

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE



3 1761 07096556 1

ASIL'S SEME
TRANSFERRED

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE
LIBRARY

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

THE IRISH
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD

A Monthly Journal,

UNDER EPISCOPAL SANCTION

THIRD SERIES.

VOLUME VIII.—1887.

“ Ut Christiani ita et Romani sitis.”

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

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

DUBLIN:
BROWNE & NOLAN, NASSAU-STREET.
1887.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Nihil Obstat.

GIRALDUS MOLLOY, S.T.D.,

CENSOR DEP.

Imprimatur.

✠ GULIELMUS,

Archiep. Dublin., Hiberniae Primas.



FEB 20 1954

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Act of Perfect Contrition and Perfect Charity, The	865, 991
Alphabet, The	147, 350
Altars and Chancels, Dimensions and Proportions of	492
Among the Graves—V.	681
Aquinas, St. Thomas, The Politics of	690
Arran of the Saints	118
Augustinian Literature, Recent	1069
Barry, Robert, Bishop of Cork and Cloyne, 1647-1662	702
Bigotry	481
Bossuet and Claude	1016
Canadian Sketches	979
<i>Catholic Dictionary</i> , The Brown Scapular and the	794, 1004
Chancel, Dimensions and Proportions of Altars and	492
Charity, Perfect, The Act of Perfect Contrition and	865, 991
Church Abroad, The 77, 162, 255, 373, 456, 550, 634, 1035, 1173	
Civil Law in Ireland, Clerical Ministry and	324
Clare West, Proselytism in: A Retrospect	411
Claude, Bossuet and	1016
Clerical Ministry and Civil Law in Ireland	324
Comerford, O.S.A., Dr. Patrick, Bishop of Waterford and Lis- more, 1629-1652, Memoir of	1082
Communion, Frequent	57
Contrition, Perfect, and Perfect Charity, The Act of	865, 991
CORRESPONDENCE:—	
Deaf and Dumb, On the Oral System of teaching the	167, 261, 642, 749 833, 951
George, Mr. Henry, The Economic Doctrine of	1044, 1133
Intermediate System, The Examination Papers under the, and Public Opinion	268
Missa Pro Populo in Ireland	744
Nationalization of the Land	947
Plurality of Ancient Benefices	744
Rosminian Philosophy, The	85
Council of Trent, Sketch of the History of the	193
Deaf and Dumb, The Oral System of Teaching the (See also Correspondence)	1093
De Burgo, Dr. Hugh	577, 731, 823
Diocesan Synod, Phases of the	399

	PAGE
DOCUMENTS :—	
Absolution, General, and Blessings, with Plenary Indulgence	563
Abstinence Union, Catholic Total, Brief of His Holiness Leo XIII. on, addressed to the Right Rev. Dr. Ireland, Bishop of St. Paul, Minnesota	476
Administration, Letters of, Official Notice regarding Pro- bate of Wills and	858
Benedict XIV., The Decree of, published for Holland in 1741, is extended to all the Dioceses of the United States in which the Decree <i>Tametsi</i> has been published	278
Church, Indulgences retained in a New	661
Confraternities, Scapular, Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences on various points relating to the Blessing of Scapulars and Privileges of	1045
Daily Offerings, Indulgenced Form of	186
English Martyrs, Beatification of the Fifty-four (See also "Rites")	182
Erhard, (St.) Bishop of Ardagh, and Secondary Patron of the Diocese of Ratisbon, Interesting Correspondence between the Most Rev. Dr. Woodlock, Bishop of Ardagh, and the Most Rev. the Bishop of Ratisbon, regarding	88
Exposition, Altar of, on Holy Thursday, Decree of the Congregation of Rites regarding	1049
Feast Days of Obligation, The Number of, in the United States reduced to six	276
Indulgences, Decrees of the S. Congregation of	185, 1142
Italy, Prohibition to take part in the Elections in	662
"Knights of Labour," Important Statement regarding the Association of the, prepared by Cardinal Gibbons and presented by his Eminence to the Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda	461
"Knights of Labour," Letter from Cardinal Manning to an eminent prelate expressing his adhesion to the views put forward by Cardinal Gibbons regarding the Association of the	475
Leo XIII., Letter of His Holiness to the Archbishop of of Cologne	555
Leo XIII., Letter of His Holiness to Cardinal Gibbons on the Catholic University for the United States	558
Leo XIII., Letter of His Holiness on the Study of the Natural Sciences	560
Manning, Cardinal, Letter from, to an eminent prelate expressing his adhesion to the views put forward by Cardinal Gibbons regarding the Association of the "Knights of Labour"	475
Mass pro populo, Decree of the S. Congregation of the Council regarding the Pastoral obligation of offering	753

Contents.

v
PAGE

DOCUMENTS—*continued.*

Mass, S. Congregation of the Council regarding the obligation of a Parish Priest to offer, for his separate parishes .	1051
Matrimonial Dispensations, Decree of the Sacred Penitentiary regarding the mode of executing certain . . .	756
Mixed Marriages, Letter of S. Congregation of the Holy Office to the Cardinal Archbishop of Strigonia on the subject of	749
Nuptial Benediction, Decree of the S. Congregation of Rites regarding the	660
Passion of Our Lord, The Offices of the, take precedence of the Offices, even Primary, of Feasts of equal rite in occurrence and concurrence	281
Poenitentiae, Decisions of the S. Penitentiary regarding the Interrogations to be made in certain cases in foro Poenitentiae	92
Privileged Altar, The Indulgence of the	564
Probate of Wills and Letters of Administration, Official Notice regarding	853
Quasi-Domicile purposes, Request from the Plenary Council of Baltimore that a mere residence for a month would suffice for—Request deferred	280
Rites, Decree of the Sacred Congregation of, 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	380
Rosary, Decree of the S. Congregation of Indulgences regarding the	754
Rosary Documents all issued since 1883	924
Scapulars, Decree of the S. Congregation of Indulgences on various points relating to the Blessing of, and the Indulgences and Privileges of Scapular Confraternities	1045
Scapular of Mount Carmel, Condition for Enrolment in the Scapulars, Indulgences of the	658 562
Sciences. Natural, Letter of His Holiness Leo XIII. on the Study of the	560
Stipend for Requiem High Mass, Reply regarding the, addressed to the late Bishop of Providence, U.S.A., by the Cardinal Prefect of the Congregation de Propaganda Fide, dated July 10th, 1885	659
Trappists, Decree of the S. Congregation of Bishops and Regulars declaring that the Institute of the, is approved by the Holy See as a part of the Cistercian Order . . .	755
University, Catholic, for the United States, Letter of His Holiness Leo XIII. to Cardinal Gibbons, on the	55

DOCUMENTS—continued.

United States, The Number of Feast Days of Obligation in the, reduced to six	276
Vagi, Decision of the S. Congregation of the Council in an instructive Matrimonial Case regarding	851
Vestments, Decree regarding the Materials to be used in	758
Wills, Probate of, and Letters of Administration, Official Notice regarding	853
Feast of the Holy Name, The Origin of the	905
“Forma Substantialis” of Scholasticism, The	917
French Schools and Republican Rulers	769
Gallic Muses, The German and	42
German and Gallic Muses, The	42
Graves, Among the—V.	681
Great Britain, The Leakage of the Church in	343
Holy Name, The Origin of the Feast of the	905
Haynes' Observations on the state of Ireland in 1600	1112
Indian Mutiny, Some Catholic Reminiscences of	513, 603
Inniskeel	781
Ireland, Clerical Ministry and Civil Law in	324
Ireland, The Holy Wells of—Westmeath	818
Irish Bishops of Lindisfarne, The	289
Irish Bishops, Important Resolutions of the, on Coercion, the Land Bill, and the Education Question	477, 657
Irish Language, Is it worth preserving?	595
Irish Missionary Types	875
Iúrad—Its History, Signification and Tense	739
“Leakage” of the Church in Great Britain, The	343
Lindisfarne, The Irish Bishops of	289
LITURGICAL QUESTIONS :—	
<i>A Cunctis</i> , The Prayer, in the Mass	1031
Advent 1886, The Last Wednesday in	76
Antiphon of the Blessed Virgin, The, should it be always said twice in the Office?	1033
Calendar and <i>Ordo Officii Divini</i> for May and June 1887, The	71
Chalice, Carrying the, to the Altar	1034, 1131
Commemorations on the Feast of the Patron	1031
Communion Cloth, Substitute for the usual	370
Confession as a condition for gaining an indulgence, when must it be made?	368
Confession, Weekly, for Current Indulgences	157
Corporal, Extending the, at beginning of Mass	1034
Dolour Scapulars	369
Feast of the Most Holy Redeemer, Preface to be said on the	1132
Indulgence, Confession as a condition for gaining an, when must it be made?	368
Indulgences, Weekly Confession for current	157

LITURGICAL QUESTIONS—*continued.*

Lunette, Consecrating the Host on the Glass	1132
Marriage Ceremony, The	161
Mass to be said, Case of difficulty in determining the	1030
<i>Missa pro pace</i> on the Second Day of the Quarant' Ore	369
Office, should the Antiphon of the Blessed Virgin be always said twice in the?	1033
<i>Ordo, Officii Divini</i> for May and June, 1887, The Calendar and Patron, Commemoration on the Feast of the	71 1031
Quarant' Ore, <i>Missa pro pace</i> on the Second Day of	369
Scapulars, Dolour	369
Suffragia, The, in the Votive Offices	372
Votive Offices, The, Suffragia in the	372
"Materia Prima" of Scholasticism, The	618
Missionary Types, Irish	875
Mivart's (Dr.) Defence of Theism 1, 97, 303, 421, 961	808
Mozarabic Rite, The	205
New Zealand, Some Reasons why Catholics lose the Faith in	385, 886
Nomina Patriciana	

NOTICES OF BOOKS :—

Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne	668
Annunziata ; or, the Gipsy Child	666
Battle of the Faith in Ireland, The	187
Canonical Procedure in Disciplinary and Criminal Cases of Clerics	1144
Castle of Coetquen The, or, Patira	96
Catholic Truth Society's Publications	767
<i>Catholic World</i>	670
Church of Old England, The	670
Children's Mass, The	767
Civilization of the Eastern Iranians in Ancient Times	93
Clothes of Religion, The	572
Coiner's Grave, The	671
Companion to the Catechism, A	287
Compendium Theologiæ Moralis (Lehmkuhl)	863
" " " (De Varceno)	1052
Consolation to those in suffering	576
Conversations on the Blessed Sacrament	765
Cornelii Taciti Annalium Liber I.	960
Edward the Sixth	639
For the Old Land	667
Gems of Catholic Thought	572
Giordano Bruno e i suoi Tempi	569
Glimpses of a Hidden Life	286
Glories of Divine Grace, The	669
Golden Sands	95
Great Means of Salvation, The	671

	PAGE
NOTICES OF BOOKS— <i>continued.</i>	
Handbook of the History of Philosophy	761
History of St. Cuthbert, The	857
Hymn to the Eternal	667
Indifferentism ; or, is one Religion as good as another ?	953
Introduction to English Rhetoric	366
Irish Songs and Poems	672
Lalla Rookh	767
Leaves from St. Augustine	665
Legends and Records of the Church and Empire	958
Life of Antonio Resmini Serbati, Founder of the Institute of Charity, The	190
Life of Brother Paul O'Connor, The	286
„ Frederick Lucas, M.P.,	282
„ Jean Baptiste Muard	565
„ Leo the Thirteenth	768
„ St. Cuthbert	858
„ St. Cuthbert (Ven. Bede)	1053
Little Compliment of the Season	576
Marriage	758
Maxims and Counsels of St. Ignatius Loyola	95
Maxims of Christian Perfection	862
Maynooth College Calendar	955
Meditations on the Sufferings of Jesus Christ	864
Memoir of Father Felix Joseph Barbelin	1054
Month of the Dead	576
Moore's Irish Melodies	767
Moy O'Brien	861
Names of the Eucharist, The	764
Old Religion in England, The	571
Our Divine Saviour and Other Discourses	856
Percy's Revenge	672
Poetry of Sir Samuel Ferguson, The	672
Purgatory, Dogmatic and Scholastic	479
Religious Houses of the United Kingdom, The	480
Revelations made by Our Lord to Blessed Margaret Mary	860
St. Teresa's Pater Noster	568
Salve Regina	672
School of Divine Love or Elevations of the Soul to God, The	96
Select Recitations	768
Sermons at Mass	567
Sermons of the Rev. Joseph Farrell	573
Sermons from the Flemish	1056
Shamrocks	763
Short Papers for the People	663

NOTICES OF BOOKS—*continued.*

Simple Readings on some of the Parables	576
Some Historical Notices of the O'Meaghers of Ikerrin	859
— St. Germaine Cousin	576
Stonemason of Saint-Point, The	671
Tales of Eventide	1143
Theologia Moralis	1054
Thoughts of St. Alphonsus Liguori	576
Throne of the Fisherman built by the Carpenter's Son	956
To-day's Gem for the Casket of Mary	95
Where was St. Patrick born? (<i>Dublin Review</i>)	1055
Olier, Jean Jacques, Founder of the Sulpicians, The Life of	23
Orders, Religious, The Origin of	673
Palladius, St. Patrick and	723
Patrician Documents	229
Patriciana, Nomina	385, 886
Patrick (St.), Palladius and	723
Philosophy, The Rosminian (See also Correspondence)	214, 331
Politics of St. Thomas Aquinas, The	690
Popular Speaking and Preaching	1057
Probabilism, On	506, 587, 712
Proselytism in West Clare: A Retrospect	411
Religious Orders, The Origin of	673
Republican Rulers, French Schools and	769
Rosary Documents	924
Rosminian Philosophy, The (See also Correspondence)	214, 331
Sacristies, Arrangement of	492
Scapular, The Brown and the <i>Catholic Dictionary</i>	794, 1004
Scholasticism, The "Forma Substantialis" of	917
Scholasticism, The "Materia Prima" of	618
Sulpicians, The Life of Jean Jacques Olier, Founder of the	28
Synod, Phases of the Diocesan	399
Theism, Dr. Mivart's Defence of	1, 97, 303, 421, 961
THEOLOGICAL QUESTIONS:—	
Absolution from Heresy	625
Acceleratio Partus	453
Baptism, may the Minister of, act as Sponsor?	364
Butter, The use, on certain Vigils	70
Buying and selling, The Price in	364
Casus sub Impedimento Metus	452
Chaplain of a Workhouse, Duty of the, to non-Catholic inmates in danger of death	454
Communion, Fast required for	450
Confession of Doubtful Sins	359
Domicile, The kind of, required for receiving Orders from Episcopus Domicilii	629
Doubtful Sins, Confession of	349

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

JULY, 1887.

DR. HUGH DE BURGO.

THE commission with which Fr. Hugh De Burgo was entrusted by the Irish Confederates on the 29th of November, 1642, was one of great political importance. He was appointed to represent to the Most August Emperor, Ferdinand the Third of Germany, the interests and aims of the Irish Catholics at that period. The despatches which he received conjointly with Count William Gall authorised him to represent to his Imperial Majesty that the Irish "were driven to arms by the ferocity of the Puritans, who sought to destroy at once his religion and his nation,"—that the struggle in which his countrymen had become engaged was a struggle for "religion, country, liberty, and justice." He was in the name of the Supreme Council to solicit the Emperor's approval and support; and to remind him "that the Irish people were bound by many ties to the house of Austria." He was to remind him of the feelings with which Ireland was regarded by the late Emperor. Irish blood had been freely shed in the service of Austria. The valour and fidelity of Irish soldiers in defending the interests of Austria had been proved in many well contested fields: and in return for such heroic services, the richest emoluments and highest honours in the gift of the crown were generously conferred upon Irish soldiers. Fr. Burke and his lay associate, Count Gall, were to represent those facts, as at once the motive and justification of their appeal.

The young Franciscan's hopes must have been high, as he set out from the peaceful cloisters of St. Anthony at Louvain, to represent before the German Court the aims and needs of his Catholic fellow-countrymen. In their union for the holy cause of faith and fatherland, he saw an evidence of strength, and a hopeful augury of success. The steps which they had already taken were equally energetic and resolute. A national parliament had assembled at Kilkenny, which placed Preston and O'Neill at the head of the Irish troops in the east and north: and well might De Burgo and his countrymen regard their prestige as a guarantee of future military successes. He saw six thousand men of his native province, under the command of his kinsman, John Burke, an experienced officer who had served thirty-eight years under the King of Spain, and who now returned to place his good sword at the disposal of his Catholic compatriots. In that parliament sat the Catholic Peers, spiritual and temporal, O'Queely and Mountgarrett, Darcey and De Burgo; the representatives of Irish tribes, whose ancestors were old and honoured when Brian drove the invaders into the sea at Clontarf, as well as of the Anglo-Irish whose fore-fathers fought by Earl Strongbow's side, and shared his triumphs and his plunders. And already the Holy Father's formal approval and support of the movement was foreshadowed by the active support of Cardinal Antonio Barberini—the Cardinal Protector of Ireland, and nephew of His Holiness. The wrongs of Ireland were now proclaimed as they had seldom been before, by lips that were rendered eloquent by an unselfish love of country. From Gibraltar to the Baltic, from the German Ocean to the Adriatic, there was not a Catholic court or a Catholic people who were not made familiar with the cause and sufferings of the Irish. It was a new crusade in the preaching of which Fr. Hugh Burke was to have a large share of the labour and of the success. However, he had in Fathers Hartigan and O'Shea able and successful fellow labourers, while Fr. Luke Wadding overshadowed them all in his zeal for fatherland. Nothing could be more encouraging than the result. The sympathies of Catholic Europe became centred on Catholic Ireland, and

practical support was cordially, if slowly, given. It was to Irish hearts the call of duty; even those of Ireland's children who heard the summons in their exiled homes at once yielded willing obedience to the call.

The man who at such a critical moment would be selected by his countrymen as ambassador to some of the greatest courts in Europe, must have been a man of known abilities, recognised prudence, and undoubted patriotism. But there can be no doubt that Fr. Burke had already established for himself a reputation for these and other high qualities. His name was even then associated in Flanders, with those of Colgan and O'Clery. His position as superior of the house at Louvain was the willing tribute of his Franciscan brethren at this period to his piety and worth.

Hugh De Burgo was born in a remote village called Clontusket, in the diocese of Clonfert. His father was a gentleman of considerable influence, and connected by close ties of kindred with the ancient and noble house of Clanricarde. And it may be added that this was the period to which Sir J. Davies virtually refers when he stated that "there were more able men of the name than of any other name in Europe." Hugh being intended for the Church, like his elder brothers John and Oliver, was educated with care by his pious parents from his earliest childhood. He made his elementary classical studies in his father's house, under the guidance of the family tutor, a man named O'Malley, whose classical attainments were in those days widely known and recognised. O'Malley certainly had pupils worthy alike of his abilities and attention in the subject of our sketch, as well as in his brother John, afterwards famous as Archbishop of Tuam; and in Oliver, afterwards Vicar General of Clonfert. In his twentieth year John left home for the Irish College, Lisbon, where after a satisfactory examination he was received as a student. Hugh, having decided to become a religious, proceeded to Louvain, where he prosecuted his studies as a humble monk of the order of St. Francis. He arrived at Louvain in 1614, and was in due course promoted to Holy Orders, after the completion of a very distinguished course of studies. The pathways in life of the

brothers seemed to diverge widely for a period. But it was only for a period, as they were destined to struggle together through one of the most troubled periods of our history; and as the character of Hugh De Burgo was much influenced by the career of his brother John, some of the leading events in the life of the latter must occupy our attention.

At the close of a distinguished collegiate course at Lisbon, John was selected to defend a public "thesis" against a chosen disputant selected by the College of Evora. The disputation was continued for three days, when the laurels were awarded to John de Burgo. The fame of his abilities had reached Salamanca, and that old university did him the honour of inviting him to take part within its halls in a similar friendly academic contest. Here, too, he was victorious; and in generous recognition of his abilities, the degree of Doctor of S. Theology was conferred upon him. After those noteworthy triumphs, he returned to his native diocese to engage in the laborious and then dangerous duties of a secular priest. Such, however, were the evidences of ability and zeal which he displayed in the discharge of his sacred duties, that he was appointed to the episcopal charge of the See of Clonfert in the eventful year 1641. The ceremony of his consecration in the following year was celebrated as an event of great importance. Fires blazed on the slopes of the Echte ranges in manifestation of popular joy. Even the aristocracy shared in the rejoicing. The Earl of Clanricarde with many of his distinguished friends journeyed to the remote church of Kinalahan, and graced the ceremony by their presence. O'Queely, the saintly and patriotic Archbishop of Tuam, was the consecrating prelate. He fondly hoped that the influence of the newly consecrated would secure many powerful friends for the cause which he loved so well. He was not destined to live and experience the sadness of disappointment. Immediately after his consecration, Dr. De Burgo was nominated one of the representative Spiritual Peers in the national Parliament at Kilkenny. His connection with the Marquis of Clanricarde caused his accession to be regarded as a marked gain to the cause of the Confederates. It was also expected that the active

support of Clanricarde would be thus finally secured. But these hopes were not destined to be realised. Clanricarde never joined the Confederates, and from the moment of the Bishop's consecration, he seems to have cautiously laboured to utilize his kinsman's great influence to weaken the national cause.

Such was the position which John De Burgo held in Ireland when his brother Hugh was associated with Count Gall in the Irish Embassy to the German court.

In the letters and despatches which he carried with him to that court, very special and just emphasis was laid on the oppression of the Puritans. It was expressly stated in those documents, that the "Irish had been driven to arms by the *ferocity* of the Puritans, who seek to extinguish at once their religion and their nation." And they added with truth that the cruelty exercised against them was but intensified by their fidelity to their king. In the letters which he received for presentation to other European courts, similar statements were made.

In his letters to the Duke of Bavaria, it was stated that the war against the Puritans in which his country was engaged, was one against "the enemies of the Church of God, and of the Princes of the Christian world." The aims and objects of his countrymen are as forcibly stated in his letters to the Prince of Liege. The *bondage* which they are represented as endeavouring to shake off is described as "worse than Egyptian." They deemed it a glorious enterprise to enter on that struggle in defence of the laws of God and of His Church. To shed their blood in testimony of their earnestness, they deemed as still more glorious. But to sacrifice all—lay down their lives in the attainment of their object, they regarded as the most cherished object of their ambition.

Fr. Burke was entrusted with other important communications. These to the Archbishop of Mechlin, and to the Nuncios at Flanders and Liege are noteworthy.

In those documents it was shown how the Irish were plundered of their land, and despoiled of everything; how they were cast into prison, and sent into exile; and how, not

content with those acts of cruelty, their enemies were then engaged in a supreme effort to utterly eradicate the Catholic religion from the land. Conscious that "their cause was the cause of God," they arose, though unarmed, against their enemies. So they assured the Holy Father himself, when with the heroic confidence of soldiers of the cross, they appealed to him for his aid and benediction. Rich and poor were united by fellowship in common calamities. The condition of the Catholic gentry was extremely sad. Robbed of their estates, they were, in many instances, forced to eke out an existence as tillers of the soil. Many died broken-hearted; and many others became raving maniacs under the consciousness of their wrongs.

The speedy return to Ireland of several experienced Irish officers, who were engaged in military service on the continent, was a source of much encouragement. Of those exiled patriots we have already mentioned the name of Colonel John Burke, who was appointed by his countrymen Lieutenant-General of Connaught; Owen O'Neill had also served in Spain, and enjoyed there a rank and reputation worthy of the representative of the Royal House of Ulster. In July, 1642, he returned to Ireland to sacrifice all for his country's cause. He was accompanied by many other Irish officers who, like him, returned to take their part in the gallant struggle for faith and fatherland. Several distinguished foreigners also volunteered their services, among whom the names of Count Overmere, Captain Oliver, and Antonio Vanderhipp, may be specially mentioned.

The Confederates were already giving encouraging proofs of their earnest activity. They were in possession of the most important ports on the western and southern coasts. The vessels in Wexford harbour were all manned by seamen from the town, under the Confederate flag. A vessel from Dunkirk "of good strength" had arrived to aid them, and had captured as many as five or six of the Parliamentary cruisers. Many other vessels were daily expected.

Fr. Burke's appeals were already bearing fruit. The Archbishop of Mechlin, to whom he had appealed in his country's name, had forwarded valuable assistance. His

Grace's welcome aid was fittingly forwarded to O'Neill, Ireland's greatest soldier. To Fr. Burke was entrusted the pleasing duty of giving him assurance of Ireland's gratitude. He was frequently reminded by the Council, that they sadly needed money. "The want of money," they wrote, "keeps us back from doing those things that are expected of us." His attention was also directed to matters of even minute detail, such as guns and war materials. Powder was much needed. He was therefore urged to send experienced men of that *trade* "and of any other that hath relation to warr," to this country. As such an agent as "the Lord General of Leinster Ladye" did not hesitate to use her influence at Namur to induce MM. Le F'ever and Goure, powder manufacturers, to come to Ireland to "worcke for the publique use at 6s. *le peice per diem*," we may be well assured that the matter was carefully attended to by Fr. Burke. A large quantity of ammunition had been already forwarded by him to Galway in charge of General Burke. The Council had occasion to point out, however, that many of the skilled artisans who arrived, though "vast in their promises," were able to execute but little. In the letter of instructions which was forwarded to him in December, 1642, we find he was urged to hasten to them a printer, and "coyners of money."

Continued acts of oppression, exaction, and extortion, on the part of the governing party, had caused a wide-spread scarcity of money. An order for a new coinage was issued by the Supreme Council, on the 16th November, 1642. A quantity of copper coin was issued to the value of £4,000. There was also a considerable share of silver coin issued. "Silver half-crown pieces were issued, to the value and goodness of English money then current." As this looked like an unlawful encroachment on the prerogatives of the crown, the Supreme Council was careful to point out that the step was taken by them in the interests of his Majesty and of the country. Specimens of the coin then issued represent on one side a crowned king in a kneeling posture, playing on a crowned Irish harp. The motto is "Floreat Rex." The opposite side represents St. Patrick with a shamrock, explaining to a group of people the mystery of

the Holy Trinity. On the saint's left is a shield with the arms of Dublin, and the inscription "Ecce Grex."

In order to encourage the importation of food supplies, as well as of war materials, Fr. Burke was directed to publish amongst the Flemish merchants and traders, that all such supplies might be imported entirely free of "duties." His attention was directed in a special manner, to the need of experienced seamen for the then growing Irish navy. A form of proclamation was drawn up by the Council, and forwarded to him for circulation. The object of the proclamation was to induce foreign seamen to engage in Irish service. The successful results of his labours in this respect are gratefully acknowledged by "his loving friends" of the Supreme Council in the letters quaintly dated "the last of December," "We find the benefit of your industry," they write, "by the resort of frigates unto us, and the encouragement which is given to adventurers to come upon our coasts, who are so well satisfied with their usage here that they now heartily affect the service."

Francis Oliver, to whom we have already referred, was a Belgian officer highly esteemed by the Irish, and one in whom Fr. Burke took a special interest. Indeed, it was mainly on the strength of Fr. Burke's recommendation, that he was appointed to the important office of Commander of a vessel named "St. Michael the Archangel," and Vice-Admiral of the Confederates. His squadron would consist of his own vessels as well as of "such as should join with him." He had already captured some prizes. These, as well as such as he might afterwards seize, he was free to convey into any ports in the kingdom which might be in the possession of the Confederates. The commission which was granted by the Supreme Council to their "well-beloved friend," Captain Francis Oliver, was dated from Kilkenny, on the "last of December, 1642." The terms of the commission were flattering as well as favourable to him. Foreign States and Potentates were asked "to defend, assist, and favour the said Captain." It is clear that much was expected from him; but those high hopes were not destined to be realized. He was soon after captured at Holland with his vessels and men, and detained

a prisoner there. The intelligence occasioned feelings of great uneasiness amongst the Confederates. Fr. Burke received a letter on the subject, dated 8th August, 1643, in which the Supreme Council expressed their deep sense of "the sufferings of Captain Oliver, and doe give you many thanks for your care of him, and of the Kingdom's honour in him."

But a greater disappointment awaited them. Belgian sympathy seemed to have undergone a sudden and an unexpected change. An edict was published at Dunkirk, by which all Belgian subjects in the service of the Confederates were required to return immediately to their country. Such an edict was calculated to prejudice the cause of Ireland in the face of Europe. Consequently the feelings with which the intelligence of its publication was received in Ireland, were those of indignant surprise. And when it is remembered that the number of Belgians then engaged in the service of the Confederates did not exceed twelve, it will be obvious that the publication of the edict was not dictated either by a sense of national necessity or utility. The Supreme Council lost no time in addressing a note of remonstrance to Don Francisco De Melos, Governor of Flanders. They expressed surprise that the sympathy and assistance which he had extended to them since the beginning of their just war, should be thus unexpectedly withdrawn. They were naturally surprised it should have occurred at a time when the cause of His Majesty of Spain, and that of Ireland, were identified. As the *execution* of the decree rested with His Excellency, they expressed a hope that he will not allow it to injure their cause. And finally they informed him that they commissioned Fr. Burke to wait on His Excellency, with full powers to arrange the difficulty. He received, however, very minute instructions for his guidance in this delicate matter. He was instructed to inform the Governor that the publication of the edict, or of the "placarr," as the quaint language of the letter expresses it, was the occasion of blank astonishment in Ireland. He was to speak of the services rendered by Ireland to the houses of Austria and Spain. They were services which should be remembered. Even within

the preceding sixty years, whole regiments of Irishmen were engaged in their service in Spain, and Flanders, Germany, Italy, and even in the Indies. Ireland's devotion to Spanish interests in the evil days of Elizabeth entailed upon many noble Irish families the loss of estates and fortune. Under these circumstances it was but natural that Fr. Burke, as representative of the Irish nation, should emphasize the magnitude of those striking proofs of fidelity, on the part of his countrymen, to Spanish interests. Nor had that fidelity grown weaker, even in the all absorbing struggle in which Ireland was then engaged. She had, at that very time, equipped two vessels to convey two thousand men to engage in the service of His Majesty of Spain. They had actually written on the subject to the Spanish Secretary of State. But as De Melos might have known nothing of the matter, Fr. Burke was authorised to give him a knowledge of the facts, should he deem it "necessary."

The most correct estimate of Fr. Burke's success in this and in the other missions in which he was engaged, may, perhaps, be formed from the letters addressed to him by the Supreme Council. A letter addressed to him from Cloumel, on the 7th April, 1645, contains the following flattering estimate of his acts:—

"You have given us occasion to approve of your endeavours, and we believe that nothing is omitted by you for the advancement of our cause that lies within the reach of a prudent and careful patriot. . . . We give you assurance that we are well satisfied with your carriage, and doe approve of your actions."

It cannot be easy to exaggerate the labour and anxiety attaching to the execution of commissions of such importance as those to which we have briefly referred. Yet we are satisfied that an unselfish patriotism, an absorbing desire to see the wrongs of his fellow-countrymen redressed, were the influences by which Fr. Burke was sustained in prosecuting his great mission. Emoluments there were none. Even the means of defraying *necessary expenses* seem to have been in his case both uncertain and insufficient. He was, indeed, assured by the Supreme Council that they were aware that the expenses incurred by him as their agent were necessarily

great; yet they can adopt no more satisfactory means of aiding him in defraying those expenses, than to recommend him to borrow £100 from Mr. Richard Everard, or "any other merchant." Should this rather precarious means fail, then—and only then—was he authorized to deduct that small sum "out of any moneys which for the use of this Kingdom should come into his hands." This was at the best but a poor and precarious provision for such a man. But those were days of heroic self-sacrifice.

J. A. FAHEY, P.P.

(To be continued.)

ON PROBABILISM.—II.

PROBABILISM, as we all know, appertains to conscience, and represents a special phase of it. Very properly, therefore, its treatment ranks after that of "human acts," conscience being concerned in giving practical application in detail to the general principles laid down in the doctrine of "human acts." Conscience, on this account, places us face to face with acts as they occur, one by one, in our everyday life, and tells us for our moral guidance how we are to act in each instance; and ever true to its derivative import, *conscientia*, it guides our moral conduct in accordance with the knowledge which the understanding places before it.

St. Thomas describing the various functions of conscience says of it, that it testifies, that it binds or impels, that it accuses or approves, excites remorse or self-reproach; and he explains himself by noticing, that according as we have done good or evil, conscience testifies in one direction or the other; also when anything occurs to be done, or not to be done, we decide accordingly, and in doing so our conscience binds, or impels us; and finally, we look back on what we have done or not done, whereupon conscience accuses, approves, excites remorse or self-reproach. (*P. i.*, 2, 79.)

Cardinal Newman treating of conscience in a similar comprehensive way speaks as follows in his own inimitable style:—

“Conscience considered as a moral sense, as an intellectual sentiment, is a sense of admiration, of approbation and blame; but it is something more than a moral sense—it is always emotional—it always involves the recognition of a living object, towards which it is directed. So, as is the case we feel responsibility, are ashamed, are frightened, at transgressing the voice of conscience; this implies that there is ONE to Whom we are responsible, before Whom we are ashamed, Whose claims upon us we fear. If on doing wrong we feel the same tearful, broken-hearted sorrow which overwhelms us on hurting a mother; if on doing right we enjoy the same sunny serenity of mind, the same soothing, satisfactory delight, which follows on our receiving praise from a father, we certainly have within us the image of some person to whom our love and veneration look, in whose smile we find our happiness, for whom we yearn, towards whom we direct our pleadings, in whose anger we are troubled, and waste away. These feelings in us are such as require for their existing cause an intelligent being. We are not affectionate towards a stone, nor do we feel ashamed before a horse, or a dog; we have no remorse or compunction in breaking mere human law; yet, so it is, conscience excites all these painful emotions, confusion, foreboding, self-condemnation; and on the other hand, it sheds upon us a deep peace, a sense of security, a resignation and a hope, which there is no sensible, no earthly object to elicit. “The wicked flees, when no one pursueth;” then why does he flee? Whence his terror? Who is it that he sees, in solitude, in darkness, in the hidden chambers of his heart? If the cause of these emotions does not belong to this visible world, the object to which his perception is directed must be supernatural and Divine, and thus the phenomena of conscience as a dictate avail to impress the imagination with the picture of a Supreme Governor, a Judge, just, holy, powerful, all-seeing, retributive, and is the creative principle of religion, as the moral sense is the principle of ethics.” (*Grammar of Assent*, p. 106.)

Not only does conscience guide us in the ever occurring details of life in accordance with the light or knowledge presented to it by the understanding, but it, moreover, prompts the understanding to acquire constantly increasing knowledge, that we may know more fully, and fulfil more faithfully our various obligations towards God, our neighbour, and ourselves in our passage through this life to the end of our creation. Thus it is that our desire of happiness a desire which no enjoyment in this world can fully satisfy,

is within us the motive principle, or main-spring of conscience, making us feel the sentiment so touchingly expressed by St. Augustine, "My heart is restless, O my God, my heart is restless, nor can it rest till it rest in Thee."

In obeying the promptings of conscience for increased knowledge with a view to our moral guidance we recognize our obligations under the natural law under the Divine positive law, and under human law as well civil as ecclesiastical, and hence result the well known terms of "law" and "liberty" which are in such frequent use in the discussion of questions respecting Probabilism.

The preacher of God's Word, and the minister of the Sacrament of Penance are by their education and everyday practice, familiar with their ordinary work, and doubts and difficulties are of exceptional occurrence to them. But when they occur, they raise the question, do any of the before-mentioned laws decide the point at issue, or do they leave the agent free to act at his own discretion under the general obligation of referring the course he adopts to God alone as the ultimate end of all "human acts," and paying due regard as well to object and circumstances in accordance with the required conditions of moral rectitude, so as to comply with the Apostolic maxim: "*Whether you eat or drink, or whatsoever else you do; do all to the glory of God.*" (1 Cor. x., 31.)

In solving this question we are to recollect that we are not to expect metaphysical, or mathematical certitude to stay our mind upon. We must be satisfied with reasons or motives of a less coercive character. The Almighty, as the Scriptures tell us, "*has ordered all things in measure, and number and weight.*" (Wisd. xi. 21.) But He has not been pleased to give us rules of such precision in the course we are to pursue for our moral guidance. It may have been the design of His adorable wisdom to allow us a certain range of latitude for serving Him in a generous spirit according to the maxim: "*God loveth a cheerful giver*" (2. Cor. ix., 7), in order that he may give in return "*good measure, and pressed down, and shaken together, and running over into our bosom,*" according to His most gracious promise. (Luke vi., 38.)

And may it not also be His blessed wish, without interfering with our free will, to reserve room for the action of His Divine grace in the help we constantly stand in need of, that, in accordance with the prayer the Church puts into our mouth, "He may prevent all our actions by His holy inspirations, and carry them on by His gracious assistance, that every prayer and work of ours may always begin from Him, and be ended as begun by Him?"

Nevertheless, as doubts and difficulties come in our way, we are bound to stay our hand, and try to acquire, as best we can, a moral persuasion such as prudent, enlightened and upright men deem sufficient to warrant the conduct we are to pursue. In this endeavour we frequently find ourselves oscillating, so to say, between "law" and "liberty" in the technical sense already explained, and our authors would conduct us along a certain path by stages indicated by the well known titles, "*probabilissima*," "*probabilior*," "*aeque-probabilis*," "*minus probabilis*," "*tenuiter probabilis*," all indicating motives in different degrees, whilst in reference to "law" we have the titles "*tutissima*," "*tutior*," "*tuta*," and "*minus tuta*," and with regard to authority, "*communissima*," "*communior*," "*communis*," and "*minus communis*." It is not necessary to explain these qualifying expressions. They explain themselves sufficiently at least for the purpose I have in view. I merely recite them in order to point out the arms with which our probabilistic disputants carry on the war of Probabilism. In a field so vast at least in the sense of furnishing ground for disputation, it is by no means a matter of wonder, that there should be extreme views, and in opposite directions, and that the extremists should not be very complimentary to each other. The laxists on their side were only too free in accusing the rigorists of following the example of the Scribes and Pharisees of old "*by binding heavy and insupportable burdens, and laying them on men's shoulders, whilst with a finger of their own they would not move them*," as also "*of shutting the Kingdom of Heaven against men, they themselves not entering in, and not suffering those to enter that were going in*." (Matt. xxiii.) On the other side, the rigorists taking their parable from Ezechieh the prophet charged their

opponents with “*sewing cushions under every elbow, and making pillows for the heads of every age to catch souls,*” (xiii. 18), pretending to conduct them to heaven by the wide gate, and along the broad way that leadeth to destruction. It became necessary for authority to interpose “*with a strong hand and a stretched-out arm;*” and Pope after Pope, through a whole century condemned wholesale, on one side and the other, their extreme teachings as extracted and formulated in definite propositions both in dogma and morality.

This lopping off on both sides narrowed the field of disputation to questions on mere Probabilism, and so having the ground cleared I feel in a position to state the purpose I have in view, which is simply to show that these questions, though warmly debated in our treatises on conscience, have, in point of fact, a very limited bearing on the practice of our Sacred Ministry, either in the pulpit or in the sacred tribunal of Penance. To carry out this purpose it will be only necessary to indicate the questions in dispute, at least the leading questions, on which the others depend, and bring forward the arguments on which I rely to establish my view.

The whole controversy turns on the questions of Probabilism, in one direction, and Antiprobabilism, or, as otherwise expressed, Probabiliorism, on the other; and we are to intercalate the middle question of Equiprobabilism between them, and, as St. Liguori stands forth so prominently in the discussion, we may be glad to have such a master for the explanation of the terms we will have to employ.

In his treatise on conscience in his *Homo Apostolicus* he defines a probable conscience to be that, which relying on some probable opinion forms to itself a practical dictate of reason (*dictamen rationis*) out of reflex or concomitant principles, for acting licitly. He then proceeds to point out that a probable opinion is that which is based on a grave motive, sufficient to gain over the assent of a prudent man, with, however, a reasonable fear of the motive in opposition to it; whereas a more probable opinion relies on a graver motive with some fear, nevertheless, of an opposite motive as being yet probable; and the equally probable opinion is balanced between motives of equal force on either

side; and he further observes, that these motives may be intrinsic as furnished by the subject itself, or extrinsic as resulting from authority outside the subject, but bearing in some way upon it, and that the motives of both kinds may relate either to "the law involved in a particular case, or a fact or facts under the law."

Having laid down these and some other preliminary notions the holy Doctor proceeds to develop what he terms his "moral system," and in doing so he sets forth the following three propositions:—

The first relates to an opinion *on the side of law* as being *certainly* more probable than an opposite opinion *in favour of liberty*, and he asserts, that in such a case we are by all means bound to follow the former opinion.

The second proposition supposes an opinion *on the side of liberty*, being merely probable, or equally probable as compared with the opinion *on the side of law*, and he insists in this case, that we are not free to follow the former opinion as being merely probable.

His third proposition supposes a concurrence or opposition of two equally probable opinions, one *on the side of liberty* and the other *on the side of law*, and he alleges that this concurrence or opposition furnishes a doubt as to whether there be a law at all in the case, or what amounts to the same, whether the law has been promulgated, and that on account of this doubt the opinion in favour of liberty prevails on the ground, that an uncertain law cannot induce a certain obligation; and he here enters into a lengthened course of argument to establish this proposition, which accordingly he adopts in his *Homo Apostolicus*, as the cardinal point of his doctrine with respect to Probabilism.

According to this exposition it would appear that the Saint was, at least when he so explained himself, an Equiprobabilist, and had a large following in that system. On the other hand he was opposed by the Antiprobabilists or the Probabiliorists, who insisted, that to be warranted in taking *the side of liberty*, mere probability was not sufficient, nor even an equal probability, but a still higher degree of probability was required in the supposed concurrence of

motives. Indeed, it is not easy to fix the Saint as being invariable, and unswerving in his teaching and practice on the subject. This may be owing to the nature of moral certitude, and still more of probability, which had to be debated with no better standard than human prudence, or the enlightened estimation of mankind.

I see in a very elaborate *brochure*, which owes its origin to the elevation of the Saint to the dignity of Doctor of the Church, the question discussed as to his precise form of Probabilism, and it would seem, according to the author, that the Saint's views underwent considerable modification at different periods of his life. The *brochure* bears the title *Vindicie Balleriniæ, seu gustus recognitionis vindiciarum Alphonsianarum, &c.* It was occasioned by a regrettable incident, which, so far as it went, cast a gloom for the moment over the joy with which the well-merited honour paid to the Saint was hailed by the universal Church.

Already had the celebrated Ballerini differed in some points from the teaching of St. Liguori, and he felt he had a right to do so, as St. Liguori himself had differed in his day from St. Thomas, St. Bonaventure, and other first class theologians, but the curt and unceremonious character of Ballerini's style offended some of the disciples of St. Liguori, the Redemptorists, and when the process came on for conferring the title of Doctor on the Saint it so happened that the Promoter of the Faith in the discharge of his official obligation of objecting to the proceeding drew his objections from the points in question of Ballerini's dissent from the teaching of St. Liguori. This gave occasion to the idea that Ballerini was opposed to the Doctorate of the Saint, and some members of the Redemptorist body deemed it a duty to their holy founder to vindicate his teaching, and in doing so they dealt rather severely with their adversary. Ballerini was thus put on his defence, and the *brochure* to which I refer was the result. In this production the author in tracing the teaching of St. Liguori makes him out, at different periods, a Probabilist, an Equiprobabilist, and a Probabiliorist. I happen to have in my possession a copy of an autograph letter I saw some years

ago in the archives of a community in Naples, addressed by the Saint himself to the then Superior of the community under date the 15th July, 1777, exactly ten years before his death, which shows what his attitude was on the subject at the time, when he was already eighty years of age.

The following is the letter, as I had it copied, and attested by the transcriber:—

REV. MIO PADRE E SIGNORE IN GESU MARIA E GIUSEPPE,

Mi è stata detta come cosa certa che il Superiore de' vostri Padri in Bari va tacciando per quella Provincia i miei compagni, i quali anche son chiamati alle missioni per che contorni, che noi siamo Probabilisti, e teniamo una dottrina larga. I miei fratelli sieguono la stessa dottrina che tengo io. Io per altro non sono Rigorista, ma neppure sono Probabilista, e dico, come ho scritto in piu mie opere di Morale, che l'opinione que sta per liberta non puo seguirsi, quando ella non ha altro appoggio che de essere probabile. All'incontro dico che l'opinione, la quale sta per la legge, deve seguirsi necessariamente sempre che ella è piu probabile. Onde replico che io non sono Rigorista, ne Probabilista ma vero Probabiliorista; e dico che oggidi, in mi meglio si sono delucidate le cose circa questa materia, che prima stava così confusa, questa è il sistema, che deve tenersi da tutti.

Prego V. P. Reverendissima di scrivere al mentovato Superiore di Bari ciò che qui ho scritto, acciocchè muti opinione circa nostra dottrina. So bene che alcuni anche in Napoli ci han caricati dello stesso difetto, ma spero, che poi siensi sincerati leggendo le diverse opere stampate, che ho dovuto pubblicare per liberar me, ed i miei compagni dalla predetta taccia. Spero questo favore da V. P. la quale sa quanto io e tutti i miei Fratelli vivono ossequiosi verso la sua Venerabilissima Congregatione. Resto raccomandandomi alle sue orazioni, mentre con tutto il rispetto mi protesto

Di V. P. Reverendissima,

Divotissimo obligatissimo servitore vero,

ALPHONSO DE LIGUORI, VESCOVO.

NOCERA DI PAGANI, 15 Luglio, 1777.

(Copiata sull' originale de verbo ad verbum.)

From this letter it appears certain that the Probabilism of the Saint, at least towards the end of his life, was of the Probabiliorist stamp, as he also leaves it to be inferred that he had exposed himself to be misunderstood by statements less distinct at earlier periods of his career, and this can be well conceived as an incident of the protracted discussions that were carried on with so much warmth on the matter.

A first condition for dialectic strife is a distinct understanding between the disputants as to the subjects and issues involved in their discussions, and this can hardly be, when the nature of the subject leaves it open to varying appreciations by different minds.

However, we know enough from what we have just seen of the distinctions of the Probabilistic controversy to enter upon the inquiry as to the practical effect, if any, this controversy exerts on the work of the sacred ministry, and I have made up my mind to think that however desirable it may be for the ecclesiastical student to be well made up on the subject, he will find it afterwards of very little practical use, either for the pulpit or the holy tribunal of Penance. But I feel I must reserve this view for a further paper, hoping you will kindly reserve space for it in the next number of the RECORD.

A VETERAN PRACTITIONER.

IS THE IRISH LANGUAGE WORTH PRESERVING ?

WHAT a melancholy, as well as deeply interesting subject for reflection, is the question asked at the head of this paper! How humiliating to national pride, to reflect, that our language should be now in such a precarious condition. How painful to think, that after weathering the fierce storms of so many centuries, in its perilous passage down the stream of time, we should now see its very existence threatened as a spoken medium. An affirmative answer to the question proposed is certain to be given by all those who love the ancient and cultured tongue of the Gaedhill, now admitted to be one of the oldest spoken in Europe, if not in the world. No doubt, the insular position of our country was the great means of saving it from the vicissitudes which befell languages amongst other branches of the human family. Should the chief of epic poets, Homer, again revisit the earth, he would no longer hear in the classic land of Greece the beauti-

ful language in which he sang his immortal lay. Were the prince of orators, Demosthenes, to thunder again in the Areopagus, he would not be understood. Should Cicero now stroll into the ancient Forum, he would hear a language different from that through which he was wont to entrance his auditory. But if Ollamh Fodla, the Irish Solon, who was their senior by centuries, reappeared again, he would hear his own musical language spoken not far from where Strongbow landed. When we ponder on this unquestionable fact, we are reminded of what has been said by that singularly able writer Thierry: "The Keltic language is destined to be as indestructible as the Keltic race itself."

Philologists usually divide into six branches the languages derived from the Aryan the primitive tongue spoken by those who lived in the high tablelands of Iran and Armenia. According to this classification Irish is placed fifth on the list. It is universally admitted, that our national language has an origin far beyond the period of authentic history. It extends far back into the shadowy past, until it seems lost in the mists of antiquity itself. The monuments to which Ireland can point as undoubted evidences of her ancient civilisation are as notably abundant as they are various. With pardonable pride she boasts of a yet more convincing proof in the living language of her people.

"Sweet tongue of our Druids and bards of past ages,
Sweet tongue of our monarchs, our saints, and our sages,
Sweet tongue of our heroes and free-born sires,
When we cease to preserve thee our glory expires."

All capable of expressing an opinion on the subject are unanimous in declaring, that language is one of the truest tests of a people's civilisation. This truth is self-evident if we contrast the cultured languages of Europe with those spoken by man in his savage state. When judged by this standard, then it must evidently follow that the ancient Gaedhill were, comparatively speaking, a highly civilised people. "The Irish language," says Vallancey, "is free from the anomalies, sterility, and heteroclitic redundancies which mark the dialects of barbarous nations. It is rich and melodious, precise and

copious, and likewise affords those elegant conversions which no other than a thinking and lettered people can use or acquire." "Est quidam," observes Ussher, "hæc lingua Hibernica elegans cum primis et opulenta." "The Irish language is the greatest monument of antiquity perhaps now in the world. The perfection at which Gaelic arrived in Ireland in such remote ages is astonishing"—(*Scotch Gaelic Dictionary* by Shaw.) "L'Irlandais, par son extension, sa culture et l'ancienneté de ses monuments écrits, est de beaucoup la plus importante des dialectes Gaeliques."—(M. Pictet.) "The Keltic dialects," says Jamieson, "seem to excel in expressive names of a topographical kind. Their nomenclatures are pictures of the countries which they inhabit." "If," says that lover of his country's language and history, Dr. MacHale, "the Irish language were to perish as a living language, the topography of Ireland, if understood, would be a lasting monument of its significance."

Sir Wm. Betham says, "that the most ancient manuscripts in Europe are in the Irish language; and the oldest Latin ones are written by the hands of Irish monks." These writers were, no doubt, earnest students of the latter, as the language of the Church. Nevertheless, as their extant works sufficiently prove, they sedulously cultivated their own beautiful and copious vernacular, quite capable of expressing the most complex ideas without borrowing from the Latin or Greek, if we except ecclesiastical terms. It is our proud boast, that we had and still have a language in which our history and antiquities are recorded long before any of the nations of modern Europe could lay claim to any such inheritance.

It goes without saying that our literature suffered irreparable disasters at the hands of the plundering Scandinavians. As our old annalists assure us, they took a special delight in "burning and drowning the books of Eriu." It is yet a proverb in the country, that whatever escaped destruction from these marauders met it at the hands of the English. The latter from the day they first landed on our shores, even unto this very hour, have left nothing undone in order to stamp out the national language. Witness the savage

enactments passed against it in the Parliament of Kilkenny, A.D. 1367. The same fiendish policy was constantly enforced, by the ruling powers with a view to banish the Irish language outside the English Pale. In the year 1483, we find the Archbishop of Dublin petitioning Parliament for leave to use the national tongue, as its outlawry in the very vicinity of Dublin "caused souls to be piteously neglected." In 1537, reign of King Henry VIII., according to the behests of that despot, a most stringent act was passed for the purpose of extending "the English habit and language." It was decreed that all spiritual promotions in Ireland, on becoming void, should be filled by candidates who were pledged under the severest penalties to use the English language and no other. If such could not be found, then the nominator should cause four proclamations to be made on four successive market days in the town adjacent to the said spiritual promotion. This formality being carried out, and the aspirant found, on swearing to observe the statute, he was at once inducted. All must candidly say that this was rather a novel way of collating to benefices, charged with the care of souls, but one quite in unison with the clerical pretensions of that much-married monarch Henry VIII., the father of Anglicanism. Suffice it to say, that in the reigns of his successors, the national language was proscribed with a hatred that knew no bounds. Every means at hand was turned to account solely with a view to insure its complete destruction.

Were it not for the self-sacrificing exertions of our continental scholars, Erin's exiles, who carried on the writing and printing of Irish books at Paris, Antwerp, Rome, and notably at Louvain, and other seats of learning, the most of the richest treasures of our language would have been hopelessly lost in those dark and dreadful times when the infamous Penal Code held sway. Even short as the period is, comparatively speaking, that has elapsed since the Four Masters and Keating wrote: and yet what destruction has befallen our literature. Many of the works which they used are not now in existence. Everything considered, it is little short of a miracle to think how we preserved so much of our literature in the midst of such bitterly hostile elements.

Some will say "that as the national language is dying out, better let it disappear as soon as possible, as it is an obstacle in the way of acquiring English." This is totally opposed to what we see done elsewhere. In the words of Dr. Franklin, "the man who acquires two languages is twice a man." See what the Welsh have done in the way of reviving their tongue, which about a century since was almost extinct. The Hungarians on obtaining autonomy decreed that their own tongue, and not the German, should be the official language. The Czechs in Bohemia are preserving their vernacular despite any opposition to the contrary. The Flemings, for some years past, have done a great deal to revive their tongue, which for centuries had been sadly neglected. With these examples before us shall we be disheartened? There was a time, in the chequered history of our country, when there was less Irish spoken than at present. According to the last census, about one-fifth of the population was returned as speaking or understanding the language of ancient Erin. This is by far a larger percentage than that accounted for in the previous one, although we are all painfully aware that the population during the decade was mercilessly decimated. Such a fact unquestionably demonstrates that the study of the language was on the increase. The Society for the Preservation of the Irish Language, founded a few years since, has already done excellent work in the way of saving from destruction that priceless inheritance, the Keltic tongue. That such is the case is patent to all who take the trouble of reading the Society's annual Reports. Within a short period 90,000 of its publications in the interests of the language have been sold, and new editions are passing through the Press. Through the efforts of the Society, Irish has now a place in the Intermediate course of education, and with very encouraging results. It is also recognised in the curriculum of the Royal University. After a great deal of diplomacy and pressure on the part of the Society, the Commissioners of so-called National Education were induced to grant certain concessions in the way of teaching Irish in the primary schools. The boon which they seemed to bestow was, from experience,

found to be almost worthless. Tantalus-like, the people in the Irish-speaking districts could not avail themselves of the scheme, hedged in, as it was, with conditions which rendered it practically inoperative. It is true that the Commissioners have to a certain extent placed the teaching of Irish on the same basis as Greek and Latin, that is to say, by paying according to the programme for examination ten shillings a pass for each successful candidate. But beyond this they do nothing for the cultivation of the language. They afford no facilities whereby teachers in training may qualify for its efficient teaching. What renders the anomaly so glaring is, that they appoint in their own Training College professors of Greek, Latin, &c., &c., and pay them liberal salaries, whilst no such thing is done for the national language. Hence, we find that teachers totally ignorant of Irish are occasionally sent to teach in districts of the country where that language is still the vernacular. Under these circumstances is it any wonder that the reports of the school inspectors from these localities are such deplorable reading? If they were capable of examining the children in their own language, we may feel confident in saying that they would not receive so many meaningless answers. But how could it be otherwise? Only quite recently Irish has been placed on the programme of examination for the Inspectorship of National Schools. All capable of offering an unprejudiced opinion in the matter will at once admit that the practice of endeavouring to teach English in the Irish-speaking districts to pupils unacquainted with the former, and through its medium, is opposed to every principle of education, and tends to perpetuate ignorance, of which unfortunately we have abundant proof. In the twenty-second annual Report of the National Board of Education, p. 75, Sir Patrick Keenan, now a resident Commissioner, says:—

“Many good men seem to forget that the people might know both Irish and English The shrewdest people in the world are those who are bilingual. But the most stupid children I have ever met with are those who were learning English whilst endeavouring to forget Irish.”

In the primary schools the obvious course manifestly is,

to teach the children English through the medium of the Irish, just as we find the bilingual system successfully carried out in other countries. The action of the Commissioners, in the case in question, is such an outrage on common sense that in no other civilised country in the world would it be tolerated for an hour. Besides they will not allow Irish to be taught to any pupils under the fifth class, which practically puts it out of the school altogether. None are better aware than the Commissioners, that in those districts of the country where Irish is still the vernacular the children of the peasantry are too poor to remain sufficiently long so that they may qualify to learn the national language according to their programme. Hence the reason of the rule. No doubt with a view to render their designs perfect, they have also decreed that it must not be taught during ordinary school hours. It is self-evident from the foregoing facts that the Commissioners tolerate the teaching of Irish for the sake of appearances, whilst at the same time they are determined to give it an euthanasia, and bury it out of sight as being indissolubly linked with a civilisation to which they have no claim. How true are the words of that sincere lover of his country the much lamented Dr. MacHale: "The so-called national system is the grave of the Irish language." The Kilkenny Statute no longer directly affects it, as it did in the mournful past. A far more deadly and disastrous effect is produced by the operation of the National system, as well as by the apathy of some amongst us who should entertain different sentiments. Here we have the modern tally with a vengeance. When we say now-a-days, let us preserve our glorious tongue, we are invariably met with the usual *cui bono?* "Leave it to the universities." We all know sadly and too well what is the result. Multitudes of our manuscripts now lie mouldering on the library shelves, with scarcely a person capable of making them known to the public. They are far less attended to than Egyptian and Etruscan inscriptions. If the living language is allowed to die out, what provision are we making to have these treasures made known in the future? It is very doubtful whether we would ever have such Keltic scholars as O'Connor, O'Donovan, O'Curry, and many others, unless they

spoke the language naturally from their childhood. It is palpable to any intelligence that without a knowledge of Irish the nomenclature, history, and antiquities of the country must ever remain a sealed book. How humiliating to reflect that in the curriculum of our schools and colleges modern languages have a very prominent place, and perhaps, learned in a way that might pass current in certain circles, whilst not a word is said about our noble tongue, which, in the opinion of the most eminent philologists, is fit to rank with the classic languages of antiquity. Everything considered, it would indeed be an indelible disgrace should we allow our national tongue hitherto so proscribed by the foreigner, and bequeathed to us with such sacrifices by our ancestors, to perish through neglect. Such censurable indifference on our part would evidently imply an avowed contempt for all that men have hitherto loved or respected. We would indeed prove ourselves unworthy sons of Erin, and justly deserving the unmitigated censure of posterity should we not appreciate our mother tongue, connected, as it is so, intimately with that glorious period of our history, when Ireland bore that time-honoured appellation, "Insula Sanctorum et Doctorum." Its disappearance from the category of spoken languages would be disastrous alike to the interests of history and philology. It should indeed stimulate us to cultivate it, when we now see it so much studied throughout the world for the sake of philology. The cultured Germans have taken the lead in this movement. Zeuss, the renowned Keltic scholar, was the first in the field. He wrote his great work, *Grammatica Keltica*, from the old time-worn manuscripts, written ages ago by the hands of Irish monks, who brought the blessings of religion and civilization to the Fatherland. In his efforts he has been ably seconded by the labours of Schleicher, Ebel, Bopp, Windisch and Zimmer. France, too, has supplied able students in the same field, namely, de Jubainville, Gaidoz, and Lizeray. Switzerland claims its Pictet. Italy, its Nigra and Ascoli. Scotland, which owes so much to Gaelic civilisation, has earnest advocates of our language in the persons of Blackie, Geddes, Mackey, and many others. In America, also, Irish is

cultivated with an energy characteristic of the great Republic. Even the Saxon, whose hatred of our language in former times knew no bounds, as if ashamed of the past, and with a view to make the *amende honorable*, has founded chairs for its culture in his universities. Already he has given us Keltic scholars whose names have acquired a world-wide reputation, namely, Latham, Pritchard, Arnold, and Max Müller. Such being the case, shall we be indifferent concerning the national trust of our language, when other nations are doing so much in its behalf? Shall we allow this priceless inheritance, our glorious tongue, to perish, inseparably connected, as it is, with the glory, the fame, the history, and the traditions of our noble and long suffering land?

P. A. YORKE, C.C.

SOME CATHOLIC REMINISCENCES OF THE INDIAN MUTINY, 1857.—II.

ABOUT eleven miles from Meerut is a small village, called Sirdhana, once the residence of the Begum Somroo, a Catholic Princess. Strange and extraordinary are the stories told of this high personage. One thing is certain—she was talented in many respects, and a great diplomat. The same may be said of Indian noble ladies in general. This has been attributed to the idle and luxurious lives they lead in the harem, smoking the hookah, and eating betel nut. They have thus plenty of time for brewing mischief; sometimes to the extent of poisoning relations, rivals, and high officials. In the village already mentioned, stands the modern palace of her highness, the old palace being converted into a native industrial school, now called St. John's College. It is intended for native boys who are Catholics. In it they are taught English, and learn different trades. They become carpenters, shoemakers, painters, &c. Here also is a magnificent church built principally of white marble, after the plan of St. Peter's in Rome. It is said to have cost the princess about a crore of rupees, or a million sterling of our money. There is a

colony of about two hundred native Catholics, all of whom are pensioners on the Begum's bounty. At her death she bequeathed a considerable sum of money to the Agra Mission, for the Church in Sirdhana, the resident priest, and the support of the school. I am not certain whether this money is still paid. All I know is, that when I was in Rome in 1870, there was litigation going on about the withdrawal of the bequest or its reduction to no small extent.

It is related of the princess that she appeared at the head of her troops, numbering 20,000 men, including artillery, cavalry and infantry, at the siege of Burtpore. And although the English general politely declined her services, still with the usual cleverness of her sex, she carried her point, and remained until the fall of the fortress. This was after the death of her husband, Sumroo. He was a German adventurer and a Catholic. Of this same individual we are told, that he gave much trouble to the English in their *annexations*, as he was in command of the native troops of different princes in the north-western provinces, always fighting against the foreigners. Owing to his good services, he obtained the Jagheer of Sirdhana and the adjacent country, and his wife by her diplomacy and winning ways got the English to confirm her territories to herself, and exempt them from the jurisdiction of the British civil power. The Begum from all accounts was a thorough soldier, and it is related of her, that while leading on her army, which was better drilled and equipped than the troops of many of the other native states, she exhibited a reckless intrepidity in the midst of the most frightful carnage. On one occasion, in the reign of Shah Alum, she saved the Mogul Empire by rallying and encouraging her own troops, when those of the king were flying before the enemy. Her highness was not only absolute in the field and in the palace, but sometimes would show her authority in ecclesiastical matters. On one occasion her chaplain, Fr. Julius Cæsar, an Italian Capuchin, was preaching the usual homily after the Gospel on Sunday, and happened to touch rather plainly and sharply on the morals of the Court. Scarcely was Mass finished, when an aide-de-camp arrived in

the sacristy to tell the Padre Sahib that her highness was very angry, and that if he made use of such language again she would have him put in irons. The unpleasant consequence, however, did not happen to the good Father, as soon after he was raised to the episcopacy. In her declining years she would spend the whole morning, surrounded by her court, distributing alms in clothes, food and money to the poor and destitute. She also built a fine church and presbytery in Meerut.

The church, as we have already said, is built on the plan of St. Peter's. It is surrounded by beautiful gardens, and especially by groves of orange trees, lemon and citron, which perfume the air with their blossoms, and bend down their branches under a weight of golden fruit. In the left aisle of the church is a magnificent mausoleum, raised to the princess by her adopted son, Dyce Sombre, to whom she left all her property. A word about this young gentleman will not be out of place. He had no sooner got to Calcutta, than, of an evening playing billiards with a young surgeon of the Bengal army, he lost a lac of rupees—£10,000. On his arrival in London he was married to the daughter of Lord ——. The marriage did not prove a happy one, and owing to some of his Oriental customs he was pronounced insane. Yet, strange to say, after travelling through the continent, and presenting himself for examination in all the capital cities of Europe, he was declared to be sound and perfectly capable of taking care of himself and his property. *All* except England pronounced in his favour. When in Rome he purchased the beautiful monument we have spoken of at the cost of nearly £20,000. I can scarcely attempt to describe it, as being above any effort of mine. The whole of the interior of the floors and walls are of pure white marble. The tabernacle on the high altar is very chaste and rich, embellished with beautiful mosaics in rich patterns of sacred symbols, so delicately formed, that they look like embroidery on white satin. Behind the high altar are numerous sacristies, rooms, and apartments, and it was in those spacious and well ventilated quarters that his lordship established a convent of nuns, French and Irish, of the Order of Jesus and Mary.

They had some English boarders and native children as day scholars.

At the time of which we are about to speak, the revolt was in full blaze over nearly the whole of the north-western provinces. The most frightful accounts reached this peaceful retreat every day. The nuns did not fear so much for themselves as for the innocent little children under their charge. The chaplain, an Italian Capuchin, wrote to the officers in command in Meerut, begging for aid in arms and men. They may have received some arms, but as to men, none could be spared. What was to be done under the circumstances? The Reverend Father at once assembled all the native Christians, and plainly told them that, as there appeared no hope of succour, they should all receive the sacraments and prepare for death. He gave the religious and children the same instruction, and very soon all had fulfilled this important duty. At the same time, he did not neglect making some preparation for defence. All the great doors of the church were well fastened and secured, except one small one to serve as a sally-port. In the College stores were some old rusty native guns, and a few muskets; these with about two dozen scimitars he gave to the native Christians. Also he had two small brass cannon, souvenirs of the Begun's park of artillery. They were used principally in firing a *feu de joie* on great festivals. Again, he had a number of dummy cannon made of wood, painted and done up so as to represent pieces of ordnance of various calibre. All these he placed on the top of the church on the balcony. Still, there was a large vacant space in the centre, right facing the entrance gate, and commanding the road before the church. The deficiency was soon supplied. An old churn was discovered in the stores, and this peaceful machine was soon metamorphosed, so as to represent a more warlike weapon. A carriage with huge wheels to support this "Woolwich Infant" was soon constructed, and all placed in position. Thus the fortifications seemed complete, at least in appearance. The Mahometans and Hindoos of the village and neighbourhood were most anxious to discover where the Padre Sahib had procured the monster gun, and when

passing the gate would invariably hasten their pace and stoop down most respectfully. Native Christians were placed as sentries all around the church to keep guard by day and night, in particular to keep off any examination of the armaments. At night all the colony of native Christians retired to the church, accommodating themselves as well as they could in the nave and aisles, while the chaplain, nuns, children, and a few natives occupied the roof. In the morning after Mass, the native Christians left for their several avocations. The Father during the day placed videttes at different and salient points to give immediate notice of the approach of any hostile force. Thus they spent many anxious days and nights in dread suspense of the future. At length came the dreadful news that the enemy was but a days' march from Sirdhana, and that the Goojurs, a low caste of Hindoos, were plundering and destroying the villages in the neighbourhood. As usual, all had returned in the evening to the church, but one and all felt some indescribable feeling that the approaching night would prove an eventful one ; and so it did.

Just here we should say in very truth, that the chaplain and Christians had no idea of making a deliberate fight for their lives. No ; all the warlike preparations were made merely to frighten ; certainly not to waste blood uselessly. To heaven alone, priest, nuns, children and native Christians looked for help. To God, through His Immaculate Mother, and the saints reigning in glory, all sent up fervent and incessant prayers in their hour of affliction. Night came on and soon they saw the near approach of the enemy. The insurgents entered the town of Sirdhana about four hundred yards from the church, and the work of destruction began. The bazaar is soon in flames, and now cries, shrieks and fiendish yells rend the air. After destroying the village, these infuriated demons march to the church in a body shouting as they advance "Death to the Christians." They surround the building, and set on fire the entrance-gate. The hour is two o'clock in the morning. All around is to be seen a lawless mob of thousands, yelling and frantically threatening destruction and death upon the poor inmates of

the church. At a short distance are visible the burning cabins of inoffensive natives, while the large torches carried by the iusurgents fill the atmosphere with a lurid glare. Meantime on the roof of the church is gathered the "Pusillus Grex." The nuns are robed in their white habits, surrounded by their weeping children, who are also dressed in white. All are now prostrate in silent adoration before their God. They appear like fresh flowers, stainless, pure and white as the untrodden snow, soon to be cut down by one sweep of the furious tempest. A holy calm reigns amongst them, the glow of love is on their cheeks as they think on their glorious destiny, think, too, that ere another sun has risen they shall behold Him upon whom angels love to look, hear His sweet voice and feel His joyous welcome. Oh! love, indeed, is stronger than death. The good Father tells them their time is now come to bid adieu to this vale of tears, gives them the last absolution in *Articulo Mortis*, and administers the Holy Viaticum. He is now about to communicate himself, but first elevates the Most Adorable Body of our Lord, and with a lively faith exclaims, "Ne tradas bestiis animas confitentes tibi, et animas pauperum tuorum ne obliviscaris in finem."—(*Ps.* 73.) Scarcely is all this done when a profound silence followed, and the blood-thirsty infidels disperse! Evidently it was not in vain that the faithful Priest of God cried out, "Ne tradas bestiis, &c.," and that He the Omnipotent God had been invoked by his chosen ones in the Most Adorable Sacrament of the Altar.

But even another danger is apprehended, the approach of mutinous regiments on their way back to Delhi, as through Sirdhana lay the direct route. Cossids or couriers are again despatched to Meerut, urgently begging for aid. Some native cavalry who remained faithful, were asked to go to Sirdhana to escort the nuns and children to Meerut. The poor fellows said they were ready and willing but dreaded the undertaking as they were so few in number. Soon the whole station of Meerut heard of the perilous position of the priest, nuns, &c., and twelve chivalrous gentlemen volunteered for the work of rescue. Honour to whom honour is due, is an old adage; but what praise and credit should be allowed to

those heroes, all Protestants, we believe, who set out on this errand of charity! At break of day the party arrived at Sirdhana with some half dozen palanquin carriages, and nuns and children were speedily arranged in these vehicles. The sacred vessels, vestments, &c., had been previously buried, and the protection of the church left to the native Christians. Two of the gentlemen rode in front of the party as a sort of advance guard, but had not proceeded more than a few miles when they saw in the horizon clouds of dust, a certain sign of bodies of troops on the march. Still on they moved in fear and hope, when, alas, the spring of a carriage breaks, and a wheel comes off another! "Nil desperandum" seemed to be the motto for all; the nuns pray, and six of the cavaliers dismount and repair the damage. But an hour of precious time is lost, and their march must now be slow and cautious to avoid another mishap. At length all arrived safely in Meerut, and the nuns were located in an empty barrack until after the taking of Delhi. But the escape the party had by the break-down on their journey was providential, for after this escort had left Meerut, the sappers and miners corps mutinied, and were, at the very time of the mishap, but a short distance in front, crossing the same road to Delhi. The names of those gentlemen who so courageously escorted the nuns I do not know, otherwise I would mention them with sincere pleasure. After the fall of Delhi, the nuns returned to Sirdhana, where they found everything as safe as when they left it. How was this, when all the churches, colleges, convents and schools, all over the Agra Mission were utterly destroyed, nothing but the bare walls left standing? It was because, in Sirdhana, Mahometans and Hindoos respected the building, calling it their "Mother's Church."

Extraordinary were the reports current at the time in England and throughout Europe. So much was this the case that his Eminence the late Cardinal Wiseman, believing that all the missionaries in the north-western provinces had been massacred, sent out to India a number of Military Chaplains to supply their place. The Agra Mission lost but two during the Mutiny. Our saintly Fr. Zacharias, O.S.F.C., of whom

I have already spoken, as having been shot on the steps of the altar in Delhi, and another priest of whom I shall say a few words hereafter, Fr. Rooney, from Navan, Co. Meath, killed in Cawnpore.

There appeared in the *Tablet* of that period an account of the Sirdhana nuns, copied from a French paper published in Lyons. It said: "The nuns at Sirdhana near Meerut, were attacked by the insurgents, lost all their property, but were now in a valley in Thibet." Such a thing would be at the time impossible. It would require two months of a journey to reach Thibet, and involve considerable expense.

I know there have been other mutinies in India, and various symptoms of rebellion before the mutiny of 1857, but I am convinced that British rule in India was in greater danger during the first Seikh campaign in 1845 than at any other time. For had the Seikhs, once they came on British territory stood their ground and not re-crossed the Sutlej river in a panic, they might have marched to Calcutta supported and accompanied by every native prince in India. Runjeet Syng, the King of the Punjaub, both a soldier and a statesman died, leaving one son, the present Maharajah Duleep Syng, as his heir. His Queen the Ranee, therefore, had absolute control over the entire kingdom. The army was well disciplined, and composed of thorough soldiers in every sense of the word. Officers from Italy and France, Messieurs Allard, Ventura, Avitabile, &c., had been their instructors. The latter, however, having amassed princely fortunes during their careers, and knowing well the Orientals were not to be trusted after the king's death thought only of returning to Europe with their bullion. But to effect this was the difficulty. An opportunity came for them during the Afghanistan campaign; they gave all their cash to the English, and got bills of exchange on Calcutta—the very thing they wanted.

At this period the Seikh army became insubordinate and demanded more money. So to calm them the Ranee told them to cross the river and fight the English. The Seikhs obeyed their Queen and crossed the river near Loodianah in

number about seventy thousand fighting men, including artillery, cavalry, and infantry. But they were under native officers, a fact that sufficiently accounts for their ultimate defeat. At the time we speak of, Lord Hardinge, of Waterloo fame, was Governor-General of India, and Sir Hugh Gough, afterwards Lord Gough, was the Commander-in-Chief of the army. A small number of troops was at once put in motion, say about 15,000 men, and marched from Umballa under his Lordship and Sir Hugh Gough. Orders had been given for all troops from the lower provinces to join them on the banks of the Sutlej. This small British force had scarcely arrived at Moodkee, some thirty miles from the frontier, when they were attacked by the enemy then but a short distance from the British camp. The day was declining, and the ground chosen by the Seikhs was covered with low brushwood so that the infantry alone could make any proper advance. The artillery and cavalry met with great difficulty, but still were able to attack the enemy. Here and there were large trees from the branches of which the enemy fired on our forces as they were passing underneath. The fighting on both sides was most desperate, and an English regiment of light dragoons suffered fearfully. As it was now getting dark both parties retired, but not before the enemy was put to flight.

The Catholic military chaplain attached to the British force was a Father Francis, a French priest. He accompanied an infantry regiment into the field of battle, and was in the midst of the carnage. At the foot of a tree he was in the act of hearing the confession of an Irish soldier who had been mortally wounded, when a body of English cavalry swept past, and one of the dragoons thinking the Rev. Father was a Seikh made a slashing cut at him with his sword and almost severed the head from the body. There was a real martyr of charity—dying in the confessional. The following day the priest was buried, together with many others, in the jungle. Immediately after the battle matters looked so serious that a council of war was held. Lord Hardinge thereupon made his will and despatched his son

with it to Calcutta, at the same time offering his services to the Commander-in-Chief as second in command. The English force then marched to Ferozeshah where the main body of the enemy was encamped. Terrible fighting ensued: but our forces held their own, and all slept that night on the bare ground, the enemy's artillery firing on them or rather over them. The ammunition of our artillery being exhausted some three or four batteries of horse artillery were despatched to Ferozepore for shot and shell, and some of the troops of the garrison then under command of General Litler. No sooner had the enemy seen the troops marching for Ferozepore than they thought they were about to be surrounded. Immediately panic seized the Seikhs and they fled, leaving nearly all their camp, equipage, and a great deal of treasure. The enemy, however, soon returned to their position and the British army marched for the Sutlej. The force under General Litler had left Ferozepore to meet that of the Commander-in-Chief.

Here I can give a short illustration in proof of what was alluded to in the beginning of these papers, that is, the general belief in the arrant cowardice of the Sepoy that he would never think of fighting against his masters. The general's division was attacked on its march by the Seikhs, and an English infantry regiment with a native regiment on each flank formed line and marched against the enemy. They had not proceeded beyond a few hundred yards when many officers and soldiers of her Majesty's — regiment fell to the ground shot dead, not from the front but from the rear. The general idea at once arose that they were surrounded by the enemy. They wheeled about and found the Sepoy regiments now right behind them, loading and firing they knew not where. Naturally there was great confusion, and the fiercest indignation was felt by the English soldiers, who with great difficulty were restrained from annihilating the two native regiments. It happened in this way: clouds of dust were raised by the Queen's Regiment charging at the double; the native regiments proceeded at a slower pace, one might say one step forward and two backward. Ultimately they

lost their proper place, became united, and on hearing firing in their front, loaded and fired where they could not see a single object before them.

Again I can adduce another specimen of the Sepoy's gallantry in the field of which I was an eye-witness. The whole of the British army, about forty thousand men, were now encamped on the left bank of the Sutlej, whilst the enemy occupied the other side. After some time a division of the Seikh army crossed the river at Sobraon, and threw up entrenchments for defence. This was the very thing the Commander-in-Chief wished for, as now he should not have to cross the river to attack them. When the enemy had made some considerable progress in their works and placed their heavy guns in position, Sir Hugh Gough called out a division of the army, when some artillery practice began on both sides. An advance of our forces followed, and some of the irregular native cavalry was ordered to the front to skirmish and also to bring in intelligence of the enemy's strength. One of the cavalry galloped back very soon; his horse was shot and dropped dead right in front of a native infantry regiment. There was no real danger to our forces at the time. This very native regiment was ordered to advance, more to show themselves to the enemy than for any more serious purpose; their marching was anything but soldier-like. It was no longer a straight line such as British troops keep in advancing in the field. No; such pushing and shouldering one another, one making a great effort to go forward, others acting in an opposite direction, such jabbering, quarrelling, abusing and cursing of one another, all presented a spectacle that was disgusting in the extreme.

After a short time the British force retired as if beaten, and the camp of the enemy resounded that night with great rejoicings as if they had been victorious. The whole affair was a ruse of Lord Gough's to draw over the river all the enemy's forces. He succeeded admirably. In fine at the battle of Sobraon a Sepoy who might get a slight scratch would fall down, and then many of his comrades would fall out of the ranks, as if to take care of him. Such was the

native soldier's courage before the mutiny, but during the revolt they certainly fought with much more spirit and determination.

As we are on the borders of the Punjaub, I should not omit some account of the providential escape of the nuns at Sealkote, about eighty miles from Lahore. What I am now about to write is from one of their number. On the 9th of July the native infantry and cavalry mutinied and killed several of their officers and other Europeans. A party of the rebels as early as half-past three o'clock, a.m., attacked the church and convent, plundering what was valuable, and destroying what they could not carry away. As soon as the alarm was given, the chaplain, an Italian Capuchin, went to the church to secure the Blessed Sacrament, which he brought to the affrighted nuns and children. They all surrounded the good priest, knowing that in the ciborium were contained their only arms, their only defence, their only hope, the meek and loving Jesus. Four times were the nuns and chaplain menaced by different parties. Each party seemed fully determined to kill the priest first of all. Five times did a naked sword touch his neck, but as many times the Most Adorable Sacrament, which he held up with unflinching faith, arrested the infidel hand. Thrice was a pistol pointed to his breast, but as often did the murderous hand fall powerless. The poor nuns were also threatened in a similar way, but with as little success. The rebels actually seemed not only frightened, but even stupified. A villain, however, was now seen actually carrying off one of the boarders, a girl of fourteen years, but she was soon rescued by the chaplain and superioress, who pursued the ruffian at the risk of their own lives. After the fourth attack, the Rev. Father and nuns thought it better to attempt an escape. They left the convent, and soon after found themselves in European society. But *how* they arrived at the place of refuge is to this day, a mystery to all. Their new retreat was soon discovered and surrounded by the rebels, from whom no quarter was to be expected, especially as the Brigadier of the Station, and other officers, were amongst the refugees. The

Brigadier was the first victim they fell upon and killed. Then the Protestant minister, his daughter, and several others of the party were all murdered. Here the work of carnage was arrested by the arrival of a fresh band of mutineers, carrying with them chests of treasure. The boxes were soon broken open, and thousands of rupees scattered on the ground. Ere long there was quarrelling about the distribution of the money. To the nuns this appeared an excellent opportunity to attempt a second flight, and a native soldier who was, strange to say, a Christian, generously offered them his services as a guide to the fort some six miles distant. No time was to be lost, so one and all at once accepted his kind offer. This poor soldier's property was afterwards destroyed, and he himself cruelly treated by the rebels after they discovered his act of charity. When about two miles from Sealkote, then in ruins, one of the nuns found herself separated from the main body; she was exhausted, naturally enough, as none of her party had tasted a morsel of food that day, and it was now three o'clock p.m. Considering the intense heat of the sun in July, and that the nuns had nothing to protect them from its scorching heat, but a bed sheet which each brought from the convent when leaving, it is most extraordinary that not one of them got a sunstroke. When it was discovered that one of the sisters was missing, their guide (fortunately he had a horse) galloped back in search of the lady. She had sat down on the road side faint and unconscious. On recovering from the swoon she rose and tried to walk on the burning sand, but fell again exhausted, at the same time offering her life in sacrifice to her God. At that moment the soldier arrived, and placing her before him on the horse, as she was too weak to ride alone soon overtook their party. Here an Irish soldier met them, and accompanied them to the fort. These very Sealkote rebels were afterwards cut to pieces by the British troops.

Our account would not be complete without some mention of Cawnpore, its massacres and wickedness which have been exaggerated by the incessant efforts of a gang of forgers, to excite English indignation to the highest point. If we but consult history we shall find not only that similar

atrocities, but even greater have been committed, without travelling further than Wexford and Drogheda. But we speak of it chiefly because there Ireland lost a generous-hearted son, and the Agra Mission an energetic, zealous, and excellent priest. The Rev. Joseph Rooney, born in Navan, County Meath, and the Rev. Nicholas Barry, from Wexford, arrived in Agra, in 1847, to establish and conduct English and classical schools in the Agra vicariate. Both Fathers were amongst the first fruits of All-Hallows' College, then presided over by the saintly Father Hand, assisted by his Lordship the present Bishop of Ardagh, and other worthy associates. As soon as St. Peter's College and St. Paul's Orphanage were firmly established in Agra, Fathers Barry and Rooney were sent by his Lordship Dr. Carli, to open a college at Manor-house, Murssooric, in the Himalayas, for the sons of officers and gentlemen. This place, now St. George's College, was the last residence in India of the present Maharajah Duleep Syng, of whom we heard lately in connection with his return to the Punjaub, of which kingdom he was the heir. As Father Rooney was now suffering from over-work, although much needed in the College, the Bishop sent him as military chaplain to Ferozepore. There he soon became very popular with both soldiers and officers. H. M. — Regiment had just returned after taking the fortress of Mooltan, and all were heavily laden with ingots of gold and silver; the chaplain was offered hundreds of these silver and golden bars, but would accept none of them. By degrees the Father made his flock think of their immortal souls. He got them to approach the sacraments, and every evening to assemble in the chapel for night prayers and Rosary.

Here I should mention that the conduct of the Irish soldier in India, as a rule, is not only good, but even edifying. Drop into a chapel, in any part of the north western provinces, in the middle of the day, and you will find some dozens of the soldiers saying the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin, but if in the evening, you will see hundreds of those brave fellows saying the Rosary in a voice of thunder. The colonel of the regiment alluded to—who was considered the bravest

of the brave, and proved himself to deserve the name at the battle of Sobraon, as well as afterwards as Brigadier during the Mutiny—would often tap the chaplain's shoulder, and say before officers and men: "Father Rooney, you are the colonel of the ——." After some time the good father's health was considerably impaired by hard work, and he had to resign his post. His Lordship then, owing to his state of health, gave him permission to return home for a few years, but to this he would not consent, and asked to be sent to some other station, whereupon the ill-fated Cawnpore was assigned to him. This was some time before the Mutiny broke out. When, however, there was no doubt of serious disaffection amongst the native army, in our frequent correspondence on the general state of matters he invariably appeared cheerful and resigned to the Holy Will of God. At length all communication was cut off from below Delhi, and it was only after the fall of that city that we learned the sad news of Cawnpore. Up to the present I have not been able to find out under what precise circumstances he met his death. That all, except one officer and three soldiers, were massacred is certain, and this officer in giving an account of his escape merely mentions that there was a priest in the entrenchments at Cawnpore.

I have already recorded the death of three priests of the Agra Missiou. One on the battle field, the other two killed in the Mutiny, all at their posts like true servants of their Divine Master. There is still a fourth whom I should not omit to mention, the Very Rev. Father Adrodatus, an Italian Capuchin, who was the whole time in the Presidency with Sir Henry Lawrence and the other Europeans in Lucknow. He had an assistant with him, a Father Bernard of the same Order, and I cannot describe the invaluable spiritual assistance and consolation the two Fathers afforded the besieged during their weary, anxious, and painful captivity. On the garrison being relieved both Rev. Fathers left for Cawnpore with the other Europeans, under a strong British escort. But the journey was too much for the venerable old man, after his fifty years of missionary work in India,

and he died mid-way between Lucknow and Cawnpore. Truly he might say with St. Paul: "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith."—*St Paul ii. Tim. iv., 7.*

I shall now conclude in the remarkable words of Dr. Russell on British rule in India. He writes in his diary as follows:—


"That force is the base of our rule I have no doubt, for I see nothing else but force employed in our relations with the governed. The efforts to improve the condition of the people are made by bodies or individuals who have no connection with the Government. The action of the Government in matters of improvement is only excited by consideration of revenue. Does it, as the great instructor of the people, the exponent of our superior morality and civilization—does it observe treaties, show itself moderate and just, and regardless of gain? Are not our courts of law condemned by ourselves? Are they not admitted to be a curse and a blight upon the country? In effect, the grave unhappy doubt which settles on my mind is, whether India is the better for our rule, so far as regards the social condition of the great mass of the people. We have put down widow burning, we have sought to check infanticide, but I have travelled hundreds of miles through a country peopled with beggars, and covered with wigwam villages."

WILLIAM BRADY.

THE "MATERIA PRIMA" OF SCHOLASTICISM.

A FEW remarks on this subject may interest the readers of the RECORD. The schoolmen have borrowed the theory of *materia prima* or primary matter from Aristotle. Some of them consider it as capable of demonstration; others only as a probable opinion, or a plausible hypothesis. I have no intention of entering into this question. I leave its discussion to abler hands. My task is less pretentious; it is simply that of exposition. I will adhere closely to the teaching of the Thomistic School.

Primary Matter, then, according to the Aristotelian system of Philosophy, is one of the constituent elements of every corporeal substance. But what is the nature of this element?



The words of Aristotle, translated into Latin are these:—*Materia non est quid, nec quantum, nec quale nec aliquid eorum per quae ens determinatur.* *Non est quid*, it is not anything complete in itself, *nec est quantum*, it is not quantity, *nec quale*, nor is it quality, *nec aliquid eorum per quae ens determinatur*, nor is it any of those things which fix the nature of a being. Of itself it is nothing, can do nothing; it has no essence, no existence, no independence. It is intangible, invisible, it eludes every attempt of the senses to grasp it. It may indeed be imagined as a kind of elastic stuff spread through the universe, a material out of which everything is made. But such efforts of the imagination are apt to be misleading and ought perhaps to be discouraged, unless indeed we use them as aids to forming a right notion of our subject. It is the mind alone that may properly conceive primary matter as being the basis of all physical nature, the substratum of all the changes that are constantly taking place around us. We understand it to be an undefinable something which underlies those changes from one state of being to another, which itself remaining the same, is perpetually putting on and casting off a form in some part or other of the material world. We know, so the schoolmen speak, that it is ever assuming new modes of existence and is in this respect so changeable that it has been compared to Proteus. For everything it is or has, it is indebted to its form. For union with the latter it has a natural craving; it seeks an alliance and, having obtained it, settles down in a fixed habitation. If considered apart from its form, it must be regarded somewhat as a wanderer, undetermined what to be or what to do. In this sense it may be viewed as unlimited, unfettered; but these epithets, which sound so well, reflect no credit upon matter. They merely imply that it is without ability for anything. It loses its claim to these fine titles as soon as it is united to its form. It loses in one sense, but only in name, it gains in every other. No form comes amiss to it. Though this is most true, yet certain proprieties must be strictly observed. As there are forms of various kinds and grades of excellence, so matter should be variously prepared, elaborated, fashioned

and finished in order to their reception. The form of such things as have only being, say a stone, is satisfied with the rudest sort of preparation. I do not speak of a stone as it afterwards may be polished by art or by an after process of nature itself, but I speak of it as it comes forth a fresh original production. The form of such a thing being itself of lowly extraction is content with matter though it be in a corresponding lowly condition. But when we ascend to plants, trees, and other living things, a more complex development is requisite. When we reach higher still and come to animals, we perceive that their forms demand not only all that has gone before, but in addition an organism exactly fitted to be an instrument of the manifold functions which they discharge. Next appears man with his organism differing from the organism of all other animals; not only differing from it, but surpassing it; surpassing it, we may hold, in kind as well as in degree, and having a delicacy of finish and elaborateness of detail which have ever excited the admiration of philosophic minds. Nothing less exquisitely moulded could be a fitting receptacle for the human form which is a spiritual substance, a rational soul. These modifications of matter are produced by the agencies of nature, otherwise named efficient causes. When matter is thus suitably prepared, it is joined to its form and is an essential part of the compounds produced. Matter is not only useful to them but it is indispensable, not only an ornament to them but it is of their very essence. Without matter such compounds are impossible; they cannot come into being at all. This is why St. Thomas and Aristotle say that it is their material cause. It is the material cause also of their existence; nay more it is the material cause of the existence even of the form itself. *Materia est causa formae, id est, ejus causa materialis. Materia est causa entis corporei.* Statements, identical with these, if not in words, at least in sense, may be frequently met in the works of St. Thomas. And it must be confessed at first they are apt to startle one, for they have a materialistic savour around them. Still they are perfectly free from such a taint, as will readily appear if they are interpreted in the light of what has been advanced in

these pages. They must always be understood of primary matter.

But they attribute to it no efficiency whatsoever. They simply and invariably mean that matter is a necessary part of a material compound. When thus explained they are like axioms, of which there are many. I will give one more: "*Formae educuntur de potentia materiae.*" "Forms are an outcome of the potentiality of matter," or "forms are extracted from the resources of matter." Each of these translations favours the modern doctrine of evolution, but then both are utterly wrong. I will offer an easy and correct one. Forms presuppose in matter a capacity to receive them, and are produced, because that capacity exists. Primary matter being so imperfect itself is also a source and origin of imperfection to other things. Not that it can exert an active influence over them; for it is without energy; it is the principle of the *vis inertiae* of things; but since they are certain developments which are grounded upon matter, and which cannot exist without it, they follow its lines, and partake of the imperfection which is inherent in it. One of these, of which only I will speak, is *quantitas dimensiva*, or *measurable quantity*. This has a twofold imperfection consisting in a twofold limitation. One as to place, the other as to time. It cannot exist at once in two places. It is sluggish and inert; it is incapable of self-motion; and when it is moved by something else, time is required, not unfrequently much time between its leaving one term and reaching another. But here some difficulty may arise. I implied above, that the illimitation of matter is an imperfection, and now I state that the limitation of quantity is the same.

Can two opposite characteristics excluding each other be causes of imperfection? They may from opposite stand-points, just as an unlimited power for evil and a limited power for good are both imperfect. But the difficulty is not altogether removed. For how can quantity, which is limited be built, as I have said, upon matter unlimited, as upon its natural basis. In this case what affinity is there between the limited and unlimited? There is this. Every limitation is a step towards nothingness. For a limitation is the

privation or negation of something and nothingness is the privation or negation of everything. Now matter is in the nearest stage to nothingness for it implies privation of every kind excepting only a positive capacity for being or existence. We need not then wonder if quantity is constructed upon it as its natural foundation. I will beg the reader to note that this reason is given not to maintain such a construction but as an answer to the objection raised against its possibility. Quantity is an extension by parts, not indeed of matter which is incapable of being extended, but of a substance which has a material nature. It performs two functions. One is to extend by parts in such a way, that each one of them shall be outside any other, while neither the substance nor its quantity may fill space or occupy a place. Another function is to extend by parts in such a way that they shall have relation to place. This distinction may be more clearly understood if I illustrate it by an example. Let me suppose then the existence of a block of timber that has been sawed into several planks, having a fixed length, breadth, and thickness, or in other words certain dimensions. Let me now suppose these boards to be plunged into water and submerged in it. Then I may see that a certain quantity of water is displaced, that a certain quantity of it touches the wood, adheres to it all round, and that the dimensions of all correspond. In this case St. Thomas would say that the dimensions of the wood were contained by the dimensions of the water which surrounds it and were measured by them (*Dimensiones corporis quod est in loco continentur et mensurantur dimensionibus loci vel corporis ambientis*). It is evident that quantity in this position would be measurable and the water would supply a means of measurement. Let me now, on the contrary, suppose, if it be possible, no contact whatever between the particles of wood and those of the water in which it is sunk. Given this supposition to be a reality, no water would be displaced by the wood for want of any contact between them, nor would there be any proportion between the extent of the one and the surface of the other that might appear to surround it. The extent or dimensions of either could bear no comparison with those of the other;

nor could the terms *greater* or *less* be predicated of one in reference to the other. St. Thomas should now say that the above-mentioned wood fills no space, but exists in a point. It is, however, still measurable, for it has parts and dimensions one of which excludes another. And if we have no instrument keen or delicate enough for the purpose, the disadvantage is ours. Doubtless an angel might easily supply one.

But even we ourselves are able to distinguish or separate in thought one effect of quantity from the other, and what we may do in thought, God, by his absolute power, may do in real nature. He may *really* separate the two effects of quantity and suspend one without suspending the other. This suspension would be miraculous, and the miracle is actually wrought in the Sacrament of the Eucharist. For it is an article of Faith that the entire body of our Lord is really present under the consecrated Host, while St. Thomas and other theologians teach that the whole measurable quantity of His body is there also. Nor does the reality of this presence depend in any way upon the larger or smaller dimensions of the Sacred Host. (See St. Thomas on the Eucharist, *Summa*, Art. 4, Quest. 76). I have already spoken of two results of quantity. I will now speak of a third which is to cause numerical distinction between beings of the same species. Nothing in the ordinary sense can be divided unless it has parts; nor can anything have the parts here meant without quantity; nor is quantity possible without matter. Again, multiplication follows division, and whereas there is only one unit at first, they come to be several units afterwards; we may number them one, two, three, and so on. Numerical multiplication then, or its equivalent, numerical distinction, is due, first to division, next to quantity, thirdly to matter. Now in the angels there is neither matter nor quantity, and this is a reason why St. Thomas holds that the distinction between them is not numerical but specific. Each individual belongs to a different species, as there are myriads of angels so there are myriads of angelical species. I said above that matter and its attendants are closely allied to imperfection. This being so, the word itself and its derivations are employed in the schools to express or imply something which has its

shortcomings, something of no consequence, something unimportant to the question at issue, and which ought therefore to be overlooked. I request the reader's particular attention to the remarkable contrast between the English and scholastic usage of the word. "What is the matter?" is a question of serious import. "Nothing at all," is an answer which has often been welcomed with a positive sense of relief. Again a material witness in a case is one without whom the trial cannot proceed. Next, a material circumstance in an event is one upon which the judgment of it will greatly depend. Lastly, a material point in an argument, is that without which it loses the whole or a great part of its force. Had a schoolman been writing he would not have used the word "matter" in any of these connections. Had he used it, his meaning would have been not alone different, but diametrically opposite. It would be almost impossible to exaggerate the wide divergence in meaning of the same words occurring in scholastic and modern phraseology. I will conclude with two or three short extracts bearing on the general subject from the *Summa* of St. Thomas. In the first part, Quest. 4, A. 1st, he writes thus: "*Primum principium materiale imperfectissimum est.*" Quest. 3, A. 2nd, he proves that God is not compounded of matter and form, "Omne compositum ex materia et forma est corpus; quantitas enim dimensiva est quae primo inhaeret materiae. Sed Deus non est corpus. Ergo, &c.

"Omne compositum ex materia et forma est perfectum et bonum per suam formam; unde oportet quod sit bonum per participationem, secundum quod materia participat formam. Primum autem quod est bonum et optimum, quod Deus est, non est bonum per participationem; quia bonum per essentiam prius est bono per participationem. Unde impossibile est quod Deus sit compositus ex materia et forma."

I will venture on a paraphrase of these arguments, which may not be unacceptable. Every compound of matter and form is a body; for measurable quantity, found in all bodies, is the first modification inherent in a compound, on the side of matter; but God is not a body, therefore, &c.

The terms, perfect and good, are equivalent with this

distinction; that a thing is named perfect because it fulfils the end of its production; it is named good because it is an object of desire to the will. Now the goodness or perfection of a compound is derived from its form, not from its matter which is good only in so far as it shares in the goodness of the form. Besides one thing is said to be prior to another when on it the other depends. Therefore in the line of goodness or perfection, the form of a compound is prior to it. Likewise anything good from the exigency of its nature is prior to what is good only by participation, as the former bestows a part of its goodness upon the latter. For the latter obtains its goodness from a second, the second from a third, and so computing backwards. But as this process cannot go on forever, we come at last to something having goodness not borrowed, but having it of and from itself, the cause of goodness in the rest, and thus prior to all of them. Such is God. But if he were a compound of matter and form, he would not be prior to his form, which is a contradiction. Therefore he is not such a compound.

I hope I have for the present said enough on a difficult subject. St. Augustine, addressing God in the 12th book of his *Confessions*, thus writes about it: *Tu eras et aliud nihil unde fecisti coelum et terram, duo quaedam; unum prope te, alterum prope nihil; unum quo superior tu esses, alterum quo inferius nihil esset.* The first clause has been understood of the angels; the second of primary matter.

T. J. DEELY, O.P.

THEOLOGICAL QUESTIONS.

ABSOLUTION FROM HERESY.

“May I trouble you to let me have your views in reference to the course to be adopted when those who are only guilty of material heresy are to be received into the Church? Not being guilty of formal heresy they have not incurred the excommunication which is reserved “*speciali modo Romano Pontifici.*” Father O’Kane, however, when describing Absolution from heresy, says c. 5. No. 468 that “the practice is to deal with all converts from heretical sects, as if they

had incurred the reserved excommunication," and Kenrick is quoted by him as stating that the Church does not acknowledge *in foro externo* the distinction between "material" and "formal" which would exempt from the reserved censure anyone living in a heretical Communion, and consequently that faculties should be got in every case from the ordinary for receiving such converts. There are others who act differently and in the case in which the heresy is merely material receive all comers irrespective of the Bishop. Which is right?

"P.P."

"Would you kindly answer the following questions in next number of I. E. RECORD.

(1.) "Does the first of the excommunications specially reserved to the Pope affect any persons except those who reject the *Confessio Fidei Catholicae*?"

(2.) "I have read in Craisson that Bishops can without special faculties absolve from heresy if brought before their *forum*. If so what additional jurisdiction does the *Formula Sexta* confer?"

"VICARIUS."

I. Heresy is commonly defined to be a voluntary and pertinacious error in regard to some truths or truth of *Catholic faith* in one who professes the Christian religion. Apostasy, which implies in technical knowledge a total rejection of Christianity, does not of course, escape the severe punishments visited from ancient times on those who rebel against God and His Church. Here, however, we are concerned with heresy alone, and with it only so far as the penalty of excommunication extends.

II. To incur the stain of heresy and the penalty of excommunication which is annexed to it, the doctrine rejected must belong to the Confession of Catholic faith. However one may sin by denying a doctrine which he considers to be revealed, or which is *next to being of faith*, or that is a *theological conclusion*, the unenviable name of heretic is not given until he has knowingly rejected a dogma which the Church commands her children to believe as the revealed word of God. The crime of heresy implies a rejection of that public faith which the Catholic Church, as an organised society, openly professes.

III. For formal heresy this denial of dogma must be *per-*

tinacious. Hence one is excused by reason of inculpable ignorance. Nay, it is not every voluntary error, injurious to faith, that constitutes formal heresy. A person holding wrong doctrine may be guilty of grave sin in neglecting to inquire about doubts that occur to him, and yet not commit the offence of which we speak, or incur the penalty thereto attached. *Gross* or even *affected* ignorance excuses from both. In short a person is not a formal heretic until he deliberately rejects a dogma of Catholic faith after it has been duly proposed for his acceptance. For to err *per-tinaciously* is to err knowingly, freely, deliberately.

IV. This much is enough for the crime, but not for the censure. To incur excommunication specially reserved to the Pope the delinquent must give outward expression to his erroneous judgment. Words are not needed, nor witnesses: but the act must be a *human* act declarative of heresy. Hence a denial of the Real Presence in a person's sleep, however publicly made, will not suffice.

V. Who can absolve from heresy? If it be merely *internal* there is no reservation. External heresy is or is not occult. If not occult, either it has or has not been brought before the bishop's *forum externum*.

Now the power granted to bishops in Chapter "Licet," of the Council of Trent, to absolve from occult heresy *in foro conscientiae*, no longer exists. That it was withdrawn by the Bulla *in Cena Domini* canonists more commonly hold. That it does not continue after the publication of the Constitution, "Apostolicæ Sedis" is absolutely certain.

Still, according to our best writers, the crime of heresy is not entirely beyond the range of a bishop's ordinary powers at present. For when notorious, if brought before his external tribunal, he may, *as a general rule*, reconcile the person interested to the Church, if he be duly disposed, and absolve him from excommunication, or even consign him to an ordinary confessor for absolution, after he himself has received the abjuration. In this latter event absolution *in tribunali Poenitentiae* will avail for both forms.

The importance of the power here in question is manifest, when it is remembered that Protestants who come before a

bishop to renounce their errors thereby bring their case sufficiently before his external tribunal for the jurisdiction to exist. This power may be termed either ordinary or quasi-ordinary.

VI. Our bishops, however, are provided with ample delegated faculties to absolve from heresy whether occult or public. In the *Formula VI^a*. this offence and the censure annexed to it are subjected to their jurisdiction, with some slight reservations which we need not here state. One of our respected correspondents asks what does the *Formula Sexta* add to the ordinary powers of bishops over heresy, as described by Craisson. Well, besides the additional security, by reason of it a person who has been guilty of occult external heresy may obtain absolution without either going to Rome, or making his offence *notorious* by bringing it before the public tribunal of the bishop. Obviously in the absence of quinquennial faculties he could have no escape from this inconvenient dilemma.

VII. It is now time to deal directly with our first correspondent's letter. We consider Fr. O'Kane's opinion to be the correct one. Many converts from Protestantism may, no doubt, in reality be free from this censure, and may therefore be already partakers *in foro interno* of those spiritual advantages of which it deprives such as have incurred it. Some of them were *bona fide*, some were doubtfully baptized, and some were not aware of the censure. Any one of these is an excusing cause. How then can absolution from reserved excommunication be necessary when a convert is received? The answer is plain enough. In order to dispense with absolution in a particular case we must be assured on competent authority that one of the excusing causes is available. This point is essential in every individual case. But, apart from delegated Inquisitors, the only person in a diocese who is competent by law to give any such assurance is the Bishop. He is *ex officio*, under the Pope, the *custos fidei* and the *jude hereticæ pravitatis* in his diocese. Accordingly he alone can *jure ordinario* pronounce *in causa hæreseos*, and declare authoritatively that one of the excusing causes exists. Hence he must be consulted in any case. Now it is as easy

for himself or his delegate to give absolution from censures, at least conditionally, as to investigate the question of their possible existence.

No doubt the opposite course has been sometimes followed in this country and elsewhere. But the procedure here advocated seems, apart from custom, to be the only one in conformity with law. From the fact that the bishop is judge of heresy it follows that the question of censures, the existence of proper dispositions for outwardly joining the Catholic community, as well as abjuration of errors and profession of Catholic faith, are points which *ex natura rei* belong for investigation to his office.

Moreover, *in foro externo*, the Church deals with converts as if they had incurred excommunication. What wonder? They have publicly belonged to a body which publicly rejects her confession of faith. *In foro externo*, which deals, not with the interior of men's hearts, but with the exterior of their outward lives, every presumption is against them. Being Christians the law inclines towards considering them liable to the obligations that follow from Baptism; and on the other hand the Church cannot go on the supposition that her marks are not clear, or her laws not known. The *onus probandi* is thus thrown on those who allege freedom from censure, and the public good at all times required that none but the clearest evidence should set aside this adverse legal presumption. Hence, though in theory excusing causes are admissible, the practice most convenient for all parties has been to deal *in foro externo* with converts from the various sects, as if they had been excommunicated.

THE KIND OF DOMICILE REQUIRED FOR RECEIVING ORDERS FROM EPISCOPUS DOMICILII.

“A Subscriber is anxious to know how far it is true that the Bishop of a person's domicile may confer orders upon him. What precisely constitutes a domicile for orders?”

“ADVENA.”

I. The *Episcopus proprius* for conferring orders or granting dimissorial letters is either *Episcopus originis*, *Episcopus*

domicilii, *Episcopus beneficii* or *Episcopus familie*. A prelate who happens to be any one of these is competent to ordain the person in question. Nay, in the absence of fraud one is allowed by common law, for a reasonable cause, to seek different orders from different bishops. Obviously, however, an arrangement may be freely made, which will bind a person exclusively to the prelate from whom he receives his first grades or dimissorial letters for orders. In that event his liberty of selection ceases, of course, to exist.

II. For the *Episcopus domicilii* as distinguished from the *Episcopus originis* to be an *Episcopus proprius* much is required beyond what constitutes an ordinary domicile. In the first place, a person should have been in habitation for ten years, or otherwise must have transferred the greater part of his property to his new abode and been in residence for such a *considerable period* as will evidence an intention of remaining *permanently*. Three years are thought to suffice for this purpose, but the Bishop is judge in the matter. Secondly, in either case the person is supposed to take an oath that he does in reality purpose remaining there for life.

I.—CAPACITY OF IDIOTS FOR THE SACRAMENTS.

What is the smallest amount of capacity that would be required in imbeciles to admit them to the Sacraments of Penance and the Eucharist? Persons of variously impaired intellects are often found in the idiot-wards of workhouses or elsewhere in an extensive parish whom it is difficult to know how to treat. Their religious training is generally neglected by their own friends, and they may not be brought under a priest's notice until far beyond the years of discretion. Many of them will forget to-day what you taught them yesterday. Yet they have reason enough to recognise a priest, or a friend, or a sacred place, but seem incapable of retaining in their memories the principal mysteries, or any save a meagre knowledge of good or evil. How far may you presume on their religious knowledge in giving either conditional or absolute absolution—and at what intervals may you give it? Would it be a violation of the *Sigillum* in such cases to tell their friends after confession that you had prepared them for Communion. If not they may sometimes go of their own accord without being to Confession.

II.—CONSENT OF PARENTS IN MARRIAGE.

Theologians state that children in getting married require, for the licity of the Sacrament, to have the consent of their parents, and if they marry without it and have not sufficient cause they are guilty of mortal sin. What would be considered a case sufficient to excuse them? Many children of poor parents especially will not on any account tell them, chiefly to avoid the noise they often raise on it. If the parties are keeping company and are committing, or are in great danger of sin—or if they are not residing in their parents' homes and are of full age, may a priest in these or similar circumstances marry them without requiring such consent? I presume that the bans have been dispensed with.

I.

Our respected correspondent in his first question puts as many important queries as can well be packed into the space he covers. At the same time his concise statement of the whole difficulty enables us to give our replies without any further explanation.

1°. What knowledge of the Blessed Eucharist must simpletons possess before being admitted to receive it? A distinction is to be drawn between the time of death and all other occasions. Outside the reception of the Viaticum, the persons with whom we are dealing must have some *actual* knowledge of the Adorable Sacrament. He must be able to distinguish our Lord's Body from ordinary bread. If he has this capacity he may receive not merely at Easter, but occasionally during the year, according as his knowledge is more or less perfect. At the hour of death, it will be enough if this imperfect understanding existed at some previous time and there be no danger of irreverence. For a person so circumstanced the Holy Eucharist may be very needful, and a respectful disposition towards it at a previous time may be construed to express an explicit desire of receiving the Viaticum at the last moment.

