out of which it would have evolved itself; and it appears in a perfect form. The only possible conclusion is that it was introduced by St. Patrick, very probably from Gaul, where he received his education, and having been thus introduced it was, by the skill and taste of the Irish penmen, brought to a high state of perfection in the sixth, seventh and eighth centuries, the golden era of Celtic culture.

What is its immediate parentage? It was generally supposed to have grown in some way not defined out of the Roman uncial. A glance, however, at the two upsets this conjecture. The Irish *g*, *b*, *a*, *m*, to say nothing of other letters, cannot have arisen out of the Roman uncial, with which they have obviously no relation. Much more probable is it that it came from the fifth century cursive character in use in the South of France. We have, in fact, proof of this. There is in the Archives of the Vatican an old MS. treatise of St. Hilary against the Arians, written in the fourth century; in which the letters are distinctly Irish, so much so, that it was assumed that the copy had been made by some Irish monk. The date, however, of the copy was found in a note, and that was A.D. 509—that is to say, fully a century before the Irish School was founded at Bobbio, A.D. 612.

Taking into account the place, Gaul, and the date, there is every reason to suppose that the writing of the Hilary MS. was general, at least among the ecclesiastics of that country in the fifth century, and was brought by St. Patrick to Ireland. How it was cultivated by Irish scholars and attained

a grace and beauty of form never surpassed before or since is shown by the "Book of Kells" and other ancient MSS. which still exist. And how in its improved form it was borne by Irish Missioners back again to the Continent and influenced the penmanship of those laborious monks, to whose patience in transcribing we owe whatever has been preserved to us of the treasures of antiquity, is a subject in itself, one of several at which it is possible only to glance in this sketch of Alphabetic history. Of course it did not remain unchanged in its new home. No alphabet did, as we have seen. It altered by degrees until it came very near the Venetian—what we call Italic—from which our actual Roman letters took their rise.

If it were possible to give here a chart with all the Alphabets in Chronological Order that have been in use, it would be seen how they are related and have grown one from the other. So that what at first sight are so widely different in form, meaning and use, as the Egyptian hieroglyphics and the Roman letters of to-day, are in truth closely connected, and the chasm is bridged over by a series of Alphabets, among which our own Irish script occupies a not ignoble place.

L. J. HICKEY.

THEOLOGICAL QUESTIONS.

CONFESSION OF DOUBTFUL SINS.

VERY REV. AND DEAR SIR,—I tender my sincere thanks for your very able reply to my queries. But permit me to state that the vagueness of my wording in the first question led you to an inference which I did not intend. The question was:—A penitent who made a good general confession six years ago, comes now to confession, having made bad confessions during these six years. He does not know whether certain sins he has actually committed were before or after the general confession. He quite forgets. Here there is a *dubium negativum de peccatis confessis*, and according to theological principles he would be bound to confess. But I think the case

resolves itself into a *dubium de commissis*, and is therefore exempt from the obligation of confession. For he cannot say whether *de facto* he has committed sins that have not as yet been submitted to the *claves*; in other words, he has no consciousness of sins that must of necessity be confessed. In the *dubium negativum de commissis*, theologians exempt from confession on the ground that he has not that consciousness of sin which the Council of Trent requires—“*quorum conscientiam.*” *A pari* in the former case, he has not this *conscientiam de peccatis necessariis*. I suppose the case of one, who has not a lax conscience, but a scrupulous conscience, if you will, but has unfortunately made bad confessions, because, through shame, he has all along concealed one sin, and only one.

With regard to the presumption against one of lax conscience ought not this principle hold; “*Standum est pro valore actus donec de nullitate constiterit?*” Sig. lib. vi., 907, Lacroix lib. vi., 208, &c., and theologians commonly admit this principle;—“Confessions are not to be repeated unless it is morally certain that they are invalid.” Therefore it is not enough that they are prudently considered invalid, they must be certainly invalid with a moral certainty which implies something more than a prudent judgment, as Ballerini remarks in a note to Gury *de Poenitentia*, 513, Quaer 3°. I confess I am somewhat puzzled, probably because I do not fully comprehend the bearing of these principles. Here is another puzzle. Lacroix lib. vi., pars 11, No. 604, says, “*Si positive dubites de mortali commissio, et non habeas prudentem rationem pro eo, quod non fuerit mortale, praeceptum confessionis possidet contra te.*” Ought not the axiom “*standum est pro libertate,*” apply to this case? or, “*melior est conditio possidentis,*” which is tantamount to it? Now, St. Liguori lib. 1, No. 36, lays down this principle, “*Possessio est jus certum retinendi contra quod non praevalet nisi certitudo.*” This principle is commonly held by all theologians. But in its application to my case, St. Liguori would seem to bear me out in my opinion in all cases of doubt. “*Unde,*” he says, “*recte concludit Croix quod licet pro possessore non sit probabile argumentum, si tamen pro petitore non sit argumentum nisi probabile, possessor adhuc licite retinet, quia possessio est jus certum retinendi contra quod non praevalet nisi certitudo.*” Applying this doctrine, why should one account himself guilty of mortal sin even though he has a grave reason for supposing his actual guilt and no prudent reason contra? Is not his liberty, or in this case, freedom from guilt in possession until he be ousted from his position by a certainty of guilt?

I have been all along contending for exemption from obligation

unless where there is a moral certainty that the obligation exists, Here is a very practical case of frequent occurrence ; one contracted a debt. He has a *dubium positivum* that he has not paid the debt ; yet he is not certain of having paid it. Should he not be exempt from payment according to the principle as stated by St. Liguori, &c. ? I suppose the case where he has no *prudens motivum* to sustain his payment of the debt—in other words, he has against him a *dubium positivum*, while he has in his favour only a *dubium negativum*. It is all very well to say that the debt is in possession and must be satisfied by at least a probable payment. My liberty should be always in possession, as long as there is no certain law to fetter it.

A SUBSCRIBER.

Our correspondent may remember we did not argue from the words of the Council of Trent in replying to his first question. They are cited with equal confidence on both sides in these controversies about doubtful sins. This of itself suffices to show that, notwithstanding their beautiful expressiveness, they do not decide every detail of the obligation of integral confession.

Neither did we dwell at any length on purely intrinsic arguments. For, considering the difficulty of the subject and the attention it has received from those best qualified to interpret the Divine and Natural Law, it seemed better to state the general conclusion theologians had come to accept than discuss the reasons that influenced their decisions.

Now when a mortal sin has been committed for certain, they require with practical unanimity a soundly probable reason for thinking it has been duly confessed before holding a penitent free with regard to further confession of his offence. But in neither of his letters does our correspondent state any fact which would afford solid ground for believing that the fault had been mentioned in a good confession. There is an utter absence of proof as to whether the sin was or was not declared before the sacrileges began. Nor does the character now given of the penitent appear to be capable of removing this obstacle, unless our correspondent wishes to consider one who is *really scrupulous* in the theological sense. This we cannot suppose, for the confession of doubtful sins is not for the *vere scrupulosi* at all.

But in the ordinary cases a mere negative doubt, or the want of solid ground for opinion, on both sides, will not suffice. It is not enough that a penitent be uncertain, as he is with regard to the even or odd number of the stars. He should have a serious reason for affirming that his obligation has been discharged apart altogether from the negative doubt which must result from the other side being uncertain. Nay, some theologians of the greatest authority appear to require more than this. The context of St. Liguori, however, makes it plain that in practice he would be almost at one on this point with the seemingly more liberal De Lugo.

In any case, there is no conflict between them when a good reason for believing a sin to have been confessed is not forthcoming. For, however uncertain the obligation of confession may be on the score of mortal guilt, the precept is absolutely certain for the concrete event. The duty of declaring an offence of this kind, if not directly enforced by the law of integral confession, is at least indirectly made sure by a reflex law acting as its guardian in contingencies of this kind. The practical obligation, therefore, is beyond all doubt.

If it be asked why theologians proclaim this restriction on human liberty, the shortest answer seems to be that, not to speak of justice, whenever an obligation has been contracted, probabilist writers require at least a sound reason for believing it has been discharged before considering it as no longer pressing for satisfaction. Probabilism must in reason require so much.

Our correspondent enters a plea on behalf of lax penitents, and quotes from two writers of the very highest authority on these questions. But his argument and quotations have reference to a different matter. The obligation or absence of obligation to repeat whole confessions is a distinct chapter. For plainly a case might arise in which a penitent would be bound to repeat a confession in which every mortal sin has been confessed, while on the other hand one might need to declare separately sins he had forgotten in an excellent confession. But as the point has been mentioned we may add that the maxim, "*Standum est pro valore actus,*" in regard

to doubtful confession applies only when, weighing all the circumstances, the invalidity of the previous confession is not morally certain for *this particular penitent*.

Our correspondent's difficulty in construing the saying he quotes from Lacroix is due, we think, to a previous conviction that there is absolutely no obligation of confessing sins doubtfully committed. Well, the great probabilist writers seem to agree about one exception. It arises, as described by Lacroix, when there is a cogent reason for believing a mortal sin has been committed and no reliable grounds for holding that the act did not occur, or that its guilt was only venial. Some modern theologians do not mention the case separately. De Lugo, on the other hand, maintains that the obligation arises even when a negative doubt exists *on both sides*.

Our correspondent relies on the principle of possession. He will find, however, that in the passage to which he refers St. Liguori is speaking about rights in *justice* that are controverted. St. Alphonsus agrees with De Lugo and Lacroix in holding that legitimate and *bona fide* possession creates a sound presumption which is not to be overcome by anything short of a moral certainty in favour of the person who claims to have disputed property taken from the possessor thereof. He also says the same reasoning applies to marriages of doubtful validity. But he does not state that it is of universal application in deciding questions of doubt. Nor do the theologians, who make such frequent use of the maxim, "*melior est conditio possidentis*" mean to convey that it rules questions under all other moral precepts on precisely the same terms as those that arise *in materia justitiæ*.

With regard to the doubtful payment of debts, we cannot at all concur in the opinion suggested. No doubt the maxim of possession will not be accepted as final in the matter, for its benefit may be claimed to some extent by the debtor also. But what we must look to is the equality which commutative justice requires. How is it attained when payments are doubtful? The obvious way seems to be by holding that the debt continues in diminished quantity. It remains, reduced by that fractional part of the whole which the

probability of previous payment expresses. Thus a half, or less, or more, may satisfy the debtor's obligations.

Some theologians, we are aware, hold him entirely excused if he have a sound reason for believing he paid in full, even though the argument to show non-payment be much stronger. But the probability of this opinion is very questionable. Accordingly we should not act upon it unless to the extent of not disturbing the *bona fides* of a penitent from whom it would be useless to expect rateable payment.

MAY THE MINISTER OF BAPTISM ACT AS SPONSOR?

A Very Rev. correspondent has sent us from England a letter on the above subject. As we cannot now find the document at hand, we state its substance in the form of a single question.

Apart from local law, the Minister of Baptism is not forbidden to act as sponsor for the child he baptizes. The responses may be given by the godmother. Nay, Lacroix thinks it sufficiently probable that a priest may name a proxy to go through the ceremonies for him.

But a local difficulty remains. For, although the Common Law does not prohibit secular priests to undertake the office of *patrini*, the first Synod of Westminster seems to exclude ecclesiastics altogether therefrom. Accordingly our respected correspondent will see that a priest in England may not at once be minister and sponsor, unless this regulation has gone into disuse. But if ecclesiastics are in the habit of acting as sponsors at all, we cannot find any insuperable objection against combining the offices of minister and sponsor.

THE PRICE IN BUYING AND SELLING.

I am anxious to have your opinion on a few questions in justice.

1. How far is a merchant or dealer bound to charge all his customers the same price for the same kind of goods?

2. A draper; Caius, in good business in a country town has customers from every class. He keeps a large assortment of tweeds

and serges constantly in stock. He has the name of charging smart prices ; but his materials are said to be the best in the town. I find, however, that he supplies bankers and professional men and shopkeepers much more cheaply than country folk. There is often a difference of two or three shillings per yard. Is this just? I suppose ready money in each case.

3. When a dealer makes a bargain with the buyer, is there any limit on the price? SACERDOS.

In answering these questions we shall attend only to virtues that are of obligation, especially to justice, leaving the style or etiquette of good business out of consideration. Our correspondent will find much information in Croll's bearing on his difficulties.

I.

Apart from special contract to sell to one customer at the rate another is charged, a dealer is under no obligation to fix a constant price for goods of the same quality. Not only may the price vary with the times; it may also change with the buyers to any extent within the limit of highest market value. *Pretium summum* and *pretium infimum* mark the greatest advantage which the virtue of justice can sanction for seller and buyer respectively. If a trader freely gives away his property for less than the smallest sum which men of ordinary judging capacity in respect of its value would consider the amount of its price in open market, the money received in exchange is only part price for the goods. In this supposition a portion of the property is either bestowed, given in charity, or heedlessly abandoned by the seller. A more likely hypothesis however is that he will go near the boundary line fixed by justice and demand almost the highest price. Charity, indeed, may occasionally forbid him to do so. But so long as he does not exceed the sum which persons of ordinary discretion in the matter would consider the highest amount for which the goods are valuable, *justice* makes no complaint. It is plain, however, that the range of prices between highest and lowest, for the necessaries of life and for manufactured wares in common use, is of a very limited compass.

II.

This second question involves a practical application of the foregoing principles. Shopkeepers sometimes think they are justified in taking any price they can secure by bargain. Occasionally, too, they imagine they may make good their losses on injudicious purchases, or levy compensation for an accident of a personal kind, by running up the prices of certain wares. But as the contract is one in which goods are exchanged for *what they are worth in money*, it is plain that the absence of a single price, fixed for all comers, or a peculiar misfortune, entirely distinct from those general accidents of trade that independently have already exerted their legitimate influence in raising prices all round, cannot create a title for exacting more than the highest current rate of sale in open competition, no matter how much the buyer haggles or how unfortunate the vendor has been. It is not for a game of chance, or to bestow his coin, an intending purchaser enters a shop. He goes in to *buy*; and so long as the contract remains one of buying and selling, failure on his part to bring the vendor by bargaining within the *pretium summum* does not alter the nature of the transaction nor therefore justify the latter in taking money, part of which is not price-money at all, since goods of corresponding value are not exchanged. A purchaser would rightly consider himself swindled to the extent of this excess. He knows very well that the seller will not in the end fix a sum below the lowest price. He has thus a range of rates through which he may strive to pull the seller. But should his skill in bargaining fail to bring the latter down to price-money, his effort to buy cheaply cannot relieve the transaction from the taint of unfairness. In such a case the sum charged is beyond market value. Money is given to which no goods correspond. The equality of commutative justice is violated, and an obligation of restitution arises as a natural consequence.

It is obvious that persons experienced in a particular kind of purchase have an advantage in dealing even with honest merchants. They will not purchase at the highest rate justice would allow. Thus the bankers, townspeople,

and professional gentlemen, mentioned by our correspondent, must as a rule be thought to fix a medium standard. They have some knowledge of the value of the materials in question, of prices elsewhere for similar goods, and of the cost of carriage. If they could procure articles of clothing more economically in some other town, it is unlikely they would continue to deal with "Caius." In short, these people possess that judgment in the matter of "tweeds and serges" which theologians require for fixing prices. Not so the "country folk," as is evident from the better bargains given those who have knowledge and experience for safeguards. It only remains, therefore, to say whether the difference of charge involves injustice. We think there can be only one opinion on the subject. The price paid by those who know what like articles cost elsewhere, may not be far removed from *pretium infimum*; but neither is it from *pretium summum*. With modern competition tending to reduce and equalize charges, the difference between an average price and a sum just above the highest rate is but trifling on manufactured goods in general request. If a certain class of tweed sells at from six shillings and sixpence to seven shillings per yard over the whole country to "those who know," is it just to charge a labouring man, who happens to be unaware of the fact, at the rate of eight shillings? It is clearly unjust. Hence *a fortiori* "Sacerdos" will infer that the practice he mentions is utterly indefensible on his statement of the facts. Nor will it avail to add that many traders act in this way, or that the lowness of prices, resulting from keen competition, forces them to these courses. The question turns on what is a just price in the present circumstances, and no consideration of better times or of equally unfair acts practised by others can touch the main point at issue. But while this is so, on the other hand, within the bounds of justice, fair latitude is by all means desirable to encourage the free exercise of industry and commercial talent.

III.

We have already answered this question; but it may be well to give Crolley's¹ words on the subject: "Quoniam vero

¹ "De Contractibus," p. 513.

multi venditores saepe plusquam pretium summum pro suis mercibus postulant, non ut illud obtineant sed quia rustici praesertim putant primum pretium semper esse nimium, et ideo nisi mercatores hoc modo agerent aequum pretium non consequerentur manifestum est iis non licere primum pretium accipere, si quis id solvere velit.”

P. O'D.

LITURGICAL QUESTIONS.

CONFESSION AS A CONDITION FOR GAINING AN INDULGENCE, WHEN MUST IT BE MADE?

Can a person who does not go to Confession every week gain a Plenary Indulgence, say for St. Patrick's Day, by going to Confession, not on the eve or morning of the feast, but some two or four days previously?

H. B.

We believe that it is necessary, when the person is not a weekly Confessionist, to go to Confession on the eve or morning of the feast, unless the Ordinary has obtained a special Indult, *ab inopiam confessoriorum*, allowing the people of the district to go within the eight days preceding the feast. This is the ruling of the Congregation of Indulgences, 28th September, 1838:—

“An vigore decreti, 12 Junii, 1822, possint omnes Christi, fideles ad lucrandam indulgentiam festivitati cuidam adnexam confiteri intra octo dies festivitatem hanc praecedentes?”

“Et in hypothesis negativa deprecatur ut haec facultas concedatur fidelibus diocesis Aturensis propter inopiam confessoriorum?”

Resp. S. Congregatio Indulg.—“*Negative quoad primam partem; quoad secundam recurrat Episcopus ad hanc Sacram Congregationem pro gratia, ut Confessio scilicet peracta a fidelibus suae diocesis infra hebdomadam ante festivitatem, attendita confessoriorum inopia, suffragari possit ad indulgentias acquirendas.*” 28th September, 1838.

MISSA PRO PACE, ON THE SECOND DAY OF THE QUARANT' ORE.

Is it in accordance with the Rubrics regulating the devotion of the Quarant' Ore to sing the *Missa pro pace* on a double of the second class, say the feast of an apostle? If so, what preface is sung?

No. The solemn Votive Mass *de SS. Sacramento* or *pro pace* on the occasion of the Quarant' Ore is forbidden on: 1° Sundays of the first or second class. 2° Feasts which are doubles of the first, or second class. 3° Ash Wednesday. 4° Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of Holy Week. 5° The days included in the octaves of Easter, Pentecost, and Epiphany. 6° The vigils of Christmas and Pentecost.

The Preface to be sung is that for the Feast of Apostles.

DOLOUR SCAPULARS.

In a former number of the RECORD it was stated that a priest having power from the Pope to bless beads etc., could not by virtue of that power bless Dolour beads. Can he bless and enrol in the Dolour Scapular? D. G.

The ordinary form in which the Pope grants the faculty of enrolling in the Scapulars extends to the Dolour Scapulars.

We append a copy of the ordinary form:—

EX AUDIENTIA SANCTISSIMI HABITA.

Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Leo Divina Providentia PP. XIII. referente me infrascripto Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide Pro Secretario facultatem benigne concessit, de consensu tamen Ordinarii, et ad quinquennium, adscribendi utriusque sexus fideles Confraternitatibus a S. Sede approbatis, earumque Scapularia fidelibus imponendi, cum applicatione omnium et singularum Indulgentiarum, et Privilegiorum, quae Summi Pontificis memoratis Confraternitatibus impertiti sunt.

Datum Romae ex actibus dictae Sacrae Congregationis die, et anno quibus supra.

What we said about the beads was that the ordinary faculty given at Rome, applies only to the Apostolic and Bridgettine Indulgences, and does not include the other Indulgences such as those granted to the Rosary proper which is blessed by the Dominicans or to the Dolour Beads.

SUBSTITUTE FOR THE USUAL COMMUNION CLOTH.

As a substitute for the communion-cloth attached to the altar or sanctuary rail, have been introduced, within recent years, into many of our American churches at least, square hand-cloths, which are either passed from one communicant to another, or carried by a server and large gilt patens with wooden handles attached, which are always carried by the server, not *directly*, but *indirectly*, through the handle.

These substitutes for the old method have many obvious advantages, not only in the matter of cleanliness, but in protecting the Blessed Sacrament from irreverence. The sacred particles are carried to the altar and there consumed, whereas with the rail-cloth unless the particles were conspicuous enough to be seen and removed, they were allowed to fall to the floor and be gathered up with the sweepings. After using the hand-cloth and the paten for a number of years, I am now informed I have been indulging in an erroneous practice. The plea is set up that the new method is wrong, because those who carry the paten or the hand-cloth are usurping the functions of a deacon or priest. With all deference to the objection I feel there is a sub-stratum of absurdity in it. It implies an abnormal enlargement of diaconal and priestly privileges. With regard to the paten, the irrelevancy of the objection is clear, because the server does not touch, nor is he allowed to touch, the paten *directly*. To carry the sacred particle that may accidentally fall on the hand-cloth can be no more wrong than to carry it on the rail-cloth, which may at any communion become the privilege of any Catholic.

However, as the objection is urged, I humbly ask, 1° Whether the practice is wrong on this special ground? and 2° Whether there is any decree or authorised usage of the Church opposed to it?

Awaiting a reply, believe me,

Yours sincerely,—J. W.

In reply we beg to say, 1° that the linen cloth is what the Church has prescribed to be used by the faithful in the ceremony of receiving Holy Communion.

The Roman Ritual (*Ordo administrandi Sacram Communionem*) when describing the preparations for administering communion mentions the linen cloth which is to be spread before the communicants, “et ante eos linteo mundo extenso.”

This cloth is usually attached to the balustrade, which is a venerable as well as a convenient arrangement. St. Charles recommended (*Instruct. pro administr. Eucharistia*), that the cloth should be held by two acolytes, as is ordered (Caer. Epes. lib. ii., cap. xxiv. 3), to be done when the clergy communicate at the predella of the altar.

At Rome and elsewhere it is now a common practice to use a card, about 12 inches square, covered with linen, which is passed from one communicant to the next. This is a convenient provision when only few communicants present themselves, or at an altar where the Blessed Sacrament is not reserved, or where there may be no balustrade.

It is generally known that communicants are directed not to use the finger towel, or priest's maniple or chasuble, as a communion cloth.

As to cleanliness the priest understands that it is his duty to see that the communion cloth is always clean. The communion cloth should be removed from the balustrade and folded when the Masses are over.

Moreover it should be borne in mind that it is the duty of the priest to instruct the people how to communicate. He has to remind them from time to time that the communicant is to hold his head slightly thrown back, his mouth moderately open, his tongue resting on his lower lip, and to keep the communion cloth spread under his chin, not in imitation of an inclined plane, but as a little table ready to receive securely the Blessed Sacrament, should it happen to fall from the hands of the priest. The young especially should be taught the importance and way of using the communion cloth for its proper purpose, *i. e.*, to take the place of a little table covered with linen, to receive the Blessed Sacrament should it happen to fall.

As to the very minute particles which may fly off, we can only say that in the administration of the Blessed Sacrament this consequence cannot be wholly avoided. Accordingly the Church does not order that the communion cloth should be even purified in ordinary circumstances. But the possible presence of these very minute particles in the cloth

is an additional reason why we should be very careful to keep the communion cloth scrupulously clean, and always respectable.

But what is to be said of the paten our correspondent describes?

We do not think that there is force in the objection that the acolyte who carries it by the wooden handle is usurping the position of a deacon or priest.

But neither can we recommend this special contrivance.

It is novel, having been introduced but recently into certain dioceses.

It is unnecessary; for the Church still continues to prescribe the use of the cloth only.

But we cannot say that it is a practice to be abolished as wrong, for the Sacred Congregation has not forbidden it in dioceses in which such a custom has been established.

Yet we do not think that it is right to introduce it into a church without the sanction of the bishop. The following is the ruling of the S. Congregation on this question:—

“An in ministranda fidelibus sacra communione liceat, loco tabellarum linearum, uti tabellis ex metallo, vel ejusmodi tolerari possit in iis diocesibus in quibus fuit introductus?”

Resp. S. R. C.—“Non esse interdicendum, nihilominus significetur Emo. D. Episcopo Alexandriae non esse improbandum usum tabularum linearum.”

20 March, 1875, in *Romana*.

THE SUFFRAGIA IN THE VOTIVE OFFICES.

On 2nd March, when we had the Votive Office of St. Joseph, should a commemoration of St. Joseph be made in the suffrages at Lauds and second Vespers?

E. K. (P.P.)

The commemoration should not have been made at Lauds, because the office was of St. Joseph; but it should have been made at second Vespers as the Vespers *a capitulo* were of the Blessed Sacrament.

THE CHURCH ABROAD.

During the past month the Church was afflicted by the loss of two of her most illustrious sons, Cardinal Jacobini and the venerated General of the Jesuit Order Father Beckx. The former was born at Genzano in 1832 and studied at the Seminary of Albano and the Roman University. He was appointed by Pius IX. one of the secretaries of Propaganda, and acted as one of the under secretaries at the Vatican Council. In 1874 he was raised to the dignity of Nuncio at Vienna. Pius IX was much criticized for the appointment of so young a prelate to that important post but when somebody in conversation with the Pope one day alluded to him as "Il piccolo Jacobini," Pius IX. answered, "Piccolo, sí, ma di testa fine." He soon won several concessions for the Church at Vienna, and when invited to meet Prince Bismarck at Kissingen, on the occasion of the famous meeting of the Emperors, he there inaugurated the policy in which he was actively engaged up to his death, of conciliating the German Government and procuring the abolition of the May Laws. He was created a Cardinal by Leo XIII. in 1879 and Pontifical Secretary of State in 1880.

Of the illustrious Father Beckx one of the children of the order which he ruled for so many years has written in the last number of the *Civilla Cattolica*, a touching account of his last days and a short sketch of his life, from which we gather the following interesting facts :—

Father Beckx was born at Sichem, near Diest, in Belgium, on the 8th of February, 1795. He belonged to a poor family and in his early years was obliged to go a distance of three miles on foot every day in order to attend school. He commenced Latin with a certain John Peeters who was an agricultural labourer, but who, like so many teachers of the olden times in Ireland, had acquired an excellent knowledge of the classics. He then entered the Seminary of Malines where he studied philosophy and theology.

The Abbé Sterkx his professor, who was afterwards Archbishop of Malines and Cardinal, had marked him out as of extraordinary ability and piety. Immediately after his ordination he entered the Jesuit Order, in October, 1819. When he had finished the term of noviciate and scholasticate he was sent to teach Canon Law at Hildesheim, and from there was directed by the order of the Holy Father to undertake the instruction of the Duke of Anhalt, recently

converted to Catholicism. His zeal extended to the Catholics of the Duchy to whom he preached incessantly, and amongst whom he founded a Church and a Mission. He was subsequently entrusted by the Pope and by the General of the Order with several delicate missions to Bavaria and to Austria, and in 1849 was nominated rector of the Jesuit College of Louvain. Again in 1851 he was transferred to the post of provincial of the Austrian province, and finally, in 1853, on the death of Father Roothaan, was elected Superior-General of the whole order.

“On his tomb,” says the writer in the *Civiltà Cattolica*, “the Society of Jesus can inscribe the eulogium of the strongest-minded of rulers, and at the same time of the most tender-hearted of fathers. His generalship with the exception of that of Aquaviva was the longest, and perhaps without exception the most prosperous in the history of the Order. He saw during the thirty years of his rule the number of Jesuits redoubled, and under his authority were established in France, Ireland, Spain, Portugal, and America, several old provinces which owe to him their new and flourishing life. He founded new missions among the savages of the Rocky Mountains, in California, New Mexico, Brazil, Guiana, the Philippine Islands, the East Indies, in Madagascar, Zambesi, Australia, Armenia, Constantinople, etc., etc. The number of colleges and convents increased, the standard of studies was raised, the philosophy of St. Thomas was promoted, literature was carefully cultivated, and the education of youth brought to great perfection. He rendered several valuable services to the Holy See and watched with paternal care over all his children whom he encouraged with frequent letters and constantly urged on to the exact fulfilment of their duties. Finally he obtained from the Holy See the canonization or beatification of over eighty Jesuits, nearly all glorious martyrs for the faith.

“And he was able to do all this for the glory of God and of his Church in the midst of the most atrocious persecutions, spoliations, sentences of exile and all kinds of contradictions. From the very first days of his generalship he saw the society persecuted in Spain, Naples and Switzerland: then banished from almost all Italy in 1859, from the Venetian territory 1866, from Spain in 1868, from Germany in 1873, from France in 1880, and besides from several Republics of South America; yet in face of so many varied trials, the great figure of Father Beckx was always the same, placid, serene and incapable of losing his equanimity. He was indeed the man destined by

Providence to rule the society in these stormy times. Pope Pius IX. himself at the time the reunion was held in Rome to elect a successor to Father Roothaan did not hesitate to say to several members of his household that no one appeared to him more worthy to fill the responsible office than Father Beckx."

Not many days after the death of Father Beckx, there died also, at Turin, a priest who was once a bright ornament of the Jesuit Order but whose natural pride brought him into collision for a considerable time with that power which in the words of Cardinal Newman, speaking of Savonarola, "none can assail without misfortune." Every one has heard of the fame as a theologian and as a scholar of Father Passaglia. Unfortunately his name has acquired more notoriety as an opponent of the Pope's temporal power than as an eloquent expounder of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. At a time when the great Pius IX. was struggling with all his might to fulfil the oath of his coronation to maintain the integrity of the Papal States the great theologian abandoned his mother Church in the hour of danger and threw all the weight of his authority into the scale with the mortal enemies of Papal power and influence. He maintained that the "non possumus" of the Pope had nothing to do with dogmas or Catholic belief, and was not founded on Holy Scripture or the traditions of the Church, and that the oaths instituted by Pius V. and Urban VII. had no validity as they were directly opposed to the welfare of Italian Society. He was rewarded by his revolutionary friends with an appointment to the chair of moral philosophy at the University of Turin. The last time he distinguished himself as a teacher was in 1880, when in a course of brilliant lectures he proved the immorality of divorce. It was well known that for some years the celebrated professor was in anything but an easy state of conscience. He was often seen in his parish Church at Turin, at the altar of the Madonna in deep meditation and prayer, and there is no doubt but the Virgin to whom he always remained devoted at heart obtained for him the grace of a happy death. When he felt seriously ill he asked for the Sisters of "Bon Secours" to attend him, and received with gratitude the visit of one of the Jesuit Fathers resident at Turin. Seeing clearly that the end was coming he sent for the parish priest of San Carlo and before him retracted all his errors, and asked pardon for the scandal he had given. He then went to Confession, and received Holy Communion. He was afterwards visited by Cardinal Alimonda and in his presence again repeated his retractations. On the following day he received the

Holy Viaticum and Extreme Unction. He bequeathed most of his earthly goods to the hospital established at Turin by the Venerable Cottolengo, and died a quiet and peaceful death with every sign of repentance and of piety.

On the very day on which Carlo Passaglia was buried at Turin Pope Leo XIII. added one more vigorous protest to the many he has recently made against the spoliation of his territory and against the insults that are daily offered to the Church in Italy. These repeated protests on the part of the Pontiff have so impressed the revolutionaries that one famous Garibaldian, Signor Fazzari, has come to the conclusion that the country must become reconciled with the Papacy at any cost, and that there never can be real union or prosperity, or happiness in Italy as long as the government is at war with the Pope. The extraordinary tokens of consideration and respect that reach Leo XIII., from all the governments of the world at the present time do not naturally tend to set at rest the anxiety of his enemies. In addition to this they are daily reminded by the *Moniteur de Rome* and the *Osservatore Romano*, that all the great Italian statesmen who effectually brought about the union of Italy clearly foresaw the disastrous results that would follow from the forcible occupation of Rome and the dethronement of the Pope. This is so true of Count Cavour that even the most ardent Radicals do not contest it. It is likewise true of Massimo d'Azeglio who survived Cavour and spent the last five years of his life in endeavouring to persuade his countrymen to refrain from doing violence to Rome. Of course it cannot be denied that the two Piedmontese ministers desired as ardently as possible that Rome with its centuries of traditions, and the prestige of its name, should be the capital of United Italy; but, at the same time, they held that arguments of persuasion alone should be used with the Holy Father to induce him to consider such a concession but that any attempt to force him, or any step calculated to deprive him of his independence, would not be tolerated by the Christian world and could not fail to bring endless difficulties and dangers upon the whole country. With regard to the Florentine minister Ricasoli even the prejudiced Arrivabene in his *Italy under Victor Emmanuel* cites the respectful supplication which he addressed to the Pope, as the father of Christianity, to settle the Italian question. All his utterances on the subject have been discussed in the *Revue des deux Mondes* in such a manner as to place his orthodoxy beyond all doubt. Discussions of the same kind have been carried on regarding Gino Capponi, but even his German

biographer, the materialist Hillebrandt, bears testimony to his attitude of respect for the Papal position and independence.

In support of the same views, the *Osservatore Romano* of March 22nd adds the testimony of many foreign sympathizers with the Italian patriots, of M. Thiers, of Disraeli, of Gonzalez Serrano, of Wellesley, Palmerston, Canning and Grey, of Napoleon III., and La Gueronnière, of di Revel, Ferrari, Lord Normanby and Lord Lansdowne. The words are quoted which Disraeli once uttered in the House of Commons, that "the question of Rome was a matter of general interest for the whole world: for the Pope is a sovereign who should not be placed under the undue influence of any power in Europe"; and those of M. Thiers who said that "the unity of Catholicism required that the Roman Pontiff should be independent in the most complete and explicit manner, and that for the Pontificate there was no other mode of independence than sovereignty in that country which centuries had assigned to it, and which all the nations of the earth had maintained for considerations of supreme interest and importance." Similar declarations are quoted of all the others.

Meanwhile the greatest opponents of the Pope are compelled to admire the prudence and dignity with which Leo XIII. under circumstances of the most extraordinary difficulty, upholds the ancient glory of the Papacy. His patience under unwonted provocation, and his fatherly desire to maintain above all things the preservation of order and of peace have overcome the most obdurate opponents of his influence. Nowhere is this more remarkable than in the case of Germany. It is consoling to witness the cordial relations that now exist between the Pope and that country after so many years of struggle. Prussia, which held out longest in defence of the May Laws, has at last come to terms. According to the new bill introduced by Prince Bismarck, all the religious orders will be allowed back except the teaching orders. It does not yet appear quite clear if the Jesuits and Dominicans will be permitted to return in their missionary capacity, but it is quite certain that neither they nor any others will be allowed to open schools. The bishops will be able to open seminaries for the education of priests, and no clerical students will be obliged to frequent the universities as required by the Falk Statutes. Some difficulties have been raised with regard to the seminaries of Posen and of Kulm, as it is feared that the Polish national sentiment may be too ardently fostered there. The extent of the veto accorded to the Government in the appointment of parish priests is also the

subject of discussion ; but it is expected these points will be amicably settled, Prince Bismarck having declared that it was never his intention to enter into a permanent struggle with the Roman Curia.

The altered tone of French republicans noticeable for some time past is also most remarkable. The following extract from *La Liberté* shows the great change that has come over a large section of republican deputies.

“It is beyond all doubt that amidst the rumours of war which have moved public opinion within the past few weeks, Pope Leo XIII. has expressed the most lively sympathy for France. We are assured that it is in great part in the interest of our country, and to preserve the threatened peace that he openly brought his influence to bear on the Catholic party in the German Reichstag to vote for the military septennate, which M. de Bismarck declared indispensable to European peace. The words which the Holy Father addressed to our Ambassador at the Vatican on the same occasion are not less characteristic. The desire to be useful to us in the difficult position in which our country is placed, is manifested in them without reserve.

“This is assuredly greatness of soul on the part of the Pontiff, for we give very little reason to the august head of the Church, to show much regard or concern for our country. We should therefore be all the more touched by those manifestations of sympathy, which are evidently a delicate appeal to our better feelings, to our reason and our justice. Once more by those expressive demonstrations the Pope seems to hold out his hand towards us, to forget the unfortunate past, and to think only of the greatness and happiness of France.

“If in these conditions we have the wisdom to desire it sincerely, the reconciliation of Church and State will be much easier than many seem to imagine. That such a reconciliation is infinitely desirable, will henceforth be the opinion of by far the greater number of “bona fide” republicans. They have seen by proof how unfortunate for the present regime has been the war against religion, what detestable passions have been let loose within the last eight years, and they evidently understand that the time has come for a more moderate, wise, and liberal policy. The majority of the Chamber evidently struck with this truth, leaves henceforward to the “*energumena*” of Radicalism a monopoly of the struggle against the clergy—Why should they persist any longer in a policy of sectarianism which has produced so much evil, and which can only excite passions and hatred?

“If it is true that Leo XIII., by the spirit of conciliation which

has characterized all his acts since his accession to the Papacy, shows such friendly dispositions in our regard, why should we not answer his generosity in such a way as to seal once more between the Papacy and France an understanding, which may have the happiest consequences for both one and the other? Why should we not, by going back on a deplorable error, endeavour to regain for the republic that great moral force of the Church, which intolerance and persecution have so awkwardly made our enemy.

“The terrible but powerful and able man, that for sixteen years has ruled European politics from Berlin, M. de Bismarck, has given us on this point an example which we should not hesitate long to follow. In order to obtain the help of the Sovereign Pontiff he gave up the *Culturkampf*. He went to Canossa though he had sworn never to travel on that road. He, a Protestant Power, became reconciled with the Catholic Church. Still more—he has glorified and raised up the moral authority of the Pope, and the prestige of the Papacy higher, and more brilliantly than any ruler that ever went before him.

“Shall we allow Germany alone to profit by the new influence which the head of Catholicity is about to acquire in the modern world and which he aspires to use so nobly.”

Another indirect testimony of respect to the Holy See is the satisfaction expressed on a recent occasion by General Grover Cleveland, President of the United States, at the elevation to the Sacred College of Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore. Americans are justly proud of the marks of distinction with which the new Cardinal has been received in Rome. It is the crowning of a life of extraordinary zeal which has been acknowledged and admired by his countrymen, without exception of creed or party. In the ordinary course of things his Eminence has still many years of life to devote to the service of the Church. That in itself is a guarantee of progress for Catholicity in the United States, and especially for Catholic Education, in which his Eminence takes such an active interest. We have before us a circular which has recently been addressed, with his Eminence's concurrence and sanction, to the Church authorities of the United States, calling upon them to devise and adopt some plan of “*concursum*” or competition between the Catholic Intermediate colleges of America with the object of strengthening the studies of boys who have a vocation for the priesthood, and developing the teaching power of the masters. The necessity for such a course and the results that might be expected from it are admirably set forth in the document itself.

“Hitherto one of the principal obstacles to the improvement of ecclesiastical studies has been found in the imperfect preparation of the aspirants admitted to pursue them. First of all, their knowledge of Latin has been, and often is still, lamentably deficient. The great majority of them reach Philosophy and Theology unable to speak or write with any freedom the language which is to be the medium of their subsequent studies. Many of them even fail to catch the sense of an easy text book. Hence a considerable loss of the time which should be given to personal thought and deeper research—a constant drag—painfully felt to the end of the course by professors and students.”

Then the proposal is made for a concursus of colleges and the success of the Intermediate system recently introduced into Ireland is emphasized as an encouragement to try something similar in the United States.

J. F. HOGAN.

DOCUMENTS.

DECREE OF THE SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES FOR THE INTRODUCTION OF THE CAUSE OF BEATIFICATION, OR DECLARATION OF MARTYRDOM, OF TWO HUNDRED AND SIXTY-ONE VENERABLE SERVANTS OF GOD, WHO WERE PUT TO DEATH IN ENGLAND FOR THE FAITH.

In the persecution which so fiercely raged in England during the sixteenth century and afterwards, against the Catholic Faith and the divinely instituted Primacy of the Roman Pontiff, very many of the faithful of every rank, after enduring mockery and stripes, bonds and imprisonment, and suffering many kinds of cruel torture, courageously laid down their lives for Religion. By their death the enemies of Catholicity, in the country which in past ages was deservedly called an Island of Saints, thought to tear up the Catholic Church by its roots. But the blood of the slain, who from the moment of their glorious death were everywhere held to be true Martyrs of Christ, became the seed of new offspring in the Church, which has there day by day wonderfully grown.

The times were adverse to the drawing up of the formalities required for the Process of these illustrious Martyrs, and to the introduction of their Cause in the Sacred Congregation of Rites, though it was greatly desired, not only in England, but also by the faithful throughout the Catholic world. But now, since the restoration of the Catholic Hierarchy in England, what was so earnestly looked for has in our day been happily accomplished; for the Catholic Bishops have been able to collect together the ancient records; and, by authority of the Ordinary, to institute in the ecclesiastical court of Westminster the formal Process as to the Martyrdom, the Cause of Martyrdom, and the Signs, or Miracles, of three hundred and five Servants of God who were put to death for the Catholic Faith.

The acts of this Process, supported by authentic documents, were laid before the Apostolic See, and were immediately followed by a Petition of the Bishops, and of many other distinguished ecclesiastics and laymen of the whole of England.

Our Holy Father Pope Leo XIII. was pleased to entrust the examination of this matter to a special Commission, consisting of several Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church and Officials of the Congregation of Sacred Rites, with directions that the said examination should be preceded by a Disquisition to be drawn up by the Right Reverend Promoter of the Holy Faith; and a Dispensation was also granted in respect to the introduction of the Cause before the lapse of the ten years required by Decrees, from the day of presenting the Ordinary Process in the Sacred Congregation, and in respect also to its introduction before the written documents had been revised.

Afterwards in a special Congregation, assembled at the Vatican on the day below-mentioned, the undersigned Cardinal Dominic Bartolini, Prefect of the said Sacred Congregation, who had charge of the Cause, proposed the following question: "*Whether the Commission is to be signed for the Introduction of the Cause, in the matter and to the effect under consideration.*"

Then the Most Reverend Fathers and the Official Prelates, after hearing the written and oral report of the aforesaid Promoter of the Holy Faith, and after the matter had been fully discussed, decided: *That the Commission is to be signed, if it shall please His Holiness, in respect of two hundred and sixty-one; namely—Anthony Brookby, Thomas Belchiam and Thomas Cort, of the Order of St. Francis; Griffith Clark, Priest; N. Waire, of the Order of St. Francis; Adrian Fortescue and Thomas Dingley, Knights of St. John of Jerusalem;*

John Travers, Priest of the Order of Hermits of St. Augustine; John Beche, Abbot of Colchester; Hugh Faringdon, Abbot of Reading; Richard Whiting, Abbot of Glastonbury; Roger James and John Thorn, Monks of Glastonbury; William Onion and John Rugg, of the Order of St. Benedict; Edmund Brindholm, Priest; Clement Philpot, layman; David Gunston, Knight of Jerusalem; John Ireland, Priest; Thomas Ashby, John Slade and John Bodey, laymen; George Haydock, James Fenn, Thomas Hemerford, John Nutter and John Munden, Priests; William Carter, layman; James Bell, priest; John Finch and Richard White, laymen; Thomas Alfield, priest; Thomas Webley, layman; Hugh Taylor, Priest; Marmaduke Bowes, layman; Edwd. Strancham and Nicholas Woodfen, priests; Margaret Clithero, of the laity; Richard Sergeant (*alias* Lee), William Thomson, Robert Anderton, William Marsden, Francis Ingolby, John Finglow, John Sandys, John Lowe, John Adams and Richard Dibdale, Priest; Robert Bickerdike and Richard Langley, laymen; Thomas Pilchard, Edmund Sykes, Robert Sutton, Stephen Rowscham, John Hambley, George Douglas, Alexander Crow, Nicholas Garlick, Robert Ludlam, Richard Sympson, and William Dean, Priests; Henry Webley, layman; William Gunter and Robert Morton, Priests; Hugh More, layman; Thomas Holford and James Claxton, Priests; Thomas Felton, of the Order of Minims; Richard Leigh, Priest; Edward Shelley, Richard Martin, Richard Flower, John Roch, and Margaret Ward, of the laity; William Way, (*alias* Wigges), Robert Wilcox, Edward Campion, and Christopher Buxton, Priests; Robert Wildmerpool, layman; Rodolph Crochet, Edward James, John Robinson, and William Hartley, Priests; Robert Sutton, layman; Richard Williams, John Hewett (*alias* Weldon, Edward Burden, William Lampley, John Amias, Robert Dalby, George Nicols, and Richard Yaxley, Priests; Thomas Belson and Humphrey Prichard, laymen; William Spenser, Priest; Robert Hardesty, layman; Christopher Bales (or Bayles), Priest; Nicholas Horner and Alex. Blake, laymen; Miles Gerard, Francis Dickenson, Edwd. Jones, Anthony Middleton, Edmund Duke, Richd. Hill, John Hog, Richd. Holliday, and Robt. Thorpe, Priests; Thos. Watkinson, layman; Momford Scott, George Beesley, and Roger Dickenson, Priests; Rodolph Milner, William Pike, and Laurence Humphrey, laymen; Edmund Genings, Priest; Swithin Wells, layman; Eustace White and Polydore Plasden, Priests; Brian Lacy, John Mason, and Sydney Hodgson, laymen; William Patenson and Thomas Pormort, Priests; Robert Ashton, layman; Edward

Waterson, Priest; James Bird, laymen; Anthony Page, Joseph Lampton, and William Davies, Priests; John Speed, layman; Wm. Harrington, Priest; John Cornelius, of the Society of Jesus; Thomas Bosgrave, John Carey, and Patrick Salmon, laymen; John Boste and John Ingram, Priests; George Swallowell, layman; Edward Osbaldeston, Priest; Robert Southwell, of the Society of Jesus; Alexander Rawlins, Priest; Henry Walpole, of the Society of Jesus; William Freeman, Priest; Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel; George Errington, William Knight, William Gibson, and Henry Abbot, laymen; William Andleby, Priest; Thomas Warcop, Edward Fulthorp, and John Britton, laymen; Peter Snow, Priest; Rodolph Grimston, layman; John Buckley (or Jones), of the Order of St. Francis; Christopher Robinson and Richard Horner, Priests; John Lion and James Dowdall, laymen; Christopher Wharton, Priest; John Rigby, layman; Thomas Sprott, Thomas Hunt, Robert Nutter, Edward Thwing, and Thomas Palasor, Priests; John Norton and John Talbot, laymen; John Pibush, Priest; Mark Barkworth, of the Order of St. Benedict; Roger Filcock, of the Society of Jesus; Anne Line, of the laity; Thurstan Hunt and Robert Middleton, Priests; Nicholas Tichborne and Thomas Hackshot, laymen; James Harrison, Priest; Anthony Bates and James Ducket, laymen; Thomas Tichborne and Robert Watkinson, Priests; Francis Page, of the Society of Jesus; William Richardson and John Sugar, Priests; Robert Grissold, Laurence Baily, Thomas Welbourne, John Fulthering, and William Brown, laymen; Nicholas Owen, Edward Oldcorne, and Rodolph Ashley, of the Society of Jesus; Robert Drury and Matthew Flathers, Priests; George Gervase of the Order of St. Benedict; Thomas Garnet, of the Society of Jesus; Roger Cadwallador, George Napier and Thomas Somers, Priests; William Scot and John Roberts, of the Order of St. Benedict; Richard Newport, John Almond, Thomas Atkinson, and John Thulis, Priests; Roger Wrenno, layman; Thomas Maxfield, Thomas Tunstal, and William Southerne, Priests; Edmund Arrowsmith, of the Society of Jesus; Richard Herst, layman; William Ward, Priest; Edward Barlow, of the Order of St. Benedict; Thomas Reynolds, Priest; Bartholomew Roe, of the Order of St. Benedict; John Lockwood, Edmund Catherick, Edward Morgan, and Hugh Green, Priests; Thomas Bullaker of the Order of St. Francis; Thomas Holland, of the Society of Jesus; Henry Heath and Arthur Bell of the Order of St. Francis; Price, layman; John Ducket, Priest; Rodolph Corby, Henry Morse, and Brian Cansfield, of the Society of Jesus;

John Goodman, Priest; Philip Powel, of the Order of St. Benedict; Edward Bamber, Priest; John Woodcock, of the Order of St. Francis; Thomas Whitaker, Priest; Peter Wright, of the Society of Jesus; John Southworth, Priest; Edward Coleman, layman; Edward Mico, Thomas Bedingfield, and William Ireland, of the Society of Jesus; John Grove, layman; Thomas Pickering, of the Order of St. Benedict; Thomas Whitbread, William Harcourt, John Fenwick, John Green (or Gavan), Anthony Turner. and Francis Nevill, of the Society of Jesus; Richard Langhorne, layman; Wm. Plessington, Priest; Philip Evans, of the Society of Jesus; John Lloyd and Nicholas Postgate, Priests; Charles Mahony, John Wall, and Francis Levison, of the Order of St. Francis; John Kemble, Priest; David Lewis (*alias* Charles Baker), of the Society of Jesus; Thomas Thwing, Priest; William Howard, Viscount Stafford; and Oliver Plunket, Archbishop of Armagh. As to the other forty-four, the decision was: Delayed, and further proofs must be given.—On the 4th day of December, 1886.

The undersigned Secretary having then made a faithful and accurate report of all that precedes to our Holy Father Pope Leo XIII., his Holiness, ratifying the decision of the Sacred Congregation, vouchsafed to sign the Commission for the Introduction of the Cause with his own hand, on the ninth day of the same month and year.

D. CARDINAL BARTOLINI,

Prefect of the Congregation of Sacred Rites.

LAURENCE SALVATI, *Secretary.*

L. ✠ S.

[Owing to the length of the essays and the large number of questions sent by our subscribers, we are obliged to hold over for this month our usual Notices of Books.—Ed. I. E. R.]

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

MAY, 1887.

NOMINA PATRICIANA.

IT is to be regretted that there are few such national saints as St. Patrick whose historical picture in many salient points has been kept in more uncertain light, or has been more absolutely obscured. The causes of this are not far to seek. However, the aim of this paper is not to dwell on these causes or indulge in useless regrets, but to supply, as far as may be, an existing want.

Second in interest only to his consecration is the question of the ordination of an apostolic bishop, especially when taken in connection with the scene of his future labours; and than the place of St. Patrick's ordination, no question has given rise to more discussion, uncertainty, and hopeless contradiction. The present article is intended then to establish as tolerably certain the ordainer and the scene of the ordination; and I the more willingly undertake to do so, as it has been associated with the famous "Staff of Jesus," whose rich ornamentation has been graphically described by St. Bernard, and whose possession was deemed necessary and sufficient for conferring primatial jurisdiction.¹

The old scholiast on the first Life of our national apostle tells us that Pope Celestine refused to consecrate St. Patrick, though he did so afterwards, because he had already sent

¹ It was publicly burned by Protestant bigots in Dublin, at the beginning of the so-called Reformation.

another bishop, Palladius, to Ireland. (*Trias Thaumaturga*, Colgan, p. 5, n. 14). The Life then proceeds to state:—

“When Celestine then refused to ordain Patrick a bishop, he turned away to an island of the Tuscan sea, and there found the Staff of Jesus in an island called Alanensis near Mount Arnon.”

The author of the third Life writes in reference to the same matter:—

“But whilst Patrick had been in Rome, he heard the voice of an angel from heaven saying ‘go to the island, Ireland, and help those who cry to thee.’ And Patrick said ‘I will not go ’till I salute the Lord.’ And the angel conducted him to Mount Arnon on the sea of Latium overhanging the rock of the Tuscan sea, in a city called Capua, and, as Moses, he saluted the Lord.”¹

The fourth Life on the same subject thus writes:—

“He therefore sailed right through the Tuscan Sea, and received the ‘Staff of Jesus’ from a certain young man in a certain island, who had entertained Christ. And the Lord spoke to Patrick on the mountain, and ordered him to go to Ireland.”²

We learn from Joceline, author of the fifth Life, the following particulars:—

“Patrick answered that he was unequal to so heavy a burden and difficult task, that he could never think of undertaking such responsibility without seeing and saluting the Lord. He was then conducted by the angel to Mount Morion near the Tuscan sea by the city of Capua, and there, as Moses, he merited to see and salute the Lord according to the desires of his ardent love.”³

The Tripartite Life (Colgan) on the question in hands writes as follows:—⁴

“He sailed through the Tuscan Sea until according to divine arrangements he came to a certain island on which, in a house as if new, he found spouses of a flourishing age with a decrepit old woman who could move only on all fours, and leaning on a stick. The saint while condoling with her extreme age and weakness learnt from the young robust man that she was his great grand daughter, and that her mother more decrepit and feeble still lived. Our saint, on inquiring into the cause of such a novelty, was told by the young man that he and his wife had been devoted to works of mercy, and that their house and table had been open, and at the service of travellers and

¹ *Trias Thaum.*, p. 13, ch. xxv.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 70, ch. xxvi.

² *Ibid.*, p. 39, ch. xxix.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 122, ch. xxxvi.

pilgrims who sought hospitality for Christ's sake. Hence on a certain occasion we entertained with all possible courtesy and attention Christ Our Saviour under the appearance of a pilgrim with a staff in hand. Before leaving us, he blessed us and our house, declaring that he was Christ the Lord; and by his blessing we have been kept in pristine youth, while our offspring not then born did not share in the like blessing. On that account they are subject to the natural law as to age. He left us the staff, which he carried, commissioned us to keep it for a certain pilgrim who was to come after many years and to be the apostle of Ireland. We therefore present your holiness with the staff left with us for you by the Lord Jesus. But Patrick refused to accept it till he should receive it from the hands of Jesus, and have him confirm the donation. And after three days' tarrying there, he came to a neighbouring mountain called Hermon, where Christ through a merciful condescension did appear to him, and directed him to prepare for the conversion of Ireland, and then gave him as to Moses the staff."

Its powers for the working of miracles are then lengthily described.

The fifth Life by Probus (Colgan, p. 48), speaks as follows in reference to the journey of St. Patrick:—

"Again the angel appeared to St. Patrick and said 'go to holy Senior, bishop, who is on Mount Hermon at the south side of the sea of the ocean; and his city is fortified by seven walls,' (Vallatam septem muris.) And the Saint having rested there for several days, received order of priesthood from him and read with him long and frequently. While the Saint tarried there, he heard in vision the voices of the young crying in their mothers' wombs in Ireland and saying, 'come, holy Patrick, and save us from the coming wrath.' At the same time the angel said to him 'go to Ireland: thou shalt be apostle of that island.' Patrick answered 'I cannot go, for there are evil men there.' The angel replied 'go;' but Patrick rejoined 'he would not go without seeing the Lord.' Patrick then went forth and saw the Lord. And the Lord said, 'sit at my right hand.' Patrick did so sit. Then the Lord said 'go to Ireland and preach the word of eternal life.' Then Patrick in reply made three requests of the Lord."¹

We have now before us all the available evidence in reference to the places and persons connected with St. Patrick's ordination. The learned Dr. Lanigan has inferred from all this that the scene of St. Patrick's ordination was

¹ "Postulo a te, Domine, ut homines scilicet Hiberniæ divites sint in auro et argento; et ego sim patronus eorum; et post hanc vitam sedeam ad dextram tuam in cælo." Ch. xviii.

the rock of Mount Saint Michael, in the bay of Cancale, near Avranches. He had to admit that there had been no fixed bishop there for a long time subsequent to St. Patrick's age; but suggests that he may have been temporarily there. He understood by the *southern sea*, the English channel, as being south in reference to an Irishman. But we must understand the *south* as spoken in reference to France. For St. Patrick when directed to go to the hermits, to Lerins, and to Rome, was in France; and it is presumable that there he was when told immediately after to go to the south side of the sea. He had been previously in the northern part of the Tuscan sea; and the *south* must be understood as referring to the director St. German rather than to the narrator. Indeed, Dr. Lanigan speaks with reserve when he says that the whole passage is curious and worthy of further inquiry.

The Bollandists indicate Pisa as the object of our inquiry. They suggest that Saint Senior may have been bishop of Pisa, who lived on Mount Hermon. But it is considered that the learned Bollandists had no better grounds for their suggestion than the similarity of the river Arno on which Pisa stands to Mount Arnon.¹

The very learned Colgan, editor of the Lives, could not with the aid of his brethren scattered through every part of Italy, identify a mount called Hermon. He would then suggest that it was probably a mistake for Orland, that Capua was perhaps used instead of Cajeta, and that thus Cajeta could truly be said by the Lives to be in the Tuscan sea; whereas Capua is not there but on the river Volturnus.² The learned writer anticipating an objection—that Cajeta was not on the way to Rome from France, brings into play the force of the winds, and throws St. Patrick in a tempest on the shore of Gaeta.

Sir Samuel Ferguson, late President of the Royal Irish Academy, suggests that the Bishop of Arles was St. Patrick's ordainer. For he judged that the seven-walled city spoken of in the Lives probably referred to Marseilles, and that the Irish writers may have mistaken seven for six, "the six-fours."

¹ *Comm. ad vitam S. P.* 29, 35.

² *Tr. Thaum.*, p. 31, nn. 25. 26.

In this theory he supposes that the Bishop of Arles ordained our Saint in Marseilles.¹ But the objection against Dr. Lanigan's supposition tells also against this theory. And indeed the indecision of the learned President does not inspire confidence; for he says that we can suppose that some city in Provence *may* have been called Capua, as Arles was called the Rome of Gaul.

The late Father Shearman who had been painstaking and successful in tracing the footsteps of St. Patrick has not been equally fortunate in the identification of his continental journeys. For he suggests that Lerins or Capraria between Corsica and Tuscany may have been the island of which we have been in search.² But it should be borne in mind that the earliest and most authentic life of our Saint speaks of his journeying through the Tuscan sea, after having passed the Alps, and of his tarrying in the southern portion of Latium. The *Book of Armagh* represents St. Patrick himself saying: "I had the fear of God as my guide in journeying through Gaul, Italy, and even in the islands of the Tuscan Sea."³ And in another passage of the same Book he is described as journeying by land and water through Gaul, *all* Italy, and in the islands of the Tuscan sea, (in *campestribus* locis et in *convallibus montanis*.)

St. German was the first person, as the *Book of Armagh* assures us, to whom St. Patrick after leaving home applied in order to prepare for the ecclesiastical state. For Germanus had excited universal remark and admiration. Previous to his consecration he had ducal power; he was Governor of Brittany, and had studied civil law in Italy. He became after consecration the head of a famous school of clerics at Auxerre. St. Patrick after having remained for some time with him went, according to the Lives, by his direction to the famous monastery of St. Martin of Tours, where he is represented to have received the ecclesiastical tonsure. He was directed subsequently to go to the 'hermits and solitaries.' In the next place St. Patrick

¹ Tr. R. I. A. vol xxvii. part 6; Dec. 1885.

² *Loca Patriciana*, no. xiii. p. 442.

³ *Documenta de S. P.* (Ed. by Rev. E. Hogan, S. J.) pp. 57, 58.

had been advised to go to Lerins where St. Honoratus presided. St. Honoratus of patrician rank turned his back on his father's home, and renounced title and earthly possessions. The School of Lerins drew around it the most noble and learned in Gaul. After some years at Lerins, St. Patrick was directed by the angel or St. Germanus, under whose guidance he acted, to go through the Tuscan Sea to some famous school of sublime virtue and apostolic detachment; and of that sort was the School of Saint Paulinus. Famous contemporaneously as were the Schools of St. Martin of Tours, who from being a centurion became monk and bishop; of St. Germanus, who from being duke became monk and Bishop of Auxerre; of that of St. Honoratus, who from being a Patrician became monk, abbot, and bishop of Arles, no less famous was the School of St. Paulinus, whose praises were celebrated by St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Martin, and St. Jerome. St. Paulinus, descended by father and mother from a long line of consuls, enjoyed himself the consular dignity. He was connected with the renowned Melania, and thus could claim kindred with the Scipios and the Gracchi. With the consent of his wife or rather at her suggestion he sold out their vast possessions in Gaul and Spain; and both having disposed in charity of their property renounced the world.

He became a cleric, a monk in the prime of life, the head of a famous school, and subsequently Bishop of Nola. Even St. Germanus had sent some students to him; amongst others was Victricius who became Bishop of Rouen. The school was near Nola, the only remnant of the vast possessions held by St. Paulinus.

We should not then wonder if our apostle had been directed to the famous school of St. Paulinus, in order to perfect himself in the science of the saints. Sailing right through the Tuscan sea to its southern limits according to the description of the Lives, a pilgrim comes to the shore of Naples. At the southern horn of the crescent bay there lies an island called Capri. It is so far southern that the Tuscan Sea mingles with the Mediterranean, and thus mediately with the Atlantic Ocean; and thus would be verified in Capri, the description

given by the Lives of an island lying in the Ocean-sea, (Tyrrheni Maris Oceani).

The island lying N.E. by S.W. would naturally be first touched at the former point by a pilgrim sailing from the Gaulish coast. Here it was St. Patrick received the "Staff of Jesus." Here the need of the staff was felt, for the cliff is very steep. It is only by a flight of three hundred and thirty-two steps, called the *Scalinata*, there is a descent to the shore. The staff was very useful whether we consider the descent or the long journey that stretched before the pilgrim homewards. And here it may not be amiss to offer some remarks on the novel incidents connected with the island.

We may suppose that the lord of the mountains, and perhaps of Capri, visited the solitaries on the island, and, on leaving, left his staff to be given to some more weary visitor than himself, such as St. Patrick: hence St. Patrick, as said in the Lives, would have the staff given him by the lord himself. Or we may suppose that there had been a legend connecting the staff in some way with our Saviour, and can understand why St. Patrick may have scrupled keeping it till he should previously have consulted the lord or master on the mountain. And as to the marked difference in the ages of those in the island, it may be accounted for on the principle by which an island near Roscrea was called the "island of the living"—a misunderstood metaphor.

Again, an easy and natural explanation of the staff may be given by supposing that a pilgrim came to the island and died there; but before dying left his staff to his hosts and then went to heaven. When the Gospel tells us that whoever entertained or gave to eat to the least in the name of Christ did it to Christ himself, the story of the "Staff of Jesus," worked up by a lively imagination with the use of metaphor or allegory need not be unintelligible. Minds less imaginative than the Celtic mind make use of figures in explaining a very plain fact.¹

¹ "Quid, putamus, nisi quia hospitalitatis officio ad suam cognitionem pervenire posse intimavit, ut cum longius ab hominibus abscesserit super omnes cœlos, tamen cum iis sit qui hoc exhibent servis ejus." St. Aug. *Quest. Evang.* lib. 2, ch. 51.

To be sure some of the Irish Lives speak of persons four hundred years old in the island. But this may be explained by supposing a legend represented in writing or art, in connection with our Saviour's entertainment at Emmaus or with some other passage of His life. And in this connection it is well to bear in mind that the Emperor Tiberius spent ten years on this island, and that he proposed to the Senate to have our Saviour admitted among the Roman deities.¹ This arose from the wonderful account which Pilate gave of our Redeemer, in the usual official statement drawn up in reference to the crucifixion and life of our Redeemer. Who can say what representations in sculpture or otherwise were made by or attributed to Tiberius in regard to our Saviour? For it is unquestionable there were false acts of Pilate forged in the third and fourth centuries, on the strength of which several lessons were founded and read for some time in parts of France. As there had been then false representations in writing, what wonder if there had been such in art? Capri is rich in relics of metals and sculpture.

If we would understand several passages in the Lives, we must make allowance for a poetic turn with a moderate use of figurative language. For instance, we learn (in *Vita Quarta*, ch. xxxvii.) "that Bishop Loarn was in Imreathan, and that he dared to rebuke St. Patrick for holding the hand of the youth at play." This, prosaically told, means that a little boy at play allowed his hoop to fall into St. Patrick's grave. He stooped and thrust down his hand for the hoop, but could not withdraw it. The neighbours thought it advisable to tell the circumstances to Bishop Loarn, who came and addressed St. Patrick: "why, Senior, detain the hand of the boy?" And Bishop Loarn was said to be in Imreathan because his remains were there.

I have lingered the longer about the island Capri, as Dr. Todd in his *St. Patrick* has deemed the incidents mentioned in the Lives in connection with it as unworthy of any notice unless a sneer, and has accused the honest and learned Father Colgan of dishonesty in his endeavour to lessen the

¹ Justin; Tertullian, *Apolog.* 5, 21; Gregory of Tours, *Histor.* l. 1. Epiphanius, *Hæres.* 50, c. 1.

absurdity of the incidents. But so far from being absurd, if read rightly they are true. If Dr. Todd were a competent historian by detecting the error of copyists, the apparent absurdity would disappear, as I shall show just now as I hasten to the main subject of my inquiry.

Probus informs us that St. Patrick having tarried three days in the island went to a bishop in a neighbouring mountain. It has been called Morion, Hermon, or Arnon. The Lives are not and should not be positive, as there is no mountain of that name there. From the Cape of Minerva, which almost touches the island Capri, on to the river Liris, there rises a semicircular chain of mountains which enclose the rich plain of Campania. A link through which to break into Campania is Mount Sarnus. It is washed by the river Sarnus, which makes its way after a course of eleven miles into the gulf of Sorrentum. The endings of the letter were mistaken in the old Lives for *H*, and thus Sarnus (appellatum Harnum) was transformed into Hermon. The mountain is so high as to overhang the rock of the sea (*supra petram Maris*). It was not literally on the rock, as mistranslated by Dr. Todd and later biographers. But what does it overhang? It overhangs the ancient Stibiæ where the elder Pliny in the year 79, from an indiscreet zeal for knowledge, lost his life. To make observations he approached too nearly to burning Vesuvius, which rises thousands of feet high between Stibiæ and Sarnus. The ancient Stibiæ gave way to a city called Castel-a-mare. It is built partly on a rock in the sea and partly on the mountain. The *petra Maris* of the Lives is a fair equivalent for Castel-a-mare. But there is another Castel-a-mare on the Sicilian coast, west of Palermo, and six miles from Alcamo; and hence the Lives very accurately added the distinctive characteristic—*Maris Tyrreni*—which Dr. Lanigan characterised as *bungling*. Alack! we would quench the lights kindled for our guidance. The description of the mountain is graphic and accurate. If there had been a monastery at Sarnus, it must have been subject to Nola, as being within a few miles of it. To my knowledge there had been no monastery there then: and if so, St. Patrick must have alluded to the mountain only as a passage

through which he moved on to Nola. Between Nola and the mountain lay St. Paulinus' monastery. He built a church there too in honour of the martyred Felix. Now we see why the bishop's city on the mountain or summit level was surrounded by a rampart and seven walls (*ejus civitas vallata septem muris*). This was the more necessary as the plain was quite level. The towers were as useful for, and more easy of defence than walls, and with great propriety may be called walls. The Lives and Silius Italicus¹ agree in their description of Nola.

“ Campo Nola sedet, crebris circumdata in orbem
Turribus, et celso facilem tutatur adiri
Planitiem vallo.”

The only draw-back to this accurate description of St. Paulinus' city, a source of irremediable confusion too to the biographers, is the allusion to the city of Capua. But it should be borne in mind that while Capua is eighteen miles from Naples, Nola is only fourteen miles distant, that Paulinus was consul, and subsequently consular of the rich province of Campania, that Capua was its capital, and that it was there the consuls used to reside.² For all these reasons we can understand how the Lives called Capua his city, though he did not usually reside there. He generally lived at Nola, owing to his great devotion to St. Felix; and to the intercession of the saint he attributed the great mercy of having had to put no person to death during his consulship. Even when bishop he dwelt in the monastery outside Nola, towards Sarnus, where he recited the offices with his monks, as he called them, fasted, acted as porter to the martyr's church, and swept it daily.

One objection lies against St. Paulinus being St. Patrick's ordainer; it is this—the Lives call him Senior. But this need not be a Christian name. Colgan suggests it to be a mistake for senator. Dr. Todd has no light to offer and makes him Saint Senior (*sanctum seniozem Episcopum*).

Senior, like *presbyter*, one the comparative of a Latin word, the other, that of its corresponding Greek word,

¹ *Punica*, lib., xii., v. 161.

² Muratori, *Dissertat.* 9. p. 816.

signified an elder or venerable, and in course of time came to mean, in ecclesiastical language, a prelate or priest, though *senior* sometimes retained its original signification. Tertullian speaks of the *Seniors* who acquired their dignity not by money, but worth.¹ The rule and even the Penitential of St. Columbanus speak too of the Senior.² The Irish Mass discovered by the famous Matthew Illyricus speaks of the Senior,³ as does also the Irish Stowe Missal,⁴ (Oblationem quam offero pro seniore nostro; senior noster, N. presbyter). We saw awhile ago how Bishop Loarn in expostulating with St. Patrick, in reference to the little boy's hand being caught, called him Senior. Colman-Elo addressed a rebuke to the monk (bone *Senior*), who grew tired of listening to the hymn in honor of St. Patrick. Nennius, who describes the excesses of King Vortigern, brings St. Germanus on the scene to reproach and correct him. In order to bring conviction home to the guilty king, the saint ordered a youth to approach his father among a crowd of bystanders; who, in obedience to the voice of the holy, very venerable bishop, pointed out the king, (mox ut audivit puer, obedivit verbo *sancti senioris*).⁵ This last instance proves how wrong was Dr. Todd in making *sanctus* a noun, in order to prepare for another mistake—that of making *senior* a proper name. A Saint Senior then in connection with St. Patrick's ordination is a myth.

A mistake of a kindred nature, but far more serious in its consequences, is one in connection with the word *dominus*. The Lives inform us that St. Patrick set out through the Tuscan Sea in order to visit the lord (*dominum*), on the mountain. Paulinus could be called such for many reasons. He was Consul; he had possessions so extensive on the Garonne, at Bordeaux, at Narbonne, in Barcelona, that Ausonius (Ep. 23), says they were divided between a hundred possessors. In addition to these claims to the title of lord or master, he was the most literary character of the day, so much so that the celebrated Ausonius acknowledged himself

¹ "Non pretio sed testimonio adepti." Apolog. 39. ² C. 7; C. 28

³ Malone's *Church History*, vol. 1, p. 189.

⁴ Fol. 28, b.

⁵ *Histor. Briton.*, ch. xxxix

inferior to St. Paulinus. In proof of his talents and the good use made of them we may point to the sweet ode annually composed in honor of St. Felix's festival. And it is very remarkable that the Lives, speaking of St. Patrick's stay with St. Paulinus, state that he read frequently and long with him. (*Lectitavit multis temporibus*). But the word applied with propriety to St. Paulinus by the original biographer underwent a slight change in the hands of the copyist, and the simple lord (*dominus*, or master), was transformed into the Lord and Saviour. Hence, the indecent and almost profane requests which the Lives state had been granted by the Lord to St. Patrick. But stripped of poetical imagery or rhetorical flourish, there is nothing unbecoming in that St. Patrick begged the prayers of St. Paulinus for the temporal and eternal happiness of the Irish, that they would receive himself as their teacher, and that he would share in the glory which he confidently hoped was in store for St. Paulinus.

While the biographers of our national saint, some very learnedly, and all very earnestly, have endeavoured to throw light on what was not very clear, Dr. Todd forms an exception. After establishing his own incapability, he accuses Colgan of dishonesty, who fairly gave his best aid. Colgan in editing one of the Lives omits the foolish petitions attributed to St. Patrick in reference to the gold and silver for the Irish while he was with the lord or master; on which Dr. Todd asks, what purpose was served by this suppression? The answer is simple, that he had given these petitions in a previous life, (*Vita Sexta*), that they may not have been in the copy that he had before him, and that they appeared incredible. The apprehension that mention of what appeared absurd would shake all faith in what was certain, would be a natural motive. Dr. Todd's criticism on the alleged omission reminds me of his strictures (p. 435 of his *St. Patrick*), on Franciscan Friars. He accuses them of paganism because they copy in the seventeenth century the old annalists, who in figurative language described the sun and wind as killing King Leogaire for having violated an oath taken on them. The friars were pagans for honestly quoting

the annals; now they are rogues because they appear not to quote what did not seem credible or worthy of God.

In the same connection Colgan is accused of stating some thing which some Irish Lives related about the people in the island near Sarnus—that some of them were four hundred years old. On this Dr. Todd remarks, “it was not worth while to commit this piece of dishonesty.”

Dr. Todd devotes some 18 pages of his *St. Patrick* (pp. 320-38) to the passages under our consideration; and as his views differ from those in this Essay, I shall briefly notice them.

He states that (a) the whole story cannot be applied to one person, a part referring to St. Patrick, and another part to Palladius, who was before him on the Irish mission, and that the places referred to are *fragments of forgotten geography* (this is copied by Sir Samuel Ferguson and Father Shearman) (b) that St. Patrick was falsely represented as receiving a good education under St. German; that (c) the biographers deliberately interpolated the old *Book of Armagh*, in order to establish St. Patrick's education under St. German; (d) and that Palladius was ordained about Capua, while St. Patrick was ordained not about the Tuscan Sea but the Straits of Dover. To reply briefly: the biographers and genuine admirers of the Saint say that he got the best education, not intellectually but morally and as an Apostle; the places being identified do not belong to a chapter of *forgotten geography*; the biographers did not interpolate the *Book of Armagh*, there was no motive for so doing, but Dr. Todd has forged a fanciful *Book of Armagh*, or misquoted the real one. “The *Book of Armagh*,” he writes, “was interpolated to impose on a credulous people the fables of the ecclesiastical education of St. Patrick under St. German;” again “interpolation done deliberately to exalt their hero.” Let the *Book of Armagh* tell its story:¹

“St. Patrick remained with Germanus no short time, like another Paul at the feet of Gamaliel: in all subjection, patience and

¹ *Documenta de S. P.* (most learnedly edited by Rev. E. Hogan, S.J.), p. 24, which supplies the missing folio of the *B. of Armagh*.

obedience he learnt, loved, practised, with all the affection of his soul, knowledge, wisdom, chastity, everything that was useful to his spirit and soul, in great fear and love of God, in goodness and simplicity of heart, a virgin in body and mind."

Comment is unnecessary on the charge of deliberate interpolation of the *Book of Armagh*.

Dr. Todd so far from being equal to a life of St. Patrick appears not able to rise to the full measure of the Saint. Hence the many pages of his work bearing on our subject are one unbroken tissue of error in fact and opinions, of groundless suspicions and accusations and baseless theories. He foolishly assumes that the Schools of St. Martin and Germanus were intended for intellectual development merely, and that St. Patrick, if there, would have occupied himself in mastering the beauties of the classics. At the risk of being deemed Gothic in my views by the admirers of Dr. Todd's *St. Patrick*, I believe that our national Saint, the lowest amount possible of knowledge sufficient for his profession supposed, learnt "from the hermits and solitaries" (*nudis pedibus*) with whom he is said to have spent eight years, what was more useful for the conversion of our forefathers than the mere secular knowledge that all the Professors of Oxford and Cambridge ever had. He sought out the best schools for learning the sublimest lessons in the science of saints. He spared no trouble, shrank from no sacrifice, from the bank of the Avon to the shores of the Mediterranean, in culling and treasuring up the choicest flowers of virtue.

Despite Dr. Todd's writings we have found, I fancy, the remotest turning point in our Saint's holy wanderings. His Ordainer, who was Bishop of Nola from the year 409 to 429, is an additional proof of the fallacy of the theory that would push St. Patrick's mission back to the third century or move it on to the end of the fifth. He was ordained by the famous Paulinus of Nola, under the shadow of Mount Sarnus.

There are grounds for thankfulness if we have been fortunate enough to have discovered the long-lost name of the place of the saint's ordination. Even in the ninth century the holy Culdee Aengus was unable to spell out of the old MSS. anything more certain than Narnchin. The

festologist in gathering saints into his long litany from France, Rome, Greece and Egypt, did not overlook the hidden away mountain of Sarnus. He venerated the spot, however dimly known, on which our glorious apostle stood. We, with a more distinct knowledge of the locality, ought not be less reverential. *Adorabimus* (in spiritu) *in loco ubi steterunt pedes ejus*. The holy writer while commemorating the saints of God not only individually but in batches and boatsfull, aye, in fleets numbering each 150 vessels does not forget the little band that headed by their gallant leader, scaled the rugged heights of Sarnus.¹ After a thousand years we too make commemoration of them, and echoing the words of the Litanist pray: "The party who journeyed with Patrick on mount Sarnus *in auxilium meum invoco; per Jesum Christum.*"²

SYLVESTER MALONE.

PHASES OF THE DIOCESAN SYNOD.

Ferraris—"Bibliotheca Canonica, etc."

Moroni—"Dizionario di Erudizione Ecclesiastica."

Soglia—"Jus Canonicum." Laureti, 1853.

Craisson—"Jus Canonicum." Paris, 1879.

Smith—"Ecclesiastical Law." New York, 1875, *seqq.*

"Pontificale Romanum—Ordo ad Synodum."

"Concilia Plenaria Baltimorensia, II. et III." Baltimore.

ONE of the chief theological works is that of Lambertini (Benedict XIV.), *De Synodo Diocesana*. The subject, therefore, should be interesting, if only from the fact of so great a writer having devoted so much attention and labour to it. Moreover, we believe that your readers in the United States and Australia will be pleased with having some facts and opinions on the subject set before them, for in the former of the two last-mentioned countries at least Diocesan Synods not unfrequently take place.

A Diocesan Council or Synod is a meeting of the clergy of a diocese over which its Bishop presides. As for its

¹ Some give 9 as the number of persons who accompanied St. Patrick, while others variously give 20, 22, and 24.

² In lucht do uechurap la pacrucc rleib narpchin *Leabar Breac* p. 23, penult, line.

definition, Benedict XIV. (*De Syn.* l. 1, c. 1, n. 4), thus writes: "Ad definitionem quod attinet non *incongrue*. . . . Synodus Dioecæsana hisce fere verbis describitur: Legitima congregatio ab episcopo coacta ex presbyteris et clericis suae dioecesis aliisque qui ad eam accedere tenentur, in qua de his quae curae pastoralis incumbunt agendum et *deliberandum* est." Here we may perceive at once the truth of what Bellarmine says (*De Conc.* c. 4), that "diocesan synods can hardly be called councils, as there is no one that has jurisdiction there, excepting only the Bishop." Still the law gives the chapter, not the clergy in general, what is equivalent to a decisive vote in certain cases, as the Bishop for instance cannot alienate Church property nor erect new parishes without their consent; moreover, legitimate custom in some places makes it necessary to have the chapter's consent to synodical statutes (v. Craisson, *Elementa Jur. Can.*, n. 414). But as that law is by no means universally binding (as, for example, where there are no chapters, nor perhaps even legally appointed consultors); and as scarce any custom of such moment is legitimately prescribed in our recently established hierarchies; and as, besides, the Bishop is not bound to ask even the opinion of his clergy in general as to his enactments, it is apparent why Benedict XIV. rather describes than defines a diocesan synod, and why Bellarmine says it is hardly deserving of the name of a council.

The synod is therefore, *strictly speaking*, and in the rigour of law, merely an assemblage of the clergy, convened *freely*, or of *obligation*, by the Bishop, for the solemn enactment of such laws as he wishes to make, or as have been made by plenary or provincial councils. We say *freely*, because these meetings can be called more than once a year, if the Ordinary wishes, and although the law of the Council of Trent (Sess. xxiv. cap. 2), ordering them to be held annually, has not been repealed, yet, as we shall see, it has very generally fallen into desuetude; we say of *obligation*, because the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore (no. 67) commands them to be held after, and for the promulgation of the statutes of plenary and provincial councils. We say *now*, *strictly speaking*, and *in the rigour of law*, because synods were

not always what they are thus described as being, but bore some analogy to what are properly called legislative assemblies, in some of the enactments or at least appointments of which the clergy had not only a consultative, but a decisive vote; and that the Church still wishes them to have this weight, seems evident from the fact that the legislation of Trent on the subject, how much so ever modified in practice, on account of unavoidable circumstances, is still unrepealed, while the description of a synod given by Benedict XIV. as a "congregatio . . . in qua deliberandum est," necessarily supposes that the clergy share in the bishop's deliberations. Above all, the formula of the Pontificale Romanum, whereby each member is invited to state "openly before all, and without any scruple as to being guilty of disturbance, whatever may displease him in what is said or done," is still suggested to be read to the clergy by the bishop; nay, on the second day, before the reading of the statutes, the clergy are to be again admonished to "bring forward without hesitation whatever they may know deserving of correction," after which, "leguntur constitutiones, per synodum approbandae, quibus lectis, habito scrutinio, quae placent per patres confirmantur." (Pontif. Rom. *Ordo ad Synodum*.)

The *placet* here referred to is declared by Sarnelli (quoted by Moroni, *Sinodo*) to be merely ceremonial, and may be only an expression of obedience, or, perhaps, implies that a wise bishop will be careful to make only such laws as will be acceptable to the body of his clergy. Absolutely speaking, according to Nardi (*Dei Parrochi*, ap. Moroni, l.c.), the Bishop is free to put any measure to a formal vote either secret or open, yet he can always say, if the proposed law is rejected: *Si non placet vobis, placet nobis*. But, as the Archbishop of Paris said at the opening of his synod in 1849, "the authority of bishops rests on the union of hearts, on a holy unity of thought and sentiment which secures to him love and respect."

But to come to the phases of the synod:—

Synods are of natural origin, that is they grew out of the very nature of man. For the bishop recognized that while

the power resided in him, the knowledge of pastoral work and of the needs of the people lay as much or more in those of the clergy who were engaged in the ordinary offices of the ministry; hence he naturally sought their approval for his proposed legislation.

“Natura et ratione ipsa ducimur,” says St. Charles Borromeo (*Acta Eccles. Mediol. in Conc. Balt. II. no. 62*), “ut in gravioribus rebus deliberandis, aliorum consilia exquiramus; vel quod cautior deliberatio est, si ad nostrum iudicium multorum sententia accesserit, vel quia apud illos quibus consulere maxime cupimus, majorem auctoritatem et pondus habet consultatio in quam plures consenserint.”

Besides this the synod was a joint visitation of his diocese, which made the clergy know and recognize each other as a body, and know and be known by their Bishop who is supposed to have visited them and their parishes severally, and now declares to them all the general needs and the remedies he would prescribe.

“Generalis quaedam visitatio Synodus; alias enim per annum particulares quasdam ecclesias duntaxat visitamus, hic vero generatim sacerdotes omnes et clericos, atque in ipsis suo etiam modo populos eis commissos.” (*S. Car. Borrom. Syn. xi.*) Nay, even it was a visitation in a similar manner for each pastor, who there sees his brethren one and all, and hears their experience, views and practice of their common calling.

Moreover, it is extremely important that laws like law-givers be acceptable to those concerned: hence just as in the early ages the bishop, even the Pope, was chosen with the expressed approbation of the people, it is but reasonable that the laws for the people's government should be enacted with the approval of those at least who represent them in spiritual relations.

The first diocesan synod, however, whose acts were published, seems to be that of Siricius, Bishop of Rome, who, writing to various bishops against Jovinian in 389, says that the heresiarch was condemned by himself and the entire clergy of Rome “assembled *before him.*” (*Bened. XIV. l. 1, c. 1, no. 6.*) These last words appear to imply that

status in the assemblage which the second order of the clergy hold in a diocesan synod.

In ancient times, before seminaries were properly conducted, or when and where the due training of the clergy was neglected, the priests had to come to the synod with their sacred vestments and utensils, to practise the ceremonies of the Mass and Sacraments. They also had to bring parchment and writing instruments to take down the bishops' regulations, and moreover three days' rations (Moroni, *Sinodo*), as well as, we presume, a portable bed such as is mentioned in the Scriptures, or at least a blanket or a cloak to serve its purpose. Dr. Smith in *Brownson's Review*, July, 1875, is our guide to much of what we shall set down relating to this subject, and we have to refer in a general way to an article which he has followed up by several erudite and approved works on Canon Law. He quotes from Phillips (*Jus. Can. vol. vii.*) an *Ordo Synodi* of the ninth century: (1) The bishop cordially saluted all the clergy assembled in synod. (2) Then followed a homily or brief instruction, after which a sermon was preached on the dignity and responsibilities of the priesthood. In fact the synod was daily begun with a sermon or instruction. (3) It was not to last over fourteen days. (4) On the first day examiners were appointed. The bishop then investigated charges against priests, and proceeded judicially in all cases coming before him. (5) Accusations against laics were also examined into and determined upon. (6) Pastors finally were bound to render an account of the administration of their parishes, of the condition of sacred vessels, vestments, etc. These synods were preceded by preparatory ones held by the archpriests or rural deans, each in his own district. Indeed the latter were held in places, monthly, while the episcopal council was, after a time, convened only once in six months; and then by decree of the Fourth Lateran, made doubtless because they were being neglected, diocesan synods were summoned once a year—a law re-enacted by the Council of Trent, and still "on the books."

Another *Ordo Synodalis* of the 10th century runs as follows: (1) The Synod should continue four days. It was daily opened

by mass, at which the laity could assist, but after which only specially invited laymen could remain. (2) After the reading of the Gospel, "cum sero esset die illo una sabbatorum et fores essent clausae," the bishop *requested the clergy to bring forward any complaints* they wished to make. The discussion of diocesan affairs then began. (3) Complaints on the part of laymen were also admitted and determined upon, and adjudicated by the synod. (4) During this period laymen were allowed to attend diocesan synods, nay, in some instances were obliged to do so. This was owing to the fact that bishops were not unfrequently possessed of vast temporal domains, and were princes of the realm.

The scope of synods at this time seems to have been to foster theological learning amongst the clergy, and preserve true faith amongst the laity. Hence errors were refuted and condemned in them. They also made regulations with regard to the proper and conscientious administration of ecclesiastical property, and the erection of monasteries. The earliest collection of synodal statutes we possess are those of Toulon (A.D. 1192), and Utrecht (A.D. 1209), while the expression "synodus diocesana" does not occur before A.D. 1290.

The decree of the Fourth Lateran commanding bishops to hold annual synods sub poena suspensionis (can. 6, cap. *Sicut olim*), was carried into effect with the natural, and most desirable results, but its observance was gradually neglected and the effect of this was that "widespread ignorance and immorality which was prevalent among priests and people at the outbreak of the Reformation." These words of Dr. Smith are confirmed by those of Carracciolo (Life of Paul IV.) wherein he declares the object of the Theatines to have been "clericis quos ingenti populorum exitio improbitas inscitiaeque corrupissent clericos alios sufficere" etc. Hence the Council of Trent renewed the Lateran decree *De Synodis Dioecesanis*, and its law being carried out they flourished for a time after the close of the Tridentine Council as we see conspicuously illustrated in the episcopate of St. Charles Borromeo, Archbishop of Milan, perhaps the chief model of bishops in modern times. But in the course

of time the synods again lapsed into desuetude, and not even the erudition and eloquence of the learned and exemplary Archbishop of Bologna (afterwards Benedict XIV.) could revive them. Nay even provincial councils seem to have shared the same fate. We have authority for stating that the Bishops of the Neapolitan province have not met in such a manner for six hundred years, the command of Lateran and Trent notwithstanding.

The tyranny of the Sacristan-Kings of Europe has doubtless had a good deal to do with these facts as the governments are so much afraid not only of the bishops, but of the people, that even to-day we believe in Republican (!) France, twenty men cannot assemble for any purpose without a permit from the police. Even the bishops too perhaps feared that the example of Ricci's Synod of Pistoja might have infected the clergy, and the parliamentary spirit aroused in '89 might attempt to control the Supreme Legislative power of the ordinary. At any rate diocesan synods in many countries of Europe are things of the past, and it belongs chiefly to our free and fresh Catholicity, in a country ruled from, and for, and by the people, to revive the genuine, proper, and legal manner of Church Government.

The first diocesan synod in the United States was held in Baltimore, beginning November 7th, 1791, at ten o'clock, A.M. The priests having vested in surplices and the Bishop in rochet, amice, alb, cincture, stole, cope and precious mitre, went in procession to the Cathedral, where a sermon was delivered by the bishop, after which all the members made the profession of faith, and two Promoters and a Secretary were appointed. The synod then adjourned to three in the afternoon of the same day. Statutes were passed as to the conditional baptism of converts, on baptismal registers, and on not confirming children before the age of reason.

The third session on the 8th took up the Sacrament of the Eucharist; treated of the first Communion of children, and enacted that they should not be allowed to receive the Blessed Sacrament immediately on reaching the use of

reason, but only when they attained to a more perfect use of the same. Statutes were also made with regard to decency of ceremonial, ecclesiastical dress, collections and trustees.

In the fourth session, November 9th, the fathers considered the Sacrament of Penance, and all were reminded of the necessity of approbation for priests; the Sacraments of Extreme Unction and Matrimony were also treated of, and mixed marriages subjected to proper guarantees.

In the last session, on the 10th of November, regulations were adopted as to holydays, manual labour being tolerated in certain cases on holydays not falling on a Sunday, and decrees were passed in regard to the offices, the life of the clergy, their maintenance and burial. (Conc. Prov. Balt. opus editum Baltimorae an. 1842.)

Many synods have since been held in the United States but on account of the *magnum incommodum* or *peculiarium rerum adjuncta* alluded to by the second Plenary Council of Baltimore (No. 67) the law of Trent has not been observed; New York, for instance, holding only five since its organization as a diocese.

The first step in the holding of a synod is the decree of the bishop convoking it. By order of the third Plenary Council of Baltimore, 1884 (No. 20), the advice of the consultors must be taken for this step, and the document ordering the synod should contain the place, time and matter for discussion (Phillips, vol. vii., quoted by Smith); this last clause, however, would appear to be only of *decentia* in the United States, because the bishop is only bound by *decentia* to ask the opinion of the members of the synod about his laws (Conc. Plen. Balt. ii., n. 66). The indiction should be made a reasonable time in advance, say one or two months, according to Ferraris (Conc. Epis., No. 103), doubtless in order that the members may discuss the proposed legislation and make up their minds what to advise the ordinary, as well as that all may pray for divine aid in advance. The powers of the clergy, although restricted in some respects, as we shall see and have seen, have been enlarged in others. For example, the bishop must now in

the United States ask his consultors' advice about convoking a synod; whereas formerly he was not bound to take counsel for this even with his chapter (Ferraris, loc. cit. no. 17). Likewise in former times he was obliged to ask the advice of his chapter before publishing his statutes, though not bound to follow it; yet two months had to elapse before the laws were in force, in order that those who felt themselves aggrieved might appeal to the bishop or to the Holy See (*Ibid.* No. 44); whereas now in the United States, such limitation in time seems not to be recognized.

When the synod is held according to the general prescriptions of the sacred canons, the following is the practice more or less exactly referred to.

After the *indiction* (*sit venia verbo!*), the Bishop invites some of his wisest and most learned priests to aid him in preparing his statutes, and a Secretary to record their views. In this preliminary congregation the officers, whose appointment lies with the bishop alone, are designated; these are: the SECRETARIUS; the LECTOR, who besides reading the roll, decrees, etc., helps the Secretary generally; the PROMOTERS, who take the initiative in the discussions, and ask the members what their various opinions are (Gavantus, *Praxis Exacta Syn. Dioec.* cap. iv.); the NOTARIUS, who formally attests the acts at the end of each session; the PROCURATOR CLERI, who advances the arguments and objections of the clergy against what they deem objectionable; the PRAEFECTI SYNODALIS DISCIPLINAE, who have charge of the seating arrangements, etc.; the JUDICES EXCUSATIONUM, who adjudicate on excuses of absentees; the CONFESSARI CLERI; PRAEDICATORES; CAEREMONIARI; OSTIARI. All these officials should be elected by the preparatory committee, or else by the clergy in general, though the bishop has the chief vote of course (Gavantus, *Bened.* xiv., op. cit. lib. x., cap. 1).

There are besides other officers to be elected or appointed in the synod itself, called OFFICIALES CLERI. The chief among these are the JUDICES SYNODALES, whose office is so important as showing the desire of the Church to guard liberty under the aegis of law, that we quote the decree of

Trent establishing and describing their duties (Sess. xxv., chap. 10, De Ref.) :

“Whereas by reason of wicked intrigue and remoteness of places a proper knowledge of persons appointed to judge cases in their own parts cannot be had . . . the holy synod ordains that in each provincial or diocesan synod there shall be designated some persons (whose names must be sent to the Apostolic See), having the endowments noted by Boniface VII. (Const. *Statutum*), in order that, besides the ordinaries, to them also may be referred ecclesiastical and spiritual cases occurring in their districts, referred, that is, by any legate or nuncio or by the Apostolic See. If one of these (four or more) should die, let the bishop, with his chapter's advice, substitute another to hold till the next synod,” etc.

Here we see a tribunal of Papal delegates to judge appeals from the ordinary, and whose sentence is reversible by the Holy See alone. They are totally different from our *Judices Causarum*, who are only associated with the bishop, and hold from him and are now superseded where the *Curia Episcopalis* of the third Plenary Council of Baltimore is organized. At present in the United States those Tridentine judges are not ordered to be designated in the synod nor out of it, but we perceive at once from the decree of Trent on the subject the consideration with which the Church regards the second order of the clergy. And this is still the general law of the Church.

Here we behold the bishop obliged to appoint four of his own subjects, in order that if appeal be made, even against his laws (Bened. XIV., lib. iv., c. 5) the Holy See may delegate its powers to them to decide the case. Every one sees how careful this must make the ordinary, how little it matters after all that the clergy have not a decisive vote in the synod, and how the rights of the subjects are guarded, all the while that the monarchical prerogative of the ruler is preserved, the strongest obstacles being still opposed to arbitrary exercise of power.

Passing over the *Testes Synodales*, whose business it was to report abuses, &c., we come to the *Synodal Examiners*; whose place it was to examine candidates for parishes, and out of the number approved by them the bishop chose the new incumbent. These Examiners were to be “proposed

by the bishop, and should be such as to satisfy the synod and be approved by it, and all conferring of parishes made except in this way was null and void" (Trid. Sess. xxiv., ch. 18, de Ref. See also 3rd Plen. Council. Balt. No. 23). Until the canonical erection of parishes in the United States examiners preside over the concursus for the "irremovable missions," and by permission of the Holy See, the bishop may appoint them out of the synod, but with his Consultors' advice (3rd Plen. Council. Balt., No. 24); nevertheless as their office may be extended to include examination for sacred orders, and for hearing confessions, &c., the Second Plenary Council, No. 76, advised that they be named in diocesan synods or meetings of the clergy. According to the Instructio of June 25th, 1878, the *Judices Causarum* are as far as possible to be chosen by the bishop in the synod "*audito consilio clericorum.*" (*Vide Responsio Conc. Plen. Balt. III., p. 296*), but according to the general law of the Church, such judges are chosen by the Chapter alone.

The diocesan synod has reference to the pastoral charge and care of souls, that is, parochial and missionary duties, and preservation of discipline amongst the clergy. Great care is to be taken, however, lest bishops make any statute opposed to more recent enactments which relax the rigour of the universal law, or against the peculiar and old usages of the diocese and country, even when these customs, if legitimately prescribed, run counter to the general discipline of the Church (*Bened. XIV. De. Syn. l. xi.; Gavantus, Praxis Exacta, p. 1, cap. vi.*), else the justness of his legislation may be impugned.

It is not necessary that we should use any space to describe the manner of conducting the diocesan synod at the present day. It may be read in the "*Pontificale Romanum*" as well as in the Baltimore "*Ceremonial.*" All that we wish to note is, that the words suggested by the Pontifical to the bishop when opening the proceedings, and already quoted by us, very clearly invite every one of the clergy to give his opinion freely and fearlessly on the proposed legislation; that the Pontifical and the

Ceremonial direct that the votes of the clergy, albeit only consultative, be taken on the measures proposed, and that while the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore does not appear to consider this last rubric obligatory, nevertheless it declares that "it is becoming (*decet*) that the bishop before enacting his constitutions ask the opinion of all the members of the synod, and patiently listen to it and carefully take it into consideration, so that what is done with the consent of all may have stronger sanction and be more easily and efficaciously executed." (No. 66.)

"*Decet*" is a very strong expression, and stronger according to the dignity of the one of whom the *decentia* is predicated. Scotus proved the Immaculate Conception with this single word: "Potuit; decuit; ergo fecit." Now the episcopate is a "*dignitas splendidissima*" (Third Plen. Coun., No. 12); hence our conclusion.

"Respectful freedom of speech is very desirable," as Phillips, quoted by Dr. Smith, maintains and supports by the identical argument just quoted from the Council: "When synods sink into mere publications of episcopal statutes, they become" (just like theological conferences similarly conducted) "irksome to the clergy and lose their hold on these;" and it was for this reason in fact that they went out of use in Europe. Although it must never be forgotten that the bishop is the sole legislator, yet it is clearly the will of the Church that he should propose his laws in synod, and it is clearly her mind that the clergy should have a full, fair and free opportunity to discuss those laws before they are enacted.

In some places the officer or officers called *Procuratores cleri* receive and report to the bishop the objections or opinions of the clergy, which must be handed in to them in writing, and this method at least, which would seem to suppose that the subjects for deliberation were made known in advance, is required by the nature itself of any council whatsoever; but in Baltimore the bishop retires after the opening religious services and forms of the *Praxis Synodalis*, and leaves the clergy to discuss his proposed legislation freely, paragraph by paragraph, with the synodic officers,

and the exceptions, if any, are taken down by the secretaries and by these referred to the ordinary.

We would further call attention to the fact that as the numbers, tone, and education of the clergy in the United States improve, the Church recognizes their right to a larger share in the administration, and their privileges are more and more extended. Witness the advance made between the Council of 1852 and that of 1866; between the latter and that of 1884. One point of legislation in particular, that of "Synodical Examiners" (Third Plen. Coun., No. 23) though now established, seemed so remote to the Fathers of 1866, that they thought it could scarcely ever be realized in our country (Second Plen. Coun., No. 126).

Finally let us conclude with the Fathers of 1884 (Third Plen. Coun., No. 17): "Verily so many and so great are the burdens and cares of the pastoral ministry, that bishops by themselves alone are scarcely equal to the administration of their dioceses. Hence it were very much to be desired that in these regions also those most wise canonical provisions regarding Cathedral Chapters could be at once carried out in practice." This cannot be done at present as they declare. When it is possible, however, doubtless the Diocesan Synod will again assume the full canonical form, and be conducted according to the regulations of the Council of Trent; the Church in the United States will cease to be governed by temporary, tentative legislation, and the Common Ecclesiastical Law will prevail throughout the land.

EDWARD M'SWEENEY.

PROSELYTISM IN WEST CLARE: A RETROSPECT.

THE *Freeman's Journal* has lately laid bare the inner workings of the Bird's Nest system in Dublin. It is a pitiful story—displaying on the one side the Magpie instinct which under the specious guise of Christian zeal watches for and pounces on the weak and wounded; and on the other the depth of moral degradation implied in the sale of their poor

innocent children to heresy by Catholic parents. While reading those sketches it occurred to me again and again, that other episodes of the same unholy war against the faith of the Irish poor are well worth recording. The West and South of Ireland must be full of them. Wherever wide-spread poverty prevailed from time to time, there was the field for operation, and it cannot but be both useful and interesting to note the methods and, thank God, the miserable failure also, of a system which leans for its support mostly on the purses and the bigotry of rich English dupes. With one of these I became thoroughly acquainted during the eight years of my missionary life in the parish of Carrigaholt. Many still remember something of the story of "The Ark." Far the greater number of the readers of the RECORD have either forgotten it or never heard it. I purpose reviewing in the following pages, the principal events that led up to, and made of "The Little Ark," as it is still affectionately called, another clear living proof of the truth that "the weak things of the world hath God raised up to confound the strong."

The parishes of Moyarta and Kilballyowen, now separate, were up to 1878 united and called, after the central and principal village, the parish of Carrigaholt. It is a peninsula twenty miles long and about two miles on the average wide, with the "lordly Shannon rolling like a sea" on the one side and the restless Atlantic beating incessantly against its iron-bound cliffs on the other. It is part of the immense property forfeited by Lord Clare in his stubborn but unsuccessful support of the Stuart dynasty. His castle still stands almost untouched by the hand of time, looking down proudly over the bay of Carrigaholt and the broad river. Around it, as tradition tells—where now, owing to the incessant tidal encroachment only rocks growing sea-weed stare you at low water—stretched the fair strand on which "Clare's Dragoons" were wont to go through their military exercises. Such a favoured locality could not but be, as it really is—rich in legend and story. Almost in our own times, Lever and Griffin have made it the scene of some of their most successful novels, and better still, Eugene O'Curry drank in there from his earliest youth that love of Irish literature, which was his inspiration in

the noble and successful task of rescuing from oblivion Erin's ancient historic records. The people speak with reverence of the fact, that in their parish St. Senan made the immediate preparation for entering on his reward. On his return from one of his periodical visits through the district, he took ill and received the last sacraments in the convent the ruins of which, like those of his own temples in Iniscathá (Scattery), still exist and retain the ancient title, Kyll-na-Giallach or Church of the Nuns. The memories of the past combine with the ever-present majesty of nature to give to the minds of those brought up there a tone and a vigour, that fits them for any struggle undertaken in defence of Faith or Fatherland.