2°. What knowledge is required for penance? It is necessary that the person should be able to distinguish between good and evil and to elicit the supernatural acts that are indispensable in penitents before absolution. This

knowledge and these acts are supposed to be somewhat imperfect. Still if the confessor can make up his mind that a penitent of impaired intellect is able to distinguish even in a feeble way between good and evil, and that he can similarly elicit an act of supernatural sorrow, we think Reuter's recommendation of giving absolution once a month is perfectly safe. Moreover if there were danger that a particular penitent had incurred the guilt of mortal sin, it would be right to absolve him irrespective of this monthly rule. But when the capacity of the penitent for such knowledge and acts, is, as our correspondent supposes, only probable, absolution should be given chiefly *in articulo mortis*, in preparation for the Paschal Communion, and when the person confesses a sin that may have been mortal. In this hypothesis the conditional form is always used.

3°. How should persons of impaired intellect know the necessary mysteries before being admitted to the Sacraments? We mean those mysteries, explicit belief in which is a *necessary means* of salvation. Well, two points deserve attention in dealing with this aspect of the case of simpletons. In the first place it is not, strictly speaking, required that they be able to state accurately what the revealed doctrine is when interrogated. It is enough if they have understood the truths and given them supernatural assent. No doubt a statement of the mystery is the ordinary guarantee that it has been believed. But it is also not impossible that a weak mind may become confused or blank as soon as it attempts to give expression to doctrine it has freely grasped. Secondly, a more important point is that actual knowledge of these truths is, strictly speaking, essential only so far as acts of faith are necessary. Not knowledge but *actual faith* constitutes the *indispensable means* of salvation for an adult who has come to the use of reason. Without supernatural assent the most profound understanding is of no avail; and knowledge is indispensable only so far as the act of faith, which cannot be elicited without it, is an absolute necessity.

Obviously, indeed, a person who knows the Sacraments sufficiently for their reception, will as a rule have equal knowledge of the mysteries. But the contrary is possible.

Hence on the principles just explained one should not hesitate to give at intervals the Sacraments to an old man who in his dotage is hazy about those necessary truths, which years before he believed with the assent of a clear mind. The same rule we would apply to simpletons if it be really probable that either now or a previous time they give or gave the assent of faith to the mysteries in question. One should also take into account the probability of explicit faith in the Trinity and Redemption not being absolutely necessary means of salvation, especially as these are the mysteries which half idiots more commonly fail to hold.

We need not add that in all these cases before giving the Sacraments great efforts should be put forth to instruct and dispose the poor subjects who are to receive them. By getting them to repeat acts of explicit faith and sorrow the proper dispositions will be much surer than they otherwise could be.

4°. Where a penitent is commonly known to be a simpleton, a confessor using due caution, can state to the person's relatives whether he is or is not to go to Communion, without either violating the *Sigillum* or bringing any odium on the confessional. But if in a particular case a priest thought his action might be misconstrued, it would be better for him to arrange to have a conversation outside the confessional with his penitent on the religious matters they have been considering. No one can object if on this occasion the penitent is asked about those religious truths which Christians should hold, seeing that the individual's capacity and, consequently, his obligations are not certain from time to time.

II.

We take the liberty of referring our correspondent to St. Liguori L. V., N. 849, &c, as being very full on most points contained in his second question. St. Alphonsus there states at length four opinions in regard to the duty of children to procure their parents' consent before marriage. From what he says we may conclude that apart from extrinsic circumstances, and looking only to the bonds of filial obedience and reverence, the obligation is probably not

grave. It is these external considerations that for certain render the omission either mortally sinful or absolutely free from guilt. Our respected correspondent can therefore infer that the reasons he alleges may suffice to exempt from the obligation where parents are so disposed that they will resist the union from motives of much less weight. He has mentioned the case of a person living apart from father and mother. Well, although *per se* this is not enough to exempt him, *per accidens* owing to his having lived apart from and independently of them for a long time, and at a distance, or for a similar cause, he may be excused.

P. O'D.

THE CHURCH ABROAD.

The religious history of the Canton of Geneva in Switzerland during the last fifteen years presents a picture of Catholic resistance to State oppression which deserves to be recorded in these pages. It was the counterpart of the Culturkampf and a re-enactment of all that was done in Germany. The motives of the persecutions were the same. The means devised were similar. The arguments and methods of the enemies of the Church were of the same insidious and intolerable character. The resistance of the Catholics was also just as determined, and the success of Leo XIII. in effecting a settlement was more complete, if less complicated than that which has just been made between the Church and the German Empire.

The following short sketch of the events that took place around Geneva, since the Vatican Council was held, may therefore be of some interest to a few at least of the readers of the RECORD.

The first assembly of old Catholics that met in Switzerland was held at Olten, on the 1st of December, 1872. It was presided over by the Prussian Reinkens, whom Bismarck had created Bishop of the schism. It was attended by a hundred and fifty delegates, and the following resolutions were passed.

1st. To use every effort to induce the parishes, municipalities and local government assemblies, to protest against the Infallibility of the Pope and against the "Syllabus."

2nd. To make overtures to the Cantonal governments to secure liberal ecclesiastics in every parish.

3rd. To admit foreign bishops to perform episcopal functions in Switzerland.

4th. To ask the federal government to dismiss the Papal Nuncio.

5th. To apply to the federal assembly for assistance in the effort to "democratize" and to "nationalize" the Church in Switzerland.

From Olten Reinkens went to preach at Soleure, at Basle, and at Lucerne. In the last mentioned city he spoke in the Protestant Church having been refused admittance into any Catholic place of worship. Later on, Herzog, who was afterwards to be consecrated, came to the assistance of Reinkens and installed, at Porrentruy, the apostate Pipy. The first pastoral of Reinkens was read in the Church of St. Germain, at Geneva, by the ex-Carmelite Hyacinthe Løyson, so that the official organ of the Council of State, *La Patrie* was able to declare in 1872 :—"Henceforward Germany and the 'old Catholics' of Switzerland go hand in hand in the fight against Roman Catholicism."

In their various missions through the country the Schismatics were seconded and encouraged by the German Ambassador at Berne, M. de Roeder, who pronounced an official discourse in Geneva, in 1873, and two others at the opening of Protestant temples in Freyburg and Sion in 1875. This quasi-religious diplomatist generally took as the keynote of his homilies the words written by Prince Bismarck to Count Arnheim in 1871.

"The bishops have become in the eyes of every government the functionaries of a foreign Sovereign, and a Sovereign who in virtue of his infallibility is completely absolute, more absolute than any monarch in the world."

Such was the general disposition of mind which prevailed through a large number of Cantons or rather which prevailed in the official circles of these Cantons: for the governing bodies were elected on a jerrymandered system, which was altogether unjust to the Catholic population. At all events the Council of State or local governing body in the Canton of Geneva was composed almost exclusively of Protestants and Freemasons, and it was this worthy body which acting under the most sinister influences from outside undertook the work of introducing new legislation for the Catholics of the Canton. The life and soul of this Cantonal Assembly, and of the Executive Council of State at Geneva was M. Carteret, a man who deserves to be mentioned as one of the bitterest and most uncompromising enemies of the Church that the present century has produced. Under his guidance the following decrees were passed by

the Cantonal Council and sanctioned by the Federal Government of Berne.

1st. The parish priests and curates shall be elected by the Catholic citizens inscribed on the roll of the municipal franchise. They may be dismissed or removed by the Council of State.

2nd. The bishop of the diocese must be recognised by the State, and cannot delegate his power without the approbation of the Council of State.

3rd. The law shall determine the number and the limits of parishes, the forms and conditions of the election of priests, the oath which they are to take on entering upon their functions, the organisation of the councils to be charged with the temporal administration of parishes, &c., &c.

Each of these articles was interpreted by sections and sub-sections introducing details that were naturally intolerable and, if possible, more incompatible than the primary clauses with liberty of conscience. One of these was the oath which all parish priests and curates were called upon to take.

“I swear before God to conform strictly to the constitutional and legislative dispositions regarding the organisation of Catholic worship and to observe all the cantonal and federal decrees relating thereto.”

It was in vain that Messrs. de Montfalcon and Veuilleret protested on the part of the Catholics. The former quoted the words which Dr. Döllinger himself once spoke in the old parliament of Frankfort.

“I wished to say that the principles of ecclesiastical organisation belong to the domain of dogma; that dogma and the constitution cannot be separated in our Catholic Church; and now I allow you to draw from that the necessary conclusion as to what is meant when we are told that the Church requires a radical change and should be reformed in all grades of government.”

In like manner M. de Pressensé, himself a Protestant, wrote in 1874 (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, April 16th).

“No one will deny that Catholicism thus remodelled is no longer what we knew hitherto by that name. It is in reality according to the formula of the oath, the Catholic worship of the Republic, that is to say, a new religion altogether.”

All protestations were fruitless and the iniquitous decrees became the law of the land. It is to the honour of the clergy of Geneva that not one was found amongst them under this heavy trial to betray the honour and the duty of the priesthood. Every one of

them signed the indignant protest which was presented to the Council of State, the refrain of which was "Potius mori quam foedari." In this protest they were joined by all the leading Catholics in the city and throughout the canton. Then came the sad days of violence and tyranny. The Federal Council of Berne sustained the Cantonal Council in the work of bigotry and sacrilege. The Papal Nuncio or Chargé d'Affaires was expelled from Switzerland. Mgr. Mermillod who had recently been appointed assistant to the venerable Mgr. Marilley, Bishop of Geneva, was sent into exile. The Brief of Pope Pius IX. condemning "les lois du schisme" as they were called, and excommunicating any priest or false minister who recognised them or submitted to them, was burnt in the streets.

This Brief, however, was read by the faithful priests to their parishioners who received it with enthusiasm and pledged themselves to support at any cost the pastor appointed by Mgr. Mermillod. The brave priests of the Swiss Canton stood shoulder to shoulder, but a small band of renegade ecclesiastics from France and Germany came forward, like wolves, to seize the prey that was offered them by the Council of State. A ridiculous form of election was gone through in which half the Protestants of the district were allowed to vote, and Loyson, Risse, Marchal, Quily, Pacherot, Pelissier, Vergoin, and several other apostates, were declared elected pastors of the Catholic parishes. These men were, as Cardinal Guibert expressed it, "the refuse of the clergy of France, men who had lost all self-respect, as well as all faith, who were looked upon as religious and moral outcasts in the country of their birth." To these were delivered up the keys of the Catholic churches. The venerable priests who had remained faithful to every duty were dragged forth and the intruders installed in their place. The people protested energetically but were overcome by the presence of whole regiments of soldiers drafted for this noble service. Every honour was conferred upon those renegades by the Calvinistic aristocracy of Geneva, large numbers of whom flocked to their sermons and filled up the churches vacated by the faithful Catholics. Bribes of all kinds were held out, as usual, to induce the poor to betray their faith, but the few that proved false, were regarded with such universal horror and contempt that others were deterred from following their example. Any Catholic official who refused to conform to the new order of things was dismissed.

Church after church was besieged and taken. It was a sore trial to the poor Catholics every time they saw their places of worship,

their schools and their burial-grounds, profaned by innumerable sacrileges. A league was formed amongst them under the name of "Union des Campagnes," and the spirit of this league can be judged from the canticle which was sung with enthusiasm at all their gatherings.

Sous les tyrans et la tempête
 Nous ne courberons pas la tête,
 Nous unirons nos coeurs, nos bras,
 La foi transporte les montagnes,
 Enfants, l'Union des campagnes
 Est forte et ne se rendra pas.

Dieu qu'adoraient nos pères
 Nous garderons ta loi.
 Jurons, jurons, mes frères
 De mourir pour la foi.

Parmi nous, il n'est pas de traître
 Et Judas qui vendait son maître
 Eût de même trahi César,
 Nous abhorrons la tyrannie,
 Mais les deniers de l'infamie
 Sont à vous seuls ! Chacun sa part !

Dieu qu'adoraient nos pères
 Nous garderons ta loi.
 Jurons, jurons, mes frères
 De mourir pour la foi.

Such lively protestations kept up the spirit of the persecuted Catholics; yet the infamous work was carried to all extremes. There is a church at Geneva, bearing the title of Notre Dame, which certainly was not municipal property, and which hitherto had not been looked upon as being in any way subject to municipal authority, differing in this from all the churches in the Canton. It is a superb edifice of the purest Gothic, the building of which cost over a million francs. This immense sum was collected by Genevese priests all over Europe. Subscriptions were given liberally not only by the bishops and priests and Catholics of Switzerland, but also by French, Belgian, Italian, and German sympathizers. Amongst the most generous donors were the Emperor and Empress of Austria, the Emperor Napoleon III., King Victor Emmanuel, the Comte de

Chambord and Queen Amélie, wife of Louis Philippe; several Princes of Bavaria and Saxony, Comte de Maistre, Comte de Riancourt, Duc de Brabant, Père Lacordaire, M. de Partalès, M. de Rochejaquelein, the Duchesse de Laval-Montmorency, the Comtesse De la Serraz and de Fégély, Lord Denbigh, Lord Gainsborough, and a host of other distinguished Catholics all over Europe. This noble monument of European piety was not spared any more than the humble little churches in the country, and was delivered up to the sacrilegious comedy of State worship introduced by the new apostles. Protests came from all parts of Europe, but as Bismarck and Gambetta favoured the innovators it was all to no purpose.

The next act of tyranny was the expulsion of the Sisters of Charity, the Little Sisters of the Poor, the Carmelite Nuns, and the the Christian Brothers. The police officers were commissioned to prevent priests from saying Mass even in private, and the priests who still remained in the Canton were persecuted by all kinds of annoyances. Heavy fines and imprisonment were decreed against those who would not show proper regard for the new ministers. On the 26th of March, 1874, twelve women were summoned to the courts of Laney, some for having laughed, others for having coughed, and a few for having sneezed when the apostate was passing. (See *Histoire de la Persécution Religieuse à Genève*, page 462). They were fined heavily. Hundreds of similar cases were dealt with, and the offenders punished most unmercifully. M. Hérédier, the Newdegate of Switzerland, signalized himself as the most vicious bigot of the of the Council. A natural result of this wanton system of tyranny was that the bonds of authority were altogether loosened, and the whole range of morality deeply affected. Assassinations trebled in number in the space of a few years. The law of divorce received alarming application. Every day had its record of suicides and of wholesale robberies. A Protestant writer named Frédéric de Rougemont describes the state of the Canton in the following words (See *Le Cri d'Alarme*, par Fréd. de Rougemont, page 77):—

“The name of justice does not exist for the present generation. It is sacrificed for that of progress. We have only to read the Swiss journals. The environs of our cities are haunted by vagabonds who attack and plunder the honest people who pass by the wayside. Strangers might think that our country has become another Calabria. Burnings, murders, robberies, are complemented by wholesale bankruptcies, without speaking of the new marriage laws which our people, to their shame, have sanctioned by a solemn vote. What the

third generation shall be of a society brought up and governed by Swiss despotism, without any fear of God, without faith in a future life, living only for this world and its pleasures, God only knows. The devil also seems to foresee and to enjoy it."

The attitude of the Catholic clergy and people throughout these exciting scenes was appreciated by Pius IX. in the Brief of December, 1876, in the following terms :—

"With regard to you, our beloved children, ecclesiastics and laity of Switzerland, we give thanks to God for the piety and sincere faith with which, struggling against the demon and the snares of his ministers, you show your invincible attachment to the Church and to this Apostolic See. We thank the Divine bounty for the strength with which it has favoured you. The day will come when you will understand what immortal joy and glory will be the prize of your constancy."

The Catholic population were enabled to defy the worst efforts of their enemies by their admirable union and devotion to their priests and by the indefatigable zeal and activity of their bishop, Mgr. Mermillod. Churches were improvised through the country and the poor barns where the true priest said Mass on Sunday were crowded to overflowing. From the farthest limits of the diocese parents conducted their children across the French frontier to be confirmed by their bishop. This was one of the most touching sights in the modern history of the church. "You have proved to me to-day," said the bishop on one of these occasions, "that you will never betray your faith, you shall never be deserters or perjurers, and you, my little children, you shall follow in the footsteps of your parents and your elder brothers. I am going to confirm you to-day over the tomb of the last Bishop of Geneva, in this town, which, three-hundred years ago received the Sisters of St. Claire, banished from our city by a stranger, who brought, for the first time to Geneva, the double reign of heresy and despotism. Let us pray all altogether that God may give us better days. Let us pray for Switzerland and for Geneva, and let us pray too for this noble nation which gives us a refuge in our exile and the protection of its liberties in our distress. You will keep this great souvenir living in your hearts all the days of your lives. You came to a foreign land to receive the Holy Ghost. You were refused the right of receiving His gifts in your native parishes. That is the hardest word I can find it in my heart to speak of my country. She holds the liberties of the Church in chains. Otherwise I have nothing to say of her but words of benediction and unalterable attachment."

The pious Bishop of Geneva, who is one of the most distinguished prelates in Europe, was everywhere sought after to preach and give clerical retreats in France, Belgium, and Italy, and took occasion of every opportunity to ask prayers for his persecuted children. These prayers were not said in vain. Even the Protestants soon grew tired of the impostors who masqueraded as priests and who turned out as troublesome in Switzerland as they had been elsewhere. M. Herzog who was elected bishop by the schismatics, and consecrated by Reinkens, in the church of Rheinfelden, in 1876, lost popularity among the Calvinists who did not believe in bishops, and who feared his influence. The federal assembly of Berne having commenced to feel that the honour and the dignity of their republic were suffering in the eyes of the world, showed signs of disapproval, and in 1883, Leo XIII. brought all his friendly and moderating influences to bear on this unpleasant situation of things. Mgr. Mermillod was created Bishop of Lausanne as well as of Geneva, and was to reside in the city of Freyburg, from which he was to exercise his jurisdiction. The decrees of expulsion were still in vigour against him at Geneva, and Messrs. Carteret and Hérédier protested loudly they would execute them if Mgr. Mermillod ever visited the city. After ten years of exile he returned to Switzerland, and was received in Freyburg and throughout the whole country with extraordinary demonstrations of joy and gratitude. Such scenes have seldom been witnessed since the early days of Christianity. He soon made his way to Geneva, where Carteret and Hérédier, notwithstanding their impotent threats, dared not do him violence—for it was well known that the executive of Berne did not wish the continuance of the scandal—and so Mgr. Mermillod, the worthy successor of St. Francis de Sales and a true friend of Ireland, returned to his flock. Several of the churches have since been restored. The influence of Carteret and his friends is on the wane, and on the whole a better state of things seems to be in store for the Church in the Canton of Geneva.

J. F. HOGAN.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE ORAL SYSTEM OF EDUCATING THE DEAF AND DUMB
FROM A CATHOLIC POINT OF VIEW.

DEAR SIR,—By the kindness of a friend my attention has been accidentally drawn to a letter that appeared in the February number of the I. E. RECORD, entitled, "Some Observations on the Oral System of Teaching the Deaf and Dumb."

The object for which that letter was written is not quite clear; but as a representation of the oral system in its method of teaching and in its results, it is as far from the truth as the silliest fables against Catholics that are to be found in the writings of Protestant historians and theologians of fifty years ago.

Your readers will, no doubt, be interested to know how far these charges and statements, contained therein, are capable of explanation.

To supply this explanation is the purpose of the present paper from one who is practically acquainted with the system, and has taken an active part in the conferences of teachers and other public movements in England in regard to the education of the deaf and dumb.

Your correspondent professes to give some observations on the oral system of teaching the deaf and dumb. Did it not strike your readers that his method of enlightening them upon the oral system was singularly defective? Instead of visiting and describing what is actually done and achieved in oral schools, he favours us with such a description only of the sign-teaching schools at Cabra. What he has to report about oral schools are not experiences, or definite facts, but rather surmises, insinuations, or deductions drawn from what he has heard or read, the bearing of which he has not rightly understood.

He is generally careful not to make his statements positive and definite. But so skilfully is the letter worded that none the less definite and positive is the impression left upon the reader that the oral system requires that both teachers and pupils, male and female, should expose the chest; that pupils must and do manipulate the chest of their teachers; that religious instruction is little heeded; that in the tribunal of penance penitent and confessor must be face to face watching each other's lips; that the one great aim of the system is to teach speaking and lip-reading; and that when the pupil enters the world he is incapable of either, drops both, and is left without any means of conversing with those around him.

Perhaps he did not intend to make his charges so positive or to apply them universally; but having found one abuse or defect in one school he attaches it to the system generally; and such is the impression produced by his letter that all who have appealed to me had been led to believe the above statements to be so true of all oral schools, that the writer had deemed it necessary to warn the priests of Ireland and England of what must be done in Catholic schools if they adopted the oral system. Priests have even endeavoured to calm their misgivings by supposing that the education of the deaf and dumb might claim the same liberty as is allowed to the students of the medical profession.

The letter was intended for Catholic readers and especially priests. The most important points are, therefore, those in which the oral system is attacked on moral and religious grounds. To these two points I will mainly devote this letter. The hearts of good Catholics must have been shocked at the serious charge against decency urged by him in a paragraph carefully constructed and heavily weighted so as to crush, as he may have supposed, all life out of any possible explanation.

He begins by stating that "in a normal school it is laid down that an 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."

There is a vein of satire running through this sentence which discloses his disapproval. Some persons will think him narrow. Of course an intimate acquaintance with the action of the tongue, teeth, and lips in the formation of articulate sounds is absolutely essential to the teacher. Is such knowledge wrong? As for the rest, such physiological knowledge would not be dishonourable in the most delicate-minded female, especially if she had to teach the mechanical process of speaking. On the contrary, it would be most useful in various exigencies. Nor need she be apprehensive of any taint in the study of such organs; for being internal, the information regarding them will be furnished from models and diagrams.

However, it is in the succeeding sentence that he offends so severely against common sense, charity and truth. He says, "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."

How unreal is all this! If such a process ever did take place in a school, let it not be said that it was an honest effort to teach speaking. Give it another name.

The paragraph may seem clever; but note how it betrays the mind that theorises without observing. A few moments' experimenting upon himself will make it evident that no amount of attention to chest muscles will guide him in speaking; and that a vocal sound does not grope along. It is instantaneous. Who, then, is so ridiculous as to attempt to watch it groping along, or to suppose that it gradually works its way like some animal from lungs to mouth, and can be viewed and felt at any point in its journey? Sound is air in vibration, not locomotion.

Again, who does not know that vocal sounds do not commence in the chest, but where the vocal chords stretch across the larynx? Hence the inspection of the chest during speech is of no consequence, for it would give no indication of the difference between one vocal sound and another, and too much attention to it would have a tendency to make all sounds guttural.

The lungs are merely the bellows, and whatever help can be gained by noticing the vibrations of the chest can be equally well obtained from the vibrations of the bones of the head generally.

But does this correspondent really believe that such a process is necessary for teaching articulation? He says "the teacher *has* to

expose, &c., &c.," by which words he shows his own belief, and wishes to impose it on others. Does he think that because speech is accompanied by some slight movement of the muscles in the chest, the pupil must first learn how to move those muscles, and afterwards how to move the jaw, tongue, or lips? If such be the case, we must expect the teacher of the violin or athletics to begin by uncovering his chest so as to teach his pupils the movements of the chest corresponding with each action of the arm or fingers. Would not such a process be ridiculous, not to say detrimental to success? The musician knowing the end to be accomplished devotes his attention to the correct position of elbow, wrist, and fingers—whatever movements may be caused in other parts of the body, are of no interest to him though they may be to the physiologist or essayist.

So also in teaching articulation, the teacher concerns himself with the organs that are immediately engaged in producing vocal sounds. The chest muscles will not be wrong if these organs of speech are right.

Perhaps the most satisfactory way of correcting the misconception that has been raised will be to give a description of the mode actually used in teaching articulation. The first step is to teach the pupil to produce vocal sound, i.e. to make the vocal chords vibrate whilst air is being passed through them, as in sounding "oo". This may be the work of an hour, or of a few days; and in order to make him conscious of the vibration, it is generally necessary to let the pupil apply the back of his or her hand to the teacher's throat and then to his own. This vibration of the vocal chords when once acquired is not forgotten. It is the raw material out of which all articulate sounds are made; and these are severally produced by regulating the opening of the mouth, and the position and action of the tongue, teeth and lips, during the emission of the sound. There is no exposure; no handling; the occasional use of a spoon or ivory paper knife will be sufficient to guide the pupil in acquiring the various vowel and consonant sounds. Remembering that the children are seven or eight years old, when for a few hours they are learning their first lesson (the only period during which there is any contact) does your correspondent still charge the oral system with indecency? Does he still protest "What place are female teachers to have in this practice?" He ventures to say that "they are not spoken of at all except in so far as they may be employed in teaching the female pupils various kinds of work." How incorrect! All the teachers at Boston Spa are females—and at least half of those

in the other institutions in England. Does he still lay down that "religious communities are thereby excluded," and that it is difficult to see "how female teachers can avail themselves at all of such training?"

Does he still ask "how can female deaf mutes be taught, considering the process laid down?" If delicacy is so easily offended, there must be an end to matrons in institutions combing the hair or washing the faces of little children. *Honi soit qui mal y pense.*

With the view of discrediting the Oral System and its teachers he suggests an unwholesome picture of a mixed school of male and female teachers and pupils engaged in studying with eyes and hands the movements of chest muscles. These are his words: "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."

What are his grounds for representing to the British and Irish Catholics that such a scene is an ordinary accompaniment of the oral system? It is clear from the last words that he is not speaking from actual knowledge, but drawing conclusions from some incomplete information.

Really this is a most serious charge, and ought not to have been advanced until its truth was beyond all possibility of a mistake. The writer knows that nearly all the Catholic Deaf and Dumb Institutions in the world, except those at Cabra and Smyllum, have adopted the oral system; he knows that they are conducted by religious communities, mostly female; he knows the dress they wear; he knows how intense is their love and devotion to one particular virtue; and yet he rushes forward and without enquiry hesitates not to proclaim an infamous abuse that may have crept into some miserable school as representative of the system which these holy servants of God and Our Blessed Lady have adopted. So unmistakable is the impression given by his words, that priests are asking how far all this is true, and think that the writer "has made out a strong case against the oral system." To my knowledge he has inflicted inexpressible pain upon these holy religious, and upon the priests and others who are connected with these institutions by raising such a suspicion in regard to them.

It is difficult to keep patience with one who flings out such an imputation, as gratuitous as it is injurious.

In case your correspondent should wish to imply the alternative

that if at Boston Spa no such process as he describes is used, the oral system is not being properly observed there, I may say that our Sisters follow exactly the system of teaching articulation that is in force at the training college and school at Fitzroy-square, the most eminent in England, where two of the Sisters spent some months under M. Van Praagh, its able director.

I challenge your correspondent to say that any Catholic institution ever did allow such a process as he describes, or to name any respectable authority who insists that such a process is necessary, as asserted by him in his fifth conclusion.

From the fact that the references he makes are always to French papers and French institutions, it would seem that the article has been written in France; and we can just imagine it possible that in some of the state schools an abuse such as he describes has crept into a school presided over by some shameless and God-hating teacher who has become too much imbued with that system of education which is intended to sap all respect for God and supernatural virtue.

But let him write against French abuses in French papers. Let him not serve up those abuses to the Catholics of England and Ireland as essential to the Oral System, giving his readers the impression that such things are done by the teachers of the oral system, whoever and wheresoever they may be. To the religious communities, to the teachers and advocates of the oral system he owes at least an absolute withdrawal, as public as the imputation.

Let us now take the question of religious teaching, which in the eyes of Catholics is so important that the merits of any system of teaching the deaf-mute must stand or fall by this test alone. Knowing how strongly the readers of the RECORD will pronounce for or against the oral system on this one test alone, does your correspondent make careful enquiries, and produce facts from which sound conclusions can be drawn before venturing to inform his readers about this point? Love of truth and justice would have required him to do so. But on this momentous question he is satisfied to write just one line, and in that to utter a very injurious calumny. He says: "The oral system does not pretend to concern itself much about the religion of its pupils."

What does he mean? Is it that the inanimate *system* as a system does not concern itself much about religion? Of course such words can only apply to living *persons*. As they stand, the words seem to have no more meaning than would such a sentence as "The

English language does not concern itself much about the religion of those who speak it." But it is clear that he intends to convey the idea that the oral system is little fitted for the purposes of religious instruction; and, therefore, that the persons who adopt it, in doing so do not pretend to concern themselves much about the religion of its pupils.

If your correspondent is satisfied without enquiry that the oral system does not concern itself about the religion of its pupils, he must have a poor knowledge of the religious spirit that animates the Abbé Tarra, Mgr. de Haerne, and the religious who one after another have adopted it. If, on the other hand, he believed that such men have consciences, and act from motives of religion, the fact that so many had embraced the oral system should have been proof enough, until he had found instances to the contrary, that the system had been carefully investigated and found to be thoroughly adapted to the purposes of religious instruction.

Instead of so hastily dismissing this important point of suitability for religious instruction, a careful man would have enquired into the results that are actually attained in oral schools. But though your correspondent can spare time and space to give a long description of what is done in religious instruction by the *sign-teaching* school at Cabra, he makes no enquiries, gives no evidence or instances of the state of religious instruction in any oral schools, but boldly assumes that in this respect there is a "sad void." This is a calumny weighty in its nature, and grievous in the sacred character and number of the persons maligned by it. If he had made enquiries about the one Catholic oral school in these islands, he would have learnt that all the children who have been there two years are learning catechism; that every Sunday the chaplain hears the lessons that have been learnt during the week, the children in each class standing up in order, reading the question from the chaplain's lips, and giving the answers vocally with almost unerring accuracy. A full instruction on the lesson is then given, to be further explained by the Sisters during the following week. He would have learnt that the pupils approach the tribunal of Penance at regular intervals of from three to eight weeks, that there are Guilds of the Angels, and Children of Mary holding their Meetings every Sunday, and receiving Holy Communion oftener than once a month.

No doubt, other institutions are doing as much or more.

What value is then to be placed upon this or any other statement of

your correspondent, who, whilst undertaking to enlighten the public, takes no trouble to inform himself, even upon the most important of all subjects, but boldly proclaims "the oral system does not pretend to concern itself much about the religion of its pupils?"

What again can be said for the fairness of your correspondent in his next sentence, who, finding that the *Review* quoted by him had taken notice of the ceremony of First Communion at one of the institutions which had been made more than usually interesting by the presence of the Bishop and the administration of Confirmation, so perverts this proof of religious training as to mislead his readers to think that this instance of children being prepared for first Communion under the Oral System was quite exceptional? Here are his words, in which he not only gratuitously assumes there is a "sad void" of religious instruction, but insinuates a wrong motive for this item of news being recorded. "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."

A little lower down is a sentence in which as on so many other occasions, whilst he carefully avoids committing himself to a direct statement he suggest a great deal. The natural impression given by his words, "but it must 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," is, that persons brought up under the oral system have no other way of conversing with their confessor but by speech and lip-reading, and that this practice is so revolting as utterly to condemn the oral system. Here as in the whole of his letter, your correspondent carefully keeps out of view that such a person can read and write. Indeed, all the children at Boston Spa are trained to conduct their confessions in writing, that being the means most universally available for them elsewhere. So far, therefore, they are on an equality with the deaf-mutes trained under the sign system.

Sometimes, however, they make their confessions orally, and in this they have a great advantage over the deaf-mute who has no speech. The latter must either commit her sins to writing, or if she prefers signs she must be face to face with her confessor. On the other hand, when confessions are made orally, there is no fear of a confession paper falling into the hands of another person; and the

priest and penitent are not face to face, but the same screen separates him from the deaf-mute as from ordinary penitents, her communications being made in speech, his in writing. Where then is the "licence too revolting?" Again I say, *Honi soit qui mal y pense*.

I cannot say what is the practice in other institutions; but your readers may presume that their chaplains have respect for themselves and their responsibilities, and will train their subjects in such a way as will guard the tender feelings of penitents, and the sacredness of the Sacrament.

Enough has now, I trust, been said in regard to the moral and religious objections raised by your correspondent, to prove how groundless they are, and how much he has neglected to qualify himself to treat upon the subject.

In regard to what may be called his secular objections, I could if this letter had not already become too long, show them to be equally groundless, and to have arisen either from ignorance or misconception. The key to the principal objections lies in the writer's misconception of the nature and end of the oral system, and in his ignoring that its pupils ever learn to write or read written language.

With regard to the first, he says, "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."

He has mistaken the means for the end. *Language* is the end, articulation and lip-reading are but the means. The great object of all systems for educating the Deaf, is to teach them to understand and use *language* as it is written and spoken by hearing people, in order that they may be able to *converse* with hearing people and acquire knowledge by reading books. We acquire language unconsciously, not because it is easy to acquire, but because from our infancy we are taking hundreds of lessons every day.

Scarcely any but those who have been engaged in teaching the Deaf and Dumb, can appreciate how difficult it is to teach language to those who have no more idea of it than a blind man has of colours. To learn to write the alphabet, and then the names of things, qualities and actions, though difficult, is comparatively easy. These are efforts of mere memory. But words no more constitute language than a heap of bricks, slates, and timber, constitute a church. A deaf-mute may soon learn a number of words, but it requires the greatest ingenuity, and continuous systematic training,

to teach him how to arrange those words and how to connect them by auxiliaries, conjunctions, prepositions, &c., so as to construct a sentence which will mean what he wishes to convey. Again he may know the meaning of every word in a sentence and yet be utterly puzzled to know what is meant by them so combined. As an illustration of the difficulty put a Cicero before a boy who knows no Latin. Give him a dictionary which contains the meaning of every word. How much will he understand? Yet he is in a better position than the deaf-mute, for he is acquainted with language (though not the Latin language), and the mode of thought in the mind of a deaf-mute is more unlike the order of words and construction of our sentences, than a Latin sentence differs from an English one.

The natural language, or mode of thought of the deaf-mute is displayed when they converse by natural signs, and bears a strong resemblance to hieroglyphic language. For instance our sentence "I went to Dublin yesterday," would be rendered by them "yesterday Dublin go." To train the deaf-mute to express himself in a mode so different to the mode in which he thinks, is the great object of the teacher of the deaf-mute. Does it not then seem self-evident that the process of teaching language is somewhat retarded when their education is conducted on the sign system; and that on the other hand the readiest way to train deaf-mutes to understand language is to use that language as much as possible? This is what is done in the oral system. The pupils are first taught to read sounds from the lips of their teacher, to write them, and to speak them. Then they proceed to words, and simple sentences. From that time the whole course of instruction is conducted by speech. The result is, as far as our experience goes, that the pupils are being trained to think in words instead of signs, and they write much easier and more correct English now than they did when the education was conducted on the sign system.

If the two systems are to be compared, the excellence or the deficiency of the oral system is not to be tested, as your correspondent would have it, by the proficiency of its pupils in speaking and lip reading, any more than the pupils at Cabra should be tested by their proficiency in the use of signs.

The true test is *language*, or the ability to converse with speaking persons whether by writing or by any other way; and if the two systems are to be compared with each other, let the final results be compared, *respice finem*.

What is attained under the sign system. The deaf-mute learns to write and read written language, he also maintains his natural language of signs, and acquires a number of conventional signs, whose use is limited, however, almost to the institution in which he is educated.

But a deaf-mute educated under the oral system has all that the other has and something more. His facility for writing and reading written language is probably greater; he can converse as readily as the other by means of signs, for it is his natural language; even if he were thrown into a company where, as in the institution, there was a system of conventional signs, he would in a few days be familiar with them all. So that the orally taught deaf-mutes, even if they carry away no power of speaking or lip-reading are on leaving the school, at least on an equality with those who have been taught by signs. But in point of fact they are in a decidedly better state, inasmuch as they also acquire more or less perfectly the art of speaking and lip-reading. Of course neither of these accomplishments is so perfect, except in few instances, that they can read from the lips of strangers, or speak so as to be understood by strangers readily. But conversation with strangers is not the business of their lives, neither is it fair as a test of whether their powers of speaking and lip-reading are useful to them. If any deaf-mute has acquired so much of the arts of speaking and lip-reading as that a few days' intercourse is sufficient to make him acquainted with another person's lip movements, and intelligible to the deaf person's voice, then, indeed, will his accomplishments be of service to him when he is in the company of his relatives, fellow-workmen and friends; that is to say, during the most considerable, important, and pleasurable part of his life. And this is attained by more than half the pupils under the oral system. For other occasions he can fall back upon the means used by those educated under the sign system, viz. writing, manual alphabet and natural signs, which the oral system does not necessarily discard altogether.

Let it ever be kept in mind that signs are the natural language of the deaf-mute, and that in the use of even a conventional system of signs as well as of natural signs, the oralist pupil if he chooses can be as perfect an adept in a few days as the one who has spent all his life in a sign-system school.

Before concluding I must call attention to two other instances of your correspondent misrepresenting facts for his own purpose. Firstly, in regard to the paragraph extracted from the *Quarterly Review of the Deaf-Mute Education*, headed, "A Weighty Authority,"

in which a friendly correspondent cautions teachers of the oral system that great care, zeal and efficiency are requisite in teachers; otherwise the result will be disastrous. Your correspondent would like this to be understood as condemnatory of the oral system. But it is simply a caution that as teaching by the oral system is a higher art than teaching by signs, so greater excellence is required. We may rest assured that concurrently with the strides that have lately been attempted and successfully attained in every other branch of public education, whatever is required for this higher system of educating the deaf and dumb will undoubtedly be supplied.

I must, however, find fault with a statement of your correspondent's, who attempts to show up the oral system as condemned out of the mouths of its own supporters, by speaking of the *Review* as "edited under the auspices of a distinguished committee in the interests of the oral system." This is not true. I was partly instrumental in the establishment of this *Review*, and can vouch that its object is the general good of deaf-mute education, irrespective of any particular system. If your correspondent had referred to the title page of the *Review* for the names of the committee under whose auspices it is edited, he would have found that amongst the eight are two, Mr. Sleight and Mr. Neal, who are uncompromising opponents of the oral system. So much for his "weighty authority."

I will refer to one more paragraph to show again how little reliance can be placed upon the data which he puts forward.

Referring to the Congress of Directors and Headmasters (not of various countries, as he wrongly says, but of the British Isles), held in London in 1885, he says: "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—as to actual results there were none worth producing."

This is a wrong conception, very dogmatically expressed, but perhaps pardonable in the case of a person who was not at the meeting, but got his information without rising from his desk by merely reading the printed report of the proceedings.

However, as a member of the conference, I listened attentively to every word that was said during the three days. The great object the congress had in view was to move for obtaining State aid for the education of the deaf and dumb. The subject had been reserved for the last sitting. Every moment was now precious, for Mr. Ackers's paper on the subject had to be read and discussed, and the best method

of approaching the Government to be decided upon and arranged for. Just before Mr. Ackers was about to read his paper on State aid, Mr. Sleight, a teacher under the manual system for over fifty years, rose to speak, and leaving the proper subject under discussion, went on for half-an-hour beyond the time that was allowed him, declaiming in favour of the manual system, and challenging the advocates of the oral system to produce the fruits of their system. He was out of order both in point of time and subject; and it is needless to say that the reason why he was not replied to was that the members were too much irritated at his having appropriated time that was so precious, and too anxious about what was then the main subject, to care to waste further time.

The very sweeping nature of your correspondent's statement should convince the reader how careless he is, and how valueless is his testimony. He says, "There were *no* fruits to exhibit; as to actual results there were *none* worth recording."

Is it not absurd to suppose that a system has *no* fruits to exhibit; or rather that it has not exhibited most satisfactory and convincing fruits, when almost every institution on the continent and most of these in our own isles have at enormous sacrifices abandoned the sign system to adopt it. It is only after most careful comparison of results, that the managers of each institution committed themselves to the change.

Those persons who wish to know what the fruits are which the oral system can produce will do well to visit its schools. Failing that, let them seek information from those who are practically acquainted with it, and not from those who have been for a lifetime attached to the manual system.

Compared with the sign teaching schools they will find the staff more numerous, and progress slower in the youngest class, but proficiency in the older classes equal if not superior. With regard to the articulation, they will find that the children do not stretch their necks or make contortions, that their voices though deficient in natural tone are not unpleasant or guttural; that their words though often difficult for a stranger to catch, are readily understood by those who have associated with them; that they are as full of life in their recreations and games as other children, and that they are thoroughly imbued with the spirit of their religion.

Moreover, remembering that Rome was not built in a day, a person who wishes to form a true estimate, will make allowance for the short time that the system has been in operation, especially in

some schools where the antagonistic effect of the previous system of signs has kept up an element of great difficulty. Instead, therefore, of accepting what he sees as the ultimate perfection that can be arrived at under the oral system, he will rather forecast from present results what will be achieved when the art has had time and opportunity to develop.

However, my object in writing this letter has not been to parade the merits of the oral system, or to draw comparisons between the two systems. But, as a priest, I saw the importance of the serious charges affecting religion and morals, that had been raised against it by your correspondent.

These, I trust, I have shown to be groundless, and to have been put forward without any careful enquiry or regard for the feelings and character of the priests and religious who were concerned.

Instead of further discussion, I think I shall best meet the wishes of your readers by giving the shortest possible reply to each of the objections which concluded his letter.

OBJECTIONS.

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 by the sign system.

2. That it requires a longer time, eight years instead of six, and therefore is much more expensive.

3. That to be uniform, which is an object universally called for, training schools are necessary for the teachers.

4. Religious communities are thereby excluded, and it is not seen how female teachers can avail themselves at all of such training.

REPLY.

It is suitable to a general school. All the pupils of ordinary capacity can be trained by it; the only exception being those whose mental faculties are so weak that under any system they must be treated separately. These are not rejected.

Partly true. But is it an objection if in the end the child gains additional faculties? To keep a child at school until it is 16 years old is no injury to it.

Uniformity is no more essential in this than in other educational systems which vary with every country, community, &c. Each large institution is a training college.

There is nothing in the process of teaching or training that is in the least objectionable, as has been explained in this letter. The fact that every Catholic institution is taught by Religious is a proof.

5. If female teachers are excluded, how can female deaf mutes be taught, considering the process of teaching laid down.

6. 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.

7. Intellectual work is for a considerable time interdicted in order to make the child speak. And the use of signs is prohibited during recreation to the great detriment of health at that tender age. Pupils are deprived of the advantage of cultivating each others' minds by interchange of ideas and sentiments.

8. As the pupils after eight years in the institution pass into the world at large, they cannot understand the lip-movements of others.

9. 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.

10. As a consequence both lip-reading and speaking soon come to an end.

The Sisters at Boston Spa went through a course of training at the Training School in Fitzroy-square, and actually taught in the classes. Where has such a process, as he describes, been laid down, except in objector's mind?

Is the proportion much larger than at Cabra or other similar institutions? Practically the principal difference lies in this that deaf-mutes are excluded from being teachers.

This was attempted by some—but has been abandoned by most, if not all. Natural signs are now allowed by even the strictest oralists. It is conventional signs, which tend to supersede language, that are forbidden.

The pupils are as lively in recreation as other children.

The pupils can soon learn to understand the lip-movements of those with whom they associate.

This is only true in the case of strangers. The speaking and lip-reading are far superior to what the objector supposes, and are a great help and consolation to the pupils and to those with whom they associate. Few people understand the deaf-and-dumb signs, but all can understand spoken words.

Is a cripple to refuse the great help that an artificial leg will give him because it cannot put him on an equality with others who have their limbs perfect?

This is sometimes the case but not generally.

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.

This is entirely wrong. Even if he drops both speech and lip-reading, he has still the power of writing unimpaired; and this is the *ordinary* means of communication between hearing persons and the deaf.

Moreover, signs being his natural language he can not only use and understand natural signs at once, but he has the greatest facility for learning even conventional signs, so that in a few days he would be quite equal to a deaf-mute pupil of any methodic sign system.¹

This sweeping assumption has been sufficiently answered in the above letter.

The orally taught deaf-mute is better able than the other to converse with hearing people, having speech and lip-reading, in addition to writing and the natural language of signs.

11. On the whole, applying the philosopher's text, *respice finem*, the oral system is by no means a success, nor does it appear likely to succeed for the end to which it aspires.

Thanking you for allowing me to make this explanation,

I am, dear Mr. Editor,

Yours faithfully,

EDWARD W. DAWSON,

Chaplain of St. John's Institution, Boston Spa, Yorkshire.

DOCUMENTS.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE IRISH BISHOPS.

[*The Resolutions on Coercion, the Land Bill, and the Education Question, which were adopted on the 20th of April, 1887, by the Episcopal Committee representing the Irish Bishops, and published in our May number,² were unanimously re-affirmed by the Annual General Meeting of the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland held at Maynooth on the 22nd ult.*]

¹ It is well known to those who are conversant with the deaf and dumb, that when two meet who have quite distinct systems of signs they will soon understand each other's signs.

² See I. E. RECORD, vol. viii., page 477.

ENROLMENT IN THE SCAPULAR OF MOUNT CARMEL.

SUMMARY.

For the valid reception of the brown Scapular it is necessary that it be blessed and imposed singly, and not together with other Scapulars.

The privilege of blessing and imposing the Brown Scapular at the same time with others will not be granted in future : and in the case of those who have already received this privilege, it is to cease in ten years from the date of this Decree.

DECRETUM ORDINIS CARMELITARUM ANTIQUAE OBSERVANTIAE DE SCAPULARI B. M. V. DE MONTE CARMELO A SIMULTANEA PLURIUM SCAPULARIUM TRADITIONE EXCIPIENDO.

Ab initio huius saeculi in usu esse coepit quatuor Scapularium simultanea et compendiosa traditio, nempe SS. Trinitatis, B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo, Immaculae Conceptionis, septem Dolorum, quibus nuperrime additum est quintum, scilicet Scapulare rubrum Passionis D. N. J. C. Haec facultas benedicendi imponendique simul praedicta Scapularia collata primitus alicui religioso Instituto, tempore praesertim ss. Missionum, breviori adhibita formula a S. R. C. approbata, deinde Sacerdotibus quoque saecularibus indulta est, qua etiam extra tempus ss. Missionum peragendarum ipsi utuntur. Quamvis autem haec agendi ratio fortasse contulerit ad istorum Scapularium receptionem facilius propagandam, ea tamen occasio fuit cur praecipuus ille honor, quo christifideles Scapulare carmeliticum quavis aetate celebrarunt, immineretur, et fervens erga illud devotio aliquantum tepesceret. Porro Scapulare Carmelitarum, quod nobilitas ipsa originis, veneranda antiquitas, latissima eiusdem in christiano populo pluribus abhinc saeculis propagatio, nec non salutare per illud habiti pietatis effectus, et insignia quae perhibentur patrata miracula mirabiliter commendant, omnino postulare videtur distinctionem honoris in ipso receptionis ritu, ut non quidem cum aliis commixtim, quasi unum ex pluribus, sed prouti in sua primitiva institutione illud beatissima Virgo uti tesseram propriam sui Ordinis tradidisse fertur B. Simoni Stokio, fidelibus quoque distinctim tradatur, nec cum aliis simul Scapularibus connumeretur. Ex quo procul dubio fiet ut illa singularis omnino, universalis et constans totius catholici Orbis religio integra servetur erga hoc sacrum Scapulare marianum, quod veluti antonomastice Scapulare audit, iure meritoque orta ex eo quod, uti traditur, pientissima Virgo speciales favores, gratias et privilegia conferre sponderit devote gestantibus hoc suum praedilectionis signum.

Haec sedulo perpendens hodiernus Vicarius carmelitici Ordinis antiquae observantiae Rmus. P. Angelus Savini honori simul consulere exoptans et devotioni sacri Scapularis B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo, instantibus quoque suis Ordinis Fratibus, huic s. Congregationi Indulg. et ss. Reliq. sequens dubium discutiendum proposuit :

Utrum conveniens sit Scapulare B. V. M. de Monte Carmelo honoris et devotionis causa, separatim potius et distincte, quam cumulative et commixtim cum aliis quatuor vel pluribus Scapularibus benedicere et imponere ?

Emi. ac Rmi. Patres in Generali Congregatione apud Vaticanum habita die 26 Martii 1887, re mature perpensa, rescripserunt : *Affirmative : et consulendum SSmo, ut Indultum huc usque in perpetuum concessum, etiam Regularibus Ordinibus et Congregationibus induendi christifideles Scapulari carmelitico commixtim cum aliis Scapularibus revocetur, et ad determinatum tempus coarctetur, neque in posterum amplius concedatur.*

Facta vero de his relatione in Audientia habita die 27 Aprilis 1887 ab infrascripto Secretario, Sanctissimus D. N. Leo Papa XIII Patrum Cardinalium responsionem approbavit, decrevitque ut praefatum Indultum in posterum non amplius concedatur, ac illi omnes, etiam Regulares Ordines vel Congregationes, quibus Indultum ipsum quocumque nomine vel forma ab Apostolica Sede est concessum eo tantummodo *ad decennium* perfruantur ab hac die computandum.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria eiusdem S. Congregationis die 27 Aprilis 1887.

FR. THOMAS M^a. Card. ZIGLIARA, *Praefectus.*

✠ ALEXANDER, Episcopus Oensis, *Secretarius.*

REPLY REGARDING THE STIPEND FOR REQUIEM HIGH MASS
ADDRESSED TO THE LATE RIGHT REV. BISHOP OF
PROVIDENCE, U.S.A., BY THE CARDINAL PRAEFECT OF THE
CONGREGATION DE PROPAGANDA FIDE, DATED JULY 10,
1885.

ILLUSTRISSIME AC RME. DOMINE,

Amplitudo Tua litteris sub die 16 Martii exponebat fideles istius diocesis solere aliquando decem aut etiam plura dollaria afferre, ut missa cantata pro suis defunctis celebretur. Aliqua pars istius summae solvitur organistae et cantoribus, quaestio autem orta est utrum reliqua pecunia tota debeatur celebranti, an vero parochus in

ea jus habeat, collatis duntaxat celebranti duobus vel tribus dollariis?

Antequam meum proferrem iudicium, opportunas informationes exquirere curavi circa consuetudinem, quae in Ecclesia Statuum Foederatorum Americae haec super re vigeat. Ex notitiis habitis sequentia deprehendi.

In ista regione consuetudo non fert ut aliqua taxa exigatur ratione cereorum, qui accenduntur sive in altari, sive circa feretrum, si adsit, utique aliqua pecunia organistae et Cantoribus est solvenda, quae etsi diversa in diversis locis, tamen in unaquaque ecclesia fixa est quibusdam vero in dioecesisibus pro missa cantata taxa fixa statuta est pro Synodum dioecesanam.

Insuper mihi relatum est in ista regione nihil solvi sacerdotibus ratione juris stolae, sed duntaxat ratione missae quae juxta vota familiae aut privata aut cantata est.

Attenta itaque hujusmodi praxi et consuetudine, propositae questioni respondendum existimo; pecunia quae, deducta summa organistae et cantoribus solvenda remanet, ipsi sacerdoti missam celebranti debetur, ac proinde parochus nullam partem pecuniae a fidelibus pro missis cantatis defunctorum oblatae suam facere posse videtur.

Interim Deum precor ut te diutissime sospitet,
Uti frater addictissimus,

JOANNES, CARD. SIMEONI, *Praefectus*.

R. P. D. THOMAE HENDRICKEN, *Episcopo Providentiae*.

DECREE OF THE CONGREGATION OF S. RITES REGARDING THE
NUPTIAL BENEDICTION.

BEATISSIME PATER,

Archiepiscopus Remensis humillime exponit :

. . . 2. In dioecesi Remensi, ut in pluribus Galliae dioecesisibus, consuetudinem invaluisse a tempore immemorabili non celebrandi missam pro sponsis nec erogandi benedictionem huic missae adnexam, si mulier jam non sit virgo. Haec consuetudo omnibus tanquam bonorum morum tutela videtur, et auctoritate Ordinariorum suffulta tanquam praeceptum exhibetur; legitur enim in Manuali Caeremoniarum Romani Ritus ad usum Eccl. Remensis sub Emo. et mem. Card. Goussset edito, p. 88: "On omet la messe *pro sponsis* ainsi que les deux bénédictiones qui s'y trouvent annexées dans le missel;

1. lorsque la conduite de l'épouse a été notoirement scandaleuse. . .”
Ideo ab omnibus haec consuetudo adnumeratur inter consuetudines
laudabiles quas Sta Synodus Tridentina optat retineri.

Quaeritur an liceat hanc consuetudinem conservare?

Feria 4 die 9 Maii, 1883.

In congregatione generali S. R. et universalis Inquisitionis habita
coram Emis. et RRmis. D.D. S.R.E. Card. in rebus Fidei generalibus
Inquisitoribus propositis suprascriptis dubiis respondendum
censuerunt.

. . . Ad 2^{um}. Stet Decreto fer. iv., 31 Aug., 1881 huic adnexo.¹

[We are indebted to a Canadian subscriber for copies of the two last
Decrees — Ed. I. E. R.]

INDULGENCES RETAINED IN A NEW CHURCH.

SUMMARY.

A new church retains the Indulgences granted to the old one
which it replaces, if built within a short distance, such as thirty yards,
of the old site.

DUBIUM QUOAD DISTANTIAM LOCI, IN QUO AEDIFICANDA SIT NOVA
ECCLESIA SODALITII ROSARII NE CESSET INDULGENTIA VETERIS
ECCLESIAE.

BEATISSIME PATER,

Cum S. Congregatio Indulgentiis sacrisque Reliquiis praeposita in
una Leodien. sub die 9 Augusti 1843 sequentibus dubiis: 1. An
cesset Indulgentia Confraternitatis ss. Rosarii, vel aliae Indulgentiae,
si nova aedificetur Ecclesia fere in loco ubi vetus existerat? 2. An
cesset Indulgentia si nova Ecclesia aedificetur in coemeterio, non in
loco veteris Ecclesiae? 3. An cesset Indulgentia si nova aedificetur
Ecclesia in alio loco, et non in coemeterio veteris Ecclesiae? resolu-
tionem dedisset: ad 1. Negative, dummodo sub eodem titulo aedificetur;
ad 2. Affirmative: ad 3. ut in secundo: dubitatur inde de vero et
praeciso sensu responsionis: ad 1. praesertim circa verba *fere in loco*.
Unde quaeritur.

An verba *fere in loco* ita accipienda sint, ut intelligantur de parva
distantia a loco, puta quantum est jactum lapidis vel spatium 20 sive
30 passuum: aut contra, an accipienda sint lato sensu, ut adverbium
fere dicatur pro muris civitatis, vel confinio oppidi, parociae? etc.

¹This Decree of the 31st Aug. 1881 will be found at page 506, vol. iii.
(1882), I. E. RECORD.

S. Congregatio Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praeposita die 29 Martii, 1886, respondit :

Affirmative ad primam partem. *Negative* ad secundam.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria ejusdem S. Congregationis die et anno uti supra.

I. B. CARD. FRANZELIN, *Praefectus*.

F. DELLA VOLPE, *Secretarius*.

PROHIBITION TO TAKE PART IN THE ELECTIONS IN ITALY.

SUMMARY.

The answer of the Congregation "*non expedire*," includes a prohibition.

How a Bishop is to deal with individual cases *juxta suam conscientiam et prudentiam*.

DECLARATIO QUOAD RESPONSUM—"NON EXPEDIRE"—DATUM A S. POENITENTIARIA RELATE AD SUPFRAGIUM FERENDUM IN POLITICIS ELECTIONIBUS.

ILLME. ET REVME. DOMINE.

Opinio inoluit apud Dioeceses Italiae quamplurimas, politicas urnas adire licitum esse, ex quo S. Poenitentiaria quoad hoc percontata, tantummodo respondit: *Non expedire*.

Ut omnis vero abiiceretur aequivocatio SSmus. Pater, audita sententia istorum EE. DD. Cardinalium, inquisitorum generalium, collegarum meorum, jussit declarari quod *non expedire* prohibitionem importat. Ego autem, declarationem hanc dum Amplitudini Tuae communico, adicere cogor, SSmum. Patrem, his in adjunctis, firman manutene prohibicionem ejusmodi.

Perutile quoque Ampl. Tuae erit responsa agnoscere, quae S. Poenitentiaria anno, 1883, dedit Episcopis seiscitantibus, tum quoad peccatum quod committitur, tum quoad censuras quae contrahuntur, politicis interessendo electionibus. Quoad peccatum, an, id est, culpae gravis reus habendus esset, qui suffragium daret pro *Deputatorum* electione responsum paruit: "sese habebit in casibus particularibus juxta suam conscientiam et prudentiam, omnibus perpensis adjunctis." Quoad vero censuras: "Irretiri vel non irretiri censuris, electionum politicarum causa, pendere ab adjunctis facti, et ab animi electorum dispositionibus; adjuncta et dispositiones ponderandae juxta normas quae in subjecta materia a probatis exhibentur auctoribus."

Interim omne bonum a Deo Ampl. Tuae adprecor.

Romae, 30 Julii, 1886.

Addictissimus in Domino,

R. CARD. MONACO.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

SHORT PAPERS FOR THE PEOPLE, (Aleuthaurion). By the Rev. C. Moore, D.D. New York: Benziger Brothers.

It is a task of as much difficulty as responsibility to explain to the people points of Catholic doctrine in a precise, accurate and attractive form. For, there is not only the difficulty of acquiring and retaining the necessary knowledge, but also the difficulty of suitably expressing what one has acquired and retained. This is specially the case in Theology; as the language of Theology is the dead Latin language, and though it is useful, if not necessary, in the teaching of the schools, yet it tends to enfeeble the powers of expression in one's own language, and to make one's technical expression unpalatable to the people.

But difficulties like this are not insurmountable. They may be overcome by labour. Few will question that it is time that they should be overcome; for there is a decided want of books or tracts popularizing Theology and its handmaid Philosophy, a class of books so earnestly recommended by the Supreme Pontiff.

All honour then to those who have made the attempt in our own language, all the more to those who have made the attempt on a large scale. As such we congratulate Dr. Moore. He found himself in circumstances similar to those which very many from time to time will find themselves in. He lived in a community for the most part composed of non-Catholics, and the subject of conversation, and of friendly discussion turned very often on religious topics. He heard a great deal of clatter and small talk on these subjects; but he felt himself encased in an armoury of scholastic formulæ, and though he could see the false points, and could fathom the fallacies, yet he felt like David in Saul's armour, incapable of quick action, and scarcely able to move under such a weight of erudition. "I wished for a book," he says, "that would interest to such a degree that it could be read without a strain on the mind; one whose narrative and arguments would be strong, but not stilted, trenchant, but not murderous, witty, but not uncharitable. With this object in view, I began in the year 1873, to publish, through the columns of the *Catholic Advocate*, the series of essays included in this volume."

These essays amount to the number of one hundred and twenty-nine. A large proportion of them deal with questions that are

treated in the theological books on the Church, and on the Roman Pontiff. They display a vast amount of theological information, and are rendered attractive from the many interesting anecdotes that are interspersed.

But from the vast field of knowledge that the author had to traverse, and from the difficulty of guarding at all times against loose expressions, it is not surprising, though regrettable, that he occasionally nods. We would refer in a special manner to his treatment of the question of St. Peter's coming to Rome. He has devoted a great many papers to that question, and has established by full and detailed evidence, the historical fact that St. Peter came to Rome, and died there. We do not, however, regard the coming of St. Peter to Rome, much less his death there, to be what theologians called a *dogmatic fact*, that is to say as Dr. Moore defines it, "a fact so intimately connected with a doctrine of the Church, that, if one should succeed in proving the assumed fact untrue, the doctrine, or doctrines founded on it would also become untenable." Such, according to Dr. Moore is the coming of St. Peter to Rome. "Now, it is evident" he says, "that, if Peter never came to Rome, Pius IX. would have no more right to call himself Peter's successor, than the king of the Cannibal isles to pretend that he is the successor of General Washington, first President of the United States. Consequently with the disapproval of the fact, all the claims and pretensions of the Pope of Rome would vanish into thin air."

That we do not conceive to be the case. It is defined by the Vatican Council that the Roman Pontiff is the successor of St. Peter in the Primacy over the entire Church; but he may be so, though St. Peter never came to Rome, much less is it required or implied by the definition, that he died there. For St. Peter could have been Bishop of Rome, though he lived at Antioch, and wherever he lived he would be within his territory. More than that, it was not necessary that St. Peter should have been Bishop of Rome; for it might have been left free to him to remain Bishop of Antioch, and then to designate any See, the Bishop of which would be his successor; if then one supposes that St. Peter designated the See of Rome, then the Bishop of Rome would be his successor. Further still, adopting the opinion which, though not defined, is now the most common, that the connection of the Primacy with the Roman See is *jure divino*, so that the Roman Pontiff *as such*, and not merely as *successor of St. Peter*. has the Primacy *jure Divino*, it is not necessary to suppose that St. Peter came to Rome for we may still suppose that even though St. Peter had not been

Bishop of Rome, his successor in the Primacy was expressly designated by the Divine will to be the Bishop of Rome, and that the Bishop of that See was by the express will of God to be successor of St. Peter in the Primacy.

There are several papers on Miracles, Apparitions, Theophany. The treatment of Miracles is very full. Theologians do not generally give the same criterion of a true miracle which Dr. Moore gives. In the paper on Theophany most of the arguments for, and against, the appearance of the Second Person of the Adorable Trinity are given, though we notice that the argument against that opinion from the appearance of the three Angels to Abraham, and afterwards mentioned in Heb., xiii. i., is not given, and this is an argument very much relied upon. But the author solves the difficulties he proposes pretty well, and so is in harmony with the more common opinion, and what was the almost universal opinion of the early fathers.

The author treats of many interesting questions concerning hell and purgatory, and devotes two papers to the life and personal appearance and habits of Dante, and what he saw in his poetical hell.

The bird's-eye-view of the General Councils is deserving of special mention, as a complete synopsis of them is given in a very small space.

Though there are faults in this work of imperfect exposition of Theological teaching, and some loose expressions, the result no doubt of hasty writing for a periodical, yet it is a work of great labour; it contains a vast amount of knowledge; it is written in a lively popular style, and is racy of American soil. It will be of considerable use not only to the people, but also to those whose duty it is to instruct them, and who in moments of weariness would wish to turn from the heavy tomes to lighter and more varied reading in Theology.

LEAVES FROM ST. AUGUSTINE. By Mary H. Allies. Edited by T. W. Allies, K.C.S.G. London: Burns & Oates.

THIS book has been compiled to supply a want that has been long felt in the field of religious literature. The works of St. Augustine are so voluminous, that few have time, and fewer still the perseverance to read them through. And yet who is there that takes an interest in the study of ecclesiastical literature, that should not wish to read some, if not all of the works of the greatest of the Latin Fathers, of him who did more to defend the Church's interests, and to mould her doctrines, than any individual since the time of the Apostles. Interest in the writings of the great Saint and Doctor, appears but to increase with time. They have been translated into almost every spoken

language. They have got two English editions of his works; one brought out at Oxford, and the other at Edinburgh. The latter contains fifteen octavo volumes, and still is far from exhausting all his writings.

The book before us—a handsome volume of about five hundred pages, contains characteristic extracts from his various writings, autobiographical, philosophical, apologetic, &c. The extracts appear to have been selected with care and judgment. They are not taken from the English editions, but are translated from the best Latin editions of his works, brought out by the Benedictines at Paris 1679.

ANNUNZIATA, 'OR THE GIPSY CHILD. By Laetitia Selwyn Oliver. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

THE style in which this pretty little book is brought out is very attractive; the matter of the book is no less so. We did not close it until we had read it through, so interesting did it appear. Each chapter has its surprises; and each has something incomplete which keeps one continually expecting completion, until one reaches the end.

“Annunziata” is the name of a mysterious child left by a Gipsy-woman to a school-mistress in England, but who, after many vicissitudes, is found to be Annunziata di Foligno, the stolen child of the Marchese di Foligno. The Marchese and Marchessa come to England for their child, and all three return to their fair Italian home.

The book is written in a truly Catholic spirit, it is admirably suited for prizes and presents; we heartily wish it a wide circulation.

J. C.

INTRODUCTION TO ENGLISH RHETORIC. By Rev. Charles Coppens, S.J. New York: Catholic Publication Society. London: Burns & Oates.

This is another valuable contribution to our stock of literature on English Rhetoric, and possesses all those qualities, which make such a treatise highly useful to that class of readers for which it is designed. It is singularly clear, simple, and orderly.

But there are special excellences in this book, which make it specially valuable as an educational work. Hitherto in many of our text-books on this subject, authors aimed solely at the training of the intellect, while no attention whatever was paid to the religious and moral training. This was a very serious oversight. To supply this deficiency, Fr. Coppens criticises the works of many authors, not merely from a literary, but also from a religious and moral point of

view, and marks out for the reader those which he considers unsafe, either to faith or morals.

Again, the author displays excellent taste and judgment in the selection of quotations for purposes of illustration. This makes the study of the book far more pleasant than it otherwise might be. He treats every part of his subject exceedingly well, and in "The Introduction to English Rhetoric" gives to students another work, which deserves as widespread a popularity as his "Art of Oratorical Composition" already enjoys.

HYMN TO THE ETERNAL. *The Voices of Many Lands, and Other Poems.* By Kinnerby Lewis. London: Sampson Low & Co., 188, Fleet-street.

This daintily dressed little volume comes to us recommended by the harp that decorates its cover, and the author's generous sympathy with us in our struggles for, and advocacy of our claims to, national autonomy. All the poems give abundant evidence of a cultured mind. In many of them lofty thoughts find a chaste and elegant expression. Several of the pieces have been set to music—a few of them by the poet himself.

The little book has the further recommendation of good clear type, and tasteful binding.

J. P. M'D.

FOR THE OLD LAND. By Charles J. Kickham. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

Of "Knocknagow" "Sally Cavanagh" and "For the Old Land" it may be truly said, as of Scott's novels, that, "as pictures of national manners, they are inestimable, as views of human nature, influenced by local circumstances, they are extremely curious . . . and, by running the course of the story through the most touching incidents, they carry the reader's sympathy perpetually with them."

The present work differs very much from "Knocknagow" and "Sally Cavanagh," but it gives abundant evidence of the power so conspicuously displayed in these two books, the power that requires no desperate plot to excite and keep alive the reader's interest.

Kickham's special excellence as an interesting writer is due to his close and appreciative observation, his keen sense of humour, his unbounded sympathy, all aided by a wonderful power of description.

He seizes the smallest features in a picture, and describes them with a care that appears unnecessary. Yet we find, on close examination, that the omission of some apparently trifling detail would deprive the description of all its charm.

His sense of humour, and his sympathy enable him to do more justice to the Irish character than any other writer who has described it; he exhibits Irishmen as witty and ingenious, without making them buffoons and cheats, and as a very religious people, without making them weakly superstitious.

Perhaps there is a want of definiteness about the character in the present work; however, the reader is always amused by Joe Sproul's eloquence, and Murty Magrath's philosophy, and charmed by Ambrose Armstrong's unselfishness and generosity.

ANNALES DE PHILOSOPHIE CHRETIENNE. Revue Mensuelle.

Directeur: M. L'Abbé J. Guien. Paris: 20 Rue de la Chaise.

SINCE the publication of the Encyclical "Aeterni Patris," the *Annales* has acquired new vigour, and has done good work in furtherance of the programme set before Christian Philosophers in that remarkable encyclical. Its essays, which are almost invariably of a high order, will do much towards the study of the Philosophy of the Fathers of the Church, and especially of the Philosophy of St. Thomas, whilst the medium of the French language will of itself tend a good deal both to the exact expression of the Scholastic formulae, and to the popularising of the teaching of the schools. Already there have appeared able essays on the primary idea of *being* and its constitution, the fundamental knowledge of which is so essential. The Aristotelian doctrine of motion—the *motor* and the *mobile*—is also ably treated in several successive numbers. The *Annales* proposes to deal with the different philosophical systems. But up to the present the system of Aristotle and St. Thomas has almost exclusively been treated. An interesting feature of the *Annales*, is the account given from month to month of the transactions of the Society of St. Thomas, lately founded in Paris, and the conferences held at the Catholic Institute of Paris on Scholastic Philosophy.

In pursuance of the study of the Natural Sciences in order to defend revelation, a series of papers was begun in the November number under the title:—*L'Histoire Religieuse D'Israel, et la Nouvelle Exégèse Rationaliste.*

New works bearing on the objects the *Annales* has in view are analysed and criticised. Amongst these the work of Cardinal Pecci, "St. Thomas on the Divine *Concursus* and the *Scientia Media*," published in an Italian periodical, is analysed, and criticised through several successive numbers.

EDWARD THE SIXTH. By F. G. Lee, D.D. Burns & Oates.

From a religious point of view, the reign of Edward VI. is full of interest. It was during his reign that the doctrines of the Reformation were exclusively introduced into England. Henry VIII. is generally set down as the father of the English Reformation, and indeed, he can fairly claim the title as it was his rejection of papal supremacy that paved the way for the religious revolution of succeeding reigns. Still the "*bloody six articles*" of Henry pressed almost as heavily on the reformers as on those who adhered to the ancient faith.

It was not till the reign of his son and successor that the doctrine of the German reformers received a political recognition in England, and were embodied in the Book of Common Prayer by Ridley and Cranmer. The chief reformers of this reign have been looked on by each succeeding generation of Englishmen as the ideals of Sanctity and the heralds of a new and superior civilization. Recently, however, there is the clearest indication that the cloud of prejudice, which was the cause of this opinion, is fast disappearing, and that the Protestants of England are coming to form a faster estimate of the extent to which these early reformers merit the praises that have been so lavishly bestowed upon them. This change is chiefly due to the researches that have been recently made by Protestant as well as Catholic historians, into their lives and characters. The latest work on the subject is from the pen of Dr. Lee. It contains much useful information on the stirring events that occurred in England during the reign of Edward VI. No statement is made or view advanced, without bringing forward full historical evidence in support of their truth.

THE GLORIES OF DIVINE GRACE. A Free Rendering of the Original Treatise of P. Eusebius Nieremberg, S.J. By Dr. M. Jos. Scheeben, Professor in the Archbishopial Seminary at Cologne. Translated from the Fourth Revised German Edition, by a Benedictine Monk of St. Meinrad's Abbey, Ind. New York, Cincinnati, and St. Louis: Benziger Brothers. London: R. Washbourne. Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son.

At the present day any religious book, indeed any book, outside the domains of fiction and politics, to be read at all—except perhaps by clergymen and religious communities—must be presented to the public in an attractive style. The reason is obvious. Modern

thought does not turn very much on matters appertaining to eternity. It seems to have a decided preference for the study of natural science.

Obviously then, if our religious literature is to occupy the attention of any appreciably large section of the public, it must be made more attractive than it is ordinarily found to be. Useful spiritual books indeed we have, in unstinted measure—but could they not be made more entertaining? We must be pardoned for thinking that many of our religious books are sent upon the world lacking the latter desirable qualification.

Religion and religious truths, we think, might be made a very interesting, as well as useful study, and in proof of our contention we would point to Dr. Scheeben's book. The learned author's treatment of his subject is characterised by great solidity, as well as much fertility of thought, and is methodical throughout. He has succeeded in making his exposition of an important subject—what it purports to be—both useful and interesting, and we would point to it as a good specimen of what we could wish our religious literature to be.

English speaking Catholics will find the intrinsic excellence of the book enhanced by that desirable but rare product—a translation excellent in style, yet faithful to the text. J. J. M'D.

THE CATHOLIC WORLD: *A Monthly Magazine.* New York, 6, Park-place. London: Burns & Oates.

At the present day Catholics feel keenly the want of such books as can safely be put into the hands of the general reader, whose reading must not be dissociated from recreation, and whose interest is excited and sustained as well by the charms of a graceful style as by abundance of matter. For this large and ever-growing class of readers this excellent Monthly is well suited.

THE CHURCH OF OLD ENGLAND.

This is the title of a "Collection of papers bearing on the continuity of the English Church, and of the attempts made to justify the Anglican position." The object of the papers is stated in a short notice prefixed by the editor. They are intended to "offer a ready and complete answer to the chief claims and objections set up by the Anglican Church in its endeavours to pass itself off as Catholic." In the paper on St. Peter's Roman Episcopacy, we have a very full and accurate treatment of an interesting question.

THE STONEMASON OF SAINT-POINT. A Translation from the French of A. de Lamartine. By Georges Emile Barbier. Dublin: Browne & Nolan.

THIS is a good translation of Lamartine's "Tailleur de Pierres." M. Barbier may be congratulated on the exact knowledge which he has acquired of the English language. In this work he always finds the happiest idiomatic English expressions to render the corresponding ones in French. We believe, however, that he has done a bad service to boys preparing for examinations by offering them this translation. No language can be learned at all when the mind of the boy is passive instead of being active, and that is almost always the case when translations are used, particularly when the original work is so easy as the present. Annotated editions of the French text, such as those of M. Gosset of Oxford—*L'Avare*, *Tartuffe*, *Les Fourberies de Scapin*, or those prepared by M. Boielle, are all that can be desired, and give as much assistance as any student who knows the elements of the language should require. If, on the other hand, the translation is intended, as it well may be, for English readers unacquainted with French, the asterisks, references-marks, parentheses and foot-note annotations intended for the schools, take away much from the pleasure one might find in reading an otherwise pleasant and pure English translation.

J. F. II.

THE GREAT MEANS OF SALVATION. By St. Alphonsus de Liguori. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THIS is the third volume of the centenary edition of the complete Ascetical Works of St. Alphonsus, edited by Fr. Eugene Grimm. It comprises the important treatises on Prayer, on the choice of a state of life, and on the vocation to the religious state and to the priesthood. It would be almost impertinence to commend such a valuable book, which the saint considered the most useful of all his writings. "If it were in my power," he adds, "I would distribute a copy of it to every Catholic in the world."

It is only necessary for us to refer to the printing and general appearance of the volume, which are all that could be desired, and, indeed, such as might be expected from the eminent publishers.

THE COINER'S CAVE. By Wilhelm Herchenbach. Translated by Mrs. Josephine Black. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

The Coiner's Cave is a short story in which the dangers and precautions against detection, inseparable from the coiner's trade, are

very well described. The story has several exciting incidents, and the writer's power of description is considerable.

The translator has done her part of the task admirably. There are none of those departures from English idiom and English terms of expression, which so often disfigure the pages of otherwise admirable translations.

PERCY'S REVENGE. By Clara Mulholland. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

Percy's Revenge increases the debt of gratitude that the reading public, and especially the youthful portion of it, owe to the gifted author.

Under the form of a simple story, delightfully told, are conveyed lessons in truthfulness and honesty, and in that self-forgetfulness and consideration for others without which even the family circle cannot be happy.

The characters introduced are judiciously few, and they are all well-drawn; we cannot but sympathise with poor Percy, and admire the efforts he makes to be good.

IRISH SONGS AND POEMS. By Francis A. Fahy. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, O'Connell-street.

The author claims but to be "a singer of rhymes that will not linger." We hope his claims will be disallowed. His "rhymes" have the merit of patriotism. They are just such as our peasantry are apt to catch, and make long-lived.

THE SALVE REGINA. THE POETRY OF SIR SAMUEL FERGUSON. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

The Salve Regina, by Father Antony Denis, S.J., is a translation from the Second Edition, consisting of thirty-one Meditations divided respectively into two, three, and sometimes four chapters. The book is serviceable as a Month of Mary and will win many clients for our Queen.

The Poetry of Sir Samuel Ferguson, by Mr. Justice O'Hagan, is a just analysis of his friend's chief poems. The neat and attractive little book is a reprint of two thoughtful and appreciative Essays first published in the *Irish Monthly*.

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

AUGUST, 1887.

THE ORIGIN OF RELIGIOUS ORDERS.

AFTER the Papacy there is perhaps no institution in the Church that deserves more the admiration of her children and the careful attention of mankind than her Religious Orders. Had she no other claim to be recognized as Divine in her origin, they would be quite sufficient to establish her claim. For no supposition of the Church's being a mere human institution can explain why so many of her children have in every period of her history given up all that the world holds dear, to embrace what the world in its practice so clearly condemns, viz., poverty, chastity, and obedience. For more than fourteen hundred years Religious Orders have taken a prominent part in almost every movement that was directed to the improvement of man's religious and educational condition. They have been the homes of learning and piety, the devoted defenders of the Church against her enemies, the heralds of religion and civilization to the uttermost parts of the earth. These services the Church has been ever ready to acknowledge by the many favours which she has bestowed on Religious Orders in each succeeding age. The world also owes them a debt which it is slow to acknowledge, and slower still to repay. Religious Orders have, then, entered largely into the life and action of the Church in sanctifying her children and promoting the interests of civilization. They are not, however, essential to the Church's constitution: she lived and

fulfilled her mission without them for the first three centuries; and that a period the most critical in the whole course of her history. During those years of her infancy and early growth, without their assistance, she had to withstand the combined attacks of Judaism, Paganism, and Greek Philosophy, and pass through the fiery persecutions of a Nero, a Decius, and a Diocletian. They are not then essential to the Church; neither are they of Divine institution. They are the outgrowth, the development, and full expression of her Religious life. This Religious life, which in its essence consists in the practice of the three virtues of poverty, chastity, and obedience, is as old as the Church herself, for it was practised by the College of the Apostles. It found expression in many different forms before the institution of Religious Orders. To trace briefly the history of those phases of Religious life, and show how each gradually developed into another till they culminated in the institution of Monastic Orders, is the purpose we set before ourselves in the present paper.

Anti-Catholic writers maintain that Christian monachism began with the Decian persecution (249-51), and that the first monks found in the Church were the hermits that were driven by this persecution to take up their abode in the deserts of Egypt. In holding this view they either totally ignore the witness of history, or distort it so as to make it subservient to their preconceived theories about the origin and growth of monachism. According to them, Christian monachism is not the result of an effort to carry out in practice the evangelical counsels, and to follow a mode of life that is praised in the Old Testament, and received from Christ such an unmistakable sanction in the eulogium passed by Him on St. John the Baptist. On the contrary, they hold that it is opposed to the spirit of the Gospel, that its first stage was brought about by persecution, and that the following stages were the result of error and superstition. Christian monachism did not begin with the Decian persecution; long before that time there were in the Church monks, or such as lived a life of retirement in the practice of poverty, chastity, prayer, and other ascetical exercises. St. Athanasius, in his life of St. Anthony, says that before

the time of St. Paul of Thebes¹ and St. Anthony, there were no hermits in the Church, but that there were monks who lived in cells in rural districts close to towns. He also tells us that when St. Anthony, about the year 266, thought of embracing the life of a hermit, he went to consult an old man who led the life of a monk from his early years (*ineunte aetate*). This would clearly require that he who was an old man in 266 and had embraced the life of monachism at an early age should have been a monk before 249, when the Decian persecution began. Cassian,² traces the history of Christian monachism in Egypt back to the middle of the first century of the Christian era: he states that it was introduced into the Church of Alexandria by St. Mark, and that the plan of life introduced by St. Mark was followed by subsequent Egyptian monks. Many writers of the last century, accepting the authority of Eusebius, held that the Therapeutae were Christians and the founders of Christian monachism. Had the Therapeutae been Christians, as stated by the Father of Ecclesiastical History, the honor might be fairly claimed for them of having introduced not merely the first stage of Christian monachism, but, even its more advanced stage, *scil.*, monasticism. For they lived a kind of community life in the practice of poverty, chastity, and retirement from the world. It has, however, been conclusively established, that the Therapeutae were not Christians, but an ascetical sect that sprung up among the followers of the Jewish Philo of Alexandria. It is very probable that some of them were converted to Christianity and exercised no inconsiderable influence on the forms in which Religious life afterwards manifested itself among the Christians of Egypt.

The monks or religious solitaries of the first two centuries are by many writers called *anchorites* to distinguish them from the *hermits*—citizens of the desert—that made their appearance during the Decian persecution; though, by most writers the words are taken as synonymous. For the sake of clearness we shall use them in different senses, understanding

¹ St. Paul of Thebes became a hermit in 250.

² *De Inst. Coenob.*, Lib. ii., cap. 5.

by *anchorite* a religious solitary who lives not far removed from the abodes of men; while *hermit*, in accordance with the derivation of the word, will be taken to designate a religious solitary of the desert. At first, as we are told by St. Athanasius,¹ the *anchorites* lived in rudely constructed cells in fields near towns; but, when churches began to be built towards the close of the second century, they had their cells constructed either beside the church, or, as generally happened, in its very walls. The latter arrangement had this advantage, that the *Inclusi*, as they are sometimes called, could hear Mass and receive the Sacraments without leaving their enclosure. This mode of life was interrupted by the Decian and following persecutions. When peace was restored to the Church by Constantine the Great it was again introduced, and was adopted in many countries of Europe, especially in England, where it became so popular that it was made the subject of legislation. Thus, the Council of Lincoln (1323) ordered that the cells of *anchorites* should in future be constructed in the walls of the Church and that each cell should be provided with three apertures, viz., one into the Church, one for light, and one through which food might be passed to the anchorites. It also prescribed the ceremonies and prayers that were to be used in enclosing the religious solitaires. It continued in England as late as the Reformation, when it disappeared with the other forms of Religious life.

A remarkable class of anchorites called *Stylites* or pillar-saints made their appearance in Syria in the beginning of the fifth century. They pursued a manner of life strange in itself, and stranger still when judged by the standard of modern tastes and habits. To effect a more complete separation from earth than that afforded by the cell in the church, they took up their abode on the tops of pillars—a fact, from which they derive their name—and here they lived often for many years without descending to the earth. The height of the pillar did not always remain constant, but was often raised to indicate the progress in perfection supposed to be

¹ Life of St. Anthony.

made by the Stylite. Thus, *e.g.* the pillar of St. Simon Stylites, the first and best known of this class of solitaries, was raised four times during the thirty-two years that he spent in this mode of life. The changes in height are thus described by the poet, Tennyson :

“Then, that I might be more alone with thee,
Three years I lived on a pillar, high
Six cubits, and three years on one of twelve :
And twice three years on one that rose
Twenty by measure ; last of all I grew
Twice ten long weary years to this,
That measures forty from the soil.”

The Stylites generally took up their abode near towns that they might have an opportunity of preaching to the numbers that, on their way to or from the towns, flocked to see them, and were attended by disciples who supplied them with the necessary food. They were bound by chains to the pillars, and could never lie down to rest, as the diameter of the top was generally about two feet and a half, and never exceeded a yard. Neither had they any protection against the inclemency of the weather other than that afforded by the hair skins with which they were clothed. The sufferings they had to undergo cannot be conceived by us, much less realised. Tennyson has undertaken to give a description of them by contrast in the following lines on St. Simon Stylites :

“ But yet
Bethink thee, Lord, while they and all the saints
Enjoy themselves in heaven, and men on earth
House in the shade of comfortable roofs,
Sit with their wives by fires, eat wholesome food,
And wear warm clothes, and even beasts have stalls,
I, 'tween the spring and downfall of the light,
Bow down one thousand and two hundred times,
To Christ, the Virgin Mother, and the saints ;
Or in the night after a little sleep,
I wake : the chill stars sparkle ; I am wet
With drenching dews, or stiff with crackling frost.
I wear an undress'd goatskin on my back ;
A grazing iron collar grinds my neck ;
And in my weak, leaden arms I lift the cross,
And strive and wrestle with thee till I die.”

The Stylites were confined almost exclusively to the East; the only example known in the Western Church being that of a monk named Thulfilach, who, after spending some time on a pillar near Treves, was prevailed upon by the bishop of the diocese to retire to a monastery. They were most common in Syria, where they continued as late as the thirteenth century. Perhaps the most noteworthy instance of this peculiar mode of life is that given by SURIUS, in his catalogue of saints, of one ALIPIUS, Bishop of Adrianople, who resigned his See, and embracing the life of a Stylite, spent seventy years on a pillar. So much for the anchorites, and that phase of anchoritic life pursued by the Stylites: we shall now pass to consider the next stage of monachism.

We have mentioned that the anchoritic mode of life was interrupted by the Decian and following persecutions: it would perhaps be more correct to say, that the anchoritic stage of monachism was transformed by these persecutions into the heremical. The Decian persecution was the severest of the many that had as yet been carried on against the Church; and nowhere were the imperial edicts executed with greater rigour than in Egypt. Christians wherever found were put to death, churches were burned down, the anchoritic cells were destroyed and their holy inmates had to flee into the deserts to find amidst nature's solitudes the peaceful rest denied to them by the cruelty of man. Their example was followed by thousands who sought to escape persecution, and, by embracing the life of the hermit, to imitate their great prototype, St. John the Baptist. Then did Egypt "the mother of many wonders" see the most striking of her wonders, viz.—her cities and towns deserted, her deserts and mountain wastes peopled by holy solitaries living the lives of angels rather than of men. St. Chrysostom¹ speaking of this wonderful transformation brought about by the hermits in Egypt says: "If any one goes into the solitudes of Egypt he will see the entire desert raised above Paradise itself; and innumerable angels appear before him in the

¹ Hom. in St. Matt. cap. v.]

bodies of men." The two most remarkable and best known of the Egyptian hermits are St. Paul of Thebes and St. Anthony. To the former the consent of ages has given the title of "*first hermit.*" We are told by St. Athanasius¹ that he retired in 249 to the most secluded part of the Thebaean desert, where he took up his abode in a grotto with a stone for its door, and not sufficiently large to contain two at the same time. His raiment was the skin of a wild beast bound with a girdle of palm leaves, and his food was supplied each morning by a raven. In this mode of life he spent 100 years, and when he died, the charitable work of burial was performed by a lion. The life of St. Paul may be said to be substantially the life of many. The accounts that have come down to us of these saintly denizens of the desert are so replete with the wonderful, that our first prompting is to think that they were endowed with powers more than human and natures that were angelic. Catholics and non-Catholics would do well to read some of their lives: the former, to see what men endowed with a lively faith are capable of doing for God and eternity: the latter, to find examples of devotion and self-sacrifice that will be sought for in vain outside the Catholic Church. "Who is so ignorant," says Montalembert, "or so unfortunate, as not to have devoured those tales of the heroic age of monachism? Who has not contemplated, if not with the eyes of faith, at least with the admiration inspired by an uncontrollable greatness of soul the struggles of these athletes of patience. Everything is to be found there, variety and pathos, the sublime and simple epic of a race of men, *naijs* as children and strong as giants."

The heremital life, possessing as it did many advantages peculiar to itself, suffered from one great drawback, viz., the want of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and of the Sacraments, for the hermits were mostly laymen. To remedy this defect the monks living in the same district brought their cells together and erected a common church where they might attend at Mass and receive the Sacraments. Such a collection

¹ Life of St. Anthony.

of cells was called a *laura*, and formed a kind of transition stage between the purely heremital and coenobitical, modes of religious life. We are told by Eveagrius¹ that the difference between the *laura* and *coenobium* or monastery consisted in this: "a *laura* was many cells divided from one another where each monk provided for himself, while the *coenobium* was one habitation where all the monks lived in society and had all things in common."

That the *laura* should soon give way to the monastery is what we should expect. The transition, however, might have occupied a much longer time than it did, had not the great St. Anthony appeared to hasten it. After spending forty years as a hermit in the practice of those austerities that have hallowed his name in the Church he was persuaded to leave his retreat in the desert by the prayers of numerous hermits who wished to live under his spiritual direction. In the year 305 he founded at Faium, not far from Memphis, an institute, the members of which lived in community and recognised St. Anthony as their superior. This is the first religious institute that can claim the title of *monastery*. St. Anthony introduced an important element into the religious life, that was destined very soon to receive a further development. Before his time the monks lived in separate cells, bound together by no other bonds than a common mode of life, and that triple tie which unites all orthodox Christians. He brought them together and formed them into a kind of family under the rule of a superior and in this way added a closer bond to those by which they were already united, viz., a special governmental union. It is on account of this new element which he introduced into monachism that St. Anthony has been recognised as the founder of monasticism.

Though St. Anthony was the founder of monasticism, he cannot lay claim to the further title of founder of *monastic orders*. There were still important advances to be made before that further development of monasticism could be reached. As yet, there was no monastic rule, neither were

¹ Let. 1, cap. xxi.

vows required of those who embraced monasticism. The time, however, was not distant when those advances were to be made, and the men were already at hand that were to make them. St. Pachomius the disciple of St. Anthony drew up the first monastic rule, and before his death he had the pleasure of seeing it observed by 7,000 monks. St. Pachomius may claim the title of being founder of the first *Religious Congregation*.

The last stage in the development of monasticism was reserved for the great St. Basil. After he became Bishop of Ceserea, he brought the monks of his diocese together, and drew up a rule for their observance which after a short time was adopted throughout the East. He required that all who should embrace the Religious life should take the three solemn vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. He tells us that before his time these vows were not required. Hence St. Basil was the founder of the first Religious Order. This Order was never popular in the west, as its rule was not sufficiently in keeping with the climate of Europe and the character of its people. A more suitable rule was introduced about a century and a-half later by St. Benedict of Nursia, who did for the west what St. Basil had already done for the east, and, thus, became the founder of Western Monasticism in its more developed form. Henceforth Religious Orders are destined to occupy an important place in the history of mankind.

T. GILMARTIN.

AMONG THE GRAVES.—V.

ONE of the finest monuments that have come down to us from comparatively remote times, having survived the ravages of time and escaped the spoiler's hand, is that of the O'Connor family in the old Dominican church of Sligo. Its style is what is usually called the Renaissance, which, whatever may have been its beauties or defects elsewhere, was in this country, at the time when this monument was erected,

wholly devoid of grace of outline and harmony of parts. Usually pillar rises over pillar, and arch over arch in a stiff formal manner, making but a poor contrast with the flowing tracery and the delicate pillars of the Gothic buildings into which they were allowed to intrude. This monument has most of these defects, and they are made more evident by the comparison which forces itself on the spectator between it and the little that unhappily remains of the old building. This Archdall describes as "beautiful and of extraordinary workmanship."

Yet, however defective its outlines may be, the details of its ornamentation leave but little to desire. As we cannot set before our readers any kind of print of the monument, we must strive to make up for the deficiency by a somewhat lengthy description. Below, as a support, we have some finely wrought scrollwork, with fruits and flowers grouped together with great skill, in the centre of which is a sand-glass with wings, and beyond it on either side a death's head, fitting emblems of the quick flight of man's mortal life. Immediately above this is a plain panel bearing the inscription with which we shall deal later; on each side a winged head. A high projecting moulding separates this panel from the next member and acts as a support for two figures, each in an arched recess, kneeling with their hands joined as if in prayer. The male figure to the left is clad in plate armour; his helmet is at his feet. The female figure to the right is clothed in the dress worn by women towards the end of the 17th century; a ruff round the neck, a rosary hanging from her waist, and a coronet on her head. The semi-circular spaces over the heads of the figures contain inscriptions, but these are almost wholly frayed away; so too the inscription on the square panel over the arches and separated from them by a double moulding. Over this panel and supported by a very heavy moulding we have a coat of arms, viz., on a shield a tree; over the shield a knight's helmet; as crest, a crowned lion passant regardant. On either side, not however as supporters, but as independent figures on pedestals set against the pilasters, are two full-length figures in high

relief, one holding in the right hand a key, in the left a sword; the other having in the right a sword, in the left a book, most probably representing SS. Peter and Paul. The whole is surmounted by a fine figure of the Crucifixion.

The inscription on the lower panel is as follows, the end of each line in the original being marked by a star:—

HIC JACET FAMOSISSIMVS MILES DONATVS CORNELIANVS COMITATVS*
 SLIGIAE DOMINVS CVM SVA VXORE ILLVSTRISSIMA
 DOMINA ELINORA BUTLER *
 COMITISSA DESMONIAE QNE ME FIERI FECIT ANNO 1624 POST MORTEM SVI*
 MARITI QVI OBIT 11° AVGVSTI ANNO 1609 ITEM EIVS FILIA ET
 PRIMI MARITI, VIZ : *
 COMITIS DESMONIE NOMINE ELIZABETHA VALDE VIRTVOSA DOMINA
 SEPVLTA * FVIT HOC IN TVMVLO 31° NOVEMBRIS
 ANNO DOMINI 1623. *

[Here lies the most famous Knight Donough O'Connor, Lord of the County of Sligo, with his wife, the most illustrious Lady Elinor Butler, Countess of Desmond, who caused me to be made in the year 1624, after the death of her husband, who died on the 11th of August, in the year 1609. Also her and her first husband the Earl of Desmond's daughter, by name Elizabeth, a very virtuous Lady, was buried in this tomb on the 31st of November, 1623].

Two obvious errors occur in the above inscription, the first in line 4 where "qne" is put for "que"; the second gives 31 days to the month of November.

The Irish name O'Conchobhair is here translated Cornelianus. O'Donovan in this very valuable introduction to the topographical poems of O'Duggan and O'Heerin says of such changes of Irish names as this: "Conchobhar, or as Sir Richard Cox writes it Cnogher, is not identical, synonymous or even cognate with Cornelius . . . It is evident that there is no reason for changing the Irish Conchobhar to Cornelius, except a fancied and a very remote resemblance between the sounds of both." We may add it is just as evident that disputes about the way in which the name should be written in English are not unlike those *de lana caprina*, since the resemblance of sound between any one of them and the Irish word is almost as remote as between it and the Latin adaptation.

It is a common idea that all bearing the name of O'Connor are descended from a common stock, the royal Siol Muireadhaigh. This is a mistake; there were others who bore the name of a totally different descent, and little inferior to the Connaught family. The O'Connor Failge, O'Connor Kerry, O'Connor of Corcomroe, O'Connor of Dungiven, were all of them chiefs of extensive territories from a very remote period. O'Connor Sligo, however, belongs to the Connaught family, being descended from Brian Luighneach, the son of Cathal Crobderg, who was King of Connaught from 1198 to 1224. The tribe-name occurs in Irish history as early as the beginning of the 14th century. The Four Masters tell us under the date 1403 that "Murtagh Bacagh, son of Donnell (Lord of Sligo), died in the Castle of Sligo." This was built by Maurice Fitzgerald, second baron of Offaly, then Lord Justice, one of "the English who came to Connaught to build castles there." He was the founder of the Dominican monastery also. Richard Earl Marshal was said to be engaged in a conspiracy against the Crown. The Lord Justice was ordered to send him alive or dead to England. At a conference held on the Curragh of Kildare he was exhorted to surrender. He refused to do so, and charged into the midst of the crowd and was wounded. He died soon after of the wound. The Baron fearing the resentment of the Earl's brother hastened to London, and in the King's presence swore solemnly that he was wholly innocent of all share in the Earl's death; and as a further act of conciliation, he founded this house, the monks of which were to offer up prayers for the soul of the murdered Earl. In 1414 the monastery was burned to the ground by accident. Pope John XXIII. granted an indulgence of ten years and as many quarantines on the usual conditions to all who aided in its restoration.

Donough O'Connor succeeded his uncle Calvagh in the chieftaincy in 1581. The territory over which he had sway extended from Magh Ceidne to Ceiscorrainn and from the Moy to the boundary of Brefney. He claimed chiefry too over the O'Dowds, the two O'Haras, and O'Gara, but he was himself subject to O'Donnell.

The first mention made of him in the *Annals of the Four*

Masters is under the date 1597. "O'Connor Sligo, Donough, son of Cathal Oge, mustered a numerous army of English and Irish troops, a short time after the feast of St. Brigit to march to Sligo. O'Donnell (the famous Hugh Roe) was in Cahry, in readiness to meet him; and he made an attack on O'Connor before he could reach Sligo. None of O'Connor's army waited to resist him excepting a few in the rear, who were overtaken on the Traigh Eothaile. These were wounded and drowned. O'Connor returned back, and his mind was not easy for having gone on that expedition." In the same year we read of his having established friendship and concord between his brother-in-law Theobald na long, and the Governor of the province of Connaught, Sir Conyers Clifford. These went into the country of MacWilliam, and drove him from it, despoiling and totally plundering all who remained in confederation and friendship with him. MacWilliam went to complain to Hugh Roe O'Donnell, who immediately made a hoisting into Connaught to assist MacWilliam, and the country was unable to resist him, so that he seized their hostage and pledges. He left his brother Rury to strengthen MacWilliam against his enemies and returned back to Tyrconnell.

Crucory O'Clery's unpublished Irish Life of Hugh Roe O'Donnell makes frequent mention, often in no very creditable terms, of O'Connor. In it we are told that he came from England to Ireland in the beginning of the summer of 1599, as he was commanded by the Queen and her council, and that he went secretly with a small body of soldiers to Collooney, and made excursions from that place into the lands of O'Donnell's dependents. O'Donnell set out in haste from Ballyshannon, intending to come on O'Connor unawares. O'Connor had withdrawn to the castle, which was a place of great strength, owing to its natural position and to the ramparts that had been made around it. The only thing left was to surround it and to reduce the garrison by cutting off their supplies. When the Earl of Essex heard that his friend and companion in arms was in such straits, he ordered the Governor of Connaught, Sir Conyers Clifford, to assemble all the forces that he could, both the English that

were in the garrisons, even as far as Limerick and Askeaton, and the Irish, who were then obedient to the Queen. The rendezvous was the monastery of Boyle. O'Donnell heard of their approach, and leaving a part of his forces to watch O'Connor, he set off with the rest to guard the passes over the Curlew mountains. A battle followed, known as the battle of the Curlews, in which the English were totally defeated, and their commander Clifford slain. His body was carried to Trinity Island to be buried; his head taken to be shown to O'Connor. "He would not believe that the English forces had been defeated; but when he was shown the Governor's head, he was perplexed thereat, and gave up all hope of release; and what he did was to come out into O'Donnell's presence and to make complete submission to him. . . . It was better for him he did so, for O'Donnell gave him abundance of cattle and horses, and every kind of beast, and corn too, so that he might inhabit his territory."

Two years later some friends of O'Donnell who happened to be in the neighbourhood of Dublin and used to hear the news, told him that one of the old English had seen letters in the hands of the clerks of the Council, in which O'Connor Sligo, in return for his friendship, promised the Lord Justice, "to search out and deliver up Hugh Roe to him and to the Council, whether by force, by wounding, or by capture." O'Donnell was sorely grieved when he read the letter. He sent a messenger to Hugh O'Neill to ask his advice. O'Neill considered for a long time what answer he should give, and at length replied that whereas O'Connor's treachery was well proved, he should be seized and cast into prison. O'Donnell assembled a troop of horse, and bade them be ready to do what he should command them. This they all promised as one man. They set off for Carbery Drum Cliabh, where O'Connor then was. He was sent for, and when he made his appearance, seized and carried away, to be imprisoned in Lough Esk.

The following year we find him once more on the side of the English. O'Sullivan tells how, at the crossing of the Erne at Ballyshannon, he and Inchiquin, who was drowned there, vied with each other which should be the first to attack the Irish enemy.

After about a year's imprisonment he was released by Rury, Hugh O'Donnell's brother. "He promised to be entirely submissive to O'Donnell's son; and they entered into a treaty of friendship with each other."

This was after the battle of Kinsale, when the Irish cause seemed to be a losing one. When news came of Hugh Roe's death in Spain, both O'Donnell's brother and O'Connor accepted the terms of peace offered them by Mountjoy, and laid down their arms.

No further mention is made of him in Irish history. Moryson in his *Threnodia*, printed at Innsbruck, 1659, gives among the nobles who were slain by heretics "the most illustrious Teigue O'Connor Sligo, descended from the family of the last and most powerful monarch of Ireland, a man of wonderful innocence and goodness; after the amnesty made with the whole Kingdom he was put to death by hanging at Boyle in the year 1652." More than one of the name too distinguished themselves in the service of foreign princes; their history we cannot give here.

The history of Elinor, Countess of Desmond, is indeed a tragic one. Born of the noble house of Dunboyne, a junior branch of the Ormond family, she was married to the Earl of Desmond. Between his family and hers, the Fitzgeralds of Desmond and the Butlers, a feud of the fiercest kind had existed for centuries; nor was it stopped by this union. When Earl Gerald, and with him all the Irish chiefs of Munster, and many even of the old English of the Pale, rose up in defence of their faith, which was threatened with utter ruin, his most relentless enemy was the Earl of Ormond. O'Sullivan, in his *Compendium of the History of Catholic Ireland*, gives a detailed account of this war during the fifteen years that it lasted. Little by little the Earl's soldiers were cut off either in the open field or by secret treachery. His few followers had to abandon him, and strove to seek safety for themselves. Sander, the legate, whom the Pope had sent to Ireland in order to cement the union of the north and south in defence of their common interests against their common enemy, "wandering in the woods without succour, died in a raving phrenesy," as Lord Burghley announced

with joy. The Countess Elinor was her husband's constant companion in his flight from one place to another. And so closely pressed were they on one occasion by their pursuers, that they escaped only by remaining all night long up to their necks in a lake. The countess thought to touch the Queen's heart by a woman's appeal.

"Most noble mistress," she wrote, "if I have not followed and performed according to my duty your Majesty's directions and promises I made before your Highness when I last departed your princely presence, I renounce God and do humbly refer me to the report of your Majesty's governor and council. Though my husband's dealing since his departure from Dublin proceeded not (God I take to witness) through any evil intention towards your Majesty or dignity, but rather incensed by ungodly disturbing of the common tranquility to conceive otherwise of your worthy governor than he had cause, yet I durst not, until now that he hath both heartily repented and dutifully performed such things as was required by your Majesty's deputy and council of him, once more open my lips nor put pen to paper to entreat for your Highness' merciful clemency for him. But since that he is reconciled and hath most humbly submitted himself to your Majesty, I with all humbleness in most humblewise do heartily beseech your Majesty to vouchsafe of your accustomed mercy to restore him into your Majesty's favour."

But the appeal was not listened to. Not long after Ormond could say to the Lords Justices: "I wrote to you that the next news should be the killing of Desmond; so (I thank God) it is come to pass that the eleventh of this month he was slain in his cabin at a place called Glance-gnielye near the river Maigne by Donell McDonell O'Moriarty. So praying God to send the like end to all traitors and unnatural subjects, I commit your Lordship to God's guiding." Desmond's head was sent by Ormond to Walsingham and put upon a pole on London Bridge.

When the Countess entered into the second marriage we do not know. It may be, indeed the Four Masters say it explicitly, that she was not without a hope of seeing her son restored to his father's honours. He had been for a long time confined a prisoner in the Tower of London. There he had been taught to look on the faith for which his father died as a damnable heresy. When in due time he had the lesson well by heart, the poor weakling was brought over to Ireland in

order to wean the people by his example from their errors. The author of *Pacata Hibernia* tells of "the mighty concourse of people at his entry into the town of Kilmallock, in so much as all the streets, doors, and windows, yea the very gutters and tops of the houses were so filled with them as if they came to see him whom God had sent to be that comfort and delight to their souls and hearts most desired; and they welcomed him with all the expressions and signs of joy, every one throwing upon him wheat and salt (a prediction of future peace and plenty). The next day being Sunday, the Earl went to church to hear divine service, and all the way his country people used loud and rude delhortations to keep him from church, unto which he lent a deaf ear; and after service and the sermon was ended, the Earl coming forth from the church was railed at and spat upon by those that before his going to church were so desirous to see and salute him." This mission of course proved an utter failure, and he returned to London and died there soon after.

There is mention in the same book of a certain Dermot O'Connor who was married to Margaret the daughter of the countess. "She too had been brought up among the English and stood reasonably well affected to the English Government, and likely it was that she would use all her industry to advance the service, in the hope that if it succeeded well, it would prove a good step or ladder to procure the liberty of her brother, son and heir to the old Earl of Desmond (now prisoner in the Tower) and to raise his fortunes." She prevailed on her husband to play the traitor and deliver up James Fitz Thomas to Carew, then Head President of Munster, the reward offered to him being £1,000 which the lady was to receive on the handing over of Fitz Thomas to the President's messenger.

Archdall says the countess was buried in a chapel which she directed to be built near the abbey of St. Dominick in Sligo; towards the erecting thereof and a monument therein she bequeathed £500 out of her arrears in England to be taken out by her noble cousin James, Earl of Ormond, and to be built by her appointment. Probably the chapel was never

built, but the monument was set in its present position in the lady chapel of the church.

De Burgo, who wrote the History of the Dominican Order in Ireland more than a century ago, speaks of other monuments as existing then in the church and cloisters, notably of a statue that was erected to a certain Pierce O'Timmony, illustrious for his birth, wealth, and virtues, and most attached to the Order, in proof of the lasting gratitude of the of the Order to him. This has disappeared and with it almost all the others.

DENIS MURPHY.

THE POLITICS OF ST. THOMAS AQUINAS.

“AS I was thinking what gift I could offer, worthy of your royal dignity and at the same time in keeping with my profession and office, it struck me that I could not do better than write for a king a book upon kingly government, in which I should expound to the best of my ability the origin of royalty and the duties of kings according to the authority of Holy Scripture, the teaching of philosophers, and the example of praiseworthy princes.” These words with which St. Thomas opens his treatise *De Regimine Principum ad Regem Cypri*, show that the saint did not consider that in writing about politics he was quitting his own proper sphere of duty. What he has written we may study and fearlessly preach to our people.

The Angelical Doctor's works on Politics are three in number: (1) a Commentary on Aristotle's *Politics*; (2) *De Regimine Judæorum ad comitissam Flandriæ*; (3) the above-mentioned treatise, *De Regimine Principum ad Regem Cypri*. Some doubt has been raised as to the genuineness of these works, or portions of them. De Rubeis, whose *Dissertationes Criticæ* have been prefixed to the Leonine edition of St. Thomas's works, is of opinion that the following only are genuine: (1) Commentary on Aristotle's *Politics* I., II., III.,

cc. 1-6; (2) *De Regimine Judæorum*, the whole; (3) *De Regimine Principum*, I, II. Care will be taken to quote only from the genuine texts. Political questions are also discussed in the *Summa*, the Commentary on the Sentences, and the various Commentaries on Holy Scripture. It would not be possible within the compass of a short article to give a complete account of St. Thomas's opinions on politics. All that I propose to do here is to take certain questions which are of interest at the present day, and to state the saint's answers.

I. THE ORIGIN OF GOVERNMENT.—The first question that interests us is the origin of government. And here at once we are struck by the contrast between the method of the Angelical Doctor, and the method usually followed at the present day. The nineteenth century is often called the century of progress, yet the characteristic of its writers is their study of the past. In almost every branch of inquiry it is now a recognized canon that unless we know what has been we cannot understand what is, and we cannot foresee what is to come. Hence patient investigators are everywhere raking up the past, and carefully scrutinizing every survival. Deductive reasoning is by no means excluded. All that is required is that the theories should first be suggested by the study of facts, and afterwards be shown to be in agreement with what might have been expected from the study of principles. If we were to inquire into the origin of government according to this method, we should go back into the past and endeavour to detect the earliest germs of government, and to trace their subsequent growth; we should examine with the greatest care the condition of backward peoples at the present day, looking upon them as so many survivals of stages through which the more advanced nations have already passed. Such is not the method pursued by St. Thomas. His argument is an *à priori* one, and it is briefly this: Society is natural; society implies government; therefore government is natural. Society is natural for two reasons: Man has needs to be gratified and faculties to be exercised. The due gratification of the one and the exercise of the other cannot take place if he lives alone. Nature has

provided the lower animals with food, covering, and the means of defence, or at least of flight. Man has none of these, but he has reason whereby he can procure them. One man, however, cannot do this all by himself. Division of labour is necessary and this means that men should live together and combine the results of their efforts. Again, man alone of all animals possesses the faculty of speech and this cannot be exercised unless he lives in the company of others. "It is better therefore that two should be together than one; for they have the advantage of their society." (*Eccles. iv., 9.*) Now if it is natural to man to live in society there must be some government.¹ For if a number of men live together each one will seek his own good, and there will be no common action but endless strife unless there be somebody to point out and to enforce what is for the common good. "Where there is no governor, the people shall fall" (*Prov. xi., 14.*) Hence St. Thomas's opinion about the origin of government is that it is natural. It must be remembered that though this term "natural," is borrowed from Aristotle, the saint uses it in a somewhat different sense from his master. Nature, according to St. Thomas, is God's work, and consequently whatever is natural has a sort of divine right. "All power is of God," because government arose naturally. This of course does not refer to any particular form of government. All that is meant is that a government of some sort is not a mere matter of convention among men, but flows from the very nature of mankind.