Before the great famine the parish had a population of over 12,000, almost exclusively Catholic. In 1849 it had dwindled down to less than 8,000. More than a third of the people had been sacrificed within four years to misrule and mismanagement. In that terrible year the Parish Priest of Kilrush and Vicar General of the diocese of Killaloe, was shocked to learn, that the three priests in Carrigaholt were down with cholera and the whole flock literally left without a pastor. Though much over-worked—for Kilrush with its group of workhouses, ranked next to Skibbereen in those evil days—Father Kelly proceeded at once, taking with him Father Meehan, one of his curates, to the relief of priests and people. He told me that after crossing the ferry they had to begin visiting from house to house people sick of cholera and famine fever, till before the night fell they had administered the last sacraments to no less than about forty of the poor sufferers. In the account brought to him of the condition of the priests, there was no exaggeration. All three were lying ill, and poor Father Duggan the parish priest, whose almost super-human energy during the famine, was the admiration of all in West Clare, after a short struggle of only a few days against a violent attack of cholera, went to his reward. The people told me, that on the Sunday on which he took the sickness, he had to say Mass in the chapel of Dunaha, and before his return home, was called to, and attended, eighteen cases of cholera and fever. The shedding of blood for the

Faith does indeed give a distinctive character, a never-failing aureola, to martyrdom. Only that was wanting to the sacrifice of their lives made by Father Duggan and many other Irish priests, in those awful years when they nobly sacrificed their lives, martyrs to duty.

The occasion brooked of no delay and so the bishop, Dr. Vaughan, in a few days after, gave Father Michael Meehan who had anointed Father Duggan, charge of the stricken flock. There was, I firmly believe, a Providence directing the appointment. A man of more than ordinary ability, energy and perseverance, was required for an impending struggle, of which neither priest nor people suspected anything then, and just such a one did God vouchsafe the parish in its new pastor. When I mention the fact, that during his college career in Maynooth, he won high premiums in all his classes, competing not unsuccessfully in some of them, with no less a rival than Dr. Murray the late professor of Theology, I have said all I need say of his ability; and before this paper is concluded, if the reader takes the trouble to run through it, proof sufficient will have been afforded, I think, of his energy and perseverance, and priestly zeal.

At the time of Father Duggan's death, there was but one National School, that of Carrigaholt, in the whole parish of twenty miles in length. Such schools were few and far between, especially in remote localities so far back as 1849. Private schools, mostly night-schools, did the work, and from a religious point of view, did the work admirably, of educating the young. Between the village of Cross and Loophead a distance of about ten English miles, there was neither a fixed school nor a chapel. All the tenants there were tenants-at-will, completely at the mercy of landlord or agent, and in that year of "black '49" the crowbar, as well as the famine, had done its fearful work among them. It is easy to conceive how public spirit—hope itself, must have almost died out there, and then it was, that what I am, I think justified in calling an inhuman, as well as an unscrupulous effort, was begun and persevered in for years, to bribe or terrify the disheartened people into an outward, mere hypocritical, profession of Protestantism. The guiding spirit

in this attack, was a local little despot, who lived near Ennis. He was agent to two absentee landlords of great territorial influence, and he availed himself of his position in the carrying out of his designs to a degree, that made him be regarded by the tenantry almost as the Czar is by his subjects. His will was fate. He was said to be the inventor, he certainly made use of, a grappling-iron machine, for the more expeditious tearing down of thatched roofs. He had married a daughter of the landlord, owning most of the property from Cross to Loophead, as well as other properties in the same, and other parishes in Clare. The landlord, it seems, shared in the proselytizing spirit of his son-in-law and agent, and between them, it was deemed the fitting opportunity to commence the work, before the new parish priest could win for himself the affection and firm hold of his flock, which his predecessor secured and enjoyed. The first move made was to all appearance not only harmless, but of a most benevolent nature. The landlord and agent undertook to provide schools and teachers and educate the children of the tenants, free of all cost. Could kind-hearted agent or landlord go farther? There was to be no interference, *not the slightest*, with the religious instincts of the children within the schools. To make sure of this, so as not to leave room for the remotest suspicion, although the teachers appointed happened to be Protestants, with one—for the time being—nominal exception, the parish priest, or some priest deputed by him, was allowed to bring out the children who cared for it—they were not to be coerced—and impart to them *outside* the schools religious instruction at a fixed hour on a fixed day of each week of the whole year. The parents who would not send their children for instruction on such favourable conditions were to be, and *were actually*, regarded as unmanageable and refractory, and worthy of tight and strict handling in all the ways known to landlords and agents, when their will was law; and the priest who would not arrange, amid all his other duties, to be there at those schools at that fixed hour in each week, afforded clear evidence that, in his educated intelligence, Catholic teaching was not worth the trouble of a ride or a drive of a few paltry

miles. So if the rising generation who were to be more enlightened than their forefathers through the generosity of their landlord, did not receive thorough Catholic teaching not he but their own regularly appointed pastor was to blame! The bait took. It was skilfully arranged and cleverly thrown out, and for a time, in the first excitement of a new sensation, was eagerly gobbled at. Three schools, one at Dunaha, another at Kilballyowen, and the third at Kiltrelig, the most western and the most vulnerable point, because farthest away from any of the parish chapels, were in an almost incredibly short space of time set in full swing. The children, however, going to the schools soon began to open, literally, the eyes of their benighted parents. They told them things they never heard before of confession, though they were so familiar with it; of the idolatry of the Blessed Eucharist; but above all of the wickedness implied in paying special devotion to the Virgin Mother of God. It came to be known that in one at least of those schools, that as far as I can remember taught by the nominal Catholic, a picture of the Blessed Virgin was passed along from desk to desk *to be spat upon* by each of the children as a final parting with the old superstition. One of the curates, Fr. M'Mahon, the present parish priest of Kilmihil, going to this same school at the appointed day and hour to teach the Catechism, found the poor children as if glued to their seats and with carefully averted eyes and closed ears. The eye of the master was on them. They had been evidently warned that it was not advisable for them to go out under the elements at the bidding of anyone, especially of anyone claiming authority as a Priest of Rome. The time had now come for dropping the mask. There was no longer any need of disguise. The schools were established, and the children were frequenting them. There was hardly one in the miserably-impooverished district who had not something to hope for or fear from the evangelical agent, so opposition to his project seemed almost vain, especially when the full scheme disclosed itself by the presence in the locality of a couple of parsons, a staff of Scripture-readers, the building of a Protestant church, and crowning all, the appointment of

the agent's brother at a good round salary as local manager and manipulator in the interests of the Irish Church Missions Society. His special duties were to go about among the tenants and labourers, offering the starving poor little patches of potatoe land and remunerative employment on condition of keeping their children in the schools and going with them to the Protestant Church to receive enlightenment on the absurdities of Catholic dogmatic teaching. Those who were not in dire want, and who could not, therefore, be induced to go so far were to be coaxed through the respect they owed the "Masther," to accept a religious edifying tract, even a Douay Bible—anything from him. He could then put their names down on his list, as in a sense converts, for were they not willingly opening their eyes at last to the blessed truth! The most glowing accounts of the success of the mission were forwarded to the Society, and money flowed steadily into the pockets of such deserving officials.

Such was the state of things that stared Fr. Meehan in the face at the very outset of his career as Parish Priest. No wonder that he was struck with consternation at the sight of his poor parishioners, made the victims of such base unchristian traffic. His first effort, aided by his curates, was to rescue the children. Theirs was the greatest danger. He could count with some confidence on the return to the fold of those who had been instructed, no matter how imperfectly. "Good-bye, God Almighty, till the potatoes grow well again," was the cry of one of the starving creatures, and the principle upon which they all, or nearly all, acted. But if the children's minds were poisoned from early youth in all probability they were lost for ever. "Save the child," became the end to which all his efforts, all his energies, were directed. But how? That was the difficulty that threw him almost into despair. He had neither school nor chapel in the neighbourhood of the bulk of those who had fallen or were falling away, nor any chance of securing either, as the whole place was in the hands of the proselytizers. His appeals, his admonitions, could only reach them as echoes from the distance, if they reached at all. In this extremity he bethought him of giving Holy Mass and instruction to the

people every Sunday and Holiday in the house of some independent farmer. There at least he could work directly on the community, among whom the poor renegades lived. This went on for some time and with good effect, until it was brought home to the farmer who lent his house that he was a marked man. Then a chance offered of which Fr. Meehan gladly availed. Two labourers, whose cabins were adjoining, were about to emigrate. He negotiated with them, gave them some money, got possession from them, threw down the wall separating the poor little cottages, built up with it an altar at one end, and lo! St. Patrick's Church, with its coat of new thatch became a living present reality in the very thick of the fight. It was hoped that shame would deter the landlord and agent from interfering with a structure so insignificant beside the handsome Gothic Protestant edifice literally looking down on its upstart rival with the high-sounding title. But little, even then, did priest or people know of the men they had to deal with if they thought so. As soon as ever the law could be put in motion Fr. Meehan was ignominiously evicted out of St. Patrick's Church. When the day for taking forcible possession arrived, even the "souters" as they were then beginning to be called, could not be induced to touch the rude stone altar. It was the agent's own hands, I was assured, that wielded the crow-bar in rooting it out of its place. Where those hands are now, not all the police intelligence, nor the rewards offered can discover. His remains were stolen from the vault in which they were placed a few years ago. I abominate the barbarous act. I only mention it as a public well-known occurrence to which people have attached some significance. That eviction looked like the final crushing blow to the hope entertained by priests and people of a successful struggle against the evangelical invasion. The bulk of the people, indeed, stood firm to the Old Faith. They were not a whit less zealous in the good cause than their priests. Scripture-readers came in occasionally for hard knocks which they provoked and profited by as showing how they suffered for the faith that was in them. But all to no purpose. The demoralizing influences were there securely lodged, and no one could

tell how far or how deeply they might spread. Every day Fr. Meehan trudged about from house to house, encouraging the timid, supplying as far as his means would permit the wants of those who were in the greatest temptation, and using all possible persuasion on the parents who would listen to him, to withdraw the children from the schools. "Kill, boil, eat them if you have to do it," he said once in bold metaphor, "that will be but destroying their bodies, but don't sell their immortal souls." All this time those who most needed his council obstinately shut their houses and closed their ears against his appeals. The great want he felt, was in having no place in which he could gather the well-disposed together and offer for them, in their presence, the Holy Sacrifice, and nourish in them a strong Catholic zeal, which might make, with God's help, its influence felt on their weak and fallen brethren. He was ever thinking, how he could overcome this apparently insurmountable difficulty. At last in the moment of his greatest gloom, a light broke in on him. Could he not build a movable timber structure large enough to shelter him while offering the Holy Mass, and which could be fixed in some nook on the shore, from which neither landlord nor agent could again evict him, and round which the faithful people would be sure to come in spite of wind or weather? He seized on the idea, worked it out, built the little wooden shed, placed it on wheels so as that it could be easily moved about as the weather, or the convenience of the people might require, put windows in the sides, so that the congregation kneeling round might see the Altar, and fixing the Cross over this novel house of Divine Worship called it, in what proved to be a prophetic spirit, "The Ark." It did, indeed, become an ark of salvation to the sorely-trying and harassed people, a veritable "tower of strength against the face of the enemy." Here was literally the turning of the tide. Priests and people driven not merely to the wall, but to the ocean, fixed the Ark on its shore and gathering round it, turned to face resolutely the persevering and insidious attack on the Faith of their Fathers. An attempt made to have it removed, as an illegal obstruction to the highway, failed; and there on the wild sea-coast, in all weathers

the people knelt under the canopy of Heaven, on the Sundays and Holidays of the next five years, their eyes fixed on the little wooden Temple of God, where the great Sacrifice was being offered, and their hearts glowing with the enthusiasm born of such a novel method of Divine Worship. A stranger looking on the scene, used afterwards to declare, that he knew little of the fervour of Irish Catholic faith, till he heard from that kneeling crowd with heads reverently bent at the moment of consecration, the suppressed murmur, wrestling with the beating of the sea on the shore, "Cead mile failthe, a Thierna," "a hundred thousand welcomes, O Lord." Not to weary the reader, it will be enough to add, though many interesting incidents ensued, that the poor unhappy perverts one by one began to exhibit signs of repentance. The children were by degrees withdrawn from the three Protestant schools, leaving them empty monuments by the roadside, of the utter defeat of landlord and Kildare-street proselytism. Only a few who had bound themselves hand and foot to the agent and his family, continued to frequent the Protestant place of worship. The greater number of those, who had committed themselves deeply, could not bring themselves, through shame of their apostasy, to join the congregation at the Ark. They left the country as quickly as they could, but in every instance, came, before leaving, to the priests, seeking re-admission to the Catholic Church, and a written acknowledgement to show their friends over the water, that they had renounced the detestable name of "souper." I remember well the joy manifested in the countenances of some of these for whom I performed the pleasing office.

After years of silent struggle, the world around began at last to know something of its peculiar hardships. Dr. Cahill, happening to come to Kilkee on his holidays, visited the scene, and immediately the *Catholic Telegraph* published his indignant protests. Public opinion in England and Ireland, honourable Protestants even joining in the outcry, was so aroused that the very landlord and agent, who led the attack were forced to grant a site for a Catholic Church. Subscriptions poured in, and a handsome Gothic structure now takes the place of the Ark. It still stands however,

cherished by the people upon whom it brought under God's grace such great blessings. Chips of it are all over the world, carried away by the Exiles of Erin, as mementos of the fight for the Faith, while Father Meehan has passed away to the reward of a life spent nobly and zealously in the service of God and His people. His mortal remains lie near the Ark in the Church, which is his most befitting monument, and amid a people who owe it to his energy, under God, that what seemed a curse proved a lasting blessing.

P. WHITE, P.P.

DR. MIVART'S DEFENCE OF THEISM.

THESIS II.—(CONTINUED).

“There is and always must have been, underneath, behind, and distinct from matter, an agent which is ever working in and through matter, and which created it, if it ever was created.”

PROPOSITION II.

“Our intellect forces us to acknowledge that certain judgments are necessarily true; but if there were nothing but matter, there could be no truth necessary.”

LET me repeat briefly what has been the drift of the previous papers.

I have endeavoured to establish two Theses:—first, that there was always something; second, that there must have been always something other than mechanical force. This second point has been proved from the fact that forces are ever being produced from and reduced to nothing. Chemical changes go on unceasingly; life began, species were evolved, until at last arose the man; what are these but new forces? Even the individual is a new force, comes into being to last its time, and then, as a rule, to lapse into nothing. Can matter create or annihilate?

For most of the argument in the preceding papers Dr. Mivart is not responsible; hence the paucity of quotations. He supplies however, a far-reaching principle,—that matter cannot create, and that without creation evolution is impossible. Vital energy is different in kind from mechanical force; intellect

and will are different in kind from sense. The higher forms of force could no more result from the lower than gold can be got from silver or silver from copper. This I take to be the central stronghold of Dr. Mivart's position.

He does not refer, except very incidentally,¹ to changes in inorganic matter; accordingly, what has been said on that point has been taken from the ordinary handbooks of Catholic philosophy. The same is true of most of what has been stated about substantial forms. These statements seemed necessary to meet an obvious difficulty which has been urged by Mr. Huxley² and others. They contend that, as we see no reason for admitting substantial forms in watches, so neither can they be admitted in other substances; "vitality," "aquosity," and all the other "itys," are but the unmeaning formulæ of ignorant pedants; they have disappeared since the days of Martinus Scriblerus. We reply that a watch does not mean a new substance or force different from that of its material, whereas water and life do.

Let us now proceed with the argument. Have we any further evidence that there must be in existence something distinct from material force? Yes; there are such things as necessary truths; and matter could never account for them. Here are two assertions.

I. In the first place we assert a fact,—that "there are such things as necessary truths." This may be taken as already proved;³ for what has been said with regard to the principle of causation, applies equally to all other truths of the same kind.

We are forced to believe certain propositions as absolutely and invariably true. This invincible propensity cannot be the result of association; for it is found to exist before associations have been formed, whereas it does not result from associations that are frequent and constant. We have no invincible propensity to believe that fire may not burn or the sun stand still.

¹ Cf. e.g. "Genesis of Species," p. 210.

² "Lay Sermons," p. 137.

³ RECORD, April, p. 305.

Should it be objected that some of our examples are drawn from miraculous interventions, which are not admitted, we reply that we only suppose the *possibility* of miracles, and this cannot be reasonably doubted. For why should a law of Nature be stronger than any other possible force?

Mr. Mill and his school do not deny that miracles may be conceived to occur, whereas we cannot conceive geometry untrue. They explain the difference between the two orders by the phenomena and laws of counter-association.

“No frequency of conjunction between two phenomena will create an inseparable association, if counter-associations are being created all the while. If we sometimes saw stones floating as well as sinking, however often we might have seen them sink, nobody supposes that we should have formed an inseparable association between them and sinking. We have not seen a stone float, but we are in the constant habit of seeing either stones or other things which have the same tendency to sink, remaining in a position which they would otherwise quit, being maintained in it by an unseen force. . . . Every fact of that nature which we ever saw or heard of, is *pro tanto* an obstacle to the formation of the inseparable association which would make a violation of the law of gravity inconceivable to us.”¹

Of course there always are counter-associations; and their effect is, without doubt, to make it more easy for us to imagine miracles, such as stones floating in water. But do not similar counter-associations occur in connection with truths which we must consider necessary? Parts are known to swell out so as to appear each greater than the previous whole. Who has not often seen a straight stretch of railway in which the parallel tracks seem to approach? Yet these counter-associations do not enable us to believe that the whole can be less than its part, or that parallel straight lines can ever meet. Similarly it has been believed for centuries that spirits—God and the soul—are present entire and yet without multiplication in every part of an extended space. Christians have even thought that there is a Trinity of Persons in One God. Mr. Mill does not, of course, admit

¹“On Hamilton,” p. 332; cf. Logic, B. iv., c. 5.

these truths; but he cannot deny the fact of association. And yet no Christian in his senses can bring himself to admit that one may be five million, or that x may be equal to $3x$.

Counter-associations, therefore, do not explain how it is that we believe certain things to be possible, which we have never seen, whereas we are forced to think other things impossible. We do not deny that association has great influence on the mind. The Association Psychology contains a half-truth which might easily be mistaken for the whole. This half-truth has been already stated:¹ "Constant and oft-recurring occasions for associating any two things beget a habit by virtue of which we are liable on other occasions, when we feel the presence of one of these things, to expect or imagine the presence of the other." Dr. Mivart calls attention² to another illusion of a somewhat similar character:

"As a general rule, things which are very distant, or which happened a very long time ago, are known to us only in roundabout ways, and are more or less uncertain. On the other hand, our convictions concerning the things about us at any given moment can be tested by our senses, and we are certain regarding them. Thus it comes that we associate 'uncertainty' with statements about what is remote, and 'certainty' with what is present."

Notwithstanding these two influences, however, it is manifest that no amount of mere association, no nearness of presence, will of itself make us believe a thing to be *necessary*; whereas we are forced to assent to certain propositions as *necessarily* true for all space and all time, and this the very first moment we comprehend their meaning.

II. I take, therefore, our first assertion as proved,—that "there are such things as necessary truths." We contend, moreover, that "matter could never account for them."

This statement hardly requires proof: it seems to be

¹ RECORD, April, p. 306.

² "Nature and Thought," p. 123.

admitted by all; for why do materialists invariably deny that there are such truths? Manifestly because in their system there could be no ground for necessity.

Matter is finite and contingent. It may be thought uncreated, but it is not necessary. It is easy to conceive a state of things in which there would be no matter or material force; but one cannot conceive any state in which necessary truths would not maintain,—in which trilaterals might have four angles, and things might be and not be at the same time. Not being necessary itself, it is manifest that matter alone supplies no basis for necessary truths.

If there be anything about matter that wears even the appearance of necessity, it is those properties that we call natural laws. Stones must sink in water; men must die; the sun must rise; and so on. In effecting these necessities the utmost force of matter is expended; it can go no further. And yet how little necessary are these laws when compared with truths! How easy it is to conceive stones floating or a man immortal; but who can conceive anything existing and not existing at the same time?

Nay more; a consistent materialist could not admit even the conditional necessity of natural laws. For he could not consistently admit anything except what he knows by experience; and there can be no experience of necessity. We have experience of the past and of the present, but not of the future, and necessity has no meaning except in relation to future events. A materialist may *expect* things to last as they are for some time. They have been so in the past; they are not likely to change. It would be foolish to count on escaping death, or being able to walk over the sea to-morrow or next day. So too, it would be foolish to expect the British Empire to break up spontaneously in an hour, or that the next rich man one meets will make one his heir. In some such way as this a consistent materialist might rely on the constancy of natural laws; they are likely to last; but necessity—what knows he of it?

In confirmation of this statement I will quote the testimony of Mr. Huxley, who is often more consistent

to materialistic principles than the materialists with whom he objects to be classed.

“What is this dire necessity and ‘iron’ law under which men groan? Truly most gratuitously invented bugbears. I suppose, if there be an ‘iron’ law, it is that of gravitation; and if there be a physical necessity, it is that a stone, unsupported, must fall to the ground. But what is all we really know and can know about the latter phenomenon? Simply, that, in all human experience, stones have fallen to the ground, under these conditions; that we have not the smallest reason for believing that any stone so circumstanced will not fall to the ground; and that we have, on the contrary, every reason to believe that it will so fall. It is very convenient to indicate that all the conditions of belief have been fulfilled in this case, by calling the statement, that unsupported stones will fall to the ground, ‘a law of nature.’ But when, as commonly happens, we change *will* into *must*, we introduce an idea of necessity which most assuredly does not lie in the observed facts, and has no warranty that I can discover elsewhere. For my part, I utterly repudiate and anathematize the intruder. Fact I know, and law I know, but what is this Necessity save an empty shadow of my own mind’s throwing?”¹

This teaching is not true, and the common sense of mankind proclaims that it is not; but that is not the question with which we are now concerned. What I would have you observe is the force of the argument by which the writer proves that, on the materialistic hypothesis, there could be no necessity,—not even the conditional necessity of natural laws. I think the argument is unanswerable; but how much less could matter alone suffice to explain the far greater—the absolute—necessity of first truths. That these truths are absolutely necessary has been already proved. Hence there must be something in existence besides matter,—something higher and better than matter, as producing a greater and more absolute result.

PROPOSITION III.

“Our reason tells us that we are free and subject to a moral law; but if there were nothing but matter, there could be no free-will, and consequently no moral order.”

Here we make three other assertions: first, that we are

¹ “Lay Sermons,” p. 143.

free; secondly, that we are subject to moral law; thirdly, that matter alone is unable to account for either of these.

I. We are free. It is unnecessary to explain fully in what circumstances we enjoy this freedom. Indeed I think that actions free in themselves are fewer than is commonly supposed. We contend that we are free in *some* things; that in certain circumstances and under the influence of certain motives we determine to put forth certain energies, whereas we might have determined to abstain or to act differently in the very same circumstances and influenced by the very same motives. In the act of determining ourselves we are free.

The fundamental proof of this assertion is drawn from consciousness. Let Dr. Mivart explain:

“Consciousness can inform us what is meant by being dragged along (if we are dragged along) or otherwise compelled to go in any direction; and therefore consciousness is equally able to inform us that we are not being dragged along or otherwise compelled. Now let us suppose I am conscious of determining to take a walk. In the first place I am conscious that it is I myself who determine, and secondly, that I have no feeling of being forced or compelled in so determining. What more is necessary to make my determination free than to know, as I do, that it is emphatically mine, and that I was exempt from compulsion in making it? Further, though I will not assert that I am conscious of having the power to choose what I will of two alternatives, yet I do maintain that when I have resolved upon anything, my consciousness tells me that the act of resolution was mine, and that before determining it I stood in the same relation to two alternatives, *e. g.*, to walk out or to stop at home. It tells me further, that I have chosen one alternative, and I have a conviction almost as strong, that I might have chosen the other,—just as when I draw two balls out of a bag, I know by experience I have drawn one and have a conviction founded on this experience that I might have drawn the other. In one word, I am perfectly sure that every time I will anything I am conscious that I myself perform the act, and I am quite unconscious of any necessity compelling me to perform it.”¹

¹“Nature and Thought,” p. 195.

This argument is cast into peculiar form for a special reason. Mill denies that we are "conscious of being able to act in opposition to the strongest desire or aversion;" "and quite right, too," remarks Dr. Mivart, "if he meant to deny, as he probably or possibly did, that we are conscious of freedom; for freedom may mean nothing more than the absence of necessity, and we cannot be conscious of nothing or mere absence." Dr. Mivart might seem to contradict himself afterwards, when he says that "I am conscious, secondly, that I have no feeling of being forced or compelled in so determining." This latter assertion, however, is afterwards put into another and better form: "I am quite unconscious of any necessity compelling me to perform" an act of will.

The argument might be analysed in part as follows:—(a) I am conscious that I act; (b) I should be conscious of a feeling of compulsion if I were compelled to act; (c) I am not conscious of any such feeling; (d) therefore, I might abstain.

The second of these propositions is the only one about which there can be any serious difficulty. Can one be sure that one should be conscious of compulsion if one were compelled? Might not one be compelled so agreeably as to relieve one of the feeling of restraint. If, to use Bayle's illustration, a conscious weather-cock were "impressed at the same time with a movement to the east and also with an internal inclination to turn to the east, evidently, such a weather-cock would be under the delusion that it turned itself to the east in accordance with its own inclination to go that way."¹

Let Dr. Mivart reply:

"Bayle's weather-cock actually points against the truth of what he urges. He supposes it to be at the same time both in the act of willing to turn to the east and also being blown in that direction. This seems to me to be parallel with the co-existence of a desire on my part to go to the meeting of the British Association at Sheffield,

¹ "Nature and Thought," p. 196.

together with my being at the same time seized, carried to the railway station, and sent to Sheffield by force. In that case my volition and the direction of my journey would coincide, but nevertheless, my common sense would tell me plainly enough that this coincidence was due to my having both desired to go to Sheffield, and to my having also been forcibly sent there. What would be true in my own case must—accepting Bayle's illustration—be true also of the weather-cock; and so it would know, clearly enough, that it both wished to turn to the east and was also carried there 'willy nilly' by the wind."

In considering whether there might not be an unfelt compelling force acting on us, we should distinguish between mere mechanical motions and voluntary acts. We may be moved mechanically without feeling the motion; as a matter of fact no one ever feels the diurnal and annual motion which all earthly bodies have with the planet through space. Not so with regard to the will; whenever the force of a motive is so strong as to render it necessary for the will to act, we are conscious of being necessitated. Thus we feel that we cannot choose evil as such, nor refrain from embracing that which we know to be good *sub omni ratione*. But even when mechanically moved by a force stronger than ours, if we are made aware of the motion, no matter how desirable it may be, we know that resistance or rest is impossible.

Dr. Mivart's example of the railway train shows this; it might be illustrated also from the earth's motion. We often long for some particular season,—spring or summer. We are travelling towards it with immense speed. We might never have known the necessity under which we thus live; but knowing it, does any one think that he is free to go or to stay, to move round with the earth to that portion of its orbit where summer is found, or to remain in this portion where it is always winter? Neither should a conscious weather-cock think itself free. Surely we do not feel this compelling power in our ordinary actions.

Again it is urged that we do not take into account the force of motives. The will depends on the intellect. We cannot desire anything but what we know to be good,—good in these present circumstances. Let there be two

objects before me, one better than the other. Can I choose the less and so deprive myself of the greater good? I can choose but what I know to be good; can I think it good to deprive myself of something greater and better?

This is and always was the stock argument of the opponents of free-will. It is urged by Mill and his school with as much confidence as if it had never been heard of before,—as if it had not been tried and found wanting hundreds of years before the time of St. Thomas.

In connection with this objection Dr. Mivart makes a wise observation. Determinists as a rule deny vital activity; they think that we are merely played upon by forces from without. If that were so, we could not, of course, resist the strongest motive, as an iron nail cannot but be drawn to the strongest magnet. But the supposition is false.

“Consciousness informs us that certain motives are impelling us to form certain determinations; it distinguishes also between the relative force of these several motives, and it proclaims that none of these motives produce or necessitate the determination itself, which it affirms to be one's own act. It is the exercise of a new force, entirely distinct from the force of motives. The existence of the strongest motive, and the influence which it exerts to urge us to an act of the will, is due to some cause over which we have no control; of the existence of that effect which we call ‘an act of volition,’ we are the cause—we produce it and we continue it.”¹

But still the difficulty remains; I can choose but what I know to be good; can I think it good to deprive myself of something greater and better?

I answer: one cannot elect *formally* to deprive one's self of a greater benefit, though one may deprive one's self *in effect*. One cannot choose but what is seen to be good; but given two objects both of which are seen to be good, one can deliberately choose the less of the two, knowing that the effect of the choice will be to give up something better.

How do we know that we can do this? Partly from consciousness and partly from experience. If there be placed before me two packages, one containing ten sovereigns the

¹ “Nature and Thought,” p. 201.

other containing twenty, and if I get my choice, I know that I am not necessitated to take the twenty. It is most likely that I will take the twenty; but even when I do, consciousness tells me that the act is mine, and I feel no compulsion. If I were under compulsion, I should feel it. Therefore I could have abstained, or I could have chosen the package of ten, as I know from experience in other circumstances that I have power to do.

What then, it may be asked, determines the will to one package more than to the other? The will itself; the act is its act. The human will is not like a piece of iron between two magnets; it is alive. It cannot act except in certain conditions,—except the object is seen to be good. But given two such goods, it can choose either, since it feels no compulsory motion to one of the two.

But, it is said, one must at least make up one's mind to choose, and this very fact of desiring one object more than another is an antecedent motive that effectually prevents the will from choosing the other object. One cannot prefer one thing and choose the other:

“When we think of ourselves hypothetically as having acted otherwise than we did, we always suppose a difference in the antecedents; we picture ourselves as having known something that we did not know, or not known something that we did know, which is a difference in the external inducements; or as having desired something, or disliked something, more or less than we did; which is a difference in the internal inducements.”¹

Of course “one must make up one's mind to choose; and this very fact prevents the will from choosing the other object.” But this fact of making up one's mind, instead of being an “antecedent motive,” is the very act which we contend is free. Hence we deny that we “suppose a difference in the antecedents” “when we think of ourselves hypothetically as having acted otherwise than as we did.” We do not “picture ourselves as having known something that we did not know.” And if we imagine ourselves “as having desired something . . . more or less than we did,” this is not an “antecedent” but the free act itself.

¹ Mill, “On Hamilton,” p. 583.

Indeed in his book on Logic, Mill virtually gives up the case. It is a question, he tells us, not of free-will but of causality. He sees no essential difference between walking and being made to walk. In this latter case "the imagination retains the feeling of some more intimate connection, of some peculiar tie or mysterious constraint exercised by the antecedent over the consequent." In the former case "we are certain . . . that there is not this mysterious constraint. We know that we are not compelled as by a magical spell, to obey any particular motive . . . But neither is any such mysterious compulsion now supposed by the best [!] philosophical authorities, to be exercised by any other cause over its effect. *Those who think that causes draw their effects after them by a mystical tie are right in believing that the relation between volitions and their antecedents is of another nature.*"¹ All, therefore, who believe in force, or the principle of causality, should also believe in free-will.

It would be out of place in a paper like this to deal exhaustively with all the arguments for and against free-will. I can but refer to another proof which Catholic writers have always thought to be of great value,—the argument from morality.

I shall presently endeavour to show that there are such things as moral law, duty, goodness, wickedness,—and this quite independently of utility or the reverse, of pleasure or pain. Good men are entitled to reward; bad men deserve punishment. All this supposes free-will. A magnet does its work well, but its goodness is not moral goodness. We do not *reward* machines. Vegetables and brutes may be *trained* but not *punished*. Beasts are *beaten* but not *blamed*. When we speak of reward or punishment in relation to brutes, we use a metaphor. We speak thus because of analogy; just as we talk of their friendliness, intelligence, and other such qualities.

These conclusions flow necessarily from our notion of right and wrong, which is independent of utility and its

¹ "Logic," Book VI., ch. ii.; the italics are mine.

opposite, of pleasure and pain. Mill tells us that "there are two ends which on the Necessitarian theory are sufficient to justify punishment: the benefit of the offender himself and the protection of others. To punish him for his own good . . . is no more unjust than to administer medicine." It is to supply a motive "counterbalancing the influence of present temptations." "In its other aspect, punishment is a precaution taken by society in self-defence. Free-will or no free-will, it is just to punish so far as is necessary for this purpose, as it is just to put a wild beast to death (without unnecessary suffering) for the same object."¹

All this supposes that criminal acts are those that are hurtful either to one's self or to society.

If this supposition be untrue, what other reason can be alleged as a justification of punishment? If a man has benefited both himself and society by bad acts, why should he be punished? Mill would, of course, deny the hypothesis. We on the other hand affirm, that, however close be the connection between crime and injury either to one's self or to the state, *crime is not injury*; and hence what justifies the restraint of one, cannot justify the punishment of the other.

II. This brings us to our second assertion,—“we are subject to moral law.”

Here also we have to deal with a question of fact, with regard to which it might seem at first sight as if there were no dispute. For, though there may be some so dead to all finer feeling as to deny that there is any distinction between good and bad, they must be very few, if any. The materialists of our time pretend to champion morality as stoutly as ourselves. Yet even with regard to the fact of the existence of a moral order we do not agree in reality. We use the same words but do not attach to them the same ideas. Hence it has to be proved that actions are good and bad, not in the materialistic sense.

¹ "On Hamilton," p. 592.

Let us understand in the first place what our opponents mean. Dr. Mivart shall explain.

“Their view is that in spite of the present differences between the ideas ‘pleasure’ and ‘duty,’ they are, nevertheless, one as to their origin—an origin consisting ultimately of pleasurable and painful sensations. Moral conceptions, they say, have been evolved from pleasurable sensations by the preservation through long ages (in the struggle for life) of a predominating number of such individuals as happened to have a natural and spontaneous liking for practices and habits of mind useful to their tribe or race, while individuals possessing a marked tendency to contrary practices and habits of mind were destroyed. The descendants of individuals so surviving (because fittest to survive) have, they say, inherited a strong liking for such useful habits of mind, and at last—finding this inherited tendency thus existing in themselves, distinct from their tendency to conscious self-gratification—have come to regard it as something fundamentally distinct, innate, and independent of all experience. In fact, according to this school, the idea of ‘right’ is only the result of the gradual accretion of useful predilections, which from time to time arose in a series of ancestors naturally selected. In this way ‘morality’ is, as it were, the congealed past experience of the race; and ‘virtue’ becomes a sort of retrieving which the thus improved human animal practices by a perfected and inherited habit, regardless of self-gratification, just as the brute animal has acquired the habit of seeking prey and bringing it to his master, instead of devouring it himself. ‘Conscience’ is thus (according to the teaching of this school) but an accumulation of traditional feelings of utility; ‘right action’ is but a form of self-seeking; and our ‘perception of right’ is but a modified feeling of pleasure which has come to mistake itself for something higher.”¹

Let our author further explain the Catholic view.

“In the first place I should say that ‘virtue’ and ‘utility’ are ideas not only fundamentally distinct, but so far in natural opposition, that the existence of ‘utility’ in an action may now and again detract from its virtue. So essential is the distinction that not only does the idea of ‘benefit’ not enter into the idea of ‘duty,’ but we even see that the very fact of an act not being beneficial to us, makes it the more praiseworthy. Its merit is increased by

¹ “Nature and Thought,” p. 135.

any self-denial which may be necessary to its performance, while gain tends to diminish the merit of an action. It is not that the absence of gain or pleasure benefits our neighbour more: it is that any diminution of pleasure which circumstances may occasion, irrespective of any advantage thereby occasioned to our neighbour, in itself heightens the value of an action. That therefore cannot be the substance of 'duty' which increases dutifulness by its absence. In the second place it is evident that good intention is of the very essence of an act of 'duty,' and not good results nor pleasurable feelings felt in its performance. I do not mean by this to deny that there is a primary objective goodness in the nature of a virtuous man's action, but, with our limited knowledge, intention is our test. No action done with a bad intention can be good, whatever its result. If a man intending to do harm to another by a spiteful act, really benefits him thereby through some miscalculation, his spiteful act is not made into a 'good' one or 'an act of duty,' because it happens accidentally to turn out well."¹

The question at issue between the two schools is, what is meant by goodness or badness which all acknowledge to be real? Materialists contend that utility,—and therefore pleasure and pain,—is the ultimate essential constituent; that, when thoroughly analysed, actions are found to be good or bad according as they are beneficial or hurtful either to individuals or to the race.

On the contrary we maintain that the essence of goodness is not pleasure, but that it is "simple and inexplicable"²—goodness. It is as simple as being, as inexplicable as unity. We maintain that there are two orders, the physical and the moral; that there are in each order primary ideas incapable of analysis, and first truths incapable of proof; that goodness is such a primary idea; and that some such axiom as, "good is to be done," is *seen* to be true, rather than *deduced* as a conclusion from any more primary considerations of pleasure or utility.

Dr. Mivart, in the extract just quoted, gives two reasons for this teaching. 1° Ask yourself in the first place what you mean by saying that an act is good. Do you mean that it is

¹ See "Nature and Thought," p. 136.

² *Ibid*, p. 138.

calculated to benefit the race? Or rather, do you think the ideas "virtue" and "utility," not only "fundamentally distinct, but so far in natural opposition that the existence of utility in an action may now and again detract from its virtue," whereas "the very fact of an act not being beneficial may make it the more praiseworthy?" If there be a God, would it be "good" to offend him even for the sake of benefiting mankind? Is Mill right when he says that it is "better" to go to hell for ever than deny the truth?

But if it may be conceived to be "good," and the "duty" of all men, to choose for their portion eternal torment, whereas it might be "bad" to benefit the race on certain conditions, surely pleasure and pain, benefit or injury, cannot be the ultimate essence of "goodness" and "badness." And as actions are admitted to be "good" or "evil," it follows that these qualities must mean something other than is intended by utilitarians.

So much for the first argument. 2° In the next place utility does not depend on intention, whereas morality does. If I benefit society when intending to injure it, my act is not virtuous. Of course, as a rule, it is useful for society that its members should act with an intention of benefiting; because, as a rule, one injures where one intends to injure. The contrary may, however, be conceived to happen; and if the good and the useful be identical, and if, moreover, my present act, no matter what it was calculated to effect, be conceived to actually effect benefit, not injury,—why is the act not useful, and therefore good? Accordingly, if you find that to your mind goodness and badness depend on intention, you cannot be a utilitarian.

In dealing with this question, as with so many others, our opponents have seized on a half-truth, and have erected thereon a whole system of fallacies. The half-truth is,— "that good conduct and happiness ultimately coincide."¹ As a matter of fact, good acts usually do benefit the race, whereas

¹ "Nature and Thought," p. 139.

evil brings ruin in its train. This, however, might arise in two ways; either (1) because the good and the useful are *identical*, or (2) because they are intimately *connected*, though perfectly distinct. That this latter is the true view, is manifest from the reasons already assigned. If they were identical, we should be unable to separate them, not only in fact, but even in thought; just as we cannot conceive of man except as rational. But we can conceive an act which would be very evil, though contributing to the pleasure of the whole race. It would be evil to offend God by any act no matter what its consequences, or to be ungrateful or treacherous. And similarly we have it on the authority even of Mr. Mill, that it would be good for each one, and therefore for all, to be buried in hell rather than contradict the known truth.

For further confirmation of this teaching we appeal to the common sense of mankind. Is there or is there not a distinction between the ideas of goodness and badness, of reward and punishment, as applied to brutes and to men? We form higher or lower *estimates* of brutes, but we do not *approve* or *blame*; we *supply motives*, but we do not in any strict sense *reward* or *punish*. The same is true even of those actions, which, though performed by men, are not intended. We do not *punish* lunatics, we *restrain* them: we do not *blame* a man for what he does in his sleep. But such actions are useful or hurtful to society; and even lunatics and brutes may be terrified or allured by motives.

Hence the good and the evil are not identical with the useful and the hurtful; and, as a consequence, the terms "morality," "duty," "goodness," &c. are not to be understood in the materialistic sense. The notion of "goodness" is primary and ultimate; it is simple and inexplicable; it is not deduced but intued. The utmost analysis of ethics must suppose that it is "right" and "good" to follow the right order. If we inquire further and ask why it is "good" to follow the right order, there is no answer but that we *see* it to be "good."

¹See "Nature and Thought," p. 138.

Akin to the notions of "good" and "evil" are those of "duty" and "law." Let "right" and "wrong" be what you will, it is admitted, and indeed it is manifest, that we "ought" to do the one and avoid the other. Why "ought" we? Because it leads to happiness? Because it improves the race? But why "ought" one to do either? What binds one to the race? You see that the good of the race is not the root of "right;" it *supposes* "right" as its own root.

Dr. Mivart lays stress on this point:

"All our knowledge is either self-evident or is legitimately deduced from what is self-evident, and this of course applies to our ideas of right and wrong, as well as to all the rest of our knowledge. Now, if you or I know certainly that some definite line of action is right, the proposition which declares it to be right must either be self-evident or must be deduced from other propositions as to what is right, one of which at least must be self-evident, or else we can have no basis for our knowledge whatever about right or wrong. In other words the general propositions which lie at the root of any ethical system must themselves be ethical. This truth cuts the ground from under—renders simply impossible—the view that a judgment as to moral obligation can ever have been evolved from mere likings and dislikings, or from feelings of preference for tribal instincts over individual ones."¹

A consistent utilitarian has but one way out of the difficulty,—to deny that there is any such thing as duty. But what an alternative! Because pleasure and pain do not afford a reasonable basis for an ethical system, are we to doubt or deny the moral order? I could as easily persuade myself that the sun does not shine, that science is a lie, that I did not exist a moment ago, or that I do not exist now, as believe that one act may not be better than another, that St. Francis was not better than the ruffians of his time. These things are not proved, they are seen.

Another solution has been attempted, however. Why should it be our duty to benefit the race? Because, it is

¹ "Nature and Thought," p. 142.

said, "the survival of the fittest has given man a natural bias towards, and a liking for, such conduct;" and because "with the accumulated force of countless millions of years of evolution behind you, you should trust to the beneficial effect of the prejudices it has made ingrained and inherent in your nature."¹

Indeed; but why "should" we? What makes it our "duty?" Besides, it is not true that we have any such bias and prejudice. Go to the gaols; has the survival of the fittest given the wretches there incarcerated a natural tendency to benefit their kind? And would that they were alone in their wickedness, or the worst of their race! How silly they think us who tell us, with all our knowledge of the wicked world, and of the selfishness of the human heart, that each one has a natural inclination to sacrifice his own appetite for the sake of the general good.

We believe on the contrary that the majority of men have no natural inclination to sacrifice their individual interests for the general good; and that, even though they had, they would break through such inclination on some very early opportunity. They might be compelled by superior force to respect the rights of others; but soon after they have got the upper hand the weak should go to the wall. The strong and bad should then survive, because fittest to survive; they should transmit to their descendants their tendency to plunder and prey; and thus it might be, that, after a few centuries, all that we look upon as best and holiest should be rightly thought worst and wickedest, and that the saints of the future should be men with hearts as of Judas, of Nero, or of Marat.²

I take it, therefore, not only that actions are good and bad, but that their goodness or badness does not depend on pleasure or pain, on utility or injury. We shall soon see what corollary must be deduced from this teaching.

III. So far two facts have been proved: (1) that we are free, and (2) that there is a moral order. The third part of

¹ See "Nature and Thought," p. 140.

² *Ibid.*, p. 141.

our assertion remains: "Matter is unable to account for either of these."

1° And first with regard to freedom. If the will were material, how could it be free? For remember what Materialists assert,—that there is nothing known to us which may not be explained by the persistence of these forces that are found in inorganic matter; that life, sensation, intelligence, are no new products, except in so far as they represent a new arrangement of pre-existing energies; that our force of will is the very same which in other forms might result in a steam-engine or an electric machine; that we are but "the cunningest of all nature's clocks."

But how can this be? Physical science and all experience tell us that in the inorganic world there is no power of initiative, that non-vital matter must be set in motion from without. Moreover, we have it on the same authority that the amount of motion produced is invariably proportionate to the energy expended. A piece of iron between two magnets must be drawn to the stronger; the heavier of two bodies must bring down its own arm of the balance; equal forces acting in the same directions must draw the object on which they act along the same line. And so, if we were mere machines to be set in motion from without,—by motives,—we should have no more freedom of action than a piece of iron between two magnets or than a sack of wheat in the scales.

The only satisfactory explanation of our free-will is to admit (1) a power of initiative, which (2) is not altogether the slave of motives, and which, accordingly can act somewhat independently and choose its own line. But such power is not contained within the properties of inorganic matter. Hence there must be something very much better than matter in the world.

2. Next with regard to morality. If good and evil may not be resolved into pleasure and pain, how can they be explained? No other analysis has even been attempted by Materialists. The "good" is something very different from the "useful"; it could not be, if matter were all in all.

“Good” is to be done: that is an axiom the truth of which we see in the very notion of good. But why is it to be done? “To be done” connotes “duty”; and “duty” supposes “praise,” “blame,” “reward,” and “punishment.” But what is “duty” to a Materialist? Why am I to do good—to do my duty—if there be nothing but matter? If I do not do good, what then? Am I deserving of blame or punishment, and why? The race, indeed; perish the race! If plunder, ingratitude, treason, lust, make my life pleasanter here,—and they well may,—I should be a fool to deprive myself of pleasure for the sake of posterity. If there be nothing but matter, I shall be nothing then: *dum vivimus, vivamus*. Hence if there were nothing but matter, there could be no real moral good or evil,—no real moral order.

W. McDONALD.

(To be continued.)

WAS ST. THOMAS A THOMIST?

- (1) “Controversiarum de divinae gratiae liberique arbitrii concordia initia et progressus.” Auctore G. Schneemann, S.J., Friburgi Brisgoviae, 1881.
- (2) “S. Thomas et doctrina praemotionis physicae seu responsio ad Rev. P. Schneemann, S.J., aliosque doctrinae Scholae Thomisticae impugnatores.” Auctore P.F. Ant. M. Dummermuth Ord. Praed., Sac Theol. Mag. et in Collegio Lovaniensi ejusdem ordinis Stud. Reg. Parisiis apud editores ephemeridis *L'année Dominicaine*, via dicta “du Cherche-Midi,” 1886.
- (3) “Bañez et Molina,” Par le R.P. de Regnon, S.J.
- (4) “Saint Thomas et le Thomisme.” Lesserteur.
- (5) “La Revue Catholique.” Louvain, 15 Janvier, 1883.
- (6) “La Prédétermination physique et la Science moyenne. Sentiment de Saint Thomas.” Par son Eminence le Cardinal J. Pecci traduit de l’Italien. Le Mans: Leguicheux.
- (7) “Jahrbuch für Philosophie und speculative Theologie.” Paderborn und Münster 1 Band. 2 Heft. 1886.
- (8) “Literarische Rundschau,” December 1886.

THE questions which cluster round the mysterious relations existing between the fore-knowledge of God, His infinite causality and the action of His grace on the one

hand, and the human soul with its complete freedom and moral responsibility both in the natural and supernatural orders, on the other, have in all times exercised the minds of philosophers and theologians. How warm, indeed, the struggle between contending schools could at times become, was seen in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when the Holy See was obliged at length to interfere and calm the ardour of the combatants.

Among Catholic Theologians there are, as is well-known, two principal schools on the question of grace—the Thomists and the Molinists; the Thomists finding their leading representatives in the Order of St. Dominic, the Molinists in the Society of Jesus.

Both schools agree in accepting those positions which belong as much to reason as to faith, that God is the source of all created being, the first mover in all created motion, and at the same time that man's will is absolutely free and that he is accordingly responsible for his free choice.

They differ however as to the manner in which God is the first mover of the free act of the human will.

The Thomists maintain that, as in all other created action, there must be a previous movement from God, so in the case of the created will, no act can be performed without the previous action of God, not merely persuading but moving the will to this or that determinate act. This divine impulsion they term *physical premotion* or *predetermination*; and contend that it differs from the divine action upon necessary created causes, not in being less powerful or all-embracing in its efficacy, but in its being of such a nature as not only to cause the act of the will but to render that act absolutely free.

The Molinists on the other hand maintain that God does not thus premove the will, but that the will makes its own choice, and that God so interpenetrates and concurs with this election that the resulting action belongs both to God and the creature.

It is in these divergent propositions that the kernel of the controversy is to be found. For if God premoves the will to every act, whether natural or supernatural, *Praedestinatio ante praevisa merita* follows naturally, nor does any fresh difficulty

arise about the divine fore-knowledge. If, on the contrary, the choice of the will is in any way outside the divine causality, the question at once arises: How then does God know free created acts? Hence the *scientia media* of the Molinists as an attempted explanation, which, if satisfactory, would avoid the difficulties of *Praedestinatio post praevisa merita*.

As to the theological question in dispute, the writer of this paper wishes to make no secret that his convictions lie entirely on the side of the Thomists, although he is by no means blind to those grave difficulties which arise from our inability to grasp the conception of a divine action moving the will efficaciously to this or that determined act, and at the same time leaving its freedom intact.

But beyond stating the question in dispute, it is not intended here to defend the Thomist doctrines from the objections of their adversaries; but merely to consider the *historical* aspect of the same question, that is to say, which of the two systems represents the traditional teaching of St. Thomas and his earlier followers.

There is no doubt that this aspect of the controversy has assumed a new interest since the publication of the Encyclical of our present Holy Father, Pope Leo XIII., the "*Aeterni Patris*," urgently recommending the doctrines of St. Thomas, "that great master whom the Dominican family rightly glories in as its own," as interpreted by the tradition of his greatest commentators.

As was to be expected, a laudable desire to follow the Pope's directions was shown on all sides by professors and students in Catholic seats of learning. Those text books were chosen both in theology and philosophy which seemed best to represent the mind of the Angelic Doctor. Zigliara, Gonzalez, and Liberatore took the places of Tongiorgi and Palmieri in philosophy, while for theology a disposition showed itself to take up Billuart, at any rate for the more speculative parts of theology. Now Billuart, as is well known, is a strong, nay, often violent, opponent of Molinism, and it was but natural that the upholders of the latter system should view with alarm this tendency towards Thomistic teaching.

It must be made evident to all that the principles of Billuart and modern so-called Thomists were not those of St. Thomas and the early Dominican school, but the inventions of a later date. So with this object in view a Latin treatise was published at Freiburg by the late Father G. Schneemann, a distinguished writer of the Society of Jesus, in which it was boldly affirmed that not only had St. Thomas never taught the doctrines of the existing Thomist school, but that his faithful interpreters, Capreolus, Ferrariensis, Cajetan and the rest should, with their master, rather be reckoned among upholders of Molinism. The true father of modern Thomism is the Spanish Dominican, Bañez, so that his followers should rather be called Banesians than Thomists.