II. THE END (OBJECT) OF GOVERNMENT. In the next question, the end or object of government, St. Thomas's method has more to commend it. The origin of government is now usually treated as a question of fact, and hence the *à priori* method is not commonly followed in discussing it. But the end of government is a question of right. What are the purposes for which government should

¹ "Si ergo naturale est homini quod in societate multorum vivat, necesse est in hominibus esse per quod multitudo regatur." (*De Reg. Princ., I., 1.*)

exist? And here the *a priori* method is available. We have already seen that the origin of government is due to the necessity of having some person or persons to point out and to enforce what is for the common good. Here we have also the end of government—the welfare of all. Governments should not exist for the benefit of the governors only but for the benefit of the governed also. “The enormous faith of many made for one” is strongly opposed by St. Thomas. Rulers who seek their own interest, he says, are cursed by the Lord through the mouth of His prophet, saying: “Woe to the shepherds that fed themselves.” (*Ezech.* xxxiv., 2.) By the common good is meant the good of the whole man. Government is not a mere machine for the protection of life and property. It has other officials besides the soldier and the policeman. It should provide for the moral well-being of the citizens as well as the physical. St. Thomas, following Aristotle, maintains that Ethics and Politics though not identical are yet inseparable. But this point will be more fully treated under the next head.

III. FUNCTIONS OF GOVERNMENT.—The functions of Government concerning the common weal are two-fold: directive and coercive, or, as we should now say, legislative and executive. The general principles of Natural law are plain to all men. Every one knows that he should do injury to no man, that he should honour his father and mother, and love and fear God. But in many cases it is not easy to decide, for instance, whether what we intend to do would injure our neighbour or not. There must be some authority to determine this. Moreover, Natural law does not enter into details. It lays down, for example, that evil-doers should be punished, but it does not specify the quantity and quality of the punishment. And even when we know what is right we are often tempted to disobey, because the benefits to be derived in this life from disobedience make us unmindful of the punishments of the world to come. Right conduct should therefore be enforced by punishments here on earth. For these reasons, then, that is to say, to determine and apply the Natural law, and to arm it with a temporal sanction, Human, or Positive law, as the English

jurists term it, is necessary. This relation between Human and Natural law is much insisted on by St. Thomas. Human law is law only in so far as it is derived from Natural law; if it disagrees with Natural law it is not law at all, but rather a corruption of law.¹ It is not, indeed, the business of government to prohibit all kinds of vice, but only the more grievous kinds, especially those which endanger the existence of society, as, for instance, murder and theft. If the government were to go beyond these, men would resist, and greater evils would ensue, according to the proverb: "He that violently bloweth his nose bringeth out blood." (*Prov.* xxx. 33.) Some vices may, then, be left unpunished, or rather left for God's punishment.² In the same way government does not command the practice of all the virtues but only of such as are for the common weal. This leads us to the important question whether human laws are binding in conscience. Hobbes has maintained the famous paradox: no law is unjust. According to him the command of the sovereign makes right and wrong. St. Augustine uses almost similar words, but his meaning is very different.³ "No unjust command is a law," that is to say, if the sovereign should ordain anything contrary to the moral law, such ordinance would not properly be a law, and, therefore, would not be morally binding. This is also St. Thomas's answer. Just laws bind in conscience; unjust laws do not bind in conscience, except, perhaps, for the avoidance of scandal and disturbances. But when are laws just? They are just when they are for the public good, when they do not exceed the powers of the law-giver, and when the burdens for the common good are imposed in due proportion; if they are wanting in any of these conditions, or if they are opposed to the spiritual good, they are not, strictly speaking, laws at all, and consequently carry with them no moral obligation:—

"*Leges positae humanitus vel sunt justae vel injustae. Si quidem justae sint, habent vim obligandi in foro conscientiae a lege*

¹ "Omnis lex humanitus posita in tantum habet de ratione legis in quantum a lege naturæ derivatur. Si vero in aliquo a lege naturali discordet, jam non erit lex, sed legis corruptio."—1a. 2æ. q. 95, a. 2.

² *Ib.* q. 96, a. 2.—Compare Bentham's *Principles of Morals and Legislation*, chap. xiii., Cases unmeet for Punishment.

³ "Lex esse non videtur quæ justa non fuerit."—*De Lib. arb.* I., 5—quoted by St. Thomas.

aeterna a qua derivantur, secundum illud (*Prov. viii. 15*): 'Per me reges regnant.' Dicuntur autem leges justae, et ex fine, quando scilicet ordinantur ad bonum commune; et ex auctore, quando scilicet lex lata non excedit potestatem ferentis; et ex forma, quando scilicet secundum aequalitatem proportionis imponuntur subditis onera in ordine ad bonum commune. . . . Injustae autem sunt leges dupliciter: uno modo per contrarietatem ad bonum humanum e contrario praedictis. . . . Et hujusmodi magis sunt violentiae quam leges; quia sicut Augustinus dicit, 'Lex esse non videtur quae justa non fuerit.' Unde tales leges non obligant in foro conscientiae nisi forte propter vitandum scandalum vel turbationem. . . . Alio modo leges possunt esse injustae per contrarietatem ad bonum divinum."—1a. 2æ. q. 96 a. 4 c.

The third objection and answer are also worthy of notice:

"Praeterea [objicitur] leges humanae frequenter ingerunt calumniam et injuriam hominibus, secundum illud (*Isai. x. 1*) 'Vae qui condunt leges iniquas et scribentes injustitias scripserunt, ut opprimerent in judicio pauperes, et vim facerent causae humilium populi mei!' Sed licitum est unicuique oppressionem et violentiam evitare. Ergo leges humanae non imponunt necessitatem homini quantum ad conscientiam. . . . Ad tertium dicendum quod ratio illa procedit de lege quae infert gravamen injustum subditis; ad quod etiam ordo potestatis divinitus concessus non se extendit; unde nec in talibus homo obligatur ut obediat legi si sine scandalo vel majori detrimento resistere possit."

Another question of great interest is whether law may be changed. It would seem that Human law cannot rightly be changed, for, as we have seen, it is derived from the Natural law, which is held to be unchangeable. St. Thomas, however, maintains that human law may rightly be changed for two reasons, one of which we may call subjective and the other objective. These reasons are especially interesting, because they give us his views about "Progress." The first reason is that it is natural to man to proceed from the imperfect to the perfect. Take, for instance, speculative science. Early philosophers treated it imperfectly; those who came after them improved upon their teaching. So, too, in practical matters. Early institutions and inventions were defective; improvements were afterwards introduced. But, besides this subjective progress, there is also objective change. The

circumstances in which man is placed (his environment, as we now call it) are continually changing. For these two reasons, then, human law is rightly changeable, namely, on account of man's progress in knowledge whereby he is better enabled to discover and establish what is for the common good, and also on account of the change of conditions which makes different regulations useful under different circumstances. St. Thomas was thus no rigid conservative. He would not endorse the formula—"Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari." On the other hand he was no lover of change for the sake of change. He holds that change of law is in itself injurious to the common welfare. Custom is the great force which makes men obey the law, and change destroys this force. No change should, therefore, be made unless the gain compensates for the injury, and this will be the case when the new law brings very great and very evident gain, or when there is the greatest necessity to repeal the old law either because it is manifestly unjust or very hurtful.¹

IV. FORMS OF GOVERNMENT.—Hitherto we have been considering what is common to all governments; we have now to examine the different forms of government. The supreme power must always be exercised by one, or by few, or by many, and it may be exercised for the common good or for the good of the rulers. When this power is in the hands of one who is the shepherd of his people, seeking their interest and not his own, the government is styled a Royalty. If a small number of persons excelling in virtue govern for the welfare of all, the government is an Aristocracy. If the supreme power resides in the multitude and is exercised by them for the common good, the government is a Republic. To these three good forms of government are opposed Tyranny, which is the rule of one for his own interest; Oligarchy, where a few oppress the people; and Democracy,

¹ "Et ideo nunquam debet mutari lex humana nisi ex alia parte tantum recompensetur communi saluti, quantum ex ista parte derogatur. Quod quidem contingit vel ex hoc quod aliqua maxima et evidentissima utilitas ex novo statuto provenit; vel ex eo quod est maxima necessitas, vel ex eo quod lex consuetæ aut manifestam iniquitatem continet, aut ejus observatio est plurimum nociva."—1a. 2æ. q. 97, a. 2.

where the common people oppress the better classes. We have thus the following six forms of government :—

		<i>Good.</i>		<i>Bad.</i>
Rule of One	...	(1) Royalty	...	(4) Tyranny
„ Few	...	(2) Aristocracy	...	(5) Oligarchy
„ Many	...	(3) Republic	...	(6) Democracy

Putting aside for the present the bad forms, we may ask, which sort of government is best? St. Thomas gives a decided preference to Royalty. His opinion is founded on a number of reasons. The chief aim of government should be to secure the unity of peace among the citizens. Now it is plain that this unity can be better secured by one than by many, just as the most powerful cause of heat is something that by its very nature is hot. Moreover, the government itself must be united, and not a prey to diversity of opinion. This also can be more easily attained when one alone is ruler. Furthermore, nature herself points to Royalty as the best form of government. Our members are moved by one—the heart; and in our souls there is one power which presides—our reason. The bees have one who is their king, and in the whole universe there is one God the Maker and Ruler of all things. Now inasmuch as art should imitate nature, the best government will be the government of one. These arguments are confirmed by experience. States which are not subject to one suffer from dissensions and are restlessly tossed about; whereas in those which are ruled by a king peace reigns, justice flourishes, and wealth abounds. Hence the Lord promised to his people by the mouth of His prophets as a great boon, that there should be one prince in their midst. The superiority of Royalty over the other forms is further shown by the fact that the government of a few or many degenerates into tyranny more commonly than the government of one. For when dissensions arise in aristocracies or republics, it often happens that one man obtains the supreme power, and rules the multitude for his own benefit. The Roman Republic, for instance, fell into the hands of the most cruel tyrants; and, speaking generally, if any one reads history he will find that republics and aristocracies lead more frequently than royalties to tyranny. At the same time

St. Thomas freely admits the great drawbacks of the government of one. Democracy is bad, Oligarchy is worse, but Tyranny is the worst of all.¹

A tyranny is stronger than the others, and therefore has greater power for evil. Moreover, the people suffer according to the different passions which sway the tyrant. If he is avaricious, he robs them of their goods; if his temper is violent, he sheds their blood for no crime. He hates the good more than the wicked, and consequently does his best to make men wicked and keep them so. He sows discord among his people, and forbids all kinds of gatherings which promote friendship and mutual confidence. In short, the subjects of a tyrant are in the claws of a wild beast.² Another objection to monarchy is that the citizens have little inducement to patriotism, because they consider that their efforts benefit the king more than the public, whereas in a republic all are benefited. Hence we find greater public virtue in republics than in monarchies. Still, on the whole, the royal form of government is the best. St. Thomas next goes on to show what measures are to be taken to prevent a king from degenerating into a tyrant. Great care should be exercised in selecting the person who is to hold the kingly office; no opportunity should be given him of becoming a tyrant, and his authority should be limited. But how can this be accomplished? By combining in due proportion the three forms, Royalty, Aristocracy, and Republic. Two things are needed to make a good constitution. The first is that all the citizens should have some share in the government, so that all may be interested in the maintenance of order; the second is that the constitution should be framed according to the different forms of government above enumerated. Hence the best constitution is that in which one worthy man is supreme, and under him are other worthy men chosen out of the people and by the people. We thus have a combination of

¹ "Sicut autem regimen regis est optimum, ita regimen tyranni est pessimum." . . . "Magis igitur est nociva tyrannis quam oligarchia, oligarchia autem quam democratia."—*De Reg. Princ.* I. 3.

² "Idem videtur tyranno subjeci, bestię sævienti substerni."—*De Reg. Princ.* I. 3.

monarchy, in so far as one is supreme; aristocracy, because a number of the worthiest have power; and of democracy (that is, popular government), because the rulers are chosen of the people and by the people. But here we must give the saint's words, as no translation can do them justice:—

“Circa bonam ordinationem principum in aliqua civitate vel gente duo sunt attendenda: quorum unum est ut omnis aliquam partem habeant in principatu: per hoc enim conservatur pax populi et omnes talem ordinationem amant et custodiunt . . . Aliud est quod attenditur secundum speciem regiminis vel ordinationis principatum . . . Unde optima ordinatio principum est in aliqua civitati vel regno, in quo unus præficitur secundum virtutem qui omnibus præsit; et sub ipso sunt aliqui principantes secundum virtutem: et tamen talis principatus ad omnes pertinet, tum quia ex omnibus eligi possunt, tum quia etiam ab omnibus eliguntur. Talis vero est omnis politia bene commixta ex regno, in quantum unus præest, ex aristocratia, in quantum multi principantur secundum virtutem, et ex democratia, id est potestate populi, in quantum ex popularibus possunt eligi principes, et ad populum pertinet electio principum.”¹

It is interesting to note that only five or six years before St. Thomas wrote this, Simon de Montfort had laid the foundations of the English House of Commons. The following extract from Blackstone's *Commentaries* bears a striking resemblance to the passage quoted above:—

“As with us the executive power of the laws is lodged in a single person (the king) they have all the advantages of strength and despatch, that are to be found in the most absolute monarchy; and as the legislature of the kingdom is entrusted to three distinct powers, entirely independent of each other: first, the sovereign; secondly, the lords spiritual and temporal, which is an aristocratical assembly of persons selected for their piety, their birth, their wisdom, their valour, or their property; and thirdly, the House of Commons, freely chosen by the people from among themselves, which makes it a kind of democracy: as this aggregate body, actuated by different springs and attentive to different interests, composes the British Parliament and has the supreme disposal of everything, there can no inconvenience be attempted by either of the three branches, but will be withstood by one of the other two . . . If the supreme power were lodged in any one of the three branches separately, we must be exposed to the inconveniences of either absolute monarchy, aristocracy, or democracy.”—*Introd. sect. iii.*

¹ 1a, 2æ. q. 105 a. 1 c. Cf. “Est etiam aliquod regimen ex istis commixtum quod est optimum.”—*ib.* q. 95 a. 4 c.

St. Thomas by no means insists that this mixed form of government should be set up in every state for all time. On the contrary he holds that it can exist only among an enlightened and moral people. He quotes in this connection an admirable passage of St. Augustine :—

“ Si populus sit bene moderatus et gravis communisque utilitatis diligentissimus custos, recte lex fertur, qua tali populo liceat creare sibi magistratus, per quos respublica administretur. Porro si paulatim idem populus depravatus habent venale suffragium, et regimen flagitiosis sceleratisque committat, recte adimitur populo tali potestas dandi honores, et ad paucorum bonorum redit arbitrium.”¹

We should also note that St. Thomas speaks of the election of kings, and that the aristocracy mentioned by him is not an aristocracy of mere birth or wealth, but of virtue.

V. SEDITION, TYRANNY, REBELLION.—Our final heading enumerates certain diseases of the state. Governors and their subjects are but men, and consequently may fall away from their duty: rulers sometimes seek their own interest at the expense of their subjects, and subjects sometimes refuse to obey their rulers. Both these difficult matters have now to be dealt with. We have already seen that just laws are binding in conscience, and that laws are just when they are enacted for the common good by a competent legislator and are not contrary to Divine or Natural law. Rulers are justified in making such laws and subjects are bound to obey. Sedition, St. Thomas teaches, is opposed both to justice and the common good, and is therefore a mortal sin.²

If, however, the laws are unjust, they have no binding force, and it is lawful for the subjects to disobey if they can do so without scandal or greater damage. But what if the government becomes a tyranny? When St. Thomas was a young man he is said to have held that tyrannicide was lawful.³

De lib. arbitrio l. 6 quoted in 1a. 2æ. q. 97a. 1.

² “Seditio opponitur et justitiæ et communi bono; et ideo ex genere suo est peccatum mortale et tanto gravius quanto bonum commune . . . est majus quam bonum privatum . . .” 2a 2æ. q. 42a. 2c.

³ “Qui ad liberationem patriæ tyrannum occidit, laudatur et præmium accipit.” In II. Sent. D. 44 q. 4 a. 2. De Rubeis, however, has defended the saint against the charge.

In his later works, however, he strongly rejects this opinion. The whole question is treated at great length in the sixth chapter of the first book *De Regimine Principum*. If the tyranny is not excessive, the subjects should bear it rather than run the risk of greater evils. For if their resistance fails, the tyrant will be provoked to greater excesses. Even if they succeed, they may fall into anarchy or into the power of another tyrant who will take care to provide against rebellion, and thus their last state may become worse than the first. It is related that when the Syracusans were longing for the death of Dionysius, an old woman never ceased praying that he might be spared. The tyrant asked her why she did so. "When I was a girl," she answered, "we had a grievous tyrant whose death I prayed for. He died, and a worse tyrant succeeded. His death also I prayed for, and now we have you who are still worse. If you were to die, a more dreadful tyrant would come after you." But if the tyranny is altogether intolerable, no private person may take it upon himself to slay the tyrant, for St. Peter tells us to be subject with all fear not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward. Thus, when the Roman emperors persecuted the Church, the Christians did not resist, even when they had arms in their hands, as in the case of the Theban Legion, but laid down their lives for Christ. Moreover, this private vengeance would be hurtful even to the people, because bad men would put to death good kings. A better way to proceed against a tyrant is by public authority. If the people have the right to choose their ruler, they have also the right to depose him when he becomes a tyrant. Such conduct is not seditious—rather it is the tyrant who is guilty of sedition.¹ If, however, the choice of a ruler belongs to some superior power, the people should apply to him for remedy against the tyrant. Here St. Thomas would seem to hint at the

¹ "Perturbatio hujus regiminis (tyrannici) non habet rationem seditionis; nisi forte quando sic inordinate perturbatur tyranni regimen, quod multitudo subjecta majus detrimentum patitur ex perturbatione consequenti quam ex tyranni regimine. *Magis autem tyrannus seditiosus est, qui in populo sibi subjecto discordias et seditiones nutrit, ut tutius dominare possit.*"—2a. 2æ. q. 42 a. 2 c.

advantage of an appeal to the Holy See. But if all human means fail, recourse must be had to the King of Kings, Whose hand is not shortened that it cannot save, neither is His ear heavy that it cannot hear. But to merit this help the people must cease from their sins, because a tyrant is often the minister of God's just wrath.

T. B. SCANNELL.

ROBERT BARRY, BISHOP OF CORK AND CLOYNE,
1647-1662.

NOTRE DAME DE MISERICORDE.

THE popular devotion of the city of Nantes in Brittany, is to the shrine or statue of our Lady of Mercy, *Notre Dame de Miséricorde*. The history of this devotion is so much mixed up with and owes so much to our exiled clergy in the dark days of persecution that in presenting a memoir of the life of Dr. Robert Barry I find it necessary to give a notice of this devotion to Notre Dame de Miséricorde. A vast forest covered the northern portions of the environs of the city of Nantes which the inhabitants commenced to clear away in the ninth century. In the 10th century an extraordinary monster, sometimes called a dragon, which is believed to have been crocodile like, shewed itself in the forest and during two or three years devoured a great number of travellers as well as of the inhabitants of Nantes. The entire city was in terror and had recourse to the intercession of the Blessed Virgin, and made a vow to build a chapel in her honour under the invocation of our Lady of Mercy as soon as this monster would be put to death. This vow having been made, three of the principal inhabitants of Nantes asked to have the honour of going alone into the forest and prepared themselves with Christian dispositions for the fight with the monster.

The first of these "chevaliers" whose dispositions, the tradition has it, were less penetrated with faith than the

others, on entering the forest was met by the monster and became his prey. He then attacked the others but was killed by them. The inhabitants who watched the result from the ramparts of the city came at once with the Bishop of Nantes and his clergy and laid on the spot near the entrance to the forest the foundation of the chapel, which they made a vow to build. They cut off the head of the monster, and kept the lower jaw bone which they enclosed in a silver box and placed it in the treasury of the cathedral where it was shewn up to the time of the first French Revolution. This occurrence is generally ascribed by historians of the city of Nantes to the year 1026. The chapel exists no longer, having been destroyed in that memorable epoch of the great Revolution, with its stained glass windows which depicted the events just mentioned.

The statue of our Lady was preserved by a pious woman, called Soeur Jeanne, who, when the fury of the revolution passed by, presented it to the parish church of St. Similien, to which parish the former chapel belonged.

In all their troubles the "Nantais" have had recourse to N. D. de Miséricorde and have had many favours, through her intercession. When the persecution at home drove our clergy into exile, they found protection and warm welcome in France, and nowhere more than at Nantes. It was selected by Dr. Patrick Comerford, Bishop of Waterford and Lismore, and Dr. Robert Barry, Bishop of Cork and Cloyne, as their home in exile. The States of Brittany voted them what was necessary for their maintenance, and such was the intercourse between Ireland and that seaport in those days that from there they could more easily communicate with their flock by letters and govern by vicars their dioceses.

They had recourse to our Lady of Mercy for help for themselves and their sorely tried people. The devotion, hitherto so popular, became, by this means, more so. The establishment of "The Station" to our Lady of Mercy, which takes place every year, from the Ascension of our Lord until Pentecost, is due to these prelates. Its object is to imitate the retreat of the Blessed Virgin and the apostles in the upper room in Jerusalem, and by the intercession of

the Blessed Virgin to prepare the faithful to receive the gifts of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost. This station was approved of by Pope Clement XIII., Nov. 6, 1764—and again by Pope Clement XIV., 14 December, 1771, who renewed for seven years the Plenary Indulgence granted by his predecessors for the like term to the faithful who, having complied with the usual conditions, would perform the station to our Lady of Mercy.

On the 28th July, 1786, Pope Pius VI. granted the like favour in perpetuity.

From the time of the foundation of the station, devotion to N. D. de Miséricorde seems, from documents handed down, to have been made their own by the exiled Irish clergy, whether in the chapel of N. D. de Miséricorde or the parish church of S. Similien. Cornelius O'Keeffe, a priest of the united Diocese of Cork and Cloyne, and a native of Glenville, and doctor in theology, was rector of S. Similien in 1710, whence he was promoted to the See of Limerick over which he presided from 1720 to 1737. He was succeeded at S. Similien's by Peter Burke, of the Diocese of Clonfert, doctor in theology, superior of the community of Irish priests (Irish College), Nantes, who held this cure until his death in 1724. The change from the former chapel, and the renewal of devotion to N. D. de Miséricorde, after the revolution in 1803, served to increase the devotion. On each day of the station pilgrimages arrive; crowds of the Nantais, rich and poor, frequent the shrine from five in the morning until nine o'clock in the evening. It is calculated, that at least from 8,000 to 10,000 people make the pilgrimage. The station was made with more than usual solemnity this year, on account of the monumental windows, explanatory of the devotion and in memory of its originators, which have been just placed in the church of S. Similien, from the design of the late M. Claudius Lavergne, and executed by his son and successor in his establishment for the manufacture of stained glass, Paris.

Without entering on an explanation of the several windows, and their subjects, suffice it to remark that one of the principal has for its subject, S. Patrick, Apostle of

Ireland, in memory of the place Ireland had in the establishment of the station, and also another window contains the armorial bearings of Doctor Patrick Comerford and Doctor Robert Barry, to whom is attributed the establishment of the station. As France, the home in exile, and last resting-place of our persecuted prelates, thus honours their memory, after the lapse of more than two hundred years, and pays a tribute to their labours, it is only just, that we who are at home should remember them. For this reason, I propose to give in this paper a short memoir of Doctor Robert Barry.

Robert, son of David Barry and Ellen Walters or Waters, was born towards the end of Queen Elizabeth's reign, probably about the year 1588 or 1589. He was of the Barrymore family. His father is styled "Dominus Ardiae," probably the modern "Ballyard," where the name of Barry is still represented, in the parish of Briagh (Brittway), near the river Bride. Having learned classics at home, Robert was sent to Bordeaux at an early age, where he perfected himself in humanities and followed the course of Philosophy in the schools of the Jesuit Fathers. After a short course of Theology he was ordained priest, probably about the year 1612 or 1613. On his return to Ireland he was named chaplain to Ellen Barry, of Buttevant, Countess of Ormond, and accompanied her to England on the occasion of her marriage with Sir Thomas Somerset, third son of the Earl of Worcester. Doubtless, referring to this period and to his zeal as a young priest that the Nuncio Rinuccini, recommending him in after years to the notice of the Holy See, says "that he has laboured much for the Faith in England and in Dublin and in other missions." Soon after this he went to Paris and spent there three years in following the course of Theology at Sorbonne, and again coming to Bordeaux was made Doctor of Theology. He then made a tour through Italy and spent two years in Rome, after which he was made Vicar Apostolic of Ross in May, 1620 (having been made Prothonotary Apostolic in December, 1619), and Abbot in commendam "De Choro S. Benedicti" (Middleton), by Pope Paul V., who sent him to his new labours furnished with special faculties which the exigencies of the times

required; not only did he show his zeal in the diocese and abbacy under his care, but by his preaching the word of God and by his writings, he converted even in other parts, those who were estranged from the Church, strengthened the wavering, and reconciled those who were at enmity, and for thirty-six years laboured much in the ministry.

His lot was cast in troubled times; from his great prudence and learning he was chosen by the "Confederate Council" as one of their members, to treat with Ormond at Jigginstown. He was also one of those who were sent to England to gain the King to the Confederate cause, and also to France to notify to the Queen the justice of their cause. In all difficulties he was had recourse to as to an oracle, so much so that "the Supreme Council" asked to have him appointed Bishop of Ross; but while the bulls were being expedited, the Bishop of Cork, Dr. William Terry, died and he was substituted in his place, and consecrated in Waterford by the Nuncio in the year 1648, probably in the month of April. With regard to his appointment De Burgo, in his *Hibernia Dominicana*, has another story from which it appears the Ormondists wished to appoint another more favourable to their cause, and have Dr. Barry appointed to Ross, but were defeated by the recommendation of the Nuncio who writes in more than one place in the highest terms of Dr. Barry. Immediately on his consecration Dr. Barry returned to his diocese, and as the city of Cork was in the enemy's power, he held a synod of his clergy at Macroom, when he gave instructions suited to the troubled state of the times, and restored by severe disciplinary laws what religion had suffered. He visited the parishes, administered the sacrament of Confirmation to those who had not had for many years the opportunity of receiving it; reconciled those who had been at enmity, and preached in season and out of season the word of God. He ceased not to discharge his episcopal duties in the diocese until he was summoned by the Nuncio to Kilkenny, and stood firmly by him on the occasion of his excommunication against the Supreme Council. His zeal for the splendours of Catholic worship which he wished to see restored, made him oppose the truce made with

the enemy. In writings and disputations Dr. Barry defended the cause taken up by the Nuncio, and sustained by him and his party. His name is signed to the sentence of excommunication pronounced by the Nuncio, and posted on the gates of the cathedral and churches in Kilkenny. He had after the departure of the Nuncio from Ireland to take to flight and conceal himself. Though Cromwell permitted many ecclesiastics to leave the country, still knowing how great a defender of Catholic faith was Dr. Barry, he held out no hopes for him, but determined to seize him and treat him as he did Dr. MacEgan, Bishop of Ross, his successor in the care of that see, whom his lieutenant hanged at Carrig-a-Drohid. Wherefore, the good prelate hid himself in woods and marshes, suffered hunger and cold and for a long time was obliged to remain at night without shelter of a roof in his hiding places, until at last a friendly ship brought him to Brittany.

Dr. Maziere Brady (in his *Episcopal Succession*) says that Dr. Comerford was at St. Malo in 1651, to which place he escaped from Ireland, after twice falling into the hands of pirates, and he and Dr. Barry proceeded to Nantes, where they were received with great kindness and respect by the clergy and people.

Dr. Comerford died on Sunday, 10th March, 1652 and was interred in the cathedral of St. Pierre, at Nantes. Although he is mentioned with Dr. Barry as founder of the station of N. D. de Miséricorde, still it must have been Dr. Barry who had most to do with the extension of this devotion as Dr. Comerford lived such a short time at Nantes. After the death of his great friend, the Bishop of Waterford, Dr. Barry continued to reside at Nantes and assisted the bishop of that city Monseigneur Gilles de Beauvais, in the discharge of his episcopal functions. He governed from thence his own diocese by letters, through vicars with whom he frequently corresponded. He was also entrusted with faculties by the Nuncio to remove the censures from those who incurred them and many had recourse to absolution from them at his hands. At length, after a severe illness of three months, borne with Christian fortitude he died at Nantes at 3 o'clock in the morning, Friday, the 7th July 1662. Beloved by all

and lamented in death he was interred with much pomp and his obsequies attended by all classes in the cathedral at Nantes. He was interred in the chapel of St. Charles, before the altar at the entrance to the choir. Cardinal Moran mentions in his *Persecution of Irish Catholics*, that the body of Dr. Comerford was found quite incorrupt when the tomb was opened to receive the remains of Dr. Barry. His tomb had inscribed on a blue marble slab the following inscription:—

“Messire Robert (Barry), par la grace de Dieu et du Saint Siège Apostolique, évêque de Cork (et de Cloyne) en Hybernie, réfugié à Nantes par la persécution des hérétiques en Angleterre, lequel mourut le 7 Juillet, 1662.”

For much of the information contained in this article the writer is indebted to Canon Delorme, of the Collegiate Church of St. Donatien, Nantes.

The following extracts and Matrimonial Dispensation may be of interest:—

Extrait des Registres de la Trêve de Toussaint, paroisse de Sainte Croix de Nantes:—

Le sept de Juillet mil six cent soixante et deux le corps de Révérend Père en Dieu, Messire Robert Evêque de Corq (Irlande,) réfugié à Nantes pour la persécution des hérétiques d'Angleterre depuis huit ou dix ans, fut sépulture en l'Eglise cathédrale devant l'autel Saint Charles. Décède près la chapelle de Toussaint de Nantes.

Extrait des “Conclusions Capitulaires” du chapitre de la Cathédrale de Nantes (Vol. 1659-1666, page 67, au recto):—

Juillet 1662	Robert Barry Evêque de Cork et de Cloijn
Enterrement de	en Hibernie exilé de son païs pour la foy
Mons. l'Evêque	Catholique. Estant entré au chapitre a re-
de Cork	présenté à Messieurs que ledit Seigneur
Hibernie.	Evêque estoit

décédé ce jourdhuy sur les trois heures du matin et que durant sa vie il avait temoigné grand desir d'estre inhumé dans cette Eglise pourveu que Messieurs du chapre. l'eussent agréable. Et cela estant supplié mes dits Sieurs d'ordonner l'heure et la solennité de l'enterrement comme il leur plairoit. Sur quoy le chapitre après avoir delibéré a arrêté de faire de main le dit enterrement à l'issue de la grande messe, avec toute la solennité accoustumée des enterremens solennels. Et pour ce on sonnera aujourdhuy trente gobets de la plus grosse cloche depuis Midy jusqu'à Midy et demy, et ensuite un clas de toutes les cloches jusqu'à une heure et demie, et autre sem-

blable clas ce soir à huit heures, et demain à six heures du matin suivant la coutume puis demain après la grande messe l'on ira processionnellement en la maison où est décedé ledit Seigneur Evesque, paroisse de Ste. Radegonde pour lever le corps lequel sera conduit par la rüe de chasteau et par la grande rüe en cette eglise ou sera chantée solennellement la messe des deffuncts et après les ceremonies faictes le corps sera inhumé dans l'enfeu qui est sous les marches devant l'autel de St. Charles. Et pour faire l'office audit enterrement est député Monsieur Robin chanoine.

Le vendredi septième jour de Juillet 1662.

Messieurs Merceron, scholastique ; Blanchard, herlat.

Boylesve, S. Vallin, Robin, Dubreil, le Bigot, Pageot, tous chanoines.

Ibidem, au verso.

Service de
Mr. l'Evesque
de Corek.

Le chapitre a arresté de faire de main à l'issue
de la grande messe le service de feu
Monsieur l'Evesque de Corek avec toute

la solennité ordinaire et a député Monsieur Robin pour faire l'office. Et on sonnera les clas ordinaires de toutes les cloches auourdny à Midy et à huit heurs du soir et de main à six heures du matin.

I am indebted to the kindness of the late Richard Caulfield, Esq., LL.D., for the following dispensation given by Dr. Wm. Terry, Bishop of Cork, and the performance of the marriage, by the favour of this dispensation, is attested, among others, by Dr. Robert Barry, Vicar Apostolic of Ross. It is the oldest document I am aware of, in existence of the same description in connection with the Diocese of Cork:—

“Guilielmus Dei et Apostolicae sedis gratia Coreagian. et Cluanen. Episcopus.

“Universis et singulis Christi fidelibus praesentes inspecturis litteras salutem.

“Apostolicae sedis spectata prudentia animarum tranquillitati ita providere consuevit, ut quoties fidelium laudabile votum id postulaverit, Juris rigorem benigna plenitudinisque potestatis communicatione suaviter temperet, quatenus Canonum Decretorum rigida observantia, aut nimia eorundem indulgentia, conscientiarum quieti nocumentum non praebet. Cum itaque Ellyna Cornaci Cartii Diocoesis Nostrae Corcagiensis mulier Guilielmum Jacobi Barrii Diocoesis Rossensis virum, in Canonicis 3ⁱ. et 4ⁱ. 4ⁱ. similiter et 4ⁱ. consanguinitatis graduum impedimentis ex diversis stipitibus procedentibus sibi consanguineum in maritum ducere cupiat, nobis ex consensu praefati Guilielmi humiliter supplicari fecit, quatenus in praedictis impedimentis de benignitate Apostolica opportunum dispensationis remedium concedere dignaremur supplicationisque causam allegans, asserit, quod intra limites dictae Diocoesis quam inhabitat, nullibi cum tanta

animarum conjunctione, dotis competentia, aliorumque commodorum assecutione, sine aequali aut arctiori forsan consanguinitatis affinitatisque vinculo, matrimonialiter conjungi queat. Nos igitur animarum tranquillitati matrimoniique libertati, quantum cum Dei adjutorio possumus, consulere cupientes, Dietae exponentis supplicationi ut annuamus, facile adducimur. Ideoque in praedictis 3^l. et 4^l. 4^l. similiter et 4^l. consanguinitatis graduum impedimentis, apostolica, qua hac in parte fungimur, potestate dispensantes, facultatem tenore praesentium concedimus, ut iisque non obstantibus cum praefato Guiljelmo praedicta Ellyna matrimonium in facie Ecclesiae juxta formam a Concilio Tridentino praescriptam in praesentia parochi et testium contrahat, solemnizet, et postmodum suo debito tempore consumet, atque ad debitos omnes effectus ex legitimo matrimonio sequi solitos, in utroque foro perducere libere et licite possit et valeat.

“ Ne vero aliud consanguinitatis aut affinitatis impedimentum (2^m. gradum utriusque non attingens) hic non specificatum inter praenominatos Ellynam et Guiljelmum lateat, tenore praesentium volumus pro nominato et indulto habeatur. Decernentes nec illud, si forte existat, nec denunciationum ex injuria temporum nostraque super iisdem propter rationabiles causas, obtenta dispensatione praetermissionem obstaculo futuram, quominus matrimonium sit licitum, et proles inde suscipienda habeantur legitimae

“ In quorum omnium fidem et testimonium his propria manu subscripsimus, et sigillum quo ad talia utimur, subinprimi curavimus. Datum Corcagiae in loco solitae mansionis nostrae die 4^o Novembris Anno Dni. 1635.

“ GUILIELMUS, Corcagien.

“ Et Cluanen. Eps.

[On back of parchment.]

“ Nos introscripti Guiljelmus et Ellyna noviter conjuncti fatemur nos virtute hujus dispensationis a nobis humiliter obtentae matrimonialiter fuisse conjunctos Die mensis.

“ Anno Dni. 1635.

“ WM. BARRY.

“ Nobis praesentibus :—

“ THADIA FORHANE Parocho.

“ ROBERTUS BARRY Prot. Apost. Vicarius Rossen. et
Theologiae Doctor.

“ TEIGUE M^cCARTHY.

“ JOHN OGE BARRY.

“ CHARLES CHARTIE.”

The manuals of devotion to “N. D. De Misericorde” and the constant tradition, has it that the Station was established by an Irish bishop, and the tradition points to Dr. Comerford and to Dr. Barry. In 1773, Dr. René Lebreton de Ganbert,

curé of the parish of S. Similien, in pages 37-38 of a manual, now out of print and very scarce says:—

“ Un Evêque d’Hybernie exilé de son pays, persécuté pour la foi Catholique, et réfugié dans cette ville de Nantes qu’il édifia par les exercices d’une piété exemplaire, établit cette Station dans la chapelle dédiée à l’honneur de la Sainte Vierge, sous le titre de Notre Dame de Miséricorde dans la paroisse de Saint Similien. Cette évêque ayant communiqué ses intentions à Mgr. Gabriel de Beauvau évêque de Nantes, célébra la Sainte messe dans cette chapelle s’y rendit tous les jours, depuis l’Ascension jusqu’ à la fête de la Pentecôte, accompagné de quelques ecclésiastiques et de plusieurs personnes de piété, avec qui il récita des prières analogues aux pieux motifs qui les assemblaient. Plusieurs villes de Royaume et un très grand nombre dans l’univers chrétien, avaient déjà, les unes des confréries, les autres des dévotions semblables à celles-ci ; d’autres des exercices particuliers de piété pour préparer les fidèles à la venue du Saint Esprit, lorsque ce digne confesseur de la foi entreprit à Nantes cet établissement, la paroisse de Saint Similien fut honorée de cette faveur par le choix qu’il fit de la chapelle de Miséricorde.”

Which of the bishops founded the devotion? Dr. Comerford writes to the Nuncio Rinuccini from S. Malo, 3rd March, 1651 (he died 10th March, 1652, at Nantes); when he wrote from S. Malo he had only just come from Ireland, and did not know where to turn his steps. His stay there was very short. Dr. Barry spent ten years, and acted as auxiliary bishop during that period, so that necessarily he was identified with the city and its people; and seeing that its foundation was, by the author of this manual, ascribed to the bishop, who went year after year to the sanctuary, in my opinion Dr. Barry was the founder of the Station.

In the list of “Registered Priests” in 1704, James Holane, aged 72, received Orders from Dr. Barry, at Nantes, in the year 1659; and from the same bishop, Luke White, of Clonmel, aged 67, in the year 1656, also at Nantes. He performed several ordinations for the Bishop of Nantes, as appears in the archives of the Evêché at Nantes.

PATRICK HURLEY.

PROBABILISM.—III.

I RESERVED from the last paper, which I had the honour of addressing to the I. E. RECORD on the subject of Probabilism, the chief purpose I had all along in view, which is to show that, however earnestly theologians discuss the distinctions they point out between Probabilism, Equiprobabilism, and Probabiliorism, these distinctions affect in a very small degree, if, indeed, they do at all affect the sacred ministry of the Church in the practical work of upholding Christian morality from the pulpit, or in the sacred tribunal of penance.

I now proceed to give effect, as best I can, to this purpose, hoping not to trespass too much upon the pages of the RECORD.

In the first place, after lopping off excessive rigour on one side, and laxism on the other, the Church allows free range to discussion within the limits of the distinctions under consideration, and disputants of eminent learning and sanctity have ranked themselves on different sides. If on any side there was anything blame worthy the Church would have restrained this liberty, for according to the words of St. Augustine, "quae sunt contra fidem, aut bonam vitam, nec approbat, nec facit, nec tacet Ecclesia." (*Epist 55 ad Januarium*), and this argument derives particular strength from the fact that in the process of St. Liguori's canonization the subject of Probabilism in its several branches was brought so prominently under notice. We are consequently free in the practice of our ministry, as the case occurs, to take sides, and I cannot blame you, as you cannot blame me for the sides we respectively take, if we happen to differ.

2ndly. There is a considerable number of questions, on which all Probabilists are agreed, for instance, questions about the matter and form of the sacraments, questions about faith, certain questions about justice and obedience, in all which even beyond the sphere of Probability of the highest order, certainty as far as possible must be sought out, and adhered to. Here also our ministry remains unaffected, as there is no room left for wavering.

3rdly. The questions coming within the range of Probabilistic discussion are of exceptional occurrence. The ordinary practice of the ministry follows a beaten track, and with a competent knowledge of theology, which is to be supposed, together with a certain degree of experience, we go arm-in-arm in the ordinary course of duty, whatever phase of Probabilism we may adhere to.

4thly. In our preaching we are to be guided by the golden rule "in medio stat virtus," and we are to refrain from the inculcation of views bordering on rigorism in one direction, and laxism in the other—from rigorism, as our teaching would not be followed, and might, therefore, be the occasion of sin on this account; and we should, as regards indulgent teaching, have to fear lest on account of the evil tendency of poor human nature our leniency would lead to abuse according to the maxim "grant an inch and people will take an ell" on the side of freedom in their moral conduct. We should observe the same moderate course in the holy tribunal of penance, recollecting always the words of our Divine Lord, that His yoke is sweet, and His burden light.

There is rather a pleasant anecdote told of the celebrated De la Motte, Bishop of Amiens, in the last century. It is known of his Lordship that he was fond of a practical joke whenever the occasion came in his way, but of course always with a view to something good. The story goes on to relate that a lady came to him to decide for her a case of conscience respecting herself, and stating the case she said:—

"Monseigneur, I come to trouble your Lordship, on a case of conscience. It concerns myself, and I am sadly perplexed about it. It is simply this: I have been in the habit of using some artificial means for improving my personal appearance."

"You mean," said the Bishop, "painting your face, madam."

"It is just so, as your Lordship has so plainly expressed it. Well, I took a scruple about the matter, and I consulted my confessor if there was anything wrong in it, who being rather indulgent said it was no harm, and that I should not disturb myself about such a trifle, as he called it. However, I did not feel at ease as to his view, and I addressed myself to

another confessor, who appeared quite shocked, telling me in a very decided tone, that it was in a manner casting a reproach on God to have recourse to adventitious contrivances to falsify the work of His hands, and the good gentleman added other things about humility and resignation in a very severe mood. Your Lordship has now the case fully in your hands, and I come to be relieved of the perplexity into which these two good gentlemen have cast me."

The Bishop falling back on his chair, and putting on a grave face, replied by saying :—

"Madam, I am a man of moderate views."

"Yes, Monseigneur, and let me say that is the precise reason I have had in venturing with such confidence to approach you, and I shall be so relieved by what you will tell me."

"I like moderation in all things, and I hate extreme opinions. On this account I would say, that you are to take a middle course between the extreme decisions of the two confessors, that is to say, you are to paint one side of your face, and leave the other as God left it."

The Bishop's meaning was of course easily seen in its general import; and it would teach us, that by avoiding extremes on one side and the other we can go together in the practice of our ministry, whatever may be our theoretic views respectively.

For example, you and I may be exercising our ministry in the same church, whilst holding different ideas on Probabilism; you, let us suppose, a Probabiliorist, and I simply a Probabilist or Equiprobabilist. You are absent for a time shorter or longer, and your penitents turn over to my confessional; I cannot raise any difficulty in my treatment of them on the presumption that they are guided by you in accordance with the stricter system to which you adhere; nor would you be authorised to object to my penitents in a similar supposition, on account of my more lenient views; nay, we may be mutually confessor and penitent to each other, and our different leanings and holdings as to one system or another do not tie up our hands, or cause the least difference between us.

5thly. As a matter of experience it is quite ascertained, that in practice we pay little, if any, attention to the probabilistic distinctions, or the controversies respecting them. The aspirant to the ecclesiastical state may, indeed, attach much importance to them, during the course of his preparatory studies, and embracing a particular system in preference to the others, he may fancy, that he has found an "organism" for the application of moral theology similar to that of Aristotle of old, or to the *Organum Novum* of Lord Bacon in more modern times for their systems of logic. But, as he enters on his ministry, he realises the vast difference between theory and practice, when it becomes his great endeavour to apply his theological knowledge, in the use he has to make of it, to the work, that comes before him in his every-day life. By attention and observation he comes to see how his knowledge of principles is to be applied in practice. His work in the commencement is on this account necessarily slow, as he seeks to warrant by principle every step he takes in practice. By degrees, however, he acquires experience, and standards of judgments grow up in his mind, which after a time guide him securely, and promptly, and leave him at ease in all ordinary cases; and, when any matter out of the ordinary course comes in his way, he pauses, and recognizing the difficulty, he has recourse to his books, or, it may be, to some one of longer and larger experience, and having thus satisfied himself as to how he should act, the special case becomes a precedent in his memory to deal with similar exceptional cases, as they arise, and in this way he gets up an enlightened practice of his ministry.

And in all this there is nothing singular in the ecclesiastical profession, that we do not find in the other learned professions as well. A medical student, for example, by his assiduity in the lecture hall, and by his private study at home, may become very learned in the theory of his profession. But this knowledge is far from being sufficient for the work he has before him. He must, moreover, see the practice of his profession in the various diseases that affect poor humanity, as they are treated in the wards of the public hospital, where he witnesses practice combined with

science; and after all this training he still finds how much remains to be acquired when he puts his own hand to the work, and until he has exercised his profession for some time, carefully applying the principles he has learned to the cases as they come actually one by one before him. And what has not the law student still to learn after he has been called to the bar, as he witnesses the practice of the courts, and has to deal himself with briefs, as they come into his hands? In the same way the ecclesiastical student has learned enough in college to qualify him to begin his ministry, and by practice in accordance with what he has learned he makes gradual progress, and acquires experience, till he becomes master of his work.

I must not, however, leave it to be inferred from what I have said, that I under-value the discussions of theologians on the probabilistic controversy. Quite the contrary, I respect, as every one must respect, the men eminent for learning and piety, who took part in that controversy, as we must all admire the power of argument, with which they sustained their respective systems. A student has much to learn in studying the subject in its various phases, and he cannot fail to derive great benefit from its discussion. But what I venture to insist upon is, that a student, who having embraced one system or another should be much deceived and disappointed, if he thought that he was to find in it an "organism," a kind of theological instrument, to carry out in a quasi-mechanical way the practical work of his ministry. Benedict XIV. would recommend a quite different course in his celebrated Constitution issued on the occasion of the Jubilee of 1750, in which he lays down the following rule for confession: "*in re dubia propriae opinioni non innitantur; sed antequam causam dirimant, libros consulant quam plurimos, eos cum primis, quorum doctrina est solidior, ac deinde in eam descendant sententiam, quam ratio suadet, ac firmat auctoritas.*" And St. Liguori himself, whose venerable name is so much mixed up with the question of Probabilism prescribes towards the end of his moral system as follows: "*confessarius, antequam opinionem amplexetur, tenetur utique intrinsecas rationes perpendere, et cum ei occurrat ratio*

adeoque convincens, cui adæquatam responsionem suppetere non aspicit; tunc oppositam amplecti non potest, quamvis plurimorum doctorum auctoritas ipsi faveat, modo auctoritas non sit tanti ponderis, ut videatur ei magis quam rationi deferendum.”

These two great authorities are dealing in these instructions, let it be observed, with the work of the confessional, and they are equally emphatic in laying down the rule for the guidance of confessors, that they are to use their own powers of thought sustained by eminent authority in coming to their conclusions, or, to repeat the words of Benedict himself “in eam descendant sententiam quam ratio suadet, ac firmat auctoritas.”

And as the question of authority presents itself, it may not be out of place to take account here of the well known declarations of the Sacred Penitentiary in favour of the theology of St. Liguori. They bear date 5th June, and are in the form of replies to questions submitted to that tribunal by the Cardinal Archbishop of Besançon.

The first question asked, whether a professor of sacred theology can safely follow, and profess, the opinions, that St. Liguori professes in his Moral Theology; and it is answered that he can, but, it is added that those are not to be considered as deserving censure, who follow opinions set forth by other approved authors.

The second question asked, whether a confessor is to be disquieted, who follows in the practice of the sacred tribunal of penance all the opinions of St. Liguori for the sole reason that nothing deserving censure was found in his works by the Holy Apostolic See; and the eminent prelate observed with regard to the confessor in question, that he read the works of St. Liguori only to know accurately his teaching without weighing the motives or reasons, on which the various opinions rested, considering himself to act safely on the ground, that he can prudently judge teaching, which contains nothing deserving censure to be sound, safe, and by no means opposed to the sanctity of the Gospel: and the sacred Penitentiary replied, that the confessor so acting was not to be disquieted, having regard to the mind of the

Holy See as to the approbation of the writings of the servants of God with a view to their canonization.

These declarations, no doubt, impart a high character to the moral theology of St. Liguori, which character is greatly enhanced by his being since raised to the dignity of a Doctor of the Church. But in controversial, as in other warfare, disputants are disposed not unfrequently to make too much of the vantage ground they may have secured. Accordingly, we are not to be surprised in observing the position maintained, that although the Holy See did not pronounce upon each and every opinion of St. Liguori taken singly and separately, still it would be a grave offence as well against the reverence due to the holy doctor, as also against that due to the Holy See to assert any one doctrine of his to be absolutely false, because, as it is alleged, such a proceeding would be an implicit impugning of the judgment of the Holy See itself.

Again, granting that, owing to the nature of probability, it is not impossible that some of the opinions of the holy doctor be proved improbable, and even false, nevertheless, it is asserted, that it is only some great doctor above all exception, who would be competent to pass such an adverse judgment, and this upon the ground, that all the unreformed opinions of St. Liguori are commonly held and acted upon.

In opposition to these views we are referred to the qualifying phrases accompanying the declarations of the Penitentiary, which, it is alleged, show that that tribunal was not called upon to pronounce on the truth of St. Liguori's teaching, but on a line of conduct pursued by a professor of moral theology, as also by a confessor. With respect to the former it is maintained that the qualifying phrase, which says, that "those are not to be blamed, who follow the opinions of other approved authors," affords licence evidently to challenge opinions of St. Liguori, and hold the opposite of his teaching as regards such opinions; whilst the answer respecting the confessor limits the approbation to the terms and scope of the Holy See in its general approbation of the writings of other servants of God, as well

as those of St. Liguori, which simply amounts to this, that nothing has been found in them to be an obstacle to their canonization. As, therefore, no special merit beyond this can be claimed for others, so neither can there be for St. Liguori.

The answer of the Sacred Penitentiary, saying, that the confessor in question is not to be disquieted in his practice, it is further observed, is not to be taken as an approval—at least it is a very slender approval—of his mode of acting. It comes pretty much to this, that if you or I were carrying on our ministry in a church under a very holy and learned man, we should be glad to have recourse to him in our doubts and difficulties, but we should, nevertheless, be much at fault, did we cease to work our own brains, and consult the leading works on theology in our own library, and be guided by them as well as by our living authority. St. Liguori, in his day, consulted the great theologians who had gone before him, and not content with their authority he sought out the motives and reasons of their decisions, and was not afraid to differ from them, even from the Angel of the School, St. Thomas, and the seraphic doctor, St. Bonaventure, although only a simple theologian himself, at the time. Nay, he differed from himself, and reformed in advanced life several opinions he had previously published, and continued even to his death retouching his Moral Theology, so as to leave several discrepancies after him between that most useful work and his *Homo Apostolicus*. It cannot, therefore, be denied to other theologians to go behind his authority, great, no doubt, though it is, and investigate his reasons, and come as Ballerini, Gury, and others have come, to opposite conclusions.

But, though we should allow ourselves to be ruled by his authority, we should yet have to do for ourselves in the practical application of his decisions, and in this we should be constantly exposed to go wrong, if we did not master the principle, or point, on which his decisions turned. We can easily understand this from what we every day witness in our courts of justice, in which the decision, or verdict, depends on two authorities, the judge and the jury.

The judge may lay down the law in a most lucid explanation of its provisions, but the jury have yet to see if the fact or facts under consideration come within the scope of the law as expounded by the learned judge. They have various circumstances to take account of, as all facts have their circumstances, and no wonder that, notwithstanding the able charge of the judge, they cannot in so many cases agree, their disagreement generally arising from their not clearly apprehending the point upon which the case hinges. So likewise must it be with us, even as we consult the most eminent authorities. We must still see ourselves to the application of the principle involved in the case we have to deal with, and be guided by principle according as we understand it, in employing our own minds in the consideration of its bearing on the matter in hand. Neither are we safe in ruling case by case on the ground of similarity. Such a mode of acting is distinctly repudiated by Canon Law not only where *a pari* reasons, but reasons *a fortiori* would present themselves, simply because the legislative authority does not mean that its enactments should go beyond what in terms they express. In a similar way it may happen in the other departments of practical theology, that, though cases be similar in their leading features, there may be a principle involved, which calls for different decisions in the cases respectively.

Even beyond this we have still to consider reflex principles, which are easily misunderstood in their application. St. Liguori, for instance, would extend the principle, or axiom of law, "*melior est conditio possidentis*," beyond questions of property, and solve other questions as well by its application. He makes the case of a person who, on Thursday night, does not know if 12 o'clock has yet arrived, and he would allow him in the doubt to eat meat, notwithstanding the law of abstinence on Friday, his principle being that Thursday's liberty being in possession, the maxim "*melior est conditio possidentis*," bears him out. But it is open for anyone to say, that this legal axiom is not in itself a self-evident principle, but rather an inference derived from the presumption that the occupant, in the ordinary course of things,

could not have entered into possession of property without having a right to do so, and this presumed right you are not allowed to challenge without showing cause. Everyone, therefore, sees how reasonable the axiom is as applied to property. But it does not by any means appear clear, that you could go farther, and apply it to a day, saying, it is doubtful whether just now it is Thursday or Friday, but the liberty of Thursday is in possession, and, therefore, according to the axiom, "*melior est conditio possidentis*," I will eat the meat laid before me. There are two serious differences between the cases. In the case of property possession there is a right grounded on a principle antecedent to possession, in the other case there is no such principle, and the doubt, moreover, is a doubt of simple nescience without a reason *pro* or *con* as to whether it be still Thursday, or you have already entered on Friday.

St. Liguori has unquestionably left to the Church a treasure of priceless value in his Moral Theology, and his *Homo Apostolicus*, but notwithstanding our reverence for the saint, now a Doctor of the Church, it may be doubted if these works be altogether suitable for students, who are mere learners of Theology, and this for the simple reason, that they are too learned to be placed yet in their hands. Learning and teaching are correlative, and judicious teaching must not go beyond the existing capacity of the learner. Is not this the lesson of the talents in the Gospel? One was given five talents, another two, and another one, and why the distinction? The Gospel explains it in saying, "*to every one according to his ability*" (*Matt. xxv. 15.*) And did not our Divine Lord himself observe this rule of discretion, as instructing his disciples He observed to them, "*I have yet many things to say to you, but you cannot bear them now.*" (*John xvi. 12.*) Let us for a moment consider what St. Liguori tells us of himself in his preface to the *Homo Apostolicus*.

"I have endeavoured for the most part to explain my opinion, giving its due weight of greater, or equal, or lesser probability to every other opinion . . . But, whenever I did not find a convincing reason on one side, I have not ventured to condemn the opposite side, like others who too readily repudiate opinions maintained by several grave authors whom our holy Father, Pope Benedict,

already quoted in his elaborate works, abounding in every kind of erudition, mentions not without esteem, and frequently makes use of them But I would admonish you, kind reader, not to consider me to approve of opinions because I do not reject them, for, sometimes, I faithfully explain these with their reasons and advocates, in order that others may, according to their prudence, judge of their weight. Moreover, you will observe that when I note any opinion as being more true, I do not regard the contrary opinion as probable, although I do not expressly condemn it as improbable. Also when I call one of the opinions more probable without passing any judgment on the probability of the other, or when I use the expression, 'I do not venture to condemn it,' I do not, therefore, mean to say it is probable, but I leave it to the judgment of those who may be more prudent."

Now, is it not to be feared, that for a mere tyro in theology these minute distinctions are too embarrassing for him to keep in view, as he is endeavouring to make his way onward through his studies? And, as he observes in going along so many grave authors ranged on opposite sides, with different degrees of probability, and various opinions, set forth in the order first, second, and third, and so much, moreover, to be understood behind what is expressed, as also so much left undecided awaiting the judgment of the more prudent, is there not danger that thus at sea, with so many winds in different directions, he may deem it a matter of very little consequence what direction to take?

I therefore humbly think that the great value of St. Liguori's theological writings is reserved for those who, having already read a course of theology as it is usually taught in our seminaries, or great schools, have their minds matured to benefit by the teaching of the holy Doctor.

A VETERAN PRACTITIONER.

ST. PATRICK AND PALLADIUS.

WAS ST. PATRICK AND THE PALLADIUS MENTIONED BY ST. PROSPER AND THE VENERABLE BEDE ONE AND THE SAME?

NO ecclesiastical writers no point of Irish history has presented greater difficulties than the date of St. Patrick's mission. This is evident to any one who studies Ussher and Lanigan, and it was apparently this difficulty that induced Dr. Ledwich to deny the existence of our Apostle altogether. Now this stumbling-block would be entirely removed if it could be shown that the Palladius referred to by Prosper and Bede was not a different person from St. Patrick. This we hope to prove satisfactorily in the following paper, and if our arguments are not arranged in the logical sequence we could desire, the laborious duties of a missionary life must plead our excuse.

It is established by the testimony of the Irish writers that a person named Palladius preached the gospel in Ireland before St. Patrick.

There was a person named Palladius who was sent by Pope Celestine in 431 to preach the gospel in Ireland. This is established by the testimony of Prosper:—"Ad Scotos in Christum credentes ordinatus a Papa Celestino Palladius primus Episcopus mittitur." (*Chron.*) And again:—"Nec signiori cura ab hoc eodem morbo Britannias liberavit, quando quosdam inimicos gratiæ, solum suæ originis occupantes, etiam ab illo secreto exclusit Oceani; et ordinato Scotis episcopo, dum Romanam insulam studet servare Catholicam fecit etiam barbaram Christianam." This testimony of Prosper is repeated by Platina.

Bede writes:—"Anno dominicæ incarnationis 423 Theodosius junior post Honorium regnum suspiciens viginti et septem annis tenuit cujus anno imperii octavo Palladius ad Scotos," &c.

Is the Palladius mentioned by Prosper the same person as the Palladius mentioned by the Irish writers? We assert that he is not, but that he is St. Patrick. We do not confound the Palladius of the Irish writers with St. Patrick, but

we assert that the Palladius of the Irish writers is a different person from the Palladius of Prosper, and that the Palladius of Prosper is St. Patrick. About the Palladius of Prosper we have no information except what is contained in the passage quoted.

The Palladius of Prosper was sent "ad Scotos in Christum credentes." The Palladius of the Irish writers is sent to Ireland considered as an absolutely heathen country. Nennius, who of course speaks of the Palladius of the Irish writers, says he was sent "ad Scotos convertendos," a different expression from that of Prosper; therefore the Palladius of Prosper is not the Palladius of the Irish writers. On the other hand Patrick was sent to Ireland in which it was suggested some had already been converted by the Palladius of the Irish writers; therefore while the description of the mission "ad Scotos in Christum credentes" does not fit in with the Palladius of the Irish writers, it does fit in with St. Patrick. In a word, the Palladius of Prosper made the island Christian; the Palladius of the Irish writers was unable to convert any one, or scarcely any one, therefore the Palladius of Prosper is not the Palladius of the Irish writers. St. Patrick is the person who did make the island Christian, therefore the Palladius of Prosper is St. Patrick.

So conclusive is this argument that there is no way of getting out of it, except by charging Prosper with having stated what was untrue. Lloyd, Ussher, and Lanigan are quite conscious of the difficulty. Lanigan says that Ussher with his usual sagacity observes that Prosper's book was written not long after the mission of Palladius, when he had not heard of the ill success of that missionary. But the *Chronicon* of Prosper comes down to A.D. 455, that is 24 years after the sending of Prosper's Palladius. Granting, however, that it was written soon after Palladius' mission, then Lanigan's and Ussher's exculpation of Prosper simply comes to this, that not only did he state that the island was made Christian, though he did not know it to be so; but that he stated it to be Christian when he could not have known it to so, and when it could not have been so. Is it credible that Prosper, knowing nothing more than that a missionary had

been sent, should roundly state that the mission was successful; or, granting that he might have stated merely from conjecture that it was successful, is it possible that from conjecture also he should have roundly stated that the whole island was converted? A statement of that kind would not have been made without certain knowledge.

Henthorn Todd did not accept that explanation of Prosper's words that they are only a too sanguine anticipation of success, which comes to what we said before, viz., that Prosper stated as a fact what was not a fact, what he had no reason for believing to be a fact, and what he could not have known to be a fact even if it were true. Dr. Todd, seeing the necessity of an explanation, gives one himself which is, that Prosper did not mean to say that Ireland was converted, but that by having had a bishop sent to it, it was admitted into the list of Christian nations. What a glorious exploit that was for Celestine! According to that explanation he could in twenty-four hours have made the whole world Christian. Did ever any one venture to say that because a missionary was sent to China, therefore China had become a Christian country?

One conclusion can be drawn from all these attempts at explaining away Prosper's words, and it is this, that every writer admits that if Prosper's words be true, then the Palladius of Prosper cannot be the Palladius of the Irish writers. They thus put us under the necessity either of denying (as the explanation) that Prosper wrote the truth, or of denying that the Palladius of Prosper is the Palladius of the Irish writers. To deny that the Palladius of Prosper is the Palladius of the Irish writers brings us into collision with no statement made either by the Irish writers or by Prosper, neither can it by any possibility come in collision with any such statements, for nothing whatever is known about the Palladius of Prosper except that his name was Palladius, that he was a deacon, that he was ordained by Celestine in 431, was sent to the Scots believing in Christ, and converted them, every point of which description corresponds with Patrick.

It may be useful to remark here again what we stated before, viz., that we do not identify Patrick with Palladius

because Palladius by itself stands for the Palladius of the Irish writers, but we do identify him with the Palladius of Prosper—with Patrick, but not Palladius as the name is used—in Irish histories. Thus we do not identify Nero with Cæsar when we say Nero was the Cæsar mentioned by St. Paul.

We are not then at liberty to set aside Prosper's statement that the island was converted, merely for the purpose of identifying the Palladius of Prosper with the Palladius of the Irish writers, an identification which has nothing to support it but the coincidence of a name which was then a very common name amongst ecclesiastics. Prosper knew, not merely conjectured, that the island had been converted, and it cannot be denied that he knew to whom the conversion was due. Prosper attributes the conversion to Palladius, therefore Palladius is the person who converted it, but Patrick is the person who converted it, therefore the Palladius of Prosper is Patrick.

Bede knew by whom Ireland had been converted, he gives the honor of its conversion to the Palladius of Prosper, but he knew it was converted by Patrick, therefore Bede understood the Palladius of Prosper to be St. Patrick.

So clear are those arguments, that many eminent men who have not adverted to the distinction between the Palladius of Prosper and the Palladius of the Irish writers, and the identity of Prosper's Palladius with Patrick, have come to the conclusion that St. Patrick never existed, on account of the impossibility of his having been passed over by Prosper and especially by Bede, if in reality it was Patrick who converted Ireland. We admit the impossibility of his being passed over; we deny that he is passed over; but undoubtedly he is passed over if the Palladius of Prosper is the Palladius of the Irish writers, therefore he is not. Finally, the Palladius of Prosper was sent in 431; the Palladius of the Irish writers was sent long before that, for he was sent long before St. Patrick; but if the Palladius of Prosper and that of the Irish writers be the same, St. Patrick must have been sent before 431, therefore the Palladius of Prosper is not the Palladius of the Irish writers. Of course

that argument depends upon the truth of the statement that Patrick was sent by Celestine. In favour of that statement we have the unanimous testimony of all the Irish writers; against it we have nothing but the argument that there was not time after the mission of Palladius for St. Patrick to have got a mission from Celestine. Now let it be well understood that the whole literature about the Roman mission of St. Patrick, for and against, depends on this, that Palladius was sent in 431, and as Celestine died in 432, Patrick could not have had a mission from Celestine. But how, we ask, do you know that it was in 431 that Palladius was sent? Certainly not from the Irish writers; their whole testimony about the Palladius they mention is in direct contradiction of that date. You may say that Prosper states it. Yes; he states that a Palladius was sent in 431, but how do you show that that Palladius is the same as the one spoken of by the Irish writers? Until you show that, you cannot show that the Palladius of the Irish writers was sent in 431. He may have been sent in 422, and there would in that case be sufficient time for all the events recorded about that Palladius to have occurred before St. Patrick's mission. We admit that we are compelled to choose between rejecting the unanimous testimony of the Irish writers that Patrick was sent by Celestine, and rejecting the identity of the Palladius of Prosper with the Palladius of the Irish writers. Of course if the narrative of the Irish writers comes into collision with well-established facts, it should be rejected. But it comes into collision with no fact. It comes into collision only with a statement unproved and unprovable, viz., that the Palladius of Prosper is the Palladius of the Irish writers, a statement, not only unprovable, but which, taking into account the arguments given already, is the direct reverse of the truth. The statement, therefore, of the Irish writers about the Roman mission of St. Patrick cannot be set aside—cannot be rejected, but that statement is incompatible, as is acknowledged, with the Palladius of Prosper being the same as the Palladius of the Irish writers, therefore he is not the same.

If it be urged that it is improbable that Prosper would

pass over the mission of the Palladius of the Irish writers, and that therefore the Palladius he mentions at 431 must be the same, we answer that we must make our choice of the probability of two omissions—we must say whether is it more probable that he passed over the Palladius of the Irish writers, or passed over St. Patrick. If it be the one of them he mentions, then he omits the other. Whether is he likely to have passed over a mission which produced no results, or the mission which converted the island? The same argument applies still more strongly to Bede. It is utterly improbable that they both passed over the successful mission, and mentioned the unsuccessful one; it is, therefore, utterly improbable that the Palladius they mention is the Palladius of the Irish writers. Perhaps Prosper out of adulation to Celestine mentioned the missionary Celestine sent, and omitted Patrick whom he did not send. But Prosper's *Chronicle* was written after Celestine's death when there was no cause for adulation; besides, would it not appear to be rather a sarcasm against Celestine, than a compliment to him, to speak of his having accomplished a something which another did, and which he failed to do. Prosper was the bosom friend of Sixtus III. the successor of Celestine, and private secretary to Leo I., successor of Sixtus; why then in their reign should he have had such zeal for elevating Celestine as to attribute to him what he did not do, for if the Palladius of the Irish writers be the Palladius who was sent in 431 by Celestine, then of a certainty Celestine had no share whatever in the conversion of Ireland. Prosper does not say merely that Palladius converted Ireland: he says that Celestine converted Ireland. If that have any meaning at all, it comes to this that Celestine sent the person who converted Ireland, but the person who converted Ireland was Patrick, therefore Celestine sent Patrick.

If Patrick was the person Prosper had before his mind, can we explain why he did not call him Patrick, but Palladius, can we explain why the Irish writers do not call him Palladius. We think we can explain the difficulty, not only satisfactorily, but also in a way to confirm our statement.

Patrick was a Roman citizen ; he was, moreover, of noble family. "Ingenuus sum," he says, "secundum carnem, nam decurione patre nascor. Vendidi autem nobilitatem pro utilitate aliorum." Therefore he must have had more than one name. There never was a Roman citizen, that is, one born a Roman citizen, who had not several names ; still more is that true of the noble families. Take, for example, Marcus Tullius Cicero, Caius Julius Cæsar-Octavianus, Thascius Cæcilius Cyprianus, &c. Every Roman citizen, besides his *nomen* (name), corresponding to our *surname*, a name which he had by birth, had a *prænomen* (a fore-name, a personal name) corresponding to our *Christian name* and generally had also a *cognomen*, and often an *agnomen*, *Patricius* was a personal name, which was St. Patrick's *nomen*—his name? "Multa," says the Scholiast on *Fiac*, "Patricius habuit nomina ad similitudinem Romanorum nobilium. Succat primum nomen ejus in baptismo a parentibus suis ; Cathraige nomen ei inditum servitutis tempore in Hibernia ; Magonius, i. e. magis agens quam ceteri monachi nomen ejus tempore discipulatus apud Germanum ; Patricius vero vocatus tempore suæ ordinationis." St Patrick's names, then, according to the Irish authorities, were *Patricius Succat Cathraige Magonius*. Of these *Succat* and *Cathraige* are the Irish equivalents of his Roman names. Putting back *Succat* and *Cathraige* into their Roman equivalents, we have Patrick's name as follows, *Patricius Palladius Quadratus Magonius*.

"Terechan Episcopus hæc scripsit ex libro Ultani episcopi ejus ipse alumnus vel discipulus fuit. Inveni quatuor nomina in libro scripta Patricio apud Ultanum episcopum Conchubernensium. Sanctus Magonus qui est clarus ; Succetus qui est deus belli Patricius : Cothertiacus quia servivit iiii domibus magorum, &c." The reasons they assign for Patrick receiving these names we may pass over : they did not know that a Roman was born with a name, and often more than one. The Latin equivalent of *Succat* can be only *Palladius*. *Pallas* was the war-goddess, as *Ares* was the war-demon. *Pallas* is derived by Plato from *πάλλω* I brandish, and would represent spear-brandisher. Whether Plato was right or not

in his derivation does not concern us, the fact is all the same. Pallas was the war-goddess. As a representative or equivalent of Succat we must choose between Palladius, Arius, and Martius, for no other names in use are drawn from war-gods. Martius and Arius cannot have been names; they were rare among any but the old Roman families, whereas Palladius was a usual name at the time. It cannot be denied that this name Succat is, at least, a curious confirmation, nay, a confirmation almost as strong as proof, that St. Patrick's *nomen* (name) was Palladius. We do not need to prove further than we have done that his name was Palladius, for every argument to show that the Palladius of Prosper is the same as Patrick also proves that Patrick's name was Patricius Palladius. Patricius is the name by which he would be known in his own family and among his familiars, but outside his own family the only name by which he would be known would be Palladius—his *nomen* (name). That *nomen* (name) Palladius, is the only name which Prosper could use in speaking of him, and most probably, the only name by which Prosper knew him. On the other hand, in Ireland, seeing that there was another Palladius who had become of note before Patrick's arrival, Patrick could not be called in Ireland by the name of Palladius, but only by the name of Patrick. The Palladius of the Irish writers was in possession of the name, and by necessity the second comer would be called by one of his other names, either his prænomen or his cognomen—his personal name or his after name. Thus it was a matter of necessity that he would be known to the Irish writers only by the name of Patrick, and would be known to the continental writers only by the name of Palladius, for there was little chance that the appellation given to him in Ireland, would become known on the continent, at least until after a very long period.

Taking into account these considerations, we will see that the difference of name affords no reason for doubting that the Palladius of Prosper is the same person as Patrick; for the difference of name is just what must have occurred if they were the same. Next, the identity of name gives very little presumption for saying that the Palladius of Prosper

and the Palladius of the Irish writers are the same person, for the name was a very common one among ecclesiastics.

We, therefore, unhesitatingly adopt the conclusion that, the Palladius who *did not* convert Ireland cannot be Prosper's Palladius *who did*; that as the Palladius of Prosper is the person who did convert Ireland, and as Prosper knew and Bede knew that Patrick was the person who converted it, therefore the Palladius of Prosper and of Bede is our St. Patrick—the Patricius Palladius Quadratus Magonius.

E. O'BRIEN.

DR. HUGH DE BURGO.—II.

THE attitude which the Confederate States of Holland might assume towards the Irish Catholics, was regarded by the Supreme Council as a matter of very great importance. As a naval power, the States held a high place at that period. And as the Irish sea-ports were in a measure unprotected, and the coast much infested by the hostile cruisers of the Puritans, it was deemed extremely desirable to secure the support or sympathy of the Confederate States. Under the circumstances it was decided to commission Father Burke to treat with Holland with plenary powers. His commission was dated from Wexford on the 7th of August, 1643; and though brief it was well calculated to flatter its illustrious (*perillustri viro*) recipient, and also to conciliate the Government to whom he was sent as ambassador. "The Most Potent States" were assured that Father Burke was a man on whose *integrity* and *prudence*, the most implicit reliance might be placed. He received very minute instructions as to the objects of his mission. The Council's views on the subject, are forcibly urged on their agent in a letter addressed to him from Ross:

"The great use which wee have of shipping to defende our coaste, and infest the enemy is well known to you, and without some considerable number of them bee drawn into a body, with intent to secure our coast, and not to apply themselves wholly to traffic we shall want that end we look most after."

The prospects of a profitable trade had indeed, brought several vessels to the Irish coast; and though the Confederates had reason to complain of the selfishness of some in applying themselves so much to "traffic," they still desire that their ambassador should remind the people of Holland of the advantages which were sure to arise from a "free commerce" between both countries. He was to remind them of the *ancient friendship* which existed between Ireland and that "nacion;" and to urge forcibly, that the states should not permit that time-honoured friendship to be destroyed by the machinations of enemies. In order to prejudice the Irish cause in Holland, the English Dissenters represented Irish Catholics as in revolt against their King. Father Burke was instructed to point out that the Irish were driven to arms only by the oppression of the Puritans, who were also his Majesty's active enemies; that they had taken up arms only when they had clearly ascertained that their enemies had undertaken a war of extermination against them; and in fine that they had already addressed a "remonstrance of grievances" to his Majesty, soliciting his protection and support. The Council recounted for him even many recent proofs of the regard of the Irish people for their Dutch friends. "We are sure that to this day we continue our good affections to them." "And since these troubles," they add, "we did their men right and courtesies; the particulars, you have by our letters: and we are ready to doe more."

The particulars are given in the letters referred to, with minuteness; and are of sufficient interest to be referred to here.

But a short time previously, a Dutch merchant vessel under the command of a Captain Both, had been forced to put in at Berehaven, owing to the illness of its crew. The sick men were taken ashore, and received necessary care; and the vessel, which was richly laden, was guarded by the native Irish during their convalescence.

A frigate under the command of a certain John Classye, with seventy-six men on board, had experienced at Bantry bay a reception similar in its kindness. But a still more singular proof of the regard in which the Dutchmen of

those days were held by the Irish, was shown by another instance which occurred about Christmas of the same year. The vessel was from Fandanbouke, and was wrecked at Dungarvan. As soon as her nationality was ascertained, care was taken by the people of the coast to save every thing of value which it contained. Amongst the valuables was a sum of 1500 *pistoles of gold* which was scrupulously preserved for the States, by the mayor of Waterford.

“These (they add) have been some expressions of our redde will to persevere in that constant intercourse of good offices which have passed between them and our nacion, and some light unto them how useful it will be to have us continue the same desires.”

These facts should at least constitute a strong plea for the liberation of Captain Oliver and his men; a subject which Father Burke was urged “to negotiate with all his skill and industry.” Such indeed was the anxiety felt for Oliver by the Confederates that they sent out a naval officer named Lambert, to aid Father Burke in effecting his liberation.

Under the circumstances the need of an experienced officer that should have supreme control over the Irish navy was all the more strongly felt. The Confederates were already in treaty with a certain Antonio le Condén Boué D’Overmere “a man of quality in Flanders,” and nearly allied to Preston, the Leinster general. This personage would himself supply a “squadron of frigates for their service,” on certain conditions. Amongst the most important of his stipulations was, that he would be appointed admiral of all the foreign vessels that might volunteer for active service of the confederates. He also claimed considerable share of the prizes which might be captured by Flemish vessels, together with certain important and unusual trading privileges. The Supreme Council apprehending that such concessions might be calculated to promote jealousies, and thus to injure their cause, resolved that the commission should be granted only under certain wise restrictions. The nature of those restrictions were communicated to Father Burke; and permission was given to him to grant or withhold the commission, as he might deem advisable.

“We have sent unto you a commission under our seale for Monsieur Overmere, the articles of our agreement with him, and our

answers to some questions of his ; all which are left to your dispose, eyther to bee detayned or given unto him at your election as your judgement and conscience shall conceive best for the advantage of the common cause."

The commission was however ultimately withheld.

A treaty with Holland was the result of Father Burke's mission to that country; and this treaty it was thought desirable to publish throughout Ireland by a formal proclamation. From the terms of the proclamation, it seems clear that strenuous efforts had been made by malicious and designing parties, to have it appear, that the Confederate Irish were the open enemies of the States of Holland. Under those circumstances the importance of the treaty may not be easily exaggerated.

"To prevent, therefore, the mischeefes which might arise from the want of a right understanding of our sense herof, wee thought fit to establish and declare, and by those presents, doe publish and declare, that the States of Holland are now in league and amytie with our Sovereign Lord, and us his most faithful subjects."

And it was also declared that such as might presume to violate that treaty, with "the Hollander," rendered themselves liable to the penalties incurred by the ordinary disturbers of the "publicke peace."

Father Burke's successes in Holland were attained under very great difficulties. In addition to those already indicated, communication with Ireland was rendered for a time, difficult and uncertain. Many of the important despatches forwarded to him there, by the Council, never reached his hands. They wrote to him expressing their natural astonishment that so many of their letters should have miscarried. The date of this communication was the 8th of August, it would appear that Father Burke had received none of the letters addressed to him from Ireland since the preceding January. In his labours, however, he was sustained by the consciousness of unselfish zeal in his country's interests, until *at length* the assurances of his *country's* gratitude reached him. The Council continued to approve of his "endeavours," and to assure him that they felt satisfied he had omitted nothing consistent with prudence

and foresight. The following extract from a letter addressed to him by the Supreme Council, will show more clearly, their estimate of his untiring assiduity:—

“REV. FATHER—“We have received your several letters concerning your employment into Holland, and the diary of the accidents which befel you, wherein we find you have acquit the trust reposed in you with that care and judgement that merits thanks at our hands, which we heartily retourn unto you.”

The march of events at home and abroad, had been so far favourable to Catholic Ireland. It was much to have secured the sympathy of Bavaria, and Belgium, with that of Imperial Austria. The treaty with Holland also concluded through Father Burke's agency, was very important. The ambassadors of France and Spain were formally received at Kilkenny, and the sum of 20,000 crowns presented on the occasion in the name of the Spanish nation, went to prove, that the presence of their Excellencies in Kilkenny was no mere empty pageant. Father Scarampi, the Papal Legate, had also arrived in Ireland the bearer of 30,000 dollars, and valuable military supplies. Much of confiscated Catholic and Church property in the west, and south, was once more in Catholic hands; and very many of the grand old cathedrals so long desecrated by the heretics, were again glorified by the pomp of Catholic ceremonial. Such advantages pointed encouragingly to ultimate success. Yet strange to say it was at such a juncture that the question of a “cessation of hostilities,” began to be discussed. Father Burke hears of the “Cessation” for the first time, in the letter of the 26th of January just quoted “We have” they write “in the meantime while you are expecting of answers to particulars of your letters, sent you those to let you know the motives which did induce us to treat of a “Cessacion of Armes.” What opinions he entertained on this important proposal, it is now difficult to ascertain. But considering his zeal, in promoting his country's cause, it is difficult to think they could have been other than those of strong disapproval. Lord Ormond was instructed by the king to urge it privately, but strongly. As might have been expected, it had ardent advocates in such men as Clanricarde, and many more of the Anglo-Irish aristocracy,

who regarded with a jealous eye the claims of the Church for the restoration of its confiscated property.

The reasons against the Cessation were strong and obvious, and forcibly put before the public by Father Scarampi, the Papal Legate. He urged that the needs of the Irish for military supplies could not be regarded as a justification of the proposed Cessation. Though their needs might have been urgent then, they were at least, far less urgent than in the preceding year, when they had entered on the war. Were the Irish to rest satisfied with the advantages already gained, and not continue to follow up these successes, they would forfeit the support of the European countries then favourably disposed towards them. Constitutional liberty and the free exercise of faith should be obtained he urged "by arms and intrepidity, not by Cessations and indolence." It is impossible to read the Legate's statements against the Cessation without being struck by his political foresight.

"That *peace will ever be made between the King and Parliament,*" he continued, "is *exceedingly improbable*; nor would it be our advantage; for if they *combined*, we should be necessitated to surrender, &c. If the parliament prevail—which God forbid—all *Ireland will fall under their arbitrary power*; the swords of the Puritans will be at our throats, and we *shall lose everything except our Faith.*" Events soon proved how literally those prophetic words were realized. Should the Irish, on the other hand, vigorously prosecute the war, they would be found by the victorious English party whether King or Parliament, "well provided with increased territories, stronger in foreign succours," in a word, in a position to have their grievances fully redressed. He urged also that the war was a religious war, and as such had received the support of Princes not otherwise hostile either to the King, or Parliament. A treaty of peace which should secure no *permanent gain* to Irish Catholics, would alienate the sympathy of those Princes, and he indignantly added, "it should not be supposed that he had been accredited by the Holy See merely to obtain an uncertain peace *for a single year*, in which brief period no foundation could be laid for the *security* of the *Faith and the Kingdom.*" But

notwithstanding those and similar representations the intrigues of Ormond prevailed; and in an evil hour the treaty of Cessation was accepted by the Confederates. The armistice was accordingly proclaimed in Dublin by the Lords Justices "for one whole year beginning the 15th day of September, Anno Domini 1643, at the houre of twelve of the clock of the same day."

One of the chief objects which the advocates of the Cessation asserted they wished to attain, was that they might be able during the armistice, to dispatch large reinforcements to England to aid the king; they also affected an anxiety, to be in a position to discharge in part, their obligations to the King of Spain. But the treaty of Cessation was no sooner signed than it was shamelessly violated by the Puritans, in the south and north. General Munroe had taken the field in the north; and the Supreme Council thought it necessary to dispatch a strong force under the command of Castlehaven to that province. And not only was that force of six thousand foot, and six thousand horse, considered necessary, but it was felt that "a great reserve of men for their supply" was also required. Under these circumstances the promised reinforcements for Spain could not be sent. Father Burke was accordingly required to represent to the Spanish Viceroy, Don Francisco de Melos, the foregoing facts, as a justification for the inability of the Confederates to fulfil, just then, their engagements to his Catholic Majesty of Spain. He was, however, to assure him, that they by no means repudiated their obligations. But, as they could not then part with their troops, without exposing the safety of the kingdom to imminent danger, they would defer the fulfilment of their obligations to a more favourable time. The Ulster Puritans had, as a matter of fact, received just then large reinforcements in men from Scotland; and large grants of money from the English parliament. A letter dispatched by the council to Fr. Burke, on the 22nd February, 1643, contains full and interesting particulars regarding the matter. "We could not," they write, "without the ruine of the kingdome, for the present, parte with our men, but we will see provide that, how-

ever it falls out with us, we will perform our promiss with the King of Spaine."

It would have been well if they had measured their duties to King Charles, by the same equitable and cautious course of reasoning. Here, however, they permitted their "loyalty" to a worthless king, to blind them to their country's needs. They arranged with "all cheerfulness" to present his Majesty with £30,000 in consideration of "his royal intentions" towards them. The Irish Catholics were indebted to his Majesty for nothing more valuable than his "intentions." For his recognition of their position, and claims at the time of the treaty, they were mainly indebted to their own valour.

However undesirable the treaty of Cessation may have been, it indicated a sufficient degree of success to the Catholic cause, to justify, in a measure, the tone of self-congratulation noticeable in a letter addressed to Pope Urban VIII., by the Supreme Council, on the 14th June, 1644. After recounting for his Holiness the various benefits secured to the Catholics, they add:—"And these great benefits for our nation were reserved, most Holy Father, for your Pontificate, under whose auspices the Catholic religion so long oppressed in this island, now lifts its head with dignity, and is seen once more arrayed in a manner becoming the Spouse of Christ; and our people are confident that they shall eventually win the reward of their courage and patience." There can be no doubt that Urban VIII. entertained a high estimate of their ardour in unselfishly promoting the interests of religion, when it is remembered that he gave the Supreme Council the privilege of *nominating to benefices and vacant Sees*. He was pleased "to suspend the grant of any spiritual promocion or benefice within the kingdome, other than to suche persons as should be returned unto him," with the recommendation of the Supreme Council. Of this gracious concession they proceeded to avail themselves in this letter of the 14th June, to which we have already referred. As might have been expected there were many episcopal sees then vacant, in Ireland. Amongst the sees then vacant, for which the

Council desired that provision should be made, were those of Achonry, Ferns, Limerick, Kilmacduagh, and Ross. The period was fruitful of eminent ecclesiastics, whose admitted abilities reflected honour on their Church, and country. Amongst those Father Burke, Doctor O'Dwyre of Limerick, Doctor Kirwan, and others were specially distinguished. We are not, therefore, surprised to find that their names were selected for immediate ecclesiastical preferment. "Father Hugh De Burgo, of the Order of St. Francis, now in Flanders," stood first amongst those, whom, from the knowledge which they had "of their good lives and abilities, well fitting a pastoral charge," they recommended to the notice of his Holiness for the see of Achonry. The amiable and holy Doctor Francis Kirwan, who was also recommended for the same see was appointed Bishop of Killala; while Father Hugh De Burgo was subsequently consecrated Bishop of Kilmacduagh.

J. A. FAHEY, P.P.

(*To be continued.*)

IÚRAD—ITS HISTORY, SIGNIFICATION, AND TENSE.

IN the year 807 Ferdornach wrote out of his own head, or as I believe, copied, on fol. 189 *ba* of the *Book of Armagh*, the glosses *cimbidi* and *iúrad* on some words of the last three verses of the 27th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. Mr. Whitley Stokes¹ in 1860, Ebel² in 1871, Dr. Windisch³ in 1879 and 1880, Dr. Güterbock and Dr. Thurneysen⁴ in 1881, Dr. Thurneysen⁵ in 1883, Dr. Kuno Meyer⁶ in 1884, and Mr. Stokes⁷ in 1886, give and treat the interesting vocable, *iúrad* as a gloss on "factum est;" while I, in 1884, copied, and have since printed it as a gloss on "accederent." I believe

¹ *Irish Glosses.* ² *Grammatica Celtica.* ³ *Grammar and Dictionary.*

⁴ *Index to Zeuss.* ⁵ *Irische Miscellen.* ⁶ *Irish Miscellanies.*

⁷ *Celtic Declension*, p. 61.

these most learned men to have been mistaken; and I think Ferdornach was misled by the manuscript from which he copied, and that, in transcribing the gloss, "*Scriba sapiens*"¹ *se aliosque circumscripsit*.

Mr. Stokes thought in 1860 (as I have not the book within reach, I speak from memory) that *íúrad* = *factum est*, and is connected with the Gaulish word *eiwopov* (*fecit*) and the Irish *fritammiurat*, *fritammiorsa*; Ebel² says the same, but adds, "si quidem recte *íúrad* (gl. *factum est*), *fritammiurat* (afficient me), *fritammiorsa* (gl. me adficiet) conferuntur;" and he registers it as a "praeteritum primarium passivum;" in their Index Glossarum of *Gram. Celtica*, Doctors Güterbock and Thurneysen connect it with *friuair*³ (*efficit*); in his grammar Dr. Windisch⁴ states, approvingly, that "Stokes connects *íúrad factum est*, with *eiwopov*; in his Woerterbuch he says, "cfr. *fri-iuram*, afficio," and he makes *fritamm-iur-sa* a 3rd. pres. ind., and *fritamm-iurat* 3rd. pl. pres.; he gives "*íúrthund* cfr. *urtadh* to gore, to hurt, O'Don. Suppl.," without any reference to *íuraim*. Dr. Meyer says⁵ *íuraim* (*facio*) is proved by the following forms:—

3 sg. rel. ind. *mairg íuras in n-orgain sa!* LU. 87b (about twenty examples.)

3 sg. imper. pass. *íurthar ind orgain*, LU. 88a.

3 sg. pres. sec. pass. *ro iurtha mac secht m-bliadain*.

3 sg. b-fut. pass. *ní iurfaithe ind orgain*, the ruin would not be wrought.

On this Dr. Thurneysen writes⁶:—

"Mr. Meyer stands up for the existence of the fabulous verb *íuraim*, *facio*; but all the forms are examples of the future *íorr*, *íurr*. I will add to them the 2nd. sg. which is four times in the MS. of Milan, *inní irr*, wilt thou not strike? *inní írrsin*, *indahierr*; and the 3rd. sg. *íúrthund*, he will kill us."

To these examples Mr. Stokes⁷ adds, *nád n-íurmais orgain*, we should not work ruin; *ní iurtha ind orgain*, thou shouldst not commit the murder; in *ro iurtha mac*, a child was destroyed, we have an inorganic Middle-Irish form, made

¹ So designated in *Chron. Scot.* 846, and called *Eagnaidh agus scribhaidh toghaidhe* in F. Masters, 844.

² *Gr. Celt.*, pp. 35, 477.

³ P. 118.

⁴ Vorrede, p. vii.

⁵ *Rev. Celt.*, vi. 191.

⁶ *Rev. Celt.*, vi. 371; cf. p. 96.

⁷ *Celtic Declension*, p. 61.

from an s-future stem *orgs*; *noirrtha orgain, frisoirctis*¹ (adversabantur). He remarks then that all these forms seem to be s-futures from the compound verb **i-orgim*, and the forms in which Kuno Meyer sees a root *iur*, are all, he thinks, to be referred to the root *org*, the simple s-stem *orgs* regularly becoming *orv, ors, orr*, and even *or*. It is possible, he continues, that the simplex may be in the imperat. sg. 2, *urtha-sa* (betake thyself) LL. 58^a, and the t-pret. pl. 3, *urthatar* (they betook themselves) LL. 55^a; and that those words may have originally meant “make,” “they made.” Cf. the German phrases “sich davon *machen*,” “sich fort *machen*.” Of *iúrad* he writes in the same paper: “*Eiôru*, written *ieuru* in seven other Gaulish inscriptions, . . . seems compounded with the prep. *ei* = Gr. *ἐπί*, Skr. *api*, with regular loss of *p*. The root may be *ur*, “to make,” which Mowat finds in the Lat. *ur-na* . . . and which may also be the source of the Gr. *ύρχη*, whence Lat. *urceus*. In Irish the root apparently occurs, compounded with *ī* = *ἐπί* in *íúrad* (gl. factum est).”²

Such is the substance of a discussion about a fabulous verb *iúrain*, founded on the “gloss” “*iúrad*, gl. factum est.” Dr. Thurneysen³ affirms that “*iúrad* alone can be compared with *εωπον*, and only on the supposition that the gloss is a simple translation of the Latin word.” But I venture to think that it glosses “occiderent” or “accederent,” which the glossator or transcriber mistook for *occideret* or *accideret*; and that *iúrad* really means “occideret,” he would kill, or perhaps “accideret,” which the glossator took to mean *striking* upon or against the shore. With a hope of making this clear, I shall give the text of the *Book of Armagh*, 189ba:—

1. militum consilium fuit
ut custodias occiderent* nequis cum
natasset effugeret centorio h. vol
eas seruare paulum prohibuit fieri
5. iussitque eos qui possent natare mi
tere se primos et euadere et exire ad
terram et cæteros alios in tabulis tereb
ant et quosdam super ea quae de nauis
sent et sic factum est ut omnes animae
10. accederent* ad terram et cum euasisse
mus

¹Is not this last a 3rd. pl. sec. present, the 3rd. sg. pres. of which is *orcaid* ?

²*Celtic Declension*, pp. 61, 62.

³*Rev. Celtique*, vi. p. 98.

Over “custodias” is written *cimbidi*, in the margin is a Latin gloss cut into by the binder, and conveying, if I remember rightly, that *custodiae* means qui custodiebantur, i.e. the prisoners. * Between ll. 9 and 10 is written *iúrad*; between ll. 10 and 11 is *euaderet* or *euaderent*; over the first *e* in *euaderet*, and the first *c* in *accederent* there is a dot; over the *n* of *accederent* there is a mark (of reference?); over *sic* is the mark of length (or reference?); over “factum est” there is nothing. It seems that *iúrad* and *euaderet* gloss *accederent*.

As *iúrad* could not be a gloss on “*sic*,” I copied it as a gl. on “*accederent*” about three years ago, though I could not explain it. My view at present is, and I hope it may be received as more than a bold guess, or shrewd conjecture:—
 1°. That *iúrad* glosses “*occiderent*” (yet = *occideret*), and that it should have been written immediately after *cimbidi*; 2° that it was misplaced, because *accederent* “caught the eye” of the writer, perhaps after a nap; 3° that it is in the singular, as the *centurio* or *paulus* was uppermost in his mind, or because the MS. had *occiderent* or *accederent*, as “*euaderent*,” here in the *Book of Armagh*, can hardly be distinguished from “*euaderet*.” This view is founded on, or confirmed by the facts, (a) that *iúrad* could mean “*occideret*,” as 3rd. sg. secondary future of *orcaid*, *occidit* (Milan MS. 19^a); (b) that *iúrad*, or any other word like it, has not been proved to mean “*factum est*,” or anything like it. From the Milan gl. “*fritamm-iorsa* i. l. *quamdiu me adficiet*,” it first appears that a word apparently akin to *iúrad* is a future; Dr. Thurneysen has shown that many words like it are secondary futures, and in this he is supported by Mr. Stokes. I beg to introduce *iúrad* as sec. fut. to these learned men, hoping that they will give it *fáilte móir*. I shall now tabulate the persons of this tense, marking with a dash the compound or conjunct forms already found, and with an asterisk those which, I fancy, may be met with hereafter:—

ACTIVE SECONDARY S-FUTURE OF *orc-aid*.

<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
1. <i>iúrainn</i> *	<i>iúrmáis</i>
2. <i>iúrtha, írrtha</i>	<i>iúrthe</i>
3. <i>iúrad</i>	<i>iúrtais</i> *

PASSIVE SEC. S-FUTURE.

3. *iúrtha*

*iúrtis**

S-FUTURE ACTIVE.

Singular.

Plural.

1. — *iurr*, — *iorr*

— *iúram,** — *arram,** *iúrmme**

2. *írr*, *ierr*

— *arraid*, *iúrthe**

3. *iúr*, *orr*, — *arr*, — *ar*.

— *iúrat*, *iúrit**

Relative iúras

*iúrte**

S-FUTURE PASSIVE.

3. *iúrthar*

iúrtar, iuratar**

“*iúrfaithe*” is an S + B. future secondary 3rd. sg. passive, and is as corrupt as would be *audiebis* for *audies*; it should be *ní iúrtha*.

The meaning¹ of *orcaid*, is 1° *occidit*, (i. e. a. vehementer cædit; b. ad necem cædit,) in which sense under the form of *ár*,² slaughter of persons, it figures so often in the Irish Annals, that the Milan gloss might serve as a summary of them:—*Inti díb bis tresa orcaid alaile, qui ex iis est fortior occidit alium.* 2° *ex-cidit*, as in “*urbes excidere*,” “*aedes sacras, domos excidere*” (*Cicero*). In this sense *orcain*, *orccain*, *argain*, are used *passim* in the *Chron. Scotorum*, the *Annals of the Four Masters* and of *Loch Cé*:—thus *orgain Chluana Creamha agus guin daeine* in the *Four Masters* an. 810, which is rendered “*direptio organorum ecclesiae Clooncreeve et jugulatio hominis*” in the *Annals of Ulster* an. 814. On this erroneous translation Dr. O’Connor bases a very learned note on organs,³ and Mr. Warren grounds his statement, that “the Irish Annals speak of the destruction of church organs.”⁴ 3° *occidit* in a figurative sense, as *bith m-oirc domsa, gl væ mihi est.*, *Wb*, 10^d, which reminds one of “*hei mihi, Geta! occidisti me fallaciis tuis*” (*Terent. Phorm.*), and might be rendered “*actum est [“factum est!”] de me*” (*Plaut. Pseud. I. 1. 63*).

Hence I should translate literally (though *barbare*) *mairg iúras in n-orgain-sa, væ illi, qui occidit occisionem hanc*; cf.

¹ O’Don. in *Suppl.* gives from *Cormac* “*iurtadh* to gore, hurt, query cognate with English hurt.” The form *iurtadh* should be, I think, *iúrad* or *iúr*; and if any one were now to hint at “un petit soupçon” of *orc* in hurt, heurter (*French*), *ored* (*Ang. Sax.*) *āwarpéaw*, *würgen*, *eg-orger* (!), he might be referred to *Pott* (*Etymologische Forschungen*).

² *ár*, *iúr*, *úr*, *irc*, *iort*, *irt*, *iorthach* (deadly) are found in the dictionaries.

³ *F. Masters* p. 423 note.

⁴ *Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church*, p. 126.

“copias occisione occideret” (Cicero, 14 Phil. 14), “mirum somnium somniavi,” he did the deed, he sang a song, he struck the blow, “thou shalt die the death.” (Douay Bible Gen. 2. 17), etc.

If *túrad* glosses “accederent,” then I think the glossarist mistook this for “occiderent,” or had “cædo” and “cedo” mixed up in his mind; and I propose *túrad* occideret as the real meaning. This secondary future, according to Dr. Windisch¹ answers to the French conditional, and has, says Dr. Thurneysen, “toutes les fonctions du conditionel roman;”² but that the conditional always corresponds with it, seems not correct, as here the French translate—les soldats furent d’avis de tuer les prisonniers—ut custodias occiderent; again St. John I. 19; dochum go bh-fiafróchaidis—pour demander; marufeste (Z² 471)—si vous saviez, si vous eussiez su; and so on in many cases with which I do not wish to crowd this paper.

EDMUND HOGAN, S.J.

CORRESPONDENCE.

PLURALITY OF ANCIENT BENEFICES.—MISSA PRO POPULO IN IRELAND.

REV. DEAR SIR,—In connection with the above obligation an important question was lately proposed to the Sacred Congregation. I annex the material points of the case, and the answers given. If I mistake not the question sent to Rome from France contains some considerations calculated to enlarge the responsibilities of a considerable portion of the Irish clergy, and consequently a discussion on what for argument’s sake I may be permitted to call the parallelism of the relative positions in this country and in France may not be altogether devoid of special interest to many of your readers. In view of the practical question proposed to the S. Congregation and the reply of that august body, we are led to inquire if the decision given in the one case may be taken as applying to Ireland either indirectly or by inference; according to established general principles. Are the cases analogous?

¹ Gram. 6. § 250.

² *Rev. Celt.* vi. p. 94.

If so, like case, like rule. Should we hold the analogy to exist, then the decision before us bears upon our status, and without further special inquiry or any appeal to antiquity we are bound to acquiesce in and to be subject to the operation of defined law. If however, there has existed in this country and for this we must have proof positive, a special provision amounting to a certain limitation of the law, then we may *salva conscientia* follow in the existing practice. But ecclesiastical law is a matter of "sterne assertion," and is not to be blown away by mere speculation; much less by "the amiable feebleness of hypothesis." It is easy to understand how many of the disciplinary laws of the Church in the peculiar and direful social circumstances of this country for past centuries, became complicated and impracticable. During those penal days the exercise of the pastoral authority and the performance of sacred functions were surrounded with abnormal difficulty and irregularity, and very often attended with violent resistance, and positive danger to life. But happily those days have passed away and at length the Church of God in this country can adequately carry on, even in minutest detail, the work which our Lord has given her to do in so complex a form, embracing matters of faith and discipline, ritual and ceremonial. Now we can advantageously, yet with reverend speculation, apply a searching analysis to those laws of the Church which are not rendered impracticable by the condition of the country or local circumstances; and to this category somewhat belongs the legislation—the extension or limitation of which is the matter of my present letter.

Take the case as it stands in France. A priest has two churches and of course two flocks. One represents his original flock. The other has been annexed. Of course he has to say two Masses on Sundays and holidays. Now the Sacred Congregation has decided, that this priest is bound to offer up Mass for each of the two parishes,—that is, that one Mass will not serve for both, or in other words, that he must apply his second Mass to the members of the *second* parish; or to make it still clearer—for the superadded parish and flock:—*unitae accessorié*," to quote the expressive phrase of Craisson's *Juris canonici Manuale*.

In the time of Pius VII (1801), the ancient dioceses and parishes were by the Concordat suppressed in France, and new parishes created,—"*concurrente simul utraque potestate, ecclesiastica scilicet et civili*;"—this led Craisson to inquire—"An parochi sunt hodié in Gallia vere et proprié dicti parochi." To this he answers,

“Parochos inamovibiles esse veros et in sensu juris proprie dictos parochos,” “nullamque de hoc moveri difficultatem.”

Having thus by anticipation cleared away one radical difficulty, I will proceed with the case, following the form in which it was presented to the Sacred Congregation :—

“Pro insufficienti sacerdotum numero in dioecesi Divionensi non raro accidit ut idem parochus tribus ecclesiis inserviat, nempe : 1. Suae propriae parochiae ; 2. Modo permanenti alteri ecclesiae quae, in alio loco sita tituloque parochiali non gaudens, annectitur ecclesiae parochiali ; 3. Ecclesiae loci parochialem titulum habentis, sed, penuriae sacerdotum causa, parochum proprium residentem non possidentis ad tempus.”

“Vi suae institutionis, talis parochus singulis dominicis ac festis diebus bis celebrat, nempe in sua ecclesia parochiali, sed permanenter ecclesiae parochiali annexa ut dicitur. Inde sequitur ut idem omnino nequeat missam celebrare dominicis ac festis diebus in tertia ecclesia, nempe parochiae cujus ad tempus curam habet. Cum tamen ei parochiae, in qua non residet, invigilare teneatur tum ad visitandos aegrotantes, tum ad catechizandos pueros ac multa alia munia adimplenda. Quaeremus : 1. An talis sacerdos debeat supplere missas quas pro sua secunda parochia non potest celebrare diebus dominicis ac festis ; ambabus parochiis inter se multum distantibus ; 2. An debeat alterutram ex missis, quas celebrat, ut dictum est, singulis dominicis ac festis, applicare simul pro utraque parochia ; 3. An debeat applicare huic parochiae missa privata, quae in ecclesia annexa sine titulo parochiali celebratur ?”

“Cum evenerit ut plures sacerdotes bona fide pro sua secunda parocia non cebraverint, ut in casu postulamus, ut ipsis, suae omissiones si necesse sit condonentur.”

“R.—Ad I. Affirmative, nisi quod optandum foret ut secundam missam celebraret in secunda parocia.”

Ad II. Non licere.

Ad III. Affirmative,

Die 24 Julii 1886.”

The obligation of a P.P. in respect to the “Missa Pro Populo” is here distinctly reiterated ; and that obligation being relative is only circumscribed by the extent or limit of his charge ; so that, if he is in the position of one shepherd placed over two flocks within one fold he owes a duty to each section if that subdivision had been *once* a parish with covenanted spiritual rights.

I use the word *covenanted* advisedly, because it will shorten my

labour when I come to draw on theologians and canonists for support and light.

Let us waive this point for a little, and come directly to the hypothetical position. Some will be disposed to say that the flock *hic et nunc* under the P.P. is morally one and cannot be regarded in a distributed sense after incorporation. I admit the territorial union: and even the "*beneficia unita.*" I will further allow that the P.P. is not only administering but actually has canonically the "*cura animarum*" within the territory allotted to him. All those points however do not together or separately put in abeyance the particular and specific right of the application of a "*singula missa pro singulis parochiis,*" as Lehmkuhl states, for which assertion he takes his stand on a Decree of S. C. C. March 1771.

This learned author is very decided on the two-fold obligation of a pastor charged with the enlarged responsibility implied in such a case as we are considering. He says, "*Cui vero plena cura pastoralis competit; ille pro parte gregis sibi commissi sacrificia offerre absolute debet.*" The italics are employed by the author. And in the same article, paragraph V. he writes. "*Imo si parochi duarum parochiarum administratio committitur debet aut per se aut per alterum curare ut pro singulis parochiis singulae missae applicentur.*"

From the above it would appear that the learned Jesuit Father does not seem to think that corporate union dispenses with the particular right to Mass enjoyed by each community, previous to incorporation.

Moreover the obligation, by which a pastor is bound, of saying Mass for his flock or flocks is in proportion to the *finis praecepti* and this being a "*lex affirmativa;—requiritur faciendi id quod praecipitur.*"

The various grounds which concurrently stamp this obligation as one of a very grave character, seem to call for a very strict interpretation of its signification. Thus—*ratione officii; jure naturali; ex charitate, jure divino; and "ratione curae animarum."* (Trid. Sess. 22). We need not then be surprised at the solicitude with which modern theologians in particular discuss the particular case under review. We again find Craisson in his lucid "*Manuale Juris Canonici*" pointedly putting this question "*An parochus qui duas parochias regit et ideo bis in die celebrat, utrique parochiae suam missam applicare teneatur, non obstante reddituum exiguitate,*" "*Affirmative.*"

Craisson writes very diffusely "*de vera notione parochi et parochiae,*" but having quoted him so far already I will leave your readers to examine that chapter for themselves and I expect they will find a good deal to be placed to my account.

It is time for me to bring my remarks to a close, and in summing up I can appropriately quote Fr. Ballerini:—*clarum et venerabile nomen*—"Parochus duabus parochiis praepositus duplicem Missam recurrentibus festis tenetur applicare nisi unio duarum parochiarum sit plenaria et extinctiva ita ut ex duabus ecclesia parochialibus una prorsus ob extinctionem tituli alterius evaserit." At length we arrive at the *crux* of the question. Ballerini lays down the absolute condition according to which corporate union makes a change in the general law, but how far that applies to our national case is a point I must postpone for the present. I have found bishops when collating parishes to use language in their official documents as—"the united parishes" of so and so. Now the historico-theological question is whether such *uniones* are *plenariae et extinctivae*?

But to exhaust this subject or even to deal with it fairly would require a volume and not the narrow compass of a letter.

With great respect I beg to remain

Your obedient Servant,

G. J. GOWING, P.P.

Kill, Co. Kildare.

[The decision of the 21st of July, 1886, in no way alters the clear teaching of theologians regarding the pastoral obligations of offering Mass on Sundays and Feasts of obligation for each separate parish of which the pastor has charge.

The case made was this: A priest has charge of two parishes which are *not* united. One of them is his own parish in which there are two churches—a parochial and an auxiliary church, and the pastor is wont to say Mass on Sundays and Holidays of obligation in each of these churches.

The other parish is one which is temporarily vacant, and the charge of which is entrusted to the pastor of the neighbouring parish.

The S. Congregation says:—

1. That Mass should be offered for the people of each of the two parishes on Sundays and Holidays.

2. That this should be done, even though the allowance for the pastoral care of the parish is miserably small.

3. That it is not allowable to offer the same Mass for both parishes in discharge of the twofold obligation.

4. That the second Mass should be said in the parochial church of the second parish, rather than in the auxiliary church of the first parish.

Ballerini, quoting the S. Congregation of the 11th of March, 1774, in the words cited by our correspondent, states clearly the nature of the parish priest's obligation in regard to two or more parishes of which he has the pastoral charge:—

"Parochus duabus parochiis praepositus duplicem Missam recurrentibus festis tenetur applicare nisi unio duarum parochiarum sit *plenaria et extinctiva*, ita ut ex duabus Ecclesiis parochialibus una prorsus ob extinctionem tituli alterius evaserit."

The bishop is the competent authority to decide whether the union is complete.—Ed. I. E. R.]

THE SIGN SYSTEM *VERSUS* THE ORAL SYSTEM OF TEACHING
THE DEAF AND DUMB.

VERY REV. AND DEAR MR. EDITOR,—I see in this month's number of THE RECORD an elaborate, and somewhat lengthy communication from the respected Chaplain of the Boston-Spa Institution for the Deaf and Dumb, Yorkshire, England, commenting on a paper from me in the number of February last, on the Oral System of teaching the deaf and dumb. The communication calls for a rejoinder, but as I happen to be just now away from home, and expect to be absent for some little time yet, I must defer what I have to say for your September issue, merely observing for the present, that I am glad to have elicited the criticisms of so able an advocate of a system I have ventured to call into question, as the controversial treatment of a subject so practical and important, and, at the same time so interesting to a benevolent public, cannot but do much good by putting its merits and demerits in comparison with the time-honoured system of methodic signs.

I have the honour to remain, Very Rev. and dear Mr. Editor, most respectfully yours,

THE AUTHOR OF "CLAIMS OF THE UNINSTRUCTED DEAF-MUTES TO BE ADMITTED TO THE SACRAMENTS."

DOCUMENTS.

LETTER OF S. CONGREGATION OF THE HOLY OFFICE TO THE
CARDINAL ARCHBISHOP OF STRIGONIA ON THE SUBJECT
OF MIXED MARRIAGES.

SUMMARY.

The Holy Office insists on the Catholic education of all the children of the marriage, and the removal of the danger of perversion of the Catholic party by exact compliance with the usual conditions prescribed by the Holy See.

Eminentissime ac Reverendissime Domine.

Quae ab Eminentia tua Rma nomine etiam aliorum Episcoporum exposita fuerunt de nova lege in isto Hungarico Regno sancita quoad religiosam institutionem et educationem proles ex mixtis connubiis provenientis, Eminentissimorum una necum Inquisitorum Generalium animum vehementer commoverunt. Probe enim intellexere tum praesentissimum fidei aeternaeque salutis discrimen, cui tot animae exinde objicerentur, tum graves angustias et detrimenta, quae

parantur sacris Ecclesiae Catholicae ministris. Hinc Emmi Patres optassent quidem quam maxime viam aliquam reperire, qua et fidei pericula amoveri, et simul Clerus catholicus ab imminente vexatione subtrahi posset; verum, re mature perpensa illud summopere urgendum eique instandum censuerunt, ut quod zelus sacerdotalis sacris Hungariae Antistitibus jam suggererat, nunc post latam hanc legem eo magis curetur totis viribus, ut fideles a mixtis nuptiis contrahendis avertantur, atque omnino deterreantur. Etenim ad remedium quod attinet ab Eminentia tua propositum, obtinendi nempe a S. Apostolica Sede facultatem, qua vobis liceat cum sponso vel sponsa catholica in vetito mixtae religionis nupturientium dispensare, et benedictionem etiam nuptialem impertiri in iis saltem ineundorum mixtorum matrimoniorum casibus, in quibus, ex recte cognita partis catholicae, imo utriusque sponsi mente et voluntatis dispositione sperari potest fore, ut catholica educatio pro posse tribuantur proli etiam illi, quae vi legis civilis haud catholice educanda foret etiamsi sua forma sive baptismo hac intentione impertito, sive alio actu externo ad Ecclesiae sinum non reciperetur; illud tale visum est Emmis Patribus, ut ab eadem S. Apostolica Sede nedum permitti, sed neque tolerari unquam possit. Profecto novit Eminentia tua, Ecclesiam numquam permittere, imo neque permittere posse mixtarum nuptiarum celebrationem, nisi graves causae canonicae concurrant, et nisi opportuna exhibeantur cautiones, quarum virtute a conjugate catholico amoveatur perversionis periculum, et provideatur catholicae institutioni ac educationi prolis universae. Quae quidem catholica doctrina a Summis Pontificibus saepissime enunciata est et declarata in iis etiam concessionibus, in quibus illos indulgentiae se limites attigisse professi sunt, quos praetergredi nefas omnino sit. Ut alii Pontifices praetereantur, Pius VIII. s. m. in litteris Apostolicis ad Archiepiscopum Coloniensem ejusque suffraganeos die 25 mart. 1830 datis gravissime inculcat: "Nostis autem Ven. fratres, ipsas omnes cautiones eo spectare, ut hac in re naturales divinaeque leges sartae tectae habeantur; quandoquidem exploratum est, catholicas personas, seu viros seu mulieres, quae nuptias cum a catholicis ita contrahunt, ut se aut futuram sobolem periculo perversionis temere committant, non modo canonicas violare sanctiones, sed directe etiam gravissimeque in naturalem atque divinam legem peccare. Atque exinde jam intelligitis, nos quoque gravissimi coram Deo et Ecclesia criminis reos fore, si circa nuptias hujusmodi istis in regionibus contrahendas illa a vobis aut a parochis vestrarum diocesium fieri assentiremur, per quae si non verbis, factis tamen ipsis indiscriminatim approbarentur." Quin etiam s. m. Gregorius XVI. ad ipsos Hungariae Episcopos

praedecessores vestros in litteris, quibus parem extremorum limitum indulgentiam ad istud Regnum extendit, idem omnino divinum jus asseruit de cautionibus in ipsa divina et naturali lege fundatis, in quam procul dubio gravissime peccat, quisquis se vel futuram sobolem perversionis periculo temere committi. Atque tandem jussu Pii IX. s. m. ad omnes Archiepiscopos Episcopos et Ordinarios di 15 nov. anni 1858 disertis verbis edictum est: "Quae quidem cautiones remitti seu dispensari numquam possunt, cum in ipsa naturali ac divina lege fundentur quam Ecclesia et haec S. Sedes sartam tectamque tueri omni studio contendit, et contra quam sine ullo dubio gravissime peccant, promiscuis hisce nuptiis temere contrahendis se ac prolem exinde suscipiendam perversionis periculo committunt." Secundum hanc doctrinam S. Apostolica Sedes semper constanterque retinuit atque retineret, nullomodo in vetito mixtae religionis fas esse dispensare, nisi singulis in casibus praeter causas canonicas simul concurrant tres conditiones sequentes, videlicet: 1. Ut partes, et praesertim haeretica, veras cautiones praestiterint, quibus se coram Ecclesia obligent ad ea, quae ab iisdem eadem Ecclesia exigit; inter quae praecipuum locum tenet catholica educatio universae omnino prolis absque ulla exceptione sive restrictione; 2. Ut superior ecclesiasticus moralem certitudinem habeat sive de cautionum sinceritate pro praesenti, sive de earumdem adimplemento pro futuro; 3. Ut cautionis exhibitio notoria sit, vel saltem talis esse possit ad omne scandalum removendum.

"Quae cum ita sint, nulla ratione fieri potest, ut spes illa, quae unice in bona voluntatis contrahentium dispositione fundatur, verarum cautionum locum tenere valeat, tum quia reapse contrahentes nullam coram Ecclesia obligationem assumerent, tum quia haec spes in praesenti rerum conditione, prout ab Eminentia tua descripta est, non excludit, imo supponit prolem nascituram, quae sequitur sexum parentis haeretici, a ministro sectae baptizandam ac institutione eidem sectae adscribendam esse; quae res non solum totam rationem cautionum pro Ecclesia subverteret, sed cautionem constitueret pro haeresi. Ex his necessario consequitur, fas non esse in expositis rerum adjunctis benedictionem nuptialem impertiri. Si enim absque consuetis cautionibus numquam licet super vetito mixtae religionis dispensare, multo minus licitum esse poterit sacro benedictionis ritu talia matrimonia honestare, quae juxta inconcussam Ecclesiae doctrinam legi non solum ecclesiasticae, sed naturali atque divinae omnino adversantur.

Quare Emmi Patres, postquam declararunt valde commendandum esse istius Hungarici Regni Episcoporum zelum ab ea, quae circa

gravissimum hoc argumentum jam ab ipsis acta sunt, sive Dei et Ecclesiae jura in publicis Regni Comitibus defendendo et propugnando, sive praesertim promovendo fidelium instructionem et inculcando sinceram Ecclesiae doctrinam quoad mixta connubia; necessarium omnino judicaverunt, ut Episcopi de dispensationibus super impedimento mixtae religionis requisiti, eas nullomodo concedant, nisi prius a partibus et praesertim a parte heterodoxa consuetae cautiones exhibitae fuerint. Nam lex civilis prohibet quidem conjugii haeretico, ne filios respectivi sui sexus catholicae Ecclesiae baptizandos et educandos tradat, sed nullam eidem poenam comminatur, si prohibitioni contraverit, adeoque pars haeretica nullam difficultatem habere poterit sive in praestandis requisitis cautionibus, sive in iis adimplendis. Tota difficultas se habet ex parte Parochorum, contra quos revera poena statuta fuit; sed prospectata eorum religione dubitandum non est, quin poenas patienter potius sustinere parati sint, quam proprio officio et ministerio deesse. Quamobrem Parochis praecipiant, ne praetextu vitandi poenas a lege civili sancitas contra sacerdotes in Ecclesiae sinum recipientes eos, quos ipsa eadem civilis lex sectis haeticorum devovet, aliquem respiciant sive a baptismo, sive a catholica educatione, sive a caeteris Sacramentis; quinimo iisdem Parochis imponant, ut invigilent, ac mediis opportunis et prudentibus satagent inducere parentes in mixto matrimonio viventes ad servandas et implendas promissiones datas. Si quando vero connubium sine cautionibus necessariis initum fuerit, non propterea conjugem catholicum negligant, sibi que ac suo peccato relinquunt, sed studeant eum ad poenitentiam adducere, ut suae obligationi quoad catholicam educationem proles quantum potest satisfaciatur: quod quandiu non proestiterit, aut saltem sincere promiserit, Sacramentis suscipiendis utique imparatus censi debet; omnem denique dent operam, ne unquam accidat aliquem perire ex suorum ministrorum incuria et negligentia. Interea opportunum erit, ut Episcopi collatis prius inter se consiliis, concorditer ad Apostolicam Sedem recursum habeant, et ab instando ad regia comitia numquam cessent, ut rei catholicae in tam grave discrimen adductae efficaciter consulatur.

Haec Emme et Rmme Dne, postulationi exhibitae respondenda censuerunt Emmi Inquisitores Generales, quae eorum nomine caeteris Episcopis et Ordinariis istius Regni erunt ab Emma tua communicanda.

Interim quo par est obsequio ejusdem Emmae tuae manus humillime deosculor.

Romae, ex S. Congreg. S. Officii die 21 jul. 1880.

P. Card. CATERINI, Praef.

DECREE OF THE S. CONGREGATION OF THE COUNCIL REGARDING
THE PASTORAL OBLIGATION OF OFFERING MASS PRO POPULO.

SUMMARY.

1. A pastor has charge of two entirely distinct parishes, one is his own parish, the other is a neighbouring parish of which he has only temporary charge. He is bound to have Mass offered on Sundays and Holidays of obligation for the people of each of the parishes, even though the revenue he receives for his care of the second parish is very inadequate.

2. In his own parish there are two churches—one the parochial and the other an auxiliary church, and he is wont to say Mass on Sundays in each church. When the charge of the second parish is put upon him, he is recommended to say the second Mass in the parochial church of the second parish, rather than in the auxiliary church of his own parish.

3. It is not allowable to offer the same Mass for both parishes in discharge of his double obligation.

DIVIONEN. MISSAE PRO POPULO

Die 24 Julii 1886.

Per summaria precum.

Compendium Facti. Ordinarius dioecesis Divionensis in Gallia Apostolicae Sedi exposuit: "Pro insufficienti sacerdotum numero in dioecesi Divionensi, non raro accidit, ut idem parochus tribus ecclesiis inserviat, nempe: 1. suae propriae parochiae; 2. modo permanenti alteri ecclesiae, quae in alio loco sita tituloque parochiali non gaudens annectitur ecclesiae parochiali; 3. ecclesiae loci, parochialem titulum habentis, sed, penuriae sacerdotum causâ, parochum proprium residentem non possidentis, *ad tempus*."

"Vi suae institutionis talis parochus singulis dominicis ac festis diebus bis celebrat, nempe in sua ecclesia parochiali et in altera ecclesia non parochiali, sed permanenter ecclesiae parochiali annexa, ut dicitur. Inde sequitur ut idem omnino nequeat missam celebrare, dominicis ac festis diebus in tertia ecclesia, nempe parochiae ejus ad tempus curam habet. Cum tamen ei parochiae, in qua non residet, invigilare teneatur, tum ad visitandos aegrotantes, tum ad catechizandos pueros ac multa alia munia adimplenda, ducentos francos pro supra memoratis functionibus a gubernio Gallico recipit."

"Quaerimus 1. an talis sacerdos debeat supplere missas quas pro sua secunda parochia non potest celebrare, diebus dominicis ac festis,

attenta etiam ea circumstantia quod dicta pensio ducentorum francorum vix remuneraret suprascripta munia, ambabus parochiis inter se multum distantibus; 2. an debeat alterutram ex missis, quas celebrat, ut dictum est, singulis dominicis ac festis, applicare simul pro utraque parocchia; 3. an debeat applicare huic parochiae, missâ privatâ, eam missam quae in ecclesia annexa sine titulo parochiali celebratur.”

“Cum evenerit ut plures sacerdotes bonâ fide pro sua secunda parocchia non celebraverint, ut in casu, postulamus, ut ipsis, suae omissiones si necesse sit condonentur.”

Resolutio. Sacra C. Concilii, re cognitâ, sub die 21 Julii 1886, censuit respondere: “Ad I. Affirmative, nisi quod optandum foret, ut secundam Missam celebraret in secunda parocchia. Ad II, Non licere. Ad III. Affirmative si in secunda parocchia celebrare non potest, facto verbo cum SSmo etiam quoad sanationem quoad praeteritum.”

DECREE OF THE S. CONGREGATION OF INDULGENCES REGARDING
THE ROSARY.

SUMMARY.

One is not to add the Sacred Name at the end of the “Holy Mary” to gain the indulgence of five years and five quarantines.

De Indulgentia concessa Confratribus SS. Rosarii proferentibus nomen Jesu in Angelica Salutatione.

ORDINIS PRAEDICATORUM.

Cum inter Christifideles quorundam locorum invaluerit pia consuetudo invocandi SSimum Nomen Jesus in fine Angelicae Salutationis immediate post *Amen*, dicendo: *Nunc et in hora mortis nostrae. Amen. Jesu*: dubium occurrit circa Indulgentias quinque annorum totidemque quadragenarum Sodalibus Smi Rosarii concessas, qui in fine uniuscujusque *Ave Maria* Nomen Jesus pronuntiabunt; uti in summario Indulgent. § IX. n. 3 a S. Congregatione Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praeposita recognito, ac a s. m. Pio IX. approbato 18 Septembris 1862. Sunt enim qui putant, Indulgentias illas non fuisse concessas Confratribus Sanctissimi Rosarii invocantibus Nomen Jesus in fine, idest, absoluta *Ave Maria* post *Amen*, addito *Jesu*. Quapropter hodiernus Procurator Generalis Ordinis Praedicatorum votis plurimorum Fratrum et Sororum sui Ordinis obsecundans, ad majorem gloriam Smi Nominis Jesus in quo tota salus nostra pendet, atque

incrementum pietatis ergo Ipsum : sequens dubium proponit et humilimas porrigit preces pro ejus solutione :

An Indulgentias, de quibus in praedicto Summario, illi luerentur Confratres, qui Nomen Jesus pronunciant post verba *Benedictus fructus ventris tui* : vel qui idem SSimum Nomen pronunciant additum in fine uniuscujusque Ave Maria, dicendo : *Nunc et in hora mortis nostrae. Amen. Jesus?*

Sacra Congregatio Indulgentiis sacrisque Reliquiis praeposita die 29 Martii 1886 respondit :

Affirmative ad primam partem : Negative ad secundam.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria ejusdem S. Congregationis die et anno uti supra.

J. B. Card. FRANZELIN, *Praefectus.*

F. DELLA VOLPE, *Secretarius.*

DECREE OF THE S. CONGREGATION OF BISHOPS AND REGULARS
DECLARING THAT THE INSTITUTE OF THE TRAPPISTS IS
APPROVED BY THE HOLY SEE AS A PART OF THE CIS-
TERTIAN ORDER.

DUBIUM — Eme et Rme Domine,

Non pauci inveniuntur sacerdotes, etiam docti, quique per plures annos Romam incoluerunt, asserentes Monachos Trappenses tum antiquae reformationis de Rancé, tum recentioris sub regula S. Benedicti cum primitivis constitutionibus Cistercii, ambæ in distinctam congregationem constitutæ, nullo pacto esse approbatos, sed tantum a Sancta Sede toleratos, non obstante facultate vota solemnia profitendi eis restituta, vigore Rescripti apostolici diei 5 februarii 1868

Quum porro his disputationibus solvendi imparem me ingenue professus fuisset, atque Dominum Reverendissimum Vicarium generalem dubius adissem, is mihi ultro asseruit Trappenses haud dubio esse approbatos, veluti pars et membra universi Ordinis Cisterciensis.

Cui demum oraculo iterum adversarii contradicentes, suppliciter igitur Eminentiam Vestram enixe adprecior, quatenus mihi anxio mentem suam circa propositum dubium aperire dignetur.

Hms, obseqms et addictms.

F. Leo, Prior Beatæ Mariæ Minoris Clarævallis in America septentrionali.

Die 22 junii 1886

Sacra Congregatio Eminentium et Reverentium S. R. E. Cardinalium negotiis et consultationibus Episcoporum et Regularium præposita, super præmissis respondendum censuit, prout respondet: Pater Procurator generalis Congregationis B. M. de Trappa oratorem moneat ut acquiescat responso dato a R. P. Abbate Vicario generali suæ Congregationis.

Datum Romæ ex secretaria ejusdem Sacræ Congregationis, sub die 21 decembris 1886.

Concordat cum suo originali quod asservatur in archivio secretariæ Sac. Congreg. Episcoporum et Regularium.

Loco ✠ sigilli.—Romæ, die 28 decembris 1886.

Aloysius, Episcopus Gallinicensis.

Concordat cum originali.—Romæ, die 29 decembris 1886.—Fr. STANISLAUS, Procurator generalis B. M. de Trappa.

DECREE OF THE SACRED PENITENTIARY REGARDING THE
MODE OF EXECUTING CERTAIN MATRIMONIAL DISPEN-
SATIONS.

DUBIA quoad clausulas quibus utitur Dataria Apostolica in expediendis dispensationibus matrimonialibus.

Beatissime Pater,

Episcopus L. exponet quod inter novas clausulas, Dataria Apostolica in expediendis dispensationibus matrimonialibus utitur, invenitur quaedam tenoris sequentis: “Discretioni tuæ committimus et mandamus, ut de præmissis te diligenter informes, et si vera sint exposita exponentes ab incestus reatu, sententiis et censuris, et pœnis ecclesiasticis et temporalibus in utroque foro, imposita eis propter incestum hujusmodi pœnitentia salutari, Auctoritate Nostra hac vice tantum per te sive per alium absolvas. Demum si tibi expediens videbitur quod dispensatio hujusmodi sit eis concedenda, cum eisdem exponentibus, remoto, quatenus adsit, scandalo, præsertim per separationem tempore tibi beneviso, si fieri poterit, Auctoritate nostra ex gratia speciali dispenses, prolem susceptam, si quæ sit, et suscipiendam exinde legitimam decernendo.” Hic quaeritur:

I. Utrum executor ad validitatem executionis quatuor teneatur ponere actus seu decreta distincta, id est actum primum, quo Parochum vel alium deleget ad verificationem causarum; actum secundum, quo executor sive per se, sive per alium, sponsis impertiatur

absolutionem, et pœnitentiam imponat; actum tertium, quo sponsis scandalum reparandum injungatur; actum quartum, quo dispensatio, et prolis legitimatio concedatur?

Et quatenus negative:

II. Utrum sufficiat ponere duos actus seu decreta, scilicet primum actum seu decretum quo parochus seu alius delegetur ad verificationem causarum; secundum actum seu decretum, quo sponsis sive per executorem, sive per alium impertiatur absolutio, et imponatur pœnitentia, scandalum reparandum injungatur, dispensatio concedatur, et prolis legitimatio; et quidem ita, ut dispensatio et legitimatio concessa intelligatur sub conditione, quod sponsi prius absolutionem obtinuerint et reparaverint scandalum?

III. Utrum ad validitatem executionis requiratur nova et canonica verificatio causarum vi litterarum apostolicarum instituenda, casuque Ordinarius de causis dispensationis exactam et per juratos testes habitam informationem ceperit antequam preces, pro obtinenda dispensatione, Sanctae Sedi porrexisset?

IV. Utrum verba (in utroque foro absolvas) ita intelligenda sint, ut requiratur duplex absolutio separatim impertienda, una scilicet in foro externo, alia in foro interno; an ista verba ita intelligenda sint, ut requiratur una tantum absolutio in foro externo impertienda, quae valeat etiam pro interno?

V. Utrum casu quo separatio sponsorum fieri possit, ad effectum reparandi scandalum, executor ad validitatem executionis separationem eisdem imponere debeat; vel an ad validitatem ejusmodi sufficiat ut executor aliis mediis efficacibus scandalum reparandum curet?

Sacra Poenitentiaria, propositis dubiis mature perpensis respondit;

Ad I^m. Providebitur in secundo.

Ad II^m. Sufficere, ita tamen ut dispensatio et legitimatio prolis ab ipso tantum executore effici possit.

Ad III^m. Negative.

Ad IV^m. Negative ad primam partem; affirmative ad secundam.

Ad V^m. Expedire ut scandalum removeatur per separationem, sed non prohiberi quominus alii modi adhibeantur qui prudenti judicio Ordinarii sufficiant ad illud removendum.

Datum Romae in Sacra Poenitentiaria, die 27 Aprilis 1886.

✠ F. SIMONESCHI,
Ep. P. Regens.

A. RUBINI,
S. P. Secr. E.

L. ✠ S.

DECREE REGARDING THE MATERIAL TO BE USED IN VESTMENTS.

Sancti Severini.—A Rev. D. Francisco Mazzuoli Episcopo S. Severini insequentia dubia, italico idiomate expressa S. Rituum Congregationi pro opportuna declaratione proposita fuerunt, videlicet :

Se possa permettersi l'uso de sacri paramenti lavorati in tessuto 1° in tutta lana ; 2° in lana e cotone ; 3° in seta e cotone ; 4° in bavella e cotone ; 5° in tutta cotone.

Et S. eadem Congregatio, referente Secretario, sic respondendum censuit : *Serventur decreta* in una Mutinem. diei 22 Septembris 1837 ad 8, n. 3¹ et in una Senen. diei 1877 ad 5².

Atque ita respondit ac declaravit diei 15 Aprilis 1880.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

MARRIAGE. By the Rev. Charles W. Wood. Manchester: J. Roberts and Sons, 1887.

THE Church in this age of ours seems to be threatened by a new danger. The so-called Reformation, casting aside contemptuously the sacramental character, and abolishing without ceremony the two essential properties—Unity and Indissolubility—of marriage, has already borne bitter fruit for the Christian family. The manifold evils and disorders from which the Church, by her action with regard to matrimony, had long preserved society, are now unhappily prevalent. In almost every land marriage is regarded by the civil authority as a purely civil contract ; by every sect outside the true fold it is recognized as such, and hence in our times we have to contend with the evils and dangers that spring from civil marriages.

Many, too, within the pale of the true Church often seem to forget the sacramental character of matrimony. They seem to be ignorant of the great graces given for the married life by this sacrament. Frequently they lose sight of the many dangers both before

¹ Ibi : “Quaeritur : Num Planetae, Stolae et Manipula possint confici ex tela linea, vel gossypio, vulgo *Percallo*, coloribus praecriptis tineta, aut depicta?”—Et S. Rit. Congr. respondit : “Serventur Rubricae et usus omnium Ecclesiarum, quae hujusmodi Casulas non admittunt.”

² Qu. : “An Planetae ex lana confectae permittantur?” Et S. Rit. Congr. respondit : “Usus Ecclesiarum laneas casulas non admittit.”

and after marriage. We see ill-considered marriages, mixed marriages, irreligious marriages, and often we are brought face to face with the far reaching evils of such unions.

Fr. Wood in his work on Marriage discusses these manifold evils, and suggests practical solutions of the difficulties against which a missionary priest will very often have to contend.

The work is a development of an essay on the sanctity of Christian marriage read at the November Conference of the Salford clergy. Those who heard it at once desired that the essay should be published, and the present volume is the outcome of that general wish.

This book on Marriage is divided into three parts. The first part is doctrinal. The third part contains a collection of documents and legal and ecclesiastical forms. An extract from Balmez on the influence of the Church in the formation of Christendom, and three discourses delivered by Père Monsabré during the Lent of 1887, bring the work to a close. The second part—the principal one—is a clear statement of the Conference case from which the book before us has grown. Perhaps we could not indicate the general purport of the entire volume in a better manner than by giving at length the Conference case:—

ON THE SANCTITY OF MARRIAGE.

Titius is in charge of a large mission, and is deeply concerned for the souls committed to his care. He is much struck with the appalling evils arising from the low estimate in which the sanctity of marriage is held. He hears of marriages taking place in the Registrar's office and in the Protestant Church. He is constantly harassed with *mixed marriages*, and the majority of marriages which take place in his Church are unsatisfactory, owing chiefly, he thinks, to the people's ignorance of the greatness of the sacrament, and of the duties it involves.

This abuse bears bitter fruit, for the children of such marriages must, like their parents, be irreligious. They are to be found in Board schools and Protestant schools; and after the years of schooling are passed, they are lost sight of, until perhaps they themselves come to present themselves for marriage.

Titius, previously disturbed in his conscience, asks the following questions:—

I. Can he, in conscience, allow these evils in reference to Christian marriage to continue without making special efforts to check them?

II. He is told that people 'must be instructed'; upon what points should he instruct parents in their duties to children, with a view to preventing irreligious marriages?

How should he treat parents in the tribunal of penance with the same view?

III. What points of instruction should he choose when speaking in the pulpit—

(1) On the subject of Christian marriage?

(2) As to the remote preparation for marriage, *e.g.*, company-keeping?

(3) As to the immediate preparation for marriage?

IV. How should he deal in Confession with those who keep company?

V. What must he do with those who are keeping company with Protestants?

Father Wood treats each question at length. He gives us in his treatise valuable instruction. He traces for us in simple, earnest language the influence we are to use, the method of proceeding we are to adopt in order to procure holy marriages of parents, fitting education of children, and, in fine, the holy marriage of these children. The writer evidently has had experience; he speaks not like one who knows of the dangers and difficulties he treats of but from books; his knowledge is manifestly gained from the everyday observation of a zealous priest. We meet with no novelties, nothing startling. Every conclusion arrived at, every advice given bears conviction to the mind of the reader. The preacher who is often at a loss to collect suitable material for a much-needed yet difficult subject, will find this volume replete with suggestive thoughts. The confessor, perplexed at times, will value this treatise on Marriage as a book from which he may in difficulties draw information and guidance. The laity may look to this book as to one by which their estimate of the Great Sacrament will be raised. No one can peruse it, no matter how cursorily, without gaining much from the perusal. To all we can recommend this work as one in which useful instruction is conveyed. The author has conveyed to us that information in a manner certain to be appreciated by the reader. Brief synopses of the subject-matter precede the chapters, and are interspersed through the paragraphs. An index of the more important works is given at the end of the volume.

As we are sure the work will meet with a rapid sale, might we be allowed to suggest that, if the author could insert a chapter dealing with dispensations, and the manner to be adopted in obtaining them, he would render a very useful work yet more useful.

HANDBOOK OF THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY, by Dr. Albert Stöckl. Part I. Pre-Scholastic Philosophy. Translated by T. A. Finlay, S.J., M.A. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

FATHER FINLAY has done a substantial service to English Catholic literature by translating Dr. Stöckl's profound and ably written History of Philosophy. Now-a-days many books are published that are never wanted. Some are published before the need for them is felt, while to a very few belongs the privilege of supplying at their first appearance a keenly-felt want. To this last class belongs the translation, the first part of which is before us.

Anyone desirous of acquiring even an elementary knowledge of philosophy must make himself in some degree acquainted with the history of philosophy. Now, for Catholic students in these countries no text book of the history of philosophy, at once reliable and handy, hitherto existed. A few years ago, it is true, Vallet's *Histoire de la Philosophie* was published, but many who wish to study philosophy, and whose prospects require them to do so, are not sufficiently acquainted with French to enable them to profit by the use of works bearing on philosophy written in that language. Translations of Tenneman, of Schwegler, and of Ueberweg, have been published at different times within the past half century, but these works, as Father Finlay points out with regard to one of them, are not suited for Catholics. Most students of philosophy know Latin, but in that language as far as we know, there exists no history of philosophy that exactly meets the wants of Catholics in these countries. For the brief outlines of the history of philosophy given as an appendix to such works as Rothenflue's *Institutiones Philosophicæ*. and the old Sulpice Tract, cannot be looked upon as satisfactory. The writers of such sketches did not propose to themselves to trace the connexion between the different philosophical systems, nor did they attempt to point out such special features in the personal characteristics of certain philosophers, or in the circumstances of the times in which they lived, as may have contributed to bring about the great revolutions in the development of speculative thought.

The want of a good History of Philosophy written in English and from a Catholic standpoint has therefore for a long time existed, and has especially in recent years been very keenly felt. Now, however, such a book had become an absolute necessity. Father Finlay's translation has not therefore to create a demand for itself.

Dr. Stöckl's book, as the translator tells us, is largely used in the Catholic schools of Germany. For many years Germany has been the

centre of educational activity. A sufficient proof of the utility and thoroughness of the work then is to be found in its use in German schools. The volume before us treats of pre-Scholastic Philosophy. Beginning with the earliest indications of speculation, the author in this part of his work reviews the philosophico-religious systems of the Chinese, the Hindus and the Medo-Persians. He traces the rise and development of Greek philosophy from its first rude beginnings with Thales and Anaximander, down to its crowning glories in the elaborate and beautiful, if defective, systems of Plato and Aristotle, and finally he places before his readers an account of the struggle between Pagan philosophy and the Gospel, between "Athens and Jerusalem," between "the Church and the Academy," and tells them how some of the early Christians, as Tertullian, utterly abhorred the ancient philosophy, while others, as Clement of Alexandria regarded it as St. Paul regarded the Mosaic law as *παιδαγωγος εις τον Χριστον*.

Dr. Stöckl is himself a true philosopher, and recognises, as every philosopher who seeks for truth and not for notoriety must, that revelation must guide and restrain his speculations. Speaking of the philosophers of the Christian period he says—

"Some have fallen in with the ordinances of God, have submitted to divine revelation, and in submission to it as the guiding principle of their inquiries, have sought to penetrate the truth more profoundly, and to establish it on a more unassailable foundation. Following this path they have achieved the most brilliant successes, the system which such thinkers have built up being the most imposing with which the history of Philosophy has furnished us.

"Others again have followed a course at variance with the divinely established order. . . . The philosophic movements begun by them have led always, in course of due development, to far reaching errors, and have at length lost themselves in Scepticism and Materialism." (Page 7.)

Father Finlay's name is a sufficient guarantee that his part of the work has been well done. It is sometimes difficult to render German and especially the German of philosophical works, into intelligible English. This difficult task Father Finlay has very successfully accomplished, and has earned for himself the gratitude of students not merely for giving them a translation of a highly important work, but for giving them a clear and readable translation of it. Let us express a hope that the remaining parts of the work will soon follow.

We noticed a few trifling errors of the press in glancing through this volume. On page 193, we read, "Some writers—Tertullian for example—did much *effect* to this." On page 211, "but the latter *He* only a creature" and on page 196 "they carried their arbitrary treatment of the *Scriptures* so far as to reject portions of *it* altogether."

D. O'L.

SHAMROCKS. By Katharine Tynan. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, & Co.

The many readers who admired Miss Tynan's previous volumes, will be curious to see whether in this book of *Shamrocks* her early promise is fulfilled. We think it is, fairly: the present volume is not unlike its predecessors, and contains, at least, one poem of pathos and power.

Miss Tynan was always best at description. We find in *Shamrocks* the same rich word-painting of scenery and, indeed, of all objects of sense. Her pages glow with the colours of sea and sky, of hill and flower; they thrill with the music of birds, of streams, and of the human voice. Many specimens might be quoted; we must be content with one,—a description of the song of “Lir's lonely Daughter” :—

“The voice was a woman's voice, all passionate fair,
 Full of pleading and pain—
 Singing, soaring, thrilling the earth and the air,
 Falling like golden rain;
 Drawing the heart from the breast, and an anguish of tears
 From eyes that never had wept.
 I stood as one of the dead, and, unknowing of fears,
 My pulses a stillness kept.”

Another of the strong points of our poetess is her keen sympathy with all that is sensitive in human joy and sorrow. She is so far a poet of sense; the intellectual may come yet. We have in *Shamrocks* one fine example of what she can do in this way,—perhaps the best poem that ever dropped from her pen. It is too long to quote it entire; and it is all too closely connected to allow us to quote a part. These who read “The Dead Mother” will confess that Miss Tynan has true poetic genius.

In many of the descriptive pieces we have remarked a recurrence of certain peculiar words and phrases, the frequency of which, if not guarded against, might tend to a suspicion of poverty of thought or of expression. We noticed, also, what appeared to us imperfections both of rhyme and of metre; but really metre has become so irregular of late, it would be almost impossible to say what is metrically imperfect now. Nor do we wish to be ungenerous to a lady who never forgets her religion in her poetry, and who draws some of her finest inspiration from the legendary poems of Erin.

WALTER McDONALD.

THE NAMES OF THE EUCHARIST. By Luigi Lanzoni. A Translation from the Italian, with an Introduction by Dr. Hedley, Bishop of Newport and Menevia. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

Devout worshippers of Jesus Christ in the Blessed Sacrament will hail with satisfaction a translation into English of *The Names of the Eucharist* by Father Luigi Lanzoni, the Superior-General of the Institute of Charity, a little work which at the time of its publication last year by its gifted author attracted considerable attention, and won golden opinions not less amongst the learned than amongst the pious of Italy. For while embodying with deep theological learning the precious deposit of Catholic faith and tradition with respect to the great mystery of the Blessed Eucharist, the little instructions suggested in turn by one of the many beautiful names of the Eucharist which have been handed down to us by Christian tradition, are treated with a sweet unction which simply carries away the heart with love for Jesus Christ in the Sacrament of His tender love. Shakespear asks, with no little depth of meaning, What is there in a name? and our author in his preface well observes, that "names contain the philosophy of things, and the extraordinary wealth of names applied by Christian tradition to the greatest of the Sacraments lays the lines of a complete treatise on the Eucharistic mysteries."

Wishing, however, to commend to the faith and piety of English readers so precious a little work, for which we have to thank Father Cormack who has given us a very creditable translation, no other praise need be added to that of Dr. Hedley, Bishop of Newport and Menevia, under whose inspiration and encouragement the book is now published in English, gracefully adorned and honoured by a truly beautiful introduction from his Lordship's own pen. The Bishop writes: "It is a privilege to be permitted to introduce to the English-speaking public such a book as this. The writer, the learned and amiable General of the Institute of Charity, has chosen the happiest of subjects; and his translator, the Rev. Father Cormack, of the same Institute, has given a faithful and idiomatic version of a most charming book. The title, *The Names of the Eucharist*, suggests such a variety of thought and such wealth of devotion, that we may well wonder it has never been used before. The author's idea has been to take some thirty "Names" which are used in speaking of the great Sacrament and Sacrifice, beginning with 'Eucharist' and ending with 'Holy Viaticum,' and to write a short devotional commentary on each. This he has done with much knowledge of Holy

Scripture and of the Fathers, and with a pleasing and pious unction, so as not only to instruct the mind, but elevate the heart to Almighty God." The Bishop then, at considerable length, enquires how it is possible that, with such a Sacrament in our midst there should be comparatively so little tender devotion amongst those who yet believe in the Real Presence—so few to attend daily Mass, so few to visit their Lord in His Sacrament of love, so few to occupy themselves with the adornment of His house, of His altar, and of all that belongs to the altar—a work which should indeed be to every Catholic a proud labour of love. "The very presence of a church in our neighbourhood," says his Lordship, "ought to be felt in the whole of our daily life. The sight of the tower or roof of a Catholic church on a journey should naturally bring to our lips the 'Tantum Ergo,' or the 'Ave Verum.' A procession of the Blessed Sacrament should find us proudly following the Sacred Host. When the 'Forty Hours' are being held, we should be glad to make any alteration whatever in our arrangements and habits for the sake of publicly and deliberately showing our allegiance to the King of the earth. No other way of acting is logically possible to a Catholic; and no other, we may add, can possibly be understood by a non-Catholic.

"These thoughts," Dr. Hedley goes on to observe, "have been suggested by a book which is in truth a panorama of Eucharistic devotion. For a name is a picture, and the names of the Eucharist touch every point of its human and divine interest. The names of the Blessed Eucharist are countless. Holy Scripture, the Fathers, the Martyrs, the days of persecution, the ages of faith, the devotion of later times, have all added some mystical word to that long list which in vain tries to put into human utterance all that the Blessed Sacrament is to man. The little treatise," concludes the Bishop, "is a worthy and welcome addition to our devotional books, and will certainly do its part in dissipating those clouds of ignorance and negligence which too effectually hide that sacred Sun, whose influence should warm and fertilise this earth of ours."

CONVERSATIONS ON THE BLESSED SACRAMENT. A Preparation for First Communion. Edited by Very Rev. J. B. Bagshawe, D.D., Canon Penitentiary of Southwark. London: St. Anselm's Society, 5, Agar-street, Strand.

The day of First Communion is among the most important days in one's life, as it surely ought to be the happiest. But to have it productive of most good it is necessary to prepare well for it. That

preparation should consist chiefly in laying the solid foundation, like a wise architect, of sound Christian and Catholic principles in the young unformed mind.

We welcome the *Conversations on the Blessed Sacrament* as a contribution to this most important subject, and we welcome it all the more because it is written in the easy natural style of conversation.

A mother and her two daughters take part in these conversations; the younger daughter is eleven years, and is considered by her confessor old enough for First Communion; the elder is sixteen, is already well instructed, and has read some controversial works. A Protestant relative, who is dissatisfied with her present state joins in the conversations. She is inclined to become a Catholic, but, like so many others, the doctrine of the Catholic Church on the Blessed Sacrament stands in the way.

The book is divided into four parts. The first part treats of the types of the Blessed Sacrament, and of the relations of the Old and New Law. The second part is controversial. It treats of the meaning of figurative language, and how the words of Institution are not figurative. The third part is chiefly Scriptural. It deals with the texts of St. Paul on the Blessed Sacrament. In this third part there are interesting conversations on the "Different Liturgies," "The use of Latin in the Mass," "Benediction and Devotions to the Blessed Sacrament." The fourth or practical part consists of the immediate "Preparation for Holy Communion."

Several controversial questions are introduced. Numbers of objections are urged; difficult texts of Scripture with the different explanations of Commentators are brought forward, yet, one would think, quite out of place in a book primarily intended to prepare a child eleven years, or thereabouts, for her First Communion. But one may find a reason for introducing them from the fact that a non-Catholic of more matured judgment takes part in the conversations, and puts the difficulties she is accustomed from childhood to have heard urged against the Real Presence. Besides, the children for whom these conversations are intended are those whose lot will be cast among non-Catholics, and it is right to have them well furnished with a ready means of giving, if required, an account of the Faith that is in them.

At the same time it would be misleading to act as if one were bound to go to the Bible for one's faith, or to make it the ordinary means by which the Christian revelation is made credible. Accord-

ingly, amidst the constant appeals to the Bible, we are pleased that a little conversation is devoted to show that one should have sufficient motives of credibility had one never seen the Bible; but we should be more pleased had the Catholic teaching—that the Church's living voice is the ordinary means appointed by Christ to bear witness to the truths of Revelation—got more prominence, as it surely should be reduced to practice, in the forming of a young Catholic mind.

For those who are engaged in the religious training of the young, this book will be found to be of much use, not only from the amount of information it contains, but also from the style which is truly conversational, and from the fact that it is the result of much experience in teaching.

J. C.

CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY'S PUBLICATIONS,. London:
18, West-square.

Volume I. of the *Catholic's Library of Tales and Poems* (Catholic Truth Society) is "good, readable, and cheap." The selections are varied and interesting. Such of them as are not written by Catholics have a Catholic tendency. Books of this kind are the need of the age.

The Church of Old England (Catholic Truth Society) is a collection of Papers at one time published separately but now presented to the public collectively. "They offer a ready and complete answer to the chief claims and objections set up by the Anglican Church in its endeavours to set itself off as Catholic," and, as such, need no recommendation.

Volume I. of the *Catholic Truth Society's Publications* contains the larger publications of the Society "in a form suitable for libraries, and convenient for reference." All the subjects treated are of great practical importance at the present day.

THE CHILDREN'S MASS, &c. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

Fr. Maher's *Children's Mass, &c.*, consists of an accompaniment for the organ or harmonium for the voice part (already published) of the Music and Hymns used at the "Children's Mass." The little book contains also a Benediction service, an introduction "showing how the 'Children's Mass' should be conducted;" a synopsis of the subject matter: and a number of English Hymns.

Part II. of *Moore's Irish Melodies* (with Pianoforte accompaniments) and *Lalla Rookh* (The O'Connell Press series) are marvels of cheapness.

SELECT RECITATIONS. By Eleanor O'Grady. New York:
Benziger Brothers.

The object of the compiler of the *Select Recitations* is worthy of all praise. "That something more than taste," she writes in the preface, "and an acquaintance with our literature is necessary for the work [of preparing a book of Recitations for Catholic youth] is evident from the fact, that of the many volumes of Recitations published, scarcely one can be placed in the hands of our children without, in some way, offending faith or morals."

The present volume certainly meets this want in this respect, as nothing in the least objectionable is admitted into it. It contains over 100 pieces, and very many of them have the attraction of freshness about them—being drawn to a large extent from American poets.

LIFE OF LEO THE THIRTEENTH. By John Oldcastle.
London: Burns & Oates (Limited).

This is an interesting sketch of the Life of Pope Leo XIII. Mr. Oldcastle does not attempt to write a full biography, but with a few touches of his graphic pen he depicts the young student at the college of Noble Ecclesiastics at Rome, the youthful Governor of the Province of Benevento and of Spoleto, the Nuncio at Brussels, and the Cardinal Archbishop of Perugia, until he finally fixes the attention of the reader on the chief lineaments of the noble character of him who is the Head and glory of the Church, and the object of admiration to those outside the fold for his learning, statesmanship, and unceasing labour in the cause of the peace and social improvement of the nations.

The little book, which consists of about 120 pages, is enriched with a chapter by Cardinal Manning on Leo XIII., as successor of St. Peter, another by Fr. Anderdon on "The Pope's Muse," and a third by Miss Meynell on "The Pope's City."

Many who have little time for reading will be pleased to know that they can get through this interesting and instructive Life of Léo XIII. in an hour or two.

INTERMEDIATE EXAMINATIONS, 1888.

BROWNE & NOLAN'S SPECIAL LIST.

JUNIOR GRADE.

ADDISON: Selections from the Spectator. Edited with Introduction and Notes, Critical and Explanatory. By W. F. Bailey, B.A. Fifth Edition. Cloth, 1s.

"Executed in a masterly manner."—*Freeman's Journal*.

"No labour has been spared to facilitate the student in his reading."—*Irish Times*.

METASTASIO: Giuseppe Reconnosciuto. With Notes, 8d.

"The notes on the text are always to the point, and supply all such information as cannot be readily got from a dictionary."—*Educational Times*.

FENELON: Télémaque. Book I. With Vocabulary and Notes. [In Preparation.]

MIDDLE GRADE.

HORACE: Select Satires. Edited with Introduction, Notes and Appendices. By J. I. Beare, B.A. 3s.

"Mr. Beare's notes to Horace are the happiest condensations of philology, history and rendering."—*Freeman's Journal*.

"The notes are excellent; the student who uses them can scarcely fail to understand the text."—*The Schoolmaster*.

MILTON: Paradise Lost. Book I. Edited with Introduction and Notes. By Daniel Croly, M.A. 1s.

SENIOR GRADE.

EURIPIDES: Troades. With Revision of Text and Notes, chiefly intended for Schools. By R. Y. Tyrrell, M.A., D. Litt., F.F.C.D. 4s. Second Edition. Appended to the Notes is a full description of the Metres.

"This edition of the 'Troades' may, we think, be used with great advantage and pleasure by adult scholars as well as learners."—*The Tablet*.

"The 'Troades' is ably edited by Mr. Tyrrell, who has not only furnished Euripides' drama with notes, but has revised the text. The notes are full and good, and are enlivened by excellent translations of the choral odes, of which some famous specimens are found in this play."—*The Schoolmaster*.

TACITUS: Annals. Book I. With Notes.

[In Preparation.]

The Schoolmaster writes:—"We have seldom seen such favourable specimens of Classical Works prepared for use in the higher forms in schools, and for private students as these volumes. They are thoroughly well equipped, with introductions, clearly printed texts, and notes abundant in number and quantity and good in quality."

Freeman's Journal writes:—"This issue, in point of editorial scholarship and typographical accuracy, is a credit to all concerned in the publication."
Publishers' Circular writes:—"Messrs. Browne & Nolan are publishing an admirable Classical Series."

HANDBOOK OF GREEK COMPOSITION, with Exercises.

By Henry Browne, S.J. 3s. 6d. Also, **First Greek Exercises**, illustrating the large print rules of the **Handbook**. 6d. (*Browne & Nolan's Classical Series*).

- "*The Handbook of Greek Composition* is one of the best books we have seen for pupils who are beginning to translate Greek into English. . . . It will doubtless find its way into many English Schools, and will be of great value to private students who are reading for University and other public Examinations."—*School Guardian*.
- "Mr. Browne, in little more than a hundred pages, has succeeded in compiling a very complete and useful handbook."—*Educational Times*.
- "The method is clear, the diction simple, and the arrangement rational."—*The Athenæum*.
- "We especially like the system of printing the rules on the left hand page, and examples side by side with them on the right, and the practice of setting the corresponding Latin construction side by side with the Greek may probably be helpful."—*Saturday Review*.
- "Mr. Browne has made a distinct advance upon former text-books which ought to secure the success of his book."—*Irish Times*.
- "The author has succeeded admirably in his attempt to combine brevity with clearness. . . . The arrangement would, we think, scarcely admit of improvement."—*Dublin Review*.

NATURAL PHILOSOPHY: Outline of a Course of. With Examination Papers. By Rev. G. Molloy, D.D., D.Sc., F.R.U.I., Rector of the Catholic University of Ireland.

I. Mechanics, Hydrostatics, Pneumatics, Sound, and Heat. 2s. 6d.

- "The Questions and Exercises in the present volume, are extremely well chosen and grouped; and the hints here and there furnished for the benefit of unassisted students, where any difficulty might be anticipated, are just sufficient to serve their purpose, and still leave ample room for individual effort."—*Journal of Education*.

II. Light. 1s.

III. Magnetism and Electricity. 1s.

LESSONS IN DOMESTIC SCIENCE. By F. M. Gallaher. 2s. 6d.

- "We know of no better book on all that concerns physical health, care of a household, and the proper execution of domestic duties, and we should be glad to think that it was in the hands, and its contents in the mind, of every married and unmarried woman in the three kingdoms."—*Whitehall Review*.
- "The woman who has learned all that this little work can teach her must be a valuable member of any household."—*Literary World*.
- "An excellent little work."—*Pictorial World*.
- "One of the most useful and interesting books of the kind we have seen."—*Waterford News*.
- "Will soon be one of the most popular, as it will undoubtedly be one of the most useful of our school-books."—*Galway Vindicator*.
- "A book on Domestic Science by a well-known authoress of this city has just appeared, and I strongly recommend the study of it to every lady of a family in the Association. It treats of health, food, sanitary matters, home management, &c."—*Extract from Report of Medical Officer to Dublin C. S. Medical Aid Association*.

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

SEPTEMBER, 1887.

FRENCH SCHOOLS AND REPUBLICAN RULERS.

THERE is no question more easily misunderstood abroad, than this question of Public Education in France. And the fact admits of one explanation only. It is that our foreign friends and critics deluded by the pompous declarations and disingenuous sophistry of our Republican rulers accept as an established truth, that the intentions of those rulers are sincerely liberal, and that the Catholics complain loudly, less because they are harshly dealt with, than because, being "reactionnaires," they feel fatally prejudiced against the Republican Government and its legislative work.

I remember having read in a foreign journal printed in a Catholic land, that the first article in the platform of the French Conservatives was a strong protest against *palace schools* being built for the children of the people, and that such an "article," to be sure, was not likely to add many voters from the people's ranks on the Conservative electoral roll.

Now such an accusation is mere nonsense. The French Conservatives have never objected to the children of the people being provided with schools; but they have protested and they protest still against so many *unnecessary* schools being built at the public expense—not in the public interest—but in the more or less avowed design of waging war against the Catholic religion of the people. I take for instance the case of a little *commune*, amongst the many *communes* of France. It had its two schools, one for its boys and the other for

its girls. But the two schools happened to be respectively under the care of the Christian Brothers, and of the nuns of some order. There the Government interfered saying, "you have your schools, well and good; but we want schools also, and you know they must be secular schools."

Then the Government says to the Prefect, the Council General and the Municipal Council: "You have to build secular schools now. If you have the money, so much the better; but if you want it, we promise to lend it to you, and moreover, will take our part of the expense."

When the Municipal Council had a Republican or infidel majority, the course was followed without objection. The *palace school* was built. The Catholics of the *commune* could preserve their school if they were allowed to do so by the Governmental University authority, which has supreme power in educational questions. But they had to pay first for the *palace school*, and to be weighed down with new additional rates for the same purpose.

When the Municipal Council was a Conservative one, the Government used very different language. "Well, you won't give the secular schools we wish for. Nevertheless we will manage to have them some day or the other. Meanwhile, we will spare nothing to worry you, to harass you and to let your constituents know that we intend to have the secular schools forced upon them." And the menace was often more than mere talk. The Government inspectors and their accomplices were put on the alert. Many a saintly nun, many a worthy brother were made the objects of a scandalous criminal information. Sometimes also they were accused of having infringed the neutrality prescribed by the law. In every case the school was secularised at once. In vain the population headed by its mayor and municipal councillors would try to save their school. They had to witness the expulsion of their chosen teachers from their school by the prefect and the *gendarmes*—and to find at once for the children and the teachers of their choice a convenient accommodation.

These things repeatedly occurred under the law and administration of Jules Ferry. We have gone further now

that the famous and infamous law of M. Goblet Minister of Public Instruction has been voted by our infidel majorities of the Chamber and of the Senate. But we will deal a little later with this new phase of the Republican persecution against Catholic France. For the moment we have our point to settle. It is not on account of ill-will or prejudiced partisan policy that the French Conservatives have protested against the *palace school*. These so called palaces were designed to be in every *commune* the infidel fortress—not a defensive but an aggressive one—raised against the church and the parochial house. In every possible circumstance the Conservative party would have been justified in opposing strongly such a use of the public money. But they are doubly right in opposing it when every citizen in the land is taxed to the utmost, when the public exchequer is emptied by two or three colonial wars made according to the ruinous and desultory process of M. Jules Ferry, and by the costly programme of public works due to M. de Freycinet, as well as by the growing follies of the Republican party in every department of the public service. The Republic was to be for Frenchmen the cheapest form of government. In fact it is just the reverse. Cheapness under the system is as scarce as liberty. And as to the character of Republican liberty we French Catholics know it well. As the chivalrous Count de Mun said when defending the sacred rights of Catholic conscience against M. Goblet and his infidel majority: “It is a liberty that cannot be paraded through our populations without being escorted by the prefect and *gendarmes* so as to suppress everywhere the legitimate rising of the Catholic fathers and mothers.”

II. So great, however, in this world is the power of profuse and fine-resounding declarations that in many a foreign country our Republican party is granted the monopoly of liberalism in France. Some time ago I read in a London journal some extracts from a report by M. Arnold upon the the new school system in this country. M. Arnold, as your readers are perhaps aware, was commissioned by the former Tory Government to make inquiries and collect information about our schools. Of course he came here amongst us; he

has seen and has reported. I do not profess to know the conclusions of his report which were not given in the paper I had in hand; but from the extracts I have read, I can safely infer that M. Arnold was not, on the whole, badly impressed by what he had seen of our Republican schools and teachers. It was of course the very thing to be expected. The English enquirer could not gain access to any school without being duly patronised and introduced by the proper authority. The "magister" was not without being duly warned about the quality and mission of the visitor before whom he had to conduct his class.

Is it a result to be wondered at if M. Arnold did not see or hear anything indeed that was not entirely consistent with *decorum* and propriety? Nay! had the *communal* schoolmaster been personally and habitually inclined to break the so-called *neutrality*—of which the least one can say is that it is a decorous *lie*—he was bound in such circumstances, to give his foreign visitor a favourable opinion of the respectability of his methods and the fairness of his *rôle*.

But let us grant for argument's sake that M. Arnold has met with that *rara avis*, a neutral schoolmaster really and sincerely bent upon the task of giving his pupils a teaching as free as possible from every latent or open attack upon their religious conscience. The testimony is just worth giving here as a statement of facts, and what is this statement of one, two, three, or more particular cases worth, against the overwhelming mass of established facts on the other side? Hardly a week, and I might fairly say hardly a day elapses without bringing out its scandal. The provincial press daily supplies the Catholic papers of Paris with the narrative of the revolting misdeeds of the Republican Government's teachers. And a few well-known cases will tell sufficiently of the nature of these misdeeds.

In the *Somme*, M. Goblet's own department, a *secular* lady not content with a sectarian teaching, catechizes half-a-dozen unfortunate little girls and by means of a hideously concocted story, brings before the tribunal an infamous action for immorality against the venerated pastor of the parish. Happily before the tribunal the miserable

story falls to pieces. The learned counsel of the pastor by a sweeping cross-examination makes short work of the conspiracy. The secular lady comes out in full light as the answerable authoress of the hideous concoction. Moreover, the life of that virtuous lady is narrated by the press. Before being admitted by our rulers to the sacred duty of teaching childhood she had led an adventurous and immoral career, and had even been a *riding* heroine in a circus!

It was too much of course for the departmental authorities. The adventurous lady was removed at once from her school where she had been such a success. But she was not so far dismissed from the ranks of the Government's secular teachers. She is now somewhere working on behalf of the good cause of secular education. A journal at least, has published the fact, and has not been contradicted.¹

Here is another case:

In the village of Benon (*Gironde*) a secular teacher desirous of impressing his young pupils with a due contempt for the superstitions of old, takes down the Crucifix forgotten upon the wall of the school. With the necessary accompaniments of odious gestures and sacrilegious words, he goes to the closet where in presence of all his young pupils he drops the sacred emblem of Catholic faith. Is that revolting story an old one? No, it took place little less than a year ago. Was it a secret one? No, it has been fully narrated by the local press. Every one who cares about the Conservative press in France knows the story. Nobody, however, has heard of the chastisement inflicted upon the miscreant. The language of M. Goblet in a similar case leads us to believe that perhaps he has been severely remonstrated with for his want of discretion. Perhaps he was momentarily displaced, and if so the fact has escaped my notice. But for certain he was not, nor will he be, dismissed for ever from the service. Our freethinkers want *secular* teachers and at any cost they will keep them.

A more recent case yet is that of the secular teacher in a

¹ The whereabouts of the interesting lady have been now duly ascertained. She is now in the educational service of the Colonies, in New Caledonia, not at the penitentiary of course, but in charge of a secular school.

village near Siorac Belvès, in the diocese of Périgueux. In that village a man of ill-fame had just died. The man was an apostate priest. He had led an immoral life, he had died a fearful death. But he had to be made the object of one of those awful masquerades, which our freethinkers call an *enterrement civil*, a "prayerless funeral," and which are nothing if they are not insulting manifestations against the Catholic faith of our Catholic populations. The business of course was managed by the freethinkers and the freemasons of the locality. And to give some *éclat* to their demonstration they mustered the rank and file of the party, so the government teacher at the head of his pupils cut a prominent figure in the sacrilegious masquerade. The *neutrality* which forbids the introduction of a single Catholic prayer-book into a government school is apparently respected when the master heading his boys takes a leading part in a designedly anti-Catholic demonstration.

But it would take volumes to recapitulate the scandals of every description which have marked everywhere in France, the progress of the secularization of our schools. Suffice it to say that, as a rule, the most insignificant instance of religious zeal on the part of the Catholic teachers has immediately called forth the secularization of the school or the chastisement of the teacher, while on the part of the secular teachers the most flagrant offences against "neutrality" have been easily pardoned, if not abetted and encouraged.

Everyone will grant that such a state of things has its meaning and disposes most effectively of the sweet words of M. Arnold on the perfect innocuity and decorum of our new educational system.

III. The facts, however, we have just commented upon, have all happened under the educational legislation we owe to the notorious M. Jules Ferry. M. Goblet, this distinguished successor of M. Jules Ferry at the head of our Education Department, has given us the crowning reform of Primary Education, such as it ought to be understood in an Infidel Republic. It may be safely said, indeed, that M. Goblet has made this reform his personal business. It is he who pushed

the bill through the Senate, hoping that if voted on satisfactory lines by the Upper Chamber, where the Government has a clear and well disciplined majority, it would be dispatched by the Lower Chamber and become law at once. It is he who discussing the Bill before the senators has made use of the occasion to add to his arguments, offensive remarks about dogmas and things sacred to the Catholics, to throw ridicule upon the dogma of original sin and upon the devotion to our Lady of Lourdes!

One must easily believe that a law discussed and voted on such lines is a complete piece of anti-Christian legislation. As was very truly said at the time "it is less a law upon primary education, than a law against Christian education in the primary schools."

It would be entirely too long to enter into the details of that infamous law which occupies no less than five columns of small type in an ordinary paper. But, I presume your readers will be glad to be acquainted, in a brief way, with the guiding principles and the main provisions of that *chef d'œuvre* of the legislative skill of our intolerant worshippers of the goddess Reason.

The Bill is divided into six parts, and each part into chapters, with the exception of the last two parts, which, providing as they do, for some regulations of a transient character and for the application of the Bill in the Colonies, do not call for a special notice.

In the first part are set forth the conditions under which the primary schools generally are founded, worked, and inspected by the State authorities.

The second part deals with the public schools, their rules, and their *personnel* or staff.

The third specifies the restricted liberties which the primary unofficial schools are to enjoy.

The fourth chapter in fine enacts the rules to be applied for the nomination and jurisdiction of the Departmental Councils and School Committees. These two bodies—the first for the Department, the second for the *Commune*—will have to decide upon every question connected with the working of the schools. The decisions of the School Committees may be

appealed against to the Departmental Council, whose decisions in their turn will be liable to an appeal to the Superior Council of Public Instruction, sitting in Paris under the presidency of the Minister.

IV.—Such is the “machinery” of the last bill framed by M. Goblet and voted by the Chambers, as the crowning chapter of the long and unjust war waged by our Republican rulers against the Catholic soul of France. The most unfair consequences of that illiberal law must be summed up here in a few lines. Every religious public school will have to depend for its existence as such upon the justice and tolerance of the Departmental Council, which will be a tool in the hands of the University Inspector and of the Prefect. The Catholic public teachers actually practising are indeed entitled to elect representatives for the Departmental Council. The number, however, of their nominees is so limited that they can never be anything but an impotent minority. And even that poor remnant of public life is to be taken from them; a clause in the new law enacts that all religious public schools for boys must be secularized in the *maximum* delay of five years. As to the free religious schools they will not be founded, they will not be worked except at the pleasure and by the authorization of the State Inspector and of the Prefect of the Departmental Council. Still more, they are to be attacked at their very foundation. Under the old law every Frenchman who would subscribe an engagement to serve for ten years in the profession of a teacher was, *ipso facto*, liberated from the military service. But under the new law which, voted by the Chamber, has not yet been taken up by the Senate, military service is made obligatory for all. And while the State teachers are to be included in the thousands who every year shall be *excused* for valid reasons, the religious teachers will not escape the life of the barracks.

One may then easily perceive what a near future has in store for our religious teachers. After having served their full time as soldiers, when everything is settled about their capacity, their diplomas, and their *civic* certificates and military discharge, they will have to fight for a school against the University Inspector, the Prefect, and the Departmental

Council. And that, so at least the Republicans hope, will be the end of Catholic primary education in France.

Before concluding that part of our observations we must remark here, that when in the opposition our Republicans had repeatedly asked to see the primary school free from the control of the Prefect, and of the central power. Then they kept constantly and loudly declaring that the primary schools should be brought under the direct influence and supervision of the local elective bodies. Now they have the power, but they do their best to make the moderate control of olden times a perfectly unbearable yoke. And they shrink from their programme, because it would allow a Catholic department and a Catholic commune to have Catholic public schools. Once more those virtuous democrats have eaten their promises of freedom.

V.—If our Republican reformers could say that the popular will claims from them the enactment of so monstrous a piece of legislation, they would at least have the shadow of a pretext. But they have not even that shadow. Everywhere in France—and I do not except the towns where the electors send Republican representatives to Parliament—the tide of popular favour is on behalf of the religious schools. Almost everywhere the Catholic schools are crowded to the utmost, in spite of the fact that in many cases the parents have to pay a small contribution, while in the State schools they could enjoy perfectly free education and other official favours. Almost everywhere it is only the want of resources of Catholic charity which are a limit to the foundation of Catholic schools.

Since the year 1877, 5,253 public schools have been secularized, and of that number 4,701 have been called back to existence as Catholic *private* schools. Within the same period, the public religious schools have lost on account of the secularization 845,000 pupils; but on the other side, as private Catholic schools they have regained 535,421 pupils. Who can have the least doubt that if the Catholics had been able to build everywhere their own school, near the secularized school, they should have now an immensely greater number of pupils?

The figures I have just quoted are taken from the latest official statistics of the Ministry of Public Instruction. From the same paper I quote also the following figures, as giving the comparative strength of a few religious and State schools in the country :—

			State School.	Religious School.
			PUPILS.	PUPILS.
Arpajon (Cantal)	30	120
Boissezon (Tarn)	6	150
Cancale (Ille et Vilaine)	100	860
Digne (Basses Alpes)	65	170
St. Flour (Cantal)	30	175
Bouillorgues (Gard)	2	140
Mauzat (Puy de Dôme)	15	168
Ranchol (Rhone)	15	102
St. Mars des Prés (Vendée)	8	38

These figures are taken *en courant* to give an idea of the favour our Catholic schools are enjoying amongst our Christian populations. I could of course extend my quotations, and meet with figures of a less favourable kind. I cannot profess to give it as a fact that the Catholic schools have everywhere more pupils than the State schools. It is not so, since, as I have already stated above, the State schools number a greater total of pupils than the Catholic ones. But then it must be remembered that of 5,253 Catholic public schools which have been secularized from the year 1877, 4,701 only have been re-established as Catholic private schools. What I assert is, that where the Catholics can build school against school, except in an insignificant lot of radical strongholds, they can safely compete against the State.¹

As I have already stated, it is only the want of resources and the insufficiency of the religious staff, which— notwithstanding the administrative persecution—prevent the Catholics in the educational struggle from crushing the State downright in spite of the resources of the Budget.

VI. But shall I perhaps be asked, How is it that since the majority of French families are Catholic—how is it that we have a Parliament bent upon making war against Catholic education and an electorate which does not revolt against

¹The figures quoted above are taken from the official statistics made known at the beginning of this year. The ministry has since published statistics giving the complete figures for the last year, and in every sense they may be said to support my conclusions.

such a Parliament. My answer is that I can only state the fact, I do not profess to be able to explain it in a satisfactory way. It is not useless, however, to recall that too often, according to a celebrated saying of Pio Nono, "the universal suffrage is the universal lie." Our infidel writers and politicians have been continuously, in this century, poisoning the popular mind with utterly false notions upon the Catholic and glorious traditions of France. An unprincipled press, moreover, is daily inundating the country with the vilest imputations and calumnies against the clergy and the Conservative cause. At the same time those writers and politicians have kept loudly declaring that they were not hostile to religion but to the *abuses* of the clergy only. They kept affirming, in spite of every historical truth and experience in France, that their Republican party was the only party able to give us true union, true justice, and true liberty. No wonder then if, thanks to a Conservative party which is divided into three camps, and which, we sorrowfully confess, has lacked faith, energy and union, poor France has been once more entrapped into another awful experience. The voter who in his private affairs would not fail to think of his home, of his family, of his soul, is less concerned about doctrines and facts which—so he believes at least—develop themselves in the purely political region. It is a grievous mistake. Evil doctrines are not to be kept innocuous in the governing sphere of a society. They descend through every channel of social life, striking and wounding every nerve of the national body and their consequences sooner or later make themselves felt from the proudest mansion to the humblest peasant's cabin. The first laws of our Republic against the liberty of Catholic teaching were designed against higher education. The intermediate or secondary schools are let alone for the moment. The Government is afraid of causing them to be deserted, if they take from them the small religious guarantee the parents find there yet. The middle class would defend their children, but the people are defenceless. The object of the last law of M. Goblet, if given a long run, is intended to take every child of the Catholic workman and peasant from his parents' faith to nurse him in the infidelity of a godless State.

But I dare say our Republican rulers will not succeed to

the end in their war against the Catholic soul of France. Their educational legislation has told against them more than all the efforts of the generous sons of Catholic France, than all the good works and impassioned speeches of the defenders of our old faith and honour. That law which they consider as the crowning blow of their triumphant infidelity, is, if I am not mistaken, the beginning of their political ruin. Last year, at the general elections, their party, with so many millions of voters, gained the day only by a majority of some hundred thousands of votes. When France sees that she has no choice left save a complete apostacy or the downfall of the actual Republican party, that party will be crushed ignominiously. Our Republicans once more had their chance, a marvellous chance, of founding, probably for ever, their Republic. They have been tried and found wanting. They believe they are burying Catholic France, they do not perceive that Catholic France is weaving their shroud.

Every social and public symptom permits us to hope that our children are not likely to forget the old national motto : *Vivat qui diligit Francos Christus.*

L. NEMOURS GODRÉ.

P.S.—Since these lines were written, M. Goblet's cabinet has fallen to pieces and has been replaced by the cabinet of M.M. Rouvier-Spuller. For preservation sake the new ministry is bound to a certain amount of forbearance towards the Catholics, but M. Goblet's law continues of course doing mischief. The other day all the government schools of the city of Orleans were decreed to be secularized at once by the Municipal Council by a majority of one or two votes. The blow is hard for the Catholic inhabitants of Orleans. Like the rest of the French people, they are heavily enough burdened with taxes, but they will not give up the fight. Headed by their worthy bishop, Mgr. Coullier, they are setting to the task of preserving their schools, and it is to be hoped that in the coming electoral struggles the spirited citizens of the rich and gay city by the Loire, where Joan of Arc is so devoutly honoured, will know how to deal with their Municipal and Legislative impiety-mongers according to their deserts.

L. N. G.

INNISKEEL.

“ Dim in the pallid moonlight stood,
 Crumbling to slow decay, the remnant of that pile,
 Within which dwelt so many saints erewhile
 In loving brotherhood.”

OFF the coast of Western Donegal, in the district anciently known as Tir-Ainmirech, but called Boylagh, since the thirteenth century, lies the holy island of Connell Coel. Taking the direct route from Glenties to Ardara as the base of an equilateral triangle falling seaward, Inniskeel is found a few furlongs beyond the point on land where its apex should be marked. Thither the main road from either town would appear to stretch its way. But whether to suit public convenience, or from haste to greet Inniskeel, or to show in the end that they are no slaves of geometrical rules, these two lines insist on deferring their junction until they have got clear of our imaginary figure. The little spot where they meet is sunken as compared with the immediate surroundings, but a few perches of stiff ascent on the joint road bring us to a slight eminence commanding a magnificent view by land and sea. In a single sweep from north to east the mountains of Gweedore and Glenveagh, and nearer hand, bounding the wide expanse of waters that stretch across from this side, the bold, but less striking, elevations of Aranmore, Crohy and Lettermacaward, are minutely visible, whilst just at our feet, on the bosom of Gweebarra Bay reposes in all its verdure the saintly island of Connell.

In a past era the adjacent coast presented a much bolder face than it does now. Those ocean waves and earth convulsions that formed without overwhelming the unrivalled coast scenery that extends from Ardara to Carrick, and from Horn Head to Owey, probably devoured much of the less resisting rampart-wall that guarded the space between. Be this as it may, the surroundings of Inniskeel still remain strikingly beautiful, and, if they are far excelled for wild grandeur on either hand along this romantic shore, that, too, is advantageous in permitting the peculiar character of the island to stand out in more distinctive colours.

Its appearance varies largely with the season. During winter time the western squall, that makes dismal all besides, half spares its low-lying surface in the hurry of the gale. In summer an emerald of richest setting might envy the islet's orb as the slanting rays of an evening sun pour their brilliance into its glassy bed. But the moon must bathe the crumbling walls of yonder ruin in its flow of mellow light, ere the scene presents its most enchanting view. When the sea is calm and the sky clear it seems for a moment like catching a gleam of the pure peaceful delights of another world to stand on the mainland opposite and gaze across the starlit waters at S. Connell's blissful shrine. Another moment, however, and sad thoughts begin to rise. How many saints prayed in that cell? How many warriors walked that strand, doing penance for the rough deeds of a blood-letting time? The place was surely formed by nature for a retreat from this world's cares. Alas! that such a home of prayer and sanctity, where for long ages bell and lamp and psalm enlivened the midnight air, should now be laid so lowly desolate.

“I turned away as towards my grave,
 And all my dark way homewards by the Atlantic's verge,
 Rounded in mine ears like to a dirge,
 The roaring of the wave.”

Inniskeel rests on the waters over against Narin, the village from which it is usually approached. This, too, is the nearest land; and on a first view from the Glenties road, Inniskeel seems to lean gently forward on the Narin coast, with a fond look that might speak the story of a long struggle against isolation before ruthless ocean had rushed between and forced it into its present place of unexpected contentment. In sooth, it hugs the coast at this point so closely that, if old names did not stand in our way, we would gladly confine Gweebarra Bay to the picturesque expanse of waters that wind their courses inside the hoary bar of that name, and write of “the Island” as nestling in Narin Bay under the shadow and shelter of Dunmore. This peak, the highest in its range, stands out into the sea a mile west of Narin, with the village of Portnoo lying at the foot of its eastern slope.

It commands a splendid view of land and ocean, and boldly strives to protect Inniskeel from the south-western blast. Portnoo harbour lies inland from the shortest line joining Dunmore with the island, and in any change of old names might fairly oppose Narin in claiming Inniskeel as the gem of its blue waters. Meanwhile there is competition of another sort. The former, with its unrivalled strand, is naturally the favourite sea-bathing resort. The latter is a fishing and shipping station on a small scale, and under a wise home government would become a busy commercial centre. What little trade it now enjoys is mainly due to the enterprise of a Glenties merchant. Both villages receive little but cold neglect from those under whose fostering care they might rise and flourish. The lords of the soil should try, one would think, to develop the natural capabilities of this beautiful coast. But neither hotel nor pier adorns the scene.

On its western side Inniskeel is exposed to the unbroken fury of the Atlantic waves, which one after another dash themselves to foam on its rocky girdle, and then part their bulky volumes to race almost in halves on either verge until they meet, or try to meet on "the Ridge." This is a raised bank of well-baked sand, formed by the opposing tides in an apparent struggle to reunite their forces without sacrificing lately-acquired independence. By it pilgrims and visitors enter the island on foot, horse, and car from Narin. In favourable weather during spring tides it remains bare for several hours of each ebb; but when neaps prevail, if the waves subside at all so as to allow a passage on dry land, anyone wishing to return the same way should hasten his steps. Gruesome stories are told of imprudent attempts to get out out when the time had past. Over-boldness is sure to be attended with alarm and danger. But both are avoidable without much inconvenience. For, apart from the ever-unwelcome expedient of remaining all night or awaiting next strand, a courteous resident farmer never refuses the service of his boat. His is the only island family. The other tenants, two in number, reside on the mainland.

At most points Inniskeel slopes for a few perches from the

water's edge in a craggy ascent, and then assumes a surface half flat, half rolling. The soil is considered rich for Boylagh and is used chiefly to fatten sheep and cattle. The island's remotest point is distant a long mile from Narin, and its circumference apart from slight irregularities, should reach a mile and a half. Its general outline is that of an ellipse with the long axis running east and west; but as seen from points on the coast, the appearance varies from a straight line to a circle, especially when twilight or starlight is the medium of sight.

In days of native rule this little domain was abbey land attached to the monastic buildings, whose broken walls are still the first and greatest attraction for a visitor's gaze. In the Plantation of Ulster, if we mistake not, it became part of the Inniskeel glebe property. Afterwards it had the good fortune of being annexed to the Connolly estates for a time, and then the fortune, not so good, of passing by purchase to another owner.

But material considerations are not those which are most striking in connection with Inniskeel. The island has a sacred interest in the present and the past with a long, if broken, history to commemorate its former greatness. It is still the seat of a much frequented pilgrimage in honour of St. Connell, one of the most remarkable of Ireland's early saints. It contains his church and cell; and in it repose his sacred remains in the grave that had first closed over the body of his illustrious friend, St. Dallan.

The "station" may be performed at any time. But the solemn season lasts from the 20th of May, St. Connell's day, to the 12th of September. Besides the founder's well, there is another sacred to the Blessed Virgin. Fixed prayers are devoutly said at each, as also in going round the penitential piles, of which there are several, formed as a rule of small sea-stones which are kept together by the self-mortifying attention of the pilgrims. A number of decades repeated in walking round the old ruins and before the altar of St. Connell's Church bring the *Turas* to a close.

The devotion and faith of the crowds who throng to Inniskeel during the Station season recall the memory of the

first believers in Christianity. They possess the genuine spirit of Gospel Christians, and it would be strange indeed, looking to the beneficence of God's providence towards simple, faithful souls, if prayers offered up with such fervour and commended by such powerful patronage, did not bring down on those devout pilgrims the choicest blessings of heaven. They speak to their Saviour in earnest communion of heart, believing firmly that He is the physician of physicians for soul and body. Is it then unreasonable to think that for these meek confiding ones Christ in view of Connell's merits allotted curative properties to the saint's well? Their faith, their prayers, and the blessing of heaven on the spot do indeed work wonders. Nor need going round the piles a fixed number of times, raising at intervals the position of some low-placed pebble, or moving larger stones round the head and waist, force up the idea of superstitious observance. If St. Connell or any one of his saintly followers wished to found a penitential and supplicatory course of exercises, what more proper than that their ritual should be minutely fixed and accurately handed down? Now this is the feeling that sways these crowds of pilgrims from age to age. Their faith is simple and their hope unbounded. Flourish such faith and hope! They give as just a notion of God's warm providence as the acutest reasoning of philosophy.

There seems to be no ground for questioning the popular belief that St. Connell founded the buildings which still remain. At the same time substantial parts were certainly rebuilt at a later period. Both church and cell are situated on a beautiful slope of the south-eastern side of the island. The orientation of the church seems perfect. The other edifice which stands a few paces further east points in the same direction. The ground plan of both buildings is rectangular, the former measuring fifty feet by twenty, the latter something less in breadth, but almost the same in length. The church retains its gables, windows, and doors, in an state of fair preservation; but one of its sidewalls is almost completely broken down for some yards. The altar table, of substantial flags, has retained its hold with magnificent tenacity. The cell or monastery is in a still more ruined condition.

Apparently it was never so high as the church, and at present gables, from a little above the square, serve but to block the doors and narrow windows or fill in gaps in the lower masonry of its walls. Neither building can lay claim to exceptional beauty of architecture. But they are fairly large in size, neatly and well built, and above all charmingly placed in situation.

Surrounding the sacred edifice is an old cemetery, wherein Catholics and Protestants along the coast, until recent times, eagerly sought a last resting-place for their dead. Latterly new and exclusive graveyards are of course more in favour with Catholics. The central one in Glenties parish is appropriately dedicated in honour of St. Connell, the parochial patron. In Inniskeel the burial ground reaches the stony beach, and at high water is only a few yards above the surface of the Church-pool, a well sheltered basin in which ships of very heavy tonnage may ride safely at anchor in almost every condition of the wind.

On this delightful ground with the waves expiring gently at his feet or rolling in fury on "the Ridge" beyond, St. Connell raised each morning his pensive soul from thoughts of nature's beauteous handiwork to contemplate the great Creator by whose almighty word it had all been fashioned before time for man began. A glance northwards enhanced the view. It should have swept over kingly Errigal, and rest on Aranmore or the chainless waves of the sky-meeting ocean. What a home for meditation this peaceful isle with such giant surroundings by land and sea! Assuredly no island recluse can be an atheist, can fail of being an intense believer. With the impress of divine intelligence above him and around him, with a voice in the heaving billows or rushing sea-wind, if he have ethical uprightness of intellect and will to grasp the significance of the scene, no man could escape the all-pervading sense of God's presence, no man could here live the life of a hope-forsaken infidel. Neither the din of cities, nor social strife, nor crowded brick and mortar intervene to shut out reason's strong lesson or the light of divine faith. The island saint is a true philosopher; he must be religious to the core.

Such was Connell, founder of Inniskeel, and such was Dallan its frequent visitant. Colgan has left us several particulars of the latter saint. His notes on St. Connell are only incidental. The Christian name of Inniskeel's patron is variously spelled in Irish as in English, the form Conald being supported by some ancient authorities, whilst Conall, Connall or Connell approaches much nearer the pronunciation (Cuinell) common in Boylagh. In like manner his second name is written Caol, Caoil, Cael, Coel or Ceol. Mac Cole is still a family name on the mainland. The local Irish pronunciation, however, sounds like CAOL (slender), and hence some have thought the island derived its name from the needle-like appearance it presents from certain points of view along the coast. But more probably it came from Connell's father, for to distinguish the saint from a famous Umorian chief, who bore his double appellation, he is described by our annalists as the son of Ceolman. Thus in Latin he is said to be *jilius* Ceolmani or *jilius* Manii Cœlii.¹

The year of St. Connell's birth is not known with exactness. He died about 596 and had therefore been contemporary with a host of Irish saints. Sprung from the Cinel Conall, being the fourth in descent from Conall Gulban, he was a near relative of St. Columba. His name is mentioned in several of our ancient records. It is linked for ever with the famous Cain Domnaigh, a law forbidding servile works on Sunday. The prohibition ran from Vespers on Saturday evening to Monday morning and should delight the heart of a Sabbatarian by its exacting observance, did it not in other respects so unmistakably savour of Catholic practice. In the *Yellow Book of Lecan* the Cain is prefaced by a statement of its being brought from Rome by St. Connell, on an occasion of a pilgrimage made by him to the Eternal City. The metrical version contained in a manuscript copy of the ancient laws (in *Cod. Clarend.*), says it was the

¹ "Conallus de Iniscaoil, filius Manii Cœlii, filius Caitherii, filius Emmi Cognomento Baganii, filius Conalli Gulbani, colitur in ecclesia de Innis-Caoil 20 Maii et ejus profesto tanquam totius illius districtus Patroni jejunium strictum servatur usque in hodiernum diem." Colgan, *Trius Thaumaturga*, p. 480.

“Comarb of Peter and Paul” who first found and promulgated the document. St. Connell is not credited in either account with its authorship. Nay, O’Curry thinks he was a hundred years in his grave before a knowledge of it became general in Ireland. Be this as it may our chroniclers make two notable statements in regard to it. They say it was written by the hand of God in heaven and placed on the altar of St. Peter, and secondly that it was brought from Rome by St. Connell. Now, however we may be inclined to explain away either or both these statements, there is no mistaking the avowal of respect they imply for Roman authority, nor any serious reason for calling the pilgrimage itself into question. And see the faith of our fathers shining through the old Irish ordinance. Though the law in its severity forbids journeying on a Sunday, yet¹

“ A priest may journey on a Sunday,
To attend a person about to die,
To give him the body of Christ the chaste,
If he be expected to expire before morning.”

The Cain Domnaigh was never enacted by the states or councils of Erin. That it was believed to have been brought from Rome sufficed to spread its sway.

It is now time to say something of St. Connell’s famous friend Dallan Forgail. *Euchodius* is the Latin form given by Colgan for his original name. The better known appellation of Dallan is obviously derived from *dall*, blind; for at an early stage in his career he lost the use of his eyes. Notwithstanding this dismal fate he became the most eminent man of letters in Ireland, at a time when the paths of scholarship were eagerly pursued by a host of able men. He was antiquary, philosopher, rhetorician, and poet all in one. He was the literary chief, the *jilè* laureate of Erin in his day. A saint’s life and a martyr’s death crown the glory of his fame.

He was born, as Colgan tells us, in Teallach Eathach, which we take to be Tullyhaw in Cavan. Removed by only a few

¹ This we take from Cardinal Moran’s beautiful note on Inniskeel in his edition of Archdall’s *Monasticon Hibernicum*. His Eminence expresses his obligations to Mr. O’Looney for information in regard to the Cain Domnaigh.

degrees of descent from Colla, King of Ireland, St. Maidoc, of the same lineage, was his cousin. From his mother, Forchella, he received the second name, Forgail, which we sometimes find added in the old writers. Nothing that parental care could accomplish was left undone to perfect his education in sacred and secular subjects. From an early date he took to the antiquarian lore of his country as a special study. It was in this department, so indispensable for an Irish scholar of the sixth century, that he first attained an eminent place. Not unlikely his research into ancient records had something to do with the difficulty of the style in which he wrote. It appeared archaic even to experts who lived centuries before Colgan wrote; and we are told by this author how in the schools of Irish antiquities it was usual to expound Dallan's compositions by adding long commentaries on these rare specimens of the old Celtic tongue.

The *Amhra Coluim Cille* or written panegyric on Columbkille was his best known work. When the famous assembly at Drumceat was breaking up, just after Columba had succeeded in directing its proceedings to such happy issue, Dallan came forward and presented the saint with a poem written in eulogy of his merits. A part of the composition was thereupon recited; but only a part. For, as the event is told by Colgan, a slight feeling of vain-glory brought the demons in whirling crowds above Columba's head, before the astonished gaze of St. Baithen, his disciple and attendant. No sooner did the person principally concerned in this wonderful occurrence perceive the terrible sign than he was struck with deep compunction, and immediately stopped the recital. No entreaty ever after could induce him to allow the publication of the panegyric during his life. But by unceasing effort Dallan obtained the saint's permission to write a eulogy of him in case of survivorship. An angel, we are told, brought the news of Columba's death to St. Dallan, who forthwith composed his famous *Amhra Coluim Cille*, embodying in all probability, much of his former panegyric.

As soon as the learned work was completed Dallan recovered his sight, and received a promise that anyone who would piously recite the composition from memory should

obtain a happy death. This promise was liable to abuse in two opposite ways. The wicked might be tempted to look upon the recital of the eulogy as an easy substitute for a good life. The good, from seeing this interpretation carried into practice, might naturally be inclined to turn away in disgust from all use of the privilege. In point of fact both these errors began to show themselves, and were sure to grow, did not a miraculous event occur to put the promise on a proper basis. A cleric of abandoned life took to committing the rule as a more comfortable way to heaven than the path of penance. But, after learning one half, no effort would avail for further progress. So, as he still wanted to put off, or rather get rid of the day of reckoning, he made a vow, and in fulfilment of it went to Columba's tomb, whereat he spent a whole night in fast and vigil. When morning dawned his prayer had been heard. He could recite the second part of the poem word for word. But to his utter confusion not a trace of the lines he had known so well before remained on his memory. What happened him in the end we are not told. Let us hope he applied the obvious lesson his story preaches. As Colgan says, it not merely showed that a true conversion of heart must accompany the pious repetition from memory of Columba's praises, if eternal life is to be the reward. In this particular instance the value of the promise was clearly conveyed. The person's perverse intention was visibly punished by his being afflicted with inability to fulfil an indispensable condition of the privilege. He could not even commit the words.

St. Dallan composed another funeral oration in praise of St. Senan, Bishop of Iniscattery. It was prized both for its richness of ancient diction, and for the valuable property of preserving from blindness those who recited it with devotion. He composed a third Panegyric on St. Connell Coel for whom he entertained a most enthusiastic esteem. Colgan, who says he possessed copies of the two former compositions, states that he knew not whether that on the Abbot of Inniskeel was then extant. All three, unfortunately, are now gone.¹

¹ This we gather from Cardinal Moran's note. In O'Reilly's *Irish Writers*, St. Dallan's works are said to be extant.

Dallan had often besought in prayer that he and St. Connell might share the same grave. The favour came to be enjoyed in a manner at once saintly and tragic. He had been a frequent visitor at the island monastery, and the last time he came, a band of pirates landing from the neighbouring port, burst into the sacred building, as he was betaking himself, after the spiritual exercises, to the repose of the guest-room. These fierce sea-rovers, who in all probability were pagans, from more northern coasts, plundered ruthlessly on all sides, and brought their deeds of sacrilege to a close by cutting off the old man's head and casting it into the ocean. The abbot, who contrived to escape, on hearing that his dear friend had fallen a victim to the murderers, rushed to the spot where he had been slain, but only to find the headless trunk of what had been St. Dallan's body.

With tears and prayers he at once appealed to God, beseeching Him to reveal where the head of his martyred friend had been cast. The petition of one so favoured of heaven was granted. He saw it rise and fall on the waves at a distance and then move to the shore. He took it up with reverent care and placed it in its proper place on the body, when, lo! to his grateful delight, he found the parts adhere as firmly as if the pirate's cutlass had never severed them. St. Dallan's remains were then buried under the church walls with all the honour such earnest and mutual esteem was sure to prompt. This occurred about the year 594. Before the century closed St. Connell's body was laid in the same grave. Thus was St. Dallan's life-long wish gratified at last. No wonder the spot should be, in Colgan's words, the scene of daily miracles.

St. Dallan's Feast occurs on the 29th January. His memory survived in the veneration of several other churches throughout Ulster.

A very remarkable relic of St. Connell remained in the neighbourhood of Ardara until 1844. It was the saint's bell, called Bearnan Chonail. It was purchased in 1835 by Major Nesbitt of Woodhill, for £6, from Connell O'Breslen of Glengesh, whom O'Donovan calls the senior of his name. The O'Breslens, who had been *erenaghs* of Inniskeel, claimed

St. Connell as of their family, and hence the inheritance. Since 1844 when Major Nesbitt died, it has entirely disappeared and fears are entertained that in the succession of owners it may have been destroyed beyond hope of repair. Fortunately it had been previously seen and described by eminent antiquarians. We cannot convey a better idea of its appearance than by transcribing the following paragraph from Cardinal Moran's *Monasticon Hibernicum*. It is almost an exact transcript from one of O'Donovan's Letters.

“O'Donovan says it was enclosed in a kind of frame or case which had never been opened. Engraved on it with great artistic skill was the crucifixion, the two Marys, St. John, and another figure, and over it in silver were two other figures of the Archangel Michael, one on each side of our Lord, who was represented in the act of rising from the tomb. There is a long inscription in Gothic or black letters, all of which are effaced by constant polishing, except the words Mahon O'Meehan, the name, probably, of the engraver. There are two large precious stones inserted, one on each side of the crucifixion, and a brass chain suspended from one side of the bell.”

Frequent mention is made of Inniskeel by our ancient writers. Its exposed position not unfrequently tempted the spoiler. Thus under the year 619 in the Four Masters its demolition by Failbhe Flann Fidhbhadh is recorded. This war-like chief was killed to avenge Doir, son of Aedh Allan. Failbe's mother said, lamenting him—

“'Twas the mortal wounding of a noble,
Not the demolition of Inniskeel,
For which the shouts of triumph were exultingly
Raised around the head of Failbe Flann Fidhbhadh.”

In 1583 Donough, son of Torlough O'Boyle, was slain here by the O'Malleys, so that deeds of violence must have crimsoned from time to time the green sod of Inniskeel.

Besides the illustrious saints we have mentioned, their monks through several centuries, and many secular priests, the remains of other distinguished personages were borne from a distance to repose in this hallowed ground. Here was interred Niall O'Boyle, Bishop of Raphoe, who died at Gleneineagh in 1611. The Four Masters mention an important event in which this prelate took a leading part. In 1597

a numerous army of English and Irish troops entered Tyrconnell, under the command of Sir Conyers Clifford, President of Connaught. As was usual, Irish allies led the van of the invading host. Young Inchiquin dashed into the Erne, got badly wounded from the opposite bank while helping others to brave its current, and found, when it was too late, that Sainer's waters were not over partial to the enemies of Tyrconnell. So he sank beneath the waves whilst his followers succeeded in crossing. This was a Murrough O'Brien of that time. What a change from the day more than five centuries before when in the arms of victory another Murrough gave up his life for Ireland on the banks of the Tolka! Howbeit, Cormac O'Cleary had the body becomingly interred in Assaroe; when, lo! the Franciscan Fathers of Donegal claimed it for interment in their cemetery, on the ground that the O'Briens at home always buried their dead with the Franciscan brotherhood.

By this time, however, the enemy's forces, after several vain attempts to storm Ballyshannon Castle, had taken precipitately to flight. Despite the powerful supplies of siege ammunition sent by sea from Galway, they soon felt their position become rather unpleasant, as the neighbouring chiefs began to occupy the surrounding heights, and co-operate with the brave garrison. So at the break of day, one morning the "President and Earls" retreated across the river, leaving many of their forces in the swollen tide, and their whole camp in the hands of the sturdy clansmen. A close pursuit completed the enemy's discomfiture.

But now that victory had crowned native effort, there was time for peaceful duties, and no disposition to be anything short of generous to a fallen foeman. So the Franciscan claim was laid before Red Hugh, Niall O'Boyle, Bishop of Raphoe, and Redmond O'Gallagher, Bishop of Derry. As its decision, this strong court granted the petition, and three months after they had been first interred the remains of Murrough O'Brien, were exhumed and removed with becoming honour to Donegal abbey. How a Cistercian and a Franciscan community came to contend for the body of a non-Catholic seems strange. The Four Masters lay much stress

on Inchiquin's lineage, and possibly some material point has not been recorded.

The island of St. Connell lies at present outside the parish of Inniskeel. Half a century ago itself and the adjoining districts were ceded to Ardara in exchange for certain townlands lying near Glenties. So the people of both parishes look to it with equal pride, and visit it with equal reverence. We feel sure that the lesson its great saint teaches as well as the benediction they obtain, will stand the children of Boylagh in good stead as the ages roll on. This said, we have completed a little vacation tribute of homage and gratitude, long since intended, to St. Connell and St. Dallan.

PATRICK O'DONNELL.

THE BROWN SCAPULAR AND THE *CATHOLIC* *DICTIONARY.*

THE distinguished honor paid to the Scapular of our Lady of Mount Carmel by the Holy See, in the recent Decree relative to its investiture, which appeared in the July number of the RECORD for the present year, furnishes us with an occasion for comment on an article in the *Catholic Dictionary*, compiled by the Rev. W. A. Addis, and Mr. Thomas Arnold, M.A., under the word "Scapular."

It is true that two able papers, written by the Rev. Father Clarke, S.J., Editor of the *Month*, in refutation of the article in the *Catholic Dictionary*, have already appeared in that periodical, for which the clients of our Lady of Mount Carmel owe a deep debt of gratitude to that pious and learned Editor. But as the RECORD circulates in many places in Ireland, to which the *Month* does not reach, and as we purpose to meet the objections in our own way, it will not be deemed out of place if we supply the readers of the former, with an answer to the difficulties raised against the devotion of the Carmelite Scapular by the *Catholic Dictionary*. We do this all the more

eagerly, because this devotion is so widely spread amongst Irish Catholics, and is so dear to them.

It is indeed unaccountable how an article so un-Catholic and so repugnant to the feelings and belief of Catholics, could have found its way into the pages of a Catholic dictionary.

We might expect such teaching in a work avowedly hostile to Catholic devotional practices; but certainly not in a Catholic book. Although freely admitting that nothing could be farther from the intention of the compilers of the *Catholic Dictionary*, than to throw any discredit on devotional practices sanctioned by the Church, yet we are bound to assert that the article in question has that tendency.

Having given a brief description of the devotion of the Scapular, the writer of the article says, "Two statements, then, have to be examined. Is there any proof that the Blessed Virgin appeared to St. Simon Stock and made the promises related above? Is the Sabbatine Ball genuine, and the story it tells true?" He then adds, "We take the latter question first, because it may be despatched very quickly." He does indeed despatch it very quickly, but we must add very unsatisfactorily.

Now let us examine the authorities the writer adduces, to prove that the Bulls of John XXII. and Alexander V. are not genuine; for the weight of the evidence will very much depend on the character of the witnesses.

The first he brings forward is Launoy, a doctor of the College of Sorbonne, who died at Paris in 1678. Now it is well known that his works are distinguished by their sceptical and erroneous teaching. Nearly all of them have been proscribed by the Sacred Congregation of the Index. He is called by Benedict XIV., in his work on the Canonization of Saints, a most pronounced enemy of the Roman Pontiffs and the Apostolic See. Alluding to a theological opinion of Launoy's, he designates it—

"*Temerarium profecto et contumeliosum in Christi vicarium dictum! quod a solo Launojo proferri poterat, utpote Romanorum Pontificum et Sedis Apostolicæ hoste apertissimo, ex quo ipsius opuscula a Sacra Indicis Congregatione fuerant merito proscripta.*"¹

¹ *Act de Canon. Ser. Dei.* Lib. I., c. 44., n. 18.

No doubt Launoy was a man of great learning, but he turned it to bad account. He held weekly conferences at his residence in Paris, at which opinions were taught so subversive of society, and the authority of the Church, that the King was obliged to interdict them in 1636. He next made war on religious orders, canonized saints, and some of the most cherished devotions of the Church; employing his acrimonious pen in endeavouring to discredit them by false objections and unfounded imputations.

He wrote also against the Formulary of Alexander VII. condemnatory of Jansenism; and he is accused of altering, with incredible audacity, texts which he quoted in proof of his theory. Most of his reasonings too are not more just than his quotations (V. *Dictionnaire Universel des sciences Ecclésiastiques* Tom. 2, P. 1230). Being generally of a negative character, to give them the appearance of solidity he published a work on the force of negative arguments (*De auctoritate negantis argumenti*). He has been greatly praised by Protestants, and his works have been reproduced by them, no doubt, because of his anti-catholic and anti-papal tendencies.

In his work entitled *De Simonis Stokii viso, de Sabbatinae Bullae Privilegio et de Scapularis Carmelitarum Sodalitate Dissertationes quinque*, this cynical and unscrupulous critic attacked, to use the words of Benedict XIV., with inexpressible fury the vision to St. Simon Stock and the Bull of John XXII. "Adversus utramque quasi quodam, qui satis verbis explicari non potest, furore invehitur Launojus in Dissertationibus suis."¹

To show the lengths to which the man's morbid desire for attacking admitted facts carried him, and the kind of arguments he used, we may mention that he stoutly maintained that St. Thomas Aquinas was not the author of the *Summa Theologica*. The matter is thus related by Benedict XIV. and we give it here because it is much to our present purpose.

"Denique magnis olim animorum motibus agitabatur controversia utrum Summa Theologica S. Thomae Aquinatis ab eo fuerit

¹ Benedict XIV. *de Festis*, T. 2, P. 330 Lovanii 1761. This book by Launoy is on the Index.

composita, an potius a Vincentio Bellovacensi. Joannes nempe Launoyus, *more suo*, sententiae adhaerebat quae favet Bellovacensi, innixus sermone Clementis VI. qui S. Thomam laudans, anno 1323, ad solemnia ejusdem recens canonizati et ejus operum indicem retexens Theologicae Summae non meminit, sed cum eruditus ex Dominicana Familia Theologus, Jacobus Echard, in libro de S. Thomæ Summa suo auctori vindicata (P. 439 et seq.) clarissime demonstraverit in eodem Clementis VI. sermone Summam S. Thomæ esse commemoratam."

And the learned Pontiff adds :

" Ex his omnibus plene evincitur serio perpendendum esse ante omnia an negotium sit redactum ad punctum argumenti negativi; cum aliquando fidenter asseri contingat, nullum aequaevum auctorem rem retulisse, quamvis non desint qui retulerint."¹

Now this Launoy is the authority that furnishes the writer of the article in question with a "superabundance of reasons" to show that the Bull of John XXII. and that of Alexander V. are forgeries. Of course Launoy could supply "*more suo*" as Benedict XIV. designates his methods, a "superabundance" of what he calls "reasons," for denying facts admitted by all reasonable people. How many historical facts could stand the test, if the methods employed by Launoy were to prevail? Why even the most sacred and fundamental truths of religion have been attacked in the same way, by unbelieving and heretical writers who have furnished, in their own opinion and in the opinion of those who believe with them, a superabundance of "reasons" against doctrines which they do not wish to admit, but which are held by all Catholics.

The "reasons" supplied by Launoy against the authenticity of these Bulls, have been over and over again completely refuted by various learned writers. To quote them here would not only exceed the space allowed us in these pages, but would fill volumes. We can, however, refer the reader who wishes to follow this subject more fully, to works in which the objections and difficulties internal and external, historical and theological, raised against these Bulls are fully and completely answered and refuted, viz.: *Speculum Carmelitanum*, by the Rev. Fr. Daniel of the Virgin Mary (T. 1,

¹ Act de Canon, Ser. Dei, l. iii., c. x., n. 5.

L. V., p. 3, Antverpiæ, 1653); *Vinea Carmeli seu Historia Ordinis Eliani*, by the same author (Pars V., cap. iv. et seq.); *Bibliotheca Carmelitana*, by the Very Rev. Cosma of St. Stephen (T. 1, p. 52, et seq.); *Historico-Sacra et Theologico-Dogmatica Dissertatio de Vera Origine et Progressu Monasticæ* (Nolæ, 1697), by the Very Rev. John Feyxoo de Villalobos; *Scapulare Marianum illustratum et defensum*, by the distinguished Jesuit writer Fr. Theophilus Raynaud; Benedict XIV. *de Festis*, P. 2, c. 76, et seq., also *De Beatificatione et Canoniz. Sanctorum* (L. 4, p. 2, cap. ix., n. 10). Also the works of Ven. P. John the Baptist de Lazana, G. Colvener, John Palaeonydorus, Arnold Botius, John Cheron, Iraeneus of St. James, Paul of All Saints, and others.

The writer of the article in question says that the autograph of the Sabbatine Bull has never been found. Not since it was lost, but is that a proof that it never existed? If that test were applied to other rights and privileges, how few of their claims could be proved? Why, if it were lawful to make the comparison, the autographs of the most authentic documents in the world, the Holy Scriptures, are not now in existence. Would it therefore be lawful to conclude that they are apocryphal?

If the original of the Sabbatine Bull has been lost, we have unquestionable testimony that it existed, that its loss can be satisfactorily accounted for, and that authentic copies of it have been taken, some of which are at present in existence.

The first witness who testifies to its existence is Alexander V., who tells us that he saw it himself, examined it carefully, was convinced of its authenticity, and in order to put its existence beyond future cavil, he embodied it in a Bull of his own, in which he renews and confirms the privileges contained in it:—

“Tenore cujusdam privilegii fel. record. Joannis XXII. Prædecessoris nostri, dilectis filiis, Priori Generali et Fratribus et dilectis in Christo Filiabus sororibus confratribus, et Confratriæ Fratrum dicti ordinis Carmelitarum concessi, *per nos visi et diligenter inspecti, de dicto originali sumpto*, ut de ipso in posterum certitudo plenior habeatur, præsentibus fecimus annotari, qui talis est.”

Then follows the text, *in extenso*, of the Sabbatine Bull—
“*Sacratissimo uti culmine, &c.* 1Datum Romae 7 Dec. 1409.”
Apud Mariam Majorem.¹

The authenticity of this Bull has also been denied by Launoy, but the reasons he alleges for this denial have been shown by the authors we have quoted to be groundless. A very complete answer to these objections may be read in the *Bibliotheca Carmelitana* (T. 1, p. 51, et seq.) An authentic copy of this Bull signed by public notaries, judges, &c., who testify that they have compared it with the original and found it to correspond, was deposited in the archives of the Carmelite Fathers at Genoa, as may be learned from the *Speculum Carmelitanum* (T. 1, L. V., p. 543, cap. xii., et seq.) where a copy of it is given, and where its authenticity is clearly demonstrated. Other authentic copies were deposited at the Carmelite Convents of Messina, Mechlin, Cologne, Antwerp, Rome, and other places, as is proved in the *Speculum Carm.* (Tom. 1, cap. xii., p. 543).

John Palaeonydorus in his work *Fasciculus Tripartitus*, cap. xi., Arnold Botius in his *Speculum Hist.*, cap. vii., Baldinus Lcersius in his *Collectaneum Exemplorum*, cap. vi., and others inform us, that the original of the Bull of John XXII., was conveyed to England, and an authentic copy of it kept at Genoa. This fact is also attested by a witness who will not be suspected of any bias in favour of the Bull, viz., Balacus, a renegade Carmelite Friar, who was named by Edward VI., Bishop of Ossory in Ireland. In his Catalogue of British writers, at the name N. Trineth, in the appendix, alluding not in friendly terms to the vision of John XXII., he thus writes:

“Istam apparitionem, &c., in quadam Bulla legi in Anglia; quae etiam Romae an. 1530 sub Clementi VII. renovata fuit.”

Theophilus Raynaud, the illustrious Jesuit writer, also gives clear testimony to the same fact. He thus writes in his work on the Scapular (Part 2, p. 2):—

“Joannes autographum Carmelitis ipsis tradidit, tamquam ad eos maxime attinens. Carmelitae autem variis apographis confectis

¹ Vide *Speculum Carmelitanum*, T. 1, p. 3, L. V., n. 2,161.

et huc illucque transmissis, autographum ipsum ad Generalem Praepositum, cujus in Anglia sedes ordinaria erat, deferri curarunt, apud eum, in generali ordinis Tabulario cum aliis, magni momenti, Diplomatis aut Instrumentis asservandum.”

The original of the Bull of Alexander V. was also transferred to England as we learn from the authentic copy of it, made Jan. 2nd, 1421, at the instance of Alphonsus de Theram, an Englishman, then Prior of the Convent of Captun, in the island of Majorca, afterwards Prior of the Convent of Coventry, England, who then took the original to be kept in the archives of the General in London. This copy was solemnly reduced to public form, before notaries, judges, &c., and kept at Genoa. Of this we are informed by Palaeonydorus, Botius, Leersius, &c.¹ An old authentic MS. copy, written in 1484, and kept at the Carmelite Convent, Mechlin, gives us similar information. These words are added to it—

“Haec est Bulla Joannis XXII. quam Alexander V. confirmavit, cujus originale dicitur fore in Anglia et in Conventu Januensi (Genoa) ejus Instrumentum authenticum.” (*V. Spec. Carm. T. 1., Pars. III., p. 544, n. 2158.*)

It is confirmed by Fr. Paul of All Saints, in his *Clavis Aurea* (p. 2., c. 27) where he writes thus:—

“Singulari vero Divinae Providentiae beneficium adscribendum videtur, quod Alexander in suum Diploma, Bullam Joannis verbatim, integreque retulerit, quod paucis post annis, videlicet 1421, Diplomatis Alexandri publicum, authenticumque Majoricae instrumentum conficeretur, ad instantiam R. P. Alphonsi de Theramo Angli, qui autographum, seu Bullam originalem, Alexandri, quam Judicibus et Notariis legendam, inspiciendamque, ut iidem testantur, exhibuit, atque, in Angliam ubi Prioris munere fungebatur, erat asportaturus, una cum Bulla Joannis adservendam.”

It may be asked why were these original and valuable documents brought to England and deposited there? The answer is, that, at that time, England was the most important and flourishing province of the Carmelite order, and the seat of the Prior General. There too were held many general chapters, in the first of which, after their

¹ Vide *Speculum Carm.*, T. 1, p. 562, n. 2204.

transmigration from Syria, St. Simon Stock was elected General. There too the latter was favoured with the heavenly vision in which he received the Scapular. The province too was remarkable for the number of its houses and the learning and piety of its members. Before the suppression of the monasteries by Henry VIII. it contained fifty-six convents and fifteen hundred religious. In attestation of these facts we may quote Pitsæus (*Lib. de viris illis. Angliæ agens de Carm.*). He says:—

“In Anglia plusquam in quacumque alia Europæ parte hunc ordinem floruisse constat; magisque abundasse et numero monasteriorum et doctorum virorum copia.”

Also Nicholas Herpfeldus, an English historian (*Hist. Ang., sec. 14, c. 17.*) Having enumerated many men of other orders illustrious for their piety and learning, he thus concludes:—

“Sed hos omnes et ceteros hoc seculo non modo singulos, sed uniuersos non tantum exaequant, sed longe, ni fallor, in hac scriptionum palæstra, et laude librorum laborumque, magnitudine superant Carmelitæ.”¹

In the Convent of London were kept from the time of St. Simon Stock, the archives of the order in which were preserved important documents, treasures, apostolic diplomas and Bulls granted to the order. In proof of this, we can refer to the writings of John Grosius, John Bacho, Thomas Bradley, Bishop of Dromore, Leersius.²

From these writers we learn that some of the most important Bulls granted to the order were kept in the archives of the London Convent, the library of which was the largest and most valuable in London, as we read in the *Bibliotheca Carmelitana*, (T. II., p. 473). “*Bibliotheca Carmelitarum Londinensium deperit, multitudine et antiquitate superans omnes quotquot erant Londini 1420.*”

But alas! these glorious days of the Church in England were sadly changed by the wicked Henry VIII. Having rebelled against the Holy See, because it would not comply with his unlawful demands, he cast his avaricious eyes on the

¹ *V. Spec. Carm. T. 1., p. 562.*

² *Spec. Carm. T. 1., p. 562, n. 2204.*

rich monasteries, and resolved to replenish his coffers and those of his needy and greedy nobles, with their property. We need not go into the sad story of the suppression of those monasteries and the confiscation of their property. In this general destruction, the great Carmelite library of London shared the common fate of the other religious houses. It was taken possession of by the enemy; its archives, documents, papal diplomas and Bulls relating to the order deposited there, were all seized, scattered or destroyed. It is not surprising, then, that, in this general overthrow and destruction, the original of the Sabbatine Bull, and that of Alexander V. which were deposited there, should be lost or destroyed.

That such was the fate of these Bulls, we have the testimony of George Colvenerius, Doctor of S. Theology and Chancellor of the University of Douay. In his work *Kalendarium Marianum* (Douay, 1638), he writes as follows, under the 7th December:—

“Hac die datum est Romae diploma apud S. Mariam Majorem Alexandri V. Pontificis, quae confirmat Bullam Joannis XXII.”

And afterwards he adds these words concerning the originals:—

“Diploma originale Joannis XXII. et Alexandri V. in Anglia periisse, ubi maxime florere hic solet ordo et Praepositus ordinis residere, ubi et commune totius congregationis erat Archivium, quod heretici violenta manu effregerunt.”

P. F. Daniel of the Virgin Mary, gives us similar testimony in his great work *Speculum Carmelitanum* (T. I., p. 562, c. 15).

But if these important Bulls have been lost or destroyed, many authentic copies of them remain as we have already seen. They have, too, been confirmed and ratified by many Popes. The first to do so was Clement VII. In his Bull “Ex clementi Sedis Apostolicae,” he, by name, cites those of John XXII. and Alexander V., solemnly approves them, and ratifies their contents. This Bull is dated at St. Peter’s, Rome, August 12th 1530 (Vide *Bullarium Romanum Cherub.* T. 1, p. 683, item *Bullarium Carm.* Pars 2, p. 47, et seq.) Also that of Paul III. “Provisionis Nostrae,” 1534 (*Bullar. Carm.* T. 2, p. 68) of Paul IV. in his Bull dated 30th May, 1556, in which

he expressly cites those of John XXII., Alexander V., Clement VII., Paul III., and Julius III., and confirms them (*Bullar. Carm.* T. 2. p. 107); of Pius V. in his Bull "Superna dispositione, 1566; and of Gregory XIII. "Ut laudes," Rome, 18th September, 1577, in which he confirms the concessions of his predecessors, amongst whom he expressly mentions the names of John XXII. and Alexander V.¹

There are other Bulls to the same effect from other Sovereign Pontiffs in different ages of the Church which it is unnecessary to cite here. Now, it is worthy of remark that many of these Bulls mention the two fundamental Bulls of John XXII. and Alexander V., approve of them, and ratify their contents. These Popes would not surely quote these two Bulls, give them their approbation, and make them the foundation of their own if there was any doubt of their authenticity.