The Latin work of Schneemann and another by him in German on the same subject were widely read, and the treatise came to be regarded as the best defence yet undertaken of the thesis under consideration. Various writers of Molinist views took on themselves the task of popularising Schneemann's arguments, with more or less original matter of their own. Fr. de Regnon, S.J., in a work entitled *Bañez et Molina*, and Professor Lesserteur in his book, *St. Thomas et le Thomisme*, did this for France; while in the *Revue Catholique* of Louvain, Professor Dupont attempted the same task, which was also undertaken in other theological periodicals.

From the opposite camp there appeared no reply to the whole range of Schneemann's arguments, though Dr. Prosper of Louvain and a Passionist Professor in Rome wrote pamphlets calling in question his interpretation of St. Thomas, and in Germany Schneemann was attacked in one or two of the theological reviews.

But within the last year has been published at Paris by the Regent of Studies in the Dominican house at Louvain, Fr. Dummermuth, a volume of 750 pages, which is certainly one of the most noteworthy contributions to theological literature that has appeared of late years. It goes step by step over the ground occupied by Schneemann, with a thoroughness that leaves nothing to be desired, and that

makes the book not a mere controversial brochure but a work of permanent value, an exhaustive treatise on the traditional interpretation of St. Thomas, in Dominican schools, on the questions of Grace and Free-will.

After a preliminary chapter in which the question at issue is stated, and it is brought out how consistently the Holy See has identified the Thomistic doctrines of grace with those of St. Thomas, Fr. Dummermuth occupies more than half his volume with a careful inquiry into the mind of the Angelic Doctor himself on these disputed points. After studying the lengthy extracts from the two *Summas*, the *Quaestiones Disputatae* and other writings of St. Thomas, which Fr. Dummermuth duly marshals before us, and his own elucidation of the text, and comparing them with Fr. Schneemann's treatment of the same subject, we venture to affirm, without fear of contradiction, that although here and there one may be surprised that the Master did not speak more plainly, and although this or that explanation of a difficult text may appear to us a little forced, no unprejudiced mind will remain in doubt that St. Thomas' teaching is something very different from the Molinistic doctrine of a mere *concursum simultaneum*.

In a recent pamphlet Cardinal Pecci, who declares himself neither Thomist nor Molinist but a follower of St. Thomas, while admitting that Molina's doctrine of *scientia media* finds no countenance in St. Thomas denies that the *præmotio physica* of the Thomist can claim the same great authority as its supporter. Reading his pamphlet side by side with the first part of Fr. Dummermuth's work, we can well understand that the Cardinal will find many admirers, especially among those who are lovers of peace, and desire to find a *modus vivendi* between the opposing schools, but he will be obliged to re-consider not a few of his arguments in the light of Fr. Dummermuth's demonstrations. Reading certain portions of St. Thomas by themselves, one can understand its being maintained that in the ardour of controversy, the later disciples of the Angelic Doctor have carried out to conclusions which he himself would have hesitated to accept his fundamental teaching that God is the first cause of all the actions of secondary causes, not only by giving

them the power of acting, and by preserving that power in being, but by moving them and applying them to determinate acts. But with the complete view which Fr. Dummermuth gives us of the teaching of the Master, even this concession can no longer be made, for there is scarcely an expression of the later writers which cannot find its counterpart in his own writings. That Cardinal Pecci's pamphlet will please either Thomists or Molinists we doubt, although its moderation will be admired; but of this we feel confident, that not even the learning and acuteness of writers like Fr. Schneemann will convince unbiassed persons that in some mysterious way a fundamental doctrine of St. Thomas has been entirely misunderstood in his own order of St. Dominic;—an order which, for six hundred years has in numberless general chapters imposed on its sons the obligation of following St. Thomas; of which every theological professor has always made an oath that he will never, in his teaching, depart from the doctrine of the same master; in whose theological schools, the *Summa* has ever been the text book to be read during four years of the curriculum, commented on article by article by its professors, its very words having to be committed to memory by the students.

And this leads us to the second part of Fr. Dummermuth's work, where he combats the thesis of Schneemann that the true Thomistic tradition remained in the Dominican schools only down to the time of Bañez, who, in opposition to the work of Molina, and the line generally taken by the Society of Jesus, first departed from the ancient traditions of his order, and founded the system of *Neo-Thomism*, and that ever since the true Thomist tradition is to be found among the followers of Molina.

Truly a hazardous thesis, and one which it would have been safer to have left untouched. Fr. Dummermuth's chapters "de vetere schola S. Thomae" simply reduce it to powder, and no one can rise from the persual of his pages without a conviction that whatever may be the truth or falsehood of the Thomist doctrines of grace, they were taught by a succession of the great mediæval doctors of the Dominican School down to the time of the Council of Trent,

and frequently in the very same terms in which they were afterwards formulated by Bañez. At the risk of making his book so large as to alarm all readers whose minds are not made up for a profound study of the question, Fr. Dummermuth has done more than quote a few lines of his authors, he has given often a page at a time from these old scholastics, so that no suspicion can remain on a reader's mind that he has only half the truth before him. It is instructive in this respect to compare his quotations with those of the book he is answering.

We would willingly linger over the explicit testimony borne by Aegidius Romanus, Capreolus, Ferrariensis, &c., to the truth of *praemotio physica*, but space fails us. We can only refer our readers to Fr. Dummermuth's pages.

But what foundation is there then for the statement that Bañez introduced a change into the teaching of the Dominican School? Only this, we believe, that with the rise of the Calvinistic heresies in the sixteenth century, the Grace controversy entered on a new phase. Some theologians, and at least one of the Dominican School (if we may consider Catharinus as of that school), considering Thomism an inefficient system for resisting the new errors, ranged themselves on the same side on which Molina is found, and followed the new ideas he introduced. Nor can we regret this, for perhaps there will always be minds who have a repugnance to the Thomistic doctrines, and find consolation in the opposite opinions.

But be this as it may, Fr. Dummermuth proves in his chapter on the theologians of the time of the Council of Trent, that in spite of notable exceptions the more general feeling among theologians was in favour of what appears to be the teaching of the catechism of the Council of Trent: "Quae moventur et agunt aliquid, intima virtute ad motum et actionem ita (Deus) impellit, ut quamvis secundarum causarum efficientiam non impediatur, praeveniat tamen, cum ejus occultissima vis ad singula pertineat."¹

That no fundamental change was introduced into the

¹ Cat. Conc. Trid. Parte 1, Art. 1.

Thomistic system by Bañez is evident from the fact that his own order, sworn defenders of the ancient traditions, never accused him of innovations. Fr. Schneemann indeed states, and the statement has been repeated many times, that when Bañez first published his system, one of his propositions was condemned by the Dominican Medina as "new and unheard of." It is a curious instance of how loose statements of this kind may be made and repeated, for when this "*nova et inaudita sententia*" is subjected to Fr. Dummermuth's criticism, it appears, *first*, that it had nothing to do with the questions we are discussing; *second*, that Bañez rejects it almost in the same words as Medina; and *third*, that the opinion to which Medina objected is found, not in Bañez, but in Vasquez, a writer of a very different school.

In his concluding pages, Fr. Dummermuth inquires into the opinions of the early Jesuit writers as to the mind of St. Thomas. Let one example of his treatment of the subject suffice.

The famous Jesuit, Cardinal Toletus, studied with Bañez at the University of Salamanca, but in their later days they drifted widely apart, and are found teaching very divergent opinions on Grace and Free-will. But thanks to the edition of the "Enarratio of Toletus on St. Thomas," brought out in 1869, by Fr. Paria, S.J., Fr. Dummermuth makes it evident that the Cardinal, one of the greatest of the early Jesuit Theologians, who formed the succeeding generation of the Society's Professors, is so far from accusing Bañez or other living Thomist writers of novelty of doctrine, that he expressly declares, not once but over and over again, that the school afterwards called Molinist, with which he ranges himself, is in opposition with St. Thomas, and his exponents, Cajetan and Ferrariensis.

From what we have written our readers will see that all who wish to be *au courant* with the actual state of this controversy should read side by side the works of Fr. Schneemann and Fr. Dummermuth.

The latter work has been warmly received by theologians abroad, and many of the leading theological reviews have devoted articles to the new phase of the discussion it has

opened. We commend to the attention of those interested a valuable paper by Dr. Schneider in the second number of the "Jahrbuch für Philosophie und speculative Theologie," which thus concludes :

"Whoever has read St. Thomas as a whole will simply smile at the notion that he is not a Thomist or has turned Molinist. Only those whose acquaintance with Thomas merely extends to quotations taken from him here and there can seriously maintain this. However there is a difference between St. Thomas and the Thomists. Thomas expresses the Thomistic teaching more clearly and energetically than the Thomists. This is the impression left after reading the articles collected together by Dummermuth. There it appears, and it is the merit of Dummermuth to have made this positively evident, that no Thomist goes beyond his master in the clearness of his teaching on *Praemotio Physica*."

In concluding this paper let us say that in our effort to put before the readers of the IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD the present aspect of this question, we have tried not to let our own convictions make us in any way unfair to our opponents. If in a necessarily limited article we have not at all times put forward both sides with the fulness strict justice would have demanded, we can only say that the injustice is unintentional, we have habitually expressed ourselves far less strongly than our convictions warranted, for while deeply respecting the learning of our opponents, and with a full consciousness of those intellectual difficulties which make many reject Thomism and take refuge in the easier paths of Molinism, we are firmly convinced that on the historical aspect of the question there are not two opinions tenable. Thomism may be wrong, but it is certainly the doctrine of St. Thomas and the *entire* Thomist school.

Writing in a periodical like the IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD it is scarcely necessary to say that we wish to discuss the question purely on theological grounds, and we feel confident that no one will try and read between the lines to discover any animosity to the great society which all Dominicans are bound by their constitutions to hold in special honour for the great service it has rendered to God's Church.

F. CHARLES PRIEST, O.P.

THEOLOGICAL QUESTIONS.

FAST REQUIRED FOR COMMUNION.

“If on a Sunday a drop of water entered the chalice between the consecration and consumption, would the reception of it with the Sacred Species be a violation of the fast, so that the priest could not duplicate to enable the congregation at another Church to satisfy the obligation of hearing Mass? As I knew the case to occur, where a drop of water falling from the roof of the church, which was being repaired, entered the chalice when the celebrant uncovered it sometime after the consecration at his first Mass, I shall be grateful for a word on the query if convenient in the next number of the RECORD.

“A SUBSCRIBER.”

We think it is fairly probable that the priest in this case remains *jejunus* after consuming the chalice. No doubt the law of fasting before Communion is most strict. It is, indeed, so strict that we cannot rely on *parvitas materiae* as justification for our opinion, unless by way of a helping circumstance. Neither is it enough to reflect that a drop of water, which is accidentally let down in washing the mouth, does not break the fast. For whether the water in such a case is actually mixed with *saliva* or not, the point seems to be ruled on the general ground that it descends *per modum salivae*.

Apparently, too, the usual conditions for breaking the fast are present in the occurrence mentioned by our correspondent. The substance is a *res (a) consumptibilis (b) sumpta ab extrinseco (c) per modum potus*. It is, moreover, taken deliberately. Still, so long as a contrary decision is not given, we think one may fairly hold that the fasting law does not forbid its consumption.

For, not merely has this drop fallen into the chalice against the priest's wishes. What is more important is that, if not objectionable on the score of quality, he is most strictly bound to consume it. It cannot be separated from the Sacred Species which the celebrant must receive. He is not free to leave the Sacrifice in any way incomplete, and he may not put aside the contents of the chalice with the object of consecrating anew, unless the foreign ingredient be

dangerous or very disagreeable. Now in these circumstances we do not think the Church attaches a disqualification to receiving the drop of water. Taken by itself, deliberately, it would be a barrier against the reception of our "First Food." But in the case made by our correspondent, its consumption is due to the august Sacrifice itself, and may, we think, be considered as not falling under the fasting prohibition.

THE SICKNESS IN WHICH THE VIATICUM IS GIVEN.

"A lady who has been in the habit of receiving Holy Communion three or four times a week, has been pronounced by several of the most eminent physicians to be suffering from enlarged heart with valvular disease of the same. The disease is certainly a dangerous one, and may at any moment of unusual fatigue or emotion prove fatal. There is, however, one standing danger against which all the doctors have cautioned her—getting up in the morning without having previously taken food. She does not like Holy Communion to be taken to her room, as long as she can come to receive it in the Chapel, though that could be done with some inconvenience. I may add that she can take moderate exercise in the open air and drive out, such exercise being advisable in her state of health. She may, and I hope will live many years, and her heart may be somewhat strengthened by proper treatment and care, but never entirely cured. Can she receive Holy Communion *per modum viatici et non jejuna* ?

"SCIENS SALTEM DUBITARE."

There are extrinsic objections of an obvious nature against an affirmative answer to this question. The giving of Communion *per modum viatici* at the altar rails is generally calculated to excite wonderment on the part of those around. Others, too, if they heard of the lady's practice, might indiscreetly venture to do likewise, relying on their own judgment in regard to sufficiency of cause. Let us, however, suppose that these difficulties have been surmounted. It remains to discuss the intrinsic merits of the case.

Is the lady in *actual* danger of death? Is it solidly probable that each Communion, as it occurs, will be her last? If so, as to receive while fasting involves some inconvenience, she is, according to the general law of the Church, a subject

for the Viaticum though not *jejuna*. Otherwise she must receive fasting.

Accordingly, if the proximate danger would cease on condition of her taking food early, she should be resigned to receive only so often as the priest may be able to arrive before the fast is broken. Again, she is not a subject for the Viaticum as proposed, if apart from "fatigue and emotion" there were no serious reason to fear for her life, provided she could and would by a reasonable effort avoid these sources of peril.

But when able medical men, after every fair precaution, answer our inquiries by saying that, taking all the surroundings into account, it is really probable her next Communion will be her last, she may receive though not fasting. Information as to the precise state of her health is of course indispensable. In heart disease it can be had only from the judgments of others. Hence a priest should be very careful about the replies he gets to the queries we have above suggested.

CASUS SUB IMPEDIMENTO METUS.

"Paulus Catholicus, vix et longinqua regione in qua tribus annis manserat, ad patriam suam reversus, rogat pastorem suum ut cum admittat ad nuptias cum Martha celebrandas, quaestionibus tamen a pastore propositis candide respondens, fatetur se in ista regione catholicam puellam seduxisse nomine Aloysiam, ac propterea fuisse condemnatum a iudice civili juxta regionis leges vel absolute ad matrimonium cum ipsa celebrandum sub diuturnae incarcerationis comminatione vel disjunctive ad eligendum inter nuptias et carcerem: consensum tamen, sub influxu tanti metus, ab ipso fuisse sincere datum: sed, consummato jam matrimonio, se audivisse conjugium nullitate absoluta laborare, ac deinceps a quolibet vinculo conjugali reipsum immunem reputasse.

Re ad ordinarium delata, Pauli veracitas per diligentem inquisitionem agnoscitur. Unde ejus defensor instat ut declaretur conjugium ipsius cum Aloysia fuisse nullum ob metum *gravem* in ordine ad matrimonii celebrationem incussum per sententiam tribunalis laici formaliter saltem si non materialiter *injustam*. Matrimonii autem defensor contendit metum fuisse *juste* incussum, ac proinde, sub hoc respectu validitati conjugii nihil obstare!"

Matrimonium quod cum Aloysia contraxit Paulus videtur esse validum. Nullomodo enim constat metum sub cuius influxu consensum suum dederit sponsus fuisse injustum. Lex quidem illius regionis aliis in locis non viget. At vero mala quae grassantur ubique non sunt eadem. Et sane vix est qui negaret reipublicae ad seductores quam maxime refrenandos inesse potestatem lege generali defloratorem ad nuptias cum violata ineundas, sub comminatione carceris diuturni, cogendi. Res forsitan aliter se haberet si nullum daretur effugium quo evitari possit matrimonium. In casu vero allato lex est saltem virtualiter disjunctiva. Quoniam igitur aequum est tum Paulum ratione dilecti sui forum loci illius sortiri, tum ad bonum commune promovendum legem illam vigere, poena carceris, ad quam declinandam nuptias eligit, non esset injusta; neque invalidus haberi potest contractus sub metu illius poenae confectus.

ACCELERATIO PARTUS.

“Titius, suam uxorem Bertham domi relinquens, mercaturae causa ad regionem longinquam abierat, cum intentione non ante quindecim menses redeundi. Infelix mulier mox ex adulterio gravida facta est; sed prolem sufficienti tempore ante mariti sui reditum esse nascituram sperabat, ut calamitas ipsius lateret; quum ecce, epistola Titi nuntiat eum, ingruente bello, intra paucas hebdomadas penates suos esse revisurum.

Bertha, crudeli auxietate oppressa ad medicum catholicum omni fide dignum festinat, qui agnoscens septimum mensem esse fere completum, et advertens mulierem indignationi mariti aliisque damnis inde orituris fore obnoxiam concludit absque mora accelerandum esse partum. Obtenta prius parochi sui approbatione, feliciter peragit operationem, quae nativitatem procurat prolis viabilis, cuius anima, baptismo regenerata, post breve tempus evolat ad coelum.

Porro Titius tempore praefixo adveniens, Bertham perfectae valetudini restitutum reperit, nec ullam de iufando secreto suspicionem habet.

Parochus autem a quibusdam sacerdotibus accusatus tanquam complicitatis in abortu procurando reus nunc postulat ut vel probetur eum errasse, vel argumenta praebeantur, quibus recte se egisse

demonstret; praesertim si animi perturbatione in corpus redundante grave damnum pro Berthae ipsiusque foetus incolumitate non improbabiler fuisset secuturum."

Nisi ageretur de facto jam completo opinionem nostram libentius de hac re difficillima exponeremus. Prouti res se habet, si iudicium, quod quidem videtur, sit quoad hunc casum individualement ferendum, quaestionem tantae difficultatis ad S. Sedem prius deferre omnino deceret. Quid nobis dicendum paucis explicabimus. Momenta ex utraque parte adsunt gravia. Imprimis tali partus acceleratione damnum ingens proli infertur. Hoc enim facto vel mors vel vita debilis semper sequitur. Secundo, si haec actio *ratione damni ab extrinseco eventuri* permitteretur, generi humano magnum sine dubio oriretur periculum. Altera autem ex parte negari non potest quin commoda pretiosa feminae, marito, toti familiae et interdum ipsi etiam proli acceleratione partus eveniant. Quae cum ita sint, re hinc inde perpensa, nobis videtur sic agere ob rationes allatas non licere, nisi forsitan paucis ante tempus parturitionis consuetum diebus.

DUTY OF THE CHAPLAIN OF A WORKHOUSE TO NON-CATHOLIC INMATES IN DANGER OF DEATH.

"A chaplain to a workhouse hospital in England finds that the rules of the workhouse forbid him to speak on religious matters to a patient who has been entered a *Protestant* in the Creed Register of the house. He understands that this moreover is forbidden by the law of the land.

A patient (Protestant) is dying and asks for the priest to attend him.

Quaeritur 1°. Can he do so in defiance of the law?

Quaeritur 2°. Is he *bound* to do so in defiance of the law?

In reply to Q. 2, a late lamented priest of much experience on the English mission answered, it is said, "He is not bound," relying on the fact that the evils resulting from such action in a bigoted Protestant country would be very great." "SACERDOS."

We find some difficulty in reconciling the experience of the deceased pastor to whom our respected correspondent refers with information that has come to us from another

source. We have been told on excellent authority that with a little tact and sacrifice of self a priest may secure fair liberty for the exercise of his sacred functions on behalf of the sick in English workhouses. Experience, however, in matters of this kind is liable to vary with the antecedents and surroundings of particular places. Hence, without further question as to facts, we turn to consider the difficulties proposed by "Sacerdos."

If the law to which he alludes is in some respects inconvenient, it has also decided advantages in protecting the dying poor of the Catholic Church against the inroads of proselytisers. Accordingly, whilst in discharge of the sacred office of charity towards those who are in extreme peril of salvation, a priest should avoid as far as possible all unfavourable suspicion in regard to this rule. If, then, the local authorities insist that a priest, though invited, is not free to attend any person who is not registered as a Catholic, let him at once see to the patient's right of having his name transferred to the Catholic roll. This once done, his way is clear.

But may not the officials through bigotry manage to evade the transfer? And again what is to be done when only a few moments of life remain? Either supposition plainly refers to a state of things which is easily possible. In the former case, if evidence were forthcoming to prove what has occurred, a priest should, we think, have little to fear, except perhaps for himself personally, in attending the dying man. Now no consideration of personal loss in the temporal order can withstand the claim here pressing on his charity. For, taking non-Catholic adults as they are generally found in workhouses, with their sins, their dimness in religion and their spiritual helplessness, no one can question the extreme danger of their state. A human soul in this sad plight bids us forget every temporal interest of self.

But, if we pass from this first hypothesis, higher interests may be involved. The future of religion and the claims of Catholic inmates are sometimes at stake. All evidence of a favourable kind may be beyond hope. Or again it may be a case brooking no delay. In such events we can conceive

the authorities so disposed that they will adhere to the letter of the regulation, and perhaps punish its infraction by making it impossible for any priest to attend the Catholic patients for a considerable time afterwards. Besides it is a matter of ready occurrence that several persons, if not the whole non-Catholic community, might through ignorance of what actually happened, come to detest our holy religion, if a chaplain persisted beyond his legal rights.

Thus our correspondent's questions in their most difficult aspect supply striking examples of acts from which good and bad effects follow in profusion. About the former no one among us has any serious misgiving. The salvation of a human soul is at stake, and will be secured by the priest's intervention. The evil results, too, are manifest. Now in these circumstances, if a chaplain foresees that the sinful children of his Catholic flock in the workhouse would for certain be deprived, even illegally, of a priest's ministrations at the hour of death owing to his attending this dying man, hard as the word is, we think he should not approach the poor sinner's couch. The claim of numbers here prevails.

If, on the other hand, an outcry against the Catholic priesthood or religion were the worst of *likely* consequences, whilst we can easily fancy extreme cases, in which one should prevent greater evils by leaving the poor sinner prayerfully to God, we think in ordinary circumstances the proper course would be to administer the necessary assistance relying on Providence and the justice of the cause for the future of religion in the institution and neighbourhood.

Throughout we suppose the priest is asked to be present.

P. O'D.

THE CHURCH ABROAD.

The following extract from an article in the *Ecclesiastical Gazette* of Berlin, written by Herr Stoecker, the famous Protestant pastor of that city, gives an idea of the relative position and influence of the Catholic and Protestant Churches in Germany and Prussia.

"In recent times," says this writer, "we have seen the Catholic Church in Germany acquire a preponderating influence in the State.

Whilst our Church threatens to succumb beneath the indifference of the enlightened classes, and the hatred of the lower element, Rome has gained the sympathy of princes, nobles, the gentry, the peasants, and the workmen. The Catholics entered into a struggle with the most powerful kingdom in the world and have been entirely successful. For ten years the "Centre" carried on the battle in the Reichstag, and can now be resisted only by satisfying its Catholic claims. The same Church has likewise acquired wide-spread influence in social as well as in political and religious matters. Very active in literature and in the life of association she has hindered the triumph of Socialism. She is now regarded as the friend of great economic reforms, and the pioneer amongst us of social regeneration." And farther on, "It is beyond question that the Catholic Church has taken the lead in power and influence, leaving us Protestants behind. She now seeks to maintain this advance. Her activity increases everywhere. She is sought after by courts, respected by parliaments, and loved by the people. She is indeed a power with which we have to count."

This is valuable testimony coming from one of the most earnest and intelligent adversaries of Catholicism in the German Empire. It shows too, how false are the criticisms which exult in what they call the utter break-down of the recent Papal interference in German affairs. Of the many extravagant appreciations of this action of Pope Leo XIII. which we have seen expressed within the last month, perhaps the most absurd is that which we have noticed in the April number of the *Contemporary Review*, from the pen of a gentleman who seems to be a native German, and who writes on "Contemporary Life and Thought in Germany." At page 598 he says, "It is a fact not sufficiently noticed that by this interference Leo XIII. strains the Papal Infallibility so as to make it cover everything. Evidently if there ever was a purely secular question it is that of the Septennate. The Pope can bring it within his reach only by extending it to the category of moral questions. But then what other political question may not be classed as a moral one. It was exactly the same reasoning which prompted the interference of Innocent III. in secular contexts, 'non quia judico de feudo sed quia judico de peccato.'"

As far as we Catholics are aware no disputed point of faith or morality has been decided by papal authority since the Vatican Council was held. The infallibility of the Pope, such as it was there defined and which pronounces "ex cathedra" on these matters of

belief or of morals, has not been *strained* to anything that we know of within the past sixteen years much less to an act of passing administration in the ordinary government of the Church. Both Pius IX. and Leo XIII. have addressed weighty or as the Italians say "stupendous Encyclicals" to the universal church, but even these although they are entitled to the assent and obedience of all Catholics on account of the high and sacred authority of the supreme teachers from whom they emanate, do not at all come within the limits of the definition of Papal Infallibility as set forth by the Vatican Council. That is what we Catholics hold ; so that writers like Dr. H. Geffcken must either be in complete ignorance of what is understood by Papal Infallibility, which is very unfortunate, or else they will insist that they know much better what we believe on the subject than we do ourselves. The enemies of the Pope may say what they will. He has gained what he wanted for the time being in Germany and the rulers of that country are not less anxious now than they were before the elections to secure his influence and co-operation in the struggle against socialism and revolution. Besides no act of the Pontificate of Leo XIII. has produced such a serious and salutary effect on Italian politicians. They seem to realize for the first time the paramount necessity of arranging some definite *modus vivendi* between Church and State. The following paragraphs from a letter written to the *Opinione* by a Liberal deputy of the Italian parliament, Signor Toscanelli of Florence, gives expression to the general uneasiness felt on the subject in Liberal circles.

"I am quite of your opinion as to the necessity for the Italian Government and people of arranging without foreign intervention the differences that unfortunately exist between Church and State. But in order to realize that object the State must make up its mind to grant the Holy See a position which she can honourably accept, as the Supreme Head of the Church is plainly justified in affirming that his present position is intolerable. All existing immunities are confined to the Vatican, and when the Pontiff goes outside the threshold of this palace he steps into the atheistical, persecuting state, which banishes God from the schools, from the marriage ceremonies and the courts of justice ; which denies religious assistance to the sailors of our war vessels, which allows our churches to fall in ruins, confiscates the property which has been raised at the expense of the Catholic world, and continually introduces laws hostile to Catholicism. If I were to enumerate all the acts which have been accomplished since 1860 and which taken in their entirety,

reveal a system which aims at the de-christianization of Italy I should be obliged to write for a whole week. The head of the Church is therefore compelled either to remain within the walls of the Vatican or to come forth into a kingdom which has officially declared itself to be the open enemy of Catholicism.

“I believe that if we were to recognise that the supreme ruler of the Church is the sovereign by right and in fact in the Vatican and if we were to give him in addition lands necessary for the establishments which form part of the Universal Church such as the Propaganda, the residences of generals of the religious orders and their procurators and of foreign representatives we could then have a Sacred Rome and a Profane Rome both independent of each other. What I propose is by no means calculated to restore the temporal power but would considerably modify the present state of things which justifies the Pontiff in his repeated complaints.”

This proposal proves at least that the more moderate sections of the legislature are impressed with the necessity of coming to terms with the Church. They do not fail to see that the existing relations are a source of great weakness and danger to the state. Nowhere is this aspect of the case better developed than in the recent book of Signor Gallenga—*Italy: Present and Future*.

“The dethronement of the Pope-King” he says, “was the bitterest drop in the cup of humiliation which France had to drain in the issue of her fatal contest with Germany. So long as the Pope is a prisoner, so long as Italy is one, France cannot be said to have spoken her last word. It little matters whether a Thiers, or a Gambetta, a de Freycinet, or a Floquet, or even a priest-hunter like Clémenceau or Rochefort, be at the head of the Government—in the absence of any better cause, the Pope may still at any time furnish a pretext for a French Crusade against Italy and in any such occurrence Italy would have her enemy’s ally within her own boundaries, in the very heart of the country,” and in another passage—“Italy has reached only half the goal aimed at by Mazzini when he wished to enthrone ‘Dio e il Popolo’—God and the people—The people is sovereign, but God is nowhere. What have the democrats done with him? They have broken the laws, the earthly ties of man to man and they have trampled on religion—*i.e.* on conscience which is the Divine link by which human bonds can be securely riveted. ‘Away with the Pope! Down with the Priest! Give us godless schools in a godless State!’ Such is the democratic clamour in Italy, in that benighted country where nine-tenths of the population can no

more exist without their Santa Messa (Holy Mass) than without their daily bread; and the other tenth consists of arrant infidels who dare not die without crying out 'Un prete! Un prete!' 'For God's sake send for a priest!'"

In France and Belgium the same pressing necessity of a restoration of the temporal power occupies the public mind. The eminent French publicist, M. Rendu, has rendered valuable service by his articles on "Rome capitale" and two interesting pamphlets have just been published which leave no aspect of the question undiscussed. The first has appeared at Brussels and is entitled "Nécessité d'une Restauration du Pouvoir temporel de la Papauté." It is divided into three chapters (1) "Le Pape est à la merci d'autrui" (2) "Le Pape doit être libre et indépendant" (3) "Le Pape doit être souverain temporel." The second work is entitled "La Restauration de la Royauté légitime à Rome" by M. de Dean de Varick, President of the "Catholic Circle" of The Hague in Holland. This work is still more valuable and complete than the preceding. It enters into the origin and development of the international conspiracy which has succeeded in depriving the Pope of his dominions as portion of the more general plan "pour écraser l'infame."

On the other hand the advanced Radicals of Italy are not idle. One of their ablest and most distinguished writers has recently contributed an article to the *Revue Internationale* on the "Roman Question." His argument is as follows:—"Every city or state that is conquered passes under the dominion of the conqueror. Rome was conquered, therefore it has become the property of the conqueror. Pius IX. opposed by force of arms the entry of the Italian soldiers into Rome. The resistance was short and he was vanquished. The inevitable result of this, as of every war, is a change of sovereignty over the territory of the party that was defeated. Nobody doubts that Alsace and Lorraine are now lawfully under the dominion of Germany, no more than they doubt that for over two centuries they *lawfully* belonged to France."

To this the *Civiltà Cattolica* replies (page 398): "We are sorry to see Signor Bonghi fall into such a serious error. For we hold as certain that the right of conquest when separated from the justice of the war, is null and worthless. It is simply the right of the assassin, nothing more nor less. We do not wish to examine here whether the justice of the war was on the side of France or on that of Prussia, but it is quite certain that France not only has some doubt as to the lawfulness of the possession of Alsace and

Lorraine by Germany; but she believes that she is fully justified in making war in order to regain those provinces which were hers for over two centuries. Besides the parallel between the two cases does not hold. For the German conquest of Alsace-Lorraine has been sanctioned by a formal treaty between France and Germany; whereas no treaty has ever been made and never can be made between the Holy See and the Revolution. We have on the contrary a series of the most solemn and explicit protests from Pius IX. and Leo XIII. which have prevented Europe from ever recognizing as lawful the material fact of the conquest of Rome. Whoever would recognize that fact as lawful should equally admit the right of the robber and of the assassin who are also in their way material conquerors."

J. F. HOGAN.

DOCUMENTS.

IMPORTANT STATEMENT REGARDING THE ASSOCIATION OF THE
 "KNIGHTS OF LABOUR," PREPARED BY CARDINAL GIBBONS,
 AND PRESENTED BY HIS EMINENCE TO THE CARDINAL
 PREFECT OF PROPAGANDA.

SUMMARY.

Great importance of the question.—The principles on which the investigation is conducted, found in the Encyclicals of his Holiness, Leo XIII., and Acts of the Holy See.—Wise provision of the Third Council of Baltimore for examining the character and objects of such associations, before proceeding to a condemnation.

Ten of the twelve Archbishops of the United States oppose the condemnation of the "Knights of Labour."—The reasons for this judgment enumerated and explained:—

- 1°. In the form of initiation there is no oath.
- 2°. The members are allowed to reveal their secret proceedings to competent ecclesiastical authority.
- 3°. No promise of blind obedience is exacted.
- 4°. They profess no hostility to religion or to the authority of the Church or the State.

Objects of the Association of the "Knights of Labour":—

1°. To protect the interests and rights of the working masses in the State.

2°. To redress the admitted social evils caused by the avarice, oppression and corruption of the few.

The Catholic "Knights of Labour" resist the temptation to join the Freemasons, from a spirit of obedience to the laws of the Church. The great danger of driving men who are so loyal to Holy Church into secret societies, if their own organisation formed to attain lawful ends by legitimate means be placed under the ban of the Church.

Reasons put forward by those who advocate the condemnation of the Association:—

1°. In this Association Catholics are mixed up with Protestants.

2°. Why not establish an Association under the guidance of the clergy?

3°. Such an organisation exposes Catholics to come under the baneful influence of anarchists, communists, atheists, &c.

4°. Similar associations of workingmen have been stained with crime.

These objections answered.

The democracy the great power of the future. Hence the mission of the Catholic Church to possess itself of the hearts of the masses, in order to form and guide them according to the principles of faith and religion. Important declaration of Cardinal Manning on this subject.

Evils to be apprehended from an attitude of hostility, or even of coldness or indifference on the part of the Church towards the masses.

Conclusions to be drawn:—

1°. The condemnation of the "Knights of Labour" is not justifiable on the principles hitherto followed in condemning certain societies.

2°. It is not necessary.

3°. It is not prudent.

4°. It is dangerous.

5°. It would be inoperative.

6°. It would be injurious.

7°. It would be ruinous in its effect on the support of the Church in America, and of the "Peter's Pence."

8°. It would alienate the masses from the Church and the Holy See.

9°. It would be very injurious to the influence of the Bishops in the United States.

[*Motifs de présenter au Saint-Siège cette mémoire sur les Chevaliers du Travail. Lettres Encycliques de Léon XIII. prises comme guide dans l'examen de la question. Affaires de ce genre déferées par le Concile de Baltimore à une commission d'Archevêques.*]

A. S. EM. LE CARDINAL SIMEONI PREFET DE LA S. CONGREGATION
DE LA PROPAGANDE.

EMINENCE,

En soumettant au Saint-Siège les conclusions qui, après plusieurs mois d'observations et de réflexions attentives, me semblent résumer la vérité sur la question de l'association des Chevaliers du Travail, je suis profondément convaincu de la vaste importance des conséquences qui se rattachent à cette question, laquelle ne forme qu'un anneau dans la grande chaîne des problèmes sociaux de nos jours, et spécialement, de notre pays.

En traitant cette question, j'ai eu grand soin de suivre comme guide constant l'esprit des Encycliques dans lesquelles notre Saint-Père Léon XIII., a si admirablement exposé les dangers de nos temps et leurs remèdes, ainsi que les principes par lesquels doivent se discerner les associations condamnées par le Saint-Siège. Tel fut aussi le guide du Troisième Concile Plénier de Baltimore, dans ses enseignements sur les principes à suivre et les dangers à éviter par les fidèles dans le choix ou la formation des associations, vers lesquelles l'esprit de nos institutions populaires les pousse si fortement. Et, considérant les conséquences funestes qui pourraient résulter d'une erreur dans le traitement des organisations qui souvent comptent leurs affiliés par milliers et par centaines de milliers, le Concile a sagement ordonné (n. 255) que, lorsqu'une association est répandue en plusieurs diocèses, pas même un Evêque d'un de ces diocèses ne doit la condamner, mais doit en référer la cause à la Commission permanente de tous les Archevêques des Etats-Unis; lesquels ne sont pas même autorisés à émettre une condamnation, à moins que leur décision ne soit unanime; et si cette unanimité vient à manquer, le jugement seul du Saint-Siège pourrait imposer une condamnation, pour éviter l'erreur et la confusion de discipline.

Cette Commission des Archevêques s'est réunie, en effet, vers la fin du mois d'octobre dernier, spécialement pour considérer l'association des Chevaliers de Travail. Nous ne fûmes décidés à tenir cette réunion par aucune demande de la part de nos Evêques; car personne ne l'a demandée, et même il faut dire qu'entre tous les Evêques nous n'en connaissons que deux ou trois qui en désirent la

condamnation. Mais l'importance de la question en elle-même et dans la pensée du Saint-Siège, nous l'a fait examiner avec la plus grande attention. Après notre discussion, dont les résultats ont été déjà communiqués à la Sacrée-Congrégation de la Propagande, seulement deux Archevêques sur douze ont voté pour la condamnation, et cela pour des raisons qui n'ont nullement persuadé les autres soit de la justice, soit de la prudence, d'une telle condamnation.

[*Raisons qui ont déterminé le vote de la majorité de la commission. Règles correctes. Pas de serment. L'obligation au secret ne s'étend pas aux autorités ecclésiastiques. Aucune hostilité contre la religion ni contre les lois civiles du pays.*]

Dans les considérations qui suivent, je veux présenter en détail les raisons qui ont déterminé le vote de la grande majorité de la Commission, et dont la vérité et la force ne me paraissent que plus évidentes encore aujourd'hui; et, en même temps, j'essaierai de faire justice des arguments mis en avant par le parti contraire.

1. Et, premièrement, dans la constitution, dans les lois et les déclarations officielles des Chevaliers du Travail, il peut bien se trouver des assertions ou des règles qu'on n'approuverait pas; mais nous n'y avons pas découvert les éléments, si clairement indiqués par le Saint-Siège, qui rangent une association parmi celles qui sont les condamnées.

(a) Dans leur formule d'agrégation, il n'y a pas de serment.

(b) L'obligation au secret, qui empêche la connaissance de leurs affaires à ceux qui y sont étrangers ou ennemis, ne défend nullement aux catholiques de tout manifester aux autorités ecclésiastiques compétentes, même hors de la confession. Cela nous a été absolument déclaré par leur président.

(c) Il n'y a point de promesse d'obéissance aveugle. Les fins de l'association et ses lois sont distinctement déclarés, et l'obligation d'obéissance n'outrepasse pas ces limites.

(d) Non seulement leurs fins et leurs lois ne professent aucune hostilité contre la religion ou l'Eglise, mais leurs déclarations sont tout le contraire. Le Troisième Concile Plénier ordonne que nous ne condamnions pas une association sans en entendre les officiers ou représentants: "auditis ducibus, corypheis vel sociis praecipuis" (n. 254). Or, leur président, en m'envoyant une copie de leur constitution, déclare qu'il est catholique du fond de son coeur; qu'il pratique fidèlement sa religion et reçoit régulièrement les sacrements; qu'il n'appartient à aucune association maçonnique ou autrement

condamnée par l'Eglise ; qu'il ne connaît rien dans l'association des Chevaliers du Travail qui soit contraire aux règles de l'Eglise ; qu'avec une soumission filiale il prie les Pasteurs de l'Eglise d'examiner tous les détails de leur organisation, et, s'ils y trouvent quelque chose de condamnable, de le leur indiquer, et il en promet la correction. Assurément, on ne voit là aucune hostilité envers l'autorité de l'Eglise, mais, au contraire, un esprit tout à fait louable. Après leur Convention de l'année dernière à Richmond, lui et plusieurs des officiers et membres, catholiques dévoués, ont fait les mêmes déclarations touchant leurs sentiments et l'action de la Convention, dont nous attendons de recevoir les documents.

(e) Nous ne pouvons y trouver non plus aucune hostilité contre l'autorité et les lois du pays. Non seulement rien de la sorte n'apparaît dans leur constitution et règles, mais les chefs de notre autorité civile traitent avec le plus grand respect la cause qu'ils représentent. Le Président des Etats-Unis m'a dit personnellement, il y a un mois, qu'il examinait alors une loi pour l'amélioration de quelques griefs sociaux, et qu'il venait d'avoir une longue conférence sur le sujet avec M. Powderly, président des Chevaliers du Travail. Le Congrès des Etats-Unis, suivant les conseils du Président Cleveland, s'occupe à présent de l'amélioration des classes ouvrières, dans les plaintes desquelles on reconnaît ouvertement beaucoup de vérité. Et les partis politiques, loin de les regarder comme des ennemis du pays, rivalisent pour réclamer les droits évidents des pauvres travailleurs, qui ne cherchent pas à résister aux lois, mais seulement à obtenir une législation juste par des moyens constitutionnels et légitimes.

Et ces considérations, qui montrent que dans cette association on ne trouve pas les éléments que le Saint-Siège condamne, nous portent à envisager en second lieu, les maux que l'association combat et la nature du conflit.

[L'objet de l'association est d'obtenir un remède légal aux maux sociaux et aux injustices publiques. Moyen naturel et juste. Les Chevaliers du Travail refusent les avantages de l'organisation Maçonnique.]

2. Qu'il y ait chez nous, comme dans les autres pays du monde, des maux sociaux graves et menaçants, des injustices publiques qui réclament une résistance ferme et un remède légal, c'est ce que personne n'ose contester, et ce dont la vérité a été déjà reconnue par le Congrès et le Président des Etats-Unis. Sans entrer dans

les tristes détails de ces torts, ce qui ne paraît pas nécessaire ici, il peut suffire de mentionner seulement que les monopoles, de la part des individus et des corporations, ont déjà excité non seulement les plaintes des ouvriers, mais aussi l'opposition des hommes publics et des législateurs du pays ; que les efforts de ces monopolistes, non parfois sans succès, pour contrôler la législation à leur propre profit, causent beaucoup d'inquiétude aux amis désintéressés de la liberté ; que l'avarice sans cœur qui, pour plus gagner, écrase impitoyablement non seulement les ouvriers de plusieurs métiers, mais spécialement les femmes et même les jeunes enfants à leur service, fait comprendre à tous ceux qui aiment l'humanité et la justice que ce n'est pas seulement le droit des travailleurs de se protéger, mais l'obligation du peuple entier de les aider en trouvant un remède pour les dangers dont la civilisation et l'ordre social sont menacés par l'avarice, l'oppression et la corruption.

On ne saurait nier avec vraisemblance l'existence des maux, le droit de résistance légitime, et la nécessité d'un remède. Tout au plus, pourrait-on douter de la légitimité de la forme de résistance et de remède employés par les Chevaliers du Travail. Tel doit donc être le point spécial de notre examen.

3. On peut à peine douter que, pour atteindre un but public quelconque, l'association, l'organisation des multitudes intéressées, est le moyen le plus efficace, un moyen tout-à-fait naturel et juste. Cela est si évident, et, en outre, si conforme au génie de notre pays, de notre condition sociale essentiellement populaire, qu'il n'est pas nécessaire d'y insister. C'est presque le seul moyen pour gagner l'attention publique, pour assurer la force à la résistance, la plus légitime, pour donner poids aux demandes les plus justes.

Or, il existe déjà une organisation qui présente mille attractions, mille avantages, mais que nos ouvriers catholiques, avec une obéissance filiale au Saint-Siège, se refusent d'accepter ; c'est l'organisation *MACONNIQUE*, qui existe partout dans notre pays, qui comme M. Powderly nous l'a expressément fait noter, unit le patron et l'ouvrier dans une fraternité très avantageuse pour ce dernier, mais qui ne compte entre ses rangs presque pas un seul catholique. Renonçant de grand cœur aux avantages que l'Eglise et la conscience défendent, les travailleurs se forment en associations n'ayant rien de commun avec les desseins funestes des ennemis de la religion, et ne cherchant que leur protection et leur assistance mutuelle, et l'assertion légitime de leurs droits. Mais, de ce côté-là aussi, ils se trouvent menacés de condamnation, et comme privés de leur seul moyen de défense. Est-il surprenant qu'ils demandent pourquoi ?

[*Objections contre l'association. Catholiques mêlés avec les protestants. Réponse. Protestants admis aux avantages des Catholiques. Inutilité de substituer les confréries et les réunions sous la conduite du prêtre. Dangers des influences sinistres. Réponse. Accès de violence dans les grèves d'ouvriers condamnés par l'association.*]

4. Voyons donc les objections qu'on fait contre cette sorte d'organisation.

(a) On objecte que, dans ces organisations, les catholiques se trouvent mêlés avec les protestants, au péril de leur foi. Naturellement oui, ils sont mêlés avec les protestants dans les associations de travailleurs, précisément comme ils le sont dans les travaux mêmes ; car, chez un peuple mixte comme le nôtre, la séparation des religions dans les affaires civiles n'est pas possible. Mais, supposer que la foi des catholiques en souffrirait, ce serait ne pas connaître les ouvriers catholiques d'Amérique qui ne sont pas, comme les ouvriers de tant de pays européens, des fils déçus et dénaturés, regardant leur Mère l'Eglise comme une marâtre hostile, mais ce sont des fils intelligents, bien instruits et dévoués, prêts à donner leur sang, comme ils donnent continuellement leurs moyens (quoique chétifs et péniblement gagnés), pour son soutien et sa protection.

Et, à vrai dire, dans le cas présent la question n'est pas que les catholiques sont mêlés aux protestants, mais que les protestants sont admis aux avantages d'une association dont les deux tiers des membres et les officiers principaux sont catholiques, et, dans un pays comme le nôtre, leur exclusion serait simplement impossible.

(b) Mais, dit-on, ne pourrait-on pas substituer à une telle organisation les confréries qui les réuniraient sous la conduite des prêtres et sous l'influence directe de la religion ? Je réponds franchement que je ne le crois ni possible ni nécessaire dans notre pays. J'admire sincèrement les efforts de ce genre qu'on fait dans les pays où les ouvriers sont égarés par les ennemis de la religion ; mais, grâce au bon Dieu, nous n'en sommes pas là. Nous trouvons que, chez nous la présence et l'influence explicite du prêtre ne serait pas à conseiller là où les citoyens, sans distinction de croyance religieuse, se rassemblent pour ce qui touche seulement à leurs intérêts industriels. Nous avons des moyens abondants pour en faire des bons catholiques sans aller si loin, et le simple bon sens nous conseille de ne pas pousser les choses aux extrêmes.

(c) On objecte encore que la liberté d'une telle organisation expose les catholiques aux influences sinistres des associés les plus

dangereux, même des athées, des communistes et des anarchiste. Cela est vrai ; mais c'est une des épreuves de la foi de nos braves catholiques américains, auxquelles ils sont accoutumés presque tous les jours, mais qu'ils savent bien mépriser avec bon sens et fermeté. Les journaux nous disent, et le président des Chevaliers du Travail nous a raconté, comment ces éléments violents et agressifs ont essayé de s'emparer de l'autorité dans leurs conseils, ou d'insinuer leur poison dans les principes de l'association ; mais aussi ils constatent avec quelle détermination ces mauvais esprits ont été repoussés et battus. La présence parmi nos citoyens de cet élément destructif, venu pour la plupart de certaines nations de l'Europe, est assurément pour nous une occasion de vifs regrets et de précautions particulières ; mais c'est un fait inévitable, et que l'union entre l'Eglise et ses fils rend très-peu dangereux chez nous où, en effet, le seul danger grave viendrait d'un refroidissement entre l'Eglise et ses enfants, que rien n'occasionerait plus sûrement que les condamnations imprudentes.

(d) On insiste spécialement sur les accès de violence, même jusqu'à l'effusion du sang, qui ont caractérisé plusieurs des grèves inaugurées par les associations d'ouvriers. Sur cela, il y a trois choses à remarquer ; premièrement, que les grèves ne sont pas une invention des Chevaliers du Travail, mais le moyen presque universel et perpétuel, chez nous et ailleurs, par lequel les employés protestent contre ce qu'ils jugent injuste et réclament leurs droits ; secondement, que dans une telle lutte des multitudes pauvres et indignées contre le monopole dur et obstiné, la colère et la violence sont souvent aussi inévitables que regrettables : troisièmement, que les lois et les autorités principales des Chevaliers du Travail, loin d'encourager la violence ou les occasions de la violence exercent une influence puissante pour l'empêcher, et pour retenir les grèves dans les limites du bon ordre et de l'action légitime. Un examen attentif des violences qui ont marqué la lutte entre le capital et le travail pendant l'année passée, nous donne la conviction qu'il serait injuste de les attribuer à l'association des Chevaliers du Travail. Ce n'était qu'une des nombreuses associations d'ouvriers qui y ont pris part ; et les autorités principales de cette organisation ont fait, selon les témoins désintéressés, tous les efforts possibles pour apaiser la colère des multitudes et pour empêcher les excès qui, à mon jugement, ne sauraient justement leur être attribués. Sans doute, parmi les Chevaliers du Travail, comme parmi les autres milliers d'ouvriers, il y a des esprits passionnés, ou même mauvais et criminels, qui ont commis des violences inexcusables, et qui y ont

poussé leurs associés ; mais attribuer cela à l'organisation, serait aussi déraisonnable, il me semble, qu'attribuer à l'Eglise les folies et les crimes de ses enfants, contre lesquels elle proteste. Je répète que, dans une telle lutte des grandes masses contre le pouvoir armé qui, on le reconnaît, leur refuse souvent les simples droits de l'humanité et de la justice, il est inutile d'espérer que toute erreur et tout excès de violence puisse être évité ; c'est ignorer la nature et les forces de la société humaine dans les circonstances de nos jours, que de rêver que cette lutte puisse être empêchée, ou que nous puissions persuader aux multitudes à ne pas s'organiser, seul moyen pratique de succès. Le parti de la prudence chrétienne est évidemment d'essayer de tenir les cœurs de la multitude par les liens de l'amour, afin de pouvoir les contrôler par les principes de la foi, de la justice et de la charité ; de reconnaître franchement le vrai et le juste dans leur cause, afin de pouvoir les éloigner de ce qui serait faux et criminel ; et ainsi de faire converger à une lutte légitime, paisible et bienfaisante, ce qui, par une cause de sévérité repulsive, pourrait bien devenir pour les masses de notre peuple un abîme volcanique, semblable à celui que la société craint et que l'Eglise déplore en Europe.

Sur ce point j'insiste fortement, parce que ma connaissance intime de la condition sociale de notre pays me rend profondément convaincu que nous touchons ici une question qui ne concerne pas seulement les droits des classes ouvrières, qui doivent être spécialement chères à l'Eglise, envoyée par notre Divin Seigneur pour évangéliser les pauvres, mais une question dans laquelle sont compris les intérêts les plus fondamentaux de l'Eglise et de la société humaine pour l'avenir. C'est un point que je voudrais, en peu de mots, présenter dans une lumière plus claire.