To these authorities we may add that of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, which has approved the lessons of the second nocturn of the Breviary for the feast of the solemn commemoration of the Blessed Virgin of Mount Carmel; and the decree of the Congregation of the Inquisition, under Paul V., February 15th, 1613, both confirmative of the privileges of the Sabbatine Bull.²

To the proofs we have already given of the authenticity of the Bulls in question, we may add the authority of the theological faculties of different universities. An agitation having been raised in Spain about the year 1566, against the devotion of the scapular, the matter was referred to the University of Salamanca for consideration. Four of its most learned doctors were deputed to examine it, and their unanimous decision was that the Sabbatine Bull and those of the other Sovereign Pontiffs relating to it, were authentic, and that the Carmelites could enjoy the privileges contained in them. (*Spec. Carm.* T. 1, p. 567).

The College of Sorbonne gave similar attestation. Eight of its learned doctors having examined the Bulls and considered the question, solemnly declared:—

"Indulgentiam Sabbatinam juxta tenorem Pauli V. publicandam asserendamque. August 19th, 1648."—(*Spec. Carm.* T. 1, p. 561.)

Bullar. Carm., T. 2, p. 194.

² *V. Spec. Carm.*, T. 1, p. 491.

In the year 1609, the University of Bologna gave a similar decision, adding :—

“Cum Bulla Joannis XXII. plures illaestasque Canonicas prae se ferat Summorum Pontificum confirmatorias constitutiones, nec ullo unquam tempore revocata fuerit, illam adhuc in suo robore manere.”

This is signed by six doctors and others.¹

We have, in our opinion, adduced sufficient authority to prove that the Bulls of John XXII. and Alexander V. are genuine. Launoy's condemned and oft-refuted “superabundance of reasons,” disinterred by the writer of the article in the *Catholic Dictionary* has no foundation. These “reasons” are based on audacious assumptions, and false statements. The book containing them has been placed on the index of prohibited books, and the objections raised therein have been satisfactorily answered and completely refuted by the authors to whom we have referred the reader.

We shall now consider the next assertion of the writer in the *Catholic Dictionary*, viz. : that the Bull of John XXII. has no place in the Roman Bullarium. Does it hence follow that it must be a forgery? By no means. There are many other Bulls issued by Sovereign Pontiffs that have no place in the Roman Bullarium, and yet their authenticity and the privileges conceded by them have not been questioned. John XXII. reigned as Pope for nineteen years, and during that long period transacted many important negotiations and issued many Bulls, and yet only few of them are now in existence. The rest have been lost. When we consider the stormy times in which he lived, that the Popes were obliged to live in exile at Avignon, exposed to the attacks of their enemies, we can easily account for the loss of these documents. Alphonsus Ciaconius in his history of the Popes, relates that the heretics and enemies of the Church invaded the palace of John XXII., and with violent hands opened the public archives, and destroyed the documents of the Apostolic Chancery, chiefly those issued by John. The same historian relates that Alexander V. issued some Bulls of which not one is now extant. The same fate befell Bulls and other important docu-

¹ *Spec. Carm.*, P. Daniel, T. 1, p. 571.

ments of other Popes during those stormy times. (V. *Spec. Carm.* T. 1, p. 560).

The Roman Bullarium does not profess to embrace all the Bulls ever issued. The first who compiled the Roman Bullarium was Laertius Cherubinus. He collected the Bulls from the reign of St. Leo the Great to that of Sixtus V. There are many Bulls of preceding Popes, however, not contained in this Bullarium, and few indeed of John XXII. and of Alexander V. Spondanus and Bzorius in their annals (Ad an. 1409), Renatus Choppin and others cite many Bulls of Alexander V., not one of which is mentioned in the Bullarium of Cherubinus.

The next assertion of this article is that the authenticity of the Sabbatine Bull is unhesitatingly denied by the great Bollandist Papebroch in his reply to the attack made on him by the Carmelites and by Benedict XIV. The writer could not have selected a more unreliable witness on this subject than Papebroch; for it is well known that a warm controversy was carried on for a long time between him and the Carmelites, concerning their origin, antiquity, &c. To such lengths was the controversy carried, that Innocent XII., while leaving the matter in dispute undecided, deemed it necessary to put an end to the controversy by imposing perpetual silence on the matter in dispute, by a Constitution dated 20th November, 1698, commencing, "*Redemptoris Domini Nostri.*" To show, however, that the Carmelites had the best of the argument, it may be mentioned that Benedict XIII. thought fit to break this silence, by permitting a statue of St. Elias to be erected in the Basilica of St. Peter at Rome, amongst those of the founders of other religious orders, with the following title written by the Pope's own hand, "*Sancto Eliæ Fundatori suo, Religio Carmelitarum erexit.*"

The controversy was carried on chiefly between Papebroch and Father Sebastian of St. Paul, Provincial of the Belgian Carmelites, and Professor of Theology at the University of Louvain. The latter wrote a work entitled, *Exhibitio errorum quos P. Daniel Papebrochius suis in notis ad acta Sanctorum commisit* (Coloniæ Agrippinæ, 1693), in which he convicts Papebroch of over two hundred errors. In page 100 of this

work the author ably defends the Sabbatine Bull against Launoy and Papebroch, and puts its authenticity beyond question. At page 641 of the same book he accuses and convicts Papebroch of following, imitating, and quoting Launoy, the enemy of the Holy See, the contemner of Papal Bulls, the calumniator of saints and religious orders, the sneerer at and reviler of religious practices, whose works have nearly all been condemned by the Sacred Congregation of the Index. In support of the accusations he quotes the celebrated Jesuit writer Theophilus Raynaud, who thus describes the character of Launoy—

“Probat deinde Raynaudus Launoyum esse. turbidum, inquietum garrulum, truculentum, alienae famae lanium, necnon infrunitum calumniatorem ac mendacem, omni proinde fide humana indignum.”

Then our author adds—

“Quae Papebrochium non videntur potuisse latere. Unde satis mirari non possum, quod hominem adeo infamem, cujus omnia fere opuscula ab Ecclesia sunt damnata, pro se citari audeat, dum Joannis XXII. Bullam a successoribus *proprio motu et ex certa scientia*, toties confirmatam, cum isto solo calumniatore et sedis Bullarum Pontificae contemptore, in opusculo ejus damnato proclamat esse *nullius fidei*.”

When we consider that the Sabbatine Bull has been approved and confirmed by many Popes, that it has been examined and sanctioned by the theological faculties of universities, that the objections raised against it have been again and again refuted by many able and learned writers, the fact that Papebroch agrees with Launoy in affirming that it is of doubtful authenticity has very little weight indeed, especially as the work containing Launoy's “superabundance of reasons” is condemned by the Holy See.

The writer of the article next produces two passages from Benedict XIV. (or rather the pious and learned Cardinal Lambertinus, for he had not been elevated to the Pontifical throne when he wrote the words quoted) which seem to bear the interpretation, that the learned Cardinal held that the Sabbatine Bull was of doubtful authenticity. Nothing could be more injurious to the memory of that great Pontiff than such an insinuation, for it is well known, that he took up his pen to defend it against the attacks of Launoy and Papebroch. We cannot admire the candour of the writer in quoting these passages, whilst at the same time he leaves unquoted other

passages of the same learned Pope in which he clearly affirms that it is genuine.

First let us see if these quotations bear the meaning the writer of the article would have us infer. "It is" thus runs the quotation "as hard, perhaps harder to believe in this Bull than in the story of the chapel built on Mount Carmel in honour of the Blessed Virgin during her life." But there is no difficulty in believing the latter, for it is an historical fact, supported by the authority of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, the received tradition of the whole order, and the testimony of different trustworthy writers, as may be seen in *Speculum Carm.* (T. 1. pars 2, page 355, n. 1455 et alibi). The next quotation is "He says he could give more reasons against it than he cares to produce and arguments drawn from things (in the Bull) which want all appearance of truth." The words "in the Bull" is a gloss of the writer. The writer then adds "He alludes we suppose to the style of the Bull which as Launoy points out, betrays in many ways the hand of the impostor."

Benedict XIV. says more reasons could be produced against the Bull if it should appear to him profitable or expedient (*si nobis videretur conducibile*). But evidently he did not deem it profitable to produce them. But what were these reasons? According to the writer of the article, they were, he supposes, some of Launoy's, which we may add, have been condemned by the Holy See, and refuted by many able and learned writers.

Now, Benedict XIV. clearly teaches and defends the authenticity of the Sabbatine Bull, both in his work *De Festis*, and his other great work *De Servorum Dei Beatificatione, &c.* In the former work (Tom. 2, p. 326, cap. lxx. et seq., Lovanii 1761), having stated reasons in favour of the Bull, in chapter 78, he says: "all the difficulties that could be brought against both the vision of St. Simon Stock and the Sabbatine Bull, have been removed, both by the wise disquisitions of learned men and by the decree of the Sovereign Pontiff."¹

¹ "Ea omnia, quae tum in B. Stokii visione tum in Sabbatina Bulla difficultatem creare poterant, et sapientibus doctorum virorum animadversionibus, et Romani Pontificis decreto sublata sint."

In the latter work he writes also in favour of the scapular. Having alluded to the difficulties raised against it by Launoy and Papebroch, he adds: "But the genuineness of the Sabbatine Bull, and many things in vindication of the aforesaid matters (viz., the privileges of the scapular) can be read in the work of Theophilus Raynaud, entitled *Scapulare Marianum illustratum*." (Tom. 7.)¹

It is clearly evident, therefore, that Benedict XIV. was a strenuous defender of the Sabbatine Bull and its privileges.

We have said, we think, enough to prove that the strictures against the Sabbatine Bull contained in the first question discussed in the article of the *Catholic Dictionary* are groundless, and contrary to the belief and instincts of Catholics. With the editor's permission, we purpose in another article, to examine the difficulties raised on the second question discussed in the *Catholic Dictionary*, viz.: "The Vision of the Blessed Virgin to St. Simon Stock, and and the promises made to him."

JOHN E. BARTLEY, O.C.C.

THE MOZARABIC RITE.

OVERRUN as continental Europe now is with tourists of every kind and of every nation, Spain is comparatively speaking unknown. Yet there is much in this country to interest anyone, and to a Catholic few lands could be more fascinating. Among the most interesting spots in Spain is the conical hill, almost surrounded by the Tagus, on whose summit is Toledo, the See of the Primate of Spain. Its cathedral is unique, in that the Divine Office is always recited in it by two choirs according to two Rites. The Office of the Roman Rite is said in the magnificent *Coro*; and in a small chapel, the *Capilla Muzaraba*, situated at the

¹ "Sed Bullæ Sabbatinæ veritas et multa pro dictarum rerum vindicatione legi possunt apud Theophilum Raynaudum in opusculo cui titulus *Scapulare Marianum*." (V. *Act de Beat.*, &c., L. iv., Pars. 2, cap. ix., no. 10).

S. W. corner of the church, is said that of the Mozarabic Rite. The majority of the few tourists who visit Toledo, for the most part thinking two or three hours, the interval between two trains, time enough, see this chapel, but know very little of the Rite to which it is devoted. Some, indeed, I met there who expected to find something, they did not quite know what, going on in Arabic.

The ancient Spanish Liturgy was introduced by St. Torquatus, and in all essential matters closely resembled the Roman. But after the Gothic invasion, the old Spanish Liturgy got tainted with Arianism. In 633, at the fourth Council of Toledo, presided over by St. Isidore of Seville, the Bishops of Spain reformed their Liturgy, and made the reformed use obligatory throughout Spain and Narbonne. At the beginning of the eighth century Spain was overrun by the Moors, who applied the terms "Mostarabuna" to the natives who yielded to them, whence the Spanish Liturgy received the name of *Muzarabic* or *Mozarabica*. During the period of Moorish rule this liturgy became very corrupt, and some phrases in it seemed to favour the adoptionist heresy. Early in the ninth century, after a lengthened correspondence between Rome and Spain, the objectionable passages were removed, and the liturgy declared to be orthodox. At the beginning of the eleventh century a council was held at S. Juan de la Pena, at which Sancho Ramirez, King of Arragon, induced the Bishops to supersede the Gothic Rite by the Gregorian or Roman. This decision was confirmed by the Council of Burgos in 1085; but as there was a party eager in support of the ancient national Rite, it was determined to submit the matter to the judgment of God. A fire was made, into which each Missal was to be thrown in turn, victory being with the one which remained uninjured. The story relates that the Roman Missal was first thrown in, and immediately bounded out uninjured. The national one was then subjected to the test, and remained intact in the fire. This was accepted as a judgment that both were good, and so both were tolerated.

The Roman Rite, however, gradually superseded the Gothic, and in the thirteenth century the latter was not used

in any cathedral. At the end of the fifteenth, it was not used anywhere. In 1498, the celebrated Franciscan, Francis Ximenes de Cisneros, was appointed Archbishop of Toledo; and he immediately set himself to restore the national liturgy. In the year 1500, he printed the Missal, making a few changes which brought it into greater conformity with the Roman one. In this same year he founded a college of priests to whom he assigned the duty of daily saying Mass and Office according to the Spanish Rite. He built a chapel for them adjoining the cathedral and opening from it: at the present time there is nothing of any great beauty in the *Capilla Muzaraba* itself, the most striking object being a fresco of Cardinal Ximenes before the walls of Oran, which he besieged and took in 1509. In 1502 was printed the Breviary which is still used by the chaplains. It is a remarkable book, and the Offices differ very much from the Roman; as an example, it may be mentioned that the *Gloria in Excelsis* is said at Prime. There are twelve chaplains, and two sacristans (priests) attached to the chapel, the head chaplain being a canon of the cathedral. The fourteen priests who are appointed to the Mozarabic Chapel, enjoy the privilege of using their Missal and Breviary in any part of the world.

As this Rite is not very generally known, and the Missals somewhat scarce, a sketch of the chief differences between the Roman and Mozarabic ordinaries of the Mass may be of interest to liturgical students. In the first place, the translation of the Scriptures used is not that of the Vulgate: it is older than St. Jerome's, and is very similar to, but not exactly the same as, the *Versio Italica* still used in St. Peter's at Rome. It is the only Rite in the Latin Church in which the distinction between the *Missa Catechumenorum* and the *Missa Fidelium* is maintained; this distinction being still retained in the Missal. *Alleluia* is always used even in Lent and in Requiems; perhaps this is one of the effects of the constant intercourse between Constantinople and Spain in ancient times. There are other traces of Eastern uses in the Rite, notably in the constant admonitions made to the people by the Deacon, the *Sanctus* being repeated in Greek, and the *Sancta Sanctis*.

The priest says the *Kyrie* and *Pater Noster* in the Sacristy after vesting, and then proceeds to the foot of the altar where he says an *Ave*, the *Judica me Deus*, the *Confiteor* and some versicles, after which the *Aufer a nobis*. This preparation was added by Cardinal Ximenes, the old Missals prescribing nothing before the priest went to the altar. The *Confiteor* differs from the Roman, and there are more versicles. On great feasts, before the priest ascends to the altar he says an antiphon, commencing "Per gloriam nominis tui." On the Sundays in Lent some prayers are said before the *Judica*, the priest kneeling and holding the covered chalice.

On arriving at the altar the priest makes the sign of the cross over it saying *In nomine Patris &c.*, kisses it and says the Antiphon :

Salve crux pretiosa, quae Corpori Christi dedicata es, et ex membris Ejus tamquam margaritis ornata ; salva praesentem catervam in tuis laudibus congregatam.

This is followed by a versicle and response, and five prayers, after which the priest extends the Corporal saying :

In tuo conspectu, quæsumus, Domine, hæc nostra munera Tibi placita sint, ut nos tibi placere valeamus. Attollite portas principes vestras, et elevamini portæ æternales et introibit Rex Gloriæ. Quis est iste Rex Gloriæ ? Dominus fortis et potens in prælio, Dominus virtutum ipse est Rex Gloriæ.

Then cleansing the chalice he says :

Misce Domine, in calice isto quod manavit ex latere tuo, ut fiat in remissionem peccatorum nostrorum. Amen.

He blesses the water, using the words :

Ab illo benedicatur, cujus spiritus super aquas ferebatur. In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti. Amen.

He then mixes wine and water in the chalice, saying :

Ex latere D.N.J.C. sanguis et aqua profluxisse perhibentur. Haec ideo nos pariter commiscemus, ut misericors Deus utrumque ad medelam animarum nostrarum sanctificare dignetur. Per eundem, &c.

After which the priest blesses the Host :

Benedictio Dei Patris omnipotentis, et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, descendat super hanc hostiam tibi Deo Patri offerendam. Amen.

The Host is placed on the paten ; and it may be observed that it never rests on the corporal.

Then follows the *Office* as the Introit is called, as in the Carthusian, Dominican and Sarum Missals. This is said at the Epistle corner, and is followed by the *Gloria in Excelsis*, except on the Sunday before the Nativity of St. John Baptist, called the Advent of St. John, ferias, fasts, the Sundays in Lent, after the first, and Requiems, on which days the *Benedictus* is said instead. Then follows the Collect and a Lection from the Prophets: after which, in virtue of a decree of the Fourth Council of Toledo, on Sundays and feasts of Martyrs the *Benedicite* is said. After the Lection, or *Benedicite*, is a responsory very similar to the Gradual, and then the Epistle, to which is responded, *Amen*; *Deo Gratias* being said after the announcement of the title. Before reading the Gospel the priest says *Silentium facite*, and when he kisses the book at the end:

Ave verbum Divinum, reformatio virtutum, restitutio sanitatum.

To the Gospel is responded *Amen*: and it may be noted that it is announced "*Lectio Evangelii secundum . . .*" whilst for the Epistle is said "*Sequentia Epistolæ . . .*" After the Gospel come the *Laudes*, which are always of the following form:

V. Dominus sit semper vobiscum.

R. Et cum spiritu tuo.

Lauda. Alleluia . . (Proper) . . Alleluia.

Then follows the Offertory which contains the following invocation of the Holy Ghost:

Veni Sancte Spiritus, sanctificator, sanctifica hoc sacrificium de manibus meis tibi praeeparatum.

The priest asks for the prayers of the people, turning to them for the only time during the sacrifice:

P. Adjuvat me, fratres, in orationibus vestris et orate pro me ad Deum.

Ch. Adjuvat te Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus.

Whilst the choir sing the "*Sacrificium*," the priest blesses the water with three fingers in silence; he then washes his hands, says the *Lavabo* and a prayer.

Here in the Missals is found the rubric *Incipit Missa*.

The *Missa Fidelium* begins with :

P. Dominus sit semper vobiscum.

Ch. Et cum spiritu tuo.

Some prayers follow which are proper to the feast, after which the priest says *Oremus*, and the choir sing :

Agios, Agios, Agios, Domine Rex aeternae. Tibi laudes et gratias.

After a prayer for the Church, the rubric prescribes a short sermon on the mystery of the day. Then the names on the *Diptychs*, or which were formerly on the diptychs, are recited as follows :

P. Per misericordiam tuam, Deus noster in conspectu sanctorum apostolorum, et martyrum, et confessorum, atque virginum nomina recitantur. *Choir.* Amen.

P. Offerunt Deo Domino oblationem sacerdotes nostri, Papa Romensis, et reliqui, pro se et pro omni clero ac plebibus ecclesiae sibimet consignatis, vel pro universa fraternitate; ita offerunt universi presbyteri, diaconi, clerici, ac populi circumstantes in honorem Sanctorum pro se ac suis.

Choir. Offerunt pro se et pro universa fraternitate.

P. Facientes commemorationem beatificorum apostolorum ac martyrum, gloriosae Sanctae Mariae Virginis, Zachariae, Johannis, Infantum, Petri, Pauli, Johannis, Jacobi, Andrea, Philippi, Thomae, Bartholomaei, Matthaei, Jacobi, Simonis et Judae, Matthiae, Marci, et Lucae.

Choir. Et omnium Martyrum.

P. Item pro spiritu pausantium Hilarii, Athanasii, Martini, Ambrosii, Augustini, Fulgentii, Leandri, Isidori. . . . [Then follow the names of thirty-eight others, mostly Archbishops of Toledo : strange to say that of S. Ildephonsus is not amongst them.]

Choir. Et omnium pausantium.

After the names have been recited, some prayers (proper) are said and then the *pax* is thus given; the priest stretches his hands towards Heaven and says :

Gratia Dei Omnipotentis, Pax et dilectio Domini nostri Jesu Christi, et communicatio Spiritus Sancti sit semper cum omnibus nobis.

Choir. Et cum hominibus bonae voluntatis.

Priest. Quomodo astatu pacem facite.

Choir. Pacem meam do vobis, pacem meam commendo vobis,

Non sicut mundus dat pacem, do vobis.

Novum mandatum do vobis ut diligatis invicem.

Pacem meam, &c.

Gloria et honor Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto

In saecula saeculorum. Amen.

Pacem meam, &c.

The priest saying: "Habetote osculum dilectionis et pacis, ut apti sitis sacrosanctis mysteriis Dei," takes the Pax from the paten whilst the choir sings "Pacem meam:" he gives it to the deacon, or server, who in turn gives it to the people.

Then follows :

Priest. Introibo ad altare Dei.

Choir. Ad Deum qui laetificat juventutem meam.

Priest. Aures ad Dominum.

Choir. Habemus ad Dominum.

Priest. Sursum corda.

Choir. Levemus ad Dominum.

Priest. (inclining) Deo ac Domino nostro Jesu Christo Filio Dei, qui est in coelis, dignas laudes, dignasque [here he raises his hands] gratias referamus.

Choir. Dignum et justum est.

After which is said the Preface, or as it is called the *Inlatio* or Inference; because, Cardinal Bona suggests, the priest infers from the response of the people that it is "right and just" to offer the Sacrifice. After the Preface, which is proper for every Sunday and Festival, comes the Sanctus as with us: the words "*Agios, Agios, Agios, Kyrie o Theos*?" being added to it. The priest says a prayer, which is proper, and then comes the *Canon*, which is very short, as will be seen:

Adesto, adesto, Jesu bone Pontifex, in medio nostri sicut fuisti in medio discipulorum tuorum. Sanctifica hanc oblationem ut sanctificata ✠ sumamus per manus sancti Angeli tui, sancte Domine ac redemptor aeternae. Dominus noster Jesus Christus in qua nocte tradebatur accepit panem et gratias agens benedixit, ac fregit, deditque discipulis suis dicens: accipite et manducate, Hoc est Corpus meum quod pro vobis tradetur: (*Hic elevetur corpus*). Quotiescumque manducaveritis, hoc facite in meam ✠ commemorationem. Similiter et calicem postquam coenavit dicens: Hic est enim calix sanguinis mei, novi et aeterni testamenti, mysterium fidei, qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum (*Hic elevetur calix copertus cum filiola*). Quotiescumque biberitis, hoc facite in meam commemorationem. *Choir.* Amen.

Quotiescumque manducaveritis panem hunc et calicem istum biberitis, mortem Domini annuntiabitis donec veniat in claritatem ✠ de coelis. *Choir.* Amen.

The rubric directs the priest to say the words "in meam commemorationem," and "claritatem de coelis" *alta voce*

omnibus diebus praeter festivas. The old form for the consecration of the Chalice was, "Hic est calix novi Testamenti in meo sanguine, qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum."

The Canon is succeeded by a prayer (proper), after which the priest holds the Sacred Host over the uncovered chalice and says :

Dominus sit semper vobiscum.

Choir. Et cum spiritu tuo.

Priest. Fidem quam corde credimus ore autem dicamus.

The priest elevates the Sacred Host, and the choir say the Creed, two and two ; this is only said, however, on feasts of four or six copes, within octaves, and on Sundays for which there is no proper Antiphon "ad confractionem panis." The form of the Nicene Creed used, differs in some particulars from that in the Roman Missal. It runs thus :

Credimus in unum Deum invisibilium conditorem. Et in unum Dominum nostrum Jesum Deo vero natum non factum, Omousion Patri hoc est ejusdem cum Patre substantiae ; per quem omnia facta sunt quae in coelo et quae in terra ; qui propter factus est. Passus sub Pontio Pilato. Tertia die resurrexit. Ascendit ad coelum sedet ad dexteram Patris omnipotentis. Inde venturus est judicare vivos Et in spiritum sanctum Dominum vivificantem, et ex Patre et Filio procedentem, cum Patre et Filio adorandum et conglorificandum Ecclesiam. Confitemur unum peccatorum. Expectamus resurrectionem saeculi. Amen.

The priest divides the Host into two portions, one of which is at once divided into four, the other into five portions. Each particle is known by a particular name and the nine are thus arranged on the paten :—

	Corporatio.	
Mors.	Nativitas.	Resurrectio.
	Circumcisio.	Gloria.
	Apparitio.	Regnum.
	Passio.	

When the priest has divided the sacred Host, he cleanses his fingers, covers the chalice and makes the *Memento of the living*, for which there is no special form. He then

says the *Preface to the Pater Noster*, and the prayer itself in this form, which is also used in the Breviary offices :

Priest. Pater noster qui es in coelis.

Choir. Amen.

Priest. Sanctificetur nomen tuum.

Choir. Amen.

Priest. Adveniat regnum tuum.

Choir. Amen.

Priest. Fiat voluntas tua sicut in coelo et in terra.

Choir. Amen.

Priest. Panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie.

Choir. Quia Deus es.

Priest. Et dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris.

Choir. Amen.

Priest. Et ne nos inducas in tentationem.

Choir. Sed libera nos a malo. Amen.

After the *Pater* the priest says a prayer, and taking the particle *Regnum* holds it over the chalice saying :

Sancta Sanctis et conjunctio corporis Domini nostri Jesu Christi sit sumentibus et potantibus nobis ad veniam, et defunctis fidelibus praestetur ad requiem.

During Paschal tide and the octave of Corpus Christi instead of *Sancta Sanctis*, he says :

Vicit Leo de tribu Juda. Alleluia.

To which the choir responds :

Qui sedes super cherubim radix David. Alleluia.

This is repeated three times.

After the *Sancta Sanctis*, or *Vicit Leo*, the particle is placed in the chalice which is then covered. After this the priest, or deacon if there be one, says :

Humiliate vos benedictioni.

The blessing, which is proper, is in four parts, to each of which *Amen* is answered. The choir then sings :

Gustate et videte quoniam suavis est Dominus.

P. Alleluia. Alleluia. Alleluia.

Ch. Benedicam Dominum in omni tempore semper laus ejus in ore meo.

P. Alleluia. Alleluia. Alleluia.

Ch. Redimet Dominus animas servorum suorum, et non delinquentur omnes qui sperant in eum.

P. Alleluia. Alleluia. Alleluia.

Ch. Gloria et honor Patri, et Filio, et Spiritui Sancto in saecula saeculorum.

P. Alleluia. Alleluia. Alleluia.

The priest takes the particle *Gloria*, and holds it over the chalice saying :

Panem caelestem de mensa Domini accipiam et nomen Domini invocabo.

Still holding It over the chalice he makes, without any special form, the *Memento of the Dead*.

He then says two prayers ; after which he consumes the particle *Gloria* and then the others. After another prayer he consumes the Precious Blood, and then says the *Prayer for Stability* :

Domine Deus meus, Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus, fac me te semper quærere et diligere, et a te per hanc sanctam communionem quam sumi, nunquam recedere, quia tu es Deus, præter te non est alius in saecula saeculorum. Amen.

During which the choir sings :

Refecti Christi corpore et sanguine te laudamus Domine.
Alleluia. Alleluia. Alleluia.

The priest says the Communion and a prayer, both proper, and then :

Per misericordiam tuam, Deus noster, qui es benedictus et vivis et omnia regis in saecula saeculorum. Amen.

Dominus sit semper vobiscum.

Ch. Et cum spiritu tuo.

Standing in the middle of the altar the priest, or deacon if there be one, says :

Solemnia completa sunt in nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi, votum nostrum fit acceptum cum pace.

R. Deo gratias.

Then kneeling the priest says the *Salve Regina* with the prayer *Concede nos famulos*, after which turning to the people he blesses them :

In unitate Sancti Spiritus benedicat vos Pater et Filius. *R.* Amen.

And so the Mass ends.

High Mass is only sung in the *Capilla Muzaraba* of Toledo Cathedral once a month, when there is a requiem for the soul of Cardinal Ximenes. There are two other churches in Toledo where this Rite is permitted, but I believe it is only used in them once a year. In the cathedral of Salamanca it is used on all the great feasts of the year. With these exceptions, the Rite has become obsolete.

I will conclude by mentioning a few peculiarities in the arrangement of the calendar, and the names of feasts. *Advent* has six Sundays; the *fourth Sunday of Lent* is called the *first Sunday of the Passion*, the fifth Sunday being the *second of the Passion*. December 18th is the feast of the *Annuntiatio B. M. V.*; the Epiphany is styled the *Apparitio D. N. J. C.*; Easterday, *In Lactatione diei Paschae Resurrectionis D. N. J. C.*; May the 1st is dedicated to St. Philip only, whilst December 29th is the feast of St. James, *brother of the Lord*. On July 16th there is a feast *Triumphus Sanctæ Crucis*. On Holy Saturday there is no Mass; and during Christmastide there is a special antiphon B. M. V. in the Office.

E. W. BECK.

THE HOLY WELLS OF IRELAND.—WESTMEATH.

IT is interesting to notice in the Lives of St. Patrick many references to wells and fountains, made use of by the Apostle in baptizing the pagan Irish. Before we draw attention to Westmeath holy wells, their traditions and locality it may not be out of place to follow for a short way St. Patrick's footsteps. We find that Hercules, or Ere was baptized at Tara, in the fountain or well of Loigles¹. The event is thus

¹ Loigles—Laog is a calf in Irish. We find the name in the form of Lee as Ballinree in Longford and Wicklow, *i.e.*, "The Ford Mouth of the Calves." (See Joyce's *Irish Names of Places*.)

recorded in *Documenta de St. Patricio ex libro Armachano*:¹—“Et venierunt ad fontem Loigles in Scotica nobiscum Vitulus Civitatum.”

St. Patrick's interview with, and conversion of, King Laoghaire's daughters at Cruachan is mentioned in the Tripartite.

“Patrick went afterwards to the fountain, *i.e.*, Clibech, at the slopes of Cruachan at sunrise. The clerics sat down at the fountain, Laoghaire MacNeill's two daughters, *viz.*, Eithne the Fair, and Feidelm the Red, went early to the fountain to wash their hands, as they were wont to do, when they found the synod of clerics at the well with white garments, and their books before them, etc.”

Then follow St. Patrick's instructions to the maidens, and their interrogations as to the existence of God and the spiritual life. The same events are narrated in the *Book of Armagh*, beginning thus—

“Deinde autem venit Sanctus Patricius ad fontem qui dicitur *Clebach* in lateribus Crochan, etc.”²

There is still a well at the Rath which is surrounded by a double ditch.³

The next allusion to wells in the Tripartite is found in St. Patrick's foundation at Cill-Garad (now Oran, Co. Roscommon)—⁴

“Then it was that Patrick made the well which is called *Uaran-gurad*, and he loved this water very much, ut ipse dixit

Uaran-gar, Uaran-gar

O Well; which I have loved, which loved me.

Alas! my cry O dear God,

That my drink is not from the pure well.”⁵

Patrick went to Gregraidh, of Lough Techet,⁶ founded a church there, and dug a well thereat, and no stream went into, or came out of it, but it was always full, and its name

¹ Edited with preface and notes by the learned Jesuit, Rev. Edmund Hogan, S.J.

² *Hodie Rath Croghan (Documenta, etc., E. Hogan, S.J.)*

³ *Life of St. Patrick* by Miss Cusack, p. 291.

⁴ See Lanigan's *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland*. Vol II., pp. 244-6.

⁵ Tripartite Life.—W. M. Hennessy. *Apud Cusack's Life of St. Patrick.*

⁶ *Hodie Lough Gara—Sligo.*

is *Bithlan, i.e.*, ever full. In the *Book of Armagh* the event is referred to—

“Et perrexit ad tractum Gregirgi,¹ et fundavit ecclesiam in Drummae et fontem fodivit in eo [loco, et aqua non] exluit in se et de se, [sed] plenus semper et perennis est.”

One other reference to St. Patrick's wells will suffice for this article. Again quoting the Tripartite, we find—

“Patrick went to Tobar Finmaighe, *i.e.*, a *Well*. It was told to St. Patrick that the pagans honoured this well as a God. The well was four-cornered, and there was a four-cornered stone over its mouth, and the foolish people believed that a certain dead prophet made it, etc.”

The *Book of Armagh* says :

“Et venit ad fontem Findmaige qui dicitur Slan Fons vero quadratus fuit, et petra quadrata erat in ore fontis, etc.”²

Westmeath with portion of Longford included the district known as *Teffia*, as far back as the time of St. Patrick; a tradition assigns a holy well under his protection at Usneach, near which he preached the Gospel; no traces of the well are identified. The well in the parish of Rathconrath has St. Patrick for its patron. St. Odran's well is situated near the old church of Kilkeiran, Castlejordan parish. Odran was St. Patrick's charioteer, who saved his master's life by sacrificing his own. There are other *Odrans* if we mistake not, among the Irish saints. The Bollandists mention one of the name (not *Odran* the Martyr.) There was Odran, Monk of Derry, who died A.D. 563 at Iona, and was interred there; he was son of Aingin, who was grandson of Conall Gulban. (See Ordnance Survey of Derry, by Colonel Colby). St. Fintan's well is at Brianstown, in the parish of Dysart. It was much frequented some years ago. St. Fintan was known by the name Munna, the oldest notice of him is given in his Acts preserved in Marsh's Library, Dublin, in the Codex Marsh.³

¹ Vel Gregraidi (E. Hogan, S.J., in *Documenta de S. Patricio*).

² Collectanea Tirechani—apud *Documenta de S. Patricio*, Rev. Edmund Hogan, S.J. This circumstance also mentioned in Jocelyn's Life of St. Patrick (translated from the Latin by E. L. Swift.)

³ See *Christian Biography* (Smith and Wace.)

He was of the *Hy Nial* race. St. Fintan's life as quoted by Ware begins—

“Fuit vir vitæ venerabilis nomine Munnu de claro genere Hiberniæ insulæ; idem de nepotibus Neil cujus pater vocabitur Tulcanus, mater vero Feidelmia dicebatur.”

Lanigan suggests that the name or surname Munnu may have some reference to the *Maine* (?) branch of that family. Fintan died A.D. 630. He founded Taghmon in Wexford, and most probably Taghmon in Westmeath. St. Diarmaid,¹ Bishop of Inis-Clothrann,² has a well under his invocation in the parish of Mayne—Anglicised, Darby. He was of the race of Fiachra maternally descended from Dubtach, chief poet to Laoghaire. Of Diarmaid it was said—“Ex monacho factus est sacerdos et sacerdote Abbas, et Abbate episcopus.” St. Diarmaid flourished in the sixth century. In the parish of Bunowen there is a well dedicated to the Blessed Virgin called “Tobermurry or Lady Well.” Stations were held there on 8th September in former times.

At the hill of Usneach³ is Tobar Amhaill—Saint Avell's well. At Kilmaglish is Fons S. Patricii. In the parish of Killucan there was formerly a holy well, now dried up—“Mionad's well.” A legend is attached to it which O'Donovan remarks as being a very general story of holy wells throughout Ireland. A woman, it is said, washed clothes in Mionad's well, in consequence of which profanation the well became dried up and broke out in the townland of Rathnarrow about half a mile from the original locality. There is a tradition preserved at Killucan that St. Mionad ni-Aimligh was of the O'Hanly family,⁴ and that she came from Roscommon to Killucan, and became patron of the parish. At Drumrany Saint Enan or Henan's festival was kept on the 19th August; his

¹ St. Diarmaid's ivory statue was preserved for a long time in the Island of Lough Ree. To preserve it from vandalism, it was buried in the earth, but was afterwards removed by a priest. (See Colgan's *Acta Sanctorum*—Vita S. Diarmidii. Cap. vi.

² In Lough Ree.

³ *Uisniöch*, the seat of one of the royal palaces of Ancient Erin, founded by Tuathal. The Druidic Rites were celebrated there; and a tract of land bestowed upon the Druid who lit the first fire in Erin. (See Keating and Irish Histories *passim*.)

⁴ Ordnance Survey Papers. Westmeath.

holy well is still held in reverence by the people. In the barony of Rathconrath is Disert Maeltuile, *viz.*, Maeltuile's "Desert" or "Wilderness;" Tobar Multilly used to be frequented 29th May. In the Martyrology of Donegal the following entry is inserted:—

"May 29th. *Maeltuile's Baculus*, or pastoral staff works miracles on perjurers' before they go out of the church, his well, and his yellow bell, and his Baculus and his statue are there still."

Saint Aidus, or Hugh has always been held in great reverence by the Westmeath people. He was Bishop of Killare; at Foyran there is a well dedicated to him, and at Killare, Colgan mentioned three miraculous fountains, the waters of which turned a neighbouring mill. At Kilbixy there is Saint Bigsech's well. She was of the race of Fiachra. S. Bigsecha filia Bressalii colitur 28 June (*Acta*, Colgan). In the parish of Killucan, about half a mile from a place called Scarden, there is a well that used to be visited by numbers of people, the first three Sundays in autumn, there is a stone over this well with the following inscription:—"This stone was erected by Denis Martin, and Eleanor Martin his wife, and for John Martin, and son." The people made stations by going three times round, kneeling in four places each time, saying seven Paters and seven Aves and Gloria, and finishing by kneeling on a stone in the stream, and offering up whatever prayers their devotion might suggest. At Rathlugh, parish of Kilbeggan, St. Hugh's stone, and holy well were held in great veneration. Saint Hugh is said to have prayed at this stone, and the faithful after visiting it proceeded to his well. The stone was believed by the people to cure headaches. This well is now closed up. Saint Cumian's well is situated at Leckin, St. John's well near Rathconnell, and at Noughavall parish, townland of Creggan there is a well to Saint Patrick—*Fons S. Patricii*. At a hill called *Carrick-Moile* in the parish of Lickblae Saint Brigid's well is to be seen; there is also a well dedicated to the Blessed Virgin in the same parish. At Foyran St. Aidu's well is shaded by an ash tree, part of which was consumed some years ago by a man lighting his pipe, and leaving it ignited in the hollow of the tree. Ballimore Lough-Seudy has two wells, Sunday well

and Saint Mary's. Dr. Joyce in his work on Names of Places remarks that a great many wells in different parts of the country are called *Tobar righ an domhnaigh* literally the well of the King of Sunday. At Glammerstown, there is a well dedicated to St. Baoithin; he was a contemporary of St. Columba; at the Synod of Drumceatt, the latter declared that Baoithin¹ was the handsomest man in Ireland, and Columba prophesied that his spiritual graces would equal his beauty; Baoithin far from being elated at the admiration shown for his exterior attractions prayed that his beauty might be withdrawn. He was of the race of Enda Finn, son of Cuana (of Tech Baoithin in Airteach, Westmeath). So much for the interesting Irish history that is gathered round the holy wells of Westmeath.

JOHN M. THUNDER.

DR. HUGH DE BURGO.—III.

THERE were few of the Irish nobility whose alliance was more eagerly sought for by the Confederates, than was that of Ulick De Burgo, Earl of Clanricarde and St. Albans. His estates in Ireland comprised valuable portions of the confiscated Church lands of Connaught. His landed property in England was also extensive; and his political influence there must have been considerable, considering his close family connection with the Earl of Essex. He was also a Roman Catholic, and the only Irish Roman Catholic who was permitted to hold any office of honour or trust from the Crown. His influence with his Catholic fellow-countrymen might have been considerable, though they should not expect much active sympathy from the son of the man to whom their defeat at Kinsale, but a generation before, was mainly attributable. But the Catholics feared his duplicity and selfishness, and his connection with Essex caused the great body of Royalists to question the sincerity

¹ *Dictionary of Christian Biography.*—(Smith and Wace.)

of his loudly professed loyalty to the king. He was therefore sought for by the Confederates, less through motives of regard than distrust.

In 1642 Sir Lucas Dillon and the O'Connor Don waited on his Lordship at the Castle of Loughrea, and formally invited him to aid in promoting the cause for which they and their countrymen had taken up arms. They reminded him of his Irish birth, and consequent duty to his country. The interview was fruitless. His Lordship was careful, however, "to keep them in temper," and not "to contradict their opinion," and referring to the interview in his notebook, he cynically remarked, "I was born in Clanricarde House, Lincoln's Inn Fields, London." He was appealed to by Lord Fingall and others, who explained to him their position and their prospects. And the writers add: "There wanteth in this action no more but that your Lordship will declare yourself for us, to make it happy and successful to the end." He received a special letter from Lord Gormanstown, assuring him that the Confederates "will value beyond all respects the name of a zealous Catholic." On the 28th November, the same year, he was appealed to by the Supreme Council. The letter was signed by Lord Mountgarrett, the Primate, by his kinsman, the Bishop of Clonfert, and many others. In this appeal he is asked "to resist the injuries offered to religion and God, and the indignities to which his Majesty the King was exposed." He received a copy of the circular addressed to all the gentlemen of Connaught, by which they were invited to join in the endeavour "to assure the liberty of their consciences, and preserve the freedom of the kingdom." He was also appealed to by General Preston, in a letter characterized with the direct frankness of a soldier and the sentiments of a Catholic. Preston's concluding words were well calculated to move any other less callous than the selfish Clanricarde "Let it not be said in after ages that your Lordship should be so far degenerate from the worth of your ancestors, as to further the designs of the Parliament *against God, your kindred, and your country*, but remember you are an Irishman, and if that the Irish be extirpated, you must not expect to

escape scott free." But those appeals on behalf of religion and country were fruitless. He continued to observe what is mildly described by the Supreme Council as a "stupid neutrality." It is even plainly insinuated that his "neutrality" was attributable to the dangerous influence of his country's enemies.

Though the confederates addressed Clanricarde in language that might have pleased his vanity, they had given the military commander of the province *private* orders "to have a wary eye upon his actions." Should Clanricarde attempt to use his influence "to doe them harme," General Bourke had instructions to "fall upon him as a *professed enemy*." He was disliked by the clergy, and had the Archbishop of Tuam hurled against him the severest ecclesiastical censures, he would have been supported by the Supreme Council in his action. The consequence was on Clanricarde's part, a gradual decay of influence with the people, until he had "scarce men enough left, whom he might trust with the defence of Loughreagh or Portumna."

He frequently referred to his loyalty to the king, and sometimes to his scruples of conscience, regarding the oath of "association" as a justification of his neutrality. To the gentlemen residing in the several baronies of the diocese of Clonfert, he issued a "monition," requiring them to consult Oliver Burke, the then Vicar General of Clonfert, concerning some of his alleged conscientious scruples. They were to ascertain whether considering the obligations of their oaths of allegiance to the king, they could be bound "under pain of mortal sin," to take the oath of "association" if required to do so. And secondly, whether in case they refused, they would be liable to the censure of excommunication with which the recusants were threatened. As was natural, the Bishop of Clonfert was consulted by his Vicar on those difficulties. And the following reply, authenticated by his lordship's signature, was immediately published. "I answer that the said gentlemen, &c., &c., are bound under pain of mortal sin to take the oath of association thereunto required by their ordinary: and are in their default, liable to the censure of excommunication fulminated against obstinate refusers of said oath of association."

The significance of this declaration may appear in the course of these pages in a more startling light, when we shall see the severest censures of the Church hurled by the Nuncio against the Bishop himself and his noble cousin, for an alleged violation of *the stipulations of this oath*. Amongst the stipulations of the oath the following may be regarded as specially important:—

1°. No peace should be accepted by the Confederate Catholics until the terms received the approval of a majority of the General Assembly.

2°. It should guarantee to Irish Catholics the same freedom and immunities as regarded the practice of their religion, which their ancestors enjoyed under Henry the Seventh.

3°. It should guarantee to the bishops and secular clergy, *the possession and enjoyment of all the churches and church livings* in as large and ample manner, as the Protestant clergy enjoyed the same *on the 1st October, 1641*, together with all the profits, &c., &c., “and rights of their respective sees and churches belonging as well in all places now in possession of the Confederate Catholics,” &c., &c. It is important that the reader should keep before his mind both the nature and stipulations of the oath of association, when considering the sad events by which the ruin of the Confederate cause was effected.

Even before the close of the year 1644, memorable for the “cessation of hostilities,” Fr. Scarampi’s political foresight was being amply verified. In Ulster the Scotch Covenanters under the command of Munroe, were largely re-inforced. And the troops under the command of Sir Charles Coote had perpetrated cruel massacres in Connaught. In order to prevent those outrages a strong force under command of O’Queely, the Archbishop of Tuam, was despatched against Coote. But the venerated prelate, after some slight successes, was surprised at Sligo, and slain with many of the noblest and bravest of the west. By his sad death, which was a source of sorrow throughout Ireland, the See of St. Jarlath was rendered vacant. But the anticipated elevation of John De Burgo to the Archiepiscopal See, helped to console O’Queely’s sorrowing flock. His “translation” to

Tuam was recommended by Rinnucini, a prelate remarkable alike for courage, energy, and ability, and who had been just sent as Nuncio to Ireland by the new Pontiff, Innocent the Tenth. In a letter to the Holy See on this subject, the Nuncio referred to John De Burgo, as "a person of mature judgment and upright intentions, but a little slow in expressing himself, and has now a flux in his eye which may damage his sight." If this recommendation, which was written on the 1st March, 1646, may appear cautious, it should be remembered that in a subsequent report, written in August of the same year, the Nuncio's recommendation is more decided. "I have," he says "nothing to add respecting Tuam, because the Bishop of Clonfert, from the six month's experience I have of him, seems every way worthy of promotion therein."

The Nuncio, had, however, on the same occasion, expressed an opinion of Hugh De Burgo, which must be regarded as equally complimentary. He urged on the Holy See the desirability of his advancement to the Episcopal dignity; and if he did not recommend his actual elevation to the Metropolitan See, it seems it was because he wished that a certain deference should be paid to the years of the older brother. "I knew in Paris his brother, Hugh De Burgo," writes the Nuncio, "who seemed to me a person *more active and decided*; and I believe, I recommended him, in case of a change of bishops, but not directly for Tuam, not to *throw slight on his brother*. Hugh has merits of his own; but they are materially aided by the merits of his brother John, &c." In another letter Hugh is referred to as a man of "*greater energy and activity* than his brother." But his energy and activity were still employed in promoting the interests of the Confederates on the Continent. Having completed his laborious mission to the Low Countries, he was next sent as Irish representative to Philip IV. of Spain, to ascertain what his countrymen "had to trust to, and what aid they had to expect from that Monarch." It was on his way to Madrid, that he had met the Nuncio at Paris; and made upon him those favourable impressions just referred to. From such evidence it is clear that the relations existing between John

De Burgo and the Nuncio were hitherto at least of a cordial nature.

The recommendations to the vacant Sees made by the Supreme Council in 1645, were duly considered at Rome; though the Supreme Pontiff's death, and the election of his successor, occasioned some necessary delay, there had been some appointments made in the interval. Dr. Kirwan was consecrated Bishop of Killala, though Father Hugh De Burgo had been recommended for appointment to that See. But several other appointments were deferred. Clonfert was vacant by the translation of his brother to Tuam; Kilmacduagh was rendered vacant by the death of Oliver De Burgo, who was a distinguished member of the Order of Preachers, and first Rector of the College of Louvain. He governed the ancient See of Kilmacduagh as Apostolic Administrator from the year 1626. But it was the new archbishop's earnest wish that his brother should be appointed to Clonfert; and it would seem that he used all his great influence to attain this end. The archbishop's views as to the greater desirability of an appointment to Clonfert, were, it would seem, shared by Father Hugh, but were not favourably entertained at Rome. They were opposed by the Nuncio. He had in the previous year, recommended Walter Lynch, Warden of Galway, for the See of Clonfert, and added that his elevation to that See "would tend to the good of the Province." As Dr. Lynch was universally esteemed and regarded as a "good preacher and judge," it would be difficult indeed to object to the Nuncio's selection. Yet his appointment proved a fruitful source of disappointment to the archbishop. And though Hugh De Burgo was immediately appointed to the See of Kilmacduagh, he, too is charged by the Nuncio with sharing his illustrious brother's feelings on the subject. The matter was indeed made the subject of complaint in a letter addressed by Rinnucini to the Cardinal Protector of Ireland in 1647. The estimate in which their Lordships were held by him but twelve months before, was entirely changed. He speaks of them as "represented to be haughty, and *inclined* to govern after their own fashion."

It was, as yet, perhaps premature to form such a

judgment of Hugh De Burgo's character as the ruler of a diocese. It was perhaps unjust to accept unfavourable representations regarding him, as there then existed a complete estrangement between his brother the archbishop, and the Nuncio.

In the letter just quoted, the archbishop is referred to as "one whom I have found, whenever an occasion arose, the stiffest and most obdurate of all the bishops in opposing my authority." The new archbishop's duties as "Chancellor" of the Confederate council, brought him into daily contact with the Nuncio, and the differences of opinion between them on the great subjects which then engrossed the attention of the country, became daily more sharply accentuated. This, unfortunately for Ireland, encouraged the growth of two distinct parties by which the union of the Confederates was destroyed. The archbishop was supported by his kinsman, Clanricarde who now abandons his "*neutrality*," by Ormond who was always regarded as unreliable, and by the Anglo-Irish generally, who were unwilling to part with the Church plunder which recent legislation placed in their hands. The extent and value of those possessions will be easily understood by the reader, when he remembers that the Earl of Clanricarde alone held the Monasteries of Aughrim, Clontuskert, St. John's at Tuam, Kileruenta, Rosserrilly, Loughrea, Kilbought, Annaghdowne, Clonfert, and Melick, with their possessions. He, with his party, would rest satisfied with the bare toleration of their religion.

On the other side was the Nuncio, with the great majority of the bishops, secular priests, and people of Ireland, with the great Irish General O'Neill, all of whom considered themselves bound to struggle on bravely till the ends proposed by the oath of association were attained. When, therefore, the Bishop of Kilmacduagh took possession of his See in 1674, it was to find the cause of his country, for which he had hitherto laboured earnestly and successfully, imperilled by divisions.

It would seem, however, that he understood the sad significance of those disunions, and regarded with patient

sorrow a state of things which he felt himself powerless to remedy. He seems; after his consecration, to have devoted himself almost exclusively to the duties of his diocese. During the reigns of Elizabeth and James, many of the old cathedrals of which the Catholics were deprived, were, if not plundered and wrecked, permitted to sink into ruins. The venerable cathedral of Kilmacduagh was much wrecked on the accession of Dr. Hugh De Burgo. Its restoration received his earliest attention. In 1649 he had so far succeeded, that the roof was nearly completed, and it was once more dedicated to divine service. Though he had amongst the gentry of the diocese many influential Catholic relations, whose castles still remain to attest their influence, he could have hardly laboured without the most serious misgivings. The booming of Cromwell's cannon already echoing from east and south, must probably have sounded in his ears as the death knell of Catholic hopes.

It was in 1649 that the two Irish parties referred to became directly opposed to each other. Against the authority of Rinnucini, the Ormondists entered into a treaty of peace with Inchiquin, whose hands were yet reeking with the blood of his countrymen, massacred at Cashel. The Nuncio regarded the "peace" as a gross betrayal of Irish Catholic interests, and as a violation of the oath of association. He was indignant at a course of action which he knew would be condemned by the Catholic nations of Europe; and he therefore published sentence of excommunication against those by whom the treaty was accepted. But notwithstanding the interdict, the *Nuncio was obliged to fly to Galway*. Clanricarde assuming command of the Connaught forces, laid siege to the town, and prevented the admission of provisions either by sea or land. The Archbishop of Tuam supporting his kinsman's policy—disregarded the "interdict," and now at least proved "the most obdurate" in opposing the Nuncio's authority. Rinnucini now summoned the bishops to Galway, but in vain. They were met by Clanricarde's and Inchiquin's soldiers, and compelled to return. Dr. French and Dr. Plunket had indeed come close to the city, when they learned with dismay that the Nuncio, opposed and deserted,

had set sail from Galway, leaving our unhappy country to its impending doom. Weary and careworn, the prelates repaired for hospitality to the castle of Sir Roger O'Shaughnessy of Gort, a member of the Council, and there gave pathetic expression to their conviction, that "no greater misfortune could have befallen them"—or their country. Their impressions were soon shared by the entire episcopal body. Disasters followed fast upon each other.

A synod was convened at Jamestown in 1650 for the purpose of devising some remedy for their sadly altered condition.

Ormond's policy was condemned by the synod. He was charged with being the cause of "*losing the whole Kingdom to God, the king, and the natives.*" He was asked to resign his position as Viceroy. And finally sentence of excommunication was issued against him and his adherents. The acts of this important synod had the signature of John, Archbishop of Tuam. Considering the disregard of the Nuncio's censures manifested at Galway and elsewhere, we may well assume that those of the synod of Jamestown were lightly regarded by Lord Ormond. It was too late. A peace with Cromwell might have saved the country from a continuation of carnage. But even this was rendered impossible by Ormond's duplicity.

In less than a month after another Synod was convened at Clonmacnoise. It was attended by the four archbishops, and by sixteen bishops, amongst whom was Dr. Hugh De Burgo. The perusal of its enactments almost recall the sadly solemn appeals of Jeremias to the Jews of old. The people are urged to engage in prayer and fasting, and to seek the remission of their sins through the sacrament of reconciliation.

The retirement of Ormond from Ireland in that year, and the consequent appointment of Lord Clanricarde as Lord Deputy of Ireland, inspired some of the people and prelates with new hopes. But Clanricarde had no claims to the character of a patriot or of a military leader. He had but little sympathy with the suffering people, or with the aims of the bishops. His negotiations with the Duke of Lorraine, which might have proved a source of protection to the country, were marred by his arrogance and all-absorbing selfishness.

All was lost. The Lord Protector's soldiers were, in 1652, in possession of Irish strongholds, and free to indulge, without restraint, their hatred of Ireland's creed and race. The churches were plundered and wrecked. It is recorded that over three hundred priests were put to death, and more than a thousand more driven into exile. The exercise of the Catholic religion was banned, and a price set upon the head of a priest who might venture to remain within the kingdom. Of the bishops, three were martyred, and the remainder were driven into exile. Hugh De Burgo was amongst those who had to fly to England, A.D., 1656, where he continued to reside till his death in 1660. At the request of the Bishops of his native province, he wrote from London to Rome, to make known the state of Ireland to his Holiness, through the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda. The letter is quoted by Dr. Brady in his *Episcopal Succession*. It has been also published by Dr. Moran in his *Spicilegium*. Its interest as a graphic sketch of the state of Ireland at the period, may entitle it to be regarded as an interesting and appropriate conclusion to this rather lengthy sketch.

“Of the twenty-six bishops who, previous to the recent persecution of the Church, resided with their flocks, four only, or at the most six, now survive. As the rigours of persecution allow no intercourse by means of letters between Ireland and parts beyond sea, I was sent hither (to London) by my colleagues in the province of Connaught, that I might from hence make known to his Holiness, and to your Eminence the state of that province and the neighbouring parts. Also before I departed from Ireland, Thomas, Archbishop of Cashel, was still then bed-ridden from old age; and the heretics, as I understand, dragged him from his bed, hurried him from Clonmel to Waterford, and put him on board a ship bound for Spain, without the food and commodities necessary for so old a man. By this cruelty the heretics sought to accomplish the bishop's death, a penalty they were unwilling to inflict on him publicly within the kingdom, lest his martyrdom should prove a solace to the Catholics. After a most rigid inquisition concerning all priests and ecclesiastics throughout the entire kingdom, a very great number of them fell into the hands of the heretics. They were all banished and shipped on board of vessels bound for various parts,—Spain, France, Belgium, or the Indies,—just as the first opportunity of the vessels offered; and that without food or the necessary stores after the heretics had taken all their goods and possessions for themselves. Not even a tenth part of the ecclesiastics escaped this inquisition, and

they who did escape it, lead now a life full of extreme misery in hiding places in mountains and forests. For the Catholics cannot aid themselves with loss of their chattels and farms. And lest this should happen, the good ecclesiastics prefer to continue in the woods, and to suffer every hardship rather than put Catholics to such risks. They lie concealed by day in caves, and in the mountains; and at night sally forth to watch for a few hours over the spiritual needs of Catholics. They are in great want of faculties, ordinary and extraordinary, which they humbly and earnestly request may be specially sent to me for secure transmission to them. Your Eminence, so zealous as Protector, will deign to forward those faculties to me by way of the Papal Nuncio, Paris, who will easily send them on to me. Without those faculties many things happen which bring heavy discouragements to the people and to the workmen in the Lord's vineyard. In times of such most cruel persecutions of the Church, the spiritual consolations ought to be abundant. It would be hard to suffer extremes for the Church, if the Church refused to compassionate the sufferers. This hardship will be removed by your Eminence, by your zeal for the salvation of so many souls."

J. A. FAHEY, P.P.

[P.S.—The writer of the foregoing sketch on Dr. De Burgo is mainly indebted for his materials to the valuable publications of Mr. Gilbert, F.S.A., on the Irish Confederation. He also used with profit Burke's *Archbishops of Tuam*, Hardiman's *Galway*, Moran's *Cromwellian Persecutions*, Canon O'Rourke's *Battle of the Faith in Ireland*, Father Meehan's *Confederation*, and the *Monasticon Hibernicum*.]

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE ORAL SYSTEM OF TEACHING THE DEAF AND DUMB.

I ventured to present to the readers of the I. E. RECORD in the February and March numbers of that very valuable publication some observations on the oral system of teaching the deaf and dumb, and I find myself severely taken to task for what I said by the Rev. Edward Dawson, the respected Chaplain of St. John's Institution for the Deaf and Dumb, Boston Spa, Yorkshire, so that I feel called upon to add some further observations on the subject by way of rejoinder to the Rev. gentleman.

To clear the ground for what I am going to say I desire to repeat what I noticed in the February number of the RECORD, that

my observations were suggested by the perusal of a periodical, edited and published in Paris, entitled *The International Review on the Instruction of the Deaf and Dumb*, and that consequently I could not claim for what I advanced the merit of originality in any sense, whilst, at the same time, I considered observations grounded on such an authority worthy of the most serious attention from all, who had at heart the amelioration of a considerable number of our fellow-creatures, who claimed our most earnest sympathy. The *International Review*, as its title imports, consists of communications, reports of institutions and congresses of Directors, Head-masters, &c., of the Deaf and Dumb in various countries not only in Europe but throughout the world, and is devoted under the patronage of a most respectable committee to the oral system so as to present the most complete panorama, so to say, of the system as it is practically worked out in its various methods, and the measure of success it has achieved everywhere it is in operation. If Father Dawson had not allowed himself in his great zeal, which is beyond all praise, for the oral system to overlook the authority of a publication so faithfully representing his system, as also the fact that it was, as I mentioned, from this source I drew my observations, he would not, I am sure, do me the injustice of saying that my observations "were as far from the truth as the silliest fables against Catholics, that are to be found in the writings of Protestant historians and theologians of fifty years ago." Where, I would ask, are we to look for a true account of the system, if we fail to find it in a work, in which it is presented to our view in all its details, authenticated by such high authority?

To keep in view our relative positions it may be well to state on entering into the subject of our controversy, that Father Dawson holds that the oral system is suitable not only to the instruction of individual deaf-mutes, but also generally to a public school, or institution, whilst I, on the other hand, presume to regard it as unsuitable to such establishments, and to have whatever advantages it possesses confined to individual teaching under conditions very difficult to realize in practice.

Taking this stand I object to the oral system for the public school on the following grounds: first, that for its results, such as they are, more time, and a proportionate amount of increased expense are required, as compared with the sign-teaching school. This consideration may be overlooked in the case of individuals, where means are not wanting, and the parents are ready for the largest sacrifices in the hope of having their children given back to them with the

gift of speech by the exercise of the natural organs, and that of hearing, as it may be said, by means of lip-reading, that is, by understanding others in what they say from the motion of their lips. But when there is question of a public school supported, as it may be, by State aid or Christian benevolence, the case is very different. Take, for example, the great State institution of New York with its 450 pupils, and its pension or grant of £60 a year for each pupil, and suppose two years over and above the time required in a sign teaching institution, the difference of expense would be £54,000 for the number in course of education. Or to come nearer home, let us take the Cabra Institution with its 400 pupils or upwards, the difference at £20 a year would exceed £16,000.

And if we are further to take account of the fact, that the Poor Law Boards throughout the country, who pay a considerable portion of the cost of the pupils they send to the Institution, have them, in very many instances, removed after three years, the oral system could do nothing, or almost nothing for their religious education, whereas the other system can have them instructed and prepared within that time, for approaching the Sacraments of Penance, Confirmation, and Holy Communion. Having assisted some weeks ago at a public examination of the female deaf-mutes of the Cabra School, I heard the Rev. Chaplain in moving one of the resolutions proposed to the vast assembly present speak as follows:—

“Is it not a proof of the zeal, energy, and ability of the Dominican Nuns and the Christian Brothers, that all the pupils that enter the institution at the age of nine or upwards, are able to come to confession before twelve months, and make their first communion before eighteen months, and the great reverence and longing of the children for the Sacraments are not only most consoling, but an additional proof of their knowledge. Such results are the more important when we consider that fully one-third come here at a great disadvantage, being not only twelve or thirteen, but eighteen and twenty, and some even thirty or forty years of age; and again, that more than one-fourth—28 per cent.—remain less than three years. It is satisfactory, however, to know that even those who on account of age or time in the institution cannot be taught to read and write well, can be, and are taught their prayers and the meaning of the Sacraments, as well as their duties; and each of this class when leaving school is provided with a certificate for his or her parish priest, stating that though unable to understand written language, and express themselves correctly in it, they know well what the Sacraments are, and that they have received them.”

In the second place, I object to the oral system in the public school on account of the endless divergences in the views of its advocates and teachers—divergences not merely on accidental or minor points, but of a fundamental character reaching from extreme to extreme, from the extreme, on one side, of utter intolerance of all

signs natural or conventional, in recreation or class, to the extreme on the other, through a regular or irregular progression of compromises and concessions arriving in the end at a combination—at all but a fusion of the two systems into one. Now I would ask, How can we call that a system at all, which is so unfixed and discordant? It is only in the vaguest sense it is entitled to the designation.

In the third place I object to the oral system in the public school as being wanting in adaptibility to a very large number of deaf mutes, who can be taught by the sign system. Here, too, I find the widest differences between the authorities of the system varying from four per cent. as to those who are considered capable of oral instruction, to an indiscriminate admission of all, who present themselves except mere idiots. But, taking no account of these extremes, I would invite attention to a foot note I find under page 231 of the excellent work of Mgr. de Haerne, entitled *De l'enseignement special des sourds-muets* (Bruxelles, 1855), where the distinguished author sets down the following figures on the authority of a Mr. Weld, whose testimony he puts beyond all question: "at Zurich 4 admitted out of 12 presented for admission; at Richen 17 received out of 66 presented; at Pforzheim out of 149 received on trial, it would appear, between the years 1826 and 1845, 54 were sent home to their parents as being unable to learn the system."

Amidst this great variety in the views and practice of the oralist school, room is found for the *touch practice*, if I may use the term, called "le toucher," which I described in February last, and which caused Father Dawson so much disgust. I must confess it was by no means palatable to myself, but setting taste aside, the practice occupies a large place in the *International Review* being continued through several numbers of that periodical as an accredited adjunct of the system, and I see, moreover, that Mr. T. Arnold of the Northampton Institution, whose name is so prominent in the literature on the deaf and dumb, advocates the practice not only at home in England, as reported in the *Quarterly Review*, No. 4, October, 1886, (Messrs. W. H. Allen and Co., London), but also at the third International Congress for the amelioration of the condition of the deaf and dumb held in Brussels, in August, 1883, and who in the course of his dissertation sustains his views on scientific principles, which he developed extensively on the occasion. I referred to it chiefly to point out how it excluded, so far as it was employed, female teachers and female pupils alike from all participation in the oral system, and of course to that extent narrowed its application.

Whilst requiring suitability on the ground of capacity, the system acknowledges its inability to do anything for children beyond a certain age. Seven, eight, or at most nine are the ages required. What then is to become of the multitude of candidates, who for one cause or another cannot be admitted within that period? Here, indeed, is a signal difference between the two systems—a difference so much to the disadvantage of the oral system, and in favour of the system of signs.

In the American schools in general the two systems are combined in a friendly compromise, but then the oral department, unless in very exceptional cases, imparts its advantages only to the extent of a mere accomplishment, an accessory acquirement, as if yielding to pressure from without resulting from popular delusion. They do, indeed, find special aptitudes, from time to time, and no labour is spared in their instruction, but this is not general school-work, which is the subject under consideration.

In the fourth place, I object to the oral system, as being unsuited to impart religious instruction. I find nothing short of a "consensus" on this all-important point. The advocates of the oral system even in Germany, as well as in America, admit and confess it. Now, is not this defect alone fatal to the system? Heaven and earth shall pass away, but the words of our Divine Lord shall never pass away; and His blessed lips asked the thrilling questions: "What shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and suffer the loss of his soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" (*Mark* viii. 35-37). Yes, O yes, this is the test of tests; and tell me of any system of education that is incapable of imparting religious instruction to its pupils, and I pronounce upon it the fatal words written on the wall: **MANE, THECEL, PHARES.** (*Dan.* v. 25). But in yielding this essential point and in admitting the necessity of signs for religious instruction, the oralists make a distinction between *natural* signs, and *conventional* or *systematic* signs, and say, *natural* signs by all means, but not *conventional* or *systematic* signs. I must say that to my mind this is a distinction without a difference. Are natural signs all the same, and invariable? And when a number of pupils come together, and live together, do not their natural signs by the force of circumstances become conventional and systematic? And if it be, as it is, admitted and confessed, that the language of signs is necessary in the all-important matter of religious instruction, why, under heaven, discard the conventional or systematic signs, which are so much more distinct, precise, and in every way better than arbitrary signs, as well for the positive as the sentimental teaching of religion?

I can hardly expect that Father Dawson will admit this objection for I find him speaking of the Institution that has the happiness of enjoying his services as chaplain, in reference to me, in the following terms :—

“ If he had made enquiries about the one Catholic oral school in these islands, he would have learnt that all the children who have been there two years have been learning catechism ; that every Sunday the chaplain hears the lessons that have been learnt during the week, the children in each class standing up in order, reading the question from the chaplain’s lips, and giving the answers vocally with almost unerring accuracy. A full instruction on the lesson is then given, to be further explained by the Sisters during the following week.”

In accepting this statement from Father Dawson we have simply to believe that by extraordinary zeal and exertions on his part he has made the impossible possible, in overcoming the difficulties which all others find insurmountable. But when he adds : “ No doubt, other institutions are doing as much and more,” he leaves us free to differ from him ; and I would refer him to the Report of the London Conference in 1877, at which the deficiency of the oral system especially in imparting religious instruction was distinctly and emphatically insisted upon by several of the speakers ; and it was asserted without a word to the contrary from the oralists present, that the teachers in the oral schools found it necessary to express themselves in signs when imparting religious instruction to their pupils. Mgr. de Haerne himself, who, I understand, is the founder of the Boston-Spa institution, and whose name is to be mentioned with profound respect, is made to bear testimony to this fatal defect in the oral system, for in the Report of the London Conference just referred to, he is represented as asserting, page 95 : “ The signs were much used in religious instruction, even at Berlin, because it is not enough to speak to the mind, you must speak to and from the heart also.” The Berlin institution is regarded as a model school of the oral system, where we must suppose it is carried to the highest degree of perfection of which it is susceptible, and if religion requires the aid of the sign language for religious instruction in that establishment, it is only natural to conclude generally that the other institutions pursuing the oral system throughout Germany feel the same necessity.

I found some time ago a Report in the French Paper called *Le Monde* of a Congress held in Lyons, in September, 1879, for the *amelioration of the lot of the deaf and dumb*, and having put the paper aside, at the time, I am just reminded of it to refer to a remarkable speech in favour of the sign system pronounced on the occasion by

a venerable ecclesiastic named M. Joseph Lemann. It was a pleading for the retention of the system against the proposal of superseding it by the oral method, and I feel the greater pleasure in quoting from it because, like the respected chaplain of the Boston Spa establishment, he spoke "from a Catholic point of view," but at the same time from a different—an entirely opposite stand-point. His arguments followed in consecutive order, and having stated his first and second reasons, he said:—

"Preserve it [the sign method] because *we Catholic priests, we have absolutely a necessity for it in our relations with the deaf-mute.* No, we cannot do without it. There is an act in the life of our children for the preparation of which we would desire to have several languages—it is the first communion of their souls with the God of the Altar. Oh! it is a matter of experience, a thousand times renewed, that with the help of the language of signs the knowledge of this august Sacrament is imparted with greater certainty to their understandings, its truth reaches them in a manner more profound and impressive, and were there but this reason alone, we Catholic priests, we should never sacrifice the language of signs."

From listening to this pleading of a Catholic priest, we will lend our attention to a Protestant minister on the same subject. It is the Rev. Charles Mansfield Owen, M.A., who speaks in a letter addressed to *The Hampshire Chronicle*, under date August, 1882. He writes in his capacity of Hon. Chaplain and Secretary of the Hampshire Mission to the deaf and dumb, giving to his letter the title: "Articulation and Lip-reading *v.* Finger and Sign-language."

It is as follows:—

"SIR—I hesitate to tax your kind indulgence at a time when such pressure is placed upon your columns, but I venture to ask you to insert a few words from one who not only takes a deep interest in all that concerns the deaf and dumb, and to a considerable extent is engaged in mission work amongst them, but who from family circumstances, has been associated with them from childhood. No thoughtful person can help being attracted by the very interesting accounts we have recently read of the practical results of the oral system *i.e.*, articulation and lip-reading; but I do most earnestly entreat the general public to pause before they acquiesce in the somewhat sweeping statement in the *Times* newspaper, that 'lip-reading and speech not only seemed destined to supersede the sign and finger language, but they are also of infinitely greater value.' Most gladly will I do all in my power to advance *any* system which has for its object the true amelioration of the condition of so many of our afflicted fellow-creatures, but I am more and more convinced that it would be a terrible mistake to adopt and enforce the 'articulate' system, to the complete exclusion of the sign and finger language, or even to such an extent that this latter system should prove the exception and not the rule. I venture to assert that there will always be not only a large number of deaf and dumb who will be unable to learn to speak, but also a large number whose voices will be so harsh and abnormal that it would be far preferable for them to talk on the fingers or write on paper.

“As I move up and down in society the conversation, naturally enough, often turns on this question, and I find that ‘society’ is by no means in favour of the deaf and dumb being taught to speak. Indeed, quite the reverse. By far the larger portion of ‘society’ shrinks from the oral system as being unnatural, and the deaf and dumb who adopt it are to a very large extent regarded as speaking automata rather than intelligent human beings. Now, Sir, as far as I understand, one of the strongest arguments in favour of the articulation and lip-reading system is that it enables the deaf and dumb to ‘enter into society.’ In fact, at a recent meeting at Kensington in support of their system, one of the speakers is reported to have said that ‘when the deaf speak only in the sign and manual language they are a people apart, and the affliction descended from generation to generation; whereas by the present means, they are at once admitted on equal terms as members of the whole human family.’ (The italics are my own.) I venture to assert, with all deference, that this last statement is an exaggeration, and I fearlessly challenge the supporters of the oral system to produce a single case where their method has enabled a *born* deaf and dumb person to be admitted *upon equal terms* as a member of the whole human family. The reports of the success of lip-reading belong, in a great measure, to those who have lost their hearing through illness or accident, and not, as a rule, to those who were really *born* deaf and dumb. On the other hand, I am at this moment thinking of some deaf and dumb persons who are, perhaps, more in society than any of their brethren similarly circumstanced. And what is the reason? Simply and solely because they confine themselves to the manual language, or to pen and pencil. If they could, and ventured to, indulge in what society would call unnatural and indistinct articulation, their position would be altered, and the appreciation with which they are now regarded would be considerably lessened. I have no objection to a ‘combined method’ being adopted in special cases (I maintain that articulation will only suit special cases), but should be deeply grieved to see further concession universally made. I am fully aware that the supporters of the articulation system assert that such combination is impossible; they bring forward as an argument the fact that where both systems are taught, the deaf and dumb themselves show a decided preference for the manual language, and become far more proficient in this than in articulation. Be it so. I claim this as an argument in my favour. ‘A straw shows which way the wind blows,’ and we shall do well to profit by a hint so clearly thrown out by the instincts of that very class whom we seek to benefit. Moreover, the manual language is really not hard to acquire, and it is most pleasing to notice how rapidly this knowledge is increasing throughout all classes of society. This has been the case to a very marked degree in our own diocese since the time when a special diocesan mission for the deaf and dumb was organised. It has called forth great interest and excited much sympathy, and I sincerely hope the time will come when *every diocese* will have a similar mission in thorough working order.

“Hitherto, Sir, I have set forth my objections chiefly from a *social* point of view, but there is a far more important aspect, viz., the *religious*. It seems to me a matter of no small regret that the London School Board should have entirely and absolutely adopted the oral system in all its classes. Time was when education and religion were inseparably connected, but those whom God had joined together man has put asunder. One of the chief instructors of the oral system in London told me a few days ago that they were obliged to look upon it purely from an educational point of view. He did not hesitate to acknowledge to me that it was not a good system for imparting religious instruction to a number of deaf and dumb

collected together, and he suggested that when they have left school it will be time enough to pick up the sign and manual language. Sir, I ask, in all humility, is this reasonable? Is this worthy of a professedly Christian country? The deaf and dumb are, from force of circumstances, debarred from the ordinary religious services, and the consequence is that when they leave the various schools and institutions to return to their own homes they too often lapse into loneliness and isolation. Thank God, great efforts are now being made to collect them together at various centres, and give them religious addresses and instruction, and this can only be done efficiently by means of the sign and manual language. How terribly we shall be hindered and handicapped if the rising generation of deaf and dumb are not to be educated in that language which is best suited for imparting religious knowledge. Take, for example, the various schoolrooms in our diocese, or the church in Oxford-street, London, where a number of deaf and dumb meet together. A very large proportion could not distinguish the labial movements of the speaker (especially if he indulged in a moustache—a very popular fancy of the present day), whereas the sign and manual language can be read and understood with the greatest ease at a considerable distance.

“It is said in high quarters that the sign and manual language is fatal to ‘the better way’ (i.e. the articulation system). I hope that I have made out my case, and proved that it is by no means a fact that the articulation system is the better way, either from a social or religious point of view.

“It has also been stated that the education of the deaf and dumb can never make proper progress in England until the funds now disposed of by the institutions (which, as a rule, adopt the finger and sign method), are applied in a manner totally different from that which obtains at present. I earnestly hope that those religious and philanthropic people who have hitherto so generously supported these institutions will not allow their contributions to be directed into other channels, however taking and attractive they may seem. I believe that time and experience will prove that there is only one way of really and thoroughly imparting religious knowledge to a congregation or audience of the deaf and dumb, and that is by the sign and manual language.

“I am, &c.,

“CHARLES MANSFIELD OWEN, M.A.,

“Hon. Chaplain and Secretary,

“Hampshire Diocesan Mission to the Deaf and Dumb.

“Woolston Vicarage, Southampton, August, 1882.”

In the fifth place, I object to the oral system in the public school as being wanting in results. I shall not here repeat what I said on this head in my paper of February last in the RECORD; but since then I have come by some authorities that are outspoken, indeed, on the subject. I shall quote the following, beginning with a weekly paper, published in Kansas, U.S., by the pupils of the deaf and dumb institution of that city, bearing the title of the *Kansas Star*, which under date 18th November, 1886, speaks as follows:—

“From the report of the Malone, N.Y., Institution, we clip the following, as being pertinent to our views on the subject:

“In this connection it may be well to say a few words in regard to the use of the language of signs or gestures in our institution. We do not

use signs as an end, but as a means of instruction. We hold that they are not only the best, but, in not a few cases, the only practical instrument of instruction. I make this statement on ample evidence. Even for the most advanced and intelligent deaf-mutes, and I may add semi-mutes, the explanation of difficult words and phrases by signs is of great value, but for beginners, and those whose mental faculties are of the lowest order, they are indispensable.

“I need only add here that the most distinguished men in the profession, men who have devoted the best part of their lives to devising means to reach the darkened minds of the deaf and dumb, have come to the conclusion that the sign-language cannot and should not be dispensed with. To do them full justice, they have not and never did shut their eyes to the other methods of instruction, but they have one and all, welcomed every new method that has been devised. They have given each of them a fair trial, employed the most distinguished advocates of such systems, frequently at double the salary paid to teachers of the sign system. They have sent men to Europe to investigate this new method of articulation and lip-reading, with instructions to bring an impartial report. In a word, recognizing the great difficulty with which deaf-mutes have always labored in the acquisition of language, they had hoped against hope that this new method would prove a success, and in that case they would have been the first to abandon signs. But the results of their costly experiments and the reports brought back from Europe proved beyond dispute that this new system rested upon no solid foundation, and that the exaggerated reports of the great success of the system were nothing but cunningly devised fables.

“Since then the advocates of the sign system have put forth greater efforts to perfect themselves in the language of signs, and never before have we seen such masters of the language. Go to any institution for the deaf in the United States, and you will find them enthusiastic on the subject of the use of signs in the education of the deaf and dumb. We are not retrograding, but we are advancing. Those who oppose the sign system prove beyond doubt that they know nothing of the sign language, or else they are too indolent to perfect themselves in it, and hence cry loudly for a shorter and easier means of educating the deaf and dumb. They succeed remarkably well with their best pupils, and bring forth these as the representatives of the whole school. The public is all carried away at a single bound. They imagine that the deaf can be taught to speak as well as any one, and many a parent has cherished the delusive hope that their child could be restored to society and placed on an equal footing with all the world. Hence they have snapped eagerly at the bait held out to them, and have spent thousands of dollars with the expectation that their hopes would be realized. Let us come down to the plain, unvarnished truth. The child is deaf. There is no disputing the fact. The parents themselves acknowledge it. Their family physician has informed them that there is no hope of restoration to hearing. This is, of course, a sad blow to them, and it is a long time before they realize the terrible calamity. If they are possessed of wealth, they spare no means to employ all the advertised humbug doctors, but always with the same result—total failure and loss of money. This, however, does not seem to deter them from catching at another class of humbugs, those who profess to be able to teach them to speak. The poor child is sent to an articulating school, and years are spent in the vain endeavour to teach it to speak. The parents spare no expense so long as there seems a single ray of hope that their child will be able to use speech. When, at the end of several years, the child returns to

the parental roof with the ability to say a few words, and perhaps a few simple sentences, the proud parents are satisfied, and exclaim: 'See, my child is deaf, but can talk.' They doubtless imagine that their child is a step higher than the true deaf-mute, but the fact is just the opposite. If that same child had been sent to a school where honest means were employed to educate it, it would have returned home with a mind stored with useful information, capable of giving expression to noble thoughts in written language. This is what we aim to accomplish, and all our efforts are in that direction."

I shall now adduce some authorities, which, I rather think, are not unfamiliar to Father Dawson. In the conference of Head Masters and other workers, as they were called, for the education of the deaf and dumb, held in London in 1877, the two systems were discussed by able advocates on both sides. I shall first quote from a Mr. R. Elliott, who read a long, and well studied paper, on the German, that is, the oral system. He says:

"In view of these considerations lip-reading seems to me to be an agency which is inherently defective. When I am told it is the only one to be used in teaching a poor child, who, previous to instruction, knows not one of the words, nor their meaning, and when, to this same agency we are told to look not only for the communication of knowledge but also for the development of thought and ideas in minds entirely undeveloped, I cannot help pitying the unfortunate object of a process so unnecessarily tedious and unnatural. I cannot but think, too, that to forbid to deaf and dumb children the use of signs, as a means for enlightenment, is to condemn them for a long period to the grossest ignorance, and, in the words of Canon de Haerne, is an attempt 'to force nature to submit to the yoke of art, since mimicry is the maternal language of the deaf-mute, or that, which he has learned in his infancy.'"

And proceeding to the subject of articulation, which is the other branch of the oralist system, Mr. Elliott speaks of it as follows:

"I have now to speak of the articulation of the deaf. And here I must lay claim to a little experience, for I have been a teacher of articulation for nearly twenty years. Some people think, that every deaf person has a voice, that every one has an equally good voice, and an equal capacity for learning to use it, and that, therefore, there is nothing to be done but to set to work and cultivate that voice to the required degree of proficiency. But, no idea can be more fallacious. I have found that, while some children have a natural aptitude to take the elementary sounds, which go to form words, with others no amount of time, care or skill, seem to produce any satisfactory result. And strange as it may seem to those, who have had little experience in teaching this subject, the most difficult, sometimes, I may say, hopeless cases generally are those of children, who having once heard and spoken, have been neglected since deafness has come on, and so have lost their speech Having drawn the distinction between those, who have some power of speech or hearing, or natural aptitude, or who, from some other cause, have the abilities to gain the elementary sounds distinctly and smoothly, and those, who, on the other hand, seem to be naturally wanting in that ability, and whose imperfect articulation seems never

capable, whatever pains may be taken, to rise above a jargon of unintelligible sounds, we may ask what are we to do with the latter class? Shall we, after full proof being given of their incapacity to gain speech with any degree of intelligibility, continue a hopeless task, and so lead them on to that bitter disappointment, that must be theirs, when they find that the voices, upon which so much time has been uselessly spent, are, after all, only a source of disgust to their auditors, without being a help to themselves in passing through life? For my own part, with every feeling of admiration for industry and energy, when displayed to overcome difficulties, I think such qualities are wasted when directed against impossibilities."

He next proceeds to speak of the results of the system, and on this all important branch of his subject he asserts:

"I now come to the second part of my task, in which I shall endeavour briefly to examine the results of the German system of education where it has been long followed. I shall call your attention to the investigations conducted by experts. I think that on any special subject of inquiry the evidence of men with whose profession it is connected is allowed, and rightly so, to have far more weight than that of amateur enquirers however intelligent. And I think such investigations must be all the more authoritative, when they are carried on under that sense of responsibility, which is given by the fact, that they are called for by the interests not only of a particular department, but also a department of State.

"The first of these investigations, to which I beg to call your attention is that made about 30 years ago, at the desire of the New York Institution, by the Rev. G. E. Day and Mr. Lewis Weld. I need not detain you with Mr. Day's instructions, which were full and precise. Mr. Day had been a teacher of the deaf and dumb, and had a good knowledge of the French and German languages. He visited about 20 of the principal continental articulating schools, and embodied his conclusions in a Report. In speaking of the degree of intelligibility of the utterances of the pupils he says: 'A foreigner would find no difficulty in understanding the more common forms of expression, and a few simple questions and answers as spoken by the largest part of the pupils.' He adds: 'On the whole, the greater part of the sounds they make in attempting to speak it is altogether impossible to understand.' In regard to the other, he says: 'The very general impression seems to prevail among intelligent Germans, that the articulation of the educated deaf and dumb is unintelligible. . . . The more common testimony given by physicians, clergymen, and gentlemen in other professions is: 'We cannot understand them.' Mr. Day summarizes thus: 'About one-third of the most advanced class with the aid of the signs employed, and the frequent repetition made use of, appear to understand the most of what the instructor says; another third appears to lose a considerable part; while the remainder seize the most common words, and are obviously, much of the time, at a loss as to what is going on.' He adds: 'Those who occupy the last stages in class are truly to be pitied. Unable from the want of sufficient power of attention and mental activity to unite the fleeting forms of the lips into intelligible words and sentences to the degree required, they lose a large part of the instruction, and receive only crumbs and fragments.'

"The Report of Mr. Lewis Weld, the Principal of the American Asylum, who made a similar examination, was in agreement with that of Mr. Day. In one place he says: 'I scarcely met with an intelligent person of rank, even in Germany, who spoke of the articulation of the deaf and

dumb with approbation.' Mr. Day, ten years later, made a similar examination under the same circumstances, and with the same results.

Mr. Elliott concludes by observing :

"The German system has been in England a sufficient time to have produced some specimens of pupils, who should now be following their several roads in life, examples of the advantages of the system. Can any of them be brought forward and shown in proof of the superiority of the training they have received? Do they hold their own in society, and justify in their habits and actions all that has been advanced in favour of the system? Have they attained to the measure of knowledge, however limited, of those who have been taught in the old way? And finally, have they been furnished with a faculty, by which they may raise themselves still higher in the knowledge of things human and Divine?"

"In conclusion I look forward to such a blending of the favourable points of the rival systems as shall result in the largest measure of good to those for whom we labour. If such a fusion can be made—and there are some of our best men who think it can—then the efforts of all may be brought to converge in one common united course of action, and instead of opposing each other, and each one offering his own nostrum as the sole panacea for the evils we are all fighting against, we shall work harmoniously together in the direction of that perfection of method and practice which will result in the fullest alleviation of one of the most grievous of the deprivations with which it pleases Providence to visit mankind."

We will now listen to the Rev. S. Smyth, who came also to the front in the London Conference. In his preliminary observations he distinctly affirms that it was proved, that the pupils of oral schools when they went out into life fell back on the finger and sign language.

After reviewing the favourable points of the oral system, he observes as follow :—

"It cannot be denied that one of the disadvantages of lip-reading is its indefiniteness. Its expression cannot be asserted to be distinct and unmistakable; for instance, there can hardly be any recognizable distinction in the formation of the words, *how*, *now* and *cow*, except what may be guessed from the context. There must be, therefore, great uncertainty in that mode of expression, and specially in the apprehension of new words; whereas, by means of the manual alphabet, every disposition of the fingers is distinct and undoubted. Another disadvantage of the oral system is that speech is unnatural to the deaf. Dr. Harvey P. Peet, one of the most distinguished and experienced instructors of the deaf and dumb, one who had examined this question thoroughly, held that 'speech—the use of articulate words—is natural only when acquired through the ear.' To the deaf and dumb, by the privation of hearing shut off from it inexorably, it is positively unnatural. Their only true language is that which they can instinctively create, the one outlet left through which their imprisoned spirits can break forth, that of gesture. Whatever theory may be embraced by their instructors, whatever restrictions imposed upon the use of signs, these will be their vernacular."

We are now to hear, and we should, at the same time, reverence some words from one who is entitled to be regarded as an apostle of

the deaf and dumb, Mgr. de Haerne, who assisted also at the Conference. He is known to be an advocate of articulation and lip-reading; nevertheless, he says of the use of signs:—

“The suppression of signs in the conversations held between the deaf and dumb is a proceeding contrary to nature and most inhuman. It obliges the pupils to have recourse to deceit, and to break constantly the rules of the school. It spoils their character, and rears them up hypocrites. . . . To wish to banish it completely from the establishments of the deaf and dumb, as is attempted in some institutions, especially in Germany, is to deprive the pupils of a means of communication given them by nature; it is to narrow the circle of their intellectual activity and æsthetic feeling, consequently placing a barrier to the complete development of their faculties.”

Mr. Hooper, who was justly esteemed at the Conference as an authority of the first order, having observed that his experience coincided with that of Mr. Isaac L. Peet, the Principal of the New York Institution, having visited at home and abroad many institutions, in which articulation was the basis of instruction, proceeded to say:—

“I have seen in this country many persons who received their education in such institutions. While subjecting them to the test of reading, I have found that where I followed the text with my eye, it was almost always easy to recognize the correspondence of the spoken with the printed words. In many cases, however, when I did not see the text, nor glance over it, so as to discover its tenor, I could scarcely catch a single word.”

Mr. Hooper noticed with satisfaction gentlemen acquainted with the finger alphabet and gesture language, communicating by these means what was passing at the Conference to the deaf-mutes present, and he would like to see one of those who teach on the oral system giving to those taught in their schools some knowledge of the proceedings by the movement of the lips, but this he believed had not been attempted here. He had visited some of the oral schools on the continent, and noticed one especially which placed its pupils out as boarders in families so that they should not be able to form a language of signs, but be compelled to use articulation and lip-reading out of school, and found the pupils to be greatly inferior to those taught on the sign system in their knowledge of things and words. He considered it a weak point in the oral system that it kept back the development of the pupil's intelligence, a thing essential to the system, as he learned from the lecture delivered by Mr. Ackers before the Gloucester Literary and Scientific Society. At another school in the heart of Germany, conducted on the plan of boarding the pupils in the house, the system was carried on under most favourable circumstances, the proportion of teachers to pupils being unusually

large, in which, notwithstanding, he found an intelligent boy who had been ten years under instruction, and who readily answered questions which he read on the master's lips, but failed to read a sentence pronounced by himself, and also failed to read it on the master's lips until it had been repeated several times. He came consequently to the conclusion that it is hopeless to expect the deaf and dumb, or the deaf not dumb, to be able to converse orally with one another, or even with hearing and speaking persons; as he also concluded that the development of the children's intelligence must be greatly hindered by their being deprived of the readiest means of interchanging ideas amongst themselves and with their teachers, namely, of their gesture language. At another school, the teacher being absent on account of illness, he was told by the teacher of a school of hearing and speaking children carried on in the same building, that the oral system failed, as the pupils could not make themselves understood when speaking to people out of the school. Mr. Hooper stated also of a school he visited in Switzerland, that he observed the oral system pursued in his estimation with greater success than he had witnessed in any other school, but he was pained, nevertheless, to witness the efforts required to make the pupils catch what their teachers said, and their numerous failures.

I may add another testimony from the London Conference. It is that of the Rev. James W. A. Sturdee, and I quote him especially because his statements have such an important bearing upon the results of the oral system as its pupils go forth into the world. He said that his connection with the Royal Association for the deaf and dumb had given him many opportunities for meeting with deaf-mutes after they had left school. He had met the pupils of every system—German, French, and combined—and had found that many of those taught under the German system, spoke audibly and intelligibly at first, but soon afterwards relapsed, *i. e.*, their acquired artificial speech seemed to go from them, and they resorted to dactylogy. With regard to another question, it had been stated several times that signs were not used under the German system except in the elementary stages. He had met pupils that had been educated under this system, and sent into the world as accomplished pupils, and he had ascertained from their parents that they could neither understand ordinary conversation nor answer questions. He had also spoken to them himself, and in many instances could not make them understand him. The parents of one girl told him that she never used signs to them, nor they to her. He asked her: "Did

you like your school?" and found her utterly unable to understand him. He repeated the question, and saw the mother make signs, and then she answered him. The promoters of the German system said their pupils could be educated, and sent into the world to mix with their fellow-creatures without any more assistance than hearing and speaking people received. Some time ago he attended at a magisterial inquiry in London, where a child taught under the German system was examined. He merely went to watch the proceedings, and to interpret if necessary. On arriving he found the interpretation unnecessary, as the child was taught on the oral system, but to his astonishment there was also an "oral" interpreter present.

I will bring these attestations to a close by quoting the words in which Mr. A. F. Woodbridge reviewed, and summed up the proceedings of the Conference. He said that—

"He felt strongly on the *oral* question, which he considered to be *the* question, the burning question, of this Conference. The system had been described and defended by its advocates in words, which he would shortly quote, and then proceed to give for himself and those that agreed with him, his own description of it. In a document he had seen he found that Mr. Van Asch was quoted as having one of the best schools of the kind in the country, and as strongly recommending, that all pupils on first entering an institution, should be taught on the articulating system, so that the 'silent method' (the language of signs) might gradually be superseded. Of the school in Fitzroy-square the same document reported, that the manual alphabet and all arbitrary signs were rigidly excluded there. Mr. Howard's opinion was, that the two systems should not be combined, though signs might be allowed at first. Mr. Thompson said the two methods should be kept as far apart as possible, and that they could not be combined. Mr. Akers said the German system made use of natural signs, at first, but dropped them as soon as the pupils could express themselves in words; and that no good could be done with pupils taught on the sign system. Miss Hull was strongly opposed to the use of signs, and said that her pupils had gone back in knowledge as soon as she began to use them in combination with the oral method. From all this evidence [said the speaker] we clearly see what it was that the oral system aimed at. It was to abolish signs entirely, if that be possible, and to substitute articulate speech and lip-reading. But is this possible? Can the noble and expressive language of signs, which has been the means, by which thousands have been educated, be entirely thrown aside, and the oral method set up in its place? Ever since the schools were founded, it has been employed to spread knowledge and enlightenment, and to fit the deaf and dumb to fill with equal credit the situations more commonly filled by their more fortunate fellow creatures. As tailors, carpenters, shoemakers, printers, bookbinders, clerks, artists; also as husbands and wives, fathers and mothers, it has enabled them to discharge worthily the various duties of social and domestic life, and it has prepared them for the great Hereafter. Is this an agency that ought to be abolished? He emphatically answered 'No.' He would now proceed to weigh the arguments for and against the two systems, which preceding speakers had urged. . . . 1. It was asserted, that those who taught on the oral system, would not only

obtain as much general knowledge as those taught by the sign language, but would also understand what was said to them orally, if the speakers would take pains to speak distinctly, grammatically, and standing in a good light. These appeared to him to be conditions very hard of fulfilment in the actual life of the adult deaf and dumb. 2. One gentleman thought much would be gained, if the deaf-mute could only be taught to articulate 'yes' and 'no.' But this was a very poor result for such enormous efforts; and the simple signs we ourselves involuntarily used of nodding the head, or shaking it, were surely as expressive as the two equivalent words so laboriously acquired. Mr. Howard, the Principal of the Yorkshire Institution, said 50 or 60 per cent. of the deaf and dumb could be taught to speak. This was not in accordance with his own belief, and he waited for further evidence of the fact. Now to look at the other side of the question. 1. If the sign system were abolished in schools, what would be the result to those adults, who had been educated by it? They would become still more isolated as a class, when even their fellow-mutes were unable to converse with them. 2. A strong and almost insuperable argument against the oral system was that it could not be applied to the further instruction or higher education of the existing adult deaf and dumb population of our large towns. They could not acquire the oral system; they must live and die with a knowledge of the sign language only. The oral method was only meant for the children of the future, and it would be many years before this very green tree could bear ripe fruit. 3. The discordant voices of the deaf, for want of the modulating power of the ear, must always supply an objection to the oral system. Speech, as the Rev. Mr. Smith had said, seemed unnatural to the deaf, while the language of signs came to them as their natural language. 4. The authorities already quoted all agreed that the two systems could not, and ought not, to be combined; that the attempt to combine them did harm instead of good, for that they were essentially antagonistic. This he held to be a fatal objection. The oral system would be limited to a favoured few, and the general body of the deaf and dumb would not be benefited by it in the slightest degree. . . . 5. If only 50 per cent. could be educated on the oral system, what was to be done with the rest? The sign system could benefit not merely 50 or 60 per cent., but 90, and even 99 per cent., for how very few deaf children there were in ten thousand, whom the language of signs could not reach? 6. The oral system having been in operation in this country for ten years, it was obvious to ask for visible proof of what it had accomplished, for under the old system thousands could have been educated in the same time. 7. Lastly, if the opinion of the deaf and dumb themselves were asked it would be found to be adverse to the oral system. He had frequently put the question to his own members, and the answer had been always most distinct and emphatic. They preferred the sign language as the one that was natural to them. He admired the efforts of those who advocated the oral system in trying to find out the best method of teaching; but his advice was, not to discard an old friend before they had thoroughly tried and proved the new one."

Looking back on what I have written, I see I have said a great deal, and, at the same time, I have said very little—very little from myself and a great deal from others. I have done so advisedly, for Father

Dawson would seem to rely but little, or rather not at all, on my personal experience or knowledge, and I have, therefore, preferred that others would speak, who by intelligence, experience and zeal, as well as official position in connection with the deaf and dumb, are entitled not only to attention but deference in the views and statements they advance. They are outspoken and unreserved, and their verdict is a condemnation of the oral system for general school use, reserving its application for anything that could be called success, to special cases of children who lost their hearing sometime after they had made use of speech, as also rare cases of congenital deaf-mutes in showing special aptitudes.

Father Dawson seems not to understand me as to my purpose in speaking of the Cabra schools and the sign-teaching system they employ. Let me explain. In speaking of a system it was most natural that I should illustrate its working by an example, and an example, with which I was familiar, and that, moreover, I should present its working by comparison with a generally known standard, for of what use is it to say that a particular system of teaching is working well or ill unless you have a standard in view to give definite meaning to these qualifying expressions? I, therefore, took for a standard of comparison our ordinary national schools, and to show the efficiency and success of the sign-teaching system in the Cabra schools for the deaf and dumb, I stated, as I was fully warranted in stating, that the children of these schools, age for age, and class for class, are as much advanced in the various departments of primary education as the hearing and speaking children of the best conducted schools under the Board of National Education in Ireland, that especially they are as well instructed in their religion, that they frequent the Sacraments with piety and devotion during their time at school, and what proves in a special way the lasting hold and practical influence religion retains over the conduct of their lives, they come up, year after year, at the rate of somewhere about 200 each year, according to a regulated succession, to make a retreat of several days in order to renew and confirm themselves in their good dispositions, and it is, indeed, consoling in the highest degree to observe from their dress and general appearance, that they occupy positions, in which they are making their way through life not only as good Christians, but as decent, and, according to their rank, respectable, members of society. I would be glad to see such gratifying results produced by any oralist school.

I felt a desire to say something before closing in reference to the

popularity of the oral system, and its adoption so extensively in the teaching of the deaf and dumb, for this is relied upon as a conclusive argument in itself in favour of the system. But I find I am to occupy so large a space in the pages of the forthcoming number of the I. E. RECORD by all I have said, that I must reserve my answer to this defence of the system for a future number.

THE AUTHOR OF "CLAIMS OF THE UNINSTRUCTED
DEAF-MUTE TO BE ADMITTED TO THE SACRAMENTS."

DOCUMENTS.

DECISION OF THE S. CONGREGATION OF THE COUNCIL IN AN
INSTRUCTIVE MATRIMONIAL CASE REGARDING VAGI.

CRACOVIIEN. SEU VARSAVIEN.

MATRIMONII.

Diebus 27 Martii et 26 Junii 1886.

Sess. 24 cap. I de Refor. matr.

Compendium facti. Casimirus et Josepha matrimonium contraxerunt Cracoviae die 3 Octobris 1876 coram parcho ecclesiae Omnium Sanctorum; hujusmodi matrimonium nunc censent esse clandestinum.

Vir natus est Varsaviae, ubi quoque medicinae studia absolvit; dein, incipiente anno 1874, Lovicium venit, officio medici perfuncturus in hospitali S. Thaddaei. Et ibi Josepham vidit, quam brevi amavit, cui tandem fidem despondit. Sed antequam id fieret, ipse, Junio mense 1876, ex hospitali Lovicii discesserat, ac munus medici districtualis in oppido Nowo-Minsk susceperat, ubi stabile domicilium fixit.

Mulier autem pariter Varsaviae circa annum 1835 nata dicitur, sed nescitur qua de causa, nonnisi post decennium sacro baptismo abluta reperitur in ecclesia cathedrali Sandomiriae, quando scilicet ejus parentes, penates suos Sandomiriam transferentes, illuc venerunt.

Post aliud circiter decennium Josepha major aetatis jam effecta,

cum mundum relinquere statuisset, paternam domum deseruit ac Varsaviam rediit, ut institutum Sororum a Charitate ingrederetur. Voti compos effecta, ac inter sorores cooptata anno 1857, per integrum ferme vicennium religiosam vitam honesto more duxit; non uno tamen manens in loco. Etenim Varsaviae primum in instituto S. Casimiri fuit, dein aliquot annos Biala transegit, subinde Lovicium venit quo et cognovit medicum Krasuski.

Martio mense 1867, postquam duos circiter annos in hospitali Lovicii mansisset, aliquid forsitan in mente gestans ex iis quae cum medico Krasuski egerat, Varsaviam repetiit, ac in instituto S. Casimiri aliquot hebdomadas adhuc mansit, usque dum obtenta a gubernio facultate extra Imperium proficiscendi ad sex menses, cum beneplacito suae superiorissae, Lutetiam Parisiorum venit, ibique in domo generali Sororum a Charitate, die 3 Julii 1876, religiosam vestem exiit.

Libera sui sic effecta cito Parisiis in patriam reverti studuit; sed non apud parentes Sandomiriae, non Lovicii ubi prius manserat, non Varsaviae, ubi nata et plures annos versata erat, non denique in oppido Nowo-Minsk, novo sponsi sui domicilio; sed Cracoviae stetit, et habitavit una simul cum sorore sua Julia in domo a quadam muliere Balbina conducta in platea Szewka. In hoc habitaculo degit a fine Junii aut ab initio Julii anni 1876 ad finem Augusti ejusdem anni. Inde se ad plateam Grodzka contulit in domum possessoris, cujus nomen Delarko, ibique degit usque ad tempus initi matrimonii, scilicet ad diem 3 Octobris ejusdem anni. Affirmavit autem eadem mulier: "Cracoviam veni tantummodo ad nubendum viro meo."

Celebratio autem matrimonii sic evenit: postquam Josepha in plateam Grodzka habitationem elegit, parochum illius districtus, ecclesiae Omnium Sanctorum, adiit. Jam antea ipsunmet ad effectum matrimonii rogaverat, sed ab eo fuerat repulsa, quia extra ejus parocciam tunc habitabat.

Hac vice vero eam benigne excepit. Et cum ipse sponsus Casimirus Cracoviam venisset, afferens testimonium proclamatorum bannorum et fidem status liberi parochi loci Nowo-Minsk, in qua dicebatur licere viro contrahere matrimonium ubi sibi libuerit; curatus ecclesiae Omnium Sanctorum ex parte viri nihil aliud requisivit. Item quum vir secum attulisset, eidemque curato exhibuisset delegationem Episcopi Sandomiriensis, cum dispensatione a duobus bannis Sandomiriae proclamandis ad effectum matrimonii pro Josepha, jam quoque ex hac parte parochus Omnium Sanctorum nihil excipere habuit, et

matrimonium die 3 Octobris benedixit, signans in libris parochialibus se idem benedixisse “ex delegatione Illmi. Rmi. Ordinarius Sandomiriensis.”

Celebratis itaque nuptiis, sponsi venerunt Nowo-Minsk, ibique, ubi Casimirus medicus agebat, per tres annos et ultra convixerunt, prolemque susceperunt. Sed ob indolis utriusque diversitatem discordiae cito natae sunt, quae tandem anno 1880 acriter ardentem separationem, ab invicem induxerunt. Tum vero vir, nonnullorum suasionem coram tribunali seu consistorio Varsaviensi stetit, petens suum matrimonium cum Josepha contractum ex capite clandestinitatis infirmari. Acto regulariter processu, Tribunal matrimonium pro valido et indissolubili decrevit . . . ex eo nempe quod Josepha sub id tempus, nullum aliud domicilium, adeoque nullum alium parochum habuerit, sive ideo quod fuerit persona vaga.

Ab hac sententia cum appellavisset actor ad tribunal apostolicum delegatum Lublinense, hoc censuit priorem sententiam revocare, et matrimonium nullum edicere. A qua sententia appellavit vinculi defensor apud S. C. C.

DUBIUM.

An sit confirmanda prima vel secunda sententia in casu.

RESOLUTIO. Sacra C. Concilii, re cognita sub die 26 Junii 1886 censuit respondere: *Affirmative ad primam partem; confirmandam esse primam sententiam.*

OFFICIAL NOTICE REGARDING PROBATE OF WILLS AND LETTERS OF ADMINISTRATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

VERY REV. DEAR SIR—I find that many priests are unacquainted with the arrangements of a recent Act relating to Probate of Wills, &c. You may think, with me, that it would be useful to direct their attention to the subject-matter of the enclosed *Notice*. The Wills of most priests, and also of many of their parishioners, would fall within its range. The best of it is that the intervention of a solicitor is rendered unnecessary. Even in a simple case one can hardly get out of the hands of a solicitor under £12 or £15 costs.

Yours faithfully,
M. C.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

PROBATE OF WILLS AND LETTERS OF ADMINISTRATION.

Probate of the Will, or Letters of Administration of the Estate must be obtained where a person dies possessed of personal Estate (inclusive of tenancies from year to year, farms held on judicial lease, and property held on lease for years), which, being situated in the United Kingdom, exceeds £100 in value.

The penalty for taking possession of, or in any way administering, any part of the personal Estate and Effects of a deceased person, without proving the Will, or obtaining Letters of Administration of the Estate within the period prescribed by law for the purpose, is £100, &c.

Where the death has happened on or after the 1st June, 1881, and the whole of deceased's personal Estate, as aforesaid, together with the personal Estate situate out of the United Kingdom, does not exceed the value of £300, the total cost of obtaining Probate of the Will, or Letters of Administration of the Estate, is as follows:—

	£	s.	d.
Where such personal Estate is under the value of £100	0	15	0
Where such personal Estate is over the value of £100 and under the value of £300	2	5	0
With an additional 5s. for the Stamp Duty upon the bond, where one is required.			

And in such cases application can be made either to the District Registry of the Court of Probate, or to an Officer of Inland Revenue duly appointed for the purpose.

Annexed is a list of the places at which Officers of Inland Revenue have been appointed for the purpose.

By Order of the Commissioners.

March, 1885,

Inland Revenue, Custom House, Dublin.

IRELAND.

List of places where the Local Officers of Inland Revenue are appointed to carry out the provisions of Sect. 33 of the Act 44 Vic.,

Cap. 12, for obtaining Probate, &c., in cases where Estates do not exceed £300 :—

Antrim	Cookstown	Mallow
Arklow	Donegal	Midleton
Athlone	Downpatrick	Monaghan
Athy	Drogheda	Monasterevan
Aughnacloy	Dromahaire	Mountbellew
Balbriggan	Dundalk	Mountmellick
Ballaghaderreen	Dunfanaghy	Moville
Ballinamore	Dungannon	Mullingar
Ballinasloe	Dungarvan	Naas
Ballinrobe	Dungiven	Navan
Ballymahon	Dungloe	Nenagh
Ballymena	Ennis	New Ross
Ballyragget	Enniscorthy	Newry
Ballyshannon	Enniskillen	Newtownards
Banagher	Ennistymon	Newtownstewart
Banbridge	Fermoy	Omagh
Bandon	Fintona	Oughterard
Bantry	Galway	Ramelton
Birr	Graigue	Rathdowney
Bray	Granard	Rathkeale
Boyle	Gorey	Roscommon
Carlow	Kanturk	Roscrea
Carrickmacross	Kilbeggan	Skibbereen
Carrick-on-Shannon	Killaloe	Sligo
Carrick-on-Suir	Killarney	Strabane
Cashel	Kilrush	Taghmon
Castlebar	Kinsale	Thurles
Castlerea	Larne	Tipperary
Cavan	Letterkenny	Tralee
Celbridge	Lisburn	Trim
Charleville	Listowel	Tullamore
Claremorris	Longford	Virginia
Clonmel	Loughrea	Westport
Clonakilty	Lurgan	Wexford
Clones	Macroon	Wicklow
Coleraine	Magherafelt	Youghal
Comber		

[NOTE.—We are much obliged to our correspondent for this important document.—ED. I.E.R.]

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

OUR DIVINE SAVIOUR AND OTHER DISCOURSES. By Right Rev. Dr. Hedley, O.S.B., Bishop of Newport and Menevia. London: Burns & Oates (Limited).

Books of sermons are often, if not always, disappointing. Discourses which please the ear and appeal to the heart of the listener often seem dull and tedious to the reader.

This is more especially true of sensational sermons, where the energetic and animated manner of the preacher appears to give a substance and reality to what he says. There are, indeed, some sermons full of deep thought and weighty points of doctrine which deserve to be committed to print that they may be of service not only to those who heard them preached, but also to a number of readers who had no opportunity of hearing. To this class of sermons belongs the collection whose title is given above. The author is the Right Rev. Dr. Hedley, Bishop of Newport and Menevia, and member of the great Benedictine Order, that has deserved so well of the English Catholic Church. This collection comprises admirable discourses on the Incarnation, Redemption, the Blessed Eucharist, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, and Penance. There is also a series of five discourses treating of the Necessity of Faith, the New Testament, Teaching Regarding Faith, Obstacles to Faith, and the Divine Giver of Faith. Each sermon is full of grave thoughts expressed in clear and simple language. There is nothing emotional or sensational in the discourses, as they appeal entirely to the judgment and reason. They should produce most salutary effects not only on Catholics who hear or read, but also on non-Catholics to whom they present the teaching of the Church in a very intelligible form, and do not in any way tend to create prejudice or excite the suspicion that the writer is making a case. As the Right Rev. author says in the very first of his sermons, his object is not to treat the subject in the method of dry controversy, but to explain the truth as the Catholic Church holds it, and let it convince men's minds by the very power of its own light. This plan is followed with great success. The subject of each discourse is set forth with singular clearness and brevity, the illustrations from Sacred Scripture are very apposite, and the calm but forcible reasoning is such as to move even a most prejudiced mind. The book will be a valuable addition to the library of any thoughtful and reading man, cleric or laic, Catholic or non-Catholic, and we earnestly recommend it to preachers who must address mixed congregations, or whose duty brings them into contact with non-Catholics honestly seeking after truth.—A. B.

THE HISTORY OF ST. CUTHBERT, or an Account of his Life, Decease and Miracles; of the wanderings with his body at intervals during 124 years; of the state of his body from his decease until A.D. 1542; and of the various monuments erected to his memory by Charles, Archbishop of Glasgow, Member of the Archæological Institute. Third Edition. London: Burns & Oates (Limited). New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. 1887.

This is a magnificent and exhaustive work. The first edition appeared nearly forty years ago, and yet its illustrious author has been able to add but little to it in the present edition. The fact that neither study, nor reflection, nor the research of others has enabled him to make any substantial change in the original edition proves how thoroughly the work from the beginning had been done. The appearance of the present edition of the Life of St. Cuthbert in the twelfth century-year, is very appropriate, and speaks favourably as well for the piety of English-speaking Catholics, as for the learned zeal of the illustrious biographer. The work, while it gives light to the mind, warms the affections into enthusiasm; it may be read with great profit at the convent meal and private family circle, or take its place among the classical works of a public institute.

Though the *History of St. Guthbert* consists of 360 pages, crown octavo, yet scarcely a third of it is devoted to the Life properly so called. In this third we find described the boyhood of St. Cuthbert, his call to the monastic state in the cloisters of old Melrose, his removal to Ripon, his return to and promotion in Melrose, his advancement to the abbacy of Lindisfarne, his retirement to the hermitage in Farne Island, his resignation of the bishopric, his retirement again to the hermitage in Holy Island, and finally his death there. No page of the most sensational character is more touching than the simple story of his last illness and death.

The greater part of the work is devoted to an account of the towns and churches connected with St. Cuthbert, and the three flights to which the faithful guardians of his body had to submit in order to save it from insult by the barbarians. A skilfully arranged map traces the wanderings with the body from Lindisfarne to Galloway, to York, to Lindisfarne again, to Chester-le-Street, till finally it rested under "Durham's Gothic Shade." The learned author gives a very accurate drawing of the cathedral, which became ablaze with gold and jewels, the offerings of piety. These were plundered at the

Reformation, but the body was not molested; very few cathedrals were so fortunate as Durham in having escaped from the hands of subsequent iconoclasts.

The learned author of the *History* defends St. Cuthbert from the charge of misogyny. He shows that the saint's conduct was guided by a love of discipline. And in this connection I looked out for some allusion to a visit said to have been paid to Durham by Edward III. and his royal consort, at Easter, 1333. The queen, after supper in the priory of Durham, having retired to rest, was roused by the king and reminded that St. Cuthbert did not love the company of her sex, so that she had to rise and go to the castle.

Very few saints have had a posthumous history so chequered and touching, and to very few has so ample justice been done as to him. The *History* with its fine print and meadows of margin, its maps of Holy Island, of the priory of Lindisfarne, of Durham cathedral, and of Northumbria, its antique frontispiece and bevelled binding, together with its copious index of places, persons, and subjects, offers attractions to the archæologist, the æsthetist, the historical student, and to the devout clients of St. Cuthbert.

S. M.

LIFE OF ST. CUTHBERT. By the Right Rev. Edward Consitt, Domestic Prelate of His Holiness Pope Leo XIII.; Provost of the Chapter of Hexham and Newcastle; Vicar-Capitular. London: Burns & Oates (Limited). New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. 1887.

This small octavo volume is a very interesting Life of St. Cuthbert. It is brought out on very fine paper, in clear type, and is as full of matter bearing on the life and death of the saint as the bulkier and more expensive work by Archbishop Eyre. From this it principally differs in that it does not so fully or elaborately enter into the posthumous history of the saint. At the same time Monsignor Consitt's work gives a sufficiently full account of the translation of the saint's body, and of the heroic wanderings of its devoted guardians.

In this charming little volume we are treated, too, to a graphic description of the feretory and shrine at Durham; then there follows a very satisfactory sketch of the See of Durham till the Reformation. Finally there is a notice of the examination to which the sacred remains of the saint were subjected in the year 1827.

While the second half of this little volume, consisting of some 240 pages, is devoted to the posthumous history, the first half may without a misnomer be called a Life. It is divided into several parts

by the epochs in the saint's age, and the scenes of his labour. Several chapters are devoted to each of these parts; and thus we have charming sketches of Melrose, Lindisfarne, Farne, Durham, of the saint's episcopate, of his last illness and death.

The learned author, like Archbishop Eyre, is disposed to question the "Irish Life" in the fifteenth century, which claims St. Cuthbert as an Irishman. He asserts with the generality of authorities that the saint was born in Lauderdale, near Old Melrose. Both, I think, might have strengthened their argument by adverting to the utter abhorrence of the saint expressed at the Scottish or Irish method of celebrating Easter—the disciplinary character of the rite, as well as the saint's natural mildness being considered. Though his dying instructions were: "To keep peace with one another and heavenly charity . . . moreover, maintain mutual concord with other servants of Christ;" yet, he added, "with those that err from the unity of Catholic peace either by not celebrating Easter at the proper time, or by living perversely, have no communion." Provost Consitt's charming little volume closes with a contrast drawn between the celebration of the saint's festival in the year 1448 and 1887, in Durham. The contrast is striking and sad. The saint's life has been to many only the basis of a myth:—

"On a rock, by Lindisfarne,
Saint Cuthbert sits, and toils to frame
The sea-born beads that bear his name:
Such tales had Whitby's fishers told,
And said they might his shape behold."

With a love for St. Cuthbert and his ways, which the excellent *Life* is apt to inspire, and through his powerful intercession, who knows the happy change in the near future that may be in store for his once hallowed diocese?
S. M.

SOME HISTORICAL NOTICES OF THE O'MEAGHERS OF IKERRIN.

By Joseph Casimir O'Meagher, M.R.I.A. London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster row.

While England, Scotland, and Wales can boast of genealogical works in abundance, recounting the history of various noble families, but few such useful publications have appeared in Ireland, although the materials are most conspicuous in our public and private collections. However, these are mostly in manuscripts or in documents which rest under the accumulating layers of dust that have settled over them in our archives. Some few good general works of reference to Irish family history have no doubt appeared, yet these

are both scarce and high-priced. In the present instance, a spirit of patriotism, and the circumstance of family connexion with his distinguished tribe of the Ikerrin O'Meaghers, has induced the writer to place upon record, and in a form most attractive, much interesting information regarding the Cinel Meachair. These are descended, as the Pedigrees of Ireland sufficiently prove, from the celebrated Oiliol Olum, King of Munster, in the third century of the Christian era. The book in question does not profess to be exhaustive, and yet a most orderly arrangement of plan and matter, brings the narrative down in regular chronological sequence from early times to our own day. A list of authorities consulted is truly complete, and shows the writer to be fully conversant with the sources, whence all necessary information may be drawn for purposes of research. For centuries the noble clan of the O'Meaghers were settled in their territory, situated around the Bearman Eile or gapped mountain of Ely, and now better known as the Devil's Bit, owing to a curious legend associated with its remarkable outline. The Irish Annals supply many historic illustrations. One of the most interesting, perhaps, is the notice referring to the Blessed Thaddeus O'Meachair, who became Bishop of Cork and Cloyne, A.D. 1490, and who died in the odour of sanctity in 1492, at Ivrea, among the Italian Alps, where in a beautiful marble shrine of its cathedral his sacred relics are deposited and venerated. The successive confiscations of Cromwell and of William III. obliged the martial gentlemen of this race and numbers of their clansmen to take service in the armies of France, of Spain, and of other countries on the Continent of Europe. The gallant deeds of many among them are recorded in the Appendix. However, we miss from those pages one of the renowned for all time—the illustrious hero and the great orator General Thomas Francis Meagher—and this seems to us very strange, in any historic record of this distinguished race. We are pleased to see some admirable coloured lithographic illustrations of the Irish Regiment's uniform in the French service, with other family memorials and heraldic tokens engraved. The talented author's pedigree closes a work which reflects great credit on his industry, capacity and taste. It brings to light many facts not hitherto generally known, and especially as regards the O'Meagher family.

J. O'H.

REVELATIONS MADE BY OUR LORD TO BLESSED MARGARET MARY. Written by herself. Dublin: James Duffy & Sons.

We feel certain that this little sixpenny volume will be welcomed by the devout clients of the Sacred Heart. It is a literal translation

of the memoir written by Blessed Margaret Mary, at the instance of her confessor, wherein she details with the fidelity exacted by obedience the wonderful operations of God's grace in drawing her out of the world, and then of preparing her for the great work of making known the devotion to the Sacred Heart. The various supernatural favours she received, the heavenly visions, the constant presence of our Blessed Lord in a sensible manner, are simply but graphically described, and must have a deep interest for every spiritual nature. With the exception of a few explanatory notes, every line is from the pen of the holy ecstatic herself.

J. O'D.

MOY O'BRIEN. A Tale of Irish Life. By E. Skeffington Thompson. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

We cordially welcome this book, which coming so opportunely, cannot fail to prove a wholesome antidote against the poisonous rubbish poured forth so copiously now-a-days from a venal press, against Ireland and everything Irish, ex uno disce omnes, *v.g.* *Parnell and his Island, Parnellism and Crime*, et hoc genus omne.

In our opinion the gifted authoress of *Moy O'Brien* may well plume herself on her keen political foresight in anticipating events which already have become historic. Grounding her judgments on the eternal principles of justice she was able to forecast with precision issues, soon destined, we trust, to become accomplished facts.

Anyone reading the work before us cannot fail to perceive that the authoress labours to show what Irish landlordism might have been, rather than what it was or is. She seems, as if instinctively, to shrink from saying much about its past or present, well aware, no doubt, that to speak on such a mournful and ghastly theme would far transcend the peerless powers of even Dante himself. What mind is capable of conceiving, or tongue describing, the unutterable sufferings involved in the decimation of upwards of three millions of our race?

Miss Thompson's ideal landlords are those who cease to be absentees; no longer squandering the fortunes squeezed out of the vitals of most impoverished peasantry, in the gambling hells of the continent, or amusing themselves in the London saloons. She has no sympathy for those remaining away, who know nothing, and care less for the country that is cruelly compelled to cater to their morbid tastes. The only time they think of Ireland is when they expect remittances from their trusty henchmen, the agents. According to her views Irish landlords should cease to be absentees, and

become resident amongst a warm-hearted and forgiving people; faithfully guiding them in those pursuits which would soon make our distracted country a veritable Arcadia. But is this ideal picture of what Irish landlords should be, destined to be realised? Considering their antecedents we fear not. They are now as a class, as blindly attached to their traditions as ever. The wanton savagery, of some of them seen just now in the lurid light of the peasants' burning huts, is an outrage on human nature itself. Like the Turks in Bulgaria they are ready to desist from their congenial pursuits, and take their departure provided they are liberally treated for so doing. How far their modest proposal may be complied with time only can tell. Space precludes our speaking further on this painful topic. We heartily congratulate the authoress of *Moy O'Brien* in her laudable efforts to scatter to the winds the mists of ignorance and prejudice that have alas, unfortunately, too long darkened and disfigured the fair face of our beautiful but unhappy island. P. A. Y.

MAXIMS OF CHRISTIAN PERFECTION. By Antonio Rosmini, a New Translation from the Italian. London: Burns & Oates, 1887.

Some of the most celebrated books have been found amongst the smallest, a single little volume having sometimes alone sufficed to raise its author to fame, as was the case with *The Imitation of Christ* and *The Spiritual Combat*, to quote those instances only from among many. More modest, however, have been the claims of the *Maxims of Christian Perfection*, a little work indeed, but whose author has obtained celebrity on account rather of his voluminous philosophical writings, or as a Founder of a Religious Order in the Church; so that the brilliancy of this little gem has remained somewhat obscured by the lustre of his greater works, if indeed greater they can be called. For Rosmini himself, after having dictated a series of remarkable works which at once gave him prominence amongst the learned of his time as an original thinker of profound philosophical genius, was accustomed to regard his *Maxims of Christian Perfection* as the most perfect, and most important book that he had ever written, next after the *Constitution* and *Rules* of his Order.

It may not be generally known that Rosmini, even when most busily engaged in dictating his principal philosophical works, was accustomed to meditate from two to three hours daily before the Blessed Sacrament, and that, like his master St. Thomas, it was chiefly there, or before his crucifix, that he received the light he has

communicated to the scientific world in his writings. He himself more than once admitted this to his confidential friends. But, speaking of his *Maxims of Christian Perfection*, he has left it on record, that this little ascetical work cost him more prayer and more meditation than he had devoted even to his most profound philosophical volumes. And so pleased and satisfied was he after having written it, that he used to say that he did not think there was a sentence in it that could be changed without injury to the book. Indeed, so highly did he prize the *Maxims* as a solid spiritual book, that he had it bound with each copy of the *Rules* of the Institute of Charity, that so it might be in the hands of every one of his spiritual children.

This little book, though less known to the scientific world than his philosophical writings, has nevertheless had already a run of twelve editions in the original Italian, and has been translated into French, German, and English. Wishing to bring out in this country a third edition of the book, it was thought advisable to make an entirely new translation from the original. For this we are indebted to the zeal and charity of Canon Johnson, of Westminster, who being himself struck with the singular beauty and simplicity, as well as solidity of this little spiritual book, and persuaded of the great good its circulation would do amongst Catholics of all classes, has made his elegant translation a labour of love. The *Maxims of Christian Perfection* bears the *Imprimatur* of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, is published by Burns and Oates, and may be had at the modest price of nine-pence, which places it within the reach of all.

COMPENDIUM THEOLOGIAE MORALIS. Auctore, Augustino Lehmkuhl, S.J. Editio Altera Ab Auctore Recognita. Friburgi: Herder, 1887.

It is needless now to speak of Father Lehmkuhl's character as a theologian. His fame in that capacity is already more than established by his great work in two volumes—to him a “monumentum aere perennius.” In less than four years four successive editions of it have appeared, and have been snatched up as soon as issued from the press. This almost unprecedented sale, and the unanimous verdict of the Catholic press bear unmistakable testimony to the worth of Father Lehmkuhl's work. Soon there came from various quarters a call for an abridgement to meet the wants of a numerous class of theological readers who for various reasons have no leisure for the study of extensive treatises. To meet this demand, Father Lehmkuhl, in the early part of last year published his

Compendium, and already the first Edition, consisting of 2,000 copies is exhausted. A second Edition revised by the author, and embodying the most recent Roman decrees is now before us, and it is in every sense worthy of its distinguished author. It is a marvel of clearness, conciseness, and precision. So much information, so well put, and compressed into 600 octavo pages, we have not yet met with. The young theological student, as well as the hard-worked Missionary Priest will find it a veritable treasure. And one of its special advantages to our priests is that in the treatise, "De justitia et jure," the author quotes from Dr. Crolly's great work those points on which theological decisions are affected by English law. Several theological compendiums have from time to time fallen into our hands, but we have no hesitation in saying that Father Lehmkuhl's is the best we have yet seen. J.M.

MEDITATIONS ON THE SUFFERINGS OF JESUS CHRIST. By the Rev. F. Francis Perinaldo, O.S.F. A Translation from the Italian, by a Member of the same Order. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

This is the title of a newly translated work from the Italian of Father Perinaldo, by a Member of the same Order. The object of the Rev. author in preparing the work was to provide a spiritual guide for secular persons; knowing how difficult it is for them to apply their thoughts to merely abstract ideas, he has imparted to his *Book of Meditations* a historical, a moral, and as far as possible, a local character. The history of the Passion of Christ cannot be read as we would read the life of a saint and his sufferings. It is profound meditation that unlocks the treasures and brings to light that hidden wisdom contained in the *Book of Books*. All the marvellous colouring and finish of perfection that blend with such wonderful effect in the story of the Life of Christ, are conveyed to it through the medium of His Sacred Passion. His sermons, doctrine, and miracles, scattered through his whole life, shine forth more highly as his death drew near.

No devotion then can be more excellent to raise the falling from the pit of vice, to strengthen the feeble in the path of virtue, and to quicken the persevering in the way of perfection. This book must be read slowly and with reflection, and for the convenience of persons accustomed to make daily meditation each consideration is divided into two parts, which will furnish matter for morning and evening meditation.

The printing of the work is excellent, and reflects great credit upon the eminent publishers. J. D.

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

OCTOBER, 1887.

THE ACT OF PERFECT CONTRITION AND PERFECT CHARITY.—I.

IN former numbers of the IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD we reviewed the various “*media salutis*” provided for men under the Law of Nature and under the Mosaic Law, and we found that, in the accepted teaching of theologians, those Laws or Dispensations supplied absolutely nothing that could even modify the necessity of strict and rigorously perfect contrition, as a remedy for *actual* mortal sin. The sacramental rites and multiform sacrifices that existed before the establishment of the Christian Law, were (1) “*infirmia et egena elementa*” that could not confer, because they did not “contain,” sanctifying grace; (2) they were, when appraised at their highest value, only so many agencies for exciting and making profession of faith in the future Messiah; and (3) the faith, so excited and manifested, could lead to justification only when “accompanied” and “informed” by perfect charity and contrition. Perfect contrition was, during all those melancholy ages, the “*medium necessarium*” for the remission of mortal sin; it should exist “*ex integra causa*”; if it failed “*ex quolibet defectu*” to be perfect, no “*remedium aequivalens*” was available to supply its place.

In view of this teaching, and even in the assumption that we are not ourselves personally concerned in the inquiry, we should be strangely incurious if we failed to sometimes consider what are the essential elements of the perfect con-

trition, on which the salvation of so many millions of our fellow-men had, for so long a series of centuries, so absolutely depended. We are anxious enough to become familiar with some of the prominent facts in their social and civil history; but, assuredly, even as mere students of history, we should find in the record of their relations with God and eternity, a subject immeasurably more engrossing. But, furthermore, and a thousand times more particularly, this inquiry should engage our most diligent research, when we remember that it involves a problem inextricably interwoven with many of our own most sacred personal duties and most valued interests. With all the facilities and advantages which the Law of Grace affords, it not unfrequently happens that our recovery or forfeiture of the friendship of God, and sometimes the eternal destiny of our souls, hinges upon our ability to elicit an act of perfect contrition. Hence, for every one of us, this is a question of paramount personal concern.

Before attempting an analysis of the act of perfect contrition, it may be well to remove certain ambiguities and define certain principles, a formal discussion of which, however valuable and instructive in other circumstances, would be foreign to the purpose of the present paper. We, therefore, assume as quasi-postulates:—

(1) That “*Contritio generice sumpta est absolute necessaria necessitate mediæ illi qui grave peccatum unquam commisit: fuit autem quovis tempore ad impetrandam veniam peccatorum: hic contritionis motus necessarius*” (Trid. S. xiv. c. iv).” It is, therefore, “*fide certum*” that, in the present order, penance or a retraction of mortal sin is, and has always been, an essential preliminary to pardon.

(2) That, in the words of St. Liguori, “*Contritio (perfecta) est actus formalis Charitatis, quum propter Dei dilectionem homo odit peccatum. Caritas tendit immediate in Deum, et mediate in odium peccati; Contritio autem immediate in odium peccati, et mediate in amorem Dei.*” Hence, when we discuss the extra-sacramental remission of sin, we may speak of the one or of the other almost indifferently, seeing that perfect contrition always pre-supposes the motive of perfect charity, and that the latter of necessity involves the former in the case of a soul polluted by sin.

(3) That, as defined by the Council of Trent, "Contritionem Charitate perfectam . . . hominem Deo reconciliare, priusquam hoc (pœnitentiæ) sacramentum actu suscipiatur."

(4) That the "opinio quae dicit contritionem cum charitate remissa non justificare extra sacramentum" is, in the words of St. Liguori and of the other most eminent theologians to whom he refers, "omnino improbabilis et falsa; ab omnibus theologis communiter rejecta; erronea; contra sententiam Catholicam; parum tuta in fide; temeraria et scandalosa, utpote apertissime contradicens variis Scripturae, Conciliorum, ac SS. Patrum testimoniis." (L. vi. T. iv. c. 1).

However unnecessary it will seem to illustrate by any *a priori* argument a teaching which rests, as our last quasi-postulate does, on so overwhelming a mass of unimpeachable extrinsic authority, it may nevertheless be well to indicate one or two of those arguments, in order that we may the more easily dissipate the hesitancy and alarm which arise from a superficial reading of the dissertations elaborated by some of the older theologians, in advocacy of a seemingly opposite doctrine.

We speak throughout, it must be remembered, of a "*contritio charitate perfecta*," and in claiming for it "hancque hominem Deo reconciliare." we are merely reproducing in words the dogmatic teaching of the Council. We affirm, moreover, that although that "*charitas sit remissa*," it remits mortal sin the moment it becomes a veritable "*initium charitatis*"; that the "*initium Charitatis*" is itself perfect charity, since it springs out of the "*dilectio Dei super omnia*"; or, in other words, that so soon as we conceive a sorrow for mortal sin, *ex motivo Charitatis*, that moment the continued presence of mortal sin becomes an impossibility. There is no insuperable objection to our confessing that the expression "*Contritio charitate perfecta*" is, perhaps, etymologically equivocal; but, in its consecrated theological acceptation, it signifies a contrition that is perfect in its lineage from charity, not a contrition perfected by a new alliance with charity.

That the act of perfect contrition or charity, in *quolibet gradu*, effects "*quamprimum*" the reconciliation of man with God, is manifest from the following texts of Sacred Scripture :

“Qui diligit me, diligitur a Patre meo”; “Ego diligentes me diligo.” In the theory of our opponents, those sacred pronouncements would be falsified in all those countless instances in which the “diligentes” would not have achieved some indeterminate “gradus dilectionis,” which the boldest shrink from defining, and for the exacting of which there is in reality no valid Scriptural or theological warrant. That the minimum measure of perfect charity expels mortal sin is equally manifest from the words in which the Holy Ghost asseverates, without reservation or qualification, that the “impietas impii non nocebit ei *in quacumque die conversus fuerit*,” as well as from those other words in which He binds Himself to man by an immutable and universal law: “Convertimini ad me, ET ego convertar ad vos.” The gage of God’s merciful condescension conveyed in all those promises, would be cruelly fallacious and misleading, if, underlying those words of solemn compact, there lay a necessity of accomplishing some mysterious “degrees of conversion,” which neither God nor His Church has hitherto determined. “Ratio evidens est,” writes St. Liguori, “quia sicut *quacumque aversio* a Deo tanquam a fine ultimo, etiam in gradu remisso, sufficit ad amittendam Dei amicitiam, ita *quacumque vera conversio* sufficit ad eam recuperandam.”

Such are some of the arguments by which all our great theologians support the doctrine that contrition which arises from charity “etiam in gradu remisso,” reconciles man with God, and concurrently remits his mortal sin. It is needless to add that the universality of this teaching and its practical acceptance by the Church, not alone constitute this doctrine “tuta in fide,” but render its contradictory “temeraria, improbalis et falsa.”

It would, however, be disingenuous to imply that the apparent views of some of the older theologians, and the earnest emphasis with which they give expression and advocacy to those views, do not contain much that is calculated to startle and perplex the casual reader. It would not, indeed, be easy to find language more impressively punctuated than the following extract (selected as an illustration) from the Catechism of the Council of Trent, which we find repro-

duced triumphantly by Concina and others who, by setting forth its most telling words and periods in italicised and leaded letters, and by employing the other accentuating devices of type, impart to the extract new and artificial force:—" *Ut enim concedamus, contritione peccata deleri, quis ignorat ADEO VEHEMENTEM, ACREM, ET INCENSAM ESSE OPORTERE, ut doloris acerbitas cum scelerum magnitudine aequari conferrique possit? At quoniam PAUCI ADMODUM ad hunc GRADUM pervenirent, jebat etiam ut a PAUCISSIMIS HAC VIA peccatorum venia speranda esset.*" To this extract, which commonly holds the first place, are invariably added copious cuttings from the works of St. Augustine and St. Thomas, all which, set in suitably diversified type, are adduced in further sustainment of the same theory. " *Haec adeo comperta sunt et decretoria,*" writes Concina, " *ut fateamur oportet Thomistas illos qui oppositum docent, non attigisse fontem Angelicae doctrinae, sed ex corruptis rivulis aquas suas derivasse.*" It may be parenthetically observed that when Concina, who was himself a Thomist, commented thus severely, he could scarcely have been unaware that the Angelic Doctor had composed no formal or specific treatise on Penance: " *Praeceptor Angelicus,*" says Tournely, " *sublatus e vivis, quo tempore contritionis argumentum versabat animo, luctuosum sui, et inutile desiderium reliquit.*" We have, therefore, scarcely more than the *obiter dicta* of St. Thomas, and these, as we shall find, may very well be appealed to as confirming the teaching of De Lugo, St. Liguori, and the rest.

The recurring references to " *Charitas remissa,*" " *Charitas summa,*" and other methods of expressing degrees of comparison; but, above all, the alleged necessity of a " *Contritio vehemens, acer, et incensus*" without which we are assured, " *venia speranda non esset,*" naturally introduces the important distinction between " *Charitas appreciative summa*" and " *Charitas intensive summa.*" Although Concina asserts that this " *distinctio non valde antiqua est,*" he must only have meant to convey that the distinction was not in the olden times indicated by those scholastic names; for its necessity is patent to any one who recognises a distinction between the intellect and the will. Concina himself (*Theol. Christiana,*

T. i. L. iii. c. 3), describes these two "species of charity with sufficient accuracy: "Amore *appreciativo* Deum prosequimur, quum Deum omnibus rebus praeferimus, et quum, tali amore flagrantes, omnia mala pati et sustinere, et bona quaecunque amittere parati sumus, ne Deum offendamus. Amor *intensivus* addit fervorem vehementiorem, conatum intensiorem, et sensibilem etiam quasi teneritudinem majorem et minorem."

It is manifest that if *intensio*, as thus defined, be no essential part of true charity or contrition, the arguments of Concina, &c., fall to the ground, and all that has been written regarding the necessity of "vehementia," "acritudo," "sensibilis teneritudo," &c., must be abandoned as the expression of a false and untenable idea. And here, fortunately, we can invoke the authority of St. Thomas, who, in a supplement to one of his works, discusses this question at considerable length, and expounds his views in no uncertain words: "Contritio habet duplicem dolorem; unum *rationis* [dolor *appreciativus*] qui est displicentia peccati commissi; et hic potest esse adeo parvus quod non sufficiet ad rationem contritionis, ut si minus displiceret ei [rationi] quam debeat displicere separatio a fine; sicut etiam amor potest esse ita remissus quod non sufficiet ad rationem charitatis. Alium dolorem habet in *sensu* [dolor *intensivus*], et *parvitas hujus non impedit rationem contritionis*; quia non se habet per se ad contritionem sed quasi *ex accidente ei adjungitur*; et iterum [quia] *non est in potentia nostra*," (*apud* St. Liguori, L. vi. T. iv. n. 441). Arguing in other places on the principles stated in the last few lines, the Angelic Doctor concludes that "*quaelibet* contritio est gratiâ gratum faciente informata: ergo *quantumcumque sit parva, delet omnem culpam*." And again, "*quantumcumque parvus sit dolor, dummodo ad contritionis rationem sufficiat, omnem culpam delet*." A simple development of those arguments—such as may be found in La Croix—has created an almost universal consent among theologians—"certum esse quod ad contritionem, ut justificet, non requiratur certa intensio, aut extensio quoad gradus;" and we may conclude with St. Liguori "quod omnis dolor, qui oritur ex charitate praedominante, est contritio justificans

hominem extra sacramentum, ut communiter docent D.D. citati ex S. Thoma."

With all this weight of reason and extrinsic authority in apparent opposition to the Catechism of the Council, it is due to so grave and recognised a work to rescue its teaching—if that be possible—from the censure involved in its abandonment by eminent subsequent writers, and indeed its practical abandonment by the Church. Nor is it difficult to do so; for material for abundant vindication is found in the Catechism itself. It is quite true that the venerated and saintly authors of this great work have written (Quest. xxvii.) "that for past transgressions should be felt the deepest and greatest sorrow, a sorrow not to be exceeded even in thought;" that "as the Charity with which we love God is the most perfect love, so the sorrow that accompanies contrition should also be the most vehement &c." But it is equally true that the self same chapter explains the "depth and vehemence" of that sorrow as identical with the "dolor summae appreciationis," when it adds: "If as of all things that deserve our love, God is the supreme good, so also of all things that deserve our hatred, sin is the supreme evil, it follows that for the same reason that we confess God to be supremely loved, we should also necessarily *hold sin in supreme detestation.*" As if this declaration were not sufficiently unequivocal and explicit, the authors of the Catechism devote the following chapter to formally asserting and establishing that, although "sensible sorrow is very much to be desired and commended," nevertheless contrition "ceases not to be true" should sensible sorrow be imperfect: "If we may not succeed (*si id minus consequi nobis liceat*), our contrition, nevertheless, may be true and efficacious; for it often happens that things that fall under the senses affect us more than spiritual things; and hence some persons sometimes experience a greater sense of grief for the loss of their children than for the baseness of their sins." It is manifest that however earnestly the Catechism desiderated vehement and poignant sensible sorrow, as an accompaniment of contrition, it did not regard such evidences of "intensity" as in any sense or measure essential. It also commends the shedding

of tears ; but no writer has ever asserted that their absence indicates imperfect or inefficacious sorrow.

Precisely the same exegetical rendering may be applied to the sayings of most of the other theologians of this school—to all indeed except the mere thoughtless copyists, who erroneously attribute to “accidental intensity” what was intended to indicate the essential quality of “supreme appreciation.” For the latter, a strength of conviction that God is worthy of supreme love and that sin deserves unqualified hatred, is essential. That vehemence or force of conviction is, in its unbending and tenacious character, “not to be exceeded even in thought,” since it springs from the certainty of supernatural faith ; and the sensible fervour with which our souls sometimes go forth to render homage to an object worthy of our love, or to repel the object of our detestation, is, by an easy transition, oftentimes erroneously mistaken for the intellectual act of which it is the mere casual parasite. Men are disposed to measure the reality and the stability of their conviction by the ardour with which it asserts itself ; but this effervescence of energy is not unfrequently an *ignis fatuus* most liable to mislead. In the matter of contrition, above all others, it may disport its delusive light where contrition has found no settlement, just as it may be wholly absent where contrition exists in its most perfect fulness. All this arises from the fact that, in the absence of material objects, our senses are frequently stimulated by the phantasmal creatures of imagination ; but as these are not necessarily the product of intelligence, so neither do they prove its presence and influence. The intellect steadily exercises its functions without the faintest necessary reference to their existence or to the shape they may assume. Hence, as Lehmkuhl puts it, “*intensio actus substantiam ejus non mutat.*”

“DURATION” is another accidental adjunct of contrition, to which we have as yet scarcely alluded, although theologians of considerable weight—explaining their views in diverse and inconsistent ways—sometimes seem to regard it as an essential of true contrition. Juenin, speaking for himself and “many others,” says that contrition remits sin “*tantum*

adulta charitate et per pietatis actus plurimum ducta." We are told by Collet that "post Scotum, Scotistae plures durationem temporis a Deo taxati requirunt;" but La Croix refers us to many eminent writers who undertook to interpret Scotus in quite the opposite sense. The argument adduced by Collet to establish the essential character of duration is singularly and strikingly weak, and—what is altogether unusual with Collet—is transparently untenable: "Etsi enim," he says, "in ictu oculi excidat homo a charitate et justitia, habet tamen nescio quid ambigui charitas paucio tempore perseverans, et sicut arbor vi ventorum facile et cito dejecta, non videtur bene radicata fuisse, tametsi aliquando bene radicata fuerit; sic charitas quasi momentanea, admodum suspecta esse debeat." The innuendo this argument suggests would manifestly imply that contrition—which *ex hypothesi* may be valid—could not be reasonably supposed to be lost in the second moment of its existence—a position which Collet was too rigorously orthodox to entertain. We are, as Catholics, constrained to reject, in all its modifications, the Lutheran doctrine of the "inamissibility of grace"; we are consequently bound to believe that in every stage of its existence, the habit of grace is liable to be lost; and the promptitude with which it is unhappily sometimes forfeited, affords no conclusive ground for suspecting that it had not existed. Loss and gain of sanctifying grace are effected equally "in ictu oculi"; for the same identical words, "quacumque die," are employed in Sacred Scripture to indicate the instantaneous effectuation of each. Nor would it follow from this, as a *reductio ad absurdum*, that the moments of man's life might, in our doctrine, alternate continuously in mortal sin and sanctifying grace; for no one asserts that man so lives in an atmosphere of actual grace that he may, at his capricious will, elicit or decline to elicit acts of perfect contrition. Even those theologians who teach that effective sufficient grace is given in most bountiful profusion to all men, limit the times of its concession to the uprising of such occasions as God in His wisdom shall deem suitable (*debito tempore*); in such emergencies God will not be wanting; but He cannot expose His graces to be toyed and trifled with

and wantonly abused. But, returning to the *duration* theory, we must remember that there is question here of a *transient act*, not of an *habitual state*, as the argument of Collet seems to assume. Our inquiry regards solely the elements and conditions of that act, and by no means the history of the habit infused in consequence of that act's being performed. The act is or is not valid, utterly irrespective of the future fortune of its effects. The texts already quoted prove to demonstration that man's conversion to God *ex motivo charitatis* is forthwith followed by the remission of his sin, unless indeed we admit—what no Catholic can hold—that God suspends the fulfilment of His part of the covenant, or refuses to be reconciled with those who, He foresees, will not persevere for at least some indefinite period. Just as well might we exact the prevision of final perseverance.

Perhaps we can account for the haziness of idea and expression that pervades this specimen argument, by recalling the unique and marvellous character of this conversion of God to man, and its utter dissimilarity to any other conversion we know of. The instantaneous transition from a state of sin to a state of justice is, in many ways, more stupendous than the primeval creation in which vacuous but neutral nothingness became substantial existence. Besides, all our ideas of "conversion" are derived from earthly things, and involve a series of subordinate changes which require duration for development. Human language cannot well describe, nor human ideas represent, the "fiat lux" by which the sinful soul becomes—is—the Temple of the Holy Ghost. We cannot conceive night changed into day without the intervention of at least a momentary twilight, and this means "duration." We cannot conceive enmity giving place to love where there has been no cooling down of wrath nor growth of kindly sympathy. We cannot picture to ourselves "the feast of ingathering" where there has been no spring-time of expectancy nor tardy autumn. Every purely earthly conversion is effected by time as an essential ally; not so that conversion which God worketh.

C. J. M.

(*To be continued.*)

IRISH MISSIONARY TYPES.

"THE OLD PRIESTS"—"THE DEAN."

THE class of Irish Missionary Priests to which "the Dean" belonged, has well nigh disappeared. Without disparagement of the more modern priestly type, we may state that the older has left behind it no heirs to many of the admirable gifts and special virtues that adorned it. A new sacerdotal race has sprung up abroad, as at home. It is endowed with new and excellent qualities no doubt. It is well fitted (as our new armaments are in other fields of warfare) for the changed conditions and tactics of spiritual combat and conquest. Yet we, who have lived and laboured during the transition period that marked the decline of the one and the birth of the other class, may well be pardoned if we say of the brave old pioneer band, "we shall not look upon your like again." Let others wait till the new levies, seasoned in war, drop off in their turn, "morts sur le champ d'honneur," and shed one day a proud tear to their memory. We were of "the Old Guard," raw recruits, if you will, in their immortal ranks, yet privileged to witness, and share to some extent their exploits. Let us glorify them: "Laudemus viros gloriosos et parentes nostros in generatione sua. Homines magna virtute et prudentia praeditos." (*Ecc.* xiv.) Let us linger near the grey tombs that mark the resting places of the men of the "old brigade" in many a far foreign land. Let us raise a wet eye to many a neighbouring sacred pile, the myriad monuments scattered the world wide, that record their untiring zeal, their skill and success in consolidating on earth the kingdom of God.

It were well, indeed, that many another pen should be employed in preserving the memory and sketching the traits of the fine old types of the priesthood that have passed or are passing away. Be this a contribution, worthy only from its truthfulness, to the gallery that more skilful hands may some day continue and complete. Of bishops and prelates we have pictures without number. No one seems disposed to paint the modest features or gild the pious memory of the

humbler workers in the vineyard, to whose practical labours and unrecorded virtues the growth of the Church in our day is mainly due.

The writer's reminiscences of the "old priests" and of "the Dean," will lead the reader, should he consent to visit it, to a colony that of all others received and retained the deepest imprint of Irish missionary zeal and of Irish colonial enterprise, the free and independent Colony of Newfoundland.

A nobler band of men devoted to race and religion never left the shores of Ireland than those who built up the prospering church in Newfoundland. They impressed deeply upon it the living image of the island of saints. Those "old priests," as they were affectionately and familiarly called in our time, are now beginning to be remembered only by those who are themselves turning the hill-top of life to descend into the dark vale beyond. It is well to remind the growing race of the men who acted a powerful part in preparing their country for a great religious and political future.

The "old priests" followed the tide of Irish emigration to Newfoundland in the days when that colony was as well known, and as much spoken of in Ireland, as America or Australia are to-day.¹ They came there before and during the famine years, from Waterford, Wexford, Kilkenny and Tipperary, principally. Both the priests and people who emigrated to the colony at that time bore the well-known impress of those districts in their fine personal appearance and bold enterprising character. After wide observation in many lands, the writer can state that nowhere has he seen any who excelled in those respects the "youngsters" (as they were called) who landed in the colony in those early years.

A portion only, and the smaller portion of them had been accustomed to sea-faring life before their arrival in the colony. Yet the peculiar dash and daring of those men rendered them expert and successful in the new and perilous

¹ Geography notwithstanding, the name *America* is applied in Newfoundland as in Ireland to the United States alone.

occupation to which they had now to commit their lives and fortunes. The "old priests" entered heartily into the spirit and life of the country and times. They made the unstable sea tributary to the social and enduring monuments of worship. The ice fields bore their crops, and "the Banks of Newfoundland" yielded their dividends, to sustain and adorn religion. Never in any country were the sources more prolific or contributions more generous. Sunday after Sunday the long list was read from the altar, the muster roll of the brave fishermen who proudly gave a portion of their sea spoils to establish religion in the country. Thus the great cathedral, the convents and all the edifices sacred to faith and charity were built up. The old priests were in every sense equal to their position, and that, for them was an honour as great and as hardly earned as ever was won by a Bossuet or a Lacordaire in more æsthetic fields of religious zeal. Their lore indeed was mainly that of the account book and ledger; their eloquence the art of pithy appeal or ready reprimand. They were a hardy devoted body of men, of whose exploits by flood and field tales might be told to rival the chronicles of border chivalry.

It must not, however, be concluded that they were quite unlettered or mentally unendowed. They possessed the clear head and sound sense of a healthy, unimpaired race; that freshness and vigour of mind that is begotten of simple habits, of wholesome, physical and moral influences, and is, in fact, the fruit of personal and hereditary virtue. As theologians they possessed the useful practical knowledge that suited the work they had to perform. A large range of culture would have been objectless in their circumstances. Many of them were men of marked natural ability.

But we must not lose sight of "the Dean." In fact all this is but his introduction, and will serve to spare pencil and colouring in his portraiture.

The Very Rev. Dean Cleary, known for over a quarter of a century throughout Newfoundland as simply "the Dean," was known also for more than fifty years as one of the foremost figures in the religious and social world of the colony. He came there from the parish of Bannow, co. Wexford,

where he was born in 1796. He laboured on the Newfoundland Mission from 1830 to 1881. During this entire period of over half a century he never once left the field of his labours on any plea of respite or business. His life is inseparably woven into the history of Newfoundland. He was a leading spirit in the material advancement of the country, and a trusty guide to its people throughout the petty political turmoils that rendered it notorious, until its people won for themselves Home Rule in 1855. Calm, moderate, yet strenuous, he never for a moment suffered his priestly dignity or civic honour to become tarnished amid the hot frays from which few escaped unscathed. We will consider him first as a civilizer of the land to which he devoted his life, next as a priest and a pastor.

It is not easy for the "home" priests to understand the various directions the priest's influence had to take in the Newfoundland of past days. Outside the city of St. John's there was scarce a magistrate, lawyer, doctor, commissioner of works, policeman or civil officer of any kind. The priest had by times to assume each and all of those characters, and fulfil their functions. Some of them became eminent in one line, some in another. Father Cleary became famous for *road making*. He had a better right to the *soubriquet* of "Colossus of Roads" than another prominent Wexfordman, Hon. Laurence O'Brien, who bore that title for years in the colony. Strange to say there was great opposition to road making in the colony during the early years of the Dean's life. The "merchants"—the sea-lords, to coin a word—in that country, were opposed to it lest their dealers might frequent the city instead of the fishing ground, or be even tempted to turn their thoughts to agriculture; a direction of labour most reprehensible in merchant eyes. One at least of Father Cleary's confrères was opposed to roads on *moral* grounds. This was Fr. M——, a pious, zealous man, whom the bishop, Dr. Mullock, used to style "an Apostolic savage." Fr. M—— feared that his innocent people would use the roads for frequent visits to "the city," and become contaminated by what he deemed "its vices." All this time there was no road between St. John's (the capital), and the important

settlements where the Dean's parish lay twenty or more miles away. He made the journey over and over again by sea in a frail boat, and oftener by land, for he was the king of pedestrians. On one of these occasions he set out accompanied by two men, in the depth of winter. Blinded and bewildered by a snow storm they lost the track, spent the whole night on a frozen lake, walking constantly to shake off the fatal sleep, death's harbinger under these circumstances. In the morning one of the three lay stark and cold on his icy bed. "He had a bottle of rum," said the Dean, "and made free use of it during the night."

"The Dean" would listen to no arguments, moral or commercial, against the establishment of lines of communication between the various settlements and the capital. He was a true economist though he had probably never heard of Smith's *Wealth of Nations*. As far as his influence extended he opened up on every side avenues of industry and profit for the people. Time, labour, and hands in bringing produce to the market were saved. Cattle raising and agriculture were encouraged, and he never relaxed his efforts until he had bound the city and the settlements over which he had control by a line of roads unsurpassed in the colony or elsewhere. This particular feature of his career has been dwelt upon because it was that which rendered his life remarkable and useful to the country. In older lands excellence in letters, in statesmanship, even in war and destruction, may render a man famous. But in a new land the man who aids nature to open up to his fellow men her virgin resources, who places in communication with each other the scattered groups of the social body—useless when separated for all purposes of civilization and progress—this is the man who deserves to be called great. There were two such in the clerical body in Newfoundland within the writer's memory. Right Rev. Dr. Mullock, who went in advance of all; who would have been great anywhere; who lived in a future that he foresaw and foretold and that every day is realizing—and, less enlightened, less enthusiastic, but not less solid in his views or successful in his own particular work, the Very Rev. Dean Cleary. The Dean's civilizing influence took

other directions, chiefly in the line of church building, and the encouragement of a proper style of house building and ornamentation among his people. His word, supported by his example, was law. The contrast between the pretty cottages beaming, snow white in the sunlight in his district, and the rude mouldy log cabins of other settlements was remarkable. It was a pleasant ending to a drive of eighteen miles from St. John's, passing by scattered farms and homesteads, to drop at last upon Bay Bulls,¹ the largest village on "the Dean's shore," as that whole coast line was called. A fine harbour is this Bay Bulls, with crescent shore overlooked by pleasant white houses and crowned by its neat church deftly set over where the curve rounds off to stretch out an arm towards the sea. Most of the settlers here were English, chiefly from Devon, and called in the colony *West countrymen*. They were all Protestants when the Dean came among them. There are now about four non-Catholic families in the whole district. The Dean converted the whole convertible shore without a word of controversy but by simply living there his own useful exemplary life. Leaving Bay Bulls behind we have four miles more up a wooded hill, along a flat barren, then down an abrupt incline to the Dean's gate. There Witless Bay opens to the view where the Dean had his chief residence (for he had three pretty houses in various parts of the district) for fifty years. It is a wide open bay—too open for safe shelter when there is a stiff out wind. Across its jaws like a gag is a long narrow island. Around its shores, but chiefly on the north side, are the fishers' houses and the fishing flakes. On the right, on entering the gate, are open meadows—the Dean's fields. On the left a fairly imposing building—the Presentation Convent. A quick curve, after a few yards, brings one to the door of a cottage, comfortable looking and commodious, set in the midst of a thick growth of firs and facing the open meadows and the sea. This is Dean Cleary's house, a house every one loved to visit, and that was never

¹ *Baie des Boules*; it is said to have been named by the French who landed there in 1762, marched on St. John's and took that city. It was soon, however, recaptured and held ever since by the English.

without a welcome for the wayfarer. In that quiet spot, with its thick curtain of firs shading it from the world, where the deep silence is only broken by the deeper murmurs of the ocean, great thoughts visit the soul and voices are heard within that never speak amid the tumult of the world's thoroughfares. Here on the ledge that divides the nether elements, fresh and unchanged from the Almighty hand,—the vast primeval waste and the tameless sea—overawed by those two immensities, one turns with deeper trust and brighter hope to the starry heaven that is never so inspiring, never so eloquent, as when looking down upon those sad solitudes of earth.

In such a spot as this—on the silent shores of an obscure harbour, in a land little known—the Dean spent fifty years of a peaceful, useful life. No doubt the scene lent to his character some of its own features—breadth, simplicity, liberality, and a rare *naturalness*.

The Dean had spent only two years of his long missionary life (the first two) outside of this district of Witless Bay and Bay Bulls. They were passed along the shores of the immense bays of Trinity, Bonavista, and Notre Dame, a coastline as long as from Waterford to Londonderry. One anecdote of his career in that district is well worth preserving. It affords a complete picture of the state of the mission in those early days, and throws a side-light upon the Dean's character, in which there was a marked comic strain. The young priest in his wanderings about those bays and inlets came upon a settlement (Kingscove) where no priest up to that time had officiated. He was soon surrounded by a gang of stalwart men and buxom matrons (fish only is desiccated in Newfoundland), and blockaded by a crowd of rosy children, and even grown-up boys and girls coming forward for priestly baptism. This duty was naturally accounted for, and easily performed. But who had married the parents? There never had been priest, parson, or magistrate in the place before. However, there was a school-master, and him the Dean convoked into synod to inquire into the matrimonial discipline of the community. "I married them all myself, sir," said this worthy. "And who married *you*?" asked the

Dean. "I done that myself too, sir," replied Grammaticus. "How did you perform the ceremony?" "Well, your Reverence, I made them kneel down, and I said the *De Profundis* over them!" He looked the Dean straight in the eye, as daring him to "better that" if he could.

It would be impossible, in the space to be expected, to relate even a portion of the quaint stories that grew out of the Dean's long and eventful life. Let us turn to the spiritual and pastoral side of his character.

The Dean loved the priesthood and he loved youth, but both combined were his pride and glory. He was our natural and our appointed "guide, philosopher, and friend," and no one could fulfil the trust better. He was the best man to stand between default and authority that ever lived. In that excellent clerical body there was nothing very grave to require his serious mediation. All were prompt and obedient men, and admired and trusted their great chief, Dr. Mullock. Yet it was a harrassing mission, and there were occasional troubles and heartaches. To the Dean these only gave occasion for additional exercise of kindness. Without these, the Dean's occupation as mediator would be gone, and the best part of his nature deprived of exercise. He always took the part of the weak. Notwithstanding that poor times came upon the Dean from 1860 to 1870, there was no marked interruption to the celebration of the marriage rites in Witless Bay. And at one of the ceremonies, performed during these years, an incident occurred which throws a vivid light on the Dean's character. His tender thoughtful love for the poor, especially those exposed to the sting as well as the hardships of poverty; his simplicity; his shrewdness and humour, all are displayed in the incident. It was the custom in most parishes in Newfoundland, to pay the marriage fee by a collection made on the spot among the persons in attendance, beginning with the bridegroom. No one present, of any means, would think of refusing the silent appeal of the outstretched plate in the collector's hand. Indeed, it would not have been "wholesome," as they say, to do so, for keen eyes were there on the watch, and tongues were ready sharpened to publish any such delinquency. Women of any position, are supposed

as well as men, to tender a contribution, more especially if related to the happy pair. On the occasion referred to, a woman in the Dean's parish presented herself to him the day before the wedding. She had lost her husband, and had been reduced from a comfortable to a needy condition. She represented in touching language her shame at being unable to offer any contribution at the wedding. The tradition of her late respectable position was still alive in the public memory; the parties to be united in wedlock were her relatives; so that she could not avoid the difficulty by absenting herself, &c., &c. This was just the case to awaken the Dean's tender sympathies, and touch the fine chords that were deep strung in his nature; so he handed the poor woman a pound note to be paid back at the wedding on the morrow. The wedding took place, supper was ready laid, the collection proceeded gaily and successfully. The woman was present, respectably dressed in the garments of better days that yet remained to her; all had contributed who were expected to contribute except herself. The plate pleaded to her in vain. So did the anxious eye of the Dean, who beheld with amazement her absorbed and unconscious demeanour. She was thinking probably of her late husband—nothing else could account for that resigned "far off" expression that so well became her meek countenance and widow's weeds. Knowing what he and she, but none else knew, the Dean, rather than admit a harrowing suspicion, concluded that the woman really was unconscious of what was passing around. So, to call her to her senses, he cried out as the plate was returning, "Anyone else there?" Then, after a long and fruitless pause, with a delicate gradation that did credit to his head and heart, he repeated: "*Any woman there?*" This appeal going so straight but delicately to its object, would have moved a heart of stone; but it had no effect on the decayed gentlewoman, who retained the Dean's money, confident that she could not hold it as closely as he would preserve her artifice from disclosure. This story the writer had from a clergyman who was accidentally in the secret, and present at the wedding. The Dean himself never told it, but it was amusing to witness his silent reverie when twitted

with this mischance of his charity. He was evidently perplexed to find motives of excuse for the culprit, and of comfort for being cozened himself—a thing he never relished. He always ended by giving it up, and declaring that “the poor woman wanted the money at all events.”

The last few years of the Dean's life, from about 1876 to 1881, were spent in seclusion, and then for the first time he had a permanent assistant in his extensive parish. He had lived too long in the past to mingle actively with new scenes and systems. He retired to contemplate the past and prepare for the future. There is something very sad and sacred in those musings of venerable old age. The grave old man of heaped up memories, to whom nothing is new or strange or exceptional, whose light has passed over all the hidden places of life, and departs from them now with no unkindly gleam, has about him an unearthly air. He wears an expression that nothing in life except life's long protracted ending can give. It is begotten of the fulness of mortal experience, and its meaning is read in the words *consummatum est*.

Since about 1878 the Dean, then far advanced in age, yet retaining still much of the power of his iron frame, had fallen mentally into a childish state. In this condition the writer beheld him a few years before his death in 1881. He recognised no one and was fretful at times. It was the chafing of a strong and active spirit bound in darkness, all unconscious of its own yearnings, groping for the light that lies beyond.

There was always one unfailing remedy for this restlessness. This was, to seat the good old man in the vehicle that had so often borne him to the remote ends of his parish to the homes of the sick and poor. Then his face lighted up, and all his ancient energy seemed to return. He imagined he was setting out *on a sick call!* Love of duty outlived reason, and almost the vital principle in this heroic priest, and filled him to the last with a happiness as God-like in its source as it was childlike in its display. It became almost a daily care of the Dean's assistant and successor in the parish to humour this admirable passion of the noble old man.

The history of the Church and of the world presents no picture more sublime and touching than this. The comic

features of the spectacle—the motionless carriage, the clutched reins that guided nothing, the voice and whip upraised to urge an imaginary steed—all vanish before the lesson imparted of loyalty, tenderness and truth. After an hour thus seated in his carriage in the coach-house, the Dean would suffer himself to be led back to his room, comforted by the consciousness that he *had performed his duty*.

So lived and died a man the world will never reckon among its great. The world has indeed no rule or measure for greatness like this. The world deems such a life madness and its end without honour, because the light of justice hath not shined unto it and the sun of understanding hath not risen upon it. (*Wisd. v.*)

There is no other language that has an equivalent for the Irish phrase “Soggarth aroon,” and no other people that feels in the least, as far as our observation goes, the meaning or the emotion that phrase conveys to the Irish ear and heart. In continental countries the seminarist is constantly warned in spiritual direction of the dangers to himself of being much with and to the people outside the strict duties of his office. The continental priest, at home or abroad, though he is often a model ecclesiastic and a zealous missionary, is seldom, if ever, the popular priest, the friend, confidant, and familiar of his flock, the “Father John or Tom, God bless him,” of his parish or district. In fact the foreign priest or missionary is moulded, from the marrow out, into the *ecclesiastic*. The Irish priest remains always *a man*. No other priests in the world know their people so thoroughly and instinctively as they. This is one characteristic that distinguishes the Irish missionary from all others, and makes him successful even among those not of his race, and esteemed and trusted by those not of his creed.

Another mark of the Irish missionary is his practical common sense, and we may call it *utilitarianism*. He is a founder and builder of something solid, tangible, lasting, rugged perchance, yet religious. We have always admired more than any other the statue and picture of St. Patrick which represent him holding a complete little church in the crook of his left arm, and with his *Baccal* in his right hand to

show that he is setting out to plant that church somewhere. Whoever conceived this notion had a better idea of Patrick, of his mission, his work, and the genius he transmitted to his Celtic successors in the priesthood, than the mystic who pictured him driving the snakes over the Giant's Causeway. It is the ambition of every Irish missionary to build at least one church, and every Irish missionary that gets half a chance does it. Some build ten and some have built twenty. He knows that when his voice is stilled and his labours over, the temple he raised will speak for him and work out the work he began. His idea is to gather his flock together rather than pay them single occasional visits. Where there is a church there there will be a gathering, and when there is a gathering there the Lord is in the midst, building up his kingdom in the hearts of his people by grace and the sacraments. But this subject would lead us too far. Enough if we have succeeded in distinguishing by its main features the character of the Irish Missionary Priesthood in our sketch of the Dean who was its perfect type.

R. HOWLEY.

NOMINA PATRICIANA.—II.

BY whom, and where, was St. Patrick consecrated? In answering these questions the ingenuity of theorists has been much exercised in the past; but it would have been well for them, as it is for future theorists, to lay to heart a lesson conveyed to all antiquarians in one of his enchanting sketches by the "wizard of the north." The author of the *Antiquary* introduces us to the lord of Monkbarney, who fondly imagined that he traced in a mound on his property the remains of a Roman encampment and the spot on which the last decisive stand was made by the Caledonians against Agricola, the Roman general. Full of his pet theory, Monkbarney discovered a flag on which were marked the letters A. D. L. L., and judging the stone to be a pagan sacrificial instrument, he

interpreted the letters as meaning *Agricola dicavit libens libens*. But while the antiquarian was exulting at his discovery, Edie Ochiltree, a professional beggar, appeared on the scene, alluded to the fancied Roman mound which years previously, he said, had been thrown up by himself; and in proof thereof suggested to Monkbarne to dig for a ladle, the imaginary pagan vessel, which was improvised for a rustic feast in connection with the Aiken family, and inscribed with the initials of the words *Aiken's Drum lang ladle*, and thus dissipated the airy theory of Monkbarne. A leaning to a particular theory influenced Monkbarne in the interpretation of the inscription, and a like bias appears to have influenced views in regard to the place of St. Patrick's consecration and his consecrator. Several theories have been started. Some refer to the name of the consecrator, while others refer to the place of consecration; and thus naturally, just as there happened to have been a preconceived theory in favour of a particular place or person, the interpretation of words bearing on persons and that bearing on places mutually reacted.

It is passing strange that the place of consecration of such a saint as St. Patrick has not been yet identified: nay, more; none of the half dozen of theories started appears to have suggested much less established it. But I must take warning from the example of Monkbarne; and that the general reader made judge how far my remarks are called for, and lest he may adopt, in preference to my own theory, the theories which I reject, I shall as briefly as possible state the several opinions on the questions under consideration.

The Scholiast on the first Life (Colgan, n. 13) tells us that St. Patrick was sent for consecration to Pope Celestine by Germanus of Auxerre; but that the Pope having previously sent Palladius to Ireland did not entertain the application of St. Patrick. He then turned to an island (Capri) where he received the "staff of Jesus." Urged by repeated visions he came to Germanus who sent him again with a witness of his worth to St. Celestine; and the Pope, having heard of the death of Palladius, consecrated, through Amatorex bishop of Auxerre, St. Patrick in presence of Theodosius ruler of the world (14. n). The Scholiast adds that Pope Celestine heard

in Rome the cry of children in Ireland inviting Patrick to come to them. The annotator differs from the Scholiast in this—that though he says there was an application made to Pope Celestine twice for St. Patrick, yet states that St. Patrick only once went to St. Celestine (p. 9. n. 29).

The writer of the second Life represents Germanus as sending Patrick to St. Celestine, who commissioned him to go to Ireland even while Palladius was there. St. Patrick in Ireland hearing of the death of Palladius in Britain, at Ebmoria, turned aside and received consecration from Bishop Amathorex. This version inverts the whole natural order of events.

The third Life makes Germanus send Patrick to St. Celestine. St. Patrick went to a holy man Amathorex who consecrated him. He was told by an angel to go to Ireland; but he replied that he should previously see the Lord, and having seen Him, he went to Pope Celestine who received him with honour and sent him to Ireland.

The fourth Life states that Germanus sent St. Patrick to Pope Celestine who commissioned him to go to Ireland. On his way thither, St. Patrick met the disciples of Palladius at Ebmoria, who announced his death. St. Patrick in consequence received consecration from Amathorex who gave him jurisdiction.

The fifth Life informs us that St. Patrick was ordained by Bishop Senior. St. Patrick having gone to Ireland did not succeed. He went to Rome, and received the Pope's blessing. Having heard on his way to Ireland of the death of Palladius, he received consecration from Amator.

The sixth Life sends St. Patrick to Pope Celestine who consecrated him. An angel urged him, on the death of Palladius, to set out for Ireland. The Pope sent with him some missionary auxiliaries. In returning to Ireland, he called on Germanus who gave him altar-requisites.

The Tripartite or seventh Life represents Germanus as sending St. Patrick to Pope Celestine. Patrick having made his way to Rome was well received by the Pope, who, on learning the death of Palladius previously sent, consecrated St. Patrick

in presence of Germanus and Amato Rege, the Roman, and honoured him with the distinguished name of Patrick. Here we see the consecration and witnesses of consecration are different from those given by the Scholiast on the first Life, while both authorities are contradicted by the other Lives, which are not quite consistent with each other as to the place and circumstances of consecration.

The obscurities and even contradictions which are to be met with in the Lives arise from faulty versions or wrong interpretations of the Saint's life in the *Book of Armagh*. This earliest and most authentic narrative tells us that St. Patrick warned by angelic visitations, and moved by the cry of invitation from Irish children which he heard in vision, determined to set out for the mission for which he had long prepared himself. Germanus with whom he studied sends with St. Patrick a priest named Segetius to be a companion and witness to his worthiness. It was the more necessary to have Segetius sent by Germanus in order to testify to St. Patrick's fitness for the episcopal dignity, as the Saint was not consecrated by himself. For it was well known that Palladius had been consecrated and sent by Pope Celestine to Ireland, and that the Church forbade the consecration of a second bishop without the consent of the first or chief bishop in a country. The writer in the *Book of Armagh* having told how St. Patrick, with the consent of Germanus, Bishop of Auxerre, with whom he studied, set out for his Irish mission, proceeds to describe the circumstances of accidental consecration at Eboria; and as several theories have been started on the description given in the *Book of Armagh*, I give just here a literal translation of it. St. Patrick and his companions had entered on their journey (*cœptum iter*).¹

“When then they heard of the death of holy Palladius in Britain, for Augustine and Benedict and others, disciples of Palladius, were returning and announced at Eboria his death, Patrick and those with him turned a little out of their way to a certain wonderful man, a chief bishop, Amatho (*rex*) by name, who dwelt in the neighbourhood; and there St. Patrick knowing what was to have

¹ *Documenta de S. P.* (p. 25) learnedly edited by Rev. E. Hogan, S.J.

happened received the Episcopal grade from Matho (*rex*) the holy bishop."¹

(a) One has only to read the above passage in order to reject Rome as the place of St. Patrick's consecration. Yet it has been mentioned in connection with his consecration by most of the Lives. The Tripartite (Colgan, 123, part I.) expressly states that he was consecrated by Pope Celestine in Rome in presence of Germanus and Amatus the Roman King; and that on the occasion three choirs sang in unison—the heavenly spirits, the Romans, and the Irish infants from the western wood of Foeluth. But there was no Roman King Amatus. Besides, the *Book of Armagh* informs us that Amatus, not St. Celestine, was the consecrator; and it is no better than pure fancy to have the three choirs join on the occasion. But if we suppose that Palladius died at the end of January, and Pope Celestine at the beginning of April in the same year, the interval would be too short to allow the messengers of Palladius' death to come from the confines of Caledonia to Rome.

On the one hand the Irish authorities assign the death of Pope Celestine to the 6th of April, 432. In this they are of accord with the Roman martyrology and Breviary, with Bede, Usuard, and, I may add, Ado, who, however, places his death on the 7th of April. The Irish Lives add that St. Celestine lived only one week after the consecration of St. Patrick. Furthermore, the Martyrology of Tallaght assigns the ordination or consecration of our Saint to the 6th of April. This does not refer to his priesthood, for the earliest martyrologies or Lives gave us no definite notion of the place of our Apostle's ordination or of his ordainer, and consequently it was very unlikely that the very date would be remembered:

¹ (Patricius) "coeptum ingreditur iter. . . et misit Germanus seniore cum illo Revertente vero eo (Palladio) hinc et primo mari transitu coeptoque terrarum itinere in Britonum finibus vita factus. Audita itaque morte sancti Palladii in Britanniiis quia discipuli Palladii, id est Augustinus et Benedictus et cæteri redeuntes retulerant in Ebmoira de morte ejus, Patricius et qui cum eo erant declinaverunt iter ad quemdam mirabilem hominem summum episcopum Amatho rege nomine, in propinquo loco habitantem ibique Sanctus Patricius sciens quae eventura erant ibi episcopalem gradum ab Matho rege sancto episcopo accepit." *Documenta, &c.*, pp. 25-6..

moreover the reception of priest's orders which some think he exercised in other countries before he came to Ireland was not of so much importance, if any at all, to the Irish Ecclesiastical Calendarist as his consecration.

On the other hand, though the 15th and 25th of December have been mentioned by some in connection with Palladius' death, Colgan deems it probable that he died on the 27th January, in the year 432. For he was sent to Ireland, according to Prosper's chronicle, during the consulship of Bassus and Antiochus in the year 431; and considering the delay in journeying and missionary work done by him in Ireland, his death could not reasonably be supposed to have occurred before the date assigned to it by Colgan. In this he is borne out by Ferrarius and the English Martyrology. No doubt some assign a festival in honour of Palladius to the 6th of July; but the Breviary of Aberdeen, which perhaps is its oldest authority, marks the July festival as a minor one; and surely the *natale* of a national saint in a national Calendar for the Scotch claim Palladius as their apostle, could not be fairly called a minor feast. And even though we were to suppose that the death of Palladius occurred on the 6th of July, how then could the consecration of St. Patrick in consequence of it be said to have taken place in presence of Pope Celestine who died according to most authorities in the preceding April? The interval then between the death of Palladius on the borders of Scotland at the end of January, account being taken of the delay in decent interment, would not suffice to have messengers bring the news of his death to Rome previous to the decease of Pope St. Celestine. On that account as well as for other reasons the consecration of St. Patrick in Rome by Pope Celestine, as stated in many of the Lives, is extremely improbable.

Furthermore, the Scholiast on Fiech (Colgan, p. 3, n. 14) states that it was Amatus who consecrated St. Patrick, and did not merely witness the consecration, as stated by the Tripartite, in presence of Pope Celestine and Theodosius ruler of the world. Again, while the Tripartite (vid. Colgan) represents Germanus as present at Rome at the consecration, the other authors state or imply the contrary. For the

scholiast on the first Life as well as the third, fourth, and sixth Lives, state that Germanus sent St. Patrick to Rome for consecration, while some say that our Saint called on Germanus on his return; and does not this clearly imply that Germanus' presence in Rome at St. Patrick's consecration was as fanciful as that of the infant choir from the woods of western Focluth?¹ Even the Tripartite, which is so much relied on for the consecration of our Apostle in Rome in presence of Germanus, had previously stated that Germanus sent our Saint with others to Rome, who having received his blessing embarked on the Tuscan sea. (Misit ergo Germanus denuo Patricium).

(b) There is a second theory which identifies the Ebmoría of the *Book of Armagh* with Eboracum, York. But this does not deserve much consideration, not because of the violence done to the word as because it is opposed to the express statement of the *Book of Armagh*. This assures us that St. Patrick, after leaving Germanus, learnt the death of Palladius, received consecration at Ebmoría, and crossed the British sea; therefore Ebmoría was not in Britain. The fact that St. Patrick, after leaving Germanus, faced his mission, and after consecration crossed the British sea tells also against the supposition of a consecration at Rome. This theory originated in a faulty collocation which connected Britain with the news rather than the death of Palladius.

(c) A third theory suggests that Ebmoría was Auch in the south-west of France,² and that the consecrator was Armentarius. But in going to Auch from Auxerre one goes neither towards Rome nor Ireland. It would have been far easier to return to Germanus than to go to Auch. Besides there is no great likeness between the words Ebmoría and Augusta Ausciorum. There is still as little likeness between Amato of the *Book of Armagh* and Armentarius, Bishop of Auch. Furthermore, there would in going to Auch be more than a mere turning off the road, as stated in the *Book of Armagh*. (Declinavit iter).

¹ "Audiebantur per totam Hiberniam vel usque ad ipsos Romanos." *Tr. Thaum.* p. 5, n. 5.

² *Documenta de S.P.*, p. 27, n.

(d) The suggestion of Dr. Lanigan that Evreux (called Ebroica) was meant by Ebmoria does not indeed offer any violence to the words; but the supposition which sends St. Patrick so much westwards does not at all harmonize with the idea of mere turning aside.

(e) The learned Colgan suggests Boulogne or Liege in Belgium as the representative of Ebmoria. Between this and the ancient name for Boulogne, there is not the least similarity: moreover the Eburones of Belgium were too much away from the Roman road between Auxerre and Britain.

(f) A theory has been started on the reading or version of St. Patrick's life in the Bollandists' copy, which gives Curbia for Ebmoria, and thus identifies the place of St. Patrick's consecration with Picardy. This place, though not considerably distant from the old Roman road from Boulogne to Rheims, yet does not quite square with the idea suggested in the *Book of Armagh*. No doubt, Curbia bears a closer resemblance to Corbie than to Ebmoria; yet I am disposed to judge that the Curbia of the Bollandists is only another form for Ebmoria. On that account the able writer in the *Scottish Review*, to my mind, who acknowledged to a malignant joy at seeing the old perplexing Ebmoria displaced by Curbia in the *Patrician Documents* was premature in his notes of joy and triumph.¹ Even the Bollandists whose Life gives *Curbia* do not identify this with Corbie as the scene of our apostle's consecration; and this brings us to the seventh theory.

(g) Dr. Todd suggests that St. Patrick's consecration took place on the coast of Brittany. For this he relies on the *Book of Armagh*, which states that after his consecration he went on board a vessel that lay ready for him. But that venerable book only gives an outline, and leaves details to be supplied by more minute biographies. Thus in reference to his embarkation it states that "he went on board and touched the British isles."² One thing did not at once follow the other: sailing through many miles of water intervened. There is more reason for suspecting that St.

¹ *Scottish Review*, for July, 1884.

² *Documenta*, p. 27, "ascendit et pervenit Britannias."

Patrick's consecration took place in the centre rather than on the coast of France.

(h) Anything coming from his Eminence Cardinal Moran is entitled to our best consideration; but his remarks on the present question do not inspire much confidence. In his *Essays* (p. 14), he stated that Germanus on receiving the news of Palladius' death commissioned St. Patrick, by the authority of Pope Celestine, to go to Ireland; yet, in p. 12, he had said that it was after leaving Germanus St. Patrick, on his way to Ireland, received the news of the death of Palladius. He afterwards stated that St. Patrick secured the blessing of Pope Celestine shortly before his death for the Irish mission, returned to Germanus from Rome, and journeyed towards the British sea; yet, he stated subsequently (p. 74) that St. Patrick was commissioned by St. Germanus to go to Ireland: his Eminence conjectured that the consecration of St. Patrick was connected with Troyes, and thus suggests an identification of Amatho with Lupus its bishop.

In subsequent writings his Eminence took up different ground; and ably defending the theory of the Bollandists maintains¹ that St. Patrick was consecrated at Turin by Maximus of Turin, and that there is nothing "to prevent the words of the old Lives from being literally true"—he previously said they could be true only by a figure of speech—that the consecration took place "*in conspectu Theodosii, in conspectu Celestini,*" and again "*in conspectu Germani.*" To show us that he gave the very words of the Lives, the Cardinal italicizes them; but I venture to say that no Lives, to my knowledge, not even a single Life, give these words. The Tripartite Life says that our apostle was consecrated *coram S. Germano et Amato rege* (p. 123, Colgan); and the oldest Scholiast on Fiacc, says, that he was consecrated *in conspectu Celestini et Theodosii junioris* (Ibid. p. 5); but none of these bear out the quotation given by his Eminence. And even though the authority of the Lives could have been quoted for the assertion as to the incidental question of

¹ I. E. RECORD, first series, vol. iii. pp. 17, 18.

the witnesses, they contradict each other and the Cardinal as to the main issue. For the scholiast states that Amator was the consecrator, while the Tripartite states that Pope Celestine was the consecrator of St. Patrick; and the scholiast and Tripartite imply that Rome was the place of consecration by the fact that the former states St. Germanus sent St. Patrick with a witness of his worth to the Pope for consecration, while both state that the voices of the unborn Irish mingled with the Roman choirs on the occasion; whereas Cardinal Moran's last theory is that the consecration took place in Turin, and not by Pope Celestine, as stated by the Tripartite, but by Amator. To take a part of a quotation from one author and tack it to that of another, who are at issue on the main question of consecrator with each other, and are at variance with the Cardinal on the subject matter of both our articles—the place of consecration—is a species of eclecticism not warranted by any historical canon. I repeat that neither Lives nor any Life state the consecration of St. Patrick to have taken place “in conspectu Theodosii, in conspectu Celestini, in conspectu Germani.”

But if the Lives do not warrant the statement, is there any other authority for it? Absolutely none. All the Cardinal has to advance as proof is that the Roman Pontiffs used sometimes visit northern cities, and that the court used sometimes journey from Ravenna to Turin, and that Germanus sometimes had occasion to visit the emperor at Ravenna. But there is no evidence that, in the year 432, pontiff, and emperor, and St. Germanus visited singly, much less together, the city of Turin. All the evidence points the other way. The Lives speak of Germanus sending St. Patrick to Rome for jurisdiction or consecration rather than accompanying him, and of receiving him as he returned to Auxerre. And what is more important still, the most authentic *Book of Armagh*, after speaking of St. Patrick's education under Germanus, and of the length of time spent under his direction, informs us immediately after that the

¹ “Decantata audiebantur per Hiberniam totam vel usque ad ipsos Romanos.” *Scholium*, p. 5, Colgan, et. p. 123, “*Trip.* concinnebant classes Romanorum et . . . Hibernicorum.”

saint was warned in a heavenly vision to go on the mission to which he was called, and that he did set out in obedience to the call from the *children of the wood of Focluth*, and that he was accompanied by a venerable priest whom Germanus sent with him as a witness to his worthiness of the episcopacy; for he had not been yet raised to the episcopal dignity by Germanus himself.¹ Does this give any countenance to the theory that St. Patrick turned his face to Turin after leaving Germanus, or that Germanus accompanied or followed him there?

The objections that are raised against Turin being the place of consecration are nearly as strong as those against Rome. If we bear in mind that Palladius died on the frontiers of Pictish territory, that Colgan judges the 27th of January to have been the most probable date of his death, and that most writers, native and continental, assign Pope Celestine's death to the 6th of April, we can infer that the interval between the end of January and beginning of April would be too short for a journey, especially by a circuitous route off the old Roman road, from Caledonia to Turin. Without going further North than the wall of Antoninus, there is from that place to Ivrea a distance of more than 1,200 Roman miles.² By allowing 20 miles a day, or something over 18 English miles, which is a fair average for flood and field, plain and Alp, Sunday excluded, the poor unfriended missionaries would require ten weeks to travel from Scotland to Ivrea, the reputed Ebmoria: by this time Pope Celestine would have been dead.

But even if we suppose that the messengers announcing the death of Palladius had found Pope Celestine alive, is there a scrap of evidence to show that he ever went up to Ivrea? Absolutely none. What reason can be assigned for a visit to the Alps? Why go there rather than any other part of Christendom? In the preceding year the Pope, who might with comparative ease have sailed back to the General Council of Ephesus, in defence of the maternity of the Mother of God, chose to be represented there by

¹ *Documenta*, p. 25.

² *Itinerary of D'Anville, Gale and Stukely.*

delegates. Why then go to the Alps? Besides, the Lives and the scholiasts say that Pope Celestine did not live more than a week after St. Patrick's consecration. Well, now even supposing that the Pope fell mortally ill on the very day of St. Patrick's consecration at Turin, as alleged, he could not have reached Rome easily in a week, distant by some 400 Roman miles from Turin.

While there is no evidence to show, as is incumbent on the advocates of the Ivrea theory, that the Pope was ever under the Alps, there is every reason to judge that he was not there. The diary which notices the journeys of the Popes, including Pope Celestine's predecessors and successors, is quite silent as to any journey made by St. Celestine to Turin,¹ so that as far as possible we prove a negative against the presence of the Pope in Northern Italy. Finally, how can we reconcile the confused narrative of the Lives as to the consecration of St. Patrick by Pope Celestine with the entry in the martyrology of Tallaght? This states that Patrick's ordination took place on the 6th April, while the Lives state, with other authorities, that Celestine died on the 6th April. Colgan tries to meet the objection by saying that the martyrology refers either to St. Patrick's simple ordination or appointment as archbishop. I have said enough to show that there is not reference in this to his mere ordination to the priesthood; and there is less reason to suppose that there was a festival to commemorate his Archiepiscopate. Once he was consecrated, he became bishop and Apostle and head of the Irish Church. It was competent with him to appoint bishops few or many with fixed sees or merely of an auxiliary character.² It is quite childish then to speak of his promotion to the Archiepiscopate.

Secondly, was Theodosius at Ivrea in the year 432? If his Eminence could produce any evidence to show that

¹ *Viagi di Papi*, by Abbé Francis. In 409 Innocent I. visited Jiusta; Honorius went to Ravenna; St. Leo met Attila in 452. No mention of Celestine.

² "Barbarae nationes Europae etiam olim ad fidem Christi conversae contentae Episcopis; de pallii prerogativa non curabant. Denique Hibernenses, Norici, &c., in nostris temporibus Archiepiscopos habuisse noscuntur." *Guliel. Newbridge*.

Theodosius was ever there I am anxious to see it. I could never gather from any of the records of his life, which came in my way, that the emperor had ever been in Turin or even in any part of the Western Empire. The historian of the Roman Empire tells us that on one occasion he might and ought have come but did not come.¹ His uncle died; the sceptre was usurped by a captain of the army; and instead of coming even to Ravenna, not to speak of the Alps, in aid of his cousin-german Valentinian, only seven years old, he was content with sending merely his patrician as commander. Until we get some proof to the contrary, there are good grounds for doubting the presence *at any time* at Turin either of St. Celestine or Theodosius the younger. As to the presence of Germanus there, there is nothing to justify even the suggestion of his Eminence: for the Lives state, or suppose, that Germanus so far from being present at St. Patrick's consecration sent him from his presence to be consecrated by others.

It is stated by his Eminence that the Amator of the Irish writers was Maximus of Turin, and that his character justified the praise given him for "sanctity and learning." But I beg to remark that the Lives do not allude at all to the *learning* of Amator. The Cardinal adds that Amator is the Irish name for Maximus, but so far from being so, it does not even suggest to my mind any Irish word like or unlike to it, as an equivalent for Maximus. He further adds, there was a tradition that St. Maximus was a Roman, to which the Lives allude. But the Tripartite speaks not of a Roman bishop, but a Roman king, in connection with the consecration; and as against the tradition of St. Maximus of Turin being Roman, we may quote Mabillon, who expressly states that he was a native of Vercelli and not of Rome.² Not only the Lives but their commentator understood the word *Roman* as referring to royalty and not to the episcopacy. Hence Colgan suggests that the Roman king *may* refer to Amantius the pious eunuch of Eudoxia, whose connexion

¹ *Decline and Fall of Roman Empire*, ch. 33.

² *Museum Italicum*, Vol. I., Part 2, p. 5.

with the imperial court may have acquired for him the title of king:¹ but Amantius was no bishop and it could not then be a mistake for Amator who, it is said, really consecrated St. Patrick.

Furthermore, the objection against the other theories in reference to the turning aside from the meeting place at Ebmoría tells still more strongly against the Ivrea theory. For St. Patrick at Ivrea should not only turn aside but go back fully 30 miles to Turin, nearly due south, according to Cardinal Moran's idea. Now this does not at all accord with the idea attached to the "turning aside" in the *Book of Armagh*. Thus it tells us that St. Patrick on feeling his end at hand intended going to and dying in Armagh. At once an angel suggested that he should not take such a step without consulting his familiar guardian angel Victor: at the same moment Victor appeared in a burning bush by the road-side (*secus viam*). St. Patrick in going to the bush is said to have turned aside, (*declinavit secus viam*), the very words that were applied to him at Ebmoría; therefore it were preposterous to explain these words by a journey from Ivrea to Turin.

But his Eminence lays great stress on a phrase in the Tripartite Life, which is *inexplicable*, he says, in the Gaulish theory of St. Patrick's consecration—that after his consecration he took leave of the *Apostolic Lord*. But no theory is bound to explain the words or arguments used in an opposite theory: much less are we called on to explain the Tripartite which is not consistent with itself or the other Lives. But as a matter of historical interest, the phrase *Apostolic Lord* did not apply exclusively at all times to the pope. Thus Sigebert writing to Desiderius a mere bishop calls him apostolic lord² (*Domino sancto Apostolico*.) For all these reasons alleged against the theory advocated by his Eminence, I have no hesitation in pronouncing it as untenable as any of the others.

If then Ebmoría be not represented by Rome, Ivrea, Auch, Boulogne, Evreux, Liege, or York, where did it lie? In searching for it, we should bear in mind that when different words are welded together, the union takes place by syncope

¹ *Trias Thaum.*, p. 9. *Rege Romano*. *Ibid.* p. 123.

² *Bibliothec. Patrum.*, tom. 3 Ep. 9, 17.

or loss to each word. Hence the familiar name Autun is only a new form of the old word Augusto-dunum: hence the well-known name Saragossa was Cæsaraugusta; Auvergne was Augusto-Nemetum; and coming nearer to the word under discussion, Ebro-dunum has re-appeared under the form of Embrun and Ambrun. Therefore if we suppose that Eboria underwent a like change we should expect it to have been something like *Eburo-briga*. Now this very word appears on the old maps. It is distant from Auxerre some 15 miles to the north, as the crow flies. The place is marked in the Itinerary of Antoninus. It corresponds with the present St. Florentine's¹ and is described by D'Anville as on the river Armancon in Gaul.

We should bear in mind that the *Book of Armagh* does not positively but conjecturally give Eboria as the real reading of the words; but Probus who had a copy of the Armagh Life before him gives positively Euboria, others give Eboria. Now the change from Eburo-dunum to Ambrun is as strange as, if not more than, that of Eburo-briga into Eboria. We should also consider that the letter *g* in the middle of Irish words is often silent: hence Brigid into Bride. If then in the word we drop, if I may use the term, the reduplication of the letter *b*, we easily have Eburo-ria—Eburia. For my own part I have not the least doubt as to the identification of the Eboria of the *Book of Armagh*. The old Roman road ran from Lyons through Eburo-briga; and St. Patrick after travelling some fifteen miles from Auxerre came to it. We cannot say whether the disciples of Palladius, who announced his death there, intended, probably they did, to deflect to the right towards Auxerre. St. Patrick's action was prompt and decisive. He turned aside not miles but merely off his path to the old convent of St. Florentine beside the Roman station, and received consecration.

The main source of error on the part of the Lives and their scholiasts flowed from the mistaken idea, that it was necessary that St. Patrick should receive consecration and jurisdiction immediately from the Pope; (sic² enim ordo

¹ Vide *Martyrology of St. Jerome and Usuard*.

² *Trias Thaum. Vita Quarta*, xxix.

exigebat) and from the supposed fact of such a consecration emanated the error of attributing to Celestine the name of Patrick borne by our national apostle.

A prolific source of error with our modern theorists lay in a misunderstanding of the language in the *Book of Armagh*. With the exception of the misprint in Ebmoria, for which indeed the writer prepares us by a warning note, the narrative is quite consistent and clear if properly understood. But there are some words in the passage from the *Book of Armagh* which have led to false theories.

Cardinal Moran having conceived the idea that Maximus of Turin was St. Patrick's consecrator, and that *Amahor* is the Irish word of Maximus, endeavours to show that the name of the consecrator as mentioned by the Lives is only a form of the Irish word. His Eminence says that "on one point the ancient records seem to be explicit—that the name of St. Patrick's consecrator was Amator." But if such be a fact, how is it that Dr. Todd in translating from the *Book of Armagh* a passage in reference to the consecrator (*St. Patrick*, p. 317), and his Eminence in quoting the same passage subsequently (I. E. RECORD, *loco cit.*) give the name as Amatorex? They appear to have been mistaken in making it a simple name; for the original is *Amatho rege* in the *Book of Armagh*, and in the Bollandists' copy.¹ If the *Book of Armagh* justified Dr. Todd, as it does not, in making it one word, as he does, Amathorex could be looked on as a word with the Gaulish termination of *rix* or *rex*; but the *Book of Armagh* gives no warrant for making the word Amathor and letting the *ex* take care of itself.

Not only the *Book of Armagh* but the still older Nennius give the *rex* separate from Amatho, while both make *rex* a title given to him. Nennius and the *Book of Armagh* mention that St. Patrick was consecrated bishop by Amatheus, a king and holy bishop.² This coupled with the fact that the scholiast on the *Prima Vita*, and the *Vita Secunda*, and the Tripartite³ give the *Rex* in capitals and apart

¹ *Documenta*, etc. p. 26.

² Mon. Hist. Brit. ch. 55.

³ Colgan, p. 123. Amato Rege Romano. The *Vita Quarta* gives Amatorege.

from Amato, leads to the belief that *Rex* is not a mere termination but an appellative of Amatho.¹

Now that we must admit the Lives, from the earliest in the sixth century down to those in the tenth, style St. Patrick's consecrator not only bishop but king (*rex*), the question arises; Has this epithet in the circumstances any meaning? Is it a Gaulish termination as Dr. Todd (*St. Patrick*, p. 317. n 2) would have it? King (*rex*) in ecclesiastical language was employed to mean abbot during the sixth and seventh centuries, and such was its meaning in reference to Amato: of this I now give some proof.

In one of the old Irish canons there was a decree that whoever shed the blood of a bishop or high prince. . . . should "in the judgment of the wise be crucified or bound to give seven handmaids."² The exalted prince here meant an abbot. So again (p. 141) St. Patrick says "whoever dares to steal from a king (abbot) or bishop . . . let him pay the price of seven female slaves, or do penance with the bishop for seven years" (*Mansi*, Tom. xii. col. 141). The eighth canon lays down a fine for an outrage on a simple priest, thus shewing that there was question of the ecclesiastical grades. The sixth canon, under the heading of inhospitality (*de jectone*, p. 142) enacts that "whoever does not entertain the exalted prince (abbot) or scribe . . . must pay the seventh part of the fine for murder."³ Of course there is no question here of a merely secular prince, who could, with his retinue, command whatever was best in every house. The abbot was called king or prince. So, too, in another interesting collection of canons by Wasserschleben, which was written about the same time as the *Book of Armagh*,⁴ the word *prince* is applied indiscriminately to abbot and bishop. It were tedious, as it is unnecessary, to give quotations in proof of this. But such phrases as "prince, that is, abbot;" and "he who would be a prince ought first to be a monk;"

¹ *Documenta*, &c. p. 26.

² *Die Altbritischen und irischen Bussordnung*, p. 140, Wasserschleben.

³ Martene, *Thes. nov.* tom. xii., col. 141, "episcopum vel scribam vel principem magnum."

⁴ *Die irische Kanonensammlung*, Wasserschleben.

and a "monk ought not contend with a prince;" and the decree that "no prince is to be ordained unless all the clerics, &c.;" and "let the prince take care lest he badly rule his church"; and the phrase "the will of a bishop or prince—all these phrases put beyond doubt that an abbot was expressed by the word *prince* or *king*.¹

In the office of St. Martin of Tours, it is stated that, while ready to die, he did not object to the chieftaincy of the empire (*principatum imperii*). Here the spiritual sway was called not only a principality or kingdom, but empire. The regal power meant originally a ruling or governing power; and as the rule was the more perfect in proportion to the obedience of subjects, the abbot was really king, as his subjects were bound, even in their very souls, by the vows of obedience to him. Now that we have seen the meaning of *king* in the passage under consideration, we must not be surprised to find the distinctive appellative (*rex*) separated in the *Book of Armagh* and in the other Lives from Amathus.

In the second place, mention of a *chief bishop* in connection with St. Patrick's consecration has led to mistakes. Some have understood it to mean an archbishop, and have run in search of a metropolitanical see. But it need not have, and very probably had not, that meaning in the circumstances. Writers of the eighth and ninth century in speaking of bishops often applied to them epithets which could not subsequently be employed. It was the language of compliment: there was no danger of its being misunderstood. Thus St. Patrick was spoken of by Cummean, abbot of Hy, as our pope.² So too Sidonius Appollinaris, speaking of the French bishops,³ calls them not merely high priests but the highest priests. And at the council of Agatho the fathers there, in legislating for the consecration of a simple bishop, decreed that the metropolitan should summon all the province for the consecration of mere suffragan bishops; yet these are called not

¹ *Irische Kanonensammlung*, ch. xviii. 6, 7, ch. xxi. 31, ch. xxxvii. 7; ch. xli. 2; ch. xlii. 32; ch. xliii. 6; ch. xlv. 20.

² Ussher, *Primordia*, &c., p. 840.

³ *Summi Sacerdotes*, lib. 4. ep. 11.

only pontiffs but chief pontiffs.¹ Language then which was applied to simple bishops, owing to the pretensions to which it was likely to give rise has been since applied only to the Sovereign Pontiffs. We need not then understand the epithet applied to Amatheus as implying necessarily archiepiscopal jurisdiction. We shall be the less disposed to do so if we bear in mind that he was an abbot. There is no reason then for saying that the consecrator of St. Patrick, unless by the possible accident of having been archbishop before entering religion, enjoyed metropolitanical powers or a metropolitanical see. Moreover it is certain that Ebmorla or Eburo-briga was subject to the metropolitan of Sens.

Thirdly, those who have been led to think that St. Patrick's consecrator was an archbishop have cast about for one whose name resembled Amator. Hence some have proposed Amanus Archbishop of Bordeaux; others have suggested Armenarius. Some have also suggested Amator who consecrated Germanus; but he had died fourteen years previous to the consecration of St. Patrick. The *Book of Armagh* however distinctly tells us that Amatho was the name of the consecrator. Amato or, contractedly, Amé was not an unusual name. We find a Saint Amathus bishop of Sion in the Valais, during the seventh century, and an abbot of Agaunum named Amatus in the sixth century. This name is as natural and had the same root as Amator, the predecessor and consecrator of St. Germanus at Auxerre. But Nennius, by an additional letter, suggests a different root in giving the consecrator of St. Patrick as Amatheus—a name perpetuated in the Amadei of Savoy. We may however conclude by saying that St. Patrick was consecrated by Amatus or Amatheus, abbot-bishop at Eburo-briga, the old Roman Station and the present railway station of St. Florentine, some twenty miles N.N.E. of Auxerre.

SYLVESTER MALONE.

¹ Con. ch. 35.

THE ORIGIN OF THE FEAST OF THE HOLY NAME.

WE can easily gather from Ecclesiastical history that Sunday, the feasts of Easter and Pentecost, which had been observed with appropriate solemnity during the first epoch, continued without interruption days of festive gladness or saddening sorrow, in the early ages of the Church. Her feasts, indeed, were few in number down to the time of Constantine.

At the opening of that happy period the Christians, yielding generously to the practices and holy inspirations of religion, gave expression in their exterior worship to their pious thoughts and ennobling sentiments.

The marvellous extension of Christianity under the sword of the executioner is not more powerful than the sudden growth of that mysterious worship, which in the fourth century burst into life and grew into a definite shape, gathering into itself all those constituent elements of her august ceremonial, which have continued down to our own day.

Well could Lacordaire say : “ We had won the right to clothe our doctrine in a robe of purple after all the blood they (the first Christians) had shed upon it.”

By degrees the churches increased in number and magnificence, and in proportion as paganism abandoned its temples, the Christians purified them, and inaugurated there the worship of the true God.

During the fourth century other great festivals were added to those already existing, in order to complete the cycle of sacred memorials by which the most prominent events in the life of Our Saviour were annually brought before the mind of the Christian in the order in which they took place. The Eastern feast of the Epiphany began to be celebrated in the same century in the West, but under a different signification from what it bore in the East. The festival of Christmas was of later introduction than Easter, Pentecost or the Ascension. This was owing to the uncertainty of the birthday of Our Lord.

After a time it obtained a rank equal to Easter, the cardinal feast of the Church, and eventually rose to a more exalted distinction by being made, through the efforts of some of the Fathers, to be the mother of all other feasts.¹

St. Epiphanius gives a full description of the feasts of the Church at the close of the fourth century. Their limited number at that time gradually increased with the growth of the Church till we reach that remarkable epoch in history rendered eventful by the institution of the feast of the "*Most Holy Name of Jesus.*"

Readers of Italian history and romance, as well as tourists to the Southern Peninsula, occasionally come across a place that is famous in the world of hagiology. It is Siena, an ancient and beautiful city of Tuscany, placed on a hill, and enclosed by heights of a sort of hard, dry earth, called *tufa*, so that it appears to lie among mountains.

It was erected into a metropolitan city in 1459, by Pope Pius II., one of its citizens, of the noble house of Piccolomini. From the time that it embraced the faith, this city has professed a singular devotion to the Queen of Heaven. It is called in fact the "City of the Virgin"—"*Siena vetus, civitas Virginis.*" One proof of this feeling of devotion is the dedication to the Mother of God of the cathedral, which for valuable marbles and exquisite workmanship, is reckoned one of the noblest and most gorgeous buildings in Europe. My subject carries the reader back to a time when a glorious luminary had been winning a golden reputation, which was to live in history, for pulpit oratory, and for those extraordinary gifts of winning souls and working wonders whenever and wherever he appeared during his missionary career.

He was styled Bernardine of Siena, the child of holy parents, and born and educated at Siena towards the close of the fourteenth century.

His genial, affable nature, his fair and frank countenance, to which modesty lent an air of becoming grace and dignity, made him dear to all, and the idol of attached parents. His innate goodness of nature inclined him to whatever was

¹ *Vide* "Hom. of St. John Chrysostom in diem Natalem," page 355.

right. Good habits and study placed him on the road to success. His early dispositions to piety revealed themselves in the innocent amusements common to his age. He was often found building up little altars, making small musical instruments, and carving the Most Holy Name on the trees of a neighbouring forest.

Without much stretch of imagination people foretold that this little blossom of goodness would one day be changed into blessed fruit. Coming events cast their shadows before, for, yet a mere child, he would steal away to a neighbouring church of St. Augustine to listen with the most rapt attention to the sermon, every word of which he repeated on reaching home. His progress in letters placed him in front of all his competitors. From the marvellous acquirements *in literis humanioribus*, moral philosophy and Canon Law, he passed to the study of Sacred Scripture, which became the fountain of all his knowledge, and the inspiration of that burning zeal for the conversion of sinners. Yielding to the pleadings of his heart, he withdrew to a lonely spot in the gardens near the *porta Tufi*, and erected there a little chapel and altar, with a crucifix above it, and in front a lamp, which he continually kept burning.

He doubled his accustomed prayers, prolonged his vigils, living on herbs and roots, and sleeping three short hours upon a sack of vine branches as a bed, and a log of wood for a pillow. In the light received from prayer he read the Divine Will calling him to an order that appeared to him best adapted for the accomplishment of his desire. The coarse brown frock of the Franciscan monk, fitted admirably over the irritating hair shirt and mortified heart of him who was destined to be one of the most devoted followers of the Cross, and one of the most illustrious children of the seraphic Francis. He became a bright light and mirror of sanctity in the house of novices, becoming perfect in every kind of virtue.

The Passion of Christ was the source of that abundant fruit that fed his spirit, and the scourges, scoffs, and sufferings of the God-man pierced his heart with the sword of compassion, till by the violence of its hardly suppressed throbs, he

thought it would burst the barriers that confined it in his heaving breast. A soul fed from such a source only waited the favourable moment to pour out upon others some of the flames that were enkindled by its love. Raised to the priesthood, and invested with the power of publicly preaching the Divine Word, Bernardine gave promise of that fruit which, by his holy discourses, he was afterwards to gather in the vineyard of the Lord. It was a lucky advent for the country of his birth; for in the fifteenth century Italy had been for a long time completely deluged by a flood of corruption and iniquity. The fair aspect of piety, and that tone of reverential regard for sacred things, had disappeared. Fraud, extortion, and usury increased the patrimony and swelled the coffers of dissolute men, whose sensual excesses were only bounded by their wicked desires and ungovernable passions. Every creek and inlet on the sea-board afforded shelter to those pirate ships that troubled every sea, and gave them protection and opportunity to dispose of the smuggled booty. The highways were beleaguered with assassins and depraved individuals who, buried in licentiousness, utterly discarded the rulers and discipline of the Church they dishonoured.

The clergy, too, sharing in the unhappy tone of public life, became listless, and cast away the spirit of piety, sharing in those rounds of pleasure and voluptuous gratification, which were caught from the unhappy temper of the time. All the elements of dissension were working in the bosom of Italian society, to give to their party strifes the character of a fierceness and obstinacy without parallel in history. It required a bold and unbending mind to direct with the hand of a master the spiritual destinies of a people whose hearts were the home of every species of agitation and revenge, personal enmity and political altercation.

Bernardine fully informed both by his own experience and the accounts of others, of the woeful condition of Italy, pitied her in all the sincerity of his great soul, and felt a burning desire to fly everywhere through the whole kingdom to enlighten and convert sinners by the Divine Word. The severe course of life that marked the early part of his novitiate was now pursued with greater vigour, and the late hours of the night

or the early hours of the morning found him prosecuting those studies which were to fit him for the great work he was soon to engage in. In some sequestered spot or remote place made solitary by its desert loneliness, did he often give vent to his feelings in groans of sorrow, bathing his face in tears of most tender devotion.

Often did he stretch himself on the bare ground in the form of a cross, crucifying that suffering spirit by a boundless grief, and an inward mortification to which no limit could be set. A lofty idea just then broke upon his noble soul ; it was to preach the Gospel through all Italy.

With this view he set out from his native Tuscany, journeying through Lombardy, till he reached that noble and ancient capital, Milan, where thousands flocked to the cathedral to hear him who surpassed everyone's expectation, and who, for his zeal and eloquence, was considered a new apostle sent down from heaven. To the natural gifts of person, graces adorned his pure soul for the success of his good work.

All that the masters of oratory could teach regarding a finished and perfect style of pulpit eloquence, became for him an absorbing study. His voice was agreeable, clear, deep and powerful ; it preserved gravity in its sweetness, and sweetness in its power, and was modulated in clear and easy tones. He had it so thoroughly under his command, and could adapt it so well to the matter of his discourse, with a directness, ease, and flexibility, that he easily surpassed all in grace and elocution. His eloquence, too, was controlled by those superior powers that could regulate its impulse and convey to it a character at once bold and impassioned. He could not merely move the mind, but he could shape it to his pleasure : insomuch, that whether he thundered from the pulpit in tremendous denunciations of vice, or whether he sweetly exhibited the beauty of virtue, or recreated the minds of his hearers with some witty, though always reverent remark, he was ever master of the feelings of his audience, moving them at one time, with surprising art, to tears ; at another, to smiles. His natural appearance heightened the effect of his remarkable powers. His splendid features.

expressed, with remarkable accuracy, the vivacity of a soul that spoke through his noble bearing and winning aspect. The elegance of his language was a very suitable channel to convey these sound instructions, the fruit of widely-gathered information from the fountains of true knowledge—Holy Scripture and the Fathers. Add to these a holiness of life that was never blemished by a wilful stain, and one can easily imagine why his hearers hung upon his lips, and, lost in admiration at the charms of his wonderful diction, called him the New Apostle of God.

Countless crowds of both sexes assembled before day-break in the public squares, where he was accustomed to preach, often making journeys of thirty miles. Fathers carried their children upon their shoulders; infants hung upon their mothers' necks; habitual sinners, who had remained away for years from the sacraments, were now seen making atonement, and bending their stubborn wills at the solitary voice of an humble monk, and generously performing penances that betokened the deep compunction of their converted hearts. Traversing all Italy, he put the sickle to a harvest that was never touched, and gathered, in its rich abundance, the fruit of that earnest toil, prayer, and mortification, that rendered his work so acceptable to God and so beneficial to his fellow-creatures. The land that was torn by implacable hatred and intestine strife, was reduced, by his holy and abiding influence, to Christian tranquillity; private enmities, which years had fermented into bitter hatred and accursed contention, till they burst out into public hostility when the hateful names of Guelph and Ghibelline rose above the contending factions, were abandoned at the formidable sound of Bernardine's voice. The fatal symbol that marked the flag that was lifted high above the field of blood and carnage, was effaced for the beautiful image of the Most Holy Name, that was carved or painted in its stead, in clear and well-defined characters. Christian honour and modesty began to return to a world that had hitherto been abandoned to every kind of evil-doing. Hospitals were erected; usury, fraud, and mercantile deceit ceased; multitudes of heretics, enlightened by the saint's aid to know the

truth, abjured their errors; the demon lost his tyrannical sway over countless souls, and the fervour of Christian piety flourished once more among men. After having preached through most of the towns and rural parishes in the Italian Republics, leaving no stone unturned or art unemployed to detach people from the loose method of life which gambling, party strife, and superstition, in its various branches, had brought about, Bernardine succeeded in having these licentious customs renounced, and those abominable practices abandoned, to which the slavery of bad habits had given a criminal sanction. He established everywhere a sincere union between hostile factions, that love and charity might reign sweetly in those hearts that had hitherto been embittered by the fierce venom of deadly hate. So thoroughly were those civil dissensions extinguished, that people hitherto remarkable for the inveterate hatred and jealousy they kept up, now renounced those dangerous, deadly customs, where multitudes of people fought, armed with clubs, with headpieces, and shields; so that many in those encounters were severely wounded or left for dead. Harmony and brotherly love now began to flourish, and sober, Christian lives now witnessed to the change that was wrought by zeal that never flagged, and a heroic devotion that was ever ready to sacrifice itself for the redemption of the captive sinner.

Enriched by such a golden harvest of souls, Bernardine's heart would naturally yield itself to that pardonable vanity, which is often begotten of the conquests made in these spiritual realms from which the enemy of souls had been routed. Trials came, however, from unexpected quarters to anticipate the temptation, if any such were in store for the saint. These heroic qualities of his were to be tested in the furnace of tribulation, and that humility, the foundation of all those noble qualities which made his name a household word through all Italy, was to be measured to its deepest foundation, and tried by the sharpest pangs that could sound and torture the human heart. Yet it only proved the occasion to the holy man of superabundant merit by that patient endurance, which gave a shining lustre to heroic courage and noble submission. It came about in this way: the

saint was in the habit of holding up before the gaze of the assembled multitudes, who flocked to hear his discourses, the *Sacred Name*, carved or painted on a tablet in a cipher of gold characters, surrounded by rays like the sun. At the end of his discourse he was accustomed to make the people pay reverence on their knees to this representation, to remind them of the Saviour, who was exhibited to them in this cipher, denoting His Name—that Holy Name they were bound to honour, love and respect.

He hoped by impressing this devotion deep upon their hearts, to restore a lost love towards that Holy Name, which had well-nigh been effaced from their souls by the vices that then ravaged unfortunate Italy. The exposition of the Sacred symbol from his own and the pulpit of the members of his institute, was, to say the least of it, a novelty. Impatient spirits, jealous of a great reputation, and believing themselves of a superior caste, raised a loud cry that pierced the ear of the learned and supercilious, who began to regard the practice of Bernardine as a species of idolatry, or a custom that tended to superstition, and that the people venerated those letters more than Christ Himself, who was signified by them. On the other hand, the simple-hearted and pious were truly touched by what excited a lively devotion and inspired them with a tender love towards the Redeemer of men.

Bernardine had excited a feeling of dislike in the hearts of some belonging to the other orders, and the agitation that divided learned opinion regarding the practice we have alluded to above, imparts both courage and strength to those adherents who, armed with a false zeal, animadverted upon Bernardine with all the armoury that invective or rancour could supply.

They said that “he was a rough man, wholly devoid of any learning; that his speech was rude and unpolished; that he knew forty sermons and no more; they propagated calumny, insinuating the close affinity that some of his discourses bore to heretical opinions, and they circulated in published treatises exhaustive attacks upon the soundness of his doctrine and the sanctity of his life. The principal

opponent was a Milanese, of noble birth, and a highly distinguished member of the Order of St. Augustine.

Fr. Andrew Bilio wrote and published a work entitled, "The Disciples formed by the Teaching of Brother Bernardine of Siena, of the Order of Minors." He vigorously attacked the holy practice and method of the saint in preaching the Divine Word. Under honied expressions that conveyed an outward appearance of lofty zeal and just indignation, there lay concealed a treachery, which jealousy of the heroic grandeur of a noble soul had excited, and that could seek no peace but in a base attempt to sully a reputation that was won in the conquest over minds and hearts. The invidious work was prosecuted with incredible ardour, and the doctrine of the saint was attacked by the method of exposition, which was falsely charged as not being conformable to the teaching of the Catholic Church. Envy carried so far, worked upon the prejudiced minds of Bernardine's enemies, so that a long string of charges were with great zeal and warmth presented against him at the Court of Rome. They substantially amounted to this: that the saint had invented a new heresy; that he had induced the people to commit idolatry by the exposition and adoration of unknown tablets, on which was carved the sun, and in the centre of the sun strange marks of magic characters and spells. Martin the Fifth, the reigning Pontiff, felt very much disturbed at the startling nature of the indictment, and at once summoned Bernardine from Viterbo to Rome to answer the charges.

In obedience to the voice of the Holy See, he suspended his preaching and spiritual functions, started for Rome to await the charges that were levelled against him by the bitter jealousy of factious rivals; and to crown his troubles, he was pointed at in the streets of the Eternal City as a "heretic." The Pope who then ruled the Church, was one whose election was hailed with universal satisfaction. He was saluted with the grateful titles of Angel of peace and public happiness. The Church had just put aside her mourning from a fatal schism, more destructive to her than all the persecutions and heresies of former ages. Every throne in

Europe had been either vacant or overturned, and the papacy itself had been robbed of much of that glorious prestige that gathers round it as the centre of that marvellous unity which makes the Church unconquerable.

Martin belonged to the noble house of Colonna, that wielded a high and lofty sway among the Roman nobility. His election accordingly gratified the hearts of his fellow-citizens, who hailed him as the true father of his country. As he entered the city of the Popes, his eyes surveyed with grief the heaps of ruins which marked the passage of bloody revolutions. Ruined dwellings, shattered temples, deserted streets, taught the Romans the fearful lesson easily gathered from every page of her history, the awful price she had to pay for casting from her midst the Supreme Shepherd, who was appointed to feed and guard the flock from danger.

The presence of the Pope brought back life and activity to the great capital; trade revived and money circulated, and the earth again gave up its treasures, and public monuments marked the enthusiasm that hailed the advent of the Holy Father among his own people. Bernardine was for some time not destined to share in this joy that broke over the heart of every Roman. The Pope received him with an air of severity, and promised him that punishment of the severest character would be the penalty, if the truth of the charges brought against him could be satisfactorily determined.

The man of God bowed his head, and waited with confidence the record of the decision. All his writings and discourses, gathered from Holy Writ, Theology and the Canons were submitted to a learned body of theologians, in addition to whom the Pope named as judges of the cause three cardinals, as distinguished for their extensive erudition as for the morality of their lives. On the appointed day, prelates, theologians and religious met in the Vatican Basilica. The saint's adversaries were well represented by as many as sixty-two doctors in theology; whilst the supporters of Bernardine reposed all the weight of the defence upon one solitary man, but one, who possessed many of the gifts, which had brought Bernardine a reputation

that was to live in history, and one who had derived from the example of a holy life, sources of spiritual profit that rendered the pupil in many respects as illustrious as the Master he loved.

His sole defender was St. John Capistran, whose learned voice was now raised not merely in defence of injured innocence and in the sacred cause of truth, but in behalf of one whose holy and intimate friendship he valued equally with his own life. A heightened interest was lent to the discussion by the presence of the Pope, the cardinals, and an innumerable host of spectators. The studied arguments of the saint's adversaries, based on all the craft and sophistry of the subtle dialectician and the trained theologian, invested the charges with an air of truth. The Scriptures, Fathers, and Sacred Canons were ransacked for texts and quotations to impart vigour and add weight to representations, from whose craftiness it seemed almost impossible for even a saint to emerge with safety.