[*Direction à donner par l'église au pouvoir du peuple. Absolue nécessité selon le Cardinal Manning de pourvoir à l'amélioration de la condition des basses classes. C'est le programme de l'avenir en Amérique.*]

5. Quiconque médite bien les voies par lesquelles la Divine Providence guide l'histoire contemporaine, ne peut pas manquer de reconnaître la part importante qu'y prend à présent, et que doit y prendre dans le futur, le pouvoir du peuple. Nous voyons avec une profonde tristesse les efforts du prince des ténèbres pour rendre ce pouvoir dangereux au bien social, en soustrayant les masses populaires à l'influence de la religion, et en les poussant dans les sentiers pernicieux de la licence et de l'anarchie. Jusqu'ici, notre pays

présente un aspect tout différent—celui d'un pouvoir populaire réglé par l'amour du bon ordre, par le respect pour la religion, par l'obéissance à l'autorité des lois ; ce n'est pas une démocratie de licence et de violence, mais la vraie démocratie qui cherche la prospérité générale par les voies des sains principes et du bon ordre social.

Pour conserver un état si désirable, il est absolument nécessaire que la religion continue de posséder les affections, et de régler ainsi la conduite des multitudes. Comme l'a si bien écrit le Cardinal Manning : “ Dans l'ère future, ce n'est pas avec les princes et les parlements, mais avec les grandes masses, avec le peuple, que l'Eglise aura à traiter. Que nous le voulons ou non, voilà notre œuvre, une œuvre pour l'accomplissement de laquelle il nous faut un nouvel esprit, une nouvelle direction de vie et d'activité.” Perdre l'influence sur le peuple, ce serait perdre l'avenir tout entier ; et c'est par le cœur beaucoup plus que par l'entendement, qu'il faut tenir et guider cette puissance immense pour le bien ou pour le mal. Entre tous les titres glorieux de l'Eglise que son histoire lui a mérités, il n'y en est pas un qui lui donne à présent tant d'influence que celui d'Amie du Peuple. Assurément, dans notre nation démocratique, c'est ce titre-là qui gagne à l'Eglise Catholique non seulement le dévouement enthousiaste de millions de ses enfants, mais le respect et l'admiration de tous nos citoyens, quelle que soit leur croyance religieuse. C'est la puissance de ce titre-là qui empêche et rend presque impossible la persécution, et qui attire vers notre sainte Eglise le grand cœur du peuple américain.

Et puisqu'il est reconnu de tous que les grandes questions de l'avenir ne sont pas des questions de guerre, de commerce ou de finance, mais les questions sociales, les questions qui touchent à l'amélioration de la condition des grandes masses populaires, et spécialement des classes ouvrières, il est d'une importance souveraine que l'Eglise soit trouvée toujours et fermement rangée du côté de l'humanité, de la justice envers les multitudes qui composent le corps de la famille humaine. Comme l'a très-sagement écrit le même éminent Cardinal Manning : “ Il nous faut admettre et accepter avec calme et avec bonne volonté, que les industries et les profits doivent être considérés en premier lieu. Je n'oserai pas formuler les actes du Parlement, mais voilà bien leur principe fondamental pour l'avenir. Les conditions des basses classes qui se trouvent à présent parmi notre peuple, ne peuvent pas et ne doivent pas continuer. Sur de telles bases, nul édifice social ne peut subsister.”

Dans notre pays spécialement c'est le programme inévitable de l'avenir; et l'attitude que doit tenir l'Eglise vers la solution est assez évidente. Ce n'est pas certainement à favoriser les extrêmes auxquels les pauvres multitudes sont naturellement portées, mais c'est, je le répète à les détourner de ces extrêmes par les liens de l'affection, par le désir maternel qu'elle montrera pour la concession de tout ce qui est juste et raisonnable dans leurs demandes, et par la bénédiction maternelle qu'elle donnera à tout moyen légitime pour l'amélioration populaire.

[*Conséquences désastreuses qui s'ensuivraient d'une attitude de froideur envers les classes ouvrières. Grand danger pour l'Eglise de rendre hostiles les partis politiques qui s'intéressent avant tout aux besoins des ouvriers et de perdre, à cause de cela, l'amour de ses enfants.*]

6. Et considérons un moment les conséquences qui s'ensuivraient inévitablement d'un cours contraire, d'une attitude de froideur envers les classes ouvrières, de soupçon pour leurs objets, de condamnation facile pour leurs moyens.

(a) Premièrement, il y a le danger évident que l'Eglise ne perde, dans l'appréciation populaire, son droit d'être considérée comme Amie du peuple. La logique du cœur des multitudes va vite à ses conclusions; et ce serait une conclusion funeste pour le peuple et pour l'Eglise. Perdre le cœur du peuple ce serait un dommage que l'amitié du petit nombre des riches ou des puissants ne compenserait pas.

(b) Il y a grand danger de rendre hostile à l'Eglise le pouvoir politique de notre nation qui se range ouvertement du côté des millions qui réclament la justice et l'amélioration de leur état. L'accusation d'être "unamerican," c'est-à-dire étrangère à notre esprit national, est l'arme la plus puissante que les ennemies de l'Eglise savent diriger contre elle. C'est ce cri-là qui a excité la persécution par les "Know-nothings" Américains, il y a trente ans: et ils ne tarderont pas à s'en servir encore si l'occasion leur en est donnée. Pour apprécier la grandeur de ce danger, on doit remarquer que non seulement les droits des classes ouvrières sont hautement proclamés par les deux grands partis politiques, mais qu'il est très-probable que dans nos élections prochaines il y aura un candidat pour le poste de Président des Etats-Unis pour représenter spécialement ces griefs et ces demandes populaires. Or, vouloir écraser par une condamnation ecclésiastique une organisation qui représente presque

500,000 voix, et qui a déjà une place si respectable et si universellement reconnue dans l'arène politique, cela serait regardé par le peuple américain, à parler franchement, comme aussi ridicule que hardi. Nous aliéner l'amitié populaire, ce serait courir grand risque de perdre le prestige que l'Eglise a gagné auprès de la nation américaine, et de détruire cet état de paix et de prospérité qui forme un si beau contraste avec sa condition dans quelques-uns des pays soi-disant catholiques. Déjà, dans ces mois derniers, un bruit de colère populaire et de menace contre l'Eglise s'est fait entendre; et il nous faut aller avec beaucoup de précaution.

(c) Un troisième danger, et celui qui touche le plus à nos cœurs, c'est celui de perdre l'amour des enfants de l'Eglise, et de les pousser à une attitude de rébellion envers leur Mère. Le monde entier ne présente pas un spectacle plus beau que celui de leur dévouement et de leur obéissance filiale. Mais, il faut le reconnaître, dans notre siècle et dans notre pays, l'obéissance ne peut pas être aveugle. Ce serait se tromper gravement que de s'y attendre. Nos ouvriers catholiques croient sincèrement qu'ils ne cherchent que la justice, et par les voies légitimes. Une condamnation serait regardée comme fausse et injuste, et ne serait pas acceptée. Nous pourrions bien leur prêcher l'obéissance et la confiance dans l'Eglise; mais ces bonnes dispositions ne pourraient pas aller si loin. Ils aiment l'Eglise et ils veulent sauver leurs âmes; mais aussi il leur faut gagner leur vie; et le travail est maintenant tellement organisé, que, si l'on n'appartient pas à l'organisation, on a très peu de chance de gagner la vie.

Ainsi, voici les conséquences à craindre. Des milliers d'enfants les plus dévoués de l'Eglise se croiraient repoussés par leur Mère et vivraient sans pratiquer leur religion. Les revenus de l'Eglise, qui, chez nous, viennent entièrement des offrandes libres du peuple, souffriraient immensément, et ce serait la même chose pour le Denier de Saint-Pierre. Les rangs des sociétés secrètes seraient remplis des catholiques jusqu'ici fidèles. Le Saint-Siège, qui a constamment reçu des catholiques américains les preuves d'un dévouement presque sans pareil, serait regardé comme un pouvoir non pas paternel, mais tyrannique et injuste. Ce sont là assurément des conséquences dont la sagesse et la prudence doivent éviter l'occasion.

7. Mais outre les dangers qui résulteraient d'une telle condamnation, et l'impossibilité de la faire respecter et observer il faut aussi remarquer que la forme de cette organisation est si peu permanente, comme les journaux l'indiquent presque tous les jours, que dans la pensée des hommes pratiques de notre pays, elle ne peut pas durer beaucoup d'années; d'où il suit qu'il n'est pas nécessaire, même si

c'était juste et prudent de diriger les condamnations solennelles de l'Eglise contre une chose qui s'évanouit d'elle-même. L'agitation sociale durera certainement aussi longtemps que dureront les maux à remédier ; mais les formes d'associations et d'attitude pour atteindre le but sont nécessairement provisoires et passagères. Elles sont aussi très-nombreuses, car j'ai déjà remarqué que l'association des Chevaliers de Travail est seulement une des nombreuses formes d'organisation ouvrière. Frapper donc à une de ces formes, ce serait commencer une guerre sans système et sans fin ; ce serait épuiser les forces de l'Eglise en chassant une foule de spectres changeants et incertains. Le peuple américain regarde avec un calme et une confiance parfaits le progrès de notre lutte sociale, et n'a pas la moindre peur de ne pouvoir se protéger contre les excès ou les dangers qui peuvent occasionnellement se produire. Et, pour parler avec le plus profond respect, mais aussi avec la franchise que mon devoir m'impose, il me semble que la prudence suggère, et que même la dignité de l'Eglise demande, que nous n'offrions pas à l'Amérique une protection ecclésiastique qu'elle ne demande pas, et dont elle ne croit pas avoir besoin.

8. Dans toute cette discussion, je n'ai pas du tout parlé du Canada, ni de la condamnation émise touchant les Chevaliers dans le Canada. Car nous considérerions comme une impertinence de nous mêler dans les affaires ecclésiastiques d'un autre pays, qui a sa hiérarchie propre, et dont nous ne prétendons pas comprendre les besoins ni les conditions sociales. Nous croyons cependant que les circonstances d'un peuple presque entièrement catholique, comme celui du Bas Canada, doivent être bien différentes de celles d'un peuple mixte comme le nôtre ; que les documents soumis au Saint-Office ne sont pas la constitution de l'organisation telle qu'elle est à présent chez nous ; et qu'ainsi nous ne demandons aucune conséquence de la part du Saint-Siège, qui a jugé *juxta exposita*. C'est de la condition des choses dans les Etats-Unis que nous parlons ; et sur cela nous espérons que nous ne sommes pas présomptueux en croyant que nous sommes capables de juger. Or, comme je l'ai déjà indiqué, sur les 75 Archevêques et Evêques des Etats-Unis il n'y en a que cinq environ qui désireraient une condamnation des Chevaliers du Travail, tels que nous les connaissons dans notre pays ; de sorte que notre Hiérarchie est presque unanime en protestant contre une telle condamnation. Sûrement, un tel fait doit avoir grand poids dans la solution de la question. S'il y a des difficultés dans ce cas, il me semble que l'expérience et la prudence de nos Evêques, et les règles si sages du Troisième Concile Plénier, doivent suffire pour les traiter.

[Résumé des raisons qui ont décidé la commission à s'abstenir de toute intervention dans les affaires de l'association.]

9. Enfin, pour tout résumer, il me semble évident que le Saint-Siège ne saurait former le dessein de condamner une association, alors :

(1.^o) Que la condamnation ne parait *justifiée* ni par la lettre ni par l'esprit de sa constitution, de ses lois et des déclarations de ses chefs ;

(2.^o) Qu'une condamnation ne parait pas *nécessaire*, en vue de la forme passagère de l'organisation et la condition sociale des Etats-Unis ;

(3.^o) Qu'elle ne serait pas *prudente*, a cause de la réalité des griefs des ouvriers et de l'aveu qu'en fait le peuple américain ;

(4.^o) Qu'elle serait *dangereuse* pour la réputation de l'Eglise dans notre pays démocratique, et pourrait même exciter la persécution.

(5.^o) Qu'elle serait *impuissante* pour forcer à l'obéissance nos ouvriers catholiques, qui la regarderaient comme fausse et injuste ;

(6.^o) Qu'elle serait destructive au lieu d'être bienfaisante dans ses effets, poussant les fils de l'Eglise a se révolter contre leur Mère, et à se ranger parmi les sociétés condamnées qu'ils ont jusqu'ici évitées ;

(7.^o) Qu'elle serait *presque ruineuse* pour le soutien financier de l'Eglise chez nous, et pour le Denier de St-Pierre ;

(8.^o) Qu'elle tournerait en *soupçon et hostilité* le dévouement insigne de notre peuple envers le Saint-Siège ;

(9.^o) Qu'elle serait regardée comme un *coup cruel* à l'autorité des Evêques des Etats-Unis, qui, on le sait bien, protestent contre une telle condamnation.

Or, j'espère que les considérations ici présentées ont montré assez clairement que telle serait la condamnation des Chevaliers du Travail des Etats-Unis.

Donc, je laisse le jugement de la cause, avec une pleine confiance, à la sagesse et à la prudence de votre Eminence et du Saint-Siège.

Rome, le 20 février 1887.

J. CARD. GIBBONS,
Archevêque de Baltimore.

LETTER FROM CARDINAL MANNING TO AN EMINENT PRELATE
EXPRESSING HIS ADHESION TO THE VIEWS PUT FORWARD
BY CARDINAL GIBBONS, IN THE FOREGOING DOCUMENT,
REGARDING THE ASSOCIATION OF THE "KNIGHTS OF
LABOUR."

I have read with great assent the document of Cardinal Gibbons on the Knights of Labour.

The Holy See will, I am sure, be convinced, and his Eminence's exposition of the state of our New World will, I hope, open a new field of thought and action.

It passes my understanding to comprehend how it is that officious persons are listened to rather than official. Surely the Episcopate of the whole world is the most powerful and direct instrument in the hands of the Holy See for gathering correct local knowledge and for enforcing its decisions. Who can know the temper of America, of England, and of Ireland, as they who have their finger upon the pulse of the people?

Hitherto the world has been governed by dynasties. Henceforward the Holy See has to deal with the people, and it has the Bishops in close daily and personal contact with the people. The more clearly and fully this is perceived in Rome, the stronger will be the Holy See. Never at any time was the Episcopate so detached from Civil Powers, so united in itself, and so united to the Holy See. To realize and use this is power, to fail to see it and use it, will lead to much trouble and mischief.

My thanks are due to his Eminence for letting me share in his argument. If I can find a copy of a lecture on "The Dignity and Rights of Labour," I will send it to you. It will, I think, qualify me for Knighthood in the Order.

Brentano, some years ago, published a book on Guilds, in which he proves that the associations of labour and crafts go back into antiquity. But there is this notable fact. In England and the Teutonic lands they were recognised, favoured, and chartered. In the Imperial and Latin laws they were rigorously prohibited.

There we are at this day. The Church is the Mother, and Friend, and Protector of the People. As our Lord walked among them, so his Church lives among them. The Cardinal's argument on this is irresistible.

I hope he will not leave Rome till this New World of ours is fully understood.

Believe me, always, etc., etc.,

HENRY E. CARDINAL ARCHBISHOP.

BRIEF OF HIS HOLINESS LEO XIII. ON THE CATHOLIC TOTAL
ABSTINENCE UNION, ADDRESSED TO THE RIGHT REV.
DR. IRELAND, BISHOP OF ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA.

VENERABILIS FRATER, SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM.

Eximia pietatis et charitatis opera, quibus fideles in Foederatis Americae Septentrionalis Statibus concivium suorum utilitati ac saluti procurandae consulere adlaborant, gratissima Nobis ex iis quae nuperrime retulisti acciderunt. Placuit in primis quod oppugnando exitioso ebrietatis vitio optimis consociationibus, ac praesertim *Unione Catholica perfectae abstinentiae servandae* constituta sedulam navetis operam. Exploratum sane est quam noxia ex immoderata potatione, quamque deflenda eum fidei tum moribus detrimenta pertimiscenda sint. Nec laudari satis possunt Foederatum Statuum Pastores, qui haud ita pridum in Plenario Conventu Baltimorae habito gravissima oratione incontinentiam hujusmodi condemnarant, declarantes, ipsam perpetuum peccati fomitem, foecundamque malorum radicem existere, ebriosorum familias ingenti ruina obruere, plurimosque in aeternam poenam exitiumque praecipites agere; fideles vero in eam intemperantiam perlapsos acatholicis scandalo, veraeque religionis propagationi magno impedimento esse. Itaque praecipua commendatione dignum existimamus nobile piarum Societatum consilium, quo a potu quolibet inebriante omnino abstinendum proponunt. Minime vero dubitari potest firmam hanc voluntatem gravissimo illi malo opportunum planeque efficax esse remedium, eoque validius incitamentum universis ad cupiditatem refrenandam, quo major est eorum, qui illo utantur auctoritas. Maxime vero valere debet in hoc zelus Sacerdotum quorum uti est verbo vitae plebem instruere, ac bonis moribus fingere ita eos potissimum oportet sua virtute caeteros anteire. Itaque Pastores satagant ebriositatis pestem assiduis concionibus ab ovili Christi depellere, atque omnibus abstinentiae exemplo praelucere, ut tot calamitates ex eo vitio ecclesiae ipsique patriae impendentes strenue avertere contendant. Nos vero Deum enixe adprecamur, ut votis in hac re tuis benignus faveat, consilia dirigat, coeptis assistat, atque in auspiciis caelestis tutelae, paternaeque benevolentiae Nostrae testimonium Apostolicam Benedictionem Tibi, Venerabilis Frater, aliisque Tecum sancto hoc foedere conjunctis peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die XXVII Martii An. MDCCCLXXXVII Pontificatus Nostri Decimo.

LEO PP. XIII.

IMPORTANT RESOLUTIONS OF THE IRISH BISHOPS ON COERCION, THE LAND BILL AND THE EDUCATION QUESTION.

The following Resolutions were adopted on the 20th inst. at Maynooth by the Episcopal Committee representing the Catholic Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland :—

“ RESOLVED—That, after the transaction of the ecclesiastical business for which we have met, we cannot separate without protesting, in union with our venerated brothers of the clergy of Ireland, against the Coercion Bill which on Monday last obtained a second reading in the House of Commons.

“ That, in common with our lay fellow-countrymen, we view with deep indignation this new attempt to despoil our country of her constitutional rights and liberties, and to place her at the mercy of unfriendly and irresponsible Government officials.

“ That speaking with intimate knowledge of our respective dioceses and provinces, we confidently assert that, with the deplorable exception of a few notorious districts of very limited extent, Ireland is singularly free, not only from grave crime and outrage, but from ordinary offences against the law; and in this assertion we are fully sustained by the charges delivered at the recent assizes by her Majesty’s judges.

“ That therefore we feel called upon to characterise as utterly unfounded the accusation of general lawlessness and criminality constantly made against our people and systematically propagated for party purposes by the anti-Irish Press of both England and Ireland.

“ That the demand now made by her Majesty’s Government for coercive legislation for Ireland is therefore utterly unsustainable by facts, and should consequently be rejected as causeless and unjustifiable.

“ That in our deliberate judgment the employment of the contemplated coercive enactments will not only fail to check crime and outrage within the limited area where they now exist, but will provoke opposition to law where peace and order have hitherto prevailed; that they will merely ‘drive discontent under the surface,’ and substitute for open and constitutional action the disastrous agency of secret societies.

“ That the distrust and hostility inspired by coercion will extend more or less to all legislation emanating from the same source; that those feelings will still further embitter the relations between the

coercing landlord class and their tenants, and render impracticable those calm and kindly negotiations, without which there can be no speedy or satisfactory settlement of the land question on the basis of purchase.

“That, ardently as our people desire such a settlement, they cannot help regarding with suspicion and disfavour the promised reform of the Land Laws, which is to be accompanied, or possibly preceded, by coercive legislation of such excessive severity.

“That still further doubt respecting the land measures of the Government is created by the hesitancy, if not unwillingness, of Ministers to adopt the recommendations so strongly made by the recent Royal Land Commission of their own selection.

“That it is not by County Insolvency Courts, but by the reduction of rents, regulated by the value of land produce, a reduction which the Royal Commission has declared to be of urgent necessity, that tenants will be enabled to meet the just demands of their landlords, and that an equitable basis will be established for the sale and purchase of land; that we, therefore, earnestly advocate, as an essential part of remedial land legislation, the speedy and general adoption of a fair system of rent reduction.

“That we renew the appeals which we urgently but ineffectually made before the passing of the Land Act of 1881, in favour of lessees and of the occupiers of town parks, and against the inclusion of tenants’ improvements in the valuation of their rents.

“That, without referring to Home Rule and other questions on which our opinions have been recently published, we cannot omit urging our claim upon the present Parliament for the removal of the educational grievances so frequently protested against by the Episcopal Body, which we represent. In the three departments of public education we demand perfect equality as to State help and endowments with our non-Catholic fellow-countrymen. With less we shall never rest satisfied. And we claim, as an essential condition of religious freedom, that we shall be at liberty to unite religious with secular education in all our schools.

“That copies of these Resolutions be forwarded to the Prime Minister, to Mr. Gladstone, and to Mr. Parnell.”

(Signed)

✠ WILLIAM J. WALSH,
Archbishop of Dublin, Chairman.

✠ BARTHOLOMEW WOODLOCK,
*Bishop of Ardagh and Clonmacnoise.
Secretary to the Meeting.*

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

PURGATORY, DOGMATIC, AND SCHOLASTIC. The various questions connected with it, considered and proved. By the Rev. M. Canty, P.P. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, O'Connell-street.

At the present day multitudes live their lives through, and give never a thought to the life that begins after death. They rest as contentedly in the present, as if there were no *future* to claim their chief concern. They cling as fondly to the pleasures of this life, to its hopes and dreams, as if *vanity of vanities* had never been pronounced upon them all. Even to many seemingly good Catholics that pondering of the heart, without which the land is desolate, is an unfamiliar exercise. If these people did not believe in a future life, their unconcern would be intelligible; with that belief deep down in their souls, their position is an illogical one indeed. To convince them of the untenableness of that position, as well as indeed, in almost every instance, to assist the holy souls in Purgatory, many able and learned treatises have been written. Of these not the least able nor the least interesting is the work mentioned at the head of this notice.

Father Canty's work, though controversial neither in spirit nor in tone, is nevertheless one of the latest contributions to a controversy that occupied men's minds as early as the time of Origen—the question of Future Punishment. That question was warmly discussed in St. Augustine's time. His able exposition and defence of Catholic doctrine brought the discussion to a close, and for several centuries afterwards the question was left at rest.

The controversy was reopened in the sixteenth century by the Reformers. Luther wrote against Purgatory. The views of the other Reformers accorded more or less with his. They not only attacked the doctrine of the Church on indulgences, but moreover assailed the very first principles on which that doctrine is founded. They denied the existence of venial sin, and this denial, coupled with the rejection of indulgences, led naturally to a denial of Purgatory.

Many of their followers, however, found faith in an endless hell, an inconvenient doctrine, and were unsparing in their condemnation of never-ending punishments. The outcome of this dissatisfaction is a decided tendency amongst educated Protestants of the present day

to depart from the *common* or *orthodox* (Protestant) view, and a decided leaning towards *Universalism*.

The truth is but one; the by-paths of error, built upon the shifting sand of private opinion, are infinite in number. Whilst, therefore, Protestants, consistently with their fundamental principle, and in harmony with their universal practice, seek to fashion their doctrine each by his own unaided judgment, and according to his own individual will, the faith of Catholics knows neither addition nor diminution. It is ever one and the same. Yet it is none the less incumbent on Catholics to give reasons for the faith they profess, and to state accurately and with precision such portions of Catholic doctrine as may be assailed or imperilled by current speculative errors.

Father Canty, in his preface, justifies the publication, in the English language, of a dogmatic work, on the score of a desire to place his book within easy reach of many amongst the intelligent laity, to whom a treatise written in the language of the Church would be less—if, indeed, at all—accessible. We quite agree with him in his contention that the discussion in English of such questions as Purgatory and kindred subjects, must be a great boon to many hardworking Irish Priests.

Father Canty's work, unpretentious as it is, bears abundant evidence of much thought and study. A sufficient guarantee for solidity and accuracy of doctrine, is had in the revision of the book by the Bishop of Limerick, Dr. O'Dwyer, as well as in the fact that it appears under the censorship of Dr. Magrath, and bears the *imprimatur* of the Archbishop of Dublin.

J. P. M'D.

THE RELIGIOUS HOUSES OF THE UNITED KINGDOM. Containing a short history of every Order, and every House. Compiled from official sources. London: Burns & Oates, Limited, 1887.

We can say of this little work, that it fully justifies its title. It contains in succinet form, much useful information touching the foundation, habit, and rule of the various Religious Orders, and Congregations, to which is appended a list of their Houses and Colleges—the more important of which sometimes claim a paragraph setting forth the circumstances that called them into existence, and led to their subsequent growth and development. Compiled from official sources, the information it conveys may be presumed to be trustworthy.

The convenience and utility of the little volume as a work of reference is apparent.

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

JUNE, 1887.

BIGOTRY.

PRIESTS who are called to exercise their sacred ministry in Protestant countries, will, I think, agree with me in the opinion that one of the great obstacles to the conversion of heretics is the supposed bigotry of the Catholic Church. This bigotry is the great bugbear that is set up to scare away Protestants from looking into the claims and the teachings and the practices of the Church. "Catholics are bound to believe you all sons of perdition, fuel for the everlasting fire, enemies of God, no matter what your moral and theological virtues; no matter too what your good faith and your unquestionable sincerity in the religion which you profess. Avoid contact with such people as you would shun those who believe you to be irreclaimable liars, or robbers, or assassins." That is the drift of many a Protestant essay and sermon, and the key-note of many a huge volume of anti-"Romish" controversy.

As the RECORD has a large circulation in all English-speaking Protestant countries, it may not be out of place to put together in its pages a few notes as to the real teaching of the Church with regard to those who unfortunately live without her pale; and to compare that teaching with the doctrines enunciated and the sentiments entertained on the same subject by some of those bodies which have unhappily cut themselves away from her communion.

On the evils of religious indifferentism the Church has

always spoken with no uncertain sound. If God has proclaimed certain truths to the world, men are surely not left at liberty to accept or to reject these truths in the whole or in part. If our Lord commanded adhesion to the authoritative teaching of His Church, men cannot without sin ignore that teaching, any more than they can ignore the plainest doctrines of the Bible, or the plainest obligations of the Decalogue, or the plainest behests of the Natural Law. To be indifferent with regard to even one truth contained in the body of divine revelation is manifestly to show contempt for God Himself. In the same way to be tolerant of religious error is not to display a generous or a charitable spirit, but it is to undervalue the truth that God has vouchsafed to us for the enlightenment of our mind and the regulation of our conduct. To say that every man is free to follow what religion he will, and to exercise whatsoever worship he may please, and to indulge in a freedom of conscience that is untrammelled by any authority, human or divine; to profess that every creed is equally good, and leads equally to heaven, that in fact faith counts for nothing and moral rectitude for all, as the well known couplet has it:

“For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight,
His can't be wrong whose life is in the right.”

or as Voltaire wrote: “Soyez juste, il suffit, le reste est arbitraire”—all that is unquestionably to pave the way to an entire rejection of revealed truth, and to universal unbelief.

The Vicar of Christ—the guardian of revealed truth—has therefore again and again most solemnly condemned this most baneful outcome of our latter-day liberalism. Gregory XVI., in the *Mirari Vos*, refers to this theory as “that wicked opinion that eternal salvation of the soul can be obtained under any profession of faith, if morals are directed by the rule of virtue.” He calls such a liberty of conscience as that referred to, an *insanity*; and Pius IX. qualifies it as a “liberty of perdition,” in the Encyclical *Quanta Cura*. In the Syllabus which accompanied this

Encyclical we find condemnation of such propositions as these :

“Men may in the practice of any religion whatever find the path of eternal salvation and attain eternal salvation.”

“At least good hopes should be entertained concerning the salvation of all those who in no respect live in the true Church of Christ.”

Now, this is a clear and an emphatic condemnation of error, but it is not *bigotry*. Bigotry I would define to be an unreasonable attachment to one's own opinions, coupled with an aversion or a hatred of all those who will not concur in these opinions. The doctrines of the Church can never be for us mere opinions—they are infallible truths; and the more closely and determinedly the intellect adheres to truth, the higher and the nobler is its action. No saint was ever a bigot, but every saint was supremely intolerant of religious error. No good Catholic hates or despises his neighbour because of his neighbour's unorthodox views, but every good Catholic hates doctrinal error, as every truthful man hates duplicity and falsehood. In the Catholic system therefore there is no room, theoretically at least, for the vice—for it is a vice—of bigotry. That which is sometimes laid to our charge as bigotry, is no bigotry, but an ardent love of God's truth, and a fervent zeal for its recognition by the whole world. No doubt if St. Paul lived in our day he would be set down by the infallible teachers who speak *ex cathedra* in English reviews and magazines and newspapers, as an incorrigible bigot. His exhortation “to mark them who make dissensions and offences contrary to the doctrines which you have learnt, and to avoid them,” would be regarded as an unpardonable attempt at boycotting. His anathema against all who preach a different gospel from his own would be ridiculed as a piece of ecclesiastical arrogance; and his delivering up to Satan of Hymeneus and Alexander, would be sneered at as a mere *brutum fulmen* of powerless priestly tyranny. Yet St. Paul, we know, was no bigot; he had more genuine liberality, more love for the oppressed, more sympathy for the poor and the weak, than all the liberal doctrinaires of the present day. He had the

deepest compassion for those that erred in doctrine as in morals, but he loved God's truth in all its integrity, and he did not hesitate therefore to denounce and to condemn in the most forcible terms those that wilfully denied or adulterated that truth. That and nothing more does pope or bishop at the present day, and that the Catholic Church must continue to do in fulfilment of her divine mission, "even to the consummation of ages."

But is it not, we are asked, grossly intolerant and bigoted to condemn to everlasting torments all those who do not happen to be in visible communion with the Church of Rome? To this question, we Catholics give an unhesitating "yes." But to another question implied in this we give just as unhesitating a "no." That other question is, whether we do condemn to hell all those who are without the pale of the Church? We are permitted to judge or to condemn no man. There is but One who searcheth the reins and the heart, and He alone is able to measure a man's responsibility and to pronounce judgment on his conduct. We say, and we believe that heretics can never enter into the kingdom of heaven, just as we say and believe of murderers, and adulterers, and robbers. For heresy is surely a deadly sin, and a soul defiled with sin cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.

But then, like every other imputable crime, this heresy must be wilful. It supposes essentially contumaciousness—known, and persistent opposition to revealed truth. If a man is born in a Protestant country, if he breathes a Protestant atmosphere from his cradle, if his whole intellectual food is leavened with doctrinal error from his first dawn of reason, it is clearly permissible to suppose that such a one may not be responsible for not accepting the authority of the Catholic Church. Whether as a matter of fact such responsibility does or does not attach to him, must depend upon a variety of circumstances, which it is here unnecessary to inquire into. All we Catholics say, and all the Church permits us to say, is that wilful (of course directly or indirectly) heresy is punishable for ever, like every other deadly sin that is not repented of. In this teaching of the Church, there is indeed

the noblest reverence for revealed truth, combined with the tenderest consideration for those who reject that truth, partially or entirely. In saying this, I shall not be taken by any reader of the RECORD as trying to water down the Catholic doctrine, or to make it appear less severe than it really is, in the eyes of non-Catholics. I am only following, indeed, the authoritative pronouncements of those Sovereign Pontiffs who have been most strenuous in condemning heresy, but who, nevertheless, are careful never to condemn the individual heretic. In his Allocution of 9 December, 1854, we find Pius IX. giving expression to the following words of true Christian charity and liberality:—"God forbid, venerable brethren, that we should dare to limit the divine mercy which is infinite. God forbid that we should wish to scrutinize God's hidden councils and judgments It is to be held, indeed of faith, that outside the Apostolic Roman Church no one can be saved, but it is *also to be held as certain that those who labour under ignorance of the true religion, if that ignorance be invincible, are implicated in no sin for this in the eyes of God.*" This solemn pronouncement is in itself sufficient surely to rescue Catholics from the stigma of condemning all outside the Church to everlasting punishment.

Nor is this teaching in any way antagonistic to the old maxim, "extra Ecclesiam nulla est salus." For, those that are inculpably ignorant belong, as a matter of fact, to the soul of the Church. They live, as I suppose, good moral lives. They have faith, though not a full faith, in revealed truth. They are disposed to receive that faith in its plenitude, when it is clearly set before them. Their position at present is one of ignorance and not of perversity. Their spiritual vision is clouded. The scales of old prejudices still adhere to their eyes. God can reward them for their virtuous and docile dispositions; God never will condemn them for the accident of their Protestant parentage or Protestant education, or for the invincible ignorance to which these accidental circumstances may lead.

We Catholics go farther even than this, and we extend the same enlightened and charitable consideration to Jews and Mahommedans and pagans. All these God really

wishes to be saved. To them all He gives sufficient light and grace. If they are lost it will not be on account of their inculpable ignorance of Christian truth, but because they broke that law of rectitude which their consciences inculcated as binding on them.

No doubt, indirectly, even involuntary heresy or unbelief may and does lead to the loss of souls. For it shuts out men from those countless sacramental and other graces that are to be found only in the Catholic Church. All practical Catholics are able to bear testimony to the sustaining grace, say of the monthly confession and communion, and there are few among them that would not readily acknowledge that without this continual help they could hardly hope to resist the evil bent of their nature or preserve sanctifying grace within their souls. The loss of such graces to those outside the Church cannot therefore be exaggerated, and this consideration apart from a thousand others ought to quicken the zeal of Catholics to gather the wandering sheep into the one fold of the one true Shepherd.

I think that what I have so far written fairly expresses the teaching of the Church on heresy and heretics, and I think we may defy our adversaries to fasten a charge of bigotry on a single iota of that teaching.

In practice and in the ordinary transactions of civil life Catholics are equally guiltless of the charge. In the political strife of the present day we hear loud protests against "handing over"—that is the phrase—the Protestant minority of Ireland to the intolerance of their Catholic fellow-countrymen. Those that utter this charge only give expression to their own inborn bigotry. They cannot seemingly understand one religious body getting the upper hand without persecuting another. They shut their eyes most persistently too to the most patent facts. Who ever hears of a Protestant in Ireland being persecuted or hated or scorned simply because he is a Protestant? Are Protestant parliamentary candidates rejected by Catholic Ireland because of their religious belief? Does the Catholic Corporation of Dublin refuse to appoint men to lucrative posts if these men do not happen to belong to the people's

Church? Is any inquiry ever thought necessary in Ireland as to a man's religious belief when there is question of merely civil or political matters? The answer is obvious to everybody who knows anything of Ireland. Ireland, while perhaps the most intensely Catholic nation in the world, is the least bigoted country under the canopy of heaven.

But suppose we advance a little into the territory of those who make war against us for our bigotry, I think we shall find ourselves as strong in the aggressive as we are on the defensive. Protestants who are so ready to fling the taunt of bigotry at us because of our "nulla salus extra Ecclesiam" belief, have their own theories of exclusive salvation, and these theories are undoubtedly very much more stringent and "intolerant" than any advanced by a Catholic theologian. The Calvinistic doctrine as to reprobation is indeed absolutely cruel and savage. For certain men, teaches Calvin, are destined by God apart altogether from their merits or demerits to everlasting torments. And this teaching is formally incorporated into the *Credo* of all existing Presbyterian bodies—the Westminster Confession of Faith: "By the decree of God for the manifestation of His glory some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others pre-ordained to everlasting death. These angels and men thus predestinated and pre-ordained are particularly and unchangeably designed, and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished." And again: "The rest of mankind God was pleased . . . to pass by and to ordain them to dishonour and wrath for their sin to the praise of his glorious justice." Do we not find too among the articles of the Anglican Church the following very distinct teaching on exclusive salvation: "They also are to be accursed, that presume to say that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law and the light of nature?" In the Confession of Faith formulated by the Dutch Reformed Church of the United States in 1815, we have this fundamental article of belief laid down: "That everyone is bound to join himself to the true Church . . . and that out of it there is no

salvation." This, however, be it remembered, is but a slight improvement on the Westminster Confession which had declared that outside of the Church "there is no ordinary possibility of salvation." And all this from sects that boast of unlimited "liberty of conscience" and that rail perpetually at the intolerance and the exclusiveness of the Catholic Church!

As a consequence of these doctrines we see the bitter rancorous spirit exhibited by the heresiarchs of the sixteenth century, first towards the church of their baptism, and secondly towards their dissentient brethren. Luther had unquestionably a fair command of coarse and violent language, yet he seemed to have ransacked his brains and his lexicon in vain to find expressions as virulent as his thoughts. The Pope he calls a "mad wolf," and all his followers "be they kings or emperors," "bandit chiefs" who ought to be scrupulously hunted down and destroyed. For the Catholic doctors of Louvain, the new apostle's least indecent epithets are "beasts, pigs, pagans, epicureans, atheists." The Zwinglians do not escape any better the Lutheran pencil of light. They are "damned," "fools," "blasphemers." "The devil," he declares, "is now and for ever in the body of the Zwinglians, and blasphemy shakes itself from their breast, satanized, super-satanized, and re-satanized." Calvin not to be out-done calls his adversaries "rogues," "fools," "madmen," "bulls," "pigs," "asses," "dogs," and many other titles equally polite and flattering.

Lutherans and Calvinists in England and Scotland made a heroic and a not altogether unsuccessful attempt to imitate the gentlemanly style of their continental models. In glancing over some of our Reformation literature we are enabled to pick up such pearls of rhetoric as:—"a bussard," "a beast," "a bluddering papist," "a great devil," "a beastlie and unlearned bastard," "the very draff of antichrist, and dregs of the devil," "a porkishe papist," and many others too choice for reproduction.

When the dissentient brethren so fiercely belabour each other, we ought to feel happy that the Pope, and the Church, and Catholics generally are let off with such comparatively

mild terms of reproach as the "man of sin," "antichrist," "son of perdition," "scarlet lady drunk with the blood of the saints," "heathens," "image worshippers," and so on.

Bigotry! Well I confidently challenge any of those who accuse us of bigotry to point me out a single Catholic controversialist advancing "arguments" of this nature against his adversaries.

Nor do we find much improvement if we come to the toleration shown to Catholics in the business of civil life. Every one knows what a different spirit animates the Corporation of Belfast—which will hardly consent to employ a Catholic scavenger—from that which distinguishes the municipal council of Dublin. And what I say of Belfast, I say of every municipal or poor law board in Ireland where the Protestant element has largely gained the ascendant.

Belfast, however, is but a true child of her mother. She bears all the lineaments of Presbyterian Scotland. John Knox was a bigot of the first water, and though his bigotry has been considerably diluted by the spread of education, it has managed nevertheless to filter down through the space of three hundred years. Here and there we find it in all its primitive ferocity. At the General Election of 1885, for instance, we had a minister in Argyleshire declaring, that if a Catholic was sent to represent that county in Parliament he would shake the dust of the county off his feet, and fly elsewhere before the wrath of God should fall upon the supporters of an idolater. And this seemed to strike nobody as a very exaggerated form of bigotry!

Indeed, bigotry in Scotland very often invades the domain of the ludicrous. A couple of years ago I remember that Elder Major McLeod's great argument against instrumental music in church was put in this way at a meeting of the Edinburgh Presbytery: "We cannot have organs in our churches. For an organ is a Romish idol, and God has forbidden idols. An organ is an idol, for an idol is an imitation, and what is an organ," shouted the gallant Major, "but an imitation of the human voice." Needless to say that so cogent an argument scored a victory for the veteran warrior. Everybody remembers the desolation brought upon

thousands of Scottish families by the systematic robberies of of the Glasgow Bank directors some years ago. One of our brilliant controversialists—the Rev. Dr. Wylie, I think it was—knew the cause of both the robbery and misery; it was a punishment from God upon Scotland for allowing the re-establishment in the country of the Romish hierarchy! And these are the people that shudder with horror at the intolerance and bigotry of the “Romish” Church!

The truth is that bigotry springing from falsehood, and fostered by misrepresentation of everything Catholic, is the very life of Scotch Presbyterianism. To stir up or keep alive hatred of “popery” would, indeed, seem to be the sole purpose of most of the sermons preached from Presbyterian pulpits, and I shrewdly suspect that if “popery” did come to that end which they are always predicting for it, none would regret the downfall more than the preachers themselves. For their occupation would then be gone, and they would find it hard with any other subject to interest or to attract their hearers.

Naturally this constant denunciation of Rome’s heathenism and superstition, and darkness and tyranny, produces evil effects upon the minds of the listeners; and so it is that from the days of John Knox until now, Scotland has been, as I have remarked, characterized by what the Scotch themselves call its “sturdy Presbyterian spirit,” but what most other people would designate its grim and rancorous bigotry. In the faces of many Scotchmen you can read the word as if it were printed there in letters of iron. In the presence of a Catholic priest especially that feeling is sure to betray itself. In their eyes the priest is a dark, mysterious, unintelligible sort of being—an ogre to be shunned, a ghost of the dead past walking about among the living, covered in the cerements of a long buried superstition. That is the meaning of those looks of mingled sourness, fierceness and curiosity, with which the priest is met in so many parts of Scotland. That is why even little children (and for those that love childhood, and who does not? it is most painful to witness it) scowl angrily at the priest as they pass him by, or hiss at him in their not too melodious Doric “prust, prust, papus prust.”

However it is pleasant to be able to record that this intolerant spirit is visibly on the wane even in Scotland. When people come to see the Catholic priest (as they are coming to see him more and more in Scotland) not as he is painted, but as he is in his everyday life; when they find him at every hour of the day and night seeking after some lost and abandoned creature in the lowest purlieus of town and city; or when they see him breathing the fetid atmosphere of the fever-stricken hovel; or moving about intrepidly day after day through the fever wards of the public hospital, where no other minister of religion dares to tread, they begin to question all they had heard about the ogre, and the ghost, and the craft and cruelty and tyranny, and all the other bad and terrible things that had been associated in their minds with the Catholic priesthood. Even within the last few years I am assured there has been a very great reaction in the popular mind with regard to the Catholic Church, and I may add that certain late political events have gone a wonderful way in toning down old resentments and in establishing a truer view of Catholic teaching as well as a kindlier feeling towards Catholics themselves. The Church will no doubt have a hard fight to win back Scotland to her fold; but if old prejudices and misconceptions were once cleared away; if the old fortress of traditional lies and misrepresentations were once knocked to pieces; if the Church were allowed to meet the Presbytery in a fair field, it is not difficult to discern on whose side the victory would rest.

At any rate I submit that if a charge of bigotry is to be made against the Catholic Church, it is not Protestantism or Presbyterianism, in any of its ever varying shapes, that is entitled to cast the stone.

M. F. SHINNORS, O.M.I.

PROPORTIONS AND DIMENSIONS OF CHANCEL
AND ALTARS, AND ARRANGEMENT OF SAC-
RISTIES.

MISTAKES that have been made in the construction of chancels, arising from the deficiency of knowledge of ecclesiastical functions on the part of architects, and in great part from the insufficiency of knowledge of ecclesiastical architecture on the part of priests, have suggested to one of their brethren the propriety of writing the following pages. If he contribute aught to the information of either, that may enable them to promote the glory of the services of God's Church, his object will be fully attained. The priest who has undertaken the good work of building a church, will readily find an architect who will provide a design in the main graceful and correct. He will not as easily find one who will so arrange the chancel, that it will best provide for correctly carrying out all the functions of religion.

The chancel is that portion of a church which is set apart for the offering of the Holy Sacrifice, and for the principal ecclesiastical functions. Of old the altar was always placed at the east side of the church. Hence the wall at the back of the altar is styled the eastern wall without consideration of aspect, and the side walls are termed northern and southern relatively. The chancel, therefore, is said to extend from the eastern wall of the church to the communion rail. Generally, this is placed beneath an overhanging arch, which marks the division of the roof of the chancel from that of the nave and the rail extends from wall to wall of the chancel. But in towns where communicants are very numerous, and where churches have usually aisles, it is frequently placed about four feet in advance of this arch, and is extended to the walls of the aisles on each side of the church. Wherever it is placed, the level on which it stands should be about six inches higher than the floor of the nave, and should

extend eighteen inches, and never less, in front of the rail. On this step the faithful kneel to receive Holy Communion and often they carry children in their arms as there they kneel to receive blessed palms and ashes. It should ever be considered a hard and fast rule, that the communion rail should never have more than one step before it, and that this step should be always eighteen inches deep. To set off a chancel architects will put two or more steps before a communion rail, and will make these steps inconveniently deep or shallow. But it should be always remembered that to this communion rail come the aged, the lame, and the blind, and only the greatest convenience of these should be consulted in their approach to the holy table spread by their mother, the Church, for all her children.

A church may comprise only a nave and a chancel. But for a parochial church, however small, it is well to make provision for a second altar. The providing of a second altar for the mass of Maunday Thursday, and the service of Good Friday, suggests the construction of an aisle. The mediæval architects were not repelled by the idea of uniformity from constructing only one aisle, when a single aisle supplied all the need of the church service; and their bold and happy skill raised a beauty of construction, where the timid lovers of our uninventive age would have shrunk from supplying the useful and even necessary, through inability to give it grace and symmetry. The inventors of church architecture in the middle ages constructed churches of a nave and single aisle of a beauty that we must admire and may advantageously copy, if we fail to surpass them with the materials at our command so varied beyond those of the old masters. If only one aisle be constructed to a nave twenty-three feet wide, the aisle should be considerably wider than each aisle would be, where two are built. This increase of width is needed to give dignity to the structure. A tower, though of moderate proportions, adds all the grace that simplicity needs. The communion rail may be advanced beyond the arch of the chancel, and extended across the nave and aisle. If a church have no

aisle, and the communion rail extends only from wall to wall of the chancel, the general level of the chancel must either be the same as the communion step, or any required elevation of the chancel must be reached by steps about four feet inside the communion rail. Chancels and naves may be any convenient width and length, but a chancel less than twenty-two feet six inches wide, does not provide sufficient space for carrying out becomingly the ceremonies of High Mass.

St. Charles Borromeo established the rule that high altars should not measure less than seven feet six inches in length. The predella of an altar, that is the level in its front and on which the priest stands when he offers the Holy Sacrifice, should be exactly the length of the altar. It should not extend beyond the ends of the altar, as the deacon at High Mass should stand lower than the celebrant, yet at his side during the recital of the Introit, the singing of the Collects, and the reading of the Epistle. During the recital of the first and last Gospels, the deacon should stand alongside the celebrant, but a step below him. During the Gloria and Credo, the Offertory and the Canon, the deacon stands on the predella.

The extending of the predella beyond the ends of the altar may often necessitate the widening of the chancel and also the nave, at great expense, in addition to displacing the deacon during the Holy Sacrifice. When the altar is eight feet long and the predella is also eight feet in length, and the two steps at each end measure eighteen inches each, and the levels beneath the steps at each side measure five feet each, a most excellent and convenient chancel is provided in the width of twenty-four feet. For a church of medium proportions it is a most favourable width. Should, however, the predella exceed the length of the altar by only one foot at each end, the six feet allowed for the four steps of eighteen inches each, must be reduced to four, allowing only the insufficient depth of one foot for each step, or the chancel and the nave must be widened from end to end by two feet. A chancel twenty-two feet six inches wide can provide all arrangements required for all ecclesiastical functions if the

predella is made the same length as the altar. If, however, the predella is lengthened by two feet, the narrowest chancel suitable for the ceremonies of High Mass must measure twenty-four feet six inches. An altar only seven feet long would be admissible in a difficulty, and so a width of twenty-two feet of chancel would suffice, and the deacon would have his right position, and all ceremonies of High Mass be performed with dignity and ease. Let the predella be always the same length as the altar, and let the width of the chancel be always thrice the altar's length, and a most servicable chancel will be the result. As the altar should measure seven feet six inches, the chancel should measure twenty-two feet six inches.

The extent of the predella in front of the altar that is most convenient is four feet, and a less depth is insufficient. This level is reached by two steps in front and at each end. The predella makes the third prescribed ascent, and any uneven number is admissible. Steps eighteen inches deep and six inches high are the easiest. If the measure of the depth and of the rise of steps exceed united twenty-three inches, the ascent of a considerable number will not be made with ease. If eighteen inches in depth cannot be provided for each step fifteen will suffice, but not less. Beneath these steps extends the general level of the chancel. At each end of the altar the level below the steps should not be less, if possible, than five feet deep. On this level are placed the seats for the clergy, requiring a depth of three feet, and two are needed in front of them for the convenient passage of the master of the ceremonies. The above measurements provide all spaces needed for the width of a chancel, and the ceremonies of High Mass cannot be carried out with ease and dignity if any be diminished. The length of the altar needs seven feet six inches; the two steps at each end, measuring fifteen inches each, require five feet; and the level at each end below the steps, needing five feet each, require ten. The total space should thus measure twenty-two feet six inches. This width, it is to be noted, is exactly thrice the length of the altar. And let it be ever borne in mind, that except in very wide chancels exceeding thirty-six feet, the

width will be always convenient that will closely approximate to thrice the length of the altar. As the altar is lengthened the chancel should be widened, or as the chancel is widened the altar should be lengthened. If this rule of proportion is kept, all arrangements of functions can be carried out.

Churches and chancels may be any convenient width and length. Necessity may contract the measurements. It may require the steps beneath the predella to be only one foot deep each, and the levels on each side to extend only four feet. The altar of seven feet six inches may therefore stand in a chancel only nineteen feet six inches wide. No ecclesiastical canon prohibits such a chancel, but it must be borne in mind that ascents and descents on steps only one foot deep cannot be made at ease, and on a space only four feet deep a master of ceremonies cannot pass with suitable freedom in front of the seated clergy.

The length of chancels of various widths may be nearly the same. It should be in good proportion to its width and to the dimensions of the church. The length of a narrow, yet sufficiently ample chancel, may measure from twenty-eight to thirty-four feet. If the church consist of a nave and chancel twenty-two feet six inches wide, with or without aisles twelve feet wide, and the length be from one hundred to one hundred and ten feet, the chancel need not be more than twenty-eight or thirty-four feet long. To construct a chancel only twenty-eight feet long from the communion step to the eastern wall, the following arrangements may be made. The reredos may be built into the wall, and not exceed one foot in depth. Against this the altar, four feet deep, may stand. The predella needs four feet and the two steps in front fifteen inches each. The level in front may measure eight feet, and the two steps of fifteen inches each may lead to a level four feet broad in front of the communion rail. It is well to provide four feet for the passing of the clergy in ecclesiastical ceremonies, such as communicating the faithful, distributing blessed ashes and palms, and the administration by the bishop of the sacrament of confirmation. For the communion rail and the step of eighteen inches in front, it is well to allow two feet. These

various provisions are supplied in twenty-eight feet. But a passage behind the altar will be found advantageous. If a throne be erected for Benediction to which the Blessed Sacrament is to be conveyed from the back of the altar, six feet may well be allowed between the altar and the eastern wall. The reredos is usually brought forward and affixed to these advanced altars. About a foot must be allowed for this, and some buttressing must support the throne. The steps to the throne will need two feet nine inches, and the remaining space making up the six feet will prove most useful. A chancel of these measurements, thirty-four feet in length and twenty-two feet six inches in width, gives every accommodation for carrying out all the functions of religion with suitable ease and becoming dignity. If the chancel be widened a few feet no increase of length will be required. But if it be thought well, on account of the proportions of the nave and aisles to lengthen the chancel, the eight feet provided for the level beneath the predella may be increased to twelve, sixteen, or more feet; and the two steps beneath this level may be increased to three or four. This elevation would add dignity to the chancel, and economy suggests the elevation if the site itself be a slope.