But human ingenuity can devise no argument, nor lodge an objection which the Spirit of God cannot let the light in upon and solve without any trouble. Bernardine answered every objection so clearly and so satisfactorily from the very sources from which they were taken, repelling his enemies with the very weapons furnished from their own armoury, that the Pope at once perceived that the accusation proceeded from malice and envy; that the saint had never erred against the Faith or Fathers, and that a trial so painful should be brought to an issue by a definitive judgment that gave the saint a complete victory over his enemies. His faithful friend and companion then, by permission of the Holy Father, rose and rendered the innocence of Bernardine more conspicuous, and to confirm his teaching, took up all the arguments of his adversaries—some eighty-five in number—and so satisfied the Court of Rome by the groundlessness of the charges, that Bernardine was declared to be, instead of stained by heresy, a faithful confessor and a true preacher in word and work of Catholic truth, and a most obedient son of the Church. His Holiness received him with special marks of favour, and imparting to him his blessing, gave him ample power to

to preach the Divine Word everywhere. To prosecute the noble mission he had undertaken, and to carry out successfully his sacred mission, he was to carry the Crucifix as well as the Holy Name in his pious work.

The historian of his life tells us that the Pope ordered that a solemn procession should take place, at which all the clergy and people were to assist, and in which St. John Capistran with holy pomp, should bear the glorious standard of the adorable Name amidst sacred hymns and signs of joy. In many of the large towns, the august Name which had been graven on a stone in golden characters, surrounded by rays of light, was set in the façade of the Church as a perpetual trophy of the victory just achieved. From this time the custom of painting or carving the Holy Name on church fronts, on walls or doors of houses, then became very common, and may still be seen in many parts of Italy.

To duly acknowledge this triumph, all the Orders of Minors celebrate yearly on the 14th of January, the Feast of the most Holy Name of Jesus, which they keep with a special office, by favour of a grant of Pope Clement VII., in 1530. The same feast was enriched with copious indulgences by the same Pope, which he granted to all who should recite the office of it, like those which are gained in the Feast and Octave of Corpus Christi. At the request of the Emperor Charles VI., this feast and office were extended to the whole Catholic Church by Pope Innocent XIII., to be kept on the Second Sunday after Epiphany. Thus that fierce storm of tribulation, which had threatened with its impetuous blast to extinguish the fire of devotion towards the Holy Name, conduced in the end to make it more revered, and to immortalize the triumphs of the holy preacher who had so energetically extended its glory.

JOHN DOHENY.

THE "FORMA SUBSTANTIALIS" OF SCHOLASTICISM.

IN the July number of the RECORD I attempted to describe some of the characteristics of the "materia prima" of Scholasticism. I will now venture on a similar attempt in respect to the "forma substantialis," its inseparable companion. What is the "forma substantialis" or substantial form? Is it shape, or figure, or beauty? Is it any of the things signified by the English word "form" in its ordinary sense? None of them whatever. What is it then? It is that inherent part which bestows on anything its specific perfection, supplies it with its essential requisites, and marks it off from every thing of a different species. It gives a special complexion and character to the constitution of a being, and to all its operations. It is like the mainspring of a piece of machinery, imparting gracefulness and energy to all its evolutions. It differs greatly from the matter to which it is united; it is of a higher rank; but it does not disdain the alliance. And the result exemplifies the advantage of such unions, when there is sympathy on both sides. Out of heterogeneous elements is formed a homogeneous whole. They combine to promote the common good, a perfect unity of essence and exchange of friendly offices. How this is brought about is a mystery of nature; perhaps beyond our comprehension. We cannot behold it; we cannot lay our finger on it and say we have found it, or that we have made a palpable hit. But that it is so, we must, I think, be convinced, if we pursue the inquiry by a chain of metaphysical or abstract reasoning. And our satisfaction, I venture to hope, though not sensibly felt, will be more deeply and more lastingly enjoyed. In spite of the absence of tangible evidence, we may still grasp the fact that the mingling of two elements seemingly so opposite will not produce a monstrous confusion or discord, but an order most symmetrical and a harmony most graceful. They are fused or blended into each other so imperceptibly that no one can tell precisely the line of demarcation. On the other hand they are never lost or swallowed up in each other, which would destroy every trace of the originals. The effects proper to

both are distinctly observable. Eating and drinking, man has in common with the brute creation as well as the intuition of first principles in common with the angels. But the acts of both kinds are of the same specific nature; for the former as well as the latter are referable to the glory of God, and may merit a reward given only to a work of intelligence. Their distinction is attributable to the influence of a dual element; their specific identity to the influence of one substantial form. This last is said to be the cause of the essence. The term causation is used by the schoolmen in its widest sense. Often the cause of anything is the thing itself present somewhere. Olive green on the panels of a carriage is the cause why they are coloured, for the green is itself the colouring. If a form exists anywhere it is the formal cause of its presence there. It is thus the substantial form is the formal cause of the essence being itself a part of it. It is also the cause of the properties which spring from it by emanation. Between these two, according to St. Thomas, a real distinction exists. The power of reasoning is of the essence of man; the ability to laugh is one of his properties. Some few have excelled in one without possessing the other. Of the essence of a thing is that a notion of which enters into the conception of it; a property does not enter into the conception; but it is inferred to be a necessary attendant on it. The form is called also their principle, because they originate from it. A principle may be of two kinds: the *principium quod* and the *principium quo*. The former is identical with the agent; the latter is a qualification in the agent for the performance of certain acts. Thus in reasoning, a human agent is the *principium quod*, a rational soul, the *principium quo*. But as the soul in reasoning employs the understanding, a faculty distinct from itself and closely touching the act, so the first is called the *principium radicale*, and the second *principium proximum*. The form is named substantial, because the terms essence and substance are often synonymous, also to distinguish it from an accidental form, this not being either a part of the essence or a necessary outcome from it. I may exemplify by recalling a scientific habit in a mathematician,

astronomer, &c., skill and manual dexterity in a performer on a musical instrument, a particular aptitude for a mechanical pursuit, and so forth. It is obvious that such ability, natural or acquired, is related but accidentally to the substantial form. There are other points of difference. The subject is not the same. The recipient of a perfection is its subject. Such is primary matter as to the substantial form; such is a compound of both as to an accidental form. Now, "*quidquid recipitur ad modum recipientis recipitur.*" The condition of the recipient modifies the condition of the thing received, favourably or unfavourably. The condition of the substantial form is lowered and deteriorated by its reception into matter. If it dwelt apart, the sphere of its activity would be greater, for it would then be fettered only by the limits of its nature. It is now narrowed in many other respects, and as St. Thomas says—"Forma contrahitur per materiam." The condition of an accidental form, on the other hand, is raised and ennobled by its reception into a compound. This reception is indispensable even to its existence, much more to a useful existence, for it is a creature too feeble to support any existence alone. Of this form we may verify the axioms: "*Potest adesse, vel abesse salva rei essentia;*" "*Non dat esse simpliciter sed secundum quid;*" "*advenit rei post esse completum.*" It produces only a modification of being in a thing which already exists independently of itself. As to the substantial form we verify others, "*per idem res est et in tali specie est.*" "*Idem est principium essendi et operandi.*" "*Quae dat esse, dat consequentia ad esse.*" *Esse* may signify essence, existence or the agreement between a predicate and subject expressed by the copula *est*. Here I use *esse* in the first signification. "*Forma est causa materiae.*" "*Forma et materia sunt sibi invicem causae.*" Is this last possible? Is it possible for two things to be the cause of each other's existence? Yes, not in the same but in different lines of causation; you may be instructed by a Frenchman in French, and he may be instructed by you in English; but you cannot give instruction to an individual and receive it from him on one point in the same language. Similarly the form and matter are the cause of each other's existence, one is the formal, the

other the material. The form is the cause of the perfections imprinted on matter, the matter is the cause of limiting and restraining them. As the form is a principal source of perfection, so the word itself and all its derivations are employed to indicate something of great importance or indispensable. I need not tell the reader that a rule quite the opposite holds good in English. When it is stated that a report at a public meeting was read *pro forma*, it is thereby meant that such a course was unnecessary, the contents having been known to all interested in them. It is often allowed that a document may be substantially correct, although it is wanting in some of the formalities required in framing it. A mode of procedure is declared to be "formal," because it admits of dispensation without entailing injury to a cause or an individual. Some persons get impatient, nay, angry, if it is demanded of them or only requested to keep a ceremony of social etiquette. Their preference is to dismiss it as a contemptible formality. Now a schoolman could hardly pay you a greater compliment than to say you were exceedingly formal. "Quod est maxime formale in qualibet re, id in ea est perfectissimum." He would think that he exalted the dignity even of supernatural grace if he said that it was the formal cause of man's justification. He would go farther and maintain that he then spoke most reverently of God himself when he attributed the greatest formality to the Divine perfections, and still more daringly he would refuse to look on them as perfections at all unless he might in his language consider them also as formalities. In the scale of essences there are steps, and the form of a higher step embodies in its unity the perfections of the one below it, superadding a perfection of its own. At the foot of the ladder, the form produces being with a blind instinct of resisting destruction. Higher up it produces also life, and, perhaps, in some instances, imperfect sensation; still higher, it produces in addition perfect sensation, a knowledge of things apprehended by the senses, and a strong inclination for them if agreeable. Highest of all, in man it produces the perfections of animal and rational nature combined. The superiority of one of these forms over another is easily recognized. But it may be satisfactory to discover a philosophical

test of it. I think we shall succeed by instituting a comparison between the sight and the touch; between the former and the imagination, between this last and the intellect. The object of the touch is a very small portion of a small extent of surface. It is circumscribed within narrow boundaries. Beyond these the power of touch cannot be extended, nor within these can it reach any thing which is not in immediate contact with it. As to the object of sight, distance almost in any direction appears to be annihilated. It is nothing less than a marvel that an organ so diminutive can delineate in an image just perceptible, the expanse of the firmament with its diversified features. But all this pales before the brilliant efforts of the imagination by which the past and future are realized as vividly as the present, and the present only if away or unseen. Still, in imaginary pictures we discern some very delicate shadowy lines of quantity and matter, but elevated almost to the verge of the spiritual world. This is the dwelling-place of the intellect which soars aloft in a region of its own, and meditates on truth abstracted from every condition of time and place, and, therefore, universal and eternal. The object of this faculty has no limits except such as arise from a specific and created nature, which being specific, must be definite, and being created, must be finite. But its distinctive object is unlimited truth in the abstract, or as really existing in God. I have followed the ascent towards perfection of two external senses, and two of the internal faculties of the soul; and I fancy I have suggested a mark for determining it. One of them excels another in the degree in which it becomes independent of matter, and escapes from its bondage. We may pronounce a similar judgment on the relative superiority of a substantial form.

I hope I have now prepared a way for introducing a passage from St. Thomas. In the *Summa Theologica*, *Treatise de Homine*, Quest. 76, art. 1, he establishes that an intellectual principle is united to the human body as its substantial form.

He then proceeds:—

“Sed considerandum est, quod quanto forma est nobilior tanto magis dominatur materiae corporali et minus ei immergitur et magis

sua operatione vel virtute excedit eam; unde videmus quod forma mixti corporis habet aliam operationem quae non causatur ex qualitatibus elementaribus, et quanto magis proceditur in nobilitate formarum tanto magis invenitur virtus formae materiam excedere, sicut anima vegetabilis plusquam forma elementaris et anima sensibilis plusquam anima vegetabilis. Anima autem humana est ultima in nobilitate formarum, unde in tantum sua virtute excedit materiam corporalem quod habet aliquam operationem et virtutem in qua nullo modo communicat materia corporalis et haec virtus dicitur intellectus."

First, I wish to observe that *materia corporalis* and *elementaris* here signify nearly the same thing, matter that has the *forma corporeitatis*. Secondly, that according to Aristotle and St. Thomas, plants and animals have souls as well as man, but of different kinds. At least the term *anima* and its Greek equivalent, are indiscriminately applied to them, not, of course, in the same sense. I will translate the quotation freely: In proportion to the nobility of any form is the degree (or kind) of its independence of matter and of its sway over it, and in the same proportion is the degree of excellence in its power and operation: hence we see that the form of a mixed body, that is, one composed of the four elements, air, fire, earth and water, produces an operation superior to that which is caused by any of the qualities named elementary, as heat, cold, dryness, moisture, &c. (This is merely an illustration drawn from the state of physical science in the days of St. Thomas). And the more a form advances in rank the more its power excels that of elementary matter, as, for instance, that form which is the principle of life and growth in vegetable productions, is superior to the form of one or all of the elements, while itself again must yield to that which is the principle of sensation and knowledge in animals. Now the human soul is the most noble in the list of forms. Hence its superiority to corporal matter, or the *forma corporeitatis* is so great that it possesses a faculty which is exercised without the help of a corporal organ at all, and this faculty is called the intellect. Quantity and quality are the two principal modifications of a compound, and, perhaps, to these all others may be reduced, and as the former being passive is based upon matter, so the latter being more or less

active, is based on the substantial form. What is quality? It is like those things with which we are most familiar. It is easier to enumerate some of its species than to give a satisfying definition of any of them. I mention them when I speak of bodily quickness, agility or strength, sharp sight, acute hearing, a lively imagination, a keen intellect, a strong or ardent will, a hot temper, a readiness to acquire or use knowledge; a rapid glance will show that a principle of activity animates them. It is unnecessary to name their contraries, for "eadem est scientia oppositorum." To know anything, is to know the extreme opposed to it. We may, perhaps, regard matter and form as two headings under which quantity and quality naturally fall. And although neither of them is produced by the substantial form, yet each in its way derives nutriment and support from the being or life which it imparts. The partnership between matter and form is liable to dissolution. This takes place, when they are no longer fit to be associated. Dispositions in the parts or organs grounded upon matter, fail and decay. The form departs and perishes. "Formae educuntur de potentia materiae." Such forms are produced because matter has a capacity to receive them. When it loses that capacity they cease to exist. Being unable to perform any act without the co-operation of matter, their existence apart would be useless and a burthen. This is not true of the human form which is created. As it may operate, so it may exist independently of matter; and, therefore, in a state of separation. The loss of a form is called substantial corruption; its gain substantial generation, and as matter is never without a form, so the one is always followed by the other. Hence arose the phrase, "Corruptio unius est generatio alterius." The corruption of anything leads to the generation of something else. In the corruption of plants, matter receives the "*forma inorganica*;" in the corruption of animals, it receives the "*forma cadaverica*." There is a multitude of changes of this sort involving a transition from one state of substantial being to another daily occurring in every part of the world. St. Thomas adopted and interpreted Aristotle's doctrine of primary matter and substantial forms. He largely applies it

to elucidate several of the mysteries of faith. Without a clear insight into it, considerable passages in his works are unintelligible. From the fields of natural and supernatural science he has drawn materials and woven them into a tissue remarkable for its firmness, lightness and finish. By crossing and recrossing the silver threads of one field with the gold threads of the other, he has traced patterns of exquisite and varied beauty. Happy are they who have mastered them in their design and execution, who admire their loveliness and feel delight in contemplating it.

T. J. DEELY, O.P.

ROSARY DOCUMENTS.

AT the request of many subscribers we have collected the various Documents prescribing the recitation of the Rosary, which have been issued from time to time since 1883 by His Holiness Leo XIII. or the Sacred Congregations. Both bishops and priests have occasion to refer to these Documents as the month of October comes round each year, and it has been represented to us that some difficulty is experienced in finding them all, scattered as they are in so many different volumes of the I. E. RECORD. To remove this inconvenience we now publish all the ROSARY DOCUMENTS from the first which appeared on the 16th July, 1883, to the latest published on the 11th September in the present year.

LETTER OF THE CONGREGATION "DE PROPAGANDA FIDE,"
 PRESCRIBING THE RECITATION OF THE ROSARY AND THE
 LITANY OF LORETTO FOR EVERY DAY IN THE MONTH OF
 OCTOBER, 1883.

SUMMARY.

1. The Feast of the Rosary to be celebrated with special solemnity this year (1883).
2. Five decades at least of the Rosary and the Litany of Loretto to be recited every day from the 1st of October to the 2nd of November in all parochial churches.

3. The same devotions to be carried out in other churches and in oratories dedicated to the Blessed Virgin in accordance with such arrangements as the Ordinary may be pleased to approve.

4. It is highly desirable that Mass should be said, or Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament given in connection with those devotional exercises.

5. A Plenary Indulgence is granted to all the faithful who confess and communicate on the feast of the Holy Rosary, or (if hindered from doing so on the feast itself), within the octave, and visit a church, and there pray for the wants of the Church according to the intentions of the Pope.

6. Indulgences of seven years and seven quarantines for joining within this month in the public recitation of the Rosary in a church, praying, as above, for the intentions of the Pope.

7. Persons joining in the public recitation of the Rosary and Litany in a church on ten days in this month, as also persons, who being legitimately hindered from joining in the public recitation in church, perform the exercises in private at home, for ten days, and confess and communicate and pray, as above, for the intentions of the Pope, gain a Plenary Indulgence.

S. CONGREGATIO DE PROPAGANDA FIDE.

ILLME. ET RME. DNE.

Neminem profecto latet populum fidelem potentissimo B. Mariae Virginis patrocinio insignia a Deo beneficia semper et ubique fuisse assequutum. Praecipue vero singulare praesidium per pium SSmi. Rosarii exercitium experti sunt Christifideles quoties vel haereses vel vitia impie grassarentur, vel gravissimae Ecclesiae calamitates ingruerent. Hinc factum est ut Romani Pontifices rosarias preces, cum Christi grex gravioribus premeretur angustiis, coelesti indulgentiarum thesauro ditaverint ac fideles ad huiusmodi exercitium hortari atque excitare numquam destiterint. Haec animo suo recolens SS. D. N. Leo Div. Providentia PP. XIII., ad copiosius et promptius a Datore omnium bonorum auxilium impetrandum in tot ac tam gravibus necessitatibus, quibus Christiana respublica in praesens versatur. Praedecessorum suorum vestigiis inhaerens, Beatissimae Virginis opem ab universa quanta est Ecclesia impensius postulandam censuit

et imminente solemnitate ipsius Rosarii celebritate nonnulla ad rem instituit atque indulsit, quae Amplitudini Tuae per hanc Sacram Congregationem significari praecepit. Praescripsit autem :

1°. Ut peculiari devotione et solemnitate festum SSmi. Rosarii hoc anno celebretur ;

2°. Ut a prima die mensis Octobris usque ad secundum sequentis Novembris in omnibus ecclesiis, in quibus animarum cura exercetur, quinque saltem decades Sacratissimi Rosarii cum Litanis Lauretanis recitentur.

Id etiam servabitur in aliis seu Oratoriis Bmae. Virgini dicatis iuxta modum quem Ordinarii locorum magis utilem et opportunum indicaverint. Optandum vero est ut, ubi id commode fieri possit, praeter Rosarias preces sacrosanctum Missae sacrificium celebretur, vel SSmi. Sacramenti benedictio populo Christiano impertiatur.

Quovero alacrius et maiori fidelium fructu haec peragantur, idem SSmus. D. N. sequentes indulgentias de thesauro Ecclesiae benigne concessit :

1°. Indulgentiam plenariam iis omnibus qui die festo SSmi. Rosarii, vel, ubi necessaria Sacerdotum copia ad excipiendas sacramentales confessiones non suppetat, in quocumque alio insequentis Octavae Poenitentiae Sacramento expiati et sacra communione refecti aliquam ecclesiam visitaverint, ibique pro Ecclesiae necessitatibus iuxta mentem Sanctitatis Suae pias ad Deum preces fuderint :

2°. Indulgentiam septem annorum ac totidem quadragenarum, quam singuli fideles lucrari poterunt, quoties in aliqua ecclesia praedictum Sancti Rosarii exercitium devote peregerint orantes ut supra iuxta mentem Sanctitatis Suae. Iis vero qui aliquo detenti impedimento memorato pio exercitio interesse in ecclesiis non poterunt, Sanctitas Sua benigne concedit, ut eandem indulgentiam lucrari valeant, dummodo Rosarias preces et Litanias privatim recitent iuxta intentionem Sanctitatis Suae.

3°. Qui vero per id tempus, quod est inter primam Octobris diem et secundum Novembris, decies praedicto SSmi. Rosarii exercitio interfuerint, vel, quatenus impediti, privatim illud persolverint, iisdem rite confessis et Sacra

Eucharistia refectis et, ut supra, iuxta mentem Summi Pontificis orantibus Sanctitas Sua aliam concedit plenariam indulgentiam, quam quisque die sibi beneviso, intra tamen praefatum temporis spatium, poterit lucrari.

Non dubito quin pro tua sollicitudine in exequendis Summi Pontificis mandatis et curando Ecclesiae universae bono ac spirituali fidelium tibi commissorum fructu, haec omnia iisdem tempestive significare satagas, quo singuli, si fieri potest, indulgentiarum beneficio fruantur, et Omnipotens Deus universorum fidelium preces per B. Mariae Virginis intercessionem benigne excipiens, coeleste, quod Ecclesia praestolatur, auxilium largiri dignetur.

Interum Deum rogo ut te sospitem diutissime servet.

Roma ex Aed. S. Congr. de Prop. Fide die 16 Iulii, 1883.

Uti Frater Addictissimus,

IOANNES CARD. SIMEONI, *Praefectus*.

D. ARCHIEPISCOPUS TYRENSIS, *Secretarius*.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS LEO XIII., ORDERING THE RECITATION OF THE ROSARY AND LITANY OF LORETTO FOR EVERY DAY IN THE MONTH OF OCTOBER, 1883.

SUMMARY.

1. The Origin of the Feast of the Rosary.
2. Testimony of the Popes to the excellence of the devotion of the Rosary and their efforts to extend it.
3. The Feast of the Rosary to be celebrated with special solemnity this year (1883).
4. From the 1st of October to the 2nd of November, five decades at least of the Rosary, with the Litany of Loretto, to be recited in all public churches, and if the Ordinary deem it useful, in other churches also, and in oratories dedicated to the Mother of God.
5. It is desirable that Mass should be said, or the Blessed Sacrament exposed, the Exposition to be followed by Benediction, when the people are engaged in these devotions.
6. Processions of the Sodalities of the Blessed Virgin highly approved.

7. An Indulgence of seven years and seven quarantines each time one joins in the public recitation of the Rosary and Litany, and prays in accordance with the intentions of the Pope.

8. The same Indulgence granted to those who being legitimately hindered from joining in the public devotions in the church, perform them at home and pray in accordance with the intentions of the Pope.

9. A Plenary Indulgence granted to all who perform within the prescribed time these devotions ten times, either publicly in the church, or privately at home (when hindered by just cause from attending the church), and confess and communicate.

10. A Plenary Indulgence granted to all who on the Feast of the Rosary, or within the octave, confess, communicate, and pray in some church to God and the Blessed Virgin. for the necessities of the Church, according to the intention of the Pope.

VENERABILIBUS FRATRIBUS PATRIARCHIS, ARCHIEPISCOPIIS ET
EPISCOPIIS UNIVERSIS CATHOLICI ORBIS GRATIAM ET
COMMUNIONEM CUM APOSTOLICA SEDE HABENTIBUS.

LEO PP. XIII.

VENERABILES FRATRES,

SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM.

Supremi Apostolatus officio quo fungimur et longe difficili horum temporum conditione quotidie magis admonemur ac propemodum impellimur, ut quo graviore incidunt Ecclesie calamitates, eo impensius ejus tutelae incolumitatisque consulamus. Quapropter, dum, quantum in Nobis est, modis omnibus Ecclesie jura tueri, et quae vel impendent vel circumstant pericula antevertere et propulsare conamur, assidue damus operam caelestibus auxiliis implorandis, quibus effici unice potest, ut labores curaeque Nostrae optatum sint exitum habiturae. Hanc ad rem nihil validius potiusque judicamus, quam religione et pietate demereri magnam Dei Parentem Mariam Virginem, quae pacis nostrae apud Deum sequestra et caelestium administra gratiarum, in celsissimo potestatis est gloriaeque fastigio in coelis collocata, ut homini-

bus ad sempiternam illam civitatem per tot labores et pericula contendentibus patrocini sui subsidium impertiat. Itaque proximis jam anniversariis solemnibus, quibus plurima et maxima in populum christianum per Marialis *Rosarii* preces collata beneficia recoluntur, preces hasce ipsas singulari studio toto orbe catholico adhiberi Magnae Virgini hoc anno volumus, quo Ipsa conciliatrice, divinum Ejus Filium nostris placatum et mitigatum malis feliciter experiamur. Has igitur litteras ad Vos, Venerabiles Fratres, dandas censuimus, ut, cognitis consiliis Nostris, populorum pietas ad ea religiose perficienda vestra auctoritate, studioque excitetur.

Præcipuum semper ac solemne catholicis hominibus fuit in trepidis rebus dubiisque temporibus ad Mariam confugere et in materna Ejus bonitate conquiescere. Quo quidem ostenditur certissima non modo spes, sed plane fiducia, quam Ecclesia catholica semper habuit in Genitrice Dei jure repositam. Revera primaevae labis experts Virgo, adlecta Dei Mater, et hoc ipso servandi hominum generis consors facta, tanta apud Filium gratia et potestate valet, ut majorem nec humana nec angelica natura assecuta unquam sit, aut assequi possit. Cumque suave Ipsi ac jucundum apprime sit, singulos suam flagitantes opem juvare ac solari; dubitandum non est, quin Ecclesiae universae votis adnuere multo libentius velit ac propemodum gestiat.

Haec autem tam magna et plena spei in augustam coelorum Reginam pietas luculentius emicuit, cum errorum vis late serpentium, vel exundans morum corruptio, vel potentium adversariorum impetus militantem Dei Ecclesiam in discrimen adducere visa sunt. Veteris et recentioris aevi historiae, ac sanctioris Ecclesiae fasti publicas privatasque ad Deiparam obsecrationes et vota commemorant, ac vicissim praebita per Ipsam auxilia partamque divinitus tranquillitatem et pacem. Hinc insignes illi tituli, quibus Eam catholicae gentes christianorum Auxiliatricem, Opiferam, Solatricem, bellorum Potentem, Victricem, Paciferam consalutarunt. Quos inter praecipue commemorandus sollemnis ille ex Rosario ductus, quo insignia Ipsius in universum christianum nomen beneficia ad perpetuitatem consecrata sunt. Nemo vestrum ignorat, Venerabiles Fratres, quantum laboris et luctus, saeculo duo-

decimo exeunte, sanctae Dei Ecclesiae intulerint Albigenses haeretici, qui recentiorum Manichaeorum secta progeniti, australem Galliae plagam atque alias latini orbis regiones perniciosis erroribus repleverant; armorumque terrorem circumferentes, late dominari per clades et ruinas moliebantur. Contra hujusmodi teterrimos hostes virum sanctissimum, ut nostis, excitavit misericors Deus, inclitum scilicet *Dominicani Ordinis* parentem et conditorem. Is integritate doctrinae, virtutum exemplis, muneris apostolici perfunctione magnus, pugnare pro Ecclesia catholica excelso animo aggressus est, non vi, non armis, sed ea maxime precatione confusus, quam sacri Rosarii nomine ipse primus instituit, et per se, per suos alumnos longe lateque disseminavit. Dei enim instinctu ac numine sentiebat futurum, ut ejus precationis ope, tanquam validissimo instrumento bellico, victi hostes profligatique vesanam impietate audaciam ponere cogerentur. Quod reipsa evenisse compertum est. Etenim eam orandi ratione suscepta riteque celebrata ex institutione *Dominici Patris*, pietas, fides, concordia restitui, haeticorum molitiones atque artes disjici passim coepere: ad haec, plurimi errantes ad sanitatem revocati, et catholicorum armis, quae fuerant ad vim propulsandam sumpta, impiorum compressus furor.

Ejusdem precationis efficacia et vis mirabiliter etiam perspecta est saeculo decimo sexto, cum ingentes *Turcarum* copiae Europae prope universae superstitionis et barbariae jugum intentarent. Quo tempore sanctus *Pius V. Pontifex Maximus*, excitatis ad communium rerum tutelam principibus christianis, omni studio in primis egit ut potentissima *Mater Dei*, per Rosarii preces implorata, nomini christiano volens propitia succurreret. Nobilissimum sane spectaculum per eos dies coelo terraeque exhibitum omnium in se mentes animosque convertit. Hinc enim Christi fideles non procul a *Corinthiaco sinu* vitam et sanguinem pro religionis patriaeque incolumitate fundere parati, hostem interriti opperiebantur: illinc inermes pio supplicantium agmine, *Mariam* inclamabant, *Mariam* ex Rosarii formula iteratis vicibus consalutabant, ut certantibus adesset ad victoriam. Adstitit exorata *Domina*; nam commissio ad *Echinadas insulas* navali praelio, christianorum classis, sine magna suorum clade, fuis caesisque

hostibus, magnifice vicit. Quare idem sanctissimus Pontifex in accepti beneficii memoriam, anniversarium tanti certaminis diem honoris Mariae Victricis festum haberi voluit; quem Gregorius XIII. titulo Rosarii consecravit.

Simili modo, superiore saeculo, semel ad Temesvariam in Pannonia, semel ad Corcyram insulam nobilis est de Turcarum copiis victoria reportata: idque sacris Magnae Virgini diebus, precibusque pio Rosarii ritu ante persolutis. Quae res Clementem XI. Decessorem Nostrum adduxit ut grati animi ergo, solemnem Deiparae a Rosario honorem quotannis habendum tota Ecclesia decreverit.

Igitur cum sacra haec precandi formula tantopere Virgini grataesse dignoscatur, eaque ad Ecclesiae populiue christiani defensionem et ad divina beneficia publice privatimque impetranda apprime conferat; mirum non est, eximiis eam praeconiis alios quoque Decessores Nostros efferre atque augere studuisse. Sic Urbanus IV. *quotidie per Rosarium christiano populo bona provenire* testatus est. Sixtus IV. hunc orandi ritum *ad honorem Dei et Virginis, et ad imminetia mundi pericula propulsanda opportunum*; Leo X. *adversus haeresiarchas et gliscentes haereses institutum*; et Julius III. *romanae Ecclesiae decorem dixerunt*. Itemque de eo Sanctus Pius V., *hoc, inquit, orandi modo evulgato, coepisse fideles iis meditationibus accensos, iis precibus inflammatos, in alios viros repente mutari, haeresum tenebras remitti, et lucem catholicae fidei aperiri*. Demum Gregorius XIII., *Rosarium a beato Dominico ad iram Dei placandam et Beatae Virginis intercessionem implorandam fuisse institutum*.

Hac Nos cogitatione, exemplisque Decessorum Nostrorum permoti, opportunum omnino censemus solemnes hoc tempore supplicationes ob eam causam institui, ut invocata per Rosarii preces Virgine augusta, parem necessitatibus opem a Jesu Christo ejus Filio impetremus. Perspiciatis, Venerabiles Fratres, Ecclesiae labores dimicationesque diuturnas et graves Christianam pietatem, publicam morum honestatem, fidemque ipsam, quae summum est bonum virtutumque ceterarum principium, majoribus quotidie periculis videmus oppositam. Item difficilem conditionem variosque angores Nostros non modo cognoscitis, sed facit caritas vestra ut quadam Nobis-

cum societate et communione sentiatis. Miserrimum autem est, ac longe luctuosissimum, tot animas Jesu Christi sanguine redemptas, quodam aberrantis saeculi veluti correptas turbine, praecipites in pejus agi atque in interitum ruere sempiternum. Igitur divini necessitas auxilii haud sane est hodiè minor, quam cum magnus Dominicus ad publica sananda vulnera Marialis Rosarii usum invexit. Ille vero caelesti pervidit lumine, aetatis suae malis remedium nullum praesentius futurum, quam si homines ad Christum, qui *via, veritas et vita* est, salutis per Eum nobis partae crebra commentatione rediissent; et Virginem illam, cui datum est *cunctas haereses interimere*, deprecationem apud Deum adhibuissent. Idcirco sacri Rosarii formulam ita composuit, ut et salutis nostrae mysteria ordine recolerentur, et huic meditati officio mysticum innecteretur sertum ex angelica salutatione contextum, interjecta oratione ad Deum et Patrem Domini Nostri Jesu Christi. Nos igitur haud absimili malo idem quaerentes remedium, non dubitamus, quin eadem haec a beatissimo viro tanto cum orbis catholici emolumento inducta precatio, momenti plurimum habitura sit ad levandas nostrorum quoque temporum calamitates.

Quamobrem non modo universos christianos enixe hortamur, ut vel publice vel privatim in sua quisque domo et familia pium hoc Rosarii officium peragere studeant et non intermissa consuetudine usurpent, sed etiam INTEGRUM ANNI LABENTIS OCTOBREM MENSEM coelesti Reginae a Rosario sacrum dicatumque esse volumus. Decernimus itaque et mandamus, ut in orbe catholico universo hoc item anno solemnia Deiparae a Rosario peculiari religione et cultus splendore celebrantur; utque a prima die proximi Octobris ad secundam subsequentis Novembris, in omnibus ubique curialibus templis, et si Ordinarii locorum utile atque opportunum judicaverint, in aliis etiam templis sacrariisve honori Deiparae dedicatis, quinque saltem Rosarii decades, adjectis Litaniis Lauretanis religiose recitentur: optamus autem ut ad has preces conveniente populo, eodem tempore vel sacrum ad altare fiat, vel Sacramento augusto ad adorandum proposito, sacrosancta deinceps hostia pius supplicantium coetus rite lustretur. Magnopere probamus, sodalitates a

Rosario Virginis solemnī pompa vicatim per urbes, accepta majoribus consuetudine, publicae religionis causa procedere. Quibus autem in locis id injuria temporum forte non licet, quidquid publicae religioni ex hac parte detractum est, frequentiore redimatur ad sacras aedes accursu; et diligentiore virtutum christianarum exercitatione fervor pietatis eluceat.

Eorum autem gratia, qui quae supra jussimus facturi sunt, libet coelestes Ecclesiae thesauros recludere, in quibus ipsi incitamenta simul et praemia pietatis inveniant. Omnibus igitur qui intra designatum temporis spatium, Rosarii cum Litanis publicae recitationi interfuerint, et ad mentem Nostram oraverint, septem annorum itemque septem quadragenarum apud Deum indulgentiam singulis vicibus obtinendam concedimus. Quo beneficio frui pariter posse volumus, quos supplicationibus publicis supra dictis legitima causa prohibeat, hac tamen lege ut eidem sacrae exercitationi privatim operam dederint, itemque Deo ad mentem Nostram supplicaverint. Eos vero qui supra dicto tempore decies saltem, vel publice in sacris templis, vel justas ob causas privatis in domibus eadem peregerint, et, expiatis rite animis, sacra de altari libaverint, piaculo omni et statis admissorum poenis ad pontificalis indulgentiae modum exsolvimus. Plenissimam hanc admissorum suorum veniam omnibus etiam elargimur, qui vel in ipsis beatae Mariae Virginis a Rosario solemnibus, vel quolibet ex octo consequentibus diebus, absolutis pariter salutari confessione animis, ad Christi mensam accesserint, et in aliqua aede sacra pro Ecclesiae necessitatibus ad mentem Nostram Deo et Deiparae rite supplicaverint.

Agite vero, Venerabiles Fratres; quantum vobis curae est et Mariae honos et societatis humanae salus, tantum studete populorum in Magnam Virginem alere pietatem, augere fiduciam. Divino quidem munere factum putamus, ut, vel turbulentissimis hisce Ecclesiae temporibus, in maxima christiani populi parte stet ac vigeat antiqua in augustam Virginem religio et pietas. Nunc vero exhortationibus his Nostris excitare, vestrisque vocibus incensae christianae gentes vehementiore in dies animi ardore sese in Mariae tutelam fidemque recipiant; et adamare magis ac magis

insistant Marialis Rosarii consuetudinem, quam majores nostri non modo uti praesens in malis auxilium, sed etiam nobilis instar tesserae christianae pietatis habere consueverunt. Obsecrationes concordēs ac supplices libens excipiet humani generis Patrona caelestis, illudque facile impetrabit, ut boni virtutis laude crescant; ut devii sese ad salutem colligant ac resispiscant; ut vindex scelerum Deus ad clementiam ac misericordiam conversus rem christianam remque publicam, amotis periculis, optatae tranquillitati restituat.

Hac spe erecti, Deum ipsum, per Eam in qua totius boni posuit plenitudinem, summis animi Nostri votis enixe obsecramus, ut maxima quaeque Vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, caelestium bonorum munera largiatur: in quorum auspiciū et pignus, Vobis ipsis et Clero vestro et populis cujusque vestrum curae conceditis, Apostolicam Benedictionem peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die 1 Septembris, A.D. MDCCCLXXXIII. Pontificatus Nostri Anno Sexto.

LEO PP. XIII.

DECREE OF THE S. CONGREGATION OF RITES, DATED 10TH DECEMBER, 1883, PRESCRIBING, BY ORDER OF THE POPE, THE ADDITION TO THE LITANY OF LORETTO OF THE INVOCATION *REGINA SACRATISSIMI ROSARII, ORA PRO NOBIS*.

DECRETUM URBIS ET ORBIS.

Ad praesidium columenque militantis Ecclesiae virum sanctissimum excitavit misericors Deus, Dominicum Gusmanum, inclitum Ordinis Praedicatorum conditorem et patrem, qui pugnare pro Ecclesia Catholica aggressus est, maxime precatione confisus, quam Sacri Rosarii Mariani nomine primus instituit, et per se suosque Alumnos longe lateque disseminavit. Admirabilem hanc orandi formulam nobilis instar tesserae Christianae pietatis Catholici semper habere consueverunt. Quare vix ac Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Leo Papa XIII. ad opem a Jesu Christo per Mariam Virginem Ejus Matrem praesentibus necessitatibus impetrandam, integrum mensem Octobrem Rosarii precibus in toto Catholico Orbe hoc anno exigendum, encyclicis datis Litteris,

indixit; ubique sacrorum Antistites et fideles populi, supremi Pastoris voluntati obtemperantes, frequentissima Rosarii recitatione pietatis suae et dilectionis erga Dei Matrem peramantissimam splendida argumenta exhibuerunt, certam spem foventes se, eadem Beatissima Virgine opitulante, a caelesti misericordiarum Patre in praesentibus tam privatis, quam communibus Christianae reipublicae calamitatibus efficacius optata subsidia impetraturos.

Jamvero Sanctissimus idem Dominus Noster summopere cupiens tum augeri cultum erga ipsam augustam Dei Genitricem hac praesertim orandi consuetudine eidem Virgini gratissima, tum Christifideles ad hoc obsequium Ei praestandum magis magisque excitari, humillimas preces sibi oblatas a Rmo Patre Josepho Maria Larroca Magistro Generali Ordinis Praedicatorum, nimirum ut Litaniis Lauretanis addendam indulgeat Reginae a Rosario invocationem, quae jamdudum apud Dominicianam Familiam in usu est, benigne ac perlibenter excepit. Voluit propterea Sanctitas Sua praecepitque, ut ceteris Litaniarum Lauretanarum beatæ Mariae praeconiis, et hoc in Ecclesia universa in posterum addatur postremo loco, scilicet "*Regina Sacratissimi Rosarii, ora pro nobis.*"

Mandavit praeterea super his expediri Litteris in forma Brevis. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Die 10 Decembris 1883.

D. Cardinalis BARTOLINIUS, *S.R.C. Praefectus.*

L. † S.

LAURENTIUS SALVATI, *S.R.C. Secretarius.*

CONSTITUTION OF HIS HOLINESS LEO XIII., DATED 24TH DECEMBER, 1883, ORDERING THE PERMANENT ADDITION TO THE LITANY OF THE INVOCATION *REGINA SACRATISSIMI ROSARII, ORA PRO NOBIS.*—RECITATION OF THE ROSARY IN CATHEDRAL AND PAROCHIAL CHURCHES.

SUMMARY.

His Holiness addresses an earnest exhortation to the faithful to practise the daily recitation of the Rosary in every Catholic family. He ardently desires that the Rosary should be recited daily

in every Cathedral Church, and every Feast day in Parochial Churches.

He decrees that henceforth the invocation, *Regina Sacratissimi Rosarii* be added in the Litany of Loretto after the invocation *Regina sine labe originali concepta*.

LEO PP. XIII.

AD PERPETUAM REI MEMORIAM.

Salutaris ille *spiritus precum*, misericordiae divinae munus idem et pignus, quem Deus olim effundere pollicitus est *super domum David et super habitatores Jerusalem*, etsi nunquam in Ecclesia Catholica cessat, tamen experrectior ad permovendos animos tunc esse videtur cum homines magnum aliquod aut ipsius Ecclesiae aut reipublicae tempus adesse vel impendere sentiunt. Solet enim in rebus trepidis excitari fides pietasque adversus Deum, quia quo minus apparet in rebus humanis praesidii, eo major esse coelestis patrocinii necessitas intelligitur. Quod vel nuper perspexisse videmur, cum Nos diuturnis Ecclesiae acerbitatibus et communium temporum difficultate permoti, pietatem Christianorum per epistolam Nostram Encyclicam appellantes, Mariam Virginem sanctissimo Rosarii ritu colendam atque implorandam Octobri mense toto decrevimus. Cui quidem voluntati Nostrae obtemperatum esse novimus studio et alacritate tanta, quantum vel rei sanctitas vel causae gravitas postulabat. Est enim neque in hac solum Italia nostra sed in omnibus terris pro re Catholica, pro salute publica, supplicatum: et Episcopis auctoritate, Clericis exemplo operaque praeeruntibus, magnae Dei matri habitus certatim honos. Et mirifice sane Nos declaratae pietatis ratio multiplex delectavit: templa magnificentius exornata: ductae solemniter pompa: ad sacras conciones, ad synaxin, ad quotidianas Rosarii preces magna ubique populi frequentia. Nec praeterire volumus quod gestienti animo accepimus de nonnullis locis, quos procella temporum vehementius affligit: in quibus tantus extitit fervor pietatis, ut presbyterorum inopiam privati redimere, quibus in rebus possent, suomet ipsi ministerio maluerint, quam sinere ut in templis suis indictae preces silerent.

Quare dum praesentium malorum sensum spe bonitatis et misericordiae divinae consolamur, inculcari bonorum omnium animis intelligimus oportere id quod sacrae Litterae passim aperteque declarant, sicut in omni virtute, sic in ista, quae in obsecrando Deo versatur, omnino plurimum referre perpetuitatem atque constantiam. Exoratur enim placaturque precando Deus: hoc tamen ipsum, quod se exorari sinit, non solum bonitatis suae, sed etiam perseverantiae nostrae vult esse fructum. Talis autem in orando perseverantia longe plus est hoc tempore necessaria, cum tam multa Nos tamque magna, ut saepe diximus, circumstent ex omni parte pericula, quae sine praesenti Dei ope superari non possunt. Nimis enim multi oderunt *omne quod dicitur Deus et colitur*: oppugnatur Ecclesia neque privatorum dumtaxat consiliis, sed civilibus persaepe institutis et legibus; Christianae sapientiae adversantur immanes opinionum novitates, ita plane ut et sua cuique et publica tuenda salus sit adversus hostes acerrimos, extrema virium conjuratos experiri. Vere igitur hujus tanti proelii complectentes cogitatione certamen, nunc maxime intuendum animo esse censemus in Jesum Christum Dominum Nostrum, qui quo Nos ad imitationem erudiret sui, *factus in agonia prolixius orabat*.

Ex variis autem precandi rationibus ac formulis in Ecclesia Catholica pie et salubriter usitatis, ea, quae Rosarium Mariale dicitur, multis est nominibus commendabilis. In quibus, quemadmodum in Litteris Nostris Encyclicis confirmavimus, illud permagnum, quod est Rosarium praecipue implorando Matris Dei patrocinio adversus hostes Catholici nominis institutum; eaque ex parte nemo ignorat, sublevandis Ecclesiae calamitatibus idem saepe et multum profuisse. Non solum igitur privatorum pietati, sed publicis etiam temporibus est magnopere consentaneum, istud precandi genus in eum restitui honoris locum, quem diu obtinuit, cum singulae, Christianorum familiae nullum sibi abire diem sine Rosarii recitatione paterentur. His Nos de causis omnes hortamur atque obsecramus, ut quotidianam Rosarii consuetudinem religiose et constanter insistant: itemque declaramus, Nobis esse in optatis ut in Dioeceseon singularum templo principe quotidie, in templis Curialibus diebus festis singulis recitetur.

Huic autem excitandae tuendaeque exercitationi pietatis magno usui esse poterunt familiae Ordinum religiosorum, et praecipuo quodam jure suo sodales Dominiciani: quos omnes pro certo habemus tam fructuoso nobilique officio minime defuturos.

Nos igitur in honorem magnae Dei genitricis Mariae, ad perpetuam recordationem implorati ubique gentium per mensem Octobrem a purissimo Ejus Corde praesidii; in perenne testimonium amplissimae spei, quam in Parente amantissima reponimus; ad propitiam ejus opem magis ac magis in dies impetrandam, volumus ac decernimus, ut in Litanis Lauretanis, post invocationem, *Regina sine labe originali concepta*, addatur praeconium, *Regina sacratissimi Rosarii, ora pro nobis*.

Volumus autem, ut hae Litterae Nostrae firmae rataeque, uti sunt, ita in posterum permaneant: irritum vero et inane futurum decernimus, si quid super his a quoquam contigerit attentari: contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris die XXIV Decembris An. MDCCCLXXXIII, Pontificatus Nostri Anno Sexto.

TH. Card. MERTEL.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS LEO XIII., ON THE ROSARY, AND THE SPECIAL DEVOTIONS FOR THE MONTH OF OCTOBER, 1884.

SUMMARY.

Reference to the Encyclical of last year ordering the recitation of the Rosary during the month of October.—Ready compliance of the faithful.—Reasons for the renewal of the devotions during the present October (1884) explained. A special reason for Italy on account of the prevalence of the cholera.

The Devotions and Indulgences same as for last October.

Distinctly ordered in this Encyclical that when these devotions are held in the forenoon, they ought to be in connection with the morning Mass; when in the afternoon, the prayers are to be recited in presence of the Blessed Sacrament exposed, and followed by Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament.

VENERABILIBUS FRATRIBUS PATRIARCHIS, PRIMATIBUS ARCHIEPISCOPIS ET EPISCOPIS CATHOLICI ORBIS UNIVERSIS GRATIAM ET COMMUNIONEM CUM APOSTOLICA SEDE HABENTIBUS.

LEO PP. XIII.

VENERABILES FRATRES,

SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM.

Superiore anno, quod singuli novistis, per literas Nostras Encyclicas decrevimus, ut in omnibus catholici orbis partibus, ad caeleste praesidium laboranti Ecclesiae impetrandum, magna Dei Mater sanctissimo Rosarii ritu, Octobri toto cole-retur. In quo et iudicium Nostrum et exempla sequuti sumus Decessorum Nostrorum, qui difficillimis Ecclesiae temporibus aucto pietatis studio ad augustam Virginem confugere, opemque ejus summis precibus implorare consueverunt.—Voluntati vero illi Nostrae tanta animorum alacritate et concordia ubique locorum obtemperatum est, ut luculenter apparuerit quantus religionis et pietatis ardor exstet in populo christiano, et quantam in caelesti Mariae Virginis patrocinio spem universi reponant. Quem quidem declaratae pietatis et fidei fervorem Nos, tanta molestiarum et malorum mole gravatos, non mediocri consolatione lenisse profite-mur, imo animum addidisse ad graviora quoque, si ita Deo placeat, perferenda. Donec enim spiritus precum effunditur super domum David et super habitatores Jerusalem, in spem certam adducimur, fore ut aliquando propitietur Deus Ecclesiaeque suae miseratus vicem, audiat tandem preces obsecrantium per Eam, quam ipse caelestium gratiarum voluit esse administram.

Quapropter insidentibus causis, quae Nos ad publicam pietatem excitandam, uti diximus, anno superiore impulerunt, officii Nostri duximus, Venerabiles Fratres, hoc quoque anno hortari populos christianos, ut in hujusmodi precandi ratione et formula, quae *Rosarium Mariale* dicitur, perseverantes, sibi validum magnae Dei Genitricis patrocinium demereantur. Cum enim in oppugnatoribus christiani nominis tanta sit obstinatio propositi, in propugnatoribus non minorem esse oportet constantiam voluntatis, quum praesertim caeleste auxilium et collata nobis a Deo beneficia, perseverantiae

nostrae saepe soleant esse fructus. Ac revocare juvat in mentem magnae illius Judith exemplum, quae almae Virginis typum exhibens stultam Judaeorum repressit impatientiam, constituere Deo volentium arbitrio suo diem ad subveniendum oppressae civitati. Intuendum item in exemplum Apostolorum, qui maximum Spiritus Paracliti donum sibi promissum expectaverunt, perseverantes unanimiter in oratione cum Maria Matre Jesu. Agitur enim et nunc de ardua ac magni momenti re, de inimico antiquo et vaferrimo in elata potentiae suae acie humiliando; de Ecclesiae ejusque Capituli libertate vindicanda; de iis conservandis tuendisque praesidiis in quibus conquiescere oportet securitatem et salutem humanae societatis. Curandum est igitur, ut luctuosis hisce Ecclesiae temporibus Marialis Rosarii sanctissima consuetudo studiose pieque servetur eo praecipue quod hujusmodi preces eum ita sint compositae ut omnia ex ordine salutis nostrae mysteria recolant, maxime sunt ad fovendum pietatis spiritum comparatae.

Et ad Italiam quod attinet, potentissimae Virginis praesidium maxime nunc per Rosarii preces implorare necesse est, quum nobis adsit potius, quam impendeat, nec opinata calamitas. Asiana enim lues terminos, quos natura posuisse videbatur, Deo volente, praetervecta, portus Gallici sinus celeberrimos, ac finitimas exinde Italiae regiones pervasit. Ad Mariam igitur confugiendum est, ad eam, quam jure meritoque salutiferam, opiferam, sospitatricem appellat Ecclesia, ut volens propitia opem acceptissimis sibi precibus imploratam afferat, impuramque luem a nobis longe depellat.

Quapropter adventante jam mense Octobri, quo mense sacra solemnia Mariae Virginis a Rosario in orbe catholico aguntur, omnia ea, quae praeterito anno praecepimus, hoc anno iterum praecipere statuimus. Decernimus itaque et mandamus, ut a prima die Octobris ad secundam consequentis Novembris in omnibus curialibus templis, sacrariisve publicis Deiparae dicatis, aut in aliis etiam arbitrio Ordinarii eligendis, quinque saltem Rosarii decades, adjectis Litaniis, quotidie recitentur: quod si mane fiat, sacrum inter preces peragatur; si pomeridianis horis, Sacramentum augustum ad adorandum proponatur, deinde qui intersunt rite lustrentur.

Optamus autem, ut Sodalitates Sanctissimi Rosarii solemnem pompam, ubicunque per civiles leges id sinitur, vicatim publicae religionis causa ducant.

Ut vero christianae pietati caelestes Ecclesiae thesauri recludantur, Indulgentias singulas, quas superiore anno largiti sumus, renovamus. Omnibus videlicet qui statis diebus publicae Rosarii recitationi interfuerint, et ad mentem Nostram oraverint, et his pariter qui legitima causa impediti privatim haec egerint, septem annorum itemque septem quadragenarum apud Deum indulgentiam singulis vicibus concedimus. Eis vero qui supra dicto tempore decies saltem vel publice in templis, vel justis de causis inter domesticos parietes eadem peregerint, et criminum confessione expiati sancta de altari libaverint, plenariam admissorum veniam de Ecclesiae thesauro impertimus. Plenissimam hanc admissorum veniam et poenarum remissionem his omnibus etiam largimur, qui vel ipso beatae Virginis Rosario die festo, vel quolibet ex octo insequentibus, animi sordes eluerint et divina convivia sancte celebraverint, et pariter ad mentem Nostram in aliqua sacra aede Deo et sanctissimae ejus Matri supplicaverint.

Iis denique consultum volentes qui ruri vivunt et agri cultione, praecipue octobri mense, distinentur, concedimus ut singula, quae supra decrevimus, cum sacris etiam indulgentiis octobri mense lucrandis, ad insequentes vel novembris vel decembris menses, prudenti Ordinariorum arbitrio differri valeant.

Non dubitamus, Venerabiles Fratres, quin curis hisce Nostris uberes et copiosi fructus respondeant, praesertim si quae Nos plantamus, et vestra sollicitudo rigaverit, iis Deus gratiarum suarum largitione, de caelo afferat incrementum. Pro certo quidem habemus populum christianum futurum dicto audientem Apostolicae auctoritati Nostrae eo fidei et pietatis fervore, cujus praeterito anno amplissimum dedit documentum. Caelestis autem Patrona per Rosarii preces invocata adsit propitia, efficiatque, ut sublatis opinionum dissidiis et re christiana in universis orbis terrarum partibus restituta, optatam Ecclesiae tranquillitatem a Deo impetremus. Cujus auspiciem beneficii, Vobis et Clero vestro, et

populis vestrae curae concreditae Apostolicam Benedictionem peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die xxx Augusti MDCCCLXXXIV, Pontificatus Nostri Anno Septimo.

LEO PP. XIII.

DECREE OF THE CONGREGATION OF RITES (DATED 20TH OF AUGUST, 1885,) PRESCRIBING THE RECITATION OF THE ROSARY AND LITANY OF LORETTO EVERY DAY IN THE MONTH OF OCTOBER IN THIS AND SUCCEEDING YEARS.

SUMMARY.

Devotions and Indulgences same as in former years. The arrangements also the same. The Ordinary may defer till November or December the performance of these devotions in favour of country people who cannot attend in October.

DECRETUM URBIS ET ORBIS.

Infer plurimos Apostolicae vigilantiae actus, quibus Sanctissimus Dominus Noster LEO PP. XIII., ab inito Summi Pontificatus numere, Ecclesiae ac universae societati, Deo adjuvante, optatae tranquillitati restituendis consulere satagit: luce clarior nitet Encyclica Epistola *Supremi Apostolatus*, 1 Septembris MDCCCLXXXIII., de celebrando toto mense Octobri ejus anni gloriosae Dei Matris Mariae sacratissimo Rosario. Quod sane speciali Dei providentia praecipue institutum est ad potentissimum caeli Reginae praesens auxilium adversus christiani nominis hostes exorandum, ad tuendam fidei integritatem in dominico grege, animasque divini sanguinis pretio redemptas e sempiternae perditionis tramite eripiendas. Tum vero laetissimi christianae pietatis et fiduciae in caelesti Mariae Virginis patrocinio fructus in omni loco catholici orbis ex tam salutari opere eo mense collecti tum adhuc insidentes calamitates causa fuerunt, ut subsequente anno MDCCCLXXXIV., die 30 Augusti, aliae accesserint Apostolicae litterae *Superiore anno*, cum iisdem hortationibus et praeceptionibus

pro adventante eo mense Octobri pari solemnitate ritus ac pietatis fervore in beatissimae Virginis Mariae a Rosario honorem dedicando; eo quod praecipuus fructus boni operis et arrha consequuturæ victoriae sit in inceptis perseverantia. Hisce autem inhaerens idem Sanctissimus Dominus, cum hinc nos hactenus mala multa undique perturbent, inde vero permanent et florescat in christiano populo ea fides, quae per caritatem operatur, et veneratio ac fiducia in amantissimam Dei Genitricem propemodum immensa; eo impensiori studio et alacritate nunc ubique perseverandum vult unanimiter in oratione cum Maria Matre Jesu. Certam enim in spem erigitur fore ut ipsa, quae sola cunctas haereses interemit in universo mundo, nostris [accedentibus dignis poenitentiae fructibus, flectat denique iram vindicem divinae justitiae incolumitatemque adducat et pacem.

Quapropter Sanctitas Sua quaecumque duobus praeteritis annis constituit de mense quo solemnia celebrantur beatae Virginis Mariae a Rosario, hoc pariter anno, et annis porro sequentibus praecipit et statuit quoadusque rerum Ecclesiae rerumque publicarum tristissima haec perdurent adjuncta, ac de restituta Pontifici Maximo plena libertate Deo referre gratias Ecclesiae datum non sit. Decernit itaque et mandat ut quolibet anno a prima die Octobris ad secundam sequentis Novembris, in omnibus catholici orbis parochialibus templis, et in cunctis publicis oratoriis Deiparae dicatis, aut in aliis etiam arbitrio Ordinarii eligendis, quinque saltem Mariani Rosarii decades cum Litaniis Lauretanis quotidie recitentur: quod si mane fiat, Missa inter preces celebretur, si a meridie sacrosanctum Eucharistiae Sacramentum adorationi proponatur, deinde fideles rite lustrentur. Optat quoque ut a Sodalitatibus sacratissimi Rosarii religiosae pompae, ubi id per civiles leges licet, publice ducantur.

Indulgentias singulas, alias concessas, renovando, omnibus qui statis diebus publicae Rosarii recitationi interfuerint, et ad mentem ejusdem Sanctitatis Suae oraverint, et his pariter qui legitima causa impediti privatim haec egerint, septem annorum ac septem quadragenarum apud Deum Indulgentiam singulis vicibus concedit. Eis autem qui supradicto tempore decies saltem vel publice in templis, vel legitime

impediti, privatim eadem peregerint, sacramentali confessione expiatis et sacra synaxi refectis, plenariam admissorum Indulgentiam de Ecclesiae thesauro impertit. Plenissimam hanc culparum veniam et poenarum remissionem his omnibus pariter largitur, qui vel ipso die festo beatæ Virginis a Rosario, vel quolibet ex octo insequentibus diebus, sacramenta, ut supra, perceperint, et in aliqua sacra aede juxta Suam mentem Deo ejusque Sanctissimæ Matri supplicaverint.

Qua de re et illis consulens fidelibus qui ruri viventes agriculturae præcipue Octobri mense distinentur, Sanctitas Sua concedit ut singula superius disposita, cum sacris etiam Indulgentiis, eorum in locis, ad insequentes vel Novembris vel Decembris menses, prudenti Ordinariorum arbitrio, differri valeant.

De hisce vero omnibus et singulis Sanctissimus Dominus Noster per Sacram Rituum Congregationem præsens edi decretum, et ad omnes locorum Ordinarios pro fidei executione transmitti mandavit. Die 20 Augusti, 1885.

D. CARDINALIS BARTOLINIUS, S. R. C., *Praefectus.*

L. ✠ S.

LAURENTIUS SALVATI, S. R. C., *Secretarius.*

DECREE OF THE CONGREGATION OF RITES (DATED 26th OF AUGUST, 1886,) REGARDING THE OCTOBER DEVOTIONS.

SUMMARY.

The special October devotions the same as in former years. The Indulgences also the same.

In Churches or Oratories which are too poor to provide a Monstrance for the Solemn Exposition and Benediction, the Ordinary may allow the substitution of the Ciborium. In this case the Pyxis or Ciborium is to be exposed within the open tabernacle during the Rosary and Litany, and Benediction with the Ciborium is to be given at the end of the devotions.

DECRETUM URBIS ET ORBIS.

Post editas a Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Leone Papa XIII. Encyclicas Litteras *Supremi Apostolatus*, 1 Septembris

MDCCLXXXIII, et *Superiore anno*, 30 Augusti MDCCLXXXIV, de propagando et celebrando Beatissimae Dei Genitricis Mariae Rosario, Sacra Rituum Congregatio per Decretum diei 20 Augusti praeteriti anni MDCCLXXXV, ipso Summo Pontifice annuente et imperante, statuit ut quoadusque tristissima perdurent adiuncta, in quibus versatur Catholica Ecclesia, ac de restituta Pontifici Maximo plena libertate Deo referre gratias datum non sit, in omnibus Catholici Orbis Cathedralibus et Parochialibus templis, et in cunctis templis ac publicis Oratoriis Beatae Mariae Virgini dicatis, aut in aliis etiam arbitrio Ordinariorum designandis, Mariale Rosarium cum Litanis Lauretanis per totum mensem Octobrem quotidie recitetur. Iamvero praesenti anno, qui Iubilaei thesauro ditatur, idem Sanctissimus Dominus Noster exoptans ut quo magis ingruunt publicae et privatae calamitates, eo firmiori fiducia et proposito auxilium ac remedium quaeratur, et per Mariam quaeratur a Divina Misericordia, quae totum nos habere voluit per Mariam; per hoc Sacrae eiusdem Congregationis Decretum Reverendissimos locorum Ordinarios adhortatur, ut juxta memoratas Apostolicas Litteras et Decreta, eorumque tenore in omnibus servato, Christifideles ad huiusmodi pietatis exercitium, Deiparae maxime acceptum, atque gratiarum equidem foecundum, necnon ad Sacramentorum aliorumque salutarium operum frequentiam, omni sollicitudine advocare et alicere studeant.

Confirmando iterum Sanctitas Sua in omnibus sacras indulgentias ac privilegia quae in praecitato Decreto concessa sunt indulgere insuper dignata est, ut in iis templis, seu Oratoriis, ubi ob eorum paupertatem, Expositio cum Sanctissimo Eucharistiae Sacramento, ad tramitem Decreti ipsius, solemniter modo, nempe per Ostensorium, fieri haud valeat, eadem per modum exceptionis peragi possit, prudenti iudicio Ordinarii, cum Sacra Pyxide: aperiendo scilicet ab initio ostiolum ciborii, et cum ea populum in fine benedicendo. Die 26 Augusti 1886.

L. ✠ S. D. Card. BARTOLINIUS, S. R. C., *Praefectus*.

LAURENTIUS SALVATI, S. R. C., *Secretarius*.

DECREE OF THE CONGREGATION OF RITES REGARDING THE
OCTOBER DEVOTIONS, 1887.

SUMMARY.

1. The October Devotions for this year will be the same as those of 1886.
2. The same Indulgences also are granted.
3. The Feast of the Rosary is raised to the rite of a double of the second class, for the whole Church.

DECRETUM URBIS ET ORBIS.

Inter densas errorum et scelerum tenebras tamquam spes certa orituræ salutis iam fulget excitata ac reviviscens in christianis gentibus per sacri Rosarii frequentiam erga magnam Dei Parentem pietas et fiducia, quæ omni ævo Ecclesiæ ac societati præsidium fuit potentissimum ad terrenorum infernorumque hostium vires conterendas. Verbum Sanctissimi Domini Nostri Leonis Papæ XIII. per Eius Apostolicas Litteras, præsertim *Supremi Apostolatus Officio* 1 Septembris, MDCCCLXXXIII, ad cunctas mundi regiones prolatum, divini seminis instar cadens in terram bonam, ubique *fecit fructum centuplum*, quamvis alibi, præ nimia cordium duritiæ, cadens *super petrosa et in spinis*, hætenus conculcatum fuerit et suffocatum. Ubique terrarum fideles suis coadunati pastoribus Rosarii festa mensemque in lætitiæ et fervore celebrantes, a solis ortu ad occasum, pro errantium salute, pro Ecclesiæ et societatis prementibus calamitatibus Mariam invocarunt, quæ “sicut lumen indeficiens radios evibrans misericordiæ suæ, omnibus clementissimam præbere consuevit, omnium necessitates amplissimo quodam miseratur affectu (*S. Thomas Episcopus Valentin.*)” Neque spes confundit obtinendi victoriæ ex eo maxime, quod per admirabilem Marialis Rosarii orandi ritum splendidissimum Deo exhibetur religionis cultus et plena fidei christianæ confessio. Rosarium enim cum omnia Christi Virginisque Matris mysteria suo circuitu involvat, fidem totam complectitur. Jamvero *hæc est victoriæ quæ vincit mundum, fides nostra* (1 Jo. v.)

Beatissimus Pater, de his vehementer lætatus, eo enixius

omnes Ecclesiae Pastores et universos Christifideles hortatur ferventiori pietate et fiducia perseverare in inceptis, ab augustissima Regina pacis postulantes, ut qua gratia apud Deum pollet, praesentium malorum horrendam tempestatem, everso satanae imperio, depellat, triumphatisque religionis hostibus, exagitata Petri mysticam navem optatae tranquillitati restituat. Ad haec, quaecumque superioribus annis, ac postremo per decretum Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis 26 Augusti MDCCCLXXXVI. de mense Octobri caelesti Reginae a Rosario dicando, decrevit, indulgit et jussit, iterum decernit, praecipit et concedit.

Cum vero festus dies solemnitatis sacratissimi Rosarii singulari iam populorum honore et cultu agatur, qui cultus refertur ad mysteria cuncta vitae passionis et gloriae Jesu Christi redemptoris nostri, ejusque intemeratae Matris; ad hanc succrescentem pietatem magis fovendam, et ad publicae venerationis incrementum, quod jam pluribus particularibus Ecclesiis concessit, solemnitatem praedictam et officium Deiparae a Rosario primae Octobris Dominicæ adsignatum, ecclesiastico ritu duplici secundae classis in universa Ecclesia in posterum celebrari mandavit, ita ut non possit transferri ad alium diem, nisi occurrente officio potioris ritus: servatis Rubricis. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

De hisce autem praesens praefatae Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis Decretum expediri jussit. Die 11 Septembris anni MDCCCLXXXVII., Sanctissimo Mariae Nomini sacra.

D. Cardinalis BARTOLINIUS, *S.R.C., Praefectus.*

L ✠ S.

LAURENTIUS SALVATI, *S.R.C., Secretarius.*

CORRESPONDENCE.

NATIONALIZATION OF THE LAND.

REV. SIR.—In the following letter I propose to give a brief exposition of the above theory, and to touch upon some of the social and moral questions connected with it. Many popular misconceptions exist with regard to the essence of the theory and these I shall endeavour

to remove. I believe that they have arisen partly from the fact that Mr. George in *Progress and Poverty* abstains too much from practical and concrete illustrations.

The theory of land nationalization is summed up in Mr. George's formula: "We must make the land common property." There is nothing in the terms of this formula to shock received notions regarding justice and property. Land, like other goods, is admittedly capable of transfer and alienation. The land belonging to A to-day may to-morrow by legitimate transfer belong to B. The corporation aggregate called the State may be justly the owner of landed property. Hence there is nothing obviously objectionable in saying we must by legitimate means vest the land of the country in the State.

Here arises the question of prudence. Would it be prudent to invest the State with the undivided ownership of land? One general answer I think cannot be given to this question. If a country is badly governed, if there is no confidence in the administrators of public affairs, surely it would be madness to entrust the State with the sole ownership and administration of land. If the State is represented by a despot who may say with truth, like Louis XIV., *l'état c'est moi*, it would be clearly unwise to make it the unlimited owner of the land of the country. As a preliminary therefore to entertaining for a moment the idea of nationalization of the land it would be necessary to be able to answer affirmatively the question: Is the government a good one, and does it satisfy the legitimate wishes of the people? The inability to answer this question in the affirmative was no doubt one among the many reasons which hindered the leaders of Irish politics from giving any countenance to Mr. George's theory.

When, however, a government is good, constitutional, and representative of popular wishes and ideas, it may be fairly debated whether it is prudent or not to entrust the State with the sole ownership and management of land. The best way of arriving at a solution on this point seems to be to suppose the end achieved by just means and to endeavour to gauge the results that flow from its achievement. To forecast these results with anything like accuracy it would be necessary to prepare for the purpose special statistical returns. The ordinary financial accounts, however, will serve to illustrate the theory and workings of land nationalization.

Schedule A of the Income Tax represents the annual income from landed property. In the financial year 1884-1885 (United Kingdom) the net amount assessed under this schedule was £175,636,172. If

the land were nationalized this sum would be paid into the treasury. The effect on the Budget would be startling. The estimated Revenue for 1887-88 is £88,135,000. In the hypothesis of nationalization of the land the Chancellor of the Exchequer would probably strike out the following items in this sum, namely:—

Land Tax	£1,065,000
House Duty	1,920,000
Income Tax	14,340,000
				£17,325,000

Allowing for this reduction the estimated Revenue 1887-88 would then be

From Land	£175,636,172
From other sources mentioned in Budget				70,810,000

Total Revenue of United Kingdom £246,446,172

The total Revenue therefore as compared with the current estimates for the present financial year would show an increase of £158,311,172 a sum which would enable the Chancellor of the Exchequer to pay off the National debt in less than six years.

It is not so easy to estimate the effect of nationalization of the land in the expenditure column of the Budget. It may, however, I think, be assumed that the expense of collecting the new land revenue would not be greater than that of collecting the land tax, house duty and income tax, all which taxes we suppose to be abolished. Let us then assume the expenditure column of the late Budget to remain unchanged. We shall have—

Total Revenue	£246,446,172
Total Expenditure	87,846,294
				Surplus
	£158,599,878

There are two ways of treating this surplus. It may be applied to the reduction of the National Debt, or it may be diminished by suspending the revenue from customs and excise. The surplus thus reduced will be £113,707,878, a sum which, if no better means of using it presents itself, may be applied to the reclamation of the waste lands of the United Kingdom.

The financial condition which I have just sketched realises the boon of Free Trade, which has hitherto existed only in the speculations of economists, and gets rid of the justly obnoxious income tax.

As a further illustration of the effects of land nationalization

we can consider the system with reference to the Irish Budget, sketched in the Home Rule Bill of 1886 :

MR. GLADSTONE'S IRISH BUDGET.

<i>Revenue.</i>			
Customs	£1,880,000
Excise	4,300,000
Stamps	600,000
Income Tax	550,000
Non-Tax Revenue, including Post Office			1,020,000
			<hr/> £8,350,000
<i>Expenditure.</i>			
National Debt Charge	£1,466,000
Army and Navy Expenses	1,666,000
Proportion of Civil Charges	110,000
			<hr/>
Total tribute to England	£3,242,000
Constabulary Expenses	£1,000,000
Other Civil Charges	2,510,000
Collection of Revenue	834,300
Contribution to Sinking Fund	360,000
			<hr/>
Total Expenditure	£7,946,000
Surplus	404,000
			<hr/> £8,350,000

Let us now suppose nationalization. The following effects will follow: The Income Tax returns, 1884-85, represent the landed property of Ireland at £12,934,494 (net) annual value. This sum added to the revenue, and income tax being expunged, we have the following receipts:—

From Land	£12,934,494
From other sources as above	7,800,000
			<hr/>

Total Revenue of Ireland ... £20,734,494

Assuming the expenditure column to remain unchanged, we have an annual surplus of £12,788,494.

An examination of the foregoing figures will clearly show that they represent for the United Kingdom or for Ireland a most flourishing state of the Treasury. Can such a state be brought

about? In other words, is it possible to invest the State with the ownership of all land?

Mr. George answers—Yes. But unfortunately he bases his answer on two propositions, both of which I consider false. The first proposition is:

All private property in land is unjust.

The second is:

The land of a country belongs to the people of the country.

Whether an affirmative answer to the question proposed can be based upon sounder reasons, it is beyond the scope of the present letter to enquire.

ECONOMIST.

ON THE ORAL SYSTEM OF TEACHING THE DEAF AND DUMB.

REV. SIR.—In concluding my observations on the oral system of teaching the deaf and dumb in the last number of the I. E. RECORD, I intimated, that I would return to the subject chiefly for the purpose of noticing the popularity of the system, and its extensive adoption as furnishing an argument in favour of its merits.

It is, indeed, popular to a wide extent, but I submit, with all confidence, that mere popularity unsustained by corresponding results is the flimsiest recommendations in favour of any system of a practical character, or having practical pretensions.

Mere popularity does not belong in any way to the domain of argument. It is simply a sentiment responding to a sentiment, deceptive for a time, and all the more so when fanned by benevolent aspirations for the alleviation of a misery afflicting our common humanity. Cicero in designating it as “*aura popularis*” and “*ventus popularis*,” simply announced a fact, with which the world had been familiar from the beginning, as it has been ever since, that mere popularity is but as the passing breeze, the fleeting wind that blows, unless it be backed by experience, and proved by practical results.

No doubt the oral system is popular, and why should it not? Who would not hail with welcome the prospect of rescuing so many of our fellow mortals from the state of isolation, to which their privations condemn them, and of opening to them the door of admission to the human family at large? The idea of making the deaf to hear and the dumb to speak is captivating in the highest degree, especially when caught up and entertained in all the significance of the terms of its announcement, which would mean lifting them

up to a level, or nearly so, with the rest of mankind, and according to this idea the announcement was in itself sufficient to prompt a trial, and enlist the most earnest zeal, and the most energetic endeavours to confer so great a benefit on so large a class, whose misery had engaged the deepest sympathy. The trial once commenced, and found to have somewhat succeeded in certain special instances, led to the persuasion, that it could be made generally applicable. Imitation followed example, and it became in course of time a popular reproach, that any institution for the deaf and dumb should not adopt a system heralded by so much popular favour. But all this—is it a security against disappointment? Were we to think so, we should be very slightly acquainted with history, and the records it presents of experiments in every field of labour, in which the human mind has exerted its powers of invention and innovation. Philosophy itself starts from a principle one and universal, in which all its votaries agree, and presents a problem, in the solution of which they all profess to embark; but how many systems ancient and modern has not the world beheld differing from each other, each of which had its day, enjoying popular consideration for a time, and then passing away to make room for new theories? In a similar way science begins with postulates, that is to say, self-evident propositions; nevertheless, into what divergences and antagonisms do not men of science drift off in their views and speculations?

No, popularity of itself is no test of any system aiming at practical results. It must prove its merits by experience, and this must be the criterion, by which the oral system is to stand or fall. It is in applying this criterion that I cannot be satisfied with it as a system for general application for the reasons I have adduced, at the same time that I cannot but admire the earnest zeal of its advocates, and their indefatigable efforts in its support.

Father Dawson in bringing his criticisms to a close is pleased to contradict categorically the conclusions, with which I ended my paper of February last. In doing so he would appear to forget, that bare contradictions are of no avail against conclusions logically deduced from distinct premises. The premises must be first overthrown before the conclusions can be legitimately assailed. The respected Chaplain of the Boston Spa Institution will, I trust, therefore, pardon me, if with all due deference I must maintain, that the conclusions, at which I arrived, remain good, and retain all their force, notwithstanding the pointed contradictions he is pleased to advance against them.

To come to an end, the question of educating the deaf and dumb presents three distinct systems, the system of methodic signs, the oral system, and the combined system. The oral system, at best, falls short—very short indeed, of covering the whole case of these poor children of affliction. The combined system is generally disapproved of, and even though admissible in principle, the difficulties to be encountered in carrying it out are too formidable to face them; whilst the time-honoured system of systematic signs provides for the entire class so far as they are capable of being relieved in all the phases their unhappy situation presents to our sympathy on their behalf, whilst appealing, at the same time, to the benevolence of a generous public for the support of the establishments, that persevere in maintaining it with such signal success attested by the happy results they continue to produce.

THE AUTHOR OF "CLAIMS OF THE DEAF-MUTE TO BE ADMITTED TO THE SACRAMENTS."

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

INDIFFERENTISM; OR, IS ONE RELIGION AS GOOD AS ANOTHER?
By the Rev. John McLoughlin. London: Burns and Oates, &c. 1887.

THE object of this little book, the author informs us in his Preface, "is to show that all religions are not equally right, that one only can be right, that all the rest must be wrong; and having done this, then to point out which *alone* is right among the multitudinous claimants." Comparing this extensive programme with the comparatively small volume before us, we were at first inclined to doubt that it had been accomplished. But as we read our doubts vanished. Without sacrificing clearness, without making his book a string of bald syllogisms, the author has succeeded in showing in a small volume of little more than two hundred pages, all that in his Preface he proposes to show.

The book consists of two parts, preceded by an introductory chapter. The first part is taken up with a direct refutation of Indifferentism; in the second the "notes" or marks of the true Church are pointed out, their necessity proved, and their non-existence in any sect or religious denomination outside the Catholic Church shown by arguments convincing and irrefragable.

In dealing directly with Indifferentism, Fr. McLoughlin is quite at home. In a calm and judicial manner he explains the nature of the error which he has undertaken to combat, puts the chief arguments of its advocates in the fairest and strongest light, and then with merciless logic tears them to shreds, and piles argument on argument to prove that this much-vaunted philosophico-religious system contradicts right reason as well as the express teaching of Sacred Scripture. Arguing against Indifferentism from the commission to teach all nations given by Christ to his Apostles, and from the fact, that in fulfilling that commission, the Apostles had to suffer persecution and even death. he asks—

“But how reconcile the love He (Christ) bore them (the Apostles), and His clear foreknowledge of their life-long martyrdom, with the statement that He is quite indifferent what faith people hold, provided they act consistently with it? Would it not have been cruel on his part thus to doom His special servants, His dearest friends, to those lives of suffering and deaths of shame, if it was a matter of no consequence to Him whether His people worshipped Him according to this creed or that? If men by acting consistently with whatever idea of religion they already held, became sufficiently acceptable to Him, why not leave them as they were, and save the Apostles from such trials in life, and such torments in death?”

From the history of the conversion of Cornelius, the Centurion, another overwhelming proof of the untenableness of the position of the Indifferentists is drawn. Having briefly narrated this remarkable history, he says:—

“Now, here the advocates of Indifferentism are on the horns of a dilemma. *One* of two conclusions they are forced to draw—namely, either God sends His Apostles, and even His Angels, on useless errands, or it cannot be a matter of indifference to Him what religion people profess. If Cornelius knew God, if he feared Him, if he loved Him—if he loved Him, too, in His poor by relieving those who were in distress—if he spent long hours in prayer, if his life was such that he was styled in inspired language a ‘just man,’ why should God send an angel from heaven to him, or why should He send St. Peter from Joppe to Cesarea to bring to him the light of the new Gospel, to administer to him the Sacrament of Baptism, and to receive him and his family into the one true fold.” (Page 48).

In the second part, which treats of the marks of the true Church, there was less room for originality. Yet, even here, Fr. McLoughlin has succeeded in giving to the subject a freshness, which must render this portion of his work interesting to all, and at the same time a simplicity and clearness which brings a somewhat recondite subject within the mental range of his less-instructed readers.

We heartily wish this little book a wide circulation. It has every condition necessary to render a book popular. Its subject is one of absorbing interest for all Christians; that subject is treated in a pleasing and intelligible style; the book is not too long, and, lastly, it is a marvel of cheapness.

D. O’L.

MAYNOOTH COLLEGE CALENDAR. Dublin: Browne & Nolan.

HALF-AN-HOUR is always agreeably spent by past students in looking through the latest Calendar of the College in which they were educated. The Calendar represents the College as it is, and one naturally likes to compare it with what it was in his time, perhaps many years ago.

I have looked through the Maynooth Calendar for the year 1887-8 with mingled feelings of regret and pleasure. When I turned to the list of the College staff I was saddened to miss so many names held in highest respect by old students and long identified with the place; but it is a compensation to note that the present staff is a strong one, and considerably increased in number since my days. The number of Superiors is strengthened by the addition of two Spiritual Fathers who help in the spiritual instruction and training of the students; the Professor of English is relieved from the French Class in order to devote himself exclusively to the teaching of English, and Professors of Modern Languages, Elocution and Sacred Eloquence have been added.

The Programme of Studies too is, I note with great satisfaction, considerably changed for the better. Each divinity student has now thirteen or fourteen classes of Theology every week for four years, besides the usual course of Scripture increased by a special class of "Introduction to Scripture" for 1st year's Theologians, a complete course of Canon Law, and (what I regard as a highly important addition) a weekly class for methodical instruction in the theory and practice of Pastoral Preaching in its various forms.

Old students, like myself, will be gratified to see that the course of English is now spread over the whole seven or eight years. Beginning with the Rhetoricians who have four hours a week for the class of English Language and Literature, the subject is also taught in 1st and 2nd year's Philosophy and then taken up by the Theologians who turn to practical account their knowledge of composition by preparing a sermon every month for the Professor of Sacred Eloquence. These and other changes which I noted are decided improvements.

Turning to the College Roll, it is cheering to see that, in these years of depression, Maynooth shows no sign of decreasing numbers. Maynooth of the present year has a larger number of students attending its halls than even the Maynooth of government-endowment days. The Calendar mentions 524 as the number of students in residence this year. *Prosperè procedè* is the earnest wish of an old student.

P. P.

THE THRONE OF THE FISHERMAN BUILT BY THE CARPENTER'S SON. THE ROOT, THE BOND, AND THE CROWN OF CHRISTENDOM. By Thomas W. Allies. London: Burns & Oates.

Treatises on the Primacy of St. Peter are by no means few and far between. Seasoned theologians, withered and stained with the dust of the schools have handled the subject very carefully. They have brought to bear on it the result of their life-long labours in the field of Christian dogma, and with all the powers of a mind fully matured and enriched with dogmatic lore, they have set forth the true doctrine of the Church on this most important subject and illustrated and proved that doctrine by most convincing arguments drawn from the sacred text, from reason and from history. Nor is the handling of this subject confined to theologians who deal with such topics *ex professo*. Many a 'prentice hand has been tried on it, and it has afforded rich matter for tracts and pamphlets, sermons and lectures. And this is well. It is well to spread the light and the truth though the mode of treatment be not always by the rigid method of those who handle a subject scientifically, and give first an explanation of their doctrine, then a concise statement of same, followed by proofs from Scripture and the Fathers, together with objections and other solutions. Many of the greatest and most important truths of a science can be divested of their technicalities and presented to the ordinary reader in an easily intelligible fashion. This is true of most of the dogmas of the Christian religion. They can be popularised and presented to the ordinary reader in the clearest light and the simplest language. Such style of treatment is often denounced as superficial and occasionally it deserve to be so denounced.

Mr. Allies' work on the *Throne of the Fisherman* must not be classed with the popular expositions or ephemeral works on the Primacy of St. Peter. Though a most readable book it is by no means light reading. The author was too serious and too much in earnest for that; his object was to place before all English readers the Divine Institution of the Primacy and the consequences flowing therefrom. He traces the supremacy of the successor of St. Peter from the words spoken by our Saviour to the Prince of the Apostles, wherein on two occasions before His passion and in another after His resurrection He gave him the keys of the kingdom of heaven, gave him a commission to feed His lambs, to feed His sheep, and the whole Christian flock. "And never" (as Mr. Allies says) "have words been spoken on earth which have had a greater and more continuous

efficacy, through the eighteen centuries and a half they have never been silent; they have never ceased to work upon the hearts of men, and their working has not diminished but increased with each succeeding age.

Mr. Allies naturally places as first factor in the Papal Supremacy its divine institution; as the second factor its recognition by the Church our divine Saviour founded, and as its third factor the continual protection Divine Providence has exercised over it during the many changes of eighteen centuries, and he remarks very sensibly that this recognition by the Church does not create the Primacy but bears witness to it as already created just as all the General Councils of the eighteen centuries have borne witness to its existence. To prove that the Church in the first four centuries recognised the supremacy of the See of Rome, Mr. Allies appeals most effectively to the Council of Chalcedon. If there be, then, any voice which the student of the ancient church may recognise as carrying with it the collected testimony of the first four-hundred years it is the voice of the Council of Chalcedon. This Council not only spoke of St. Peter as the rock and foundation of the Catholic Church and the basis of the orthodox faith, but addressed Pope Leo, the then reigning Pontiff, as the "very person entrusted by the Saviour with the guardianship of the vine," "whose anxiety is to preserve in unity the body of the Church," and "who presided over them as a head over its members." Thus the great General Council acknowledged St. Leo as St. Peter's successor, invested with his supremacy, and bearing all the obligations attached to that supremacy, and this view of the office it is, that is in practice now after a lapse of fourteen hundred years.

In addition to the collective testimony of the Book of the Council of Chalcedon, we have to the same effect, the testimony of numberless Greek and Latin Fathers, who wrote during the first four centuries of the Church. They bear unequivocal evidence to the *Throne of the Fisherman built by the Carpenter's Son*, by which is meant "the continuous and ever increasing influence and work of St. Peter's See, as the instrument by which the Divine kingdom is begun, propagated and maintained."

The present work covers the history of the Church so far as the subject is concerned, down to the pontificate of Leo the Great, and the writer promises to give similar, but distinct pictures, of the action of the Holy See, from the pontificate of St. Leo to the present pontificate of his illustrious and worthy successor Leo XIII. This is a very laborious undertaking, but enthusiasm and love of truth will

lighten and sweeten the labour. We wish the gifted author success, and that the undertaking may equal what he has already achieved; we can scarcely expect that it will surpass it. In a short notice like this it is impossible to do anything like justice to a great work like *The Throne of the Fisherman*. To appreciate it at its full worth it must be read slowly and carefully, and the trouble thus taken will be fully repaid by the revival of latent or long lost information, and by seeing in a new light, the connection and bearing of important events in the history of the early Church.

For many readers the chapter at the end of the work treating of Patristic Literature and St. Leo the Great will have most charms. We sincerely hope that a kind Providence will give time and strength to so earnest a worker for the completion of his great labour.

A. B.

LEGENDS AND RECORDS OF THE CHURCH AND EMPIRE. By Aubrey de Vere. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1887.

This latest work from the pen of Mr. de Vere is a direct negative to the popular assumption that the inventive or poetic faculty wanes with years, though the re-assuring powers may be strengthened. For here in this work, we have a valuable preface, which takes a large sweeping view of the progress of civilisation, and the effect of the Church's ministry in combining races in one common sacred pursuit; and then a series of poetic legends, or perhaps, we should rather say, poetised records, of Church and Empire, told with all that consummate skill in rhyme and metre, of which Mr. de Vere is an acknowledged master. It is, however, the least merit of these poems that they present, in an agreeable form, historical events, which in the great science of the philosophy of history, are of supreme importance; but we must add, that Mr. de Vere lifts into the higher world of pure poetry events which we have been accustomed to see in the broad light of recorded facts, and not through the mists of legends which claim rather the attention of the fancy, than the homage of our faith. The *Legends of the Saxon Saints*, and the *Legends of St. Patrick*, dealt almost exclusively with these beautiful episodes, which were allegorical rather than actual; and in which half the charm consisted in the suspense in which they placed us, as to whether we should refuse our intellectual assent to events whose beauty and whose mystery claimed our tenderest admiration and sympathy. In passing therefore from pure legend to history, Mr. de Vere has taken a bold

and forward step; and without actually dramatising his historical events he has brought them before us in very clear melodious language and given them a higher meaning than history does by associating them in a great hidden design to connect what was best in Paganism with the purity and sublimity of Christianity. This is most observable in *Dionysius the Arcopagite*, where we witness the blending of Greek culture with Christian morality, and see how the mind of man passes from mysticism of the East to the learning of Athens, and thence to the faith of Rome. In the beautiful stories of SS. Thecla, Dorothea, and Pancratius, we witness the struggle between Roman Paganism and Christianity, and the victory of the latter by the passive suffering of its members; and in *Constantine at Thrace*, and *Constantine at Constantinople*, and in the closing ode, *The Coronation of Charlemagne*, we see the final glory, which made Europe one vast spiritual Empire, under the protection of one vast material Empire, built by the valour of northern barbarians out of what was best and most lasting in the ruins of ancient Rome. That all this forms matter for history and historical novels we know well; that it forms material for rich, sweet poetry we would hardly suspect, if we had not read this book, where all these sublime and tragic events are told in stately verse which gives them a new aspect of sublimity; and yet so great is the influence of one strong personality, we think most readers will turn first, as we did, to the two poems entitled: *St. Jerome's Letter*, and the *Death of St. Jerome*, and they will not be disappointed. The rugged prose of the mighty Saint of Bethlehem, is translated into the most beautiful and harmonious poetry; and the death of the saint, whose whole character was, as he says, stormy and barbaric and tempered only by Christianity, is finely and dramatically drawn.

And yet we do not suppose that this work will be popular. It is altogether too high and exalted, both in design and execution, for such a fate. It does not appeal to the tastes of the present generation. Mr. de Vere, in this and in all his other works, has made a mighty sacrifice. With as perfect a command of the language as any of those writers whose alliterative jingle makes them momentarily popular, and with as true and deep a poetic sense as Wordsworth, the master of modern poets, and his own intimate friend, Mr. de Vere has chosen to pass by subjects congenial to the pagan spirit of our age, and to become what he truly is—a great Christian poet—the great Christian poet of our century. But neither Christian poetry, nor Christian painting nor Christian art of any kind is just now acceptable. An artist, who to-day would produce a Madonna or a St. Catherine with inspiration

equal to that of Raphaelle might hang it in his studio for ever, and never be asked the price. And the poet who adopts Christian subjects, no matter how faultless his work may be, must be content with the consciousness of the intrinsic merit of his work, the possible judgment of posterity, and the consolation of the Laureate :—

“ To have the great poetic heart
Is more than all poetic fame.”

Perhaps if a new generation should arise, such as is foreshadowed in the closing lines of the preface of this book, Mr. de Vere will be read when his contemporaries are forgotten. Meanwhile, his poetry will always be treasured by a few, in whom culture and true poetic taste are quite compatible with Christian enthusiasm for the glories of the Church and its saints ; and at least we may hope that many will be stimulated to enter upon these deep studies in the philosophy of the Christian establishment, in which Mr. Allies has been such a successful worker, and which is partially embodied in these graceful epics which we welcome as an important addition to Catholic literature, and very warmly recommend to our readers.

CORNELII TACITI ANNALIUM LIBER I. Edited, with Notes, by Rev. Edward Maguire, Professor of Ancient Classics, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth. Dublin : Browne & Nolan.

ONE occasionally hears men of middle age half complaining that learning is made so easy and pleasant for boys of this generation by reason of the numerous and cheap manuals published by men of high scholarship. We, however, recognize in this abundance of high class school books one of the healthiest and surest signs of the progress made in education in these latter days.

Professor Maguire's *First Book of the Annals of Tacitus* is among the latest contributions to excellent manuals. In a book of 114 pages, 41 are devoted to the Text, and the rest to Notes. In the Notes the Editor explains very clearly the numerous allusions to Roman history, biography, and constitutional practices, the more difficult grammatical constructions are pointed out and discussed, and admirable tact is shown in the phrases selected for accurate and neat translation. The editing of this book is an instance of how much is gained in securing for such work a ripe scholar who is at the same time practically acquainted with the hints and helps most needed by school boys.

We have no doubt that the students of the Senior Grade Intermediate, for whom this book is intended, will wonder that “ Tacitus has been at all times regarded as a difficult book.”

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

NOVEMBER, 1887.

DR. MIVART'S DEFENCE OF THEISM.—V.

IN previous papers I endeavoured to give an outline of the argument by which Catholic truth may be defended against Materialism in what may be called its positive form. It was proved that "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." It remains for us to inquire what is the nature of this hidden agent.

This inquiry brings us face to face with another and more subtle form of Materialism, which may be called its negative form, and which is known to modern literature as Agnosticism. Of the Agnostics Herbert Spencer is chief. He admits something distinct from matter,—something, of which we can know only that it *is*, and which, accordingly, he terms the Unknowable. Mr. Matthew Arnold, the literary leader of this school of thought, describes the same something as "the Eternal not ourselves that makes for righteousness."

And verily God is the Unknowable, though in a sense very different from that of the Agnostics. Sophar, the Naamathite, most truly says:¹ "He is higher than the heavens, and what wilt thou do? He is deeper than hell, and how wilt thou know? The measure of Him is higher than the earth and broader than the sea." He is the Infinite, with judgments incomprehensible and ways unsearchable,² whose mind no one knows, save only the Spirit that "searcheth all things, even the abysses of God."³

¹ *Job.* xi. 7-9.

² *Rom.* xi. 33, 34.

³ *1 Cor.* ii. 10.

Nor is it surprising that God should be unknowable to us, in the sense explained; for, do we not find everything unknowable? The motion of a finger, the growth of grass, the very clay on which we tread,—what hidden things they are! Scientists use learned terms; but when all has been tried and said, Nature remains an Isis still; we have but learned the approach to the veil. Far be it from us to rail at science: “may she mix with men and prosper.” Let these defend themselves who deny her due, by restricting her investigations to one region of the unknowable, and that region the most bounded and most barren.

Catholic Philosophy maintains, that, as in the region of the finite unknowable we can trace causes from effects, and from the properties of a substance learn something of its nature, so also we may increase our knowledge of the unknowable Infinite. When Robinson Crusoe saw footprints in the sand, he was safe in concluding that their unknowable cause had, at least, a human foot. Many things are unknowable about the author of the Iliad, but Mr. Arnold would be the last to deny that the poem is the result of intelligence. In like manner, from all that we see around us, we can learn something of the hidden agent that is ever at work in and through matter, by whose energy everything is produced.

THESIS III.

“The hidden agent is a person.”

By a *person* the Schoolmen mean (1) a *substance* that is (2) *complete* and (3) *intelligent*.¹ I will ask the reader not to press for formal explanations of these terms,—explanations which would carry us too far, and may be found in ordinary handbooks. Let us proceed at once to the proof.

1. The hidden agent is a *substance*. It does not inhere in and arise from something else, like *roundness* or *colour*; for, in that case, the true hidden agent should be the *something else*. It is manifest that there must be some something self-sustaining at the back of all; nor will it do to place the

¹ Abstracting, of course, from what revelation teaches about the Trinity and about the human nature of our Lord.

earth on a tortoise, and the tortoise again on a snake, unless the snake also be supported or self-supporting.

This substance, whatever it is, is *complete*. It is not a *branch* of something else, which rouses it to energy, and is, so to speak, responsible for its acts, as the intellect is part of a man. Or if it be, there is that very "something else" behind, which is itself the real agent in that case, and to which the acts are to be ascribed. There must be some spring to the machine.

The hidden agent is *intelligent*. This will be plain to any one who has mastered the proof of our second Thesis.

There are two ways of accounting for the fair and orderly world. One is the system of Materialistic Evolution;—that everything has been produced by a series of happy accidents, by blind chance. I have already shown that this cannot be; that matter never could create the smallest force, much less build up these wonderful crystals, those intricate organisms, above all, the intellect of man.

The other system supposes a hidden agent. And as the activity of this agent results in a most uniform, though exceedingly diverse and intricate structure, it is manifest that the hidden agent follows certain lines of operation,—that it carries out a pre-conceived plan. We laugh at the learned men of Lagado with their machine for the production of knowledge; but I would as soon believe such a machine capable of producing the *Æneid*, or that the Last Judgment was painted by snails on the walls of the Sistine Chapel, as be satisfied that the order of the heavens is the result of chance, or that the human body is but the outcome of a million accidents.¹

And even though a certain blind instinct were sufficient to produce the material world, what about the human soul? No force can do anything that is not in its power; and it is not, and never could be, in the power of any being to produce, even by evolution, a being higher than itself. Moreover, the soul is not evolved but specially created, as has been shown. Forms cannot produce substance, nor can dead

¹ See the whole argument in Dr. Mivart's "Genesis of Species."

matter produce life ; and so, too, nothing could have produced a living intelligence, save what is itself an intelligent living thing.

II. Let us call the other side. 1° Mr. Arnold writes :—¹

“ We venture to ask the intelligent reader whether it does not strike him as an objection to our making God a person who thinks and loves, that we have really no experience whatever, not the very slightest, of persons who think and love, except in man and the inferior animals (?) . . . True, we easily and naturally attribute all operations that engage our notice to authors who live and think, like ourselves. We make persons of the sun, wind, love, envy, war, fortune; in some languages every noun is male or female. But this, we know, is figure and personification. Being ourselves alive and thinking, and having sense, we naturally invest things with these our attributes, and imagine all action and operation to proceed as our own proceeds. This is a tendency which in common speech and in poetry, where we do not profess to speak exactly, we cannot well help following, and which we follow lawfully. In the language of common speech and of poetry we speak of the Eternal not ourselves that makes for righteousness, as if he were a person that thinks and loves. Naturally we speak of him so, and there is no objection at all to our doing so.

“ But it is different when we profess to speak exactly, yet make God a person who thinks and loves. We then find what difficulty our being actually acquainted with no person superior to ourselves who think and love brings us into. Some, we know, make their God in the image of the inferior animals. We have had the god Apis, and the god Anubis; but these are extravagances. In general, as God is said to have made man in his own image, the image of God, man has returned the compliment, and has made God as being, outwardly or inwardly, in the image of man . . . We construct a magnified and non-natural man, by dropping out all that in man seems a source of weakness, and heightening to the very utmost all that in man seems a source of strength, such as his thought and love . . . Then between this magnified man and ourselves we put, if we please, angels, who are men etherealised. The objection to the magnified man and to the man etherealised is one and the same: that *we have absolutely no experience whatever of either the one or the other.*”

¹ “ God and the Bible,” p. 14.

I have italicised the last clause, because it supplies the basis of Mr. Arnold's whole argument, and because at best this basis is but of sand. "We have no experience whatever of a God who thinks:" this is the assertion; and the implication is that we should assent to nothing which we do not experience.

Let us first consider the assertion: "We have no experience of a God who thinks." What does it mean? If it is used to signify that *sense* tells us nothing of the divine intelligence, the remark is plainly beside the question; for, with regard to God, sense tells nothing at all, not even that He exists. If the assertion means that *reason* may not conclude from what sense does experience, that the hidden cause of all things is intelligent, then, indeed, we beg to dissent from Mr. Arnold's teaching.

It is painful to have to insist so often on the utter hollowness of this philosophy of experience, which is here assumed by Mr. Arnold as the undisputed basis of his whole fabric of belief. "We have really no experience whatever, not the very slightest, of persons who think and love, except in man and the inferior animals." What then? Shall we acknowledge nothing but what we experience? Have we any experience of *existence* except in ourselves and in the world around us? And yet even Mr. Arnold proclaims that "God is, is admitted."¹ Can he mean that we have sense-experience of the existence of God?

Mr. Arnold not only confesses that "God is, is admitted," but makes some other remarkable statements.

1) God is "the Eternal not ourselves that makes for righteousness." Now, to borrow Mr. Arnold's own words, "we venture to ask the intelligent reader, whether it does not strike him as an objection, . . . that we have really no experience whatever, not the very slightest," of the eternal, or of the fountain of right, except in man and inferior creatures. If this reason be conclusive to Mr. Arnold that God should not be made a person, does it not equally prove

¹ "God and the Bible," p. 11.

that He should not be made "the Eternal not ourselves that makes for righteousness?"

2) In support of his doctrine of experience Mr. Arnold treats us to some thoughts on the well-known principle of Descartes, *cogito, ergo sum*;—with which thoughts I should not trouble the reader, were it not for the admissions they contain.

"The philosopher [Descartes] omits to tell us what he exactly means by to *be*, to *exist* . . . What to *think* means, we all know . . . [To Descartes] the terms, *I am*, *I exist*, carry an even more clear and well-defined sense than the term, *I think*. But to us they do not. We are obliged to translate them at a venture into something of this kind: 'I feel that I am alive.'¹

Much might be said of the "light and sweetness" of a mind to which *I am* means, *I feel that I am alive*;—to which the notions of *thought* and of *life* are more clear than that of *being*. Mr. Arnold tells us of the difficulty he had in finding out what *being* means, and how at last light dawned on him from Dr. Curtius' *Principles of Greek Etymology*. There he learned that *being* means *breathing, growing, standing forth*,—means them, that is, in a blunted and shadowy way now, but meant them, at first, in well-defined reality. When the primitive man wished to predicate blackness of a horse, he said: "the horse breathes (is) black." When he got to the use of abstract nouns, his verb still remained the same, he said: "Virtue breathes (is) fair valour growing (being) praiseworthy."²

Mr. Arnold, it seems, had no difficulty about the meaning of *breathes, grows, stands forth*. Suppose he were to tell us what they mean, I wonder could he do so without using or implying the notion contained under the verb to *be*.

3) See, moreover: "God is, is admitted." *Is* may be translated—"at a venture"—"*feels that he is alive*;" therefore God lives and feels. *Is*, is "not more clear than thinks;" but "He is, is admitted;" whereas we have really no experience whatever, not the very slightest, "that he thinks or loves." What lucidity!

¹ "God and the Bible," pp. 30-31.

² p. 39.

2°. Mr. Spencer is hardly more consistent. In "First Principles" we read:¹

"Duty requires us neither to affirm nor deny personality. Our duty is to submit ourselves with all humility to the established limits of our intelligence . . .

"This, which to most will seem an essentially irreligious position, is an essentially religious one—nay, is *the* religious one, to which, as already shown, all others are but approximations. In the estimate it implies of the ultimate cause, it does not fall short of the alternative position, but exceeds it. Those who espouse the alternative position make the erroneous assumption that the choice is between personality and something lower than personality; whereas the choice is rather between personality and something higher. Is it not just possible that there is a mode of being so much transcending Intelligence and Will, as these transcend mechanical motion? It is true that we are unable to conceive any such higher mode of being. But this is not a reason for questioning its existence, it is rather the reverse. Have we not seen how utterly incompetent our minds are to form even an approach to a conception of that which underlies all phenomena? . . . Does it not follow that the ultimate cause cannot in any respect be conceived by us because it is in every respect greater than can be conceived? And may we not therefore rightly refrain from assigning to it any attributes, on the ground that such attributes, derived as they must be from our own natures, are not elevations but degradations."

Let us see how all this fits into Mr. Spencer's own system. No one can insist more strongly than he on the *existence* of the Ultimate Cause. It is "a necessary datum of consciousness;" and hence "the belief which this datum constitutes has a higher warrant than any other whatever."² Again:

"The consciousness of an Inscrutable Power manifested to us through all phenomena has been growing ever clearer . . . The certainty that . . . such a Power exists . . . is the certainty towards which intelligence has been from the first progressing. To this conclusion science inevitably arrives as it reaches its confines . . . It is the conclusion we are bound to accept without reserve or qualification."²

¹ P. 108.

² Ibid, p. 98.

³ Ibid, p. 108.

An Ultimate Cause *exists*, then; and may be termed Ultimate Cause, or Absolute, or Inscrutable Power,—anything but intelligent. It “cannot in any respect be conceived by us because it is in every respect greater than can be conceived;” and yet “its positive existence is a necessary datum of consciousness.” Surely we conceive it in *some* respect when we conceive it as existing. “We may rightly refrain from assigning to it any attributes whatever, on the ground that such attributes, derived as they must be from our own natures, are not elevations but degradations;” but, if so, why assign it *being*? Do we know of *existence* except from our own and inferior natures?

Mr. Spencer is clear-sighted enough to see the difficulty. This is what he says in reply:

“Very likely there will ever remain a need to give shape to that indefinite sense of an Ultimate Existence which forms the basis of our intelligence. We shall always be under the necessity of contemplating it as *some* mode of being; that is, of representing it to ourselves in *some* form of thought, however vague. And we shall not err in doing this so long as we treat every notion we thus form as merely a symbol, utterly without resemblance to that for which it stands. Perhaps the constant formation of such symbols and the constant rejection of them as inadequate, may be hereafter, as it has hitherto been, a means of discipline. Perpetually to construct ideas requiring the utmost stretch of our faculties, and perpetually to find that such ideas must be abandoned as futile imaginations, may realize to us more fully than any other course, the greatness of that which we vainly strive to grasp.”¹

St. Thomas might almost have written these words,—except for the symbolism. “We shall,” indeed, “be always under the necessity of contemplating [the Ultimate Existence] as *some* mode of being.” Why, then, it may be asked, may we not contemplate it as intelligent? And how can we “treat every notion we thus form as *merely* a symbol, *utterly* without resemblance to that for which it stands?” Can we treat the notion of existence thus? If so, the ultimate cause does not exist for us in reality, but only in imagination. This

¹ “First Principles,” p. 113.

symbolism will not save Mr. Spencer from inconsistency, except it be thorough;—except the notion of existence, like every other notion, be treated as “merely a symbol, utterly without resemblance to that for which it stands.” But, then, what becomes of the “necessary datum of consciousness?”¹

III. It is sad to think that able men should continue to flounder thus, and all through their own conceit, because in their self-satisfaction they will not condescend to examine the system which they pretend to refute. Every hand-book of Catholic Theology explains how existence and attributes are predicated of God. He has them, and yet He has them not. He *is*, and is *wise* and *just* and *powerful*; yet is He not as creatures are, but in a manner of which we can form no just idea; as we can form no adequate notion of His wisdom, justice, or power. Still we are within our right in saying both that He *is*, and that He is *wise*, *just*, and *strong*. Let me explain.

The Schoolmen distinguish three modes of predication,—the *univocal*, the *analogical*, and the *equivocal*. In *univocal* predication the terms retain their proper signification, as when we speak of an infant's *smile*, or of a lion's *strength*. *Analogy* supposes simularity and difference. A term is predicated analogically, when the proposition is true only if the word *like* be understood. We speak thus of a *smiling* landscape, and of the *lion-hearted* king. *Equivocations* are mere puns, and are beside the present question.

It is Catholic teaching, that when we say either that God *is* or *is something*, we make use of analogy. Thus far Mr. Arnold and Mr. Spencer are right. God's existence is not the same as ours, but an inconceivably *infinite* being. His knowledge, justice, and power, are not quite the same as we see in creatures; but infinite in every line. If one were to maintain that God exists only in the same way as we all exist, such a one would contradict the Catholic teaching. If it were said that the wisdom of God is exactly

¹ The reader will see how the old controversy about the nature of universals crops up once more; it is at the root of almost every error, as of all truth.

the same as ours, it would be untrue. And yet God really exists, and is really wise, only in a way altogether superior to our way. There is but an analogy or likeness between them ;¹ we have no more claim to be called wise when compared with God, than a meadow has to be called *smiling*, or a brute beast to be thought *intelligent*. So far we are in agreement with Mr. Arnold, Mr. Spencer, and the Agnostics.

IV. 1°. Here the difficulty begins. It is true, according to Catholic teaching, that God really *is* and *is wise*. These are human terms ; they are psychologically antecedent to any notion of God. Hence they signify existence and wisdom such as we see in us and around us. But God *is not* as we are ; nor *is* He *wise* as we are. How, then, can it be true that God *really is* and *is wise* ?

I would answer thus :—We know what *being* is, such as we see it in us and around us. Thereby we understand what is *nothing*,—the negation of *being*,—“*no being*.” Let us suppose, for a moment, that the principle of causality is universally true. When we state, according to that principle, that, as there is *being* now, there cannot ever have been mere “*no-being*,” we know what is meant. If there was never mere “*no-being*,” there must have been always *some being*, according to another principle—that of contradiction ;—which, likewise, we suppose for a moment to be true universally. There must, then, have been always some being ; though *how* it was, or whether it was the same as the being we see around us, we know not, nor does the principle of causality or of contradiction say.

Similarly, we know what *wisdom* is, such as we see it in us and around us. Thereby we understand what is “*no-wisdom*.” When, therefore, we state, according to the principle of causality, that, as there is wisdom now, there cannot ever have been mere “*no-wisdom*,” we know what is meant. Hence, by the principle of contradiction, there must have been always some wisdom ; though *how* it was, or whether

¹ There are two kinds of analogy, but it is not necessary to explain them at length.

it was the same as the wisdom we see in us and around us, we know not, nor do our principles say.

This argument supposes, as has been said, the universal, absolute truth of the two principles. It supposes, in the first place, the principle of causality,—that everything positive that begins to be, must come from something that was able to give it being. An extension of this principle is further supposed,—that nothing can be able to give anything that it has not. Hence, whatever of positive reality begins in the creature, must be found in some form in the Hidden Agent that is ever at work. As well expect water from a dried-up cistern, or mathematics from a brute, as think that any agent could give out what was not within.

Everything, accordingly, that is both in us and around us, must be found,—at least *in some form*—in the Hidden Agent that is ever producing all. It is plain that the form of the result and of the agent need not be the same in every respect. If the forms be exactly similar, as when man is born of man, we can apply to both the same term in exactly the same sense. A son is as much a man as his father. When, however, the forms are different, as they may be; when the result has only a portion of the agent's form; we can no longer predicate the terms univocally of both. A house is not its architect, nor is the architect the house; but the architect has in his mind the design that he gave to the house, and is having the same, so far as it goes; though he is having much more, and is having the design in a very superior way. And so God is having all that He gave His creatures,—wisdom, power, being,—only very much more and in His own way.