The following arrangements may be well made as chancels are widened from twenty-two feet six inches to thirty-six feet. If the chancel be twenty-three feet wide, let the length of the altar be increased six inches and be eight feet, the steps fifteen inches each, and the levels beneath on each side be five feet each. If hot water pipes intrude on this space, the chancel should be widened the requisite space. An excellent width of chancel is twenty-four feet. The altar should be eight feet long, the steps eighteen inches each in the tread, and the levels beneath them five feet deep, each. The length may well be thirty feet from the eastern wall to the chancel arch, and beyond this the nave and aisles deserve a length of ninety feet, and a width of fifty. This space would accommodate from eight to nine hundred persons. But the width of chancel, exactly thrice the length of the altar, it should be noted, is particularly good. It provides full space for every function, can be fully adorned with plants and

flowers without profusion, and be well lit without a superabundance of wax lights. Such a chancel deserves a communion rail four feet in advance of its arch, extending from wall to wall of the aisles. If a chancel be constructed twenty-five feet wide, allow eight for the altar, six feet for the four steps, and eleven for the two levels, that is five feet six inches each. If a chancel measure twenty-six feet, let the altar measure eight feet six inches, the four steps six feet, the two levels eleven feet six inches, that is five feet nine each. If a chancel be twenty-seven feet wide, let the altar be nine feet long, the steps measure six feet, and the levels six each. This is an excellent arrangement. The length of the altar is a third of the width of the chancel; the steps are ample and the levels also, being six feet each. This width of chancel needs a large amount of plants, flowers, and candelabra to decorate it fitly for the devotion of the forty hours. Hence in building a church, a priest may be acting very wisely in limiting the width of the chancel to twenty-seven feet. It is the proper width of sanctuary for a nave twenty-nine feet wide, as the nave is measured from the centre of the pillar on each side. In like manner the aisles are measured from the same centre to the northern and southern walls. A nave twenty-nine feet wide may well have aisles fifteen feet six inches wide each. This width of sixty feet will suit a nave one hundred and sixteen feet long, and a church measuring one hundred and fifty feet from the eastern wall to the western entrance. A chancel twenty-seven feet wide may well have its altar advanced six feet from the eastern wall, with steps to the throne for Benediction screened by an advanced reredos. If the level of the communion step continue from the communion rail to the steps beneath the predella it may well measure twenty feet, but if two steps be placed beneath the chancel arch the level above them to the altar steps may fitly measure thirteen feet. This length of forty feet from the communion step to the eastern wall, and this width of twenty-seven feet, present a most noble and commodious chancel for a noble and commodious church. For a chancel twenty-eight feet wide the altar may remain nine feet long and the steps six, the levels

measuring six feet six inches each. A chancel twenty-nine feet wide is suitably provided if its altar measure nine feet six inches in length, the steps eighteen inches in tread, and the levels six feet nine inches in width. For a chancel thirty feet wide give ten feet to the altar, six feet to the steps, and seven feet to each level. Thus chancels may widen, and altars lengthen, and levels increase, but the steps remain eighteen inches each deep. The altar of the chancel thirty-six feet wide may well be twelve feet long. But if the width of chancels exceed thirty six feet, the altar twelve feet in length remains ample and sufficient.

When the width of the chancel reaches thirty-eight feet it may be well to increase the number of steps to the altar; to place four steps beneath the predella in place of two, and to lessen the depth of the side levels. The altar being twelve feet long, the four steps will also measure twelve feet, and the levels below, seven feet each. This increase of the number of steps may commence in a narrower chancel provided the levels on each side be allowed a depth of six feet each. Thus the chancel, thirty-six feet wide, may have twelve for the altar, twelve for the four steps, and twelve for the two levels of six feet each. An ambry (a small safe) for the protection of the holy oils should be fixed in the northern wall of the chancel.

THE HIGH ALTAR.

The best height for an altar is three feet three inches. The depth of a high altar, detached from its reredos, is usually four feet. The whole surface is a single slab of marble. The entire slab is anointed and consecrated, and the consecration extends to the entire structure. The sepulchre for the relics is near the front in the centre. The tabernacle is fixed on the surface, two feet six inches from the front; and usually two steps for the six candle-sticks and for vases for flowers are placed on each side. A passage behind the altar is so useful that it is generally provided; and if arrangements be made for conveying the monstrance to its throne for Benediction by steps rising behind the altar, it has been often judged well to separate the reredos from

the eastern wall, to make the passage between the two, and to let this space be six feet deep. The reredos and the altar are built into each other, and their united depths provide room for raising the throne behind and above the tabernacle. Height and depth are secured, and the steps are becomingly screened behind the reredos. The wider the chancel, the wider may be the reredos; and the wider the reredos, the more steps may be raised behind it, and the greater may be the elevation of the throne.

The construction of the altar is the provision of the church for the becoming celebration of the Holy Sacrifice. The tabernacle is constructed for the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament with security and honour. Its material, wrought iron or steel, preserves it from violation, and its adornment of silk, or cloth of gold, of colour or gilding, of precious stone or precious metal, gives such honour as we may be able to supply, where all that we may offer is but little. The wrought iron safe of the tabernacle may be cased with marble or alabaster, or other stone, or with cedar or other rare wood. The bulk of the whole should be moderate, and well proportioned. About eighteen inches in width, and at most two feet in height, is ample size. The wrought iron may be made to this measurement without any addition of other material. The metal should be ornamented on each side, as we usually see it ornamented on its door. It should be raised slightly, and only slightly, on a moulded pedestal. The slighter the elevation the better (at most four inches) that the door may be easily reached and opened by every priest, and the ciborium reached without effort. It should bear a well defined cornice, which may be surmounted by a brattishing of silver or copper gilt. No crucifix or vases of flowers, or ornaments of any kind distinct from its construction, should be placed upon it. Beneath its cornice silk curtains should hang upon a movable rod. The wrought iron ornamented safe may be quadrangular as described, or it may have the form of a circular tower decorated throughout, and it may bear a sloping roof, well gilt and surmounted by a pelican. Other forms may be used, but the wrought iron safe which defends the Blessed Sacrament must always be bolted

into the masonry of the altar. Where danger of violation has been considered great, the following means of security has been carried out. At the back of the tabernacle a second safe has been fixed in the reredos, or the base of the throne for Benediction. This is reached by a small door in the back of the tabernacle, and into this the Blessed Sacrament is moved every night by the priest. The lock of the inner tabernacle is unlike that of the front, and violence could not be exercised upon the door unless the outer tabernacle were removed. Where one well constructed iron safe is considered sufficient, it is fixed against the throne for Benediction. This should be two feet square, and should have some buttressing at the back, six inches at the base and less higher up. Thus the depth of the altar and reredos extends five feet six inches, and a provision of six feet is not too much for the space behind the reredos. The steps to the throne with a protecting handrail will need two feet nine inches, and the remaining three feet three inches will be found most useful for holding flowers and candle-sticks in readiness for church functions.

Side altars may be any convenient length. Three feet is a convenient depth. Eight inches may be allowed for the candlestep and for flowers, and the central crucifix. If a church have two side altars one may be provided with a tabernacle for the altar of repose on Maunday-Thursday. There should not be a tabernacle on the remaining altar. It is well to make the candlestep eight or nine inches high for the support of the cards. The depth of two feet four inches is not too much for the table of the altar. A full-sized corporal measures twenty-three and a-half inches square. It should be laid on the altar a short distance from the front, and the card should stand free of it. The crucifix of a side altar should be such a height that the card resting against the cross beneath the figure should not dwarf it. It might rise from two feet to two feet six inches above the candle-step. The statue of a saint or of the Sacred Heart might stand over the altar, and a small crucifix at its base.

THE SACRISTY.

The sacristy is a structure adjoining the chancel for the safe keeping of the sacred vessels and vestments, and for the vesting of the clergy and servers. It is advisable to separate the portion for the vesting of the priests from that for the use of the servers. This arrangement gives the laity that opportunity of communicating confidentially with the priest which they need, and protects serving boys from loss of the reverence due to sacred things. In the division for the vesting of the clergy should be the safe for the sacred vessels. Usually it will stand secured in the wall of the church. The other walls may not be thick enough to receive and protect it. A safe less than two feet high inside, and of proportionate width and depth, is not large enough; and a safe more than three feet internally is not needed. The price will be from £14 to £21. If there be no ambry for the holy oils in the gospel side of the chancel, they may be fitly kept in the safe. A requisite of first consequence in every sacristy is a reliable eight day clock, sounding hours and half-hours. The provision of presses for vestments, copes, and linen, must vary with the circumstances of churches. In determining these provisions, the requirements for vestments, &c., are to be noted. Chasubles and copes will be best preserved if they are laid in drawers without folds. A drawer for vestments should support itself when drawn out and so be slightly wider than the vestments are. A drawer or slide three feet ten inches long internally, by two feet ten inches wide, and two and a quarter inches deep, will receive two plain chasubles or tunics or dalmatics, or one richly ornamented Roman vestment. A drawer five feet two inches long internally, two feet ten inches wide, and three and a half inches deep, will receive two plain copes, or one ornamented Roman cope. Stoles, humeral veils and burses can also lie in these drawers. Vestments will also keep well if hung upon shouldered-framed swinging brackets in presses protected by doors. Drawers or slides containing vestments need doors to protect them from dust. The protection is complete if brown holland is tacked to the back of each

slide, and drawn over each vestment when put away. Linen will be better preserved, and be kept in better order, in shallow than in deep drawers. Two drawers, four or five inches deep, will be more economical than one eight or nine inches deep; and two drawers three feet wide will be more economical, and be kept in better order than one five feet wide. A drawer to contain the church books, namely, two missals a book of the gospels and epistles, the books of the chaunt of the Passion, the registers of Baptisms, Confirmations, Marriages, and Deaths, requires to be two feet seven inches wide, five inches deep, and three feet from front to back internally. The most convenient height for a vesting press is three feet three inches. If it contain drawers two feet ten inches from front to back internally, and protected as they should be by doors, the surface must exceed three feet. It will be best to make the top amply deep that three feet may be allowed for the internal length of the drawer for the missals, registers, &c. The ends of the press should be equally deep, and a protecting ledge on top would prevent things falling behind. Beneath the crucifix standing on the vesting press might be placed a card bearing the name of the bishop of the diocese, and the heading of any prayer appointed by him to be said in the Mass. The length of the press must depend on the number and the length of the drawers it is to contain.

It is well to place it against the longest wall in the sacristy. In this wall, at one end of the vesting press, is a good place for the piscina. It should have an ample basin. If this is made circular, and fourteen inches in diameter, it will suit for the washing of the purificators by the priest. If vessels, in which these have been washed, are to be emptied into it, and are to be left there to drain, it must be longer than it is wide, about eighteen inches by fourteen. The pipe to carry away the waste water, should convey it to the ground beneath the floor, where it could percolate. It is well to fence this spot by brickwerk, about a foot square, from the ground to the floor. Over this "sacrarium" a trap door would be found useful. The cotton applied after sacred unctions should be burned.

The custom is widely spread, of burning all such cotton in the sacristy, and dropping the ashes into the sacrarium. They might easily block the waste pipe of the piscina.

At the other end of the vesting press, is a good place for fixing a cabinet on brackets against the wall, or on a table, to contain small altar linen, palls, corporals, &c. For these there might be nine drawers in three rows, each drawer measuring internally eight inches from back to front, by six inches wide, and five inches high. Beneath these drawers a large one, about twenty inches wide, eight inches high, and eight inches from back to front, might receive soiled linen. Above these drawers might be a vacant space, about nine inches high, and the width of the cabinet; and there pegs might be fixed on which purificators in use might hang and dry. The cabinet should be protected by doors and a lock.

A good provision in a sacristy is a confessional for the deaf, and a speaking horn. This occasional confessional might be formed by placing at a right angle when needed, and steadied by a bolt dropping into the floor, the door of a press in which albs in use hang, and in this door a grating should be fixed. A small window, looking on the high altar would aid the sacristan, and would serve the priest in making his thanksgiving. A door giving access to a passage behind the altar would increase the utility of the space. The best mode of warming churches and sacristies is by hot water pipes. A coal fire creates dust. A gas stove tarnishes metal. The evil may be lessened by a sharp draught. Asbestos well heated by gas is cleanly; but not economical.

Churches with aisles that have but two altars (and minor churches do not need a third) have usually space for the best sacristy. A calvary four feet deep in place of a third altar would be very devotional, and the faithful kneeling before the moving representation of our suffering Lord would be likewise kneeling before His real presence on the high altar. The space between the eastern wall of the chancel and the eastern wall of the calvary may well be twenty-four feet; and whatever be the width of the calvary, the sacristy beyond

it will be very commodious, that will be seven feet wider. This width provides suitable space for the two sacristies, and also for a passage five feet wide for the priest to the altar by the best approach, namely, on the south or the north side of the calvary. Should the space for the sacristy be twenty-four feet by twenty, the priest's division may well measure fourteen by twenty, and the servers' division nine feet six inches by twenty, allowing six inches for the separating wall. In this the space of a door may be left open, or a door may be fixed of which the upper half may be glass.

Whatever may be the form or size of the servers' sacristy it will need a provision for wax candles, oil, incense, charcoal, and in some cases for house coal. It might be formed thus: over a cupboard two feet six inches high, five feet wide, and three feet deep, might be in one row three drawers five inches high, and three feet from front to back, of which the middle one should measure six inches in width internally, and the other two occupy the remaining space of five feet. Over these might be a fixed wooden tray for wax candles, with sides five inches high, and a rising lid on hinges. Across the centre from front to back might be an opening, two inches wide and twenty inches long, into the drawer beneath; the opening commencing eight inches from the front, and ending eight inches from the back. On each side might be three compartments a foot wide, comprising the three feet of the depth of the tray from front to back. The divisions of these compartments might be four inches high and fixed parallel to the front a foot apart, and might measure from each end twenty-one inches towards the centre. Here might be a free space eighteen inches wide, with the opening into the drawer below across the centre, and here wax might be scraped, and wicks adjusted, and the candles be placed in the separate compartments; and all refuse could be swept into the drawer beneath. The side drawers might receive clean towels and dusters, incense, lamp-floats, wax tapers, and any surplus wax. The cupboard below might receive on the best oil cloth an ample supply of oil, a box for charcoal, and one of house coal if needed, and a division could receive candlesticks, torches,

thuribles, &c. The bottom of the tray might be most advantageously, and at slight expense, cased with slate. Two half-inch slabs thirty-six inches by thirty, screwed down, with the two inch opening twenty inches long at the junction, would provide a cool level on which wax candles would lie straight and firm in all weathers. The divisions might be fixed by screws from beneath and might be slate.

HENRY TELFORD.

ON PROBABILISM.

THE subject of Probabilism occupies a relatively large space in our course of Moral Theology, and has, in modern times, especially since the days of St. Liguori, afforded much matter for discussion and disputation according to the varying views of authors and professors respecting it. Having paid attention just recently to the matter, as it came in my way in looking back on by-gone studies, which I feel pleasure in doing, so far as time and other occupations allow me, I am induced to place my thoughts in the hands of the Editor of the RECORD, in the idea that he may indulgently consider them not altogether unworthy of its pages, with a view to any interest they may present to its numerous readers. To treat it comprehensively, and in its various aspects, the subject is considerably extensive, so that I can do little more within the reasonable limits of a single article than clear the ground, and prepare the way for entering upon its regular treatment.

Moral Theology in its general sense, as we all know, has to do with the conduct of mankind so as to guide them in the path they should pursue, "*declining from evil, and doing good,*" according to the words of the psalmist (xxxvi., 27) in order to attain the end of their creation. This guidance of mankind is, to a very large extent, the function of the holy tribunal of Penance. In the institution of the sacrament of Penance our Divine Lord was mercifully pleased to confide

to the ministers of His Church the dispensation alike of God's mercy and justice. This dispensation places upon them a most momentous responsibility, the responsibility of judges to decide who are worthy of the mercy of the Almighty after having offended His Divine Majesty, and who, on the other hand, not being yet worthy of this grace, must be left still subject to the rigours of His justice. This marvellous discretion is most distinctly conveyed in the stupendous commission, with which they are invested; for our Divine Redeemer does not only say "*Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them,*" but He immediately adds, "*and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained,*" (*John xx. 23*). How awful such responsibility—how amazing such discretion, to deal with the mercy and justice of the Most High with respect to fellow mortals here on earth! In contemplating such a dispensation we may well exclaim with the Prophet: "*Who hath ever heard such a thing! and who hath seen the like?*" (*Isai. lxvi. 8*). St. Chrysostom commenting upon it observes: "the princes of this world have power over our mortal members to bind or loose them; but the power of the priest of God reaches the soul, and in its effects mounts up even into heaven" (*Lib. iii. de Sacerd.*); and speaking of it elsewhere in the same treatise, and comparing it with the authority divinely committed to the priests of the Old Law with respect to the leprosy, he asserts, that they were commissioned not to cure the poor patient, but merely to pronounce upon the question of fact, whether he was, or was not cured, but that the priests of the New Law had power respecting the leprosy of sin, not only to say that the sinner was cured, but actually to cure him.

But the minister of the sacrament of Penance is not only invested with judicial authority and power to give effect to the judgment he forms, but he is further invested with the attributes of physician, doctor or teacher, and father, with respect to the penitents, who approach him, as he is seated in the holy tribunal; and in the functions which these several attributes require of him, no less than that of judge, he has to guide his ministry with a discrimination as careful and solicitous, as the issues involved are serious and important.

From these considerations of the attributes of a confessor it is necessarily to be inferred, that he should be deeply versed in the science of dealing with the souls of men in the various ways the discharge of such a ministry requires, and on this account the Church from the commencement sought by every means to have her priests duly instructed before granting them licence to exercise the power received from the hands of the bishop in their ordination of forgiving and retaining sin in accordance with the divine institution of the sacrament of Penance.

The apostles, in the first instance, were especially enlightened for their various functions by the descent of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, and as they went forth on their several missions extending the kingdom of their Divine Master, and founding churches everywhere they preached, they ordained priests to minister to the faithful whom they had converted. Before ordaining them they saw that they possessed the qualities required for their sacred office, as we see in the instructions given by St. Paul to his beloved disciples Timothy and Titus. We are to allow of course, according to the exigencies of the times, that divine agency largely supplied what was wanting in human resources. Hence St. Paul tells us, that by special vocation God had given "*some Apostles, some Prophets, and other some Evangelists, and other some Pastors and Doctors, for the perfecting of the saints, for the working of the ministry, for the edifying of the Church of Christ.*" (Eph. iv. 11, 12).

The first pastors in the newly founded churches instructed the priests by whom they were assisted, and as nearly every city and town had its own bishop, the first and chief concern of the bishops was to train those whom they selected for the sacred ministry, and instruct them especially in the knowledge required for the sacrament of Penance. These instructions were committed to writing, and formed treatises and rituals in the hands of the clergy. In course of time rules and canons regulating the administration of the sacrament were drawn up, and put in use. In the Eastern Church, St. Peter of Alexandria, St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, St. Basil and St. Gregory of Nissa framed regular compilations, which

tradition has handed down associated with the names of these early Fathers, and which regulated the penances to be imposed for the various sins, which they set forth in minute detail. Other penitential canons were enacted by particular councils of bishops from the earliest ages of the Church, even before the first general council of Nice, which legislated largely on the subject.

The Western Church taking example and instructions from Rome was not slow in compiling her penitential canons, which, however, varied according to the prudence and discretion of the bishops in different countries, and these rigid ordinances continued to regulate the administration of the Sacrament of Penance with certain modifications and relaxations, as the progress of time required, till the thirteenth century.

We are now arrived at a new phase in the Church's history. Hitherto the authority of her councils and chief pastors ruled the practice of the sacred tribunal, but now, and henceforth, individual teachers are allowed to speak and claim a hearing on the subject.

Already beginning with St. Anselm, the treatment of theology has been assuming a more systematic form, already has Peter Lombard given to the world his four books of sentences compiled from the Fathers and Councils of the Church, which hand down his name to posterity as "the Master of the Sentences," and already too has the Paris University, and other seats of learning produced rich fruits in the distinguished men, that came forth from their halls. "The Master of the Sentences" was their great repertory, and in earnest rivalry they elaborated from this source that methodised system of teaching, which flourished throughout the middle ages, and is known to history under the title of "Scholastic Theology" receiving its perfection from making philosophy its handmaid, and dealing with the sacred science in the three-fold departments of dogma, speculation, and polemics; and it may be well conceived with what ardour the work of the school was carried on from the fact, that "the Sentences" had no less than two hundred and forty commentators in course of time. Side by side with scholastic theology progressed

also the teaching of morality. Gratian's decree, as also the decretals of Gregory IX. which owe their compilation very much to St. Raymond of Penafort, were, like the "Master of the Sentences," and about the same period, in the hands of men who framed out of them systematic courses of moral teaching arranged so as to embrace the whole extent of human obligation in our duties towards God, our neighbour, and ourselves, in the various positions we may occupy in our passage through life. By dealing with their matter to a large extent by illustrations, or *cases*, they obtained the appellation of "Casuists" an appellation which the Lutherans and other corrupters of Christian morality sought to apply in a disrespectful sense in their references to the moral teaching of our Catholic divines. It is to be observed that on account of the affinity, and in many instances the blending, of subjects in the various departments of theological science the scholastic teaching had also to treat frequently of matters more strictly belonging to morality, and reciprocally the casuists had to mix up scholastic questions with their own special work.

In the earnestness and rivalry of so many different minds it was inevitable that differences should spring up, and warm discussions should agitate the schools. Socrates, whose name comes down to us as the "Prince of Philosophers," pronounced the remarkable sentence of himself "all I know is, that I know nothing," whilst his constantly repeated maxim was "know thyself," thereby intimating, that we all have mysteries in our own mind, the depths of which we are incapable of sounding, whilst we are still more incapable of reaching the depths of the minds of others. We must all agree of course as to first or self-evident principles, but as we launch into coniectures, and are carried away into inferences by dialectic disputation, we are liable to part company, and drift away into endless divergences. Hence arises the necessity of a controlling tribunal, and the supreme guidance of the Church, which our Divine Lord was graciously pleased to invest with the great gift of infallibility for this purpose. Yet the Church allows large range for discussion on the principle that from the clashing of intellects the cause of truth is served as a

main result, the ruling maxim being, “in necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus charitas.”

In this mode of maintaining what we may call a “concordia discors,” or perhaps more properly a “discordia concors,” what a contrast have we not presented to us between Christian and pagan philosophy! The philosophers of old started, indeed, from a common point of agreement, namely that the craving of happiness in the human mind pointed to a “summum bonum” as they called it, by which the craving was to be satisfied, but putting before them the question in what this “summum bonum” consisted, they went asunder into endless divisions, so that Terrentius Varro, styled in his day “the wisest of the Romans,” was able to count up no less than two hundred and eighty different opinions, as St. Augustine tells us in his immortal work of “the City of God,” maintained and defended in rival philosophical systems upon the one capital point which the Christian child knows from seven years of age, namely, what is the supreme happiness, or the end in the designs of God for which we are created; and so little practical efficacy had their teaching over the conduct of their own lives, that we are appalled and horrified from our inmost souls at the worse than brutal enormities in which, as St. Paul informs us in the first chapter of his epistle to the Romans, they prostituted human nature in their every day habits of life.

And in the great revolt of the sixteenth century against the teaching authority of the Catholic Church, what dissensions violent and interminable had not the world to witness? Plainer words language could not supply than those which our Blessed Lord made use of in the institution of the ever blessed mystery of the Adorable Eucharist, and He selected these words, it is to be observed, having before His mind the discussions that were to arise in course of centuries, as if they had already sprung up. Nevertheless, the reformers so tortured these Divine words into such a variety of senses, as that, before Luther himself had passed away, he had to count several different interpretations notwithstanding his tyrannical endeavours to maintain some sort of union on the point amongst the leaders of the so-called reformation; nay, he himself

wavered from meaning to meaning, as he felt pressure put upon him in the different stages of his tragic career. Already so early as 1527 he counted up eight different interpretations of the words of our Divine Lord, and thirty years later on, if he had lived so long, he could reckon no less than eighty-five, all doing violence to the plainest words that language could supply, in order to wrest them from the acceptation they bore in the hearts, and mouths, and practice, of the whole Christian world from the ever memorable night when they were first pronounced by our ever Blessed Redeemer; and since the days of the arch-reformer how has not interpretation followed interpretation, as sect begat sect down to the present day! I have before me Whitaker's Almanack for last year, and I count up two hundred and nineteen different sects for England and Wales alone, having added five to their number of the preceding year, and as many as thirty-three since 1882; and when we find "the believers in the divine visitation of Joanna Southcott, Prophetess of Exeter," still holding their place on the catalogue, we have our memory refreshed with what St. Augustine said of the heretics of his own day, that ravings so absurd never passed through the heads of patients in the delirium of a burning fever than have seized on the minds of those, who having abandoned the teaching guidance of the Church, have cast themselves on the ever vacillating principle of private judgment in matters of faith.

And whilst tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine, what has been the ethical code of the Reformation? Alas! the corrupt passions of poor human nature were allowed full swing. What was sin, and what was not sin, were debated from press and pulpit, till all restraints were removed, and Christian morality utterly overthrown, and if sin was in any particular case admitted, it was rendered uncertain in the disputes that raged upon the subject, how the sinner was to recover the grace of his offended Creator.

Yes, we have had in our schools controversies about "genera" and "species;" we have had our "Nominalists" and our "Realists;" our "Thomists" and our "Scotists;" and, later on, our various systems respecting the action of Divine Grace on the will of man; but these divergences with several

others were all within the limits, on one side, of free discussion which the Church has constantly encouraged for the investigation of truth, whilst, on the other hand, she has ever maintained with unyielding firmness the right of restraint and control necessary for the guardianship of the deposit of Faith, divinely committed to her safe-keeping till the end of time. She has had also within her bosom in the domain of morality her various teachings from Tutorism, on the one side, to the borders of Laxism, on the other, but from her watch towers she has ever exercised an unremitting vigilance over her casuists, whatever denominations they may have assumed, or to whatever category they may have belonged, in order to preserve unsullied the attribute of sanctity, with which her Divine Founder invested her; and as the subject of Probabilism has, in modern times, occupied a conspicuous place in the disputations she has permitted, I now feel I have reached the threshold of my subject, which I must defer entering upon for the present, reserving it for another paper, for which, allow me by anticipation to bespeak a few additional pages of the RECORD.

A VETERAN PRACTITIONER.

SOME CATHOLIC REMINISCENCES OF THE INDIAN MUTINY OF 1857.

INTO a complete history of the Indian Mutiny the writer of these pages does not purpose going. Nor will he, except incidentally, touch upon the revolt which followed, and which was in certain places, more or less popular in its character. But as he was an eye-witness in the North-Western Provinces, where it assumed its most alarming dimensions, he will endeavour to present a brief sketch of the Mutiny itself, together with some account of the reasons for its occurrence. This, he considers, may be interesting to many readers of the IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD, who may not have seen the particulars which he is able to adduce, and which certainly

seem to point to a really miraculous interposition of Divine Providence, in protecting the Most Rev. Dr. Persico, at the time Vicar-Apostolic of the Agra Mission, and now Archbishop in the Kingdom of Naples, as well as the priests and nuns of the same mission, during the Mutiny. The reader, however, will be able to draw his own conclusions when the facts have been stated.

There is no doubt that the English Government had advice from the civil and military officials in India of the approaching storm. Even in the city of Delhi, the seat of the last king of the Mogul dynasty, placards were posted up on the Jumna Musjid or Mahometan Mosque, stating that the days of English rule in India were numbered. But to these and many other warnings no heed was given. In fact the idea of the Sepoy, or any of his countrymen, rising in rebellion against the English authorities, was thought too ridiculous to be entertained for a moment. It was considered positively absurd. After a twelve years' residence in India, previous to the Mutiny, and after having actually seen the native soldiers under fire in the Seikh campaign of 1846, such was our own decided conviction.

In the beginning of 1857, a mutinous spirit appeared amongst the native troops at Barrackpore, but was soon suppressed. Greased cartridges were alleged as the cause of their insubordination. The idea got abroad that the cartridges were made up in paper, greased with a mixture of suet and lard. Such materials were looked on by Hindoo and Mahometan as an abomination, for the cow was held in veneration by the Hindoo, and the hog was an object of disgust to the Mahometan. To our thinking the whole affair was a device cleverly got up by the wily Mahometans, to inveigle the simple Hindoos in their scheme.

The majority of the troops knew well that the cartridges were the same as they had been using for years. Even the Governor-General issued a proclamation, assuring the native army that the tales told them were malicious inventions and falsehoods. Lord Canning succeeded the Earl of Dalhousie as the supreme authority in India. He was called on not only to suppress, but crush the mutiny, and well and

thoroughly did he do so under trying circumstances and great difficulties. He was, as is commonly said, the right man in the right place. "Lord Canning was a real statesman,¹ because he would not listen to the blood-thirsty clamours of mere frenzy, he was nick-named 'clemency Canning,' as if clemency was an attribute of which a man ought to be ashamed."

To say that the Government ever intended to destroy the castes of the Hindoos or tamper with Mahometan belief would be an assertion not supported by facts. For example let there be a vacancy in some Government office or department, and let us suppose that the office in question is that of a sub-sheriff, worth about £50 per annum. Four candidates, all natives, but of different modes of worship, present themselves for the post, a Hindoo, a Mahometan, a Protestant and a Catholic, while a very great superiority in the matter of education is possessed by the two Christians over their competitors. Who will be successful? Invariably the Mahometan or Hindoo. Again no native soldier may become a Christian. And if he does express such a wish, he must either leave the regiment, of course with permission, or suffer from his comrades more severe trials than being merely "sent to Coventry."²

I frequently conversed with a Pundit who was by caste a Brahmin, and had come originally from Cashmere. He had been educated at one of the Government Colleges; could speak English fluently, and was well up in the sciences. This gentleman acknowledged to me that he had no religion, and laughed at the numerous and different sects in existence. But, he added, with every appearance of sincerity, that if any of the various religions were true it was the Catholic. "But, sir," he continued, "if I became a Catholic, look at the consequences. My mother, wife, and children would abandon me, and to crown all I should lose my situation; would your bishop then support me?" This person was a Government official.

¹*History of Our Own Times.* By Justin M'Carthy, M.P.

²This is not so in the Madras or Bombay Presidencies, we think.

There are colleges and schools in abundance all over India, Oxford and Cambridge in many instances supplying professors and masters; they are all principally, if not entirely, supported and endowed by the Indian Government. But in few, if in any of them is the Christian religion alluded to, or if at all mentioned no effect apparently follows. So that Hindoos and Mahometans who, before entering these godless colleges, had some belief in a Supreme Being, leave them believing in nothing, with no idea of real religion, and with their minds no better than *Tabulae rasae* in the matter of religious belief.

It was in 1498 the Portuguese arrived in India; and, for more than a century, Portugal commanded the Indian trade with no effectual opposition, though the Dutch, French and Spaniards had in the interim entered into sharp competition with them. The King of Portugal sent out in all the ships not only chaplains to attend to the spiritual wants of the sailors and soldiers, but also missionaries for the conversion of the poor benighted natives of India. And the better to succeed in this enterprise, all the Government officials were ordered by His Majesty to give every possible aid to the priests in the discharge of their spiritual and temporal duties. Large sums of money also were allotted by the Crown for these purposes. So well had the Bishops of Goa done their duty with a small band of missionaries, that when St. Francis Xavier arrived in India in the year 1542, he found a cathedral at Goa, and chapels and schools scattered over a considerable portion of the southern extremity of India.

St. Francis Xavier after only ten years of missionary labour had converted nearly the whole of southern India. Amongst his converts were kings, princes, princesses, and the nobles of their courts. It is, alas! but too true, that he was thwarted by the jealousy and covetousness of those who should have helped and encouraged him in his arduous labours. At length when he was no longer able to endure the immorality and tyranny of Government officials, he sailed to Malacca, and after some time to Japan. The vast kingdom of China appealed to his charity, and he was resolved at the risk of his life to force an entry into it, when God took him to Himself.

He died, like Moses, in sight of the land of promise.

In the vicinity of Madras, Madura, &c., there are flourishing Catholic missions of natives, as also in the island of Ceylon. On returning home in 1859, we stopped a night with his Lordship Dr. Fennelly. Going ashore in the purser's boat we saw thousands of poor natives fishing. Their clothing was merely a cloth round their loins, called a *dhotee*; they were riding on hollowed pieces of wood, which are named *catamarans*, with their legs dangling in the water. They were sometimes thrown off the catamarans by a large breaker, but in an instant they were up and on again. Whilst we were admiring their agility, the officer said to us "these all belong to you." This was really true, as on speaking to the Bishop on the subject, he assured us there were sixty thousand of these poor natives along the coast belonging to his flock.

The Portuguese in the south of India, and their other Oriental possessions, carefully observed Sundays and all the holidays of the Church, and if they did not compel the natives to observe them, at least they made them *respect* them. This is not the case in our Indian possessions, as Christian feasts are ignored by the native population; whilst the Mohurrum and other Mahometan feasts, together with the filthy and disgusting orgies of the Hindoos, are carefully attended to by the Government. In order that the tender and delicate religious feelings of the natives may not in any way be wounded, *all* Government offices are closed on these occasions. The Portuguese employed neither force nor violence in converting the Indians, but they respected and supported Christianity; and when a post had to be filled up in their offices or service, they invariably gave the preference to a native Christian. If the English had pursued the same line of conduct since their first arrival in India, now nearly three centuries ago, there should at present be millions of native Christians in the country, whereas we have not fifty thousand from Calcutta to the Khyber Pass. Close by every courthouse, or, as the natives term it, "the place where the law is sold," you will find either a Hindoo temple or a Mahometan mosque, built by the Government for the convenience of

their officials and servants, who are either Mahometans or Hindoos. This is certainly not tampering with the faith of the natives, or attempting to convert them. Many and various are the faults and crimes attributed, whether justly or unjustly we do not say, to British rule in India. But I do allege without fear of contradiction, that of the charge of tampering with the natives in religious matters, or of improving and correcting their impious code of morality, England is perfectly innocent. Consequently religion was not a factor in causing the Indian Mutiny.

No doubt America, Germany and England spend millions of money in sending out missionaries with their families and Bibles to convert the poor natives of India. These apostles are certainly energetic and active men in their way; but the almighty dollar and rupee are the real and effective causes of conversion. Protestant missionaries invariably have schools, printing presses, &c., in their service, and employ many natives in conducting them; but money, money is the real attraction. There is rarely such a thing with them as a real and solid conversion. On the smallest deficit occurring in the exchequer the natives look out for other hunting grounds.

Another reason for the outbreak is sometimes brought forward on which I place no more reliance than on religious aggression, that is Russian gold. Everyone knows that Russia has no bullion to spare, nor is her credit the best in the European market. But I now come to what, in the judgment of many, was the real cause of the Indian Mutiny, and the revolt which followed it, namely, *annexation*.

The subject is immense, but I shall touch only on its salient points, beginning with the first arrival of the English in India. In 1602 a small fleet of five ships, under the command of Captain Lancaster, arrived in Acheem roads, and established a factory. Through a Doctor Boughton, on account of his medical services at the Imperial Court, the company of merchants, with originally a capital of £30,000, obtained a Firman in 1651, from the Emperor at Delhi, to carry on trade throughout the province of Bengal. In 1661 the English company obtained the island of Bombay, from the Portuguese, and from that period to 1854, the East India

Company acquired, by fair means or foul, fifty-seven kingdoms and principalities. In the short space of forty-seven years they had become masters of the whole seaboard, from Sandoway in Arrican to Cape Comorin.

Many indeed have been the Governors of these vast possessions, from Clive down to the present Lord Dufferin. But among all, Lord Dalhousie¹ and Lord Canning hold conspicuous places; the former for his energy and ruling powers, the latter for his masterly effort in crushing the Indian Mutiny. Lord Dalhousie was certainly a great man, of commanding energy and indomitable courage. He had also some parliamentary experience in both houses. Towards the close of 1847 he succeeded Lord Hardinge, and an administration of more activity than that of Lord Dalhousie it would be difficult to trace in the history of any country. Within fifteen months the telegraph was in operation from Calcutta to Agra; thence it was extended to Attock on the Indus, as also to Bombay and Madras. We may here mention that the first Superintendent and Director of the Indian Telegraph was an Irishman, Sir William O'Shaughnessy.

During Lord Dalhousie's few years of office, he eclipsed his predecessors in the line of *annexations*. He annexed the Punjab, a portion of Burmese territory, Nagpore, Sattara, Jhansi, Berar and *Oudh*. We cannot bring forward any reasonable cause for all these kingdoms and principalities being swallowed up by the British Lion, under his Lordship's management. His minutes in the Government Records are certainly concise, sharp and decisive. Here is one of them:—
“We are Lords paramount of India, and our policy is to acquire as direct a dominion over the territories in possession of the native Princes as we hold over the other half of India.”
Now such a policy as this could only lead to a course of direct annexation in the near future. And notwithstanding that excuses and justifications were alleged by the authorities for each of these annexations to show that they were not only justifiable, but actually inevitable, none the less must a succession of such acts have produced a deep feeling of opposition

¹ *A History of Our Own Times.* By Justin M'Carthy, M.P.

among the natives, in whose midst the events were accomplished. The people of India, although naturally indifferent, cold and apathetic, were now struck with alarm as they saw their Princes thus successively dethroned. The flower of the Sepoy army came from the kingdom of Oudh, and other annexed territories adjacent, and when they saw the advancing avalanche of British power crushing their country, they felt a natural and reasonable resentment against such irksome intervention. The annexation of Oudh we consider to have been the last straw that broke the camel's back, and brought on the Indian Mutiny. Lucknow, the capital of the kingdom of Oudh, was a magnificent city. Dr. Russell, the correspondent of the *Times*, says of it :—

“Not Rome, not Athens, not Constantinople, not any city I have ever seen, appears to me so striking, and beautiful as this, and the more I gaze, the more its beauties grow upon me.”

It had numbers of magnificent palaces, villas, and gardens laid out in gorgeous style and with the most delicate taste, a population of more than a million of people and nearly two hundred thousand armed men. Cruel and tyrannical was the treatment dealt to the Sovereign of this grand city. Let us quote again Dr Russell :—

“The menagerie of the King of Oudh, as much his private property as his watch or turban, were sold under discreditable circumstances, and his jewels seized and impounded, though we had no more claim on them than on the crown diamonds of Russia. Do the English people care for these things? Do they know them? The hundred millions of Hindostan know them well, and care about them too.”

To Sir James Outram, a thorough soldier, as well as a clever diplomatist, is due the annexation of Oudh. I do not allege that such was his own personal design, but like a true soldier he was obedient to orders. My reason for alluding to the General is this. On his returning to India on one occasion there were in the steamer with him a few Catholic missionaries, who were grossly insulted by some British officers on their way out to join their respective regiments. On the matter being reported to the General, he

at once gave them a sharp reprimand, and also said he would put them under arrest if they did not at once make an ample apology to the Fathers, and promise future good conduct. The officers complied with his orders. On the General's final return to England he came by Rome, and was graciously received by the late saintly Pontiff, Pius IX., who presented him with a large gold medal.

Many other reasons might be adduced as affording fuel to the Mutiny flame, such as the haughty treatment of the Sepoys, and the despotism exercised over natives in general. Even native officers, descended from a princely line of ancestors, did not escape such degradation.

At length the eventful day arrived, big with the fate of British rule in India, the 10th of May, 1857. Some eighty men of a native cavalry regiment, for refusing to use the cartridges, were tried by courtmartial and sentenced, some to six, and others to ten years' imprisonment with hard labour. The prison in which they were confined was guarded by *native* soldiers, whilst British cavalry, artillery, and infantry, were tranquilly reposing in their barracks. The prisoners were soon released by their comrades, and immediately began their bloody work. They killed the colonel and several officers, and were busily engaged in attacking all the European inhabitants when English soldiers appeared on the scene. The mutineers were now driven from their cantonments. This was the turning point of the Mutiny; for had there been prompt and vigorous action on the part of the military and civil authorities, the mutiny could have been partially checked, if not entirely crushed. In Meerut at the outbreak there was a strong force of British cavalry, artillery, and infantry. What did they do? They marched through the bazaar after the insurgents had fled, and discharged a few rounds of shot amongst the trees where voices were heard; this, and destroying the villages of some innocent natives around Meerut made up the sum total of their exploits. It is to this day a mystery how the insurgents, after the commission of murder and arson, could march off to Delhi without opposition, when there was such a splendid British force of all arms in Meerut as could have effectually destroyed them. No;

nothing was done, and a reign of terror and bloodshed was soon inaugurated, which might have been so easily prevented at the beginning by English troops within a few hundred yards of the insurgents. Delhi is about 40 miles from Meerut. It was at the time of the Mutiny the principal arsenal for supplying with the munitions of war all the stations up to Peshawur. It contains thousands of stands of small arms, parks of artillery, shot, shell, etc.; but by whom was all this guarded? Who had the protection of this once imperial city with its four hundred thousand inhabitants? Native troops, native infantry and artillery, with a few English officials!

On the arrival in Delhi of the insurgents from Meerut, and while crossing the bridge of boats, the first European they met with was the Commissioner, the highest English authority in the place, and they killed him at once. Then they swarmed into the palace of the King, proclaimed him Emperor of India, and hoisted the standard of rebellion against English rule. We need not say any thing of the palace which was a small city in itself, and by all accounts a den of infamy. The King was an absolute monarch in his palace, though a pensioner of the British Government. At once the Sepoy troops in the city, with those on the Delhi ridge, about two miles distant joined hands with the mutineers. There were but few Europeans in the city, principally writers in the Government offices, and some officers over the Commissariat and Ordnance departments.

We have now to narrate the death of Father Zacharias, an Italian Capuchin, and the chaplain of Delhi. No sooner had the insurgents rested a little after their hasty march from Meerut, than native officials were appointed by the King's authority, and a general search ordered to discover the abodes of all Europeans in the city. Then commenced a ruthless massacre of men, women and children. Father Zacharias had been appointed but a short time before the Mutiny broke out to Delhi by the Most Rev. Dr. Persico, then Vicar-Apostolic of the Agra Mission, which at that time extended from Allahabad on the confluence of the Ganges and Jumna rivers to the borders of Afghanistan. The missionary's flock was small, consisting of a native colony of Catholics, some

few Eurasians and non-commissioned officers of the Ordnance department. The holy man quickly grasped the state of affairs, and made his preparations; but not for flight. His servants begged and implored him to dress himself in native costume and thus effect his escape; this he could have easily accomplished, as he was of a rather dark complexion and had a long black beard. But no, the saintly old man told them to provide for themselves by flight; "but as for me," he said, "I shall die in my church." Very soon after a body of cavalry appeared at the gate crying out "where is the Padre?" At that moment in the humble little chapel he could be seen prostrate before the altar, bathed in tears with the crucifix in hand, ready as a victim for the sacrifice. No reply was given to the murderers' demand, for all others had fled. So they advanced into the little court yard, tied their horses, and proceeded to the chapel. As they arrived at the door, they stopped as if in awe, looking at the prostrate figure before the altar. Soon, however, a shot was fired, and then volley after volley discharged, until his body ceased to move. He was dead. This was not enough. As if not satisfied with their bloody work they rushed into the chapel to cut and hew the lifeless remains of the holy priest. No vestige of his body nor of any of the sacred vessels or vestments were ever discovered. The chapel, with its humble presbytery, was afterwards used as a stable for cavalry. In this state it remained until the fall of Delhi, on the 8th of September, when it was taken possession of by Rev. Father Bertrand, chaplain to the British forces before Delhi, and again cleaned up and opened for Divine Service. Nearly two years after the event the writer passed through Delhi, where he had the great privilege of celebrating Mass in this church, and even then one could see slight traces of the martyr's blood on the wall within the sanctuary.

In about three weeks the British forces marched from Umballa for Delhi under General Anson and about the same time the Mutiny broke out in Lucknow and the kingdom of Oudh. All over the north-western provinces native regiments either mutinied or were disbanded, with the solitary exception of the Seikhs and Goorkhas, who remained

faithful to the British Government. To increase the danger still further, the population of the towns and villages now made common cause with the native troops against English rule. The state of affairs is thus described by Dr. Russell:—

“The revolt spread, not with lightning flash all over the plains of India, but rather as a smouldering fire, which, having long burned secretly, at last bursts forth in flame at one point, and thence creeps round and steals along through reed, and bush, and jungle, till, at the solicitation of some favourable breeze, it leaps with a mighty roar from tree to tree, and soon wraps the whole scene in a universal sheet of all-consuming, furious, irresistible heat.”

Agra, being the head-quarters of the mission, possessed a magnificent cathedral. It had six chapels, and was built in the Grecian style, not unlike the Madeleine in Paris. Its architect was an Italian Capuchin, Father Bonaventure, who died a martyr of charity. In Agra also were the bishop's palace, a large and stately building for the accommodation of his Lordship and the Missionary Fathers; St. Peter's College for ecclesiastics and European boarders; St. Paul's Orphanage for soldiers' boys, a large convent with some thirty nuns, French and Irish, and several young ladies as boarders, St. Joseph's Orphanage for native girls, and lastly, St. Patrick's Orphanage for the daughters of Catholic soldiers. All these communities, with his Lordship, Dr. Persico, the professors, priests, nuns, and children, together with the whole European and Eurasian population of Agra, had to take refuge in the old fort on the Jumna. Who can picture the weary, sad, and painful life its inmates had to lead for some four months? No sooner did the Europeans enter the fort than all native Agra turned out to have their day. The city contained nearly 300,000 inhabitants. The Budmashes, a special class of their own, something like “our corner boys,” and 2,000 prisoners from the gaol, all with one accord began to destroy Government buildings, barracks, colleges, schools, churches and private residences. Every day news would arrive in the fort of some rebel force approaching, but fortunately indeed for the inmates no real attack was made upon them. There was one English regiment of infantry in the fort, with plenty of cannon and ammunition. But they

had not two dozen men to discharge their big guns. It was principally to awe and frighten the people of the city that they had planted artillery all around. But had any small force of artillery attacked the fort, a breach could have been made in its walls in a very short time. It was built originally more for ornament than active warfare, and had very little about it, or rather nothing, according to the principles of Vauban. On one occasion the troops in the fort sallied out to arrest a band of mutineers on their march for Delhi, then the grand centre of the rebel forces. But our troops had not proceeded far when they saw the superior strength of the enemy's contingent, which consisted of both cavalry and infantry, and thereupon prudently retreated back to the fort.¹

WILLIAM BRADY.

(To be continued.)

¹ Mr. M'Carthy's paintings of Indian affairs at this time is interesting :—"Never at any time came such news upon England as the first full story of the Mutiny in India. It came with terrible, not unnatural exaggeration. Stories of wholesale massacres of English women and children, of the most abominable tortures, the most degrading outrages inflicted on English mothers and daughters. During the Indian Mutiny the blood of innocent women and children was cruelly and lavishly spilt. But there were no outrages on women in the ordinary meaning of the word. Upon this fact all historians of the Mutiny agree. . . . The advices which some English journals showered upon the Government, the army, and all concerned in repressing the Mutiny, might more fittingly have come from some of the heroes of the Spanish fury. Nay, the Spanish fury itself was, in express words, held up to the English army as an example for them to imitate. An English paper of high, and well-earned authority, distinctly declared that such mercy as Alva showed the Netherlands was the mercy that English soldiers must show to the rebellious regions of India. . . . It is painful to have to remember that the talk was not of repression but of revenge."

Dr. Russell, after contrasting Indian and English cruelty, sums up as follows :—"All these kinds of vindictive, unchristian, Indian torture, such as sewing Mahometans in pig skins, smearing their bodies with pork fat before execution, and burning their bodies, and forcing Hindoos to defile themselves, are disgraceful, and ultimately recoil on ourselves. They are spiritual and mental tortures to which we have no right to resort, and which we dare not perpetrate in the face of Europe."

THE HABIT OF ST. THOMAS, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

THE interest which Catholics take in St. Thomas of Canterbury shews no sign of abating. On the contrary, it has increased with the beatification of the English martyrs. By the recent decree a fuller light has been thrown upon the motive which actuated Henry the Eighth's almost inconceivable rage against the archbishop's name and relics. The fury which stopped not at rifling a tomb, but jackal-like, could batten even upon the dead is sometimes styled insane. For the honour of human nature we wish it could be set down to mere frenzy. It is plain, however, that there lurked much method in the Tudor's madness. He was ferocious on instinct. He understood what thoughtful men even outside the Church begin to understand, that one and the same cause linked together the glorious Pontiff, Thomas, and Blessed John Fisher; that a common interest animated Henry the Second's former Chancellor and his own Lord High Chancellor and victim, the Blessed Thomas More. All died in defence of the same imperishable rights. The Primate's blood fertilised the soil and Magna Charta sprang up; the Cardinal's blood drenched the same soil too late to save, though not too late to witness to the fundamental principle of the Charter. And now its first and vital article was blotted out. With the substitution of King for Pope the Church of England had ceased to be free. The great and strong tree of English liberty was cut down, and the stump of its roots was bound with a band of iron and brass.¹ Might not the ruthless tyrant suppose his work finished? What visible obstacle did there remain in the realm to the success of his sacrilegious plans? None. Yet he is not satisfied or at ease. An obstacle, unseen but felt, meets him on every side. An adversary as impalpable as the air, and as resistless, withstands him. This is the heroic example of St. Thomas. The martyr is still a power in the land. His story is treasured up in every heart. His

¹ Dan. iv., 12:

cathedral is still a favourite place of pilgrimage. His spirit starts from every missal and breviary, from painted window and sculptured reredos, and men are roused by it to resist even unto blood against the invasion of ecclesiastical rights and immunities. And so it came to pass that Henry "deemed his triumph incomplete so long as St. Thomas's shrine at Canterbury stood as a silent witness against him, or St. Thomas's name rose in prayers to heaven."¹ Accordingly his name by Royal ordinance was erased, and his shrine demolished. And these acts of Vandalism only served to make it clear that the patriot Bishop stood not alone, but was the leader and proto-martyr of that white-robed army which fought to the death for England's ecclesiastical and civil liberties.

It is this aspect in which St. Thomas has lately come to be more generally viewed that gives me hope that a paper on his dress when Archbishop will not prove uninteresting to the readers of the IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD. This may seem a point of little moment, but the place it takes up in all the *Vitæ* warrants us in assuming that his earliest biographers attached some importance to it. No other saint can we recall whose dress has had so much attention bestowed on it. Each chronicler, in his own way, tells us what the Archbishop wore, each supplies a detail, each adds a stroke, a very light one sometimes, to the picture. Yet all taken together fail to satisfy entirely our curiosity. With all the minuteness of their descriptions a certain obscurity hangs over the subject, and apparently conflicting statements have been to later biographers a source of much trouble and occasionally of mistakes. I have no pretention to say much that shall be new in a field where so many have laboured with industry and success. If I can help a little towards giving his clients some clear and consistent notions about the habit, which the Christian hero wore in the days of conflict and in the hour of martyrdom, these delvings will have served their purpose.

On becoming Archbishop, St. Thomas did not at once leave

¹ *Life of St. Thomas*, by the late Mrs. Hope, p. 378.

aside his worldly dress. Over the hair-shirt, which he put on as soon as he was consecrated, he retained for a time, even in the primatial chair, the secular dress he used to wear in the days of his Chancellorship. This behaviour is certainly strange, but as Fr. Morris very judiciously points out, it probably was "not from a worldly feeling that he did not conform himself in dress to his new manner of life. It may have been that he retained his gay attire in order to conceal the interior change that was taking place within him, and to secure himself from the observation of the Church."¹ The monks, however, were scandalized, and one of them reproved him. The reproof brought tears to the Archbishop's eyes, and made him determine to assume a dress more in keeping with his ecclesiastical status. He did not, however, tell his monitor what his intention was, "propositum tamen suum ista sibi referenti monacho minime revelavit."² But by the close of the year in which he was raised to the primatial See, a change took place in his exterior; his valuable and coloured dress was laid aside with its foreign and variegated furs, and he assumed a dress at once clerical and religious. What this dress was and the different articles which went to make it up may be gleaned from the original *Vita*, written by the Saint's contemporaries and faithful companions, and as far as possible, I shall give the text of the old biographers exactly as it stands in the Rolls Series, that so my readers who may not have easy access to these precious records may test step by step the value of my conclusions.

Herbert de Bosham informs us that the Saint's garments were closed all round, dark, and reaching his feet, and that the skins he wore were not costly furs but simply lambskin, "Clausæ ipsius vestes, pullæ et poderes et pelles non quidem pretiosæ sed agninæ." These pelles or garments of skin are more fully described by the Auctor Anonymus I. He also enables us to form an idea as to the relative place they held in the dress. His words are: "Super

¹ *The Life and Martyrdom of St. Thomas Becket*, 2nd edit., p. 78.

² *Rolls Series*, "Materials for History of Archbishop Becket," vol. iv., p. 21.

³ *Rolls*, op. cit., vol. iii., p. 196.

cilicium, quo ad carnem induebatur, pellicias agninas bysso tantum munda coopertas habuit.”¹ So we find that over his hair shirt St. Thomas wore more than one lambs-wool pelisse. Now referring to the *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 786, we read that “such dresses of fur (pelliciae) came into use among monks (*sic*) early in the ninth century; probably to protect them from the cold and damp during the long offices in church. The great Synod of Aix-la-Chapelle in 817 (can. 22) ordered each monk to have two dresses of fur (pelliciae).”² We may thus reasonably suppose that this was the number the Archbishop wore. An allusion is made to these pelisses by one who describes his appearance after death. “Pallium ejus et pellicia exterior,” complains Benedict of Peterborough “sicut erant cruore infecta, pauperibus pro anima ipsius minus discreta pietate collata sunt.”³ He adds a reflection which shews that time brings few changes, and that gifts of clothing often met in the twelfth century with the fate that so frequently attends such presents in the nineteenth. Speaking of the recipients of the precious relics, he says they were “satis felicibus, nisi ea statim inconsulte vendentes parvum eis pretium praetulissent.”⁴ Who obtained this pellicia I cannot find, but William, priest of Bourne, secured the pallium *i.e.* cappa, and miracles were wrought through it.⁵

“Over these pelliciae, a linen garment, the superpellicium or surplice, was worn in choir . . . In the twelfth century it reached to the ankles.”⁶ In the passage quoted above from Anonymus I. we see that St. Thomas’s pelisses were covered with clean, fine linen, “bysso munda.” This was no shirt, but the same white garment he had on when he fled from Northampton “indutus veste alba et monachili cappa super scapulas posita.”⁷ It was his surplice. Did it have sleeves, and if it had, were they wide? Zunggo, no mean authority, holds that anciently the surplice

¹ *Rolls*, op. cit. vol. iv., p. 21.

² *Cath. Dict.*, 3rd edit., p. 786.

³ *Rolls* op. cit., vol. ii., p. 16.

⁴ *Rolls*, op. cit. *ibid.*

⁵ *Rolls*, op. cit., vol. ii., pp. 53, 54.

⁶ *Cath. Dict.*, p. 786.

⁷ *Rolls*, op. cit., vol. ii., p. 335.

(colobium) was sleeveless.¹ We believe it had sleeves. Sleeves to some garment St. Thomas certainly had, for Herbert of Bosham tells us that the saint would carry manuscripts about with him in the large, loose sleeves of his dress, "schedulas etiam manicis suis laxis complicare consueverat . . . ut ita legendo semper promptius penes se haberet quod disceret."²

Doubtless the Archbishop immediately under his pelisses wore a tunic or close-fitting garment, reaching to the heels (vestis talaris). This tunic which has developed into the modern cassock, would be of a dark colour. The reader will remember the words of Herbert de Bosham, "clausae ipsius vestes, pullae et poderes." From this we may conclude that the saint wore openly more than one dark garment, that, in other words, the cappa was not his only black dress. Further on we shall revert to this point.

Over the surplice St. Thomas wore a black cappa, made of some cheap material and trimmed with white lambswool. Anonymus I. speaks of it in these terms: "Amiciebatur quoque pallio pullo, id est nigro, parvi pretii, solo tenus defluente, quod agninis pellibus muniebatur."³ The learned writer, to whom I am indebted for much definite information on this subject, holds that it was closed all round.⁴ This agrees with the statement given above from Herbert, and with what other writers tell us about the shape of the cappa in those times. It was what is known to-day as the "cappa magna," which, according to the *Catholic Dictionary* "seems to have been at first the choir vestment of Canons Regular, and which is used by cardinals, bishops, and in many churches [e.g. Rheims Cathedral], also by canons."⁵ From Hélyot we learn that ecclesiastics, finding it troublesome to have to gather up the anterior part of the cappa on their arms, first made a slit in the front to pass their hands through, and later on, put wide sleeves to it, thus converting the cappa into the monastic cowl. This latter expedient may have been in use even in the lifetime of St. Thomas,

¹ *Historiae Gen. et Spec. de Ord. Can. Reg.*, vol. i., p. 429.

² *Rolls*, op. cit., vol. iii., p. 206.

³ *Rolls*, op. cit., vol. iv., p. 21.

⁴ Fr. Morris, *Life*, &c., p. 78.

⁵ P. 116.

for we find the practice condemned as early as 1215.¹ We have no reason, however, for supposing that the Archbishop acted after this manner, but neither can it be clearly established that he could not pass his arms through the front of his cappa. That he could and did appears to me not to be altogether unlikely when we consider one of the circumstances that happened at the Council of Northampton on the memorable 13th of October 1164. "The Saint," says Fr. Morris, "would have gone to the Court vested as he was [for Mass] if some of the Templars, with whom he was intimate, had not persuaded him not to do so . . . At their urgent entreaty, he laid aside his mitre and pallium; he threw his black cappa, as a Canon Regular, over the sacred vestments,"² &c. Alanus, who is the authority for this incident,³ seems to infer that the Archbishop sought to conceal the sacred vestments, so as not to give the king any pretext for annoyance. But if this were the saint's intention and there were no slit in the cappa, his object would most certainly have been defeated the moment he took his primatial cross into his hands, for then he would have had to gather up all the front part of the cappa and thus expose to view what he knew would irritate the monarch. Let me add that this cappa was never abandoned by the saint. We have seen him wear it at Northampton; he wore it the night he fled, this, according to Fr. Morris, being the same cappa which Alan calls "monachilis."⁴ Finally St. Thomas was vested in the cappa when he met his end; it was dyed in his blood, says Benedict of Peterborough.⁵

Here we may pause and put together from the evidence before us the different articles worn by the Archbishop from the moment he changed his worldly attire. First there was a hair-shirt and drawers in one. Over this penitential garb he had two pelisses or garments of skin. A long linen surplice covered the pelisses, and probably between these and the surplice was a black gown not entirely covered by the

¹ *Histoire des Ordres religieux*, vol. ii., p. 20.

² *Life*, §c., p. 168.

³ *Rolls*, op. cit., vol. ii., p. 330.

⁴ *Rolls*, op. cit., vol. ii., p. 335; Fr. Morris, *Life*, §c., p. 187.

⁵ *Rolls*, op. cit., vol. ii., p. 16.

surplice. A black cappa adorned with lambswool enveloped him from his neck nearly to his feet, but allowed some portion of the black robe and surplice to be seen. Such I gather to have been St. Thomas's every day dress.

I am not unaware that exception can be taken to my view. Fr. Morris, whose interesting book is a valuable mine of information on all matters touching the Archbishop, says nothing of the black gown or tunic, and in one place, sets down distinctly that the surplice was worn *over* the cappa.¹ A surplice over a cappa seems so unusual an arrangement that I have been long casting about for some example of it but in vain. The statement appears to me to be almost in flat contradiction with what the Auctor Anonymus I. tells us.² I have tried to discover by what road Father Morris has arrived at this conclusion. My surmise may be incorrect, but I fancy he has been influenced by an expression of an ancient biographer, for at the close of his volume when describing the Archbishop's burial he has the words, "they took off his black cappa with its white lambswool and his fine linen surplice, which, enriched with the stains of his blood, were given to the poor."³ These details come down to us on the authority of Benedict of Peterborough and have already been given in the original Latin.⁴ But, the expression by which St. Thomas's latest biographer translates surplice is "*pellicia exterior*" in the old chronicles. Can the adjective *exterior* have been taken to mean worn over the cappa which is mentioned in close connection with the *pellicia*? And should it be taken in this sense when a more obvious interpretation presents itself, viz.: the outer pelisse of the two St. Thomas wore? Again, I doubt whether *pellicia* in documents of so early a date may be rendered by fine linen surplice. In the words "fine linen" there may be an allusion to the "*byssus munda*" spoken of by Auctor Anonymus I. as covering the garments of skin. If so it confirms the view I have adopted that the "*byssus*" was the surplice worn (as the etymology of the word surplice indicates) over the pelisses. And when *after* mentioning

¹ *Life, &c.*, p. 79.*Vide supra*, p. 529.³ *Life, &c.*, p. 424.⁴ *Vide supra*, p. 529.⁵ *Vide supra*, p. 529.

this "fine linen" garment the old biographer goes on to say that besides this and his other vestments the Archbishop was robed in an ample cappa "amiciebatur quoque pallio,"¹ &c, we are, I imagine, warranted in inferring that the cappa was exterior to and covered almost entirely the rest. Was not the "vestis alba" in which St. Thomas fled from Northampton a surplice which in those days was nearly as long as the alb is to-day? If it was, then he wore over it "his usual black cappa."² Can Alan's words admit of any other interpretation "indutus veste alba et monachili cappa super scapulas posita" ?³

The black gown or tunic involves greater difficulties. Saving the passage already given from Herbert⁴ where he says that the Archbishop's "vestes" were "pullae," which I take to mean that, besides the cappa, he wore another dark garment reaching to his feet, presumably a black "vestis talaris" or cassock, I have met only one other passage which may bear the same construction. Benedict of Peterborough informs us that, over the hair-shirt of the martyred Archbishop, the monks found a woollen shirt or robe, and a cowl, "exeuntes autem eum vestibus exterioribus . . . corpus ejus cilicio . . . involutum . . . habitumque super indutum monachalem, stamineam videlicet et cucullam reppererunt."⁵ In spite of this worthy historian I am inclined to think that the *staminea* was no monastic dress but simply the clerical or canonical black gown. My first reason for holding this to be a black gown reaching to the heels is that otherwise the "vestes pullae et poderes," described by Herbert cannot be identified. Some other dark garment reaching to the heels must have projected from beneath the black cappa to justify de Bosham's expression. A second reason is the fact that no other biographer speaks of any monastic habit, except a sleeveless cowl, being found on the corpse. Again the cowl is the only part of the Cistercian dress that we read of his assuming. Lastly, the same word *staminea* occurs

¹ *Vide supra*, p. 530.

² Fr. Morris, *Life, &c.*, p. 187.

³ *Rolls*, op. cit., vol. ii., p. 335.

⁴ *Vide supra*, p. 528.

⁵ *Rolls*, op. cit., vol. ii. p. 17.

in another passage of the same writer, and in a place where it can only mean a long robe. Speaking of a vision seen on Salisbury Plain soon after the death of St. Thomas, Benedict tells us that the boy who was favoured with this heavenly sight "obvios habuit in planitie grandi viros tres statura proceros, habitu quasi heremitas, staminiis albis vestitos."¹ Here the expression white woollen shirts is felt to be inadmissible. The writer must mean white woollen robes, and Canon Robertson, in his glossary appended to this volume, gives "robe" as one of the meanings of "staminea."² We are not, therefore, bound to render it by a woollen shirt in the other passage. Neither are we compelled to hold that it was a monastic habit, for at that time, when the cappa was closed all round, the long tunic or gown worn by canons would scarcely differ from that worn by monks if we may credit Hélyot.³

There remains another proof of its being a clerical habit, and though indirect, this proof will, I venture to think, have some weight with my readers.

St. Thomas's external appearance was such that, as Herbert of Bosham, with apparent reluctance, informs us, he was in his life-time believed to be a Canon Regular. "Nonnulli eum ob similitudinem vestium suspicati sunt fuisse, sicut vulgo dicitur, regularem canonicum."⁴ The inference was a very natural one, so long as the axiom stands that "nihil est in intellectu quod non prius fuerit in sensu." So far as men could trust the sense of sight St. Thomas was habited exactly like a Canon Regular; no other religious habit was visible at any time; the conclusion followed as a matter of course. Let us see what his contemporaries say of his new attire. According to William of Canterbury the Archbishop rejoiced "quia in triplici veste triplicem personam gereret; exteriori clericum &c."⁵ Here in the word "triplici" this writer and others seem to anticipate the Cistercian cowl which he received at

¹ *Rolls*, op. cit., vol. ii., p. 129.

² *Rolls*, op. cit., vol. ii., p. 464.

³ *Hist. des Ordres religieux*, vol. ii., p. 26.

⁴ *Rolls*, op. cit., vol. iii., p. 196.

⁵ *Rolls*, op. cit., vol. i., p. 10.

Pontigny.¹ The term "clericum" is explained by William a couple of lines lower ". . . quia exterius canonicus pateret" an explanation which shews that, by the "clericalis vestis" which St. Thomas wore habitually, we are to understand the canonical dress. We have evidence of the soundness of this interpretation in the Life by Edward Grim. At one place he says that those, who, after the death of St. Thomas would strip him of his clothes, "sub habitu Canonici Regularis eum . . . reperiunt."² At another place the same writer tells us that "tam ordinem quam habitum Canonici Regularis suscepit et susceptum . . . mirifice pariter cum officio Archiepiscopi conservavit."³ This testimony of the courageous adherent of our saint will be considered later. Gervase, a monk of Canterbury, uses almost similar language. "In exterioribus," he says, "Canonicus apparebat . . . in veste canonica [secutus est] magnum Augustinum."⁴ William Fitz-Stephen informs us that St. Thomas "sub absconso chlamydis canonicalis" wore a cowl and a hair shirt.⁵ The same writer calls these outer garments of a canon, the saint's "every day clothes," "ejus quotidianis vestibus superioribus,"⁶ and in another place says that he wore "habitum . . . supremo canonicalem."⁷ This agreement of the saint's contemporaries in stating that he wore the habit of a Canon Regular is of the greatest value. Even by itself it completely settles all questions about the Archbishop's exterior attire, and enables us to pronounce with more confidence upon the different articles that went to make up his dress. We have a point of comparison, a standard by which to judge. The ancient canonical habit we know; it has been fully described.⁸ In Hélyot's work there is a very fair engraving shewing the dress worn of old by the Canons Regular. Therein we see the black vestis talaris, over that appears the surplice perhaps three inches shorter than the cassock, and above all the black cappa with its

¹ Fr. Morris, *Life, &c.*, p. 79.

² *Rolls*, op. cit., vol. ii., p. 442.

³ *Ibid*, p. 368.

⁴ *Rolls*, *Gervase of Canterbury*, vol. i., p. 172.

⁵ *Rolls*, *Materials, etc.*, vol. iii., p. 147. ⁶ *Ibid*, p. 148. ⁷ *Ibid*, p. 37.

⁸ Tanner, *Notitia Monastica*, pref. xviii.

hood, a couple of inches of the surplice peeping out below the cappa. The cappa has an opening down the middle large enough to let the hands pass through. In short it represents exactly what Herbert de Bosham would lead us to expect.¹ This, if St. Thomas wore the canonical habit of the black Canons of the Priory at Merton, should be a faithful delineation of his dress, and according to this picture we ought to supplement and harmonize the imperfect and puzzling descriptions left us by his first biographers.

My readers will pardon me if I here insert some words from a book I have already made several references to. "The black cappa with lambswool, and the linen surplice," says Fr. Morris, "was not the monastic habit of the monks of Christ Church. It was that of the Black Canons Regular, to which order Merton Abbey belonged. When a boy there at school, St. Thomas had doubtless worn the same habit as the religious among whom he lived. It was therefore natural that, being surrounded by a chapter of religious, and sitting on a throne which had been rarely occupied save by religious, when he sought to show even by his habit that he had devoted himself to the service of God, not being himself a Benedictine, he should resume that habit which he had worn when young, and with which were associated his recollections of strictness and holiness of life."²

Some other motive may also have induced our saint to adopt this habit. Perhaps his confessor Robert the Prior of Merton suggested the idea to him. It was not the first time nor the last that an Archbishop clad as a Canon Regular occupied the throne of St. Augustine. To mention only two instances, less than thirty years before St. Thomas's consecration a Canon Regular was Archbishop of Canterbury, and within thirty years of St. Thomas's death the habit of the Black Canons of Merton was again seen on the primatial throne. The first was William, Prior and Canon of St. Osyth's.³ His

¹ *Vide supra*, p. 528. ² *Life and Martyrdom of St. Thomas*, p. 79.

³ *Rolls, Gervase of Canterbury*, vol. ii., p. 381.

Archdeacon Helewisius, the same historian informs us, was also a Canon Regular.¹ The other was Archbishop Hubert, of whom William of Newburgh says, that "after having received the pall from the Roman Pontiff, he was enthroned; and shortly after, having taken the habit of a canon at Merton, he manifested by his outward garb the religious purpose of his mind."² Hence we gather that even if Dr. Smith, the venerable Bishop of Chalcedon, were wrong in holding that St. Augustine put Canons Regular in his Church at Canterbury,³ even if the clerics brought over by him and by St. Paulinus, never set foot in Christ Church,⁴ even if the Saxon chronicler is mistaken where he states that Aelfric turned the clerics out to make room for the monks,⁵ the canonical habit was no novelty in Canterbury Cathedral, and, doubtless, the good Prior Robert was aware of this.

Prudence also may have had something to do with the selection of this particular dress. If a change was to take place, the Archbishop may have deemed it advisable to adopt a habit which he knew the king did not look upon with disfavour. Besides the respect in which the Canonical Order was then universally held,⁶ special circumstances had made the Black Canons of Merton acceptable to Henry II. "The good Canons Regular of Merton Abbey," says Fr. Morris, speaking of the time when St. Thomas was Chancellor, "were taken into the king's favour now that a child of their house had become a royal favourite. Fitzstephen tells us that the king completed the Abbey Church and endowed it, and that he would sometimes spend the three last days of Holy Week with the community."⁷ Before leaving the king—I will quote a passage from an old writer, which tends to show in what respect Henry II. held the Canons Regular, and what Order he considered St. Thomas connected with, judging from his habit: "Cum Henricus secundus Rex de nece S. Th. Cant^{sis}. diffamatus in expiationem propriae famae et sancti martyris

¹ *Rolls, Gervase of Canterbury*, vol. ii., p. 383.

² *Church Historians of England*, vol. iv., part ii., p. 611.

³ *Hélyot*, op. cit., vol. ii., p. 137.

⁴ *Rolls, Walter of Coventry*, vol. i., p. 20.

⁵ *Rolls, Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, vol. i., p. 244; vol. ii., p. 106.

⁶ *Rolls, Giraldus Cambri.*, vol. vi., pp. 46, 47. ⁷ *Life, &c.*, p. 33.

honorem de fundando monasterio in honorem ipsius martyris cogitasset, ac etiam votum fecisset, parcere volens propriis sumptibus, exactis clericis [canonicis]¹ saecularibus, in eo canonicos regulares statuit [auctoritate summi Pontificis]² ratus sancto Martyri pergratum futurum si illius habitum honestasset."—Polydorus Virgilius, *Hist. Angl.* l. 13, sub an. 1178.³

It would be interesting to know whether St. Thomas, like Archbishop Hubert, went to Merton Abbey to be invested with the habit. It would seem the most natural thing to do, but on this point all the biographers whom I have consulted, are silent. In the *Officia Propria* of the Canons Regular, we are told that after he was created Archbishop, "cum timeret in alto periclitari, habitum et institutum assumens Canonico-regularium in dicto monasterio de Maretonia, &c." But I have not seen any evidence corroborative of this statement concerning Merton.

We must conclude. We have endeavoured, so far as the works at our disposal would allow us, to draw a true and distinct picture of the exterior dress habitually worn by St. Thomas after his elevation to the See of Canterbury. We have shown whence he took his new attire, and have suggested some motives which may have influenced his choice. Had the Thomas Saga, which is based on the only life written by a Canon Regular, and Garnier been within my reach, my researches might have been more fruitful. But what I have written will, I trust, be a help in their meditations to the devout clients of this glorious member of the patriotic Triad whom the Canonical Order loves to honour amongst its saints, Thomas of Canterbury, Laurence of Dublin, and Peter Fourier of Lorraine.

I cannot finish without expressing my best thanks to the Rev. Fr. Morris, S.J., who, amidst all the work which the cause of our martyrs imposes on him, has given me much assistance in the elucidation of my subject.

GILBERT HIGGINS, C.R.I.

¹ *Rolls, Matt. Paris. Chron. majora*, vol. ii., p. 300.

² *Rolls, ibid.*

³ Pennotto, *Hist. Tripartita*, p. 385.

THOUGHTS ON THE VIATICUM.

TH**ERE** is one phase of the sacramental life of our Divine Redeemer which probably does not engage its due share of the devotion of the faithful. Jesu sacramentado—to use the Portuguese phrase which a holy man, Father Augustus Law, S.J., desired to see naturalised among us—Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament is not content with being offered up as our victim, with being received by us in Holy Communion, or with abiding constantly amongst us in the tabernacle, ready to receive us when we find time to pay Him a visit. No, all this is not enough for our Emmanuel, our “God with us”; for, when we are no longer able to visit Him, He comes to visit us; He desires to be Himself in return carried to the bedside of the sick; and, when they are sick unto death, He becomes their viaticum.

It is strange that this last title is confined to the holy Communion of the Christian deathbed. Viaticum means provision for a journey, and our journey seems then to be almost over. The Blessed Sacrament is indeed the viaticum of the whole Christian life, food for all our journey across the wilderness of this world. “I will not send them away fasting lest they should faint on the way.” That compassionate word was spoken out in the desert before the miracle which was the last and almost the most striking type of the Eucharistic banquet and which led on to the promise of that food from heaven. The name, therefore, of Viaticum would be most appropriate for the Blessed Eucharist all through the journey, rough or smooth, long or short, which lies between the first Communion of happy childhood and the last Communion of a Christian deathbed, still happier, we trust. But the journey is not quite finished yet: a short stage, but a difficult one, remains, and we still, more than ever, need all the help we can get.

That Evangelist who has interpreted the tenderness of Jesus so fully as to be called the Apostle of the Sacred Heart, utters at the very beginning of his Gospel that terrible reproach, “He came unto his own, and His own received

Him not. In none of our relations towards our Divine Redeemer is this more sadly true than as regards the obligations arising out of His sacramental presence among us, especially outside the times when He is offered in sacrifice and received in Communion. Is there any point in our spiritual life that suggests keener self-reproach than our manner of visiting our Blessed Lord in the tabernacle? Some have tried to excite their fervour in such visits by imagining that they may thus entitle themselves, in a special and even] a literal sense, to a share in the welcome which our Lord has promised to those to whom He will be able to say: "I was sick and in prison, and ye did visit Me." Pious pictures represent the Prisoner of Love as barred and fettered in the tabernacle; and the pious muse has asked indignantly:

How do we treat the Prisoner of our shrine?

Ah! does He never from His altar-throne

Look round for us and find Himself alone?

Alone! though angels round His prison shine,

Yet does His heart for our poor love so pine

That 'mid their homage He feels sad and lone

And mourns the cold unkindness we have shown,

A poor return for all His love divine.¹

But we are thinking rather of what Jesus in his sacramental life does for us than of what we should do for Him; and what therefore is it that on His part corresponds with our visits to the Blessed Sacrament? The visits which He in turn pays to us when we are unable to visit His holy temple. Those who are bound down on the bed of sickness, especially when it is to be their deathbed, can say to our Lord with this meaning also: "I was sick and in prison, and Thou didst visit me." Thus does Jesus continue still to perform one of those corporal works of mercy to which so much of His public and no doubt much of His hidden life was devoted. Jesus visiting the sick.

There are indulgences for those who in Catholic countries accompany the Blessed Sacrament when borne publicly to the dying. Many of the pious faithful, if they adverted to it, would be glad to accompany our Divine Lord in spirit when

¹ Sister Mary Stanislaus MacCarthy.

the priest carries Him by stealth to the chamber of the sick, less openly than He was borne in the Blessed Virgin's arms when St. Joseph fled with them across the desert. That word of the Gospel is verified here: *transiens per medium illorum ibat*—"passing through the midst of them He went his way" (*Luke iv. 30*). At that time He escaped from the malice of His enemies, but now He hides, from the unbelief indeed of those who dare to "find His saying hard," but also from the adoration of His faithful servants, in order that He may the more freely, at every hour of the day and night, visit in their own homes those who are no longer able to come to Him. Those to whom He thus comes may address to Him literally those words of the centurion which have been blessed and honoured in being applied so many millions and millions of times to our Eucharistic Lord when He comes forth from the tabernacle to seek the hospitality of our hearts¹: "Lord, I am not worthy that Thou shouldst enter under my roof."

It would be well for us to meditate occasionally on this startling proof of the divine condescension. It might come home to some hearts as a peculiarly touching and pathetic devotion to take part with the invisible retinue of angels in what one might venture to think of as the sick calls of the Sacred Heart. At any rate it would be an excellent exercise of faith and piety to pray with special fervour that those anointed ministers of the Eucharistic mysteries whose privilege it is—so awful though so amiable a privilege—to bear the Viaticum to the dying, may habitually cherish the feelings which we have tried to express in the following lines:—

Lord, one of thy poor creatures is yearning for Thee now.
She cannot 'mid the faithful before thy altar bow
When at the *Non sum dignus* they strike their breasts, and say:
"Lord, Lord, I am not worthy, yet come to me, I pray."

Full oft she thus received Thee, but now she captive lies
Chained to the bed of sickness, and lovingly she cries:
"I cannot come, O Jesus, but Thou wilt come to me—
Ah! how thy angels marvel such boundless love to see!"

¹ "Et pour l'hospitalité d'un cœur celle des cieux." Octave Ducros.

Then I the Lord's anointed His tabernacle ope—
 No clouds of burning incense, no snowy alb or cope—
 The pyx within my bosom I reverently lay,
 And so, a new Christ-bearer, I take my lonely way.

Not lonely: He is with me who dried the widow's tear,
 Yet through Judea journeyed unrecognized as here.
 Not lonely: angels worship their hidden Lord who speeds,
 As Mary first sped with Him, to help His creature's needs.

No tinkling bell gives warning, no tapers light the road;
 By all but me unheeded He seeketh the abode
 Of this His lowly handmaid who doth her heart prepare
 To welcome Him who cometh to ask a lodging there.

Is this her last Communion, or shall the ebb-tide turn?
 God knows. But may her bosom, made pure and purer, burn
 With love and faith and fervour, that she with joy may greet
 Her Lord, or soon or later, upon His judgment-seat.

Good Shepherd, who hast set me to tend and feed thy fold,
 In spite of faith so feeble, in spite of love so cold:
 May I in turn receive Thee when my last day is reached,
 And be my priesthood's verdict: *he practised what he preached*

Again for her I pray Thee to whom I bear Thee now,
 And for each dying creature, the death-damp on his brow;
 Yes, all whom at this moment the deadly chills benumb:
 O Jesus, be their Jesus, their true Viaticum.

In these lines the pronouns can easily be made masculine if we have to substitute "servant" for "handmaid" in the fifth stanza. One of them alludes, too, obscurely to St. Christopher, to whom the pious legend assigns the privilege of having once carried the Redeemer across the torrent near which the giant kept guard. This saint may thus be considered the patron of that phase of the priestly life, of which we are now thinking.

The preceding verses regard the Viaticum of others, but at least two poets have expressed in verse their own feelings, in receiving the Viaticum. In a small edition of the *Opere Sacre dell' Abate Pietro Metastasio*, the last page gives the following as the prayer made by the author on the occasion

of the Holy Viaticum being borne to him during a grievous illness in February, 1780 :

Eterno Genitor,
Io t'offro il tuo figlio
Che in pegno del suo amor
Si vuole a me donar.

A lui rivolgi il ciglio :
Mira chi t'offro, e poi
Niega, Signor, se puoi,
Niega di perdonar.

This may be thus paraphrased less lyrically in English :

Eternal Father, reigning high above,
Thine own dear Son I offer up to Thee ;
For He hath deigned to give Himself to me
As a fond pledge and token of His love.

Father eternal, bend on him Thine eye !
He, God made man, has shed His blood for men.
See Whom I offer Thee, and then—and then
Forgiveness, if Thou canst, O Lord ! deny.

But if Metastasio made this his Viaticum prayer, he seems to have plagiarised from himself; for this same book, four pages earlier, gives the following lines as the conclusion of his very unpsalmlike paraphrase of the Miserere :—

Pur troppo è ver che reo
Di mille colpe io sono :
Ma meco serbo un dono
Di queste assai maggior.

La tua bontà mi feo
Degno di tanto, ed io
Sequendo il tuo desio
Te l' offro, O Genitor.

T'offro lo stesso Figlio
Che già d' amore in pegno
Ristretto in picciol segno
Si vuole a me donar.

A lui rivolgi il ciglio ;
Mira chi t' offro, e poi,
O gran Signor, se puoi,
Lascia di perdonar.

Though we have turned this into a different metre from the preceding translation, the close similarity between the two passages of the Italian poet cannot be concealed:—

Too true alas! the guilt and shame
Of thousand sins are on my soul,
Yet as my own I hold and claim
A gift that can outweigh the whole.

Thy gracious bounty, Lord, doth deign
This gift so precious to bestow ;
And now I offer it again,
O Father, since Thou wilt so.

Thy very Son I offer Thee,
Who, as a pledge of love divine,
Has willed to give Himself to me
Confined within a lowly sign.

Let but thy eyes upon Him fall!
See Whom I offer Thee, and then—
Then, if Thou canst, great Lord of all!
Refuse to pardon me again.

The other poet of the Viaticum is our own Callanan, the sweet singer of Gougaune Barra.

In the appendix to his translation of Father Lanzi's *Visits to the Blessed Sacrament*, Father C. P. Meehan¹ gave with several original poems by Richard Dalton Williams, a poem written by Jeremiah Joseph Callanan, after receiving the Viaticum at Lisbon, whither he had gone in the vain hope of eluding death.

“Thou dear and mystic Shadow before whose form I kneel,
I tremble as I think upon the glories Thou dost veil,
And ask myself can one who late the way of darkness trod
Meet face to face and heart to heart, his sin-avenging God?”

I quote the opening stanza from memory, and will not go in search of the rest. For both the Irish poet and the Italian have used terms that apply equally to every Communion as well as to the last. The same fault is to be found with the prayer given in some prayer books “to be said after receiving the Holy Viaticum.” A very useful suggestion

¹ He mentions in his preface that the poet's nephew, the Right Rev. Dean Neville of Cork, gave him the poem for publication.

made by some spiritual writers is to try sometimes to receive the Blessed Eucharist in our ordinary Communion as if it were indeed our last Communion. May we, each in God's good time, receive our Viaticum with as innocent and as happy a heart as we received our first Communion long ago!

MATTHEW RUSSELL, S.J.

THEOLOGICAL QUESTIONS.

QUASI-DOMICILE.

"In this part of the country it is customary for servant girls to hire for six months, or as they say, 'for the half year.' During the time of service, *outside their native parish*, many of them get married. Will you kindly say, in the next number of the RECORD, whether the Parish Priest of the place in which they are hired for six months, or 'the half year,' can validly assist at their marriage to a boy who resides in a different parish? "CANONICUS ARMACANUS."

"A girl hires for 'a half year,' and shortly after entering service becomes acquainted with a young man also living in the town, and hired for 'a half year.' Neither the boy nor girl are natives of the parish in which the two are now hired.

"Can these two be married *validly* by the Parish Priest of the place in which they are hired?

"The question is a very practical one. The boy and girl *certainly intend* to remain for the period which *they* call 'a half year.'

"It sometimes happens that this period is the 'major anni pars,' sometimes the 'minor anni pars.' There could be no question of the validity in the first case, but even in the second, when the period is a few days less than a half year, many think that the marriage would be valid, and they reason thus; 1st. They have the 'habitatio incepta,' which is required; and, secondly, they have an intention of remaining in the place for '*a half year*,' the period for which they engaged. This being so, it is impossible for them to get outside the limits of the parish before the 'major anni pars' has passed. They, therefore, have the intention of remaining for the greater part of the year. The fact of the period which they call 'a half year' being less than a half year by a few days when mathematically determined, would not, when they don't advert to the point, interfere with their

having a *real* intention of remaining for half a year. Would you, then, be good enough to give your opinion on this important case? 'Can a boy and girl who are engaged as servants *for a half year*, who have entered in their term of service, and really intend to remain in the place for the term for which they engaged, be *validly* married by the parish priest of the parish in which they are hired?'

"SACERDOS."

The question stated by our respected correspondents is most practical. We shall endeavour to set forth in reply the conclusions which authoritative decisions and the opinions of Canonists seem to warrant. No wonder this point should excite discussion. For, in addition to the reasons above assigned, it is remarkable that the authors of certain leading text books, writing within the last few years, still think that an intention of remaining for four or five months together with the inception of actual residence may suffice in order to acquire a quasi-domicile. This certainly appears strange in view of a well-known decision of the Holy Office given in 1867 to the Bishops of England and America and afterwards communicated to the Irish prelates in answer to a postulation from the Synod of Maynooth. In it an intention of remaining for the "major anni pars" is distinctly required. Possibly some of the writers just referred to were not aware of this document's existence.

In any case, seeing that an instruction of such precision has been given so recently for our guidance, *ante factum* marriage should not be solemnized with dependence on the *parochus loci famulatus*, unless its words are *fully* verified. *Post factum* we should not feel sure that the marriage is invalid when either party intended remaining for a "half year," even in the less exact sense mentioned by one of our correspondents. If a person had purposed staying for a half year literally taken, we think it highly probable he thereby acquired a quasi-domicile. The reason is not merely that so careful a writer as Lehmkühl holds the view above-mentioned, but that many Canonists seem to equiparate in this context the two phrases, "major anni pars" and "dimidia anni pars," often connecting them by a "seu." But we wish to remind our second correspondent, that the law looks to connection with the residence, and not with the parish.

SPONSORSHIP BY PROXY.

“A person who has consented to be sponsor in Baptism, does not arrive at the appointed time, I assume that he has not withdrawn his consent; meantime, can he, *without his knowledge*, be represented by proxy, and thereby become a valid sponsor? “QUÆRENS.”

No. A procurator, to act validly, must go through the ceremonies in the name and by the mandate of the sponsor. *Sine mandato*, he is in no proper sense a proxy at all.

SECRET SOCIETIES AND THE CONFSSIONAL.

“As the question of secret societies is a practical one, may I ask you to explain what exactly is meant by certain words which are found in the fourth of the excommunications which are reserved *simpliciter Romano Pontifici*, viz., ‘*earumve occultos coryphaeos ac duces non denunciantes, donec non denunciaverint.*’

“What I wish to know is: (1) Must a member—say of the Fenian or other such society—make known the secret leaders of such society before he may be absolved? If such is the case I fear it would lead to great difficulties in dealing with a member of such societies.

“(2) If a person refuses to take the oath, but in all other respects, or at least in some respects acts as a member, or gives favour or encouragement to sworn members, does he incur the excommunication? Such a case may easily happen.

“(3) Some persons are under an impression that it is only unlawful secret societies, *bound by an oath*, which are excommunicated. I suppose such is not the case.

I. Our correspondent will find some of the points he raises briefly explained in the IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD for February, 1886. We there discussed the extent to which the obligation of denouncing secret heads of condemned societies exists at present, adding that a confessor should weigh carefully the advantages and disadvantages likely to result before admonishing his penitent of this duty. Ignorance of the prohibition excuses from formal sin against the ecclesiastical law. Ignorance of the censure prevents excommunication from being incurred. Hence, on the general principles of monition, a confessor should abstain

from making known the full gist of the law to one who cannot be relied on for compliance therewith, unless a denunciation be necessary in order to prevent some great calamity, or where the public weal is at stake. But if excommunication has been already incurred, the censure ceases only when the precept has been complied with. Obviously, too, the duty of denouncing the heads or leaders of condemned societies is incumbent on anyone who knows them as much as on penitent members of these organizations.

II. The censure is incurred in this case if the law be known. The words "iisdem sectis favorem qualemcumque praestantes" of the Bulla Apostolicae Sedis are plainly most comprehensive. Moreover a much stronger reason is often present for admonishing "faventes" who happen to be ignorant of their obligation than "nondenunciantes" similarly situated. For, apart from a proximate danger of grave sin which may arise owing to this connection, if they be admitted to the sacraments without withdrawing their support from a condemned society, serious scandal not unfrequently follows as a natural result. In this respect "faventes" are only a degree less difficult to direct than actual members. But danger of scandal is, as is manifest, more generally present if those who openly belong to a forbidden society are permitted to receive the sacraments. It is chiefly on account of this evil consequence that in many places members of such organizations are always admonished before absolution, even if little hope be entertained of a favourable result. Where, however, proximate danger of sin and scandal can be considered absent, the principles already explained with reference to "non denunciantes" will apply.

III. The censure falls on societies directed against either Church or State, whether secret or public, whether oath-bound or otherwise combined.

A CASE UNDER THE FASTING OBLIGATION.

"Sempronius sacerdos, ob infirmitates et laboriosum ministerium, a lege abstinentiae et jejunii *non dispensatus sed exemptus*, nonnunquam in eodem prandio infra quadragesimam, ostreis primum vel

sardinis et postea carnibus vescitur. Qua de re objurgatur a Caio sacerdote, tanquam transgressor legis qua fidelibus omnibus prohibetur promiscuitas carnis et piscium.

“Cui respondet Sempronius, allegando sequentes rationes :

“1. Per decem et septem saecula, etiam tempore strictissimae quadragesimalis abstinentiae, nunquam Ecclesia sollicita fuit de alimentario regimine eorum qui erant a communibus legibus exempti.

“2. Prohibitio miscendi carnem et pisces fuit recenter instituta non per modum novi oneris, sed tanquam pristini rigoris vestigium et memoriale, quando summi Pontifices permittere coeperunt usum carnis iis qui valent ab ea abstinere, et ad id tenerentur, nisi interveniret *dispensatio* proprie dicta.

“3. Nequaquam autem ista prohibitio spectat ad eos qui a communibus legibus sunt *exempti*. Nam (a) sedis apostolicae decisiones non satis clare tam singularem innovationem statuunt; (b) ratio *aequalitatis* inter validos et invalidos refutatione seria non indiget; (c) satis absonum videretur Ecclesiam *quando et quia* jugum robustis humeris impositum alleviabat, creasse simul pro debilibus humeris onus usque ad illud tempus inauditum; (d) non magis nunc decet quam olim decuit, supremam auctoritatem communibus regulationibus subjicere stomachos, quorum plerique praesumendi sunt hujusmodi regulationum incapaces.

“Caius autem argumenta quaerit ad pertinaciam Sempronii frangendam.”

Quaeret Caius et ni fallor argumenta non inveniet. Si enim Sempronius a lege tum abstinentiae tum jejunii sit *exemptus*, quo jure prohibetur permixtio? Tempore quadragesimali *dispensatus* carnes et pisces sine dubio simul sumere nequit. Hoc, autem, accidit eo quod sub hac conditione secundum legem generalem ecclesiae conceditur dispensatio. At vero nimis durum esse videretur restrictionem illam urgere ita ut attingat Sempronium, qui alioquin est a lege abstinentiae et jejunii prorsus *exemptus*. Nonne fideles, qui a lege abstinentiae diebus Veneris, decurrente anno sunt *dispensati* simul piscibus et carnibus vesci possunt? Idem, ad minimum a pari, et Sempronio licere durante toto anno etiam tempore quadragesimali nobis videtur, saltem donec contrarium auctoritative statuatur. Notandum vero est quaestionem supponere virum egregium esse ab utraque lege *exemptum*.

THE CHURCH ABROAD.

IF it is true that the enemies of the Church have never been more treacherous in their attacks or more perfidious in the manner of conducting their unholy warfare than during the present century, it is likewise a subject of pride and consolation to all Catholics that the interests of their faith have been guarded by defenders so worthy of the great cause. The august edifice has been furnished by Providence round about with champions capable of protecting it against its most unsparing enemies. In this never-ceasing struggle carried on by the "city of God" against all the powers of the world, some are but common soldiers, who lend indeed a willing hand, or play, it may be, a manly part in their small and narrow sphere, but are held withal by many ties of family and worldly interests from doing much effective work beyond attending to the wants of their own souls. That, no doubt, is a great deal, and happy are they who can do so much well. But others are not satisfied to stop here. They are leaders in the van, worthy members of the Church militant, who think only of the victory to be gained, who are always on the watch, and whose leisure is ever devoted to study and calculate the best means of defence. It is always with unspeakable regret that the Church sees such leaders disappear from the scene of their labours, particularly when "having borne the burden of the day and the heat" they took a long and noble part in the struggles of their time. Such was the feeling that pervaded Catholic France a few years ago when the indefatigable Louis Veillot was called away. His loss was mourned as a calamity by all, except, indeed, the "Liberal Catholics" or "Catholic Whigs" of French national life against whom he had laboured so long and before whom he kept always floating the sacred banner of principle. Such is also the sentiment that is felt at present throughout Catholic Italy at the death of the theologian Margotti, who for more than forty years had taken such a conspicuous part, as a journalist and publicist, in every battle (and they were many) that had to be fought in defence of the Church and the Papacy in Italy.

The sorrow felt at his decease by Italian Catholics can well be judged from the touching circular addressed by Signor Mastracchi, editor of the *Voce della Verità*, and the Marchese Crispolti, editor of the *Osservatore Romano*, to their fellow-journalists and to the Roman people.

"The loss of this distinguished publicist, though deeply felt and deplored by all Italy, is particularly sorrowful and sensible for the

eternal city—for that Rome, the seat of the Papacy and the centre of Catholicity, which for about forty years he defended with such unyielding faith and with an energy that never failed. If Turin, which was the chief seat of his labours, is in tears at his death-bed or bowed down with grief as his bier is borne through her streets, Rome who counted him amongst her most valiant defenders cannot allow him to depart without paying a last tribute of affection to his soul.

“On us, humble members of the noble phalanx of Catholic journalists who venerated in Giacomo Margotti their model and master, has been conferred the honour of taking the initiative by fixing for the thirtieth day after his death a solemn funeral to which we invite not only our colleagues of the daily and periodical Catholic press, but also the number, which is very great in Rome, of admirers of the virtues and of the genius of our dear and illustrious friend.”

Giacomo Margotti was born at San Remo, in the province of Porto Maurizio, in 1823. He made his early studies in the Seminary of Ventimiglia and afterwards pursued a higher course in the University of Genoa. He was proposed by his bishop, Monsignor Giambattista Biale, to King Charles Albert of Sardinia, for the Accademia di Soperga, in which he was received and where he remained, admired and beloved by everyone, till the year 1849. It is easy to imagine with what anxious earnestness the attention of the world and especially of the Catholic world, was turned towards Turin during those years that intervened between 1848 and 1860. The tension of feeling in Italy itself was naturally as high as possible. It was at the commencement of that troubled period that Margotti entered upon his career as a journalist. With Mgr. Moreno, Bishop of Ivrea, and the Marchese Birago di Vische, he founded the journal or periodical *L'Armonia*, with the object of defending the Pope and the Church. For nearly fifteen years he worked at this uncompromising organ of Catholic interest, having as colleagues in the editorship Mgr. Alimonda, now Cardinal Archbishop of Turin, Mgr. Guglielmo Audisio, Marchese Fabio Morea, Marchese Gustavo di Cavour (a relative of the statesman), and the Abbate Rosmini.

The Government of Freemasons that ruled Sardinia, under Cavour as Premier, in 1859 suppressed *L'Armonia* as being dangerous to the welfare of the State. This act was characteristic of those politicians who clamour for unlimited liberty of the press when there is question of an attack upon Christian institutions, but who are always ready to suppress the voice of truth when it becomes inconvenient to themselves and their projects. Margotti, however, continued

giving expression to his views in *Il Piemonte* until 1863, when by the advice of Pius IX. he founded the *Unità Cattolica*, which he directed up to the time of his death.

These were indeed troubled times in Italy, which witnessed the campaigns of Goito and Custoza, of Magenta and Solferino, of Melazzo and Mentana, which saw Charles Albert retire downcast and almost broken-hearted from the struggle against Austria, to make way for his ambitious and unscrupulous son Victor Emmanuel. It was during that time that Pius IX., who loved Italy with all the fulness of his great heart, was obliged, in pain and sorrow, to condemn the unjust plans and the guilty methods of a large section of his countrymen, that Mazzini founded the "Giovine Italia," that Santa Rosa died without the Sacraments, that La Marmora led 15,000 Italians to the Crimea, and Garibaldi plundered the two Sicilies. It was during this period also that Gioberti wrote his *Primato Morale e Civile degli Italiani*, and Count Cesare Balbo *Le Speranze d'Italia*, that the advanced patriots started the *Risorgimento*, that the Congress of Paris endeavoured to subdue the persistent clamours of Sardinia, that Manzoni's unworthy son-in-law, Massimo d'Azeglio and his still more famous successor, Count Cavour, repeated day after day in the Parliament of Turin their deadly onslaughts on the Church and its rulers.

These were stormy times for a journalist in Italy. But Margotti rose to every emergency. Every turn of affairs for good or evil brought from him impulses of eloquence and impassioned appeals to the best instincts and the noblest traditions of Italian Catholics. His words had enormous weight with all classes of his countrymen. The great Catholic soul manifested itself more clearly year after year, and at the same time laid bare before the world the pure and noble heart of a true Italian patriot. He was the unsparing enemy of evil principles and unworthy acts, but he loved his fellow-men without distinction, and with a large-hearted Christian sincerity. His disinterested motives and high-minded conception of the duties of his profession gained for him the esteem and respect even of his bitterest opponents. It is no wonder to find even in the anti-clerical *Italia*, the day after his death the following tribute to his memory:—

"He was our enemy every day and every hour for nearly forty years, yet to the man of lofty intelligence and to the valiant writer, who was the glory of the Italian press, and had no equal in his profession, it is a duty of journalistic brotherhood which we perform to-day to send to his deathbed a word of sincere and gentle sympathy, (un pensiero di compianto sincero e gentile.)"

It is almost unnecessary to say that Margotti was held in particular affection and esteem by the two Pontiffs, Pius IX. and Leo XIII. The former, a few months before he died, sent him a pen of gold, through Mgr. Mermillod, Bishop of Lausanne and Geneva, and Leo XIII., after having written to him two laudatory briefs in 1880 and 1881, sent him many other tokens of his esteem, and a last apostolic blessing before his death.

Besides his contributions to the above-mentioned journals and to various Italian reviews and periodicals, Margotti published several other works of more lasting value. In 1851 he wrote *Il Processo di Nepomuceno Nuytz, professore di diritto Canonico nell' Università di Torino*; in 1855 *Alcune considerazioni sulla separazione della Chiesa dallo Stato in Piemonte*; in 1857 *Le Vittorie della Chiesa nei primi anni del Pontificato di Pio IX.*; in 1863 *Le Consolazioni del Santo Padre Pio IX. nelle feste del terzo centenario del Concilio di Trento*; in 1867 *Memorie per la Storia dei nostri tempi dal Congresso di Parigi nel 1856 ai primi giorni del 1863*: and in 1877 *Pio IX. e il suo Episcopato nelle diocesi di Spoleto e d'Imola*.

It was the delight of Giacomo Margotti to train young journalists, particularly laymen, in the delicate art of controversy, that while urging with all the powers of earnestness and conviction the unassailable rights to which the Italian Catholics were entitled, they might always observe the courteous forms and gentle Christian manners which give a charm even to polemics, and raise Catholic journalism above the common place level of the ordinary daily press. Though an ecclesiastic himself, he well knew the value of lay assistance in the cause of Catholic truth, and often reminded his readers of the words of Joseph de Maistre (*Du Pape; Discours Préliminaire*): "We live in one of the greatest of religious epochs in which every man, who is able, is in duty bound to bring a stone to the august edifice, the plans of which are visibly designed. Every science owes something, and in these days especially should pay a tithe at least to Him from whom all science comes: for, 'He is the God of Sciences, and it is he who prepares all our thoughts.'—'Deus scientiarum dominus est, et ipsi praelegantur cogitationes.'—*Reg.* 1, ch. ii.) The priest who defends religion does his duty, no doubt, and deserves all admiration, but in the eyes of a number of inconsiderate and prejudiced people he appears to be engaged in his own cause, and though his good faith is beyond question, every observer may perceive that the unbeliever is less suspicious of the man of the world, and allows himself to be approached by him with less repugnance."

The demonstration of sympathy at the funeral of the great journalist was, making allowance for official absentees, worthy of old times in Catholic Turin.

The necessity of thus keeping on the battle of Catholicism in the Press has been emphasized by the Holy Father in a recent letter to the Catholic Congress, assembled at Lucca, in which he says (*Vid. Osservatore Romano*, May 13th):—

“The condition of things and of the present time urgently demand that all true sons of the Church should take care to spread as much as possible among every order of citizens the helps that are necessary to Christian life, to advance the instruction of Christian youth, to propagate sound doctrine through means of the Press, to support and aid by every effort the societies of workingmen that are organized on a Christian basis.”

Among various contributions to Catholic literature of another kind, we can only mention the following works which have recently appeared:—

Récits d'un voyage en Palestine et en Syrie à travers l'Égypte et le Sinai, par M. l'Abbé Raboisson. (Paris: Librairie de Saint Paul, Rue Cassette). Biblical critics praise this work, as containing much new and valuable archæological information about Egypt and Sinai. Another work, *Jerusalem, Souvenir d'un voyage en terre Sainte*, par J. T. de Belloc (Paris: Victor Palmé), is an interesting account of a pilgrimage of one thousand Frenchmen who sailed from Marseilles to the Holy Land in 1884.

Continuazione della Storia della Chiesa Cattolica dall' Abbate Rohrbacher. Scritta da Monsignor di Pietro Balan. (Torino: Giacinto Marietti.) This volume continues Rohrbacher's history to the end of the pontificate of Pope Pius IX. Being to a large extent contemporary history, it is naturally very interesting. The Belgian firm, Desclée and Lefebvre, are publishing in a regular series the works of Cardinal Capeceletro. The third volume of the series just published, is the *Storia di San Pier Damiano e del Suo Tempo*. The name of the illustrious Cardinal who for more than twenty years has commanded the respect of his countrymen without distinction, and the other biographies of saints so well known in English speaking countries, are the best recommendation that can be given of his *Storia di San Pier Damiano*.

In the metaphysical work, *Constitution de l'être*, M. E. Domet de Vorges has collected his articles in the *Annales Catholiques* in which he treats of the method to be followed in metaphysics, the origin of

metaphysical notions and distinctions, the scholastic theory of *power and act*, of existence and essence, of matter and form, of substance and accidents (Paris, 20 Rue de la Chaise).

The history of the Vatican Council by Mgr. Cecconi, Archbishop of Florence has been translated into French by M. l'Abbé Bonhomme, Curé de Saint Jean-Baptiste de Grenelle in Paris, with the assistance of M. Duvillard, curate in the same parish. It is published by Lecoffre, Rue Bonaparte, Paris.

La Ligue et les Papes is the title of a book that has appeared in France by Comte Henri de l'Epinois. This work is full of valuable documents taken from the archives of France and the Vatican which scatter to the wind many notions of the Protestants regarding the relations of the legates Morosini and Gaetani with the Dukes of Guise and Mayenne, King Henry III., Henry of Navarre, and Philip II of Spain.

J. F. HOGAN.

DOCUMENTS.

LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS LEO XIII. TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF COLOGNE.

SUMMARY.

Constant and active interest of his Holiness in the affairs of the Church in Prussia. His frequent letters to the Emperor, the Prince Imperial and the Archbishop of Cologne on this subject. Much improvement effected in the position of Catholics in Prussia—bishops restored to their Sees, parish priests to their parishes, seminaries re-established, religious Orders recalled. These salutary changes largely owing to the interference of his Holiness. His vigilance and supervision will be continued to secure further improvements.

It is still necessary to furnish to the Government the names of priests nominated to parishes. This matter is at present the subject of negotiations between the Holy See and the Ministry of Prussia.

His Holiness promises to continue to defend the Catholics of Prussia with vigilance and charity.

VENERABILI FRATRI PHILIPPO ARCHIEPISCOPO COLONIENSI.

LEO PP. XIII.

EX litteris tuis xiii. Cal. April. datis facile agnovimus, id quod iam erat Nobis persuasum, maximae tibi curae esse rei catholicae in

patria tua statum. Idque tibi laudi libentes damus: propterea quod iste animus, commune bonum tam studiose appetens, congruit cum tuae dignitatis gradu, nec est alienus temporibus, quibus nunc apud vos Ecclesia defungitur. Nostrarum vero partium arbitramur esse cum tibi ad ea respondere, quae vis ipse cognoscere, tum palam ostendere quid Sedes Apostolica sentiat de ea rogatione nuperrima, quae ad res catholicas pertinet in regno Borussico ordinandas: de qua ipsa aliquot S. R. E. Cardinales sententiam rogavimus. Nos quidem vel ab initio Pontificatus multum et serio cogitare de vobis instituimus, atque, ut ratio Nostri ferebat officii, consilium cepimus omnia conari, si qua ratione liceret pacatam tranquillitatem cum libertate legitima catholico nomini restituere. Cuiusmodi voluntatem Nostram litteris consignavimus, nec solum iis quas vel ad augustum Imperatorem, vel ad serenissimum Dynastam dedimus, sed iis etiam quas ad tuum in Archiepiscopatu Coloniensi decessorem proximum misimus.

Quamobrem, ut erat proclive factu, a diuturna sollicitudine respirare, laetamque in spem ingredi coepimus, ubi placere intelleximus, contrarias libertati catholicorum leges, emendandi causa, retractari; quo facto iter ad componenda dissidia muniebatur. Quae vero consecuta sunt, magis ad spes augendas, quam ad infirmandas valuerunt. Partim enim data est, partim datur temperandis iis legibus opera: et quamquam non est impetratum de omnibus rebus, quas merito catholici adipisci cupiunt, plura tamen constituta sunt, quibus efficitur eorum conditio melior. Et sane illud vides quanti sit, Romani Pontificis auctoritatem posse iam liberè exserere atque explicare sese in multiplici et vario rerum genere, quae Sedi Apostolicae vel cum potestate publica, vel cum Episcopis populoque catholico intercedant. Deinde, quod tam sollicito studio expetebamus, plurimum Dioeceseon consultum est regimini, longinqua orbitate sublata; paroeciis ad magnum numerum sui curiones praepositi: impedimenta, quae potestatem episcopalem in disciplina regenda exercendisque judiciis prohibuerant, amota. Restituta unum iam annum videmus Clericorum Seminaria quatuor: proximeque alterum instituendi in Limburgensibus, alterum Osnabrugensibus facultas erit: quibus dioecesibus Seminarium suum nec sit, ex iis dioecesibus alumnos alio intra regni fines in Seminariis instituendos mitti licebit. Semel autem religiosorum sodalium revocatis vel aliquibus ordinibus, manabit latius vitae actio christiana, plurimique ad perfectionem absolutionemque virtutis niti sine offensione poterunt. Qua re et catholicorum satis factum est honestissimae voluntati, constat enim.

ordines religiosos in magno eorum fuisse desiderio, et ipsi civitati ad caritatis officia, ad fingendos mores populares, ad omne humanitatis lumen provehendum utilia adjumenta comparata. Hac igitur ratione facile intelligis, Venerabilis Frater, immitibus illis legibus aut abrogari, aut certe tantum derogari, ut tolerari minus moleste posse videantur. Nihilominus erit Apostolicae Sedis summam providentiam semper adhibere, omniaque circumspicere, ut ejusmodi rerum conditioni quae ab optimo abest, plura et ampliora quaerantur. Ex altera parte conscientia Nos Apostolici muneris atque ipsa rerum gerendarum prudentia admonent, ut bonum praesens idque certum anteponamus dubiae spei atque incertae expectationi maioris. Nam quemcumque rerum germanarum cursum tempora invexerint, illa certe magna sunt et Ecclesiae profutura, praeesse Clero populoque sacra cum potestate Antistites: multitudinem catholicam posse praecepta fidei et morum a pastoribus suis accipere: sacrorum alumnos ad spem sacerdotii in Seminariis sancte erudiri sodales ordinum quorundam religiosorum ad omne decus evangelicarum virtutum animose contendere in luce atque oculis civitatum. Illud restat, renunciare parochorum designatorum nomina. Sed ad hanc rem, quam sit Clerus vester sanctitatis officii retinens, testantur ea quae edidit integritatis ac fortitudinis in maximis rerum difficultatibus documenta. De Clericis autem adolescentioribus, jure sperandum, fore ut, ad munera sacerdotalia vobis auctoribus et ducibus instituti, illa ipsa virtutum exempla aliquando renouent. Ceterum, quod ad hoc caput pertinent, iam septem ante annis recepimus, ipsoque anno proximo superiore idem confirmavimus, Nos quidem nolle in hac parte, si e re esse visum esset, Borussiae postulata abnuere: proptereaque cum refigi reformarive leges, de quibus agitur, coeptae sunt, aequum fuit obligatam fidem exsolvere. Neque est praetereundum, hanc esse unam omnium conditionem, quam Nos denique non recusavimus. Postremo totum hoc negotium, quod est de prodendis Curionum destinatorum nominibus, cum inter Nos et administratos regni Borussici agatur, quemadmodum ex litteris eminet ultro citroque missis, dabimus operam ut amice conveniat qua ratione rem interpretari, et quam sequi normam oporteat, si quando aliud Episcopus velit, aliud Praefectus, Provinciae contendat. Atque illae ipsae litterae summam sententiam continent Episcopi Fuldensis in eo quod attinet ad potestatem caussasque exceptionis opponendae. Igitur, spectatis maxime rogationibus eiusdem Episcopi Fuldensis, quas quidem Senatus sancivit, cum lata lex, de qua loquimur, multorum incommodorum remedium idque non committitium, nec sane contemnendum

afferat, eademque aditum ad pacem tam diu tantoque opere expetitam patefaciat, idcirco opus esse iudicamus ut catholici viri eiusmodi rogationi, de qua ad alterum coetum legumlatorum referetur, assentiri nē recusent. Tute autem, Venerabilis Frater, pariterque Collegae tui, quantum hortatione et auctoritate potestis, tantum conamini et efficite, ut quotquot istic catholici numerantur, omnino Apostolicae Sedi confidant, in eiusque consiliis securi acquiescant; ipsa enim catholici nominis causam eadem semper vigilantia eodemque tenore caritatis, uti debet, in Borussia tuebitur. Hac demum animus Noster cogitatione laetatur, futurum ut, deletis dissidiorum caussis, et Clerus et populus catholicus universus animum gerant cum Episcopis suis perpetuo consentientem, imprimisque, vereantur et colant, uti faciunt, Pontificem Romanum, qui in Ecclesia et principium unitatis est, et vinculum incolumitatis.

Interea, caelestium munerum auspicem et benevolentiae Nostrae testem tibi, Venerabilis Frater, et Clero populoque tuo Apostolicam Benedictionem peramanter in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die VII. Aprilis, Anno MDCCCLXXXVII. Pontificatus Nostri Decimo.

LEO PP. XIII.

A CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY FOR THE UNITED STATES.

SUMMARY.

The University to be subject to the authority of the Bishops of the United States. An Episcopal Committee to map out the curriculum, make disciplinary regulations, appoint professors, and otherwise represent the bishops as the supreme governing body of the University. The University city to be selected by the bishops.

DILECTE FILI NOSTER SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM.

Quod in novissimo conventu anno MDCCCLXXXIV Baltimorae habito communi Venerabilium Fratrum Americae Borealis Episcoporum voto propositum fuerat, de studiorum Universitate in istius Reipublicae gremio erigenda, id modo Tibi caeterisque Ecclesiarum istarum Pastoribus in animo esse reipsa auspicari, communibus litteris die 25 Octobris elapso anno ad Nos datis intelleximus. Maxime vero delectati sumus praeclaro fidei vestrae testimonio, ac sincero pietatis obsequio in hanc Apostolicam Sedem, cujus patrocinio ad tutelam Academiam a primo eius exordio commendastis. Perpetua enim Pastorum ecclesiae, praesertim vero Pontificum Maximorum, laus semper extitit, veri nominis scientiam strenue provehere, studio-sequē curare ita disciplinas, imprimis theologicas ac philosophicas, ad

fidei normam in scholis tradi, ut coniunctis revelationis ac rationis viribus invictum inde fidei propugnaculum constitueretur. Itaque Decessores Nostri de erudiendo Christiano populo vehementer solliciti, elapsis temporibus, nullis unquam curis laboribusque pepererunt ut in praecipuis Europae urbibus celeberrima scientiarum domicilia, Academiae scilicet studiorum excitarentur, quae tum media aetate, tum insequentibus saeculis florentissimam hominum doctissimorum segetem Christianae civilisque reipublicae emolumento praebuere. In hunc finem Nos ipsi, simul ac Ecclesiae gubernacula regenda suscepimus, sedulam instaurandis studiis dedimus operam et praesertim ad praeclaram Thomae Aquinatis doctrinam restituendam atque in pristinum decus vindicandum animum viresque adiecimus, id spectantes ut in graviorum disciplinarum cultu, ratione semper habita eorum omnium quae scite sapienterque recentiori aevo docti homines industria sua protulerunt, ad nobilissimam veterum sapientiam informaretur ratio philosophandi eaque disciplinam Angelici Doctoris docili studio sequeretur. Certum autem Nobis exploratumque erat ea scientiarum renovatione perfecta, literarum etiam caeterorumque humanorum disciplinorum studia cum verae pietatis cultu coniuncta plurima in civilem societatem conferre comoda posse.

Quae quidem nostrorum temporum in periculis quibus apud Europae gentes juvenus est obnoxia manifeste cernuntur, ac vos ipsi inspectis Americae Borealis conditionibus quanti facienda et quam gravis momenti sint aperte cognoscitis. Quippe immoderata cogitandi scribendique libertas ex pravis circa divinas humanasque res sentiendi modis late diffusis, uti in Europa, ita apud vos suborta effrenatarum opinionum radix est atque origo; religione vero ut plurimum a scholis exulare coacta, nefarii homines fallacis sapientiae astu Christianam fidem in adolescentium animis extinguere, impietatisque facem succendere audaciter moliuntur. Quapropter necesse est juvenilem aetatem sanioris doctrinae pabulo diligentius enutrire, praesertim vero eos adolescentes qui in Ecclesiae spem succrescunt, armis omnibus communire quibus propugnandae catholicae veritatis causae pares evadant.

Nos itaque consilium vestrum, quo communis salutis studio per moti inclytaeque istius reipublicae bono consulentes studiorum universitatem constituere aggredimini, libentissime excipimus ultroque probamus. Quo vero nobilissimum hoc institutum feliciter perficiatur maioraque in dies incrementa suscipiat, ita sub auctoritate tutelaque omnium regionis istius Praesulum perpetuo esse oportet, ut adminis-

tratio universa ab ipsis per Episcopos ad id muneris delectos geratur, quorum sit studiorum rationem definire, leges ferre disciplinae tuendae, doctores caeterosque academiae administros eligere, aliaque ordinare quae ad optimam ejus academicae gubernationem pertineant. Quae vero de his omnibus constituta fuerint par est ut examini huius Apostolicae Sedis exhibeantur quo eius auctoritate probentur. De Urbe vero in qua Universitas studiorum sit erigenda, cupimus ut cum caeteris foederatorum Statuum Episcopis consilia communicentur, rogataque singulorum sententia de hac re decernatur.

Perge igitur, Dilecte Fili Noster, cum caeteris VV. FF. istius Americanae regionis episcopis concordi animo coepta perficere, nec quisquam vestrum ulla difficultate aut labore deterreatur, firma spe fretus sese uberrimos fructus ex curis ac sollicitudinibus esse relaturum, iis fundamentis et praesidiis positis quibus digni sacrorum ministri ad curandam fidelium salutem et catholicam pietatem propagandam, optimique in reipublica cives habeantur. Nos vero enixe Deum rogamus ut mittat e sedibus tuis assistricem sapientiam quae mentes et corda omnium vestrum dirigat, et divinorum munerum auspicem praecipuaeque benevolentiae Nostrae testem Tibi, Dilecte Fili Noster, cunctisque Venerabilibus Fratribus Foederatorum Statuum Archiepiscopis et Episcopis, caeterisque omnibus qui vobis hac in re opem sua liberalitate contulerint Apostolicam Benedictionem peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die 10 Aprilis, 1887. Pontificatus Nostri Decimo.

LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS POPE LEO XIII. ON THE STUDY OF
THE NATURAL SCIENCES.

VENERABILI FRATRI NOSTRO ALOISIO EPISCOPO PRAENESTINO
CARDINALI OREGLIA, S.R.E. CAMERARIO.

LEO PP. XIII.

Venerabilis Frater Noster salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem. Quod Decessores Nostri accurare non destiterunt, ut non modo sacram, sed et humanarum scientiarum studia proveherent, earumque cultores honestarent et favore amplecterentur; id Nos semper Nostri muneris esse duximus, ac pro re nata praestare contendimus, quantum rerum, in quibus versamur, sinebat asperitas. Peculiares autem curas Nostras ad se convertit nobilis ea scientia quae naturae arcana rimatur et explicat, cuius dignitatem et incrementa, quae nostra illi attulit aetas, palam testati sumus, quum egimus de rationali

philosophia ad praecepta veterum revocanda. Imo et eius impensius colendae a catholicis viris necessitatem urgere haud negleximus, hac praesertim aetate, qua religionis hostes ex physicorum inventis et placitis tela sibi parata putant, quae Catholicae Ecclesiae dogmata oppugnent et evertant. Quare et multa commendatione dignam censuimus et ab exordiis Pontificatus Nostri praecipua benignitate complexi sumus Pontificiam Academiam Novorum Lyceorum, cuius observantia et fides, tempore etiam difficili, se Nobis probavit. Eius proinde curae commisimus ut saecularibus solemnibus memoria celebraretur insignis constitutionis, qua Gregorius XIII. Decessor Noster perturbatam temporum rationem restituit. Ex eo autem tempore huic coetui amplificando ornandoque animum adiecimus, rationesque cogitavimus, per quas sodalium vires et industria latius sese explicare possent, simulque ex eorum laboribus fructus in publicum manarent uberiores. Duplex itaque inivimus consilium, quod et eorum votis congruere novimus. Decrevimus nimirum ordinariorum sodalium numerum augeri, ut pro triginta, qui hactenus fuerant, quadraginta sint, sive in urbe morentur sive dissitos incolant ab urbe locos. Novorum autem sociorum delectum iuxta leges collegii fieri volumus. Cum porro a Nobis sperandum optandumque sit, fore ut, aucto sodalium numero, lucubrationes quoque vulgandae typis increscant, statuimus ut praeter eam quae fieri solet editionem actorum (in qua iamdudum praeclare enituit liberalitas illustris e romana nobilitate viri) nova inchoetur voluminum series, quae fusiores commentarios, historicas narrationes, documenta, quibus res physica illustratur contineat: cui rei expediendae Nostram libenter opem conferemus.

Equidem non dubitamus quin, agnito hoc testimonio Voluntatis Nostrae, iidem sodales alacrius in dies adlaborantes in explorandis naturae latebris, per alia atque alia ingenii sui monumenta et gloriam Summi naturae Auctoris et coetus sui decus amplificare studeant. Quod uti prospere cedat, auspiciem bonorum, Apostolicam Benedictionem sociis universis et singulis praedictae Academiae, Tibique in primis, Venerabilis Frater Noster, qui eius patronatu pro tua dignitate fungeris, eiusque decus maxime exoptas, peramanter in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die XXI Januarii anno MDCCLXXXVII.

Pontificatus Nostri Nono.

LEO PP. XIII.

INDULGENCES OF THE SCAPULARS.

SUMMARY.

One enrolled in the Confraternity of Mount Carmel and Third Order of St. Francis, must wear the Scapulars of both, and in the ordinary form.

The Blessing with the Plenary Indulgence (which is wont to be given nine times a year) and the two Papal Benedictions, when imparted publicly, must be given by a priest appointed over the Tertiaries for this purpose.

The Blessing with the Plenary Indulgence can be given privately after Sacramental Absolution by the confessor of each Tertiary.

The Indulgence is received when all the conditions are complied with, and not before then.

DUBIA QUOAD SCAPULARIA ET INDULGENTIAS LUCRANDAS A
FIDELIBUS PII SODALITII S. MARIAE CARMINIS.

Sacerdos Carolus Scavezzoni, coadjutor l. v. d. Avenza in Dioecesi Massensi s. Pedem pronus exosculans, Sanctitati Vestrae demisse supplicat, ut cum ipsius, tum et poenitentium suorum quieti consulendi gratia, quaestionibus quas subjicit, responsum dare benigne dignetur.

I. Qui piaie Confraternitati B. V. de Monte Carmelo nomen dedit, atque eodem tempore inter sodales Tertii Ordinis Saecularis S. Francisci cooptatus sit, tenebiturne e collo pendentia gestare, ut sacras Indulgentias lucretur, ambo Scapularia, an vero unum sufficiet, quum utrumque ejusdem coloris sit et panni?

II. Si ambo gestare necesse est, poteritne id fieri neglectis utriusque dimensionibus, si quidem invicem conjuncta sint?

III. Benedictiones cum plenaria Indulgentia (Absolutiones generales nuncupatae), quae novies infra annum dari solent (ut ex. gr. die festo S. Joseph); itemque duae Benedictiones Papales, possuntne a quolibet *Confessario* impertiri; an vero ab eo tantum, cui haec facultas facta sit?

IV. Si benedictiones hujusmodi ab eo tantum impertiri possint cui potestas data sit, a quonam dictus *Confessarius* hujusmodi facultatem accipere debet?

V. Poenitens in sacramentali Confessione suscipitne illico Indulgentiam pronuntiato verbo "impertior" an vero haec suspensa manet, donec ipse ad Sacram Synaxim accesserit?

Sacra Congregatio Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praeposita die 10 Junii, 1886, ad supra relata dubia respondit :

Ad I. *Affirmative ad primam partem ; negative ad secundam.*

Ad II. *Servetur consuetudo vicens tum penes Confratres B. V. Mariae a Monte Carmelo, tum penes Tertiarios S. Francisci Assisiensis.*

Ad III. *Benedictiones nomine Summi Pontificis, et Benedictiones cum Indulgentia Plenaria publice impertiendae dari debent ab ecclesiastico Viro qui Tertiarius in id coadunatis praeest. (Caeremoniale Tertii Ordinis S. Francisci a S. Rituum Congregatione approbatum die 18 Junii, 1883 : art. 8 et 9.) Benedictiones vero cum Indulgentia Plenaria privatim et immediate post sacramentalem Absolutionem dari possunt ab uniuscujusque Tertiarii Confessario.*

Ad IV. *Provisum in responsione ad III.*

Ad V. *Negative ad primam partem ; affirmative ad secundam, si communicatio est postremum opus ex injunctis, quod expletur.*

Datum Romae ex Secretaria ejusdem S. Congregationis die, mense et anno uti supra.

I. B. Card. FRANZELIN, Praefectus.

FRANCISCUS DELLA VOLPE, Secretarius.

GENERAL ABSOLUTION AND BLESSINGS WITH PLENARY INDULGENCE.

SUMMARY.

Formula to be used for General Absolutions, and for a Blessing which has a Plenary Indulgence attached to it.

ORANEN.

DE FORMULA ADHIBENDA PRO ABSOLUTIONIBUS GENERALIBUS ET PRO BENEDICTIONIBUS CUM INDULGENTIA PLENARIA.

Oranensis Capituli Praepositus et Dioecesis Vicarius Generalis S. huic Congregationi Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praepositae exponebat : piam Sororum Societatem a SSma. Trinitate nuncupatam et uti *Congregationem votorum simplicium* decreto S. Congregationis Episcoporum et Regularium dato die 22 Septembris 1869 approbatam plurimas habere in Oranensi Dioecesi domos : eandem Societatem, quae sub regimine est Moderatricis Generalis, Valentiae in Gallia residentis, die 15 Octobris 1847 aggregatam fuisse Ordini Fratrum Discalceatorum SSmae. Trinitatis : hujus aggregationis vi Sororibus

dandam esse novies in anno aut Absolutionem Generalem, aut benedictionem cum Indulgentia plenaria : sed disceptationem haberi de formula, quae in iisdem impertiendis adhiberi debeat post editas Apostolicas Litteras in forma Brevis die 7 Julii 1882, quae incipiunt :
Quo universi.

Hinc a S. Congregatione quaerebat :

Quae formula adhibenda sit in casu ?

In Congregatione plenaria habita in Aedibus vaticanis die 18 Decembris 1885, Emi. et Rmi. Patres Cardinales responderunt :

Adhibendam esse formulam secundam, cujus videlicet initium :
“Intret oratio mea in conspectu tuo, etc.”

SSmus. D. N. Leo PP. XIII. in audientia habita die sequenti a subscripto Secretario, Emorum Patrum responsionem approbavit.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria ejusdem S. Congregationis die 19 Decembris 1885.

I. B. CARD. FRANZELIN, *Praefectus.*

FRANCISCUS DELLA VOLPE, *Secretarius.*

THE INDULGENCE OF THE PRIVILEGED ALTAR.

SUMMARY.

The Colour of the Vestments to be worn *diebus non impeditis* is black, or, *ex causa rationabili*, violet. The priest who has failed through want of compliance with this or other necessary condition to gain the Indulgence of the Privileged Altar cannot compensate for this failure by applying an ordinary Plenary Indulgence to the benefit of the persons concerned.

QUOD PARAMENTA INDUENDA A SACERDOTE PRO LUCRANDA INDULGENTIA PLENARIA ALTARIS PRIVILEGIATI.

Cum in theologia morali auctore Scavini, edit. 11 lib. 3 pag. 229 § 283, apud Ernestum Oliva Mediolani bibliop. edita 1869, sic scriptum reperitur: Ex responsione S. Congreg. Indulgentiarum 11 Aprilis 1840, sacerdos debet celebrare in paramentis nigris, diebus non impeditis, ut lucretur indulgentiam Altaris privilegiati. Hinc quaeritur: an niger color sensu exclusivo debeat intelligi, ita ut indulgentiam Altaris privilegiati non consequatur qui v.g. ad ministrandam Eucharistiam per modum Sacramenti cum paramentis violaceis Missam de Requie celebret?—2. Utrum qui hac vel quacumque alia ratione Indulgentiam Altaris privilegiati non lucretur, possit satisfacere applicando aliam Indulgentiam plenariam defunctis, pro quibus ad Altare privilegiatum celebrare debuerat?—S. Congr. Indulgentiarum

die 2 Maii 1852 respondit: Ad 1. Ut fruatur Altare privilegiatum sacerdos diebus non impeditis, celebrare debet Missam defunctorum, et uti paramentis nigris vel ex rationabili causa violaceis.—Ad 2. Negative.”

Joseph Canonicus Ribezzo humillime postulat ut S. Congregatio Indulgentiarum declarare dignetur: Utrum hæc responsio quoad secundam partem sit apocrypha? Et quatenus negative, utrum intelligenda sit etiam de sacerdotibus, qui ad Altare privilegiatum celebrare debuerant, et jam celebraverint, sed non cum paramentis nigris a Rubrica non impeditis?—Et quatenus affirmative, quomodo ipsa conciliari possit cum decreto ejusdem S. Congregationis Indulgentiarum 22 Februarii 1847, in quo ad quæsitum: “Qui (sacerdos) diebus permissis non celebravit in paramentis nigri coloris in Altari privilegiato ad acquirendam Indulgentiam Plenariam, ad quid tenetur?”—Responsum fuit: “Debet lucrari Indulgentiam Plenariam pro iis defunctis quibus Missæ fructum applicuit, toties quoties diebus non impeditis usus non est indumentis nigri coloris.”

Sacra Congregatio Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis præposita die 24 Julii 1885 proposito dubio respondit: Responsio est authentica. In decreto vero diei 22 Februarii 1847 tantummodo sacerdotibus, pro quibus postulabatur de ratione qua compensare debebant Indulgentiam Altaris Privilegiati ad quam applicandam obligarentur et quam bona fide errantes, non erant lucrati, censuit S. Congregatio ut compensatio fieret per applicationem alterius indulgentiæ plenariæ toties quoties illam altaris privilegiati non fuerint lucrati.

Datum Romæ ex Secretaria ejusdem S. Congregationis eadem die 24 Julii 1885.

J. B. CARDINAL FRANZELIN, *Præf.*
JOSEPHUS M. CAN. COSELLI, *substit.*

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

THE LIFE OF JEAN BAPTISTE MUARD. London;
Burns & Oates.

THIS is the ninth volume of the “Library of Religious Biography,” edited by Mr. Healy Thompson. It “is not a translation, neither is it the reproduction of any previous work, the writer having enjoyed the supreme advantage of consulting a large collection of

authentic documents, hitherto unpublished." Among them are "numerous depositions taken on oath with a view to the introduction of the cause of the servant of God at Rome."

The Life of P. Muard is interesting both for what it tells of the Father's own character and labours, and for the glimpses which it gives of the French priests' life during the first half of this century. It is the story of a noble struggle:—A poor boy reared by irreligious parents attracts the attention of a good curé, is educated by him and trained to habits of piety, sent to the seminary rather against his parents' wishes, receives Holy Orders, works a parish for more than five years, converts his parents and thousands of others who had almost lost the faith during the struggle of the revolution, founds a House of Missions, and afterwards a religious congregation. Such was P. Muard. He was a pattern priest, pious, hard-working, fearless, trustful, at the service of the poor, and withal frank and kindly in his relations with his brothers in the ministry.

We have marked some passages for quotation—on P. Muard's knowledge of mystical theology, his conversation, popularity, hospitality to the poor, attention to the sick, bearing towards the wealthy, meetings of the clergy, sermons, care of the church, of pupils, entertaining his fellow-priests. But where should we stop?

He had his failings, too; amongst which there was at first a want of punctuality (failing of many), which, however, his biographer refers to insatiable zeal and spirit of self-sacrifice rather than to indolence or selfishness. He could be hasty and even angry at times. These things are remarked here, not in any spirit of disrespect, but rather with a certain thankfulness that even very holy men struggle and sometimes fall. Their life-stories have thus a power to cheer us in our own struggles, to console us in our frequent and more serious failings.

The volume before us might, we think, be relieved of a certain amount of heaviness and appearance of monotony. It is impossible to lay one's finger on any particular page that might be set down as a typical illustration of this defect, which is known rather by one's impression of the book as a whole. Perhaps if the biographer allowed himself to refer occasionally to incidents bearing on the Church history of the time, it would serve, as in so many other pleasant books, to stimulate a reader's interest. But where God's work is substantially well done, fault-finding like this may appear unreasonable.

SERMONS AT MASS. By the Rev. Father O'Keeffe, C.C. Borrisoleigh, Archdiocese of Cashel, Author of "Moral Discourses." Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, O'Connell-street.

The best way to notice a volume of sermons would be to give extracts as samples of excellence, and let the reader judge for himself. Obviously such a course would be desirable in the interests of the reader. It would, moreover, be a decided advantage to Father O'Keeffe, and better calculated to make friends for his book than the few general remarks which we must be content to offer. Our limits, however, do not permit us to give lengthened extracts, and curtailment would do an injustice to the author.

The modest volume before us comprises in all twenty sermons. The subjects are well chosen. Sermons on the "Presence of God," "Lies and Calumny," "Detraction and Backbiting," "Rash Judgment," "Temperance," "The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass," "Indulgences," &c., are eminently suited to the needs—and Father O'Keeffe's treatment of them to the capacity—of our Catholic peasantry. The greater bulk of our Catholic congregations—at least in country parishes—consists of the poor and uneducated. In stooping down to the lowly intelligence of such people Father O'Keeffe has been mindful of the example of him whose "preaching was not in the persuasive words of human wisdom," and of even a Greater than St. Paul, whose discourses, by reason of their simplicity, contrasted so favourably with the inflated language of the Scribes and Pharisees.

We are told by Fr. O'Keeffe that his Sermons are the work of the spare moments of seven years of a busy missionary life—such leisure hours as fall to the lot of a hard-working Irish curate, with his daily round of sick calls, and his daily—or at least weekly—visitation of schools. The sermons themselves bear evidence that they were not hastily written. They are short, and burdened with no superfluous words—very desirable qualities in any composition in this busy age, when people are in such a hurry to get to their conclusions. The simplicity and comprehensiveness which it was the author's purpose to combine are evidenced in every page. The outcome of much personal zeal and personal piety, Fr. O'Keeffe's Sermons are characterised by an eloquence and an ardour that leave their impression long after the book has been laid aside.

No words of ours are needed to recommend them. They will be accorded a cordial reception as well because of their intrinsic excellence, as because they are the work of the well-known and zealous author of "Moral Discourses."

J. P. M'D.

SAINT TERESA'S PATER NOSTER. A Treatise on Prayer. By Joseph Frassinetti, formerly Prior of S. Sabina, Genoa. Translated from the Italian by William Canon Hutch, D.D., President of St. Colman's College, Fermoy. London: Burns & Oates.

WE must welcome this little book as a valuable addition to the religious literature of the present day. Referred to by Fr. Ballerini in his edition of Gury's Moral Theology as an "excellent little work"—*eximium opusculum*—it has received marked commendation from that rather severe critic. A compendium of mystical and ascetical theology, it must be of utility to religious communities and to pious readers; to hard worked members of the ministry it will prove an attractive source of useful information. We possess, as the translator remarks, many excellent works dealing with ascetical and mystical theology, but the difficulty of understanding some, and the prolixity of others repel instead of attracting readers. This little work by its simplicity, brevity, and practical bearing will supply a long-felt want.

The work is an exposition of the teachings of St. Teresa, taken from her "Way of Perfection" and "The Mansions." Her instructions and reflections on prayer contained in these two works are collected, arranged and developed in the volume before us.

The "Treatise on Prayer" is divided into two parts—the first, treating of prayer in general, the second dealing with the seven petitions of the Lord's Prayer. In the first part we are taught the necessity of prayer, and the necessity of commencing the exercise of prayer. In the third, fourth and fifth chapters we have most useful information on the subject of mental prayer. In these chapters Fr. Frassinetti explains briefly and simply the kind of prayer to which St. Teresa would have us apply ourselves. Mental prayer is either *methodical* or *simple*, and simple meditation is necessary for all. This latter is "devoid of all art and method, unencumbered by divisions into certain parts and points, and unrestricted by any limits of time." It "consists in nothing else than in directing the attention of our minds to the truths of faith and to our own obligations." In the remaining chapters the teaching of St. Teresa on mental prayer is explained and defended. The first part contains many excellent instructions, many pious reflections on such subjects—as the presence of God, distractions, prudence in prayer, self-love.

The second part is an exposition of the petitions of the Lord's Prayer. As this prayer is a compendium of the Gospels, we may

expect to find useful and valuable information on every phase of spiritual life. The several petitions are treated in an orderly and simple manner. The reader of the reflections on any one petition cannot fail to acquire an exalted idea of this grand prayer.

The arrangement of the matter by the translator is most satisfactory. Short marginal synopses give at a glance the subject-matter of the paragraphs. He has deserved our gratitude for putting us in possession, in English dress, of this excellent little volume. His work has been performed with care, he has brought his experience to bear on his labour of love. The present work may well take its place beside the other works of the reverend translator. We wish it a ready and extensive circulation.

GIORDANO BRUNO E I SUOI TEMPI. Per il Padre Luigi Previti, S.J. Prato: Giachetti e Figlio. Un vol.

MODERN Italian infidels are not slow to avail themselves of the power which they now monopolize in the southern peninsula, to perpetuate the memory of those whom they are proud to call the pioneers of their independence. The political gods of recent times are of course above all to be immortalized. Even Mazzini, the cruel heartless Mazzini, the "apostle of the dagger," whose praises English statesmen have so often sounded, comes in for his share of the hero-worship. It is not alone in the "superb" city of Genoa, which was unfortunate enough to be his birth-place, that the fine arts have been profaned for his glory, but the poor Catholics of Calabria and of Romagna are taxed for the erection of marble statues and the painting of life-like pictures of the politician whom perhaps they detest most in the whole history of their country. As full of hatred of Cavour and of the "Re Galantuomo" as he was jealous of Garibaldi, who was yet worthy to be his colleague, it is hard to imagine any country falling so low as to hold Giuseppe Mazzini up to public admiration as one of the greatest of her citizens. But if a lower depth of degradation is still to be reached it is to be found in the worship of the apostate Dominican, Giordano Bruno. He, too, has his statue. It was erected at Naples in the ferment of one of the revolutions, and at a time when crowds of the poor inhabitants of that city were starving and dying of hunger on the streets. But that is not enough. His apotheosis must be celebrated in Rome itself, and out of the public treasury, out of the pockets of the oppressed Catholics of Italy, a statue is now to be erected on the very spot where his impiety brought upon him the supreme punishment of the

times in which he lived. But what is perhaps still worse, the Government has undertaken to issue splendid editions of his blasphemous works, and to publish cheaper editions which will be distributed for the perversion of the poor. The work, therefore, of the learned Jesuit, which we announce above, is signally opportune, and is besides an excellent biography of a most unworthy subject. The volume is divided into three books. The first treats of the life and travels and adventures of Bruno, and gives a vivid description of his character, which was such as to entitle him to a place in Adelung's "Histoire de la Folie Humaine." The second book contains an exposition of his doctrine, in as far as it can be gathered from his obscure, allegorical writings, and the acts of the process or trial to which he was subjected in Venice and Rome before his condemnation. The third contains various documents which clear up several points in the story of his life.

Giordano Bruno was a native of Nola in Campagna, and after having joined the Dominicans at Naples, went to Geneva where he apostatized. Falling out with Calvin and Beza he passed to Lyons, Paris, Toulouse, and subsequently to London, where he remained for a few years. He then went to Germany, and for a considerable time supported Lutheranism in Wittenberg, and thence made his way back to Italy where he fell into the hands of the Inquisition, and was burned in Rome in 1600. His most celebrated work bears the significant title "Spaccio della Bestia Trionfante," "The Expulsion of the Triumphant Beast" which was translated into English by the rationalist Toland. In this work in which the beast represents what he calls superstition or religion, he turns the mysteries of Christian faith into derision, puts Holy Scripture on the same footing with the heathen mythology, and treats the miracles of the Gospel as so many magical delusions. The most repulsive passage in the work is that in which he speaks of Our Lord in the grossest and most blasphemous language, and accuses him of teaching men "that black is white, that good is evil, and that human reason is altogether blind" "*facendoli credere che il bianco è nero, che l'intelletto umano, dove gli par meglio vedere, è una cecità, e ciò che secondo la ragione pare eccellente buono e ottimo, è vile, scelerato e estremamente malo; che la natura è una puttana bagassa; che la legge naturale è una ribalderia; che la natura e divinità non possono concorrere in uno medesimo buon fine e che la guistizia de l'una non è subordinata a la guistizia de l'altra ma son cose contrarie come le tenebre e la luce.*" His second work "Cabala del cavallo Pegaseo" is a satire against Christian piety and

a eulogium of ignorance and of what he calls "asinità" which we need not translate. In the dedicatory epistle of this work there is a "sonetto in lode de l'asino" which commences as follows:—

Oh sant' asinità, sant' ignoranza
 Santa stoltizia e pia divozione
 Qual sola puoi far l'anime si buone
 Ch' uman ingegno e studio non l'avanza

His last years were devoted to the propagation of pantheism. There was only one divinity which slept in the stone, felt in the animal and reasoned in man; as for religion which taught the worship of a personal God it was only a fable.

"Fabula que vitæ rationem evertit ea usum."

The book of Father Previti is not only interesting as a biography, but most instructive as an historical insight into the times of which it treats.

J. F. H.

THE OLD RELIGION IN ENGLAND. By the Rev. Patrick Lynch. Salford: J. Roberts & Sons, Chapel-street.

THE author tells us that his "little tract is the first of a series of papers on the Religion of the First English Christians. The present agitation for the disestablishment, and, perhaps, also the disendowment, of the Church of England, has driven the defenders of that system of belief into very difficult straits, indeed. They are compelled to assert, that the present Church, as by law established, is identical with the ancient British and the ancient Saxon Churches in this land." Fr. Lynch's aim is to prove from authentic historical documents that this assertion is groundless, and that consequently it must be confessed that the establishment is human in its origin, and not a branch of the one true Church of God.

Fr. Lynch goes over a good deal of the ground which used to be familiar to Irish controversialists some time ago, the religion of the monks of Hy, the paschal question, and the tonsure. He makes use for the most part of Adamnan's Life of Columba; and indeed proves to the hilt that the religion of the missionaries who won England to Christ, was the same as that of Rome at the present day. It is difficult to see how this can be called in question by any honest, sensible man. Defenders of the Established Church have, however, another position not so easy to be turned, that the Establishment is substantially the same now as it ever was, the only difference being, that in the sixteenth century it shook off the errors and abuses of a darker time.

We hope Fr. Lynch will find room in his papers and lectures for a discussion of this point. His ability and learning are fully proved by the tract before us, which in the meantime will be found of great value to English priests who may be called upon to state their views on the question of fact.

GEMS OF CATHOLIC THOUGHT. By Anna T. Sadlier. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Company.

"THE remark is not unfrequently made that Catholics have no literature of their own. In offering to the public these sayings of men and women, more or less widely known in the world of letters, the compiler merely aims at throwing out a suggestion, a suggestion of the real wealth of Catholics in the domain of fact, fancy, and fiction, of their actual rank in the sphere of thought as in that of imagination. Her embarrassment has been, not to find sufficient material, but to choose from a superabundance." We have counted near four hundred names of authors from whose works the selection has been made, which is surprising considering that "saints and writers on purely theological and religious topics do not come within the scope" of the compiler. There is an index of authors, and also one of subjects. The little book is got up with taste; we wish it success.

THE CLOTHES OF RELIGION. A Reply to Popular Positivism, in two Essays and a Postscript. By Wilfrid Ward. London: Burns and Oates.

THE two essays which Mr. Wilfrid Ward now publishes in a neat volume appeared originally in the *National Review*. Their main purpose is to refute Positivism in a way at once popular and scientific. Before taking up his ground to demolish Mr. Harrison's cult of Humanity, he half does his work by giving us that able writer's merciless exposure of Agnosticism, as propounded by Herbert Spencer. Awe for the Unknowable a religion! For sake of consistency, then, disrobe the Unknowable of such well-known mantles as "Energy," "Infinity," "Eternity," and see if the negative spectre that remains can command rational worship or guide human conduct. "Better bury religion at once than let its ghost walk uneasy in our dreams." But if Mr. Harrison will disallow Agnosticism the Clothes of Natural Theism without the reality of belief in one personal God, it is intolerable that he himself should steal the peculiar dress of Christianity and surround his phantom with the spirit of brotherly love, self-sacrifice, and devotion to an ideal, when the faith and hope that alone

can rationally support these feelings have gone down for ever. "By the Clothes of Religion," writes Mr. Ward, "I mean those ideas and corresponding emotions with which we invested the objects of religious faith, and which were their natural and due adornment, and the phrases that have been associated with religious belief Mr. Spencer dresses up the Unknowable with Infinity, Eternity, and Energy; Mr. Harrison dresses up humanity with Brotherly Love and the worship of an ideal. But the clothes won't fit." It costs Mr. Ward very little effort to show that the worship of "humanity controlling and controlled by nature according to law" is not sufficient, as a religion worthy of the name should be, to guide life, support in affliction, give hope in death. Where, he asks, in such a scheme, does high moral greatness find a motive force whereby it may realise itself in action "and what of the consolation it gives in affliction and hope in death?" "When a mother, wrung with anguish for her loss, asks for consolation, does it seem greater irony to say to her 'think on the unknowable,' than to say, 'think on humanity, or human progress?'" If Herbert Spencer, with all his ability, is the creature of a *monomania*, so too is Frederick Harrison. Mr. Ward's illustration in this hypothesis is most apposite. But the way both adversaries shift their equivocal positions as well as the scant courtesy they show to the dearest convictions of the noblest minds the world ever possessed must, we fear, force a suspicion that in religious matters steady uprightness of mental character is as likely to be wanting as the due physical adjustment of brain cells. Mr. Ward's volume is very pleasant reading, notwithstanding the weighty subjects with which he deals.

P. O'D.

SERMONS OF THE REV. JOSEPH FARRELL, late C.C. Monasterevan.

With an Appendix containing some of his Speeches on Quasi-Religious Subjects. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

THE author of these Sermons holds a deservedly high place among English Essayists, and there is no indication that his reputation is likely to suffer by time. That alone is a guarantee that there must be something real—something having the elements of permanency in his Essays.

It is now more than nine years since the *Irish Monthly* began a series of papers under the somewhat odd title of "Lectures of a Certain Professor." The Lectures were eagerly read and re-read, and people asked who the "Certain Professor" was, or what manner of man was he, who discoursed in so easy and familiar, yet in so dignified and philosophical a style, about divers commonplace things—even about the commonplace itself.

It was plain that he had a well-formed and highly-cultured mind, and that he had what was next in importance, the power of graceful utterance. The subject-matter and the manner of treatment appeared to point to the author as one comparatively free from the cares and anxieties of life, with superabundant material comforts, leisure-time enough, and a mind accustomed to revel in philosophic rest. "My materials," he says, "are collected in all sorts of out-of-the-way places—from the tags and fringes that hang from the most tangible subjects; from the odds and ends of knowledge; from the clippings and pairings that accumulate in mental studies, from which solid work has gone out; from the rainbow coloured theories spun from the mists that hang about the limits of *the known*, in that dim debatable land where reason glides into feeling, and certainties begin to melt into impressions."

Accordingly the hard-working curate, with his days and nights of incessant care and anxious watching, spending his life ministering to the poor and the sorrow-stricken, is not the manner of man one would at first sight, suppose the "Certain Professor" to be. Yet such he was.

When Father Farrell brought his splendid talents to bear on the commission which he received to preach the Gospel, and in which they were unsparingly spent, it is no wonder that he produced solid and abiding work. He did not live to publish his sermons, nor is it certain that he intended to publish them, though we are told that with one or two exceptions, they are written with much care. They were, moreover, nearly all written in the early years of his priesthood. But friendly hands have done what he left undone, and the public have reason to be thankful for introducing them again to the author of the "Lectures of a Certain Professor."

It will be found, we think, that there is much in common between the "Lectures" and the "Sermons;" it will be seen that the "Certain Professor" thinks and feels and speaks with the same deep thinking sensitive feeling, and graceful picturesque speech, though, of course, the subject-matter of the Sermons banishes all those lighter fancies that sparkle throughout the "Lectures," whilst it gives scope for the richer chords of sympathy that are struck by the author with unerring instinct.

The sermons are clear and simple, though there are no formal divisions in them. It is difficult to select one as a specimen. We shall, however, take the first sermon. It is on the Blessed Virgin. The introduction is a development of the ideas of Mother and Son—

Jesus and Mary—which are inseparably entwined : whosoever wishes to know the Son must know the Mother. The body of the sermon shows—1st, that the Mother's life on earth was a life of obscurity, poverty, mortification and sufferings—like the Son's ; 2nd, that the Church honours the Glorified Mother, and has recourse to her intercession, because she is worthy of honour, and both able and willing to help us.

The conclusion is an inference implicitly drawn, that like the Mother and Son our way to the Crown is by the Cross, and since Mary is our Mother we ought practically regard her as such.

Speaking of a mother's love, Father Farrell says :

“ It is unselfish and everlasting, patient and ineffaceable ; it never tires, never gives up ; time cannot weaken it ; ingratitude itself cannot kill it. Even in this cold world the mother will not forget the son whom she has borne. . . . He may have placed the early wrinkle on her brow, and sown the silver streak upon her hair ; he may have planted thorns in her pillow, and made her heart ache with very anguish for his follies and his crimes, still she remembers only that she is his mother. When all her schemes have failed, when his sins—as sins always do—have found him out and dragged him down, when the hand of sorrow has bowed him to the dust, his mother's hand is there to soothe, his mother's heart is there to sympathise, his mother's love is there to pour balm into the wounds that sin and sorrow have inflicted on his soul. And Mary is your Mother. You have it on the words of the dying Saviour—‘ Behold thy Mother.’ ”

In the Appendix there are three speeches. The first is on the Education Question, in which Father Farrell holds it to be a principle which no statesman can reasonably refuse to accept, viz. : The convictions of Catholics, as Catholics, ought to be the basis of legislation in matters of Catholic Education. He ably exposes the fallacy that Catholics are treated with equality by eliminating religion from the schools. The second speech is on Religious Education, where he develops the idea that as religion is necessary both for the individual and society, so is a Religious Education. The third speech is one delivered in 1870, at Maryborough, in favour of the Pope. It is a stirring appeal, in which he utilises the entwined sentiment of Faith and Fatherland.

Since we feel confident that these Sermons will be largely read, and that a new edition will soon be called for, we would suggest that an index of the subject-matter be prepared, which would thus make the book easy of reference, and accordingly more useful.

As we close this volume we cannot but feel regret that the unsparing hand of death cut short a life so replete with usefulness and so bright an ornament to his Church and his country, whilst we admire the fidelity which has rescued his MS. remains from oblivion, and has thus served to perpetuate his memory.—J. C.

LITTLE COMPLIMENTS OF THE SEASON and other tiny rhymes. for tiny readers, simple verses, original, selected or translated, for Namedays, Birthdays, Christmas, New Year, and other festive and social occasions. By Eleanor C. Donnelly. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1887.

THIS volume of poetry and illustrations is intended for young children. It is a marvel of variety and appropriateness. The most fertile imagination will find difficulty in fancying an occasion for which a suitable poetic effusion is not provided. The sentiments are pure and natural, the language simple, the versification pretty and careful. Miss Donnelly's little book is sure to be a first favourite.—P. O'D.

MONTH OF THE DEAD. THOUGHTS OF ST. ALPHONSUS LIGUORI. SIMPLE READINGS ON SOME OF THE PARABLES, &c.

Month of the Dead. Besides solid instruction on the doctrine of Indulgences, this little book contains numerous historical examples, which are calculated to excite compassion for the souls in Purgatory. The prayers to be found at the end render it very useful as a book of devotion.

Thoughts of St. Alphonsus is a collection of the most striking passages in the writings of the latest Doctor of the Church. The selection is very judicious, and includes a pious thought for every day in the year.

Simple Readings on the Parables supplies a want long felt by the faithful. It gives a clear explanation of those moving stories, which Our Lord made use of to convey His most sublime doctrines to His followers.

St. Germaine Cousin. The translator of this little work has conferred a favour on English readers by supplying them with an interesting story of the life and trials of one of the least known of God's saints.

Consolation to those in Suffering. The considerations and Divine promises collected into this little book are calculated to afford true comfort to those who are being purified in the fire of tribulation.



BX 801 .I68 1887 SMC
The Irish ecclesiastical
record 47085658

v.8

Does Not Circulate