Our argument supposes, further, the principle of contradiction,—that, if there cannot have been mere “no-being,” there must have been some being. But, as the principle of causality does not require that what is positive in the result should be of the same form exactly as it has in the cause; so neither does the principle of contradiction mean that there must be *being* such as we see in us and around us, if mere “no-being” has to be set aside. Accordingly we admit *being* and *wisdom* in God; nor are we forced in consistency to admit that they are of the same kind as ours.

This is not the place to defend the universal, absolute truth of the principles that underlie this argument; what has been said so often already will apply here.

2°. The objection may be urged. It might seem, that, according to this teaching, God might be said to be *material*. For matter is positive and comes from Him. Therefore He has matter, is having it, or is a material being,—which no Catholic will allow.

The answer to this form of the objection will help to illustrate the principles on which our whole system is based. One of these principles has been already stated as follows: Everything positive that begins to be, must come from something that was able to give it. Negatives, being nothing, require no principle or source of being.

Conformably to this principle we admit and contend that God has in Himself all that is positive in material things, and that He may be denominated accordingly. But inasmuch as the negations of matter require no principle of being, we are not, by the same reason, forced to admit, or even justified in admitting, that He has them. And if He has them not, we are not justified in applying to Him any term that would imply that He has.

But to say that God is material is to ascribe negations to Him. *Material* means *having a body*; and bodies are not wholly positive, but positive and negative combined. A body is a divisible substance. So far as it is a substance, it is positive; whereas divisibility is a negation; it is a want of that further perfection that we find in spirit. Hence, to say that God has a body, implies that he has the defects and negations of His creatures; an implication that is not in the least warranted by the principle on which the Catholic system is based.

3°. The difficulty, however, is not yet exhausted. Modern Agnostics are wont to reason thus:—You admit that God cannot be said to be material, for the reason just assigned, because matter implies negation. Now, should we not, for the same reason, hesitate to call Him a spirit, or a person.

For as, from what we know of spirit, we are assured that matter implies negation; so may it not be true, that, if we knew of some perhaps nobler substances, we should be equally aware that there is negation implied even in our notion of spirit. It is not contended that such higher substances actually exist; but they may, for all anyone can prove. And if they do, would it not seem to them as blasphemous to call the Hidden Agent a spirit, as it does to us to call Him a body? To avoid possible mistake, therefore, let us not think of Him as imaged in any human concept; and if we worship Him, let our worship be one of wonder, "mostly of the silent sort."¹

This form of the difficulty, is most subtle; it gives to adversaries the greatest advantage that a disputant could desire,—the opportunity to criticise, without any liability to prove truths or facts. We have, then, to show that when we call God a spirit or a person, we do not attribute negations to Him,—that we do not predicate of Him a possibly lower form of existence.

We show it thus: A negation might be attributed to a subject in two ways, either *directly* or by *connotation*. It would be directly attributed, if it were formally conceived and known to be a negation; and if it were, nevertheless, said to exist formally in the subject. As if one were to say: injustice is a defect, and A is unjust. A negation would be merely connoted, if the object of one's concept were altogether positive, though known to be finite, and if one were to attribute to the subject this positive entity. In this latter case the negation is indeed attributed in some way; not directly, however, but only because of the limitation of the object in itself.

This distinction can be made clearer by being applied. If one were to call God a body, it would be a formal and direct attribution of negation to Him. Because, in our very concept *body* is formally represented, not only as *limited*, but as partly *negative*. Not so when we call God a spirit. The

¹ See the extract from Mr. Spencer quoted above, p. 967. "Is it not just possible that there is a mode of being so much transcending Intelligence and Will, as these transcend mechanical motion?"

object of our concept is then, as far as it is at all, altogether positive; and if it is accompanied by negation, it is so, not by reason of any part, so to speak, of itself; but because every object of a finite intelligence cannot but be finite. Hence we are taught by our theologians to correct this mode of predication by remembering that when we call God a spirit, we do not mean that He is a spirit such as we know, but of an infinitely higher order. Nay, we are warned by the same authorities, that even when we say that God *is*, we should not think His mode of *existence* such as that with which we are acquainted, but a mode of existence altogether beyond our power to conceive.

Hence the reason which forbids us to call God a body, does not equally forbid us to call Him a spirit. In the first case we directly attribute negation and imperfection to Him; in the second they are only connoted. And we admit that this very connotation should be corrected and guarded against.

4°. But, it may be urged: Is it not wrong to even connote imperfection of Him? If direct attribution of a negation is unlawful, why should indirect connotation be allowed? You speak of correcting the error, but you will not admit that the same process justifies the direct predication. Would it not be better to be thoroughly consistent, and not tolerate even the connotation of error, no matter how corrected and guarded against; as you will not allow, no matter with what safeguards, the direct predication of imperfection with regard to God? If this can only be done by not thinking or speaking of Him at all, let us, then, in purest reverence, not think or speak of Him. And if we must speak of Him, let us "treat every notion we thus form as merely a symbol, utterly without resemblance to that for which it stands."

We reply:—It cannot be. Even though we were to try, we could not but think of Him. The problem of existence cries out for an answer. Some would ascribe all things to a Creator, and forthwith they think of Him. Others may

deny that there is any such being ; and thus they, too, think of Him. Agnostics try to be on their guard ; they will not take either side ; and behold, even then a side is taken, and the Agnostics think of God ! Do they not write whole books about Him ? to prove, forsooth, that we should not write, speak, or think, of Him at all. As long as we are philosophers, which is as long as we are men, with intense curiosity to know the reasons of things,—so long we cannot but think and speak of the first of all reasons, which is God.

And as for treating our notions and expressions as mere symbols, that too is impossible, for they are and must be very much more. Inadequate they are, of course, and in that sense they may be called symbols ; but they are not *utterly* without resemblance to that for which they stand. The principles on which knowledge is based are too objectively real to permit this *utter* inadequacy. They are not *merely* words or even judgments of the mind ; they represent something outside us and independent of us, as of all space and time. And the conclusions which necessarily flow from them are equally real and objective. They may be conceived and expressed inadequately, but not *utterly* so, for that were falsehood ; and these conclusions cannot be false, for they are based on objective reality and truth.

Let us, then, think of God as best we may. And where we fall short, let us acknowledge our errors ; let us correct them, and bow our heads reverently, as we recognize the Infinite.

V. The reader will be grateful for the following extract from Dr. Mivart's little work,¹ which suggested the foregoing train of thought. The Agnostic, Frankland, objects to speaking of the First Cause as a personality, by reason of the anthropomorphism of the expression.

“*Maxwell.* Do you object to such anthropomorphism in speaking of the eternal First Cause, because the term ‘personality’ is below the mark or above it.

¹ “Nature and Thought,” p. 185.

- “ F. I object to it as being shockingly, inexpressibly below the mark.
- “ M. Capital! Then we are quite at one. I will cheerfully own that it is as much below the mark as ever you like. If you can think of the Eternal Cause in higher terms than human terms, pray do so, but I am certain you cannot. If you refuse to think of the First Cause in human terms, you have but the animal, vegetable and inorganic worlds from which to take your choice. You must then think of it in lower terms than those to which you object. Zoomorphism is much more absurd than Anthropomorphism after all. Surely the rational method is to employ the highest conceptions you can, while freely acknowledging their utter inadequacy. After exhausting ingenuity in arriving at the loftiest possible conceptions, we must regard them as being but accommodations to human infirmity. We may own that they are in a sense objectively false—because of their inadequacy—though subjectively and very practically true. We must of course be careful to remove from our conception all the imperfections we can remove from it, and to regard as infinitely greater and higher, whatever is positive in our conceptions. I am really sick of the nonsense that is talked about anthropomorphism. There is good Mr. Fiske—with his ‘Comic Theism,’ whatever that may be—who tells us that Theism has been purified by a continual process of what he calls ‘deanthropomorphisation.’ He forgets that even he has not carried that process out completely, and that there remains even for him one human character to be eliminated from his conception of God, namely, that of ‘existence.’ That done, we have the non-existing as the absolutely adorable! *Das sein ist das nichts!* The funny thing, too, is that these eternal declaimers against anthropomorphism forget two things. One is that even the old inhabitants of this Abbey were quite familiar with their notion and denied that even existence could be predicated univocally of God and creatures. The other thing they forget is that physical science is full of anthropomorphism, and that every attempt to expel it is necessarily vain. We must always remain men, and have human conceptions of all things we conceive; and it is as easy in religion as in science to recognise this, and guard against any delusions thence resulting. What is necessary is to take the precautions I have just mentioned.”

THESIS IV.

“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.”

Very little need be said in proof of this fourth thesis, other than what has been said already in proof of the second. It will be sufficient to call attention to some special points.

The thesis with which we are now concerned contains two propositions, of which the first deals with actual, and the second with possible wills and intelligences. Let us take these propositions in order.

PROPOSITION I.

“The Personal First Cause is such that all created intelligences and wills are bound to submit to Him.”

This assertion is based on two reasons, one general, the other particular.

I. The general reason is well known. We were made by the great First Cause ; therefore we belong to Him, and should submit to Him. We are His property, entirely in His hands. As He created us, so He can reduce us to nothing, as He every moment reduces many things to nothing. The proof of all this is contained under the second thesis. He can place what conditions He will on our existence ; we have but to submit.

II. The particular reason has two forms, of which one regards the intellect the other the will.

1. Our intellect should submit to the Personal First Cause. For, it has been proved that “there are such things as necessary truths.” These truths do not depend on us ; we do not make them ; if our intellect does not conform itself to them, so much the worse for it. We must submit to them and be guided by them. They do not come from matter ; this also has been already proved. They can, then, have no other origin or basis than the great Hidden Agent. Hence, our intellects, in submitting to these necessary truths, submit to Him.

2. Our will should submit in like manner. For, as there are necessary truths, so is there “a moral order ;” this, too,

we have proved. But morality supposes duty, law, obedience. To whom? To none other than the great Hidden Agent that brought us into being, and that has a right thereby to command our will.

PROPOSITION II.

“The Personal First Cause is such that all possible wills and intelligences should, if created, submit themselves to Him.”

This is a much wider assertion; but it will be seen that it is securely based on the two reasons already given. Let us take the particular reason first:—

I. Not only is it to be admitted that there are necessary truths *for us*, but it is also beyond doubt that the same truths are necessary for every *possible* intellect. The whole burden of our proof has been that first truths are independent of time and space; that they were true before the world began, and should continue true were the whole fabric of creation to collapse; that they are as true in the remotest actual or possible star as they are on earth. It were foolish of me to deny them; and of you, and of any man, and of any intellect. The very Creator cannot make them other than they are. Every possible intellect must submit to them.

So too of law. Not only are certain things right or wrong now for us, but there are things that are necessarily right and wrong,—for me, for you, for all men, for the Creator Himself, throughout all space and time. It were the duty of every possible will to do what Mr. Mill, to his honour, declared himself prepared to do,—to submit to all the pains of hell rather than glorify a wicked Deity. The proof of these things has been already submitted.

II. What is the basis of these laws and truths so absolute and so universal? This brings us to the general reason. It can only be because possible things can never become actual of themselves; they require extrinsic aid. The Hidden Agent must put forth His energy. Whatever His actuality produces, is, as we have seen, bound to submit to Him. Nothing that is merely possible, could become actual without His aid. Hence all possible wills and intellects should, if created, submit themselves to Him. Conversely, every possible intellect and will is bound to His truth and to His

law; this could be only on the supposition that they are either Himself or dependent on Him.

Here I conclude. It was my intention to prove that the "Hidden Agent is without cause;" but that thesis was omitted,—deliberately. For the doctrine of Theism is independent of that proposition. If there be a Being who brought us into existence, and who, by right thereof, imposes on us reasonable obligations, are we not bound to do His will? And if one were to believe in a Being that has a similar right to command the obedience of all actual and possible wills and intellects, should not such a one be entitled to call himself a Theist? You may say that this principle will carry him further. Granted; but the question here is, not whether he should in consistency go further, but whether eternity is involved in the very idea of God. Theism does not involve belief in *all* God's attributes; and I fail to see why eternity or infinity should be more essential than others to the idea of Him.

It was the purport of these papers to call attention to Dr. Mivart's exposition and defence of the philosophy that underlies Christian faith. His spirit pervades them in many places where his name does not appear. There are many other points touched on in his little book, which would repay investigation; I hope that readers will examine for themselves. Dr. Mivart is engaged on a new and fuller work, to which we look forward with eager pleasure; may we hope that it will be accompanied by a promise of new editions of some of his previous treatises? WALTER M'DONALD.

CANADIAN SKETCHES.

I.—POPULAR ELEMENTS.

MR. FROUDE'S *Oceana* is very pleasant reading. But then there is so much sack for so little bread in its composition. He visited the various colonies in a six months' tour, "with letters of introduction." Needless to say, he was introduced to every person and everything least calculated to open his eyes to the true condition of the countries and

peoples whom he favoured with the brief sunshine of his presence. They, on their part, seem not to have known the day of their visitation. They did not avail themselves of the opportunities of fame afforded them by the appearance in their midst of a live historian. It is even doubtful that any lasting improvement has been wrought in their manners or institutions by the wise suggestions and profound predictions of this brilliant book maker. In Australia and New Zealand he lived with governors and grandees, and so he is versed in questions that concern sheep and cattle and the "natives." Canada he saw from the American side of Niagara. It was late in the season and—the way was long, the wind was cold, the tourist infirm and old. So he says little (why even little?) of Canada, and admits he knows little about the country. This is the only reliable statement in the work. Altogether he was about as much at home in the colonies and with the colonist as a certain member of the *vieille noblesse* (*vieille* with a vengeance!) was at home with "Paddy." It takes an English historian or a French baron to properly understand and describe *savage people*. In these papers, the *sack*—if any be offered—has had its solid accompaniment, at least in the experiences of the writer. They shall be a simple record of personal gleaning and observation, and of impressions formed in a sympathetic mood and amid popular surroundings. These shall be wrought to an idea and synthesised into a statement. There is not in the world a more interesting country, amongst those that belong to the world's newer settlement and civilization, than the vast territory called Canada. It is not really a modern land. Its history leads us back to the very beginnings of western discovery and enterprise. But its history does not begin with those beginnings. There is a continuity between the facts of past and present Canadian story and those which marked certain great dynastic changes in the later period of the history of Europe. The view of Canada as it stands upon the map, and much more the interior view of her social and political conditions, conveys distinct memories of events that moulded the fate of modern France and England. The legitimist cause of Great Britain as of France has had in Canada its

only healthy and happy *dénouement*. The adherents of the Stuarts in Ireland and Scotland found here a refuge. They brought here with them a memory and a passion that belong by no means to the dead past, but are potent, if not apparent, factors in the formation of the character and destinies of the Canadian people.

Here, too, the France of old, the noble and venerable France, has retired, not to die, but to revive. Here is found all that now exists of the race that ceased in old France with the *Grande Monarchie* and with the birth of the *Grande Révolution*. So, the history of Canada is linked in a special and most interesting manner, with events of seventeenth century Europe. All unconscious as it were that the drama of that epoch is over and done with on the original stage, Canada in some sense, repeats its history and happenings. All along the shores of the St. Lawrence, and even through the interior forest lands, from Acadie to Vancouver, the signs and tokens of an old civilization are apparent in the manners and language of the people. The French Canadian hamlet, in all but its material structure, is the peaceful and picturesque *paroisse* of the *Gironde*. Its very *patois* is the unchanged vernacular of Louis Quatorze days. Its *habitants* possess the *taille*, the manliness, and muscle of a people that perished in old France through the passions of the Revolution and the war plague of the Republic and the Empire. They are a hardy and prolific race possessing all the virtues with but few of the vices of the genuine Gaul. They are temperate, thrifty, and self-reliant. They are a power in this new land full of cohesive and expansive energy. Keen they are to comprehend, and adroit to wrest to their own advantage, the free political institutions which, perhaps, they never of themselves would have initiated or adopted. It is nonsense to talk of extinguishing the French Canadian under the pressure of Anglo-Saxon energy and superiority. East or west the Anglo-Saxon never yet extinguished anything that had a spark of real life within it. On the contrary his neutral temperament becomes merged and finally lost in some stronger compost. There is mighty little of the Anglo-Saxon about the Anglo-Indian. In the New England States,

where the purest type of Anglo-Saxon, the Puritan, settled and ruled for a season, and had it all his own way, he has disappeared from the scene. He has been washed out by the tide of better blood, and nothing now remains of him but a marrowless heartless skeleton. In Ireland the Anglo-Saxon—what there was of him—has been effaced. In England, herself, he has perished, or become, as Kingsley remarks, a stupid decrepit creature, cornered into the remotest districts whereto the wave of Celtic blood has not flowed to sustain and vitalize him.¹ The world is well disabused of all that Anglo-Saxon bravado. Races far removed from a Saxon origin have given to Britain a name and fame and footing in the great rendezvous of the world. Whatever was purely Saxon—and that was but little—in the outflow of those populations has been cast aside as useless for all purposes of colonization, or it has been mingled with and moulded by more brilliant and durable elements, as clay is hardened and shaped in the fire.

On the French Canadian the Anglo-Saxon type makes no impression whatever. If the two races had commingled—which they have not—the French would have long ago absorbed the Saxon element, or rather consumed it. What really exists in the Dominion, as a counterpoise to the swarming population of the French province, is the sturdy growth from Irish and Scotch stock in the maritime and Ontario provinces. But even this does not really arrest the advance of the French Canadian from east to west, from Quebec to Manitoba, across the whole Canadian territory. One leaves Montreal and turns his face towards the great

¹ Kingsley makes this statement, if I remember aright, in his *Chartist*. He adds that in the South-Eastern English counties, where alone the real Saxon type survives, the bulk of the peasantry do not know more than 500 words of their own language, words that only represent the grossest and most material ideas and utter only material needs. He says that physically, too, they are a spent race; that Celtic blood alone (he might have added Norman) has saved the Anglo-Saxon from extinction. I (myself) can testify, from extensive observation, that the purely English breed degenerates more rapidly, both in mind and body, than any other in the Colonies whenever they congregate and intermarry in remote places. I have observed particularly the phenomenon of their poverty of language and absence of intellectual ideas. As Dante says of the denizens of a certain infernal circle—“*Han perduto il Sen dell' intelletto.*”

English speaking cities of Ontario, and deems he has left the French race and language behind. But lo! he meets them again in full force, and thoroughly at home in Ottawa, the legislative centre of the Dominion. From its lumber yards to its legislative halls the city is redolent of Frenchness. When the writer was last in Ottawa in 1885 a sort of panic possessed the anti-Gallic portion of the community at discovering a sudden tide of migration from French Canada, stretching away north from Ottawa and west to the Red River, binding together the two great settlements of the race by the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. The bare fringe of the northern St. Lawrence shore is left to the English Canadian. True, upon that fringe, or hard by it, he has built such thriving cities as Toronto and Hamilton, and many more of less note, and he has pushed his outposts west to the newly flourishing city of Winnipeg. But what of that? Behind him, to the right and to the left of him, hemming him from north, east, and west, is the irrepressible French Canadian under his different titles of *habitant* or *métis*. His continuity is really unbroken all along the continent. Even in those English cities and smaller towns that dot the St. Lawrence shores he is an active quantity in the populations. The whole country along a parallel 100 miles north from the river, and the two immense provinces of Quebec and Manitoba that close both ends of the line, are absolutely his. He has flowed over into New England and the Northern United States all along the river line. But of that we have no concern here.¹ In a word he is a nation and a great one. The attempt to belittle him, so often made by the British colonist, would be ridiculous only that it is so utterly senseless

¹The total number of Canadians settled in the United States in 1880 was 610,017. Of these a very large proportion was made up of French Canadians. The old homesteads in Quebec consisting of only a few acres each having become unable to afford a living for the increasing population the younger members of their families emigrated to the United States. They found employment in the factories of the New England States, and being a prolific race they have increased rapidly. Now that Quebec and other parts of Canada have become opened up by railways for settlement an effort is being made to induce the expatriated French in the United States to return and help to build up their own country.—*Canadian paper*, September 10th, 1887.

and unjust. Canada cannot and ought not shut her eyes to the present important position of its population of French descent, any more than she should forget its splendid past which really made the history of her religion and civilization. It seems peculiar to France—or was so when that nation had a character—to retain to the end the spiritual, while losing hold of the political possession of the territories she had discovered or colonized. France has not a territorial foothold in North America to-day, she that once virtually possessed it all, except a rock and a sandbank off the Newfoundland coast called S. Pierre and Miquelon. Nevertheless, from Quebec to New Orleans, the strong traces of her former religious and chivalrous spirit remain. They present to the intelligent observer all, or nearly all, there is of taste, refinement, and poetry in the northern division of the New World.

These French Canadians are a vigorous stock, and there is no sign of decay about the type they reproduce. It is not an unusual thing to find in many of the quiet hamlets of the Quebec province a family consisting of thirty children of the same parents. Even when not reaching such abnormal increase, children abound under every roof-tree. In the New England States, where French Canadians have settled of late years in great numbers, that race outrivals the Irish in its extirpating influence upon the effete Puritan stock. Intellectually they are keen and rapid of perception rather than profound or imaginative. They excel as artisans in every branch of handicraft, notably in those that demand nice discernment, tasteful execution, and a truthful touch. The overseer of a large axe factory in Maine told the writer that in the tempering and welding of the steel edge to the head of the instrument he found no workmen from any land so accurate as they, and he employed them in that special operation to the exclusion equally of Americans and Europeans. Another art they excel in—almost a lost art now in Europe—is wood carving. Nothing can exceed the beauty and tastefulness of the best of their work in this line in church furniture and decoration. Exquisite altar fronts and reredos hand-carved and panelled in the various coloured woods of the country are to be found in the village churches in

Canada, the products of native skill and taste. Those Canadians are a people of great industry and of manifold resource. They are also a very religious people—when at home. But when separated from home influences, and the daily devout practices of family life, they easily fall away from religious observances, even those of obligation. Hence the complaints made of them by many priests in the United States as being negligent and unfaithful Catholics. The French character everywhere seems to require more than any other, external aids to sustain its religious principles and render them practical. The evil complained of in the United States is now, however, being remedied by the solicitude of the Canadian episcopate and clergy in gathering together their emigrated people and providing them with priests of their own race. Hence there are many flourishing Canadian parishes scattered throughout the New England States, and all parts of the great Republic. No race is spiritually improved by emigration. Home is in itself a sanctuary. To leave it is to fly from the soul's best shelter.

Apropos of the effect of emigration, and education also, on the character of the French Canadian, a fact recurs to the writer's mind. Being in Montreal in the summer of 1873, and desirous of visiting the charming retreat of the Jesuits at *Sault aux Récollets*, about ten miles from that city, he walked out a few miles and then hired a French Canadian farmer's horse and trap. The old man himself took charge of the *remise*. On the way we talked of many things that lay within his little world, till at length we got on the subject of schools and education.

To the writer's surprise the old farmer approached that subject with cordial disgust, and finally kindled into wrath. "Education," he cried, "I don't want to hear about education! It has brought malediction on my quiet God-fearing household!" Then, tenderly, and with tears in his voice, he told his woe. "I have a son, him you saw leaning idly on the gate as we left my house. He was the pet and pride of the family. Cheerfully did we all, his brothers and myself and the mother, strive and stint that he should be educated, for his bright parts gave promise of honour to the household.

He was sent to the university. He studied law while we worked the farm content with what *le bon Dieu* sent us. He was 'of the first' in his college. He returned to us filled with pride in himself and contempt of us and our ways. He would not work even at his profession. He went from us to that accursed United States (*ces maudits Etats Unis.*) At the end of two years he came back in rags and misery, idle and worthless as before. You have seen him. His brothers are away in the fields at work. I, too, came thence at your call. He hangs round the gate and saunters about the roads. He does nothing, absolutely nothing. But worse than all, *cher Monsieur*, he has turned from his God. He has not a spark of religion. When we meet at evening, like all Christians, to tell our chaplets, he strides out, if present, with a *Psha! Oh Mon Dieu*, he will not even pray to our Holy Virgin! *V'là c'q'c'est que l'éducation!* There's your *education* for you! Reasoning was thrown away on this old man. He had a lamentable fact before his eyes and in his heart that was not to be conjured away by distinctions of *post hoc* and *propter hoc* or by any other resources of philosophy. Besides, who was the real philosopher in the case, the farmer or the wayfarer? The latter had his doubts at the time which robbed his arguments of all earnestness. The doubts have not grown less with years and experience. When he sees religion wane among the people, in proportion as education, or what goes by the name, increases, he often recalls the old Canadian's ireful invective, "*Voilà ce que c'est que l'éducation!*"

But we must leave the French Canadian and turn to another remarkable type in the social composition of the country.

Next to the French Canadian the Scotch element is the most apparent, because the most concentrated and localized in the new Dominion. The Scotchman indeed, both of the Highland and Lowland variety, is a fixture in the soil and an active figure in the great marts of the country. The Lowland Scotch Canadian is here what he is at home, a shrewd successful man of business. The Highlander in Canada is what he rarely is, or can be, on his ancestral hills, an independent and thriving land cultivator and stock raiser. Both speci-

mèns of the Scot preserve in Canada all their national pride while casting off the national poverty on which it is said chiefly to subsist at home. The Lowlanders true to their home character and traditions, take a foremost part in the advance of education and in the practice of the learned professions. They have raised for the encouragement and cultivation of both many of the finest public institutions in the land, in and west from Montreal. But the Highland Scotch colonists and their descendants are, to the Catholic observer, a more interesting and admirable element in the body social of the Dominion. The clans foregather here as they do in the old home, more closely and affectionately perhaps from their new bond of common exile. They have each their recognised chieftain, their Macdonald, their Cameron, M'Gregor, Frazer or Chisholm. They have their allotted townships racy of old highland memories—their Glengarry, their Inverness, their Perth, and Lochaber. Better than all, they have, and preserve, and pride in their old Gaelic tongue and song. Their children's children speak and chant it to-day with the fluency and devotion of their fathers. They are all Catholics, those Canadian Highland Scotch. They are full of that deep, emotional, yet solid and practical faith which seems to be the heirloom of the spiritual minded and loyal Gael. The Highland Scotch in Canada, as at home, are *clannish*. Far from imputing that to them as a vice, or even as a fault, we should consider it one of their chief virtues, and best preservatives of virtue. It is also what lends to their life some of its poetry and picturesqueness, and to their political position in their new home its well ordered and well used influence. The Irish traveller in Canada will often utter the wish that his own race resident there had more of that concentration—clannishness if you will—both in domestic and political life that marks the habits of the gregarious Scot.

On two particular occasions circumstances brought the writer into very close contact with the Highland Scotch of the Dominion, and gave him exceptional opportunities of studying their social and religious life. To relieve and authenticate the generalities he has so far indulged in he will

ask the reader to accompany him successively to the interior and to the Atlantic border of Canada; to localities where the Scotch Celts most do congregate, to Glengarry, in the Kingston diocese, and to Northern Nova Scotia. These are the homes *par excellence* of the Highland emigrant and his descendants. Here in great force are the Macdonalds especially, a fine, dark, handsome race of pure Celts from the highlands of Inverness. They are Catholic to the core. They followed faithfully at home the fortunes of the Stuarts. They are yet full of the pathos inseparable from the memory of that brilliant but luckless line. In the winter of 1873 the writer paid a visit to a former pupil of his in All Hallows, then the pastor of Glengarry, now of Prescott on the St. Lawrence. No one but a Macdonald had ever had the spiritual rule of Glengarry till this young Irish priest, Fr. Masterson, came there. He had to win his way to the confidence and affections of the cautious clansmen. It required no small tact and devotion on his part to succeed in the delicate task. But he did succeed. If ever there was a flock that it was difficult for a shepherd to know individually this was the one. It was necessary to discriminate between hundreds of Macdonalds and never to mistake one for the other in order to entirely satisfy them that the pastor was fit for his position. For this purpose he had to store his memory with endless prenomens. All the colours that can apply to the human complexion, all the degrees of stature and diversities of character that distinguished Red from Black Hugh, Big, from Little Allister, and the sons and grandsons and cousins innumerable of each from each other had to be kept on ready record, for they were called into requisition in his daily intercourse with his faithful flock. Fr. Masterson was equal to the necessities of his position. His power of mental registration was considered phenomenal. No clansman of them all could thread their genealogical mazes better than he. So he was trusted and beloved by those Scots of high degree. It was a pleasant sight on a bright Canadian winter morning—and where is winter so bright, so calm, so exhilarating as in Canada—to see the stout farmers and their families driving in rapidly from every point in their cosy sleighs with each a dashing

span of horses to the white turreted church, the centre point of the parish. There is no town here. It is a wide valley of large farm lands and distant homesteads. The ring of the bells upon the horses' harness before the church door as they shook themselves after their hard trot made glad music in the frosty air. Every sleigh was followed by at least two immense dogs, who quietly jumped in and took possession of the warm rugs and clean straw the moment the passengers vacated the sleighs to enter the church. Woe to the wight who should venture near those vehicles while those trusty watchers lay coiled up within them! There could have been no less than 300 of these sleighs around the church walls during the celebration of Mass, which was attended with the utmost reverence by the congregation. Their air of health and comfort made their presence a joy, while the bright scarves and snow white "clouds" (a warm woollen *bourous*) of the women lent a brilliance and picturesqueness to the gathering. The writer addressed them in English and their pastor briefly in Gaelic, and after Mass the head clansmen came into the vestry to shake hands with and welcome the stranger, and pour invitations upon him. This was Sunday in Canadian Glengarry, and it is the same in all the Highland Scotch settlements of the Dominion. The great object of interest, love, and pride of all the classes throughout the country was "The Vicar," old Fr. John Macdonald, who had held their spiritual rule for over half a century, and who was still living, hale and hearty, in a pleasant cottage in Glengarry. To leave the place without calling on him would have been the one unpardonable affront to the Glensmen. He loved his young Irish successor, and made him beloved and respected of the people. Had an angel from heaven come to rule them and "The Vicar" disapproved of him, that angel would have to quit Glengarry. This fine old priest was, without exception, the most venerable and patriarchal figure the writer ever looked upon. He was nearing his *hundredth* year of age. His massive head and trunk were unbent by years, and sound in every function. Only the limbs that had travelled so many a weary mile, in days when the whole country was but an untracked wilderness, had

yielded to time and fatigue and could no longer bear up the colossal frame. Wallace himself had not passed through more bold adventures than this old Highland chief. He ruled, spiritually, and in a sense politically too, all Canada west of Montreal for half a century. His reign began when all spiritual jurisdiction from Labrador to the Frazer River and beyond, and away south across the border to New Orleans was vested in the See of Quebec "*Omnium (Americae) Ecclesiarum Mater et Caput.*" There were no bishops then in all Western Canada. Father John was Vicar-General, with unlimited jurisdiction over it all. In their highest flights of imagination the Scots, and the Irish too of that time, never went beyond him as an embodiment of spiritual authority. He was "The Vicar." No rival ever appeared on the scene. "His rights there was none to dispute." The reverence and love that centred in him in his old age gave proof of his benign and salutary use of his mighty sway.

The writer will have to reserve his experiences with the Nova Scotia Celts for another paper. There too, something must be said of the various parties and combinations into which the diverse elements of Canadian society have settled and formed. Some of them are imported, some of them are indigenous to the land. All have their bearing upon the main interest of this writing, which though not as yet touched has been kept clearly in view—viz., the condition and prospects of the Irish element and of the Church founded by it in Canada. This we have endeavoured to approach by a process of comparison and contrast. Hence this rough sketch of what may appear at first foreign to our intended picture.

R. HOWLEY.

THE ACT OF PERFECT CONTRITION AND PERFECT CHARITY.—II.

OUR last paper under this heading closed by pronouncing *duration* one of those purely accidental adjuncts which may or may not be associated with the Act of Perfect Charity, but which unquestionably form no part of its essence. It will, perhaps, strike some of the readers of that paper that the theory so uncompromisingly advanced is at variance with the teaching of Ascetic theology and with the teaching of experience as well; and hence it may be desirable to expound at greater length how far and in what sense lapse of time is said to be unnecessary for the maturing and eliciting of an act of charity.

There is no intention of asserting that the process of justification is ordinarily or even frequently perfected *in ictu oculi*, if by the process of justification is meant the whole series of acts which, on the part of God or of man, interpose from the initiatory "divine vocation" to the ultimate infusion of sanctifying grace. On the one hand "dicendum est posse Deum totam hominis justificationem a prima vocatione usque ad infusionem gratiae et remissionem peccati in uno instanti consummare"—and this proves that "time" is not an essential element; but, on the other hand, "dicendum est ordinarie, et quasi ex communi lege, praeparationem peccatoris ad justitiam, per Dei vocationem et actus ipsius hominis, cum successione temporis fieri, atque in ea hunc ordinem servari, quod mutatio incipit a divina vocatione, et paulatim procedit ab imperfecto ad perfectum, donec consummetur ultima dispositio." (Suarez, *De Causis Hab. Gratiae*, l. viii., c. xxiii., n. 3.) This necessity of time is at once manifest when we contemplate the conversion of a man who has not yet received the grace of divine faith: "prius oportet audire res fidei et eas recte concipere, et ipsarum credibilitatem penetrare, quod certe ordinario modo non subito fit. Deinde, concepta fide, non statim habetur contritio de peccatis, imo saepe necesse est ipsa fide uti ad petendum et recogitandum ut ad justitiam perveniatur." (*Ibidem.*) Even in the case of the

“peccator fidelis” a dutiful correspondence with the divine call may sometimes involve the assiduous and anxious employment of no inconsiderable time; for, while each step in advance must be the fruit of grace, the measuring out and the communicating of that grace depend absolutely on the independent will of the Holy Ghost “qui ubi vult, spirat.” Our theory, therefore, does not detract from the usefulness or the necessity of spiritual exercises; on the contrary, it recognises the indispensability of all such pious works, whenever, in the designs of God, the process of justification is not of an exceptional character. But it recognises the indispensability of those preparatory acts (and of the “duration” which they require for development) only for the more or less remote approaches to the “ipsa dispositio ultima” which is charity or contrition. When that “dispositio ultima” has once been attained, “dicendum est,” says Suarez, “infusionem gratiae habitualis fieri in instanti terminativo dispositionum praecedentium, et in eodem instanti in quo consummatur proxima dispositio, sive ad dispositionem ultimam paulatim et successive perveniatur, sicut ordinarie fieri diximus, sive tota justificatio subito extraordinario modo fiat.” (*Ibidem*, n. 7.) Neither is it inconsistent with our theory to furthermore admit that in the normal reconciliation of the sinner, and in the ordinary augmentation of grace, those preparatory exercises may spontaneously generate “amor sensibilis,” or that “dolor in sensu” of which St. Thomas speaks, and which constitute the varying degrees of “intensity.” Such specious, and oftentimes truthful, suggestions of successful progress—more especially when they seem to be the outcome of protracted effort—cannot fail to inspire tranquility and confidence. These we do not seek to underrate. Very frequently they come from the Giver of all good gifts; but it would be theologically unsound to infer, from their total or partial absence, that He had withheld the really substantial and immeasurably more precious grace of perfect charity.

The Council of Trent enumerates (Sess. vi., c. 6), in all the detail befitting so vital a subject, the acts which man must perform as his share in the work of justification. It is unnecessary to transcribe that most beautiful chapter: but a

brief examination of all the other acts there specified, will lead, in perhaps the most concise and satisfactory way, to a consideration of that particular one regarding which this paper is directly concerned, and which is the complement and crowning of all the rest.

Naturally, the first and fundamental requirement is the "actus fidei." The Council does not formally and categorically indicate the precise articles of faith upon explicit or implicit belief in which justification essentially rests, but it speaks with sufficient clearness to enable commentators to do so. Accordingly we are told by Suarez (*De Causis Hab. Gratiae*, L. viii., c. xvi., n. 8): "Fides maxime necessaria est, quae et ipsius Dei et Christi, et meritorum ejus, prout nobis ad remissionem peccatorum et justificationem obtinendam utilia sunt, notitiam praebeat . . . Satis est communi plebi fidelium fides expressa mysteriorum quae in Symbolo continentur, cum generali fide implicita reliquorum, credendo, videlicet, vera esse quae Sancta Mater Ecclesia tanquam de fide credenda tenet." A little later on (n. 10) the same theologian further explains: "Fides Dei ut justificatoris per Christum est quasi propria fides justificans. In qua fide includitur [1] recognitio proprii peccati, et [2] quod fuerit Dei offensa, quodque [3] per ejus remissionem et non aliter delendum est, ac [4] quod ad veniam obtinendam ad Deum confugere et peccatum detestari necessarium est, et [5] denique quod vere poenitentibus venia non denegetur." Suarez tersely concludes a long and interesting disquisition by laying down the following practical and valuable principle: "In homine *fideli* recogitatio peccatorum, ut sunt offensa Dei, sufficere potest ad actualem et proximam dispositionem ex parte intellectus, quia illa non habetur sine aliquo fidei actu in quo virtute continentur reliqui, et sufficienter proponitur voluntati objectum, ut se disponat." When we recollect that the "homo fidelis" of this paragraph signifies the man who has once received and never dissipated the grace of theological faith, and when we further recollect that we, unlike the priests of Continental countries, are happily warranted in assuming that no leaven of disbelief or of infidelity exists among our people, the groundwork of many

scruples and of much anxiety is removed by this definite and unassailable rule of conduct.

A short paragraph will give sufficient space to deal with those "acts of the will" which follow the act of faith, and lead up to the immediate consideration of the act of love of God and sorrow for sin. Of these TIMOR is the first named by the Council, which is careful to add that it speaks of "*divinae justitiae timor*" (Sess. vi., c. 6), or, as it explains in another place (Sess. xiv., c. 4, can. 8), "*gehennae et poenarum metus.*" As Suarez interprets the Council: "Est autem praecipue sermo de *timore poenae* . . . utique *vindicativae* . . . Timor disponit ad justitiam . . . nam qui timet malum, fugit etiam causam ejus; causa autem mali quod a Deo praecipue timeri potest, est peccatum; ergo si homo verum timorem Dei concipiat, necesse est ut peccatum fugiat, et voluntate sua ab illo avertatur. Item qui ab aliquo malum timet, quaerit *placere illi* . . . ergo, hac saltem ratione, timor Dei est optima dispositio. . . . In hoc puncto dicendum est timorem et spem aliquo modo in necessitate convenire, nihilominus tamen *spem simpliciter magis necessariam esse*. Addendum est necessitatem timoris esse moraliter ac regulariter intelligendam, quia, cum Deus vult, facile convertit hominem illuminando intellectum per fidem et attentam considerationem majestatis, et bonitatis ipsius, et gravitate peccati, quatenus offensa illius est, et excitando immediate affectum ad perfectam Dei dilectionem et ad detestationem peccati propter ipsum, et cum spe veniae ab illa obtinendae *sine interventu timoris, aut alterius actus voluntatis qui ex ipso nascatur*. Hoc saepe a Deo fit." This last consideration is of great practical value, particularly in the direction of penitents who have been for some time leading virtuous lives, and to whom the absence of *timor* is not unfrequently a source of alarm. Suarez continues: "In ordine ad justificationem non est specialis actus circa totam materiam SPEI exercere, sed solum circa id quod ad negotium justificationis necessarium est, nimirum, illa duo—*sperare gratiam* ad agendam poenitentiam sufficientem, et *veniam*, si agatur." (*Ibid.* c. xix. n. 8-12). The "PROPOSITUM NOVAE VITAE," required by the Council, "est *aliquo modo* necessarium,

nam in efficaci amore Dei, et in odio peccati absoluto, virtute includitur. An vero sit necessarium, etiam ut esse potest specialis actus ab amore et detestatione distinctus, ab auctoribus controvertitur. Verumtamen judicandum est per se necessarium essu *si memoriae* objectum ejus occurrat, fieri tamen potest in casa ut *implicite in aliis contentum sufficiat*" (*Ibid.* c. xx., n. 19). Finally, as to the mutual relations between *amor Dei* and *odium peccati*, and their separability in the process of justification, Suarez writes: "Censeo in casu et per accidens posse hominem justificari *per solum amorem formalem Dei* super omnia, virtute et voto includentem detestationem peccatorum, etiamsi tunc formaliter actus pœnitentiæ non occurrat. Ita S. Thomas et plures theologi . . . Hoc facile est gratiæ: *nescit enim tarda molimina Spiritus Sancti gratia*, et ideo, proposito Deo summe diligibili, statim, nullo alio expectato, potest voluntas cum adjutorio gratiæ in dilectionem Dei prodire, sicut justus potest diligere Deum ex ejus recordatione, nulla præcedente recordatione priorum peccatorum."

After this dreary and disproportionate exordium, we come—tandem aliquando—to the consideration of the "Motivum Amoris." There is among some theologians an opinion (which Suarez at one time called probable) that perfect charity or contrition might arise from a motive less exalted than *dilectio Dei super omnia*—if, for example, man held sin in supreme hatred because it involved shameful ingratitude towards a God who had been so bountiful a Benefactor; or because it inflicted on Him grievous and deliberate injustice. These same theologians had no doubt of the perfection of that contrition which sprang from unbounded hatred for sin, as being an *offensa Dei*, which sentiment of abhorrence might easily be found even where love and affection for God do not formally exist. We have an illustration of this feeling in the conduct of those political reformers who entertain most cordial dislike for social or political disorder, while all the time they combine and confederate for the abolition of the law, and sometimes even for the dethronement of the law-giver. De Lugo vindicates this opinion from the censure of Vasquez, by intimating that

it was supported "auctoritate theologorum non infimae notae; item ex modo loquendi antiquorum theologorum et SS. Patrum." Furthermore, he says that such "contrition," as a "medicina peccati," is more equitably and mercifully proportioned to human frailty, which, while very frequently leading man to sin, can seldom raise his soul to the level of "dilectio Dei super omnia." He reminds us that in this theory a reverent and worshipful consideration of God is ever present as a motive for reprobating sin, in which it recognises the maximum malum, "etiamsi non adsit motivum dilectionis rigorosae." At the very least, sorrow like this is a self-denying "aversio a seipso" and a turning towards God; it is a reversal and retractation of what man unhappily did by sinning, when he renounced the service of God, and paid homage to creatures. Within the limits of such "contrition" as this it may easily happen that sin would be held in such utter abomination, that, rather than commit it, the "contrite" man would be willing to endure the loss of all earthly goods, and to suffer the infliction of the severest torture. It is certainly a more perfect sorrow than that which springs from hope alone, and, as a disposition to justification, it is far in advance of that "timor servilis" which disavows sin because it shudders at the dread of retribution. Viewed as a theory, it is little wonder that sometimes at least it won the approval of Suarez, and the timorous yet earnest apologetic defence of De Lugo. It asserts the binding force of God's law, and the duty of obedience; it acknowledges that sin ruptures the peaceful relations that should subsist between man and his Creator, and, by a whole-souled repudiation of sin, seeks to repair the breach; and, finally, it seems to satisfy by literal fulfilment all that the prophet Ezechiel required (C. xviii. v. 27) to ensure salvation: "*Cum averterit se impius ab impietate sua quam operatus est, et fecerit iudicium et justitiam, ipse animam suam vivificabit. Considerans enim, et avertens se ab omnibus iniquitatibus ejus, quas operatus est, vita vivet et non morietur.*"

Notwithstanding the apparent intrinsic probability of this theory, we are bound by all the laws of prudence to abandon it, and to hold "cum communi sententia" (as De Lugo him-

self designates it) “contritionem sufficientem ad justificationem debere oriri ex peculiari motivo charitatis, scilicet, *Dei super omnia dilecti.*” The discussion of the last paragraph, however, “clears the atmosphere,” and narrows the area of debate. For it follows that we cannot describe contrition as *perfect*, neither can we rely on it for reconciliation with God, if it hold sin in utter and supreme detestation solely because sin is an act of ingratitude towards our most generous Benefactor, nor because it wantonly disturbs an exquisitely beautiful and divinely organised supernatural system, nor because it is a refusal to render dutiful obedience to the ordinances of the Supreme Monarch, nor yet because it is an abjuration of that allegiance which we owe to God as our Creator, our Redeemer, and our only Hope. We may admit all these claims in all their plenitude, and, influenced by the conscious pressure of these claims, we may have the “*animi dolor et detestatio de peccato commisso, cum proposito non peccandi de caetero,*” and yet, admirable and valuable as those dispositions unquestionably are, something is still needed to complete the “*dispositio ultima,*” which alone is followed by the infusion of sanctifying grace. Our hatred of sin must—in its ultimate principle—be dictated by our knowledge that sin is an abomination in the sight of God, and by the love we bear to His infinite perfections. In other words, it must be born of the “*motivum perfectae charitatis,*” to the discussion of which, exclusively, the remaining periods of this paper shall be directed.

Perfect charity is defined to be the “*virtus theologica qua Deum propter seipsum suasque infinitas perfectiones super omnia amamus, atque nosmetipsos et proximum propter Deum diligimus.*” (Lehmkuhl). St. Augustine, interpreting the *clausula* “*propter seipsum,*” tells us—and is careful to repeat in almost all his works—that it warns us against loving, or serving, or seeking God, “*propter aliud,*” that is, “for any temporal reward, for any reward outside Himself, for any good distinct or different from Himself, but that He may be our good, our beatitude, our recompense.” (Ballerini). And here it may be well to recall to the memory of our readers—although in doing so now, we are anticipating—

that the force of this all-important "propter" is both positive and negative: positive, in indicating the ever essential motive of perfect charity, as the impulse or power that *de facto* moves the soul; negative, in discarding all co-ordinate motives, yet not so exclusive as to exorcise the concomitancy of others that are less exalted, provided these latter exert no more than a secondary or adventitious influence on the will. To exclude them would lead to the errors of Molinos, or to the theory of Fénelon, "de pura charitate sine ulla admixtione motivi proprii interesse," which was solemnly condemned by Pope Innocent XII.

According to the characteristically concise and lucid analysis of the act of perfect charity given by Lehmkühl, the "affectus quibus actu amamus" are three, namely, "Complacentia, Benevolentia et Beneficentia."

COMPLACENTIA is defined the "actus quo amans erga perfectiones personae amatae bene afficitur, ejusque bona praesentia ut talia respicit." It is the production of the intellect and will conjointly. The action of the intellect is indispensable, in order that the divine perfections may be adequately represented to the will by faith, since love presupposes knowledge. No one can be conceived as loving an object the love-worthy qualities of which are unknown to him; and to reveal in some measure the unspeakable loveliness of God and of His attributes is the realistic function of faith: "Fides est sperandarum substantia rerum, argumentum non apparentium." It is true that men *in via* can never have more than an imperfect and obscure vision of God; but the divine attributes and essence, seen even "in aenigmate," evoke, by their transcendent beauty, the highest love of which man is capable. It is manifest that in proportion to the vividness and life-like reality of the representation, will be the evidence and attestation of the supreme excellence of God. To assist both intellect and will in supplying this fundamental pre-requisite of complacency, theologians suggest a variety of methods; but, remembering that to pursue this subject to any considerable length would be to encroach upon the domain of Ascetic theology, we must be satisfied with referring to it only in so far as may be requisite to illustrate the matter in hand.

While all maintain that the principle which moves us to love God by perfect charity must be the "bonitas Dei ut est in se," it is the common teaching of theologians that this "bonitas," as apprehended in any one of the divine attributes, is an adequate *motivum formale* of perfect love: "Quicquid enim divinum est, summe perfectum et summe amabile est atque ad summum amorem merito nos provocare potest." The divinity manifests itself to man through the divine attributes; it is through them that we are enabled to obtain a glimpse of the divine essence; and, under what conception soever we approach it, it is the divine essence that ultimately fixes and absorbs our amazed and wondering complacency, This is the meaning of what Suarez wrote (*De Essentia Dei*, L. I. cap. x. n. 3): "Attributa divina in re non distinguuntur ab essentia divina. Haec est communis sententia theologorum . . . quatenus in Scripturis dicitur Deus ipsa sapientia charitas, veritas, &c." In the same work (cap. xii. n. 3) he says: "Essentia divina est de essentia sapientiae, justitiae et singulorum attributorum, ac proinde necessario includitur in conceptu singulorum." Sometimes our faculties are engaged in contemplating the justice of God or His power, sometimes it is His mercy or His sanctity; it matters little which, for our wondering love does not terminate in the abstract quality revealed to us, but, penetrating what human language would describe as the outer habit or habiliment, it finds a resting place only when it reaches the *Ens Divinum* itself. Let us take, for example, that last-named attribute, and see how the consideration of God's sanctity, as revealed by the Holy Ghost, may lead us on to the making of an act of perfect love.

We have a distinct idea that sanctity signifies *purity without stain*, our comprehension of stainless purity resting ordinarily on the notion which remains to us when, having formed a conception of some estimable earthly object, we have succeeded in eliminating from it every feature that could imply defilement or blemish. But this method of apprehending sanctity, being almost purely negative, conveys little more than an almost impalpable abstract idea, and can afford little aid in raising our souls to the realising

of a living, positive stainlessness. Our conception grows more vivid when we institute the comparison between God and His Angels, which Sacred Scripture suggests, and learn that even "in His angels He found wickedness" (*Job. c. ix., 18.*) But even still, since the objects selected for contrast with God are themselves beyond the reach of our senses, the result of that comparison is sadly imperfect. When, however, the Holy Ghost, describing the sanctity of God, tells us that in its presence the Moon is not pure and the Stars refuse their light, our conception of essential purity becomes at once definite and positive. It cannot be otherwise so soon as we raise our eyes to heaven and picture to ourselves the vision of a Being in the manifestation of whose unsullied splendour even the Moon—raised as it is so far beyond the defilements of the earth, and on whose placid orb the eye can discover no stain—becomes obscured and tarnished and unclean. So, too, our idea of the transcendent brightness of that "purity without stain" is more and more exalted, when we picture to ourselves that, in the presence of its ineffable resplendency, the myriad Stars of the firmament grow pale and vanish. The very exigencies of our intelligence force us to attribute that infinite translucid purity to the Divine Being whose sanctity we are contemplating; and the exigencies of our will can give us no peace till our souls go forth and cling to and rapturously seek to become absorbed in a beauty so unutterably entrancing. This is nothing less than the "*Amor Dei super omnia, propter infinitam bonitatem ejus:*" it is perfect charity; for, while we contemplate the attribute with rapture, our souls are deluged with love for the Divine Substance which that attribute glorifies. A similar reflection on any of the other divine perfections will elicit the same insatiable sentiment of complacency, and lead irresistibly to the same affection of perfect love.

In closing this portion of the paper it will be enough to add, that the least difficult and, for most men, perhaps, the only practicable method of arriving at some approximately adequate notion of God's attributes, is to contrast each with the corresponding quality in His creatures; to divest the latter of their imperfections, one by one; and to

amplify illimitably the created quality from which we have withdrawn whatsoever might be conceived as unworthy of God. The resultant of all this process will indeed be humiliatingly cramped and circumscribed; but, if it be proportioned to each man's gifts of grace and intellect, no one will be held liable for its shortcoming. The idea is admirably expressed by La Croix: "Etiam sic excitari potest in Deum amor: Considera, quid ames; forte istum hominem, quia sincerus est; illum quia beneficus; alium quia justus; alium quia prudens, discretus, circumspectus; alium, quia vir pius est et sanctus, &c. Amas virtutem, quia honesta; potum, quia delectat; opes, quia utiles; florem, quia pulcher, &c. Haec omnia a Deo et in Deo sunt, modo infinities perfectiore" (*De Char.*, L. ii., n. 151.)

The second essential element in perfect charity is, according to all theologians and spiritual writers, the AMOR BENEVOLENTIAE. As the word itself implies, it is the virtue "qua amans amato bona desiderat" (Lehmkuhl.) The "motivum movens" to this love must always be the living, energising, operative conviction that God is supremely worthy of all love, independently of all His relations with creatures. Should our "benevolence" arise from, *and ultimately end in*, even the most tender and grateful remembrance of His bountiful mercies, or from the expectation that He will requite our love, or from any suggestion of self in any form, our sentiment will be, no doubt, graciously regarded by God, but it will be, nevertheless, imperfect, and, failing to lead to a nobler motive, it is incapable of expanding into true charity. This, as has been already said, does not necessarily exclude the coexistence and concomitancy of considerations that are less disinterested, provided always that they be not permitted to usurp the office of cardinal motive force, which belongs essentially to the "dilectio Deo super omnia propter seipsum." To ban them as if their presence necessarily detracted from the purity of perfect charity, would be to err with Fénelon; to affirm that they *never can* be absent, "quia homo propriam felicitatem in cunctis actibus suis necessario quaerit," would be to assert the doctrine once advanced, but afterwards recalled, by Bossuet. Speaking of this last view, Bouvier

(Vol. v., p. 112) informs us that “in hoc ab omnibus desertus est (Bossuet), seipsum reformavit, et doctrina puri amoris, quam tuebatur Fénelon, generaliter fuit admissa, sive in Gallia. sive Romae, etiam ab iis qui librum ejus damnaverunt.” However, the condemnation of Fénelon’s theory evidently proves that an “admixture of self-interest” is not incompatible with perfect charity; and the teaching of St. Thomas conclusively establishes that, if Bossuet had not so roundly asserted the *impossibility* of man’s ever succeeding in putting off self-interested considerations and devoting to God the undivided fervour of his love, he would not have been, after all, far astray in his original position. “Unicuique,” writes St. Thomas, “erit Deus tota ratio diligendi, eo quod Deus est totum hominis bonum. Dato enim, per impossibile, quod Deus non esset hominis bonum, non esset ei ratio diligendi.” This same doctrine is not obscurely involved in the definition of “divina bonitas” given by Suarez (*De Essentia Dei*, L. i., cap. viii., n. 8): “Praecipue solet Deus denominari bonus ex plenitudine omnis perfectionis, et quatenus ex plenitudine ejus propensus est ad se diffundendum et communicandum aliis, quibus bonus esse potest.” As men are constituted, it is this latter phase of the “divina bonitas”—its propensity to enrich others out of its own fulness—that is sure to first attract them; and if it win their love, the “bonitas divina” itself, from which that propensity emanates, will soon be loved *ex motivo charitatis*, for, to love the love of God is not far removed from loving His loveliness. Suarez writes still more directly in another place: “Cum Deus perfecte amatur propter beneficium, potius amatur quia nos amat; hoc autem charitatis est et amicitiae, neque actus hujus ratio objectiva est extra divinam bonitatem, nam amor quo Deus nos amat, ipse Deus est, et summa quaedam perfectio ejus. Item, ipse nos amat quia bonus est; unde, quia amatur eo quod amat, amatur etiam quia bonus est.” St. Liguori (L. vi. T. iv., n. 442) meets the difficulty which will suggest itself to every one, thus: “Non valet dicere quod ille qui diligit Deum propter bonum suum, seipsum diligit non Deum, nam sapienter respondit S. Franciscus Salesius quod si quis diligeret Deum propter bonum suum, et ita affectus est ut

si a Deo nihil speraret, eum nullomodo diligeret, hic utique peccaret quia positive excluderet charitatem . . . Qui vero amat Deum tanquam sibi summum bonum, et excludit omnem voluntatem peccandi, tunc elicit actum bonum supernaturalem, et licet non habeat charitatem perfectam, illam tamen non excludit, eamque jam incipit habere et aliquo modo ad Deum se convertit." The all-important "incipit habere charitatem" of the last sentence does not imply the possession of the "initium charitatis" in the sense of Concina and the other rigidists formerly alluded to; but it signifies that the loving of God "quia nobis bonus," conjoined with the "amor complacentiae" (which is pre-supposed), has but to advance one step farther—to abstract the thought of *self*—when it is sure to culminate in loving God "quia in se bonus est." This last is the unalterable "motivum formale charitatis," up to the attainment of which the others lead. As Ballerini expresses it: "objecta aliarum virtutum, gratitudinis, scilicet, religionis, &c.; sin minus perfectae contritionis, imperfectae certo motivum sunt aptissimum: imo *facili negotio poenitentes hac via pertrahi ad motivum perfectae charitatis possunt.*"

After this sufficiently discursive digression, we have to briefly consider the "bona" which the benevolence of charity desires to render to God. "Bona Dei," says La Croix, "alia sunt intrinseca, alia extrinseca. Intrinseca sunt infinitae perfectiones quas in se habet, uti Sapientia, Justitia, Æternitas, &c. Extrinseca sunt quae a creaturis fieri possunt, et placent Deo, nempe quod agnoscatur sicuti in se est perfectissimus, quod ametur sicuti in se est optimus, quod colatur, laudetur, adoretur sicuti in se est praecelestissimus," &c. Regarding the "bona" of both orders, Lehmkuhl, condensing the common teaching of theologians, says: "Erga Deum vero benevolentia, quae sola reipsa possibilis est, circa ejus *externam gloriam*, augmenti et detrimenti capacem, versatur eamque promovere studet. Neque vero neque pleno sensu BENEFICENTIA est, sed potius eam quodammodo imitatur. Haec autem quasi-beneficentia catenus amori divino necessaria est, quatenus firmam voluntatem denotat, qua homo *saltem ipse in se* divinam gloriam per mandatorum observantiam promovere paratus est." "Benevolence," therefore, implies

“wishing joy” to God in the fruition of His infinite glory; the offering of felicitations on His privilege of eternally feasting His eyes on His own ineffable beauty; and lowly, worshipful congratulation on the endlessness and unalterability of His supreme sway. It lovingly protests that our hearts are made happy in the knowledge that this absolute plenitude of happiness can, through all unending ages, suffer no diminution, no overclouding, no limiting of the faculty to confer and necessitate beatitude worthy of an infinitely perfect God. It goes further, and, applying itself to the consideration of how it may prove the genuine and unaffected sincerity of those protestations of love, it becomes *affective efficac* and, as far as may be, *effective efficac* as well. It labours to remove from the soul all that could be offensive to the presence of God, and devises against future offence such anxiously and affectionately contrived provisions as give assured promise of stability in His service.

“TUNC AMABO DEUM PERFECTE si Deo velim ista bona, ideo, quia Deo bona sunt . . . Si orem et quantum est in me, impediam, ne offendatur, quia propter infinitam bonitatem suam, id est, propter illas infinitas perfectiones quas habet, dignissimus est non offendi, sed super omnia amari, coli, honorari.” (La Croix.)

C. J. M.

THE BROWN SCAPULAR AND THE *CATHOLIC* *DICTIONARY*—II.

IN a former paper on this subject we gave the character of Launoy and his writings. We showed that he was animated by a spirit of bitter hostility to the Holy See, canonized saints, religious orders, and Catholic devotional practices; that his facts were often groundless, his arguments unsound, his conclusions false, and we may add too that his works have, nearly all, been condemned by the Holy See.

As the difficulties raised in the second part of the article on the Scapular in the *Catholic Dictionary*, are drawn from

this poisoned source, we might dismiss the subject summarily by stating that they have no solid foundation, and are unworthy of serious consideration.

For the satisfaction, however, of our readers, we purpose to take up each point separately, examine its merits, and ascertain its value.

The writer in the *Catholic Dictionary* says:

“As to the fact of the apparition to St. Simon Stock, it is accepted by Benedict XIV., Papebroch, and Alban Butler on the faith of a ‘Life’ of the Saint by Swaynton, who was his secretary, and wrote the story of the apparition at his dictation.”

It is a high compliment, no doubt, to Swaynton that the apparition is believed on his authority by such grave writers as Benedict XIV., Alban Butler, and a critic so severe as Papebroch.

The writer seems here to imply, however, that these grave authors accepted the truth of the apparition on the sole authority of Swaynton. Such cannot be the case, as in their writings they refer to other motives and authorities in support of their belief. Thus Benedict XIV., in his work *De Festis* (T. 2, cap. 70, et seq.), as well as in his work *De Canoniz. Sanct.* (L. 4, p. 2, cap. 9, n. 10) refers to the authors of the *Vinea Carmeli*, *Spec. Carm.*, *Clavis aurea* and the *Scap. Marianum*. Alban Butler, in his life of St. Simon, says that Benedict XIV. and Fr. Cosmas de Villiers refute Lauvoy on the testimonies of several ancient writers of the order.

That Papebroch had other motives for believing in the apparition and the devotion of the Scapular, besides the authority of Swaynton, is evident from passages in his reply to Fr. Sebastian of St. Paul’s strictures on him. In this work he thus writes:—

“Quod ad Deiparæ verba attinet, de qualicumque ordinis habitu, in quo moriens æternum non patietur incendium; ego in illis nullam video difficultatem. Ea enim Patres Carmelitæ tam commode exponunt, ut facile evadant omnem justam reprehensionem . . . Improbis porro sit qui neget, multis Romanorum Pontificum gratiis ac privilegiis ornatam, multis etiam divinis beneficiis comprobatam fuisse, istam Scapularis Mariani devote gestandi religionem.” (V Art xx., n. 28.)

Alban Butler in his life of St. Simon says in reference to the devotion of the Scapular :

“Several Carmelite writers assure us that he (St. Simon) was admonished by the Mother of God in a vision, with which he was favoured on the 16th of July, to establish this devotion.”

We may conclude, therefore, that these authors had other motives, besides the authority of Swaynton's life of the saint, for their belief in the apparition to St. Simon.

The writer says that the Carmelites refused Papebroch a sight of this life. This does not seem to affect very much the matter under consideration, but we may add that if they thought he would treat it as he did other portions of their history to which he had access, they were perfectly justified in doing so.

The writer continues thus :

“Next, to understand the force of Launoy's arguments for regarding this passage in the ‘Life’ if it be authentic, as an interpolation, we must remember that the miracle is represented as gaining immediate notoriety.”

Here the writer casts a doubt on the authenticity of this life without giving any reason for so doing. He then gives Swaynton's, or, as he calls him, pseudo-Swaynton's words. Why pseudo? Is he not as real as any personage that figures in history? He is quoted and alluded to by several historians who have written on the Scapular, and his life is recorded in the *Bibliotheca Carmelitana*, amongst the distinguished men of the Carmelite Order. These are Swaynton's words :

“The story running through England and beyond it, many cities offered us places in which to live, and many nobles begged to be affiliated to this holy order, that they might share in its graces, desiring to die in this holy habit.”

The writer then adds :

“If so, the silence of the Carmelite authors for more than a century after is remarkable.”

Whilst not admitting that the silence of Carmelite authors for more than a century after, is a valid argument against a fact that was received generally, not only throughout

England, but also in other countries, we deny that they were silent on the subject for more than a century after.

St. Simon Stock died on the 16th of May, 1265, at the Carmelite Convent of Bordeaux, whilst on his visitation there, and not in 1250, as is represented in the *Catholic Dictionary*. Not only Swaynton, his cotemporary, but other Carmelite authors, relate the story of the vision within the century after the saint's death, as we shall show further on.

The writer in the *Catholic Dictionary*, using Launoy's argument, says that Ribotus, Provincial in Catalonia (about 1340), in his ten books on the institution and remarkable deeds of the Carmelites, ignores it.

True, he is silent about it, because it did not come within the scope of his work. He wrote an apology for the Carmelites on questions at that time disputed, namely, the antiquity of the order, its hereditary succession from the Prophet Elias, its confirmation, title, &c., which facts were to be proved by the testimony of the ancient writers from whom he quoted, and not by the recent heavenly-given benefit of the Scapular, concerning which there was at that time no controversy. The same may be said of the silence of the other Carmelite authors quoted by the writer from Launoy, viz., Chimilensis, or rather, Chimetensis and others. They wrote on the origin of the order, its founder, its succession from the Prophet Elias, its title, confirmation, &c., which were questions in their time disputed. But it did not come within the aim of their works, nor would it promote the end they had in view to treat of the recent and undisputed fact of the vision to St. Simon. Papebroch gives a similar reason for his silence concerning the vision when reproached by Fr. Sebastian of St. Paul, for not mentioning it in his notice of the saint's life. These are his words :

“Importunus est qui mihi vitio vertendum putat, quod de B. Simone breviter agens in Majo, maluerim tacere de Scapulari . . . Importunissimus porro est, quisquis putat, debuisse me late excurrere in commendationem prædictæ devotionis, cum id alienum sit ab operis nostri instituto.” (*Resp. ad Exhib.*, &c., Pars. 2, p. 381.)

The writer seems to attach great importance to the

silence of the great English Carmelite theologian Waldensis, for he says :

“Strangest of all, Waldensis, a Carmelite, an Englishman, and writing in England (*De Sacramentalibus*) tries hard to prove the religious habit a sacramental, and speaks particularly of the Carmelite habit and the form which it is given.”

To this we answer that it would have been altogether outside the question were Waldensis, in his controversy with the heretics on the sacraments and sacramentals, to allude to the vision to St. Simon, which they would not admit. He wrote, no doubt, about the Carmelites and the holy habits or garments of religious in general, but it was more to defend them against the attacks of the heretics, than to explain their privileges. Hence in his work on Sacramentals, chap. 25, he mentions some of the rules of the Carmelite order, and proves that monastic rules are not repugnant to the Gospels as Wickliffe contended. In the 89th chapter he defends the antiquity of the Carmelite order, and the title of Brothers of the Blessed Virgin, both of which questions were impugned by Wickliffe. In the 92nd chapter he writes of and defends the holy habits or garments of religious in general, against which the same heretic declaimed. It would seem that this was a fitting occasion for alluding to the vision in which St. Simon received the scapular from the Blessed Virgin. But as his adversary rejected all such visions, Waldensis prudently omitted any reference to it, and instead had recourse for his proofs and illustrations to the Holy Scriptures, such as the hem of our Lord's garment, the cloak of Elias, and the like, the miraculous power of which Wickliffe would not dare deny. Hence it is easy to understand why Waldensis makes no allusion to the vision of St. Simon in his controversies with the Wickliffites.

But granting that some Carmelite historians are silent about the Scapular, that is no argument against its authenticity, as long as there are other Carmelites equally trustworthy who mention it in their works. If that kind of argument were valid, many most important events, both in sacred and profane history, might be denied or called into question. Thus the mission of the Archangel Gabriel to the Blessed

Virgin, to announce to her that she was chosen by God to be the Mother of the Messiah, is recorded by St. Luke in his gospel, whilst the other Evangelists make no mention of that august event. Would it, therefore, be lawful to call it into question? The institution of the Rosary by St. Dominick is narrated by many writers, and yet the great Dominican authors St. Thomas, Durandus and Cajetanus make no allusion to it in their works. Is it, therefore, of doubtful origin? We could illustrate this subject by many other examples from both sacred and profane history, if space would permit. But it is unnecessary, as the weakness of such reasoning is evident to all.

The next statement in the article in question is as follows :

“The vision is mentioned, apparently for the first time, so far as is known for certain, by Grossus, a Carmelite of Toulouse, in his *Viridarium* (1389),” then by Paleonidorus. (*Antiq. Ord. Carm.* vi. 8, apud Launoy).

We now proceed to show that there are many Carmelite authors antecedent to the time of both Grossus and Palaeonidorus, who relate the vision to St. Simon.

First of all it is related by the saint himself in a letter addressed to all his brethren. This holy man, by the angelic purity of his life and his great devotion to the Mother of God, merited this heavenly favour. We are told that at the early age of twelve years, he retired into the solitude of the desert and there for twenty years led a most austere life. Having been divinely inspired to embrace the rule of the Carmelite order, some members of which at that time had arrived from the Holy Land, he sought and readily obtained admission amongst them. He was sent to the University of Oxford to make his ecclesiastical studies, which he did with great success, and in due time was admitted to Holy Orders. At a general Chapter held at Aylesfort, Kent, in 1245, he was unanimously elected General of his order, which he ruled with great prudence for twenty years. On the authority of this holy man, a canonized saint of the Church, who was chosen on account of his great wisdom to be Prior General of his order, we have the story of the apparition of

the Blessed Virgin. He was not one likely to be deceived or to deceive others.

His order being greatly persecuted, he constantly prayed to his holy Patroness to protect it and give it some mark of her special favour. In answer to these prayers she deigned to give him the Scapular as a badge of her special protection.

The next who relates this vision is Swaynton, the saint's secretary, confessor and companion in his visitations. We are told by Pitsæus in his work *De Scriptoribus Angliæ*, (p. 346), that he was an English Carmelite, a Doctor of Theology and Professor in Oxford, afterwards taught sacred literature in Bordeaux, and was distinguished in every branch of knowledge. His life is written in the *Bibliotheca Carm.* (T. 2, p. 603). We there read that he was author of many works on sacred subjects, and amongst others he wrote a life of St. Simon in which he records the vision. The passage in which it is related is too long for insertion here, but may be seen in the *Spec. Carm.* (T. 1, pars. 3, N. 2077). It will be sufficient to quote a few points.

Swaynton tells us that the saint narrated to his assembled brethren, the apparition, saying amongst other things :

“Fratres charissimi, benedictus Deus qui non dereliquit sperantes in se, et non sprevit preces servorum suorum . . . Cum effunderem animam meam in conspectu Domini, quamvis sim pulvis et cinis ; et in omni fiducia Dominam meam Virginem Mariam deprecarer, quod sicut volebat nos appellari Fratres suos, monstraret se Matrem, eripiendo nos de casu tentationum et aliquo signo gratiæ nos recomendo erga ipsos, qui nos persequebantur . . . Apparuit mihi cum grandi comitatu, et tenendo habitum ordinis, dixit : *Hoc erit tibi et cunctis Carmelitis privilegium. In hoc moriens, aeternum non patietur incendium . . .* Fratres, conservando verbum istud in cordibus vestris, satagite electionem vestram certam facere per bona opera et numquam deficere ; vigilate in gratiarum actione pro tanta misericordia, orantes sine intermissione, ut sermo mihi factus clarificetur ad laudem sanctissimæ Trinitatis, Patris, Jesu Christi, Spiritus Sancti et Virginis Mariæ semper benedictæ.”

Swaynton here relates a miracle effected through the instrumentality of the Scapular, the day after the vision. The saint, accompanied by Swaynton, was journeying to Winton, where there was a man named Walter, who had led a very wicked life and was now dying in despair. The dean of the

church of St. Helen, at Winton, brother of the dying man, besought the saint to come to him and endeavour to procure his conversion. The saint accordingly came, and having prayed, laid on him the holy Scapular. The dying man was immediately changed. He sought pardon for his sins, begged to receive the sacraments, and died a happy death. In gratitude for this conversion the aforesaid dean founded a Carmelite monastery at Winton.

This miracle was the happy occasion of the further confirmation of the vision. The report of it having reached the ears of the Bishop of Winton, he sent for the saint, and questioned him as to the power of the Scapular, &c. Having satisfied himself as to the truth of the apparition, he ordered the narrative to be committed to writing, and authentically signed and sealed. (*V. Spec. Carm.*, T. 1, pars. III., p. 519.)

In the year 1348, less than a century after the death of St. Simon, we have another Carmelite author, William of Coventry, relating it in his work *Scutum Carmelitarum*. His words are :

“S. Simon de Anglia Generalis Ordinis sextus, qui Dei gloriosissimam Genitricem jugiter deprecabatur, ut Carmelitarum Ordinem, qui speciali gaudet ipsius Virginis titulo, aliquo communiret privilegio Cui Beatissima Virgo cum multitudine Angelorum, apparuit, scapulare ordinis in benedictis suis manibus tenens et dicens : *Hoc erit tibi et cunctis Carmelitis privilegium ; quod in hoc moriens, aeternum non patietur incendium.*” (*V. Bibliotheca Carm.* T. 2, p. 759.)

In the same century (1360) John Wilson, in his *Martyrologium Anglicanum*, thus writes :

“Decima sexta Maii Burdigalis in Guasconia, depositio S. Simonis Confessoris et Generalis Carmelit. in Anglia ; quo orante B. Virginem Mariam, illa apparuit ipsi cum comitatu Angelorum ferens scapulare sui ordinis in manibus et dixit : quod quicumque mortuus fuerit in isto ordine salvus erit.” (*V. Biblioth. Carm.* T. 2, p. 759, et *Spec. Carm.* T. 1, pars. III., pp. 521 et 529.)

The Scapular is also alluded to by Pope John XXII., who was elected in the year 1316, fifty-one years after the death of St. Simon. In his Bull “*Sacratissimo uti Culmine,*” or as it is called the Sabbatine Bull, he informs us that the Blessed Virgin appeared to him and told him that they who enter

the holy order and wear the sign of the holy habit (the Scapular) shall enjoy certain privileges. John was favoured with this vision as a reward for his great devotion to the Mother of God, and in answer to his prayers to her, that God would avert the evils with which the Church was menaced and deliver him from his enemies. This vision and promise corroborate and confirm the promise made to St. Simon in favour of those who wear the Scapular.

The next Carmelite writer who refers to the Scapular is John of Hildesheim in his *Defensorium Ordinis Dei Virginis Mariæ de Monte Carmeli*, written in 1370. Although this work treats chiefly of the ancient history of the order, in some verses of the last chapter, he thus alludes to St. Simon, the Scapular, and its prerogatives.

“Dat superna professis commoda vitæ
Est salvificus Prior; est et vita superstes
Stat pro signo de subveniendo sodali.”

(*V. Spec. Carm.* T. 1., pars. 2, p. 159.)

The Carmelite author who next gives us an account of the vision is John Grossus, who flourished in 1389. According to the writer in the *Catholic Dictionary*, he was the first apparently to mention it, as far as is known for certain. We have seen, however, such is not the case, as others before him, at least equally authentic, have alluded to it. This author, in his work *Viridarium*, gives a brief outline of the life of St. Simon, in which he thus relates the vision:

“Whilst devoutly praying to the glorious Virgin Mary, Mother of God, she appeared to him surrounded by a multitude of Angels, holding in her hand the Scapular of the Order, and saying, ‘*This shall be to you and to all Carmelites a privilege; he who dies in this habit shall be saved.*’”

He then adds these verses:—

“Si ordinis in signo moritur quis jure benigno
Solvitur a pœnis, fruiturque locis peramœnis
Hoc impetravit Simon a Virgine chara
Postea migravit scandens ad gaudia clara.”

After him we have in 1430, Thomas Bradley, an English Carmelite, who was appointed Bishop of Dromore in Ireland by Pope Eugene IV. He was also Apostolic Legate. In the

second chapter of his tract *De fundatione, &c. Ordinis Fratrum Glorios. Dei Genitricis Virginis Mariae de Monte Carmeli*, he thus refers to the vision :

“Erat tunc vir sanctus in religione praedicta, Simon Stock nomine natione Anglicus, qui Dei gloriosam Genitricem jurgitur deprecabatur, ut Carmelitarum ordinem, qui speciali gaudet ipsius Virginis titulo, aliquo communiret privilegio . . . Cui Beatissima Virgo cum multitudine Angelorum apparuit, scapulare . . . in benedictis manibus suis tenens et dicens : Hoc erit tibi et cunctis Carmelitis privilegium, quod in hoc moriens aeternum non patietur incendium.”

Balduinus Leersius, a Carmelite writer who flourished in 1460, also refers to the vision in the fourth chapter of his *Collectaneum Exemplorum*. His words are :

“S. Simon sextus Generalis Ordinis, Vir Magnae abstinence et devotionis, specialiter ad Beatam Virginem Mariam : multis in vita clarens miraculis : saepius Virginem Gloriosam Dei Genitricem, ordinis Carmelitarum Patronam singularem, deprecabatur humiliter et attentius, ut titulo suo insignitus pariter communiret privilegio . . . Quodam ergo tempore dum devote oraret, Virgo gloriosa Mater Dei cum multitudine Angelorum ei apparuit, Scapulare in manu tenens et dicens : *Hoc erit tibi signum et cunctis Carmelitis privilegium : in hoc habitu moriens salvabitur, &c.*, ei Scapulare tradidit. (*V. Spec. Carm.*, T. 1, pars. 3, p. 367.)

Again we have the Carmelite, Peter Bruyne, Prior of the Convent of Ghent. In the sixth chapter of his *Tabulare Ordinis Fratrum, &c.*, which was printed in 1474, he thus refers to the Scapular :—

“Itaque indui Scapularibus aspiciamus Carmelitas ; qui, sancto tradente Simone Stock, Virgineis tentum manibus Scapulare (quando suae devotionis in Virginem Mariam, veluti eujusdam praemii praeludio, Mariam etiam aspexerat) mirum in modum alacres induendum susceperunt.” (*V. Spec. Carm.*, T. 1, p. 2, p. 209.)

The next important witness we shall quote is Arnold Botius, a Carmelite of Ghent, a renowned theologian, philosopher, orator and poet, who flourished in 1480. He is thus described by the Abbot Trithemius in his book on ecclesiastical writers :

“Arnoldus Botius, natione Teutonicus, Ordinis Fratrum Beatae Mariae semper Virginis de Monte Carmeli, Conventus Gandensis ; vir in divinis scripturis studiosus et eruditus et in saecularibus litteris egregie doctus, Theologus, Philosophus, Orator et Poeta praeclarus ingenio acutus, eloquio disertus, vita et conversatione devotus.”

In the sixth chapter of his *Speculum Historiale*, written in 1494, this author alludes briefly to the vision of the Blessed Virgin to St. Simon and his receiving from her hands the Scapular. But in his larger work *De Patronatu Bmæ Virginis Mariæ*, he devotes a whole chapter, the tenth, to St. Simon, the Vision, his reception from her hands of the Scapular and its privileges.

The last author we shall quote is John Palaeonydorus, a Carmelite of Mechlin, who published in 1497 a history of the Carmelite order entitled *Fasciculus Tripartitus*. In the third book, seventh chapter, of that work, he gives an account of the Vision of St. Simon, in which he received the Scapular from the Blessed Virgin as a sign of privilege to all Carmelites. He also records the fame which this apparition gained, not only in England, but also in foreign countries, and the numbers of distinguished persons who sought to be invested with the holy habit.

There are many other writers, Carmelites and others, who in different ages of the Church have given us histories of this vision, but we abstain from mentioning them, as we have already, we hope, attained our object, which was to meet the objection in the *Catholic Dictionary*, viz., "The vision is mentioned apparently for the first time, so far as is known for certain, by Grossus, a Carmelite of Toulouse, in his *Viridarium* (1389), then by Paleonidorus (*Antiq. Ord. Carm.* vi. 8, apud Launoy), published in 1495." We have shown that there are many other trustworthy writers who have related the vision to St. Simon before Grossus and Palaeonydorus.

The writer thinks it right to add, however, that the Carmelites claimed the support of an anonymous MS. in the Vatican, said to have been written early in the fourteenth century.

This document, although spoken of thus lightly is of the highest authenticity. It was rigorously examined and approved of by learned Cardinals. It was examined and read in 1635 by the most illustrious Horatius Justinianus and exhibited to the judges of the Holy Office. After a diligent examination they found that its authenticity could

not be shaken, and consequently approved of it by their decree, as is related by Irenæus of St. James in his theological tract, cap. 1, § 5 (*V. Exhibitio errorum*, &c., by Fr. Sebastian of St. Paul, art. 20, p. 550).

There are other old MSS., ancient verses, seals, &c., which prove the constant belief of the faithful in the devotion of the Scapular. In an old MS. which belonged to the Carmelite convent of Mechlin, written in 1484, and containing memorials of the order, there is an epigram on some of its saints, in which St. Simon and the Scapular are thus alluded to :

“Anglicus iste Simon petit a Christi Genitrice
Praesidium matris ac Scapulare suum.”

V. Vinea Carmeli, p. 560.

In a convent of the Blessed Virgin near Alost in Flanders, founded about 1351, there was an old seal of the order, possessed from the time of the foundation, on which was represented a figure of the Blessed Virgin in the act of giving the Scapular to St. Simon (*V. Spec. Carm.*, pars. iii., p. 521.)

Another important piece of evidence in favour of the vision is an old canonical Office of St. Simon, written in 1435, in the books of the choir of the Carmelite Convent at Bordeaux, where the body of the saint was buried. It was used there in manuscript for many years, and afterwards printed at Bordeaux in 1580. In this Office there is frequent mention made of the privileges of the Scapular, particularly in the hymns and prayer. In the sixth lesson of Matins there is a full description of the apparition (*V. Vinea Carmeli*, p. 430, where a copy of it may be seen.)

The writer says, “No Catholic, Launoy as little as anyone, doubts the utility and piety of the institution.” It is very magnanimous, no doubt, on the part of Launoy and his admirers to admit so much, after having done their utmost, though in vain, to prove that it is of doubtful authenticity.

As to the danger, alluded to, of abuse by a misplaced confidence in the Scapular, we have no fear. Such, too, was

the impression of so weighty an authority as Papebroch, who thus expresses himself on the point :

“Neque nata sint (sicut calumniatur nonnulli) stolidam fiduciam ingerere peccantibus adipiscendae salutis, quomocumque ducatur vita.” (*V. Resp. ad Exhib. errorum, &c.*, art. 20, n. 28).

Instead of tending to cause any neglect of the more important duties of religion, it promotes their observance ; for the rules of the Sodality enjoin in a special manner such essential virtues and good works as prayer, purity, fasting, mortification, the reception of the sacraments, &c. It is known, too, that it exercises a most salutary influence on those who wear it, as they hold themselves bound, in a special manner to imitate the virtues of their holy Patroness, and to avoid everything unworthy of one wearing her holy Scapular.

Much more might be said in favour of this devotion did the space at our disposal permit. We hope, however, we have attained our present purpose which is merely to meet the difficulties raised against this devotion by the article in the *Catholic Dictionary*.

JOHN E. BARTLEY, O.C.C.

BOSSUET AND CLAUDE.

THE conference of Bossuet with Claude dates from a distance as a fact of history, but it must be ever interesting, more especially to ecclesiastics, to witness, even in history, a polemical encounter between two champions, who in their respective spheres ranked so high amongst the celebrated men who adorned the age in which they lived, and of whom the “great nation” is so justly proud.

The portrait of the illustrious Bishop of Meaux is drawn by Massillon in describing him as “a man of vast and specially favoured genius, of a candour that ever characterizes great souls, and minds of the highest order, the ornament of the Episcopate, in whom the clergy of France will for ever feel honoured, a Bishop in the midst of a court, a man

possessed of all sorts of talent, and informed in all the sciences, the Doctor of all the Churches, the terror of all the sects, the father of the seventeenth century, who wanted only to be born in the primitive ages to have been the light of councils, the soul of the assembled fathers, to have dictated the canons, to have presided at Nice and Ephesus." And the author of the life of Madame de Maintenon, speaks of the great prelate in the following eulogistic terms:—

"Led within the sanctuary by his learning and virtue, he was its ornament and oracle. He comes before us at once a controversialist, an orator, a historian, preceptor of the great dauphin, displaying in these various capacities all the depth and elevation of genius, of which the most highly gifted individual is capable. At times, running over the whole world he collects gold and flowers to embellish his writings, whilst again ascending on high he appears associated in a manner with the intelligences of heaven. Too noble to be ambitious, he sought only the merit and happiness of serving men of talent, whilst too rich in his own renown he wanted neither the honours of the ministry nor the purple to add to its lustre. He annihilated the heretics, whom he combated, and gave back life to the dead in pronouncing their panegyrics, and giving more expansion to his genius when he condensed it than when he extended its powers, he comprised the history of the universe in a few pages, in which the majesty of his style fully responded to the sublimity of the subject."

Such is a brief view of the great man, the Eagle of Meaux, whom we are to witness descending into the arena of controversial strife.

Nor was his antagonist an ordinary combatant. He was, in his day, the hero of his party, the Calvinist sect or Huguenots, as they were called in France. The son of a Protestant minister, he was brought up by him in the midst of the religious controversies that raged at the time. Having been ordained minister at the age of twenty-six, he taught theology with great success at Nimes for eight years. Subsequently he came up to Paris, and settled at Charenton, a short distance from the city, where he remained till the revocation of the edict of Nantes, when he passed on to Holland where the brilliancy of his talents attracted universal admiration, and merited for him a handsome pension from the Prince of Orange in the closing years of his life. In his

writings he combated the most distinguished men of his time, a period remarkable in history for the great intelligences that adorned it. Possessed of a subtle and penetrating mind, he combined with an extensive and varied erudition a singular dexterity in disputation, together with a mode of expression at once close, animated, and cogent, and his various works attest in him the qualities of a dialectician of the highest order.

The conference was occasioned by a Mademoiselle de Duras, a lady belonging to an ancient and distinguished family, and especially distinguished in the reign of Louis XIV., on account of the high posts occupied by her several brothers in the army as also in various departments of the civil administration of the country, and she herself had the honour of being lady of the bedchamber to the Duchess of Orleans, at the same time. She was brought up a Calvinist, but becoming dissatisfied with the pretensions of the sect, and yielding to the grace vouchsafed to her from on high, she turned her thoughts towards the Catholic religion. Like other converts she had doubts and difficulties of conscience to overcome, and it occurred to her, that she should be greatly helped to their solution by hearing them discussed by leading men on both sides; and she fixed her mind on Claude as a representative authority of the Calvinist party, and on Bossuet so celebrated at the time for his many eminent qualities, and especially for his ability, as a controversialist in the interests of the Catholic Church. She had her wishes accordingly conveyed to the illustrious prelate, who replied that he was quite willing to meet M. Claude, if he could think the conference would conduce to the spiritual good of the lady in question. So encouraged, Mademoiselle de Duras through the kind offices of the Duke de Richelieu obtained his Lordship's consent to come up to Paris on an appointed day, towards the end of February, 1678, and meet the hero of Calvinism on the following day.

Here we may be allowed a passing reflection to consider how far in general public discussions on controverted points of religion serve to be of advantage in clearing up difficulties, dispelling doubts, and producing convictions on the side

of truth in the minds of those, who assist at such interchanges of argument between men of superior powers of debate. There seem to be reasons for and against the practice under different circumstances. For, occasions may occur, when a Goliath comes forth from the camp of the Philistines, and insultingly calls aloud, "*choose out a man of you, and let him come down, and fight hand to hand.*" (1 Kings, xvii. 8.) In such a case the faithful would, no doubt, be put to shame, and sorely scandalized, whilst a triumph would be given to the enemy, unless there were a David to come forward, who *putting on the armour of God may be able to resist in the evil day,* (Ephes. vi., 17) and "*fight the good fight,*" in order to maintain the faith in all its purity and integrity as confided to the Church of God by her Divine Founder. On the other hand, a public discussion on religious subjects before a promiscuous audience, little, if at all, accustomed to regular disputation, would be likely to do more harm than good. The manner of the disputants more than the logical force of their reasoning would make impression, and as a result prejudices might be deepened on the side of error, whilst the simple faithful, together with being pained by the irreligious, not to say blasphemous, dealings of the adverse party with truths and practices dear and sacred to them, might be, moreover, disconcerted by objections set out with a show of plausibility, as we all know how liable minds untrained in dialectic practice are to be influenced and led astray by mere sophistry, which they are unable to unravel. In such circumstances the maxim, "*magna est veritas et praevalerebit,*" would have but little chance of being realised; and after all it is not in accordance with Catholic principles to commit the issues of religious discussion to the ability of individual disputants, and the verdict of an indiscriminate assembly; and I believe experience is wanting to attest any advantage resulting to religion from displays of the kind; rather do we find the Apostle's words of admonition to his beloved Timothy too well warranted: *Contend not in words, for it is to no profit, but the subverting of the hearers.* (2 Tim. ii. 14).

But the conference undertaken by Bossuet with Claude was quite of a different character. There was question of a

particular soul seeking the truth in fear and trembling for her own salvation. Her difficulties were confined to particular points, which she had already anxiously discussed in her own mind, and she was therefore quite prepared to hear them argued by persons she had reason to believe ably competent to deal with them exhaustively. The audience besides was to be strictly select, composed only of a few friends on either side, so that the interchanges of argument were sure to be conducted with all the sobriety of temper, and mutual deference so favourable to the elucidation of the subjects to be treated of, whilst Mademoiselle herself would be at liberty to propose any difficulties or obscurities she might have in her own mind for a more complete exposition, so as fully to satisfy herself respecting them.

On coming up to Paris, Bossuet, in accordance with a desire communicated to him on the part of Mademoiselle de Duras, repaired to her residence, in order to hear from her the particular subjects she desired to be discussed in the conference of next day, and the interview, which Bossuet himself relates, is most interesting, and at the same time, most useful, if not necessary, for a clear understanding of the conference itself.

Having received the illustrious prelate with all the respect due to his dignity, and personal character, she opened her mind to him briefly, and in all simplicity by telling him, that the subject she wished to have cleared up with her minister, for it would appear she had already consulted Claude upon it, was the authority of the Church, which to her mind comprised all other points of controversy as regards the Catholic Church.

Having heard her statement Bossuet immediately observed, that she had good reason for confining herself principally, if not exclusively, to the question, which embraced every other question, as she herself had so well remarked; whereupon he proceeded to enlarge upon the authority of the Church, in order to give her a clearer and fuller idea of the article, as the cardinal point of controversy between the Catholic Church and the various Protestant communions.

He noticed, in the first place, that in defence of their position

the ministers boasted, that their belief in the fundamental truths of the Christian religion was beyond all dispute, that the Catholics believed all the doctrines they professed, whilst, on their side, they did not believe all the Catholic Church believed and taught, and they therefore pretended that in holding to all that was fundamental in the Christian religion they rejected only what the Catholic Church had added thereto, and from this they maintained, that they stood upon sure and incontestable ground.

Mademoiselle de Duras here remarked, that she had frequently heard these assertions made by her ministers, whereupon he continued his explanations, saying he would only notice, for the present, that far from admitting that they believed all that was fundamental in the Christian religion, he insisted, that there was one article, and a fundamental one, which they did not believe, namely, the Church as being *universal*. It is indeed true, he observed, that they profess to believe this article in saying in their liturgy, "*I believe in the Catholic, or Universal Church,*" in the same way as the Arians of old, the Macedonians, and Socinians said in words: "*I believe in Jesus Christ and in the Holy Ghost;*" but that as these heretics are justly accused of not believing in reality what they profess to believe in words, because they do not believe as they should, that is according to the true meaning of the articles in question, so also, if it be shown, that the modern sects do not believe in the manner they ought the article of "*the Catholic Church,*" it should inevitably follow that they reject a *fundamental article* of the Christian faith.

Hence came the necessity of understanding what is really meant by the term "*Catholic Church,*" and it should be insisted upon, that in the exposition of the Creed, destined as it was from the beginning to be a standard of orthodoxy for all Christians, the expression should be taken in its most natural and literal sense, and as Christians had always understood it, that is, a society professing to believe the doctrine of Jesus Christ, and governed by His Divine Word, and as making this profession necessarily external. That this should be the natural and proper signification of the word "Church," the signification by which it was known by the

whole world, and used in ordinary conversation, he would look for no other witnesses than the members themselves of the so-called Reformation. For, as in the various prayers of their liturgy they speak of the discipline of the Church, of the faith of the Church, of the pastors and deacons of the Church, they do not assuredly mean the prayers of the predestined, nor the discipline of the predestined, but the prayers, the discipline, and the faith of all the members united in the external and visible society of the people of God; and when they say of an individual, that he edifies or scandalizes the Church, all this is unquestionably meant in reference to an external society in the same way. He pursued this demonstration in the form of baptism used by them, in the obligations prescribed to the god-parents, in their confession of faith, as also the distinction they lay down between what they recognize as the Church of Christ, and a society unduly assuming that title, asserting the rule in Article xxviii. of their confession of faith, that where the Word of God is not received, and where there is no obligation professed of submitting to it, and where, moreover, there is no use of sacraments, it cannot, properly speaking, be said that there is a Church at all in such circumstances. From these references, and the everyday usages of the Calvinist body he drew the inference, that the proper and natural signification as applied by themselves to the word "Church," is that it is a visible and external society of the people of God, amongst whom, although there be *hypocrites and reprobates*, as the confession of faith, Article xxviii., significantly asserts, still their malice cannot, as they say, efface the title of Church; that is, in other words, hypocrites and reprobates mixed with the people of God cannot deprive them of the title of Church, provided always, that it be invested with the external signs of professing the Word of God, and of using the Sacraments, as the same Article so distinctly requires. From all this he concluded, that in the common acceptation of all Christians, comprising even the Calvinistic communion, the word "Church" is taken to mean this external and visible society of the people of God, so much so, that when it is used in any other sense it is qualified by some expression to that effect, as for instance, when

St. Paul, speaking of the heavenly Jerusalem, calls it a church, but adds immediately the distinguishing words: "*Of the first born, who are written in the heavens,*" &c. (*Heb. xii. 23*).

Following up still further the signification of the word "church," he took account of its etymological import, which in the Greek language has the simple meaning of an assembly, leaving its object or purpose to be determined by the circumstances under which it was employed, as for example, where it is said, "*the assembly was confused—a lawful assembly—he dismissed the assembly*" (*Acts xix. 32, 39, 40*), the word used both in Greek and Latin is what is also used to denote a church in English. Hence both Jews and Christians used the expression in a religious sense, meaning the assembly or society, or communion of the people of God professing to serve Him. In the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, translated into Greek long before the coming of Christ, out of more than fifty passages, where the term is employed, there is not even one, in which it does not denote an external visible assembly of some sort, and there are very few, in which it means any other than a visible external assembly of the people of God. Christians have taken the expression from the Jews, and employ it to signify the assembly, or congregation, or society of the followers of Christ, professing His doctrine, and regulating their lives according to His law. Going back, therefore, to the original use of the word its meaning is fixed in that acceptation; and in more than a hundred passages of the New Testament, where it is used, there are scarcely two or three in which the reformers strive, but strive in vain, to wrest it to any other signification. An example is furnished by St. Paul, where writing to the Ephesians he speaks of our Divine Lord, as "*presenting to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish*" (v. 27). They pretend this description cannot apply to a visible Church, or to a Church on earth, since the Church, in that sense, so far from being without stain, has need of saying constantly "*forgive us our trespasses.*" But manifestly this is far from being the Apostle's meaning, for observe, the

Church, of which he speaks is the Church as described in the same place, "*which Christ loveth, and delivered Himself up for it, that he might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the Word of life.*" Surely the Church, that Christ loved, proving His love by shedding His blood for her—surely the Church that He sanctified by baptism in the Word of God—surely this was no other than the external visible Church He established here on earth, "*without spot or wrinkle,*" because holy in Himself, as her Founder, holy in the doctrine He confided to her, holy in her sacraments and the other means of sanctification, which make holiness one of her essential characteristics and attributes. By all means the predestined are a portion, and the most noble portion of the Church, but they derive their sanctification from the prayers of the Church, from the doctrine of the Church, from the Divine Sacrifice the Church every day celebrates, and the sacraments she constantly administers, and they are, therefore, included in, and by no means separated from, the visible and exterior Church of Christ, though their personal sanctity may be invisible and unknown in the same way as the sinfulness of the hypocrite and the reprobate is also invisible. Yes, by all means the Church, of which St. Paul speaks, is without stain or wrinkle, because in her teachings she has neither error of doctrine nor corruption of morals, and she contains within her bosom the elect of God, who, although sinners here on earth find in her communion external means wherein "*they are washed and sanctified and justified in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the spirit of our God.*" (1 Cor. vi. 11).

We have here, perhaps, the only passage in which it can be pretended with any kind of plausibility, that the word "church" taken by itself signifies any thing other than the external visible society of the people of God, and it is manifest that it should be understood like all the rest. But supposing, that this and two or three other passages of doubtful import, or different in meaning from the others, which are so clear and numerous, their interpretation should be governed by the latter according to the rules of scriptural criticism.

But does not our Sovereign Teacher Himself, Jesus

Christ, teach us that we are to understand the Church in this sense? Is it not in this sense He Himself speaks of it where He says, "*tell the Church, and if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican*" (*Matt.* xviii. 17), and where also addressing Peter, He says, "*thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.*" (*Ibid.* xvi. 18). Beyond all doubt the Church here meant is no other than the Church in its visible external form, for there can be no question of an invisible Church consisting of the predestined, for they are beyond the power of the devil by the fact of their predestination, and it would be quite unnecessary and superfluous to give any assurance in their regard, that the gates of hell should not prevail against them. It was, therefore, the visible external Church our Divine Lord meant in His promise, and we are left to admire the invincible force of that promise, which has so secured the society of His followers, that feeble though it has been from the beginning, humanly speaking, in comparison with the infidel world from without, and rent so often by heretical disturbances from within, there has not been a moment in its history, in which it has not stood forth to be seen as "*the light of the world,*" and "*the city seated on a mountain,*" to be seen by all mankind. (*Matt.* v. 14.)

Having insisted at such length on the visible and external character of the Church, he asked the lady why her ministers were unwilling to admit this interpretation of the Christian Church, and he went on to say, that they were forced by necessity into an opposite teaching, because when their Church was being established, its founders saw no Church on earth to enter into communion with, but breaking with the Catholic Church they invented the idea, that she had become so deformed and disfigured by errors and abuses as to have lost, in course of time, her primitive visible and external form, and continued her existence in an invisible manner, as a hidden society, consisting of God's elect, and that their work was to bring it forth pure "*without spot or wrinkle,*" out of this hidden state, and so present it to the world, as the reformed Church of God, according to which idea they would have the world believe that they were from

the beginning without suspension or interruption at any period of their existence, from the days of the apostles.

The silliness of this pretension of an invisible Church he had no difficulty in exposing by a lucid interpretation, and an irresistible application of the Scripture passages usually adduced to prove the indefectibility of the Church, and he concluded his argument by saying "thus the work of Jesus Christ on earth is everlasting; the Church founded on Peter's profession of faith is everlasting, and will confess that faith, *'even to the consummation of the world;'* her ministry will be everlasting; she will loose and bind to the end of time; she will continue unceasingly to teach all nations; her Sacraments, that is, the external livery, with which her Divine Founder invested her, shall continue to be always administered, maintaining the Communion exterior and interior of the saints until His coming. The continuance of the Church and the ecclesiastical ministry have no other limits."

To strengthen his argument still more he added, that the doctrine of the Catholic Church on the subject was so true, that the Presbyterian ministers, who deny it, do not deny it altogether, that is to say, their synods act in a manner to make it be understood and felt, that like the Catholic Church they exact an absolute submission to the authority and decrees of their Church, in proof of which he pointed out to Mademoiselle de Duras four articles in their Book of Discipline printed at Charenton, where M. Claude was minister, having for object to maintain order and submission to authority amongst their communion. The first he took from Chapter v. of the Consistories, Article xxxi., which enacts as follows:

"Discussions as to doctrine should be decided, if possible, by the Word of God in consistory, if not, the matter is to be brought before the colloque (a special kind of tribunal), thence to the provincial synod, and lastly to the national synod, where the entire and final decision is to be taken according to the Word of God, to which decision, should anyone refuse obedience point by point with an express condemnation of his errors, he is to be cut off from the church."

This ordinance, he observed, pointed to an authority visible, accessible, and exercising supreme jurisdiction

in deciding all doctrinal disputes amongst the members of their Body, or what they call their Church, thereby accepting the term "church" like all other Christians in its simple natural signification.

He appealed further to the same Book of Discipline, referring to the letter of deputation, which the several churches dispatch to the national synod couched in the following words:—

"We promise before God to submit to everything, that shall be decided in your holy assembly, persuaded as we are, that God will preside thereat, and conduct you by the Holy Ghost unto all truth and justice by the rule of His Word."

On this oath, he observed, that it could not be grounded on a mere human presumption, but must have its sanction from an express promise, of which they affect to assure themselves, on the part of the Holy Ghost, which was going fully as far as the Catholic Church in her general councils.

He, moreover, referred to a third enactment in the same Book of Discipline respecting the sect of Independents, who asserted that each particular Church should govern herself without any subjection to any authority beyond herself. This pretension was pronounced as formally condemned in the synod of Charenton as injurious to Church and State alike, opening the door to all sorts of irregularities and extravagances, and granting licence for instituting as many religions as parishes.

On this, he remarked, that on the principle of private judgment, a fundamental tenet of the Reformers from the beginning, no matter how many councils they held, the doctrine of the Independents was still incontestable, and warranted not only the establishment of as many religions as parishes, but as many as there were individuals. In contradiction, therefore, of the cherished principle of private judgment, they were of necessity compelled to adopt the obligation required by the Catholic Church of submitting to authority in matters of doctrine, and consequently induce the inference, that the Church must

always be a visible public institution or society bound together by the exercise of authority, on one side, and the obligation of obedience and submission, on the other.

Finally he appealed to a resolution of the national synod of Sante-Foi, naming four ministers, who were to repair on their behalf to an assembly, where they were to treat with the Lutherans about a common formulary of faith, having full powers to that effect according to the commission entrusted to them in the following terms: "To decide every point of doctrine, and all other matters submitted to consultation, and to agree to the confession of faith that would be adopted without even previous communication with the several particular churches, if there should be no time for doing so." From the terms of this commission he drew two conclusions, one, that the entire synod, national as it was, committed their faith without reserve to four individual members of their body, a far more extraordinary thing than that individuals should submit to the entire Church, whilst, in the second place, the synod showed, that they were very unfixed in their faith, since they consented to have its form of profession changed, and changed in points so important as those that separated the two parties, including with the rest the doctrine of the Real Presence. Did they expect the Lutherans would come over to them? In that case there would be no change needed in their formulary of faith, so that what was aimed at was, that each party retaining their own inward sentiments, both parties might agree as to a common outward confession, a result to be attained only by adding to, or taking from, their respective formulas even in essential points, at the same time that they would have the world believe, that these formulas so pieced and patched, were in strict accordance with the pure Word of God.

Mademoiselle de Duras here observed, that having already read his treatise, entitled *Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church*, she quite understood the difficulties he put forward, and not being able to see through them herself, she desired to hear what answer M. Claude would give to them, as well as what he would say on other points regarding the authority of the Church.

He then passed on to notice, that whilst the Calvinists acted in all regards as if the Church was infallible, it was nevertheless, certain that they denied this infallibility, and he added, that it was a fixed and settled principle with them, that every individual, ignorant though he might be, was obliged to believe, that he could understand the Scripture better than all the Councils, and the entire Church besides. She appeared astounded at this statement, when he further affirmed, that there was yet a circumstance more startling, which was, that there was a certain conjuncture, when one was obliged to doubt if the Sacred Scriptures were inspired or not, if the Gospel was a truth or a fable, if Jesus Christ was an impostor or a doctor of truth. She was quite appalled on hearing these extraordinary assertions, whilst he went on to affirm that these obligations of doubting, fearful as they certainly were, resulted as necessary consequences from their doctrine respecting the authority of the Church, and he felt quite certain, that he would force M. Claude to admit them. He then proceeded to explain the reasons for what he had just advanced, and he placed before her eyes the absurdity of their position in denying, on one side, the obligation of believing without examination what the Church decided, whilst on the other, they found it necessary for the purpose of maintaining order to assert for their Church an absolute submission to her decrees and decisions.

Mademoiselle de Duras intimated to him, that she quite understood his explanations, recollecting that she had seen them in his *Exposition*, and that so far she did not know what to say in reply, but she could scarcely believe her ministers to have no answer to give to them.

At this juncture the Countess de Roye, Mademoiselle's sister, entered, and announced the startling news, that M. Claude, who was to meet the Bishop next day, had received an order not to do so, and that he was, therefore, obliged to decline the engagement. The withdrawal of this order, and the further steps preliminary to the conference, I must reserve for another paper not to occupy too much space in the present number of the RECORD.

THE AUTHOR OF THE "CLAIMS OF THE UNINSTRUCTED DEAF-MUTE TO BE ADMITTED TO THE SACRAMENTS."

LITURGICAL QUESTIONS.

I.

CASE OF DIFFICULTY IN DETERMINING THE MASS TO BE SAID.

“On the Feast of St. Mel I was to celebrate in a private house a ‘Month’s Memory’ Mass for a member of the family. By mistake the violet vestments used on the previous Sunday were brought, and I could not get other vestments conveniently. What Mass should I have said? Whether should I have said (1) the Mass for the preceding Sunday—Septuagesima; (2) the Mass of St. Mel; or (3) the Mass for the Dead? “M.”

It is true, as our correspondent implies in his question, that the Rubric which says “*Paramenta altaris celebrantis et ministrorum debent esse coloris convenientis officio et missae diei secundum usum Romanae Ecclesiae,*” does not impose a grave obligation. With reference to this Rubric St. Alphonsus writes: “*Bene tamen censent Sporer et Quarti hanc Rubricam non obligare sub gravi, nisi scandalum adsit. . . . Addit Sporer, satius esse quocumque die facere Sacrum in quolibet colore quam illud omittere, hinc recte dicit a fortiori excusare omnem rationabilem causam.*” (L. 6, 378, dub. 5.)

Now we take it that the inconvenience of procuring other vestments justified our correspondent in the case mentioned in disregarding this Rubric, and consequently that it was lawful for him to use the violet vestments either in a Requiem Mass or in the Mass of St. Mel. And here we may remark that the use of violet vestments in a Requiem Mass on ordinary occasions has no sanction from the rubrics. It is true, that on All Souls’ Day in a church in which the Forty Hours’ Adoration is going on, violet is the colour to be used, but this is a special provision for a special case.

A moment’s reflection should have convinced our correspondent that he could not say the Mass of Septuagesima Sunday. A Mass *de tempore* can never be celebrated as a Votive Mass, and consequently can never lawfully be celebrated unless when prescribed by the Rubrics.

Equally evident is it that our correspondent would not have been justified in saying a Requiem Mass. The Feast of St. Mel is of double major rite—and the only case in which a private Requiem Mass is permitted on such a feast is on the day of interment when the corpse is present. On the third, seventh, or thirtieth day after death or interment *private* Requiem Masses have no privileges, and consequently can be celebrated only when the Rubrics permit the ordinary Requiem Mass.

II.

COMMEMORATION ON THE FEAST OF THE PATRON.

“When the Feast of a Patron of a Church or of a Religious Order is observed on a Sunday, should the commemoration of the Sunday be made *sub una conclusione* with the Prayer of the Feast ?

“INQUIRER.”

No; any commemoration made in the Mass by reason of *occurrence*, as in the case mentioned, has a distinct conclusion, even on the most solemn Feasts.

III.

THE PRAYER “A CUNCTIS” IN THE MASS.

1. “In a parish from time immemorial dedicated to the Blessed Virgin and St. Brigid, is it necessary in the chapels of the workhouse and convents to insert the name of any saint at the letter *N.* in the Prayer, *A cunctis* ?

“SUBSCRIBER.”

2. “When the church to which a priest is attached is dedicated to the Blessed Virgin and St. James, should he make a commemoration of St. James in the common commemoration in the Office, or insert the name of St. James in the Prayer, *A cunctis* ?

“J. F. D.”

As these two questions bear on the same matter, we will answer both together. We understand “Subscriber” to mean that the Blessed Virgin and St. Brigid are the joint Patrons of the principal church of the parish. Now, when the Prayer *A cunctis* is said in a church which has a Patron, the name of the Patron is, of course, to be inserted at the letter *N.* If the church has more than one Patron the names of all are inserted, provided the church has been dedicated

to all alike. If, however, one of them is regarded as the principal Patron, then the name of that one only should be mentioned.

To these rules there are two obvious exceptions. First, if the Patron be one of those whose names are given in the Prayer, the name is not to be repeated at the letter *N*. Secondly, if the Mass be that of the Patron, his name is not mentioned in the Prayer at all, since his intercession has been already invoked by the proper Prayer. In both these cases the celebrant is free either (a) not to insert any name at the letter *N*.; (b) to insert the name of the Patron of the diocese, or of the Patron of the place (*Patronus loci*); or (c) to substitute for the *A cunctis* the Prayer *Concede*, which is given in the *Orationes ad diversa* immediately before the *A cunctis*.

But when Mass is celebrated in a chapel or oratory having no Patron, then not the Patron of the church of the parish in which such chapel or oratory is situated, but the Patron of the diocese, or of the place is to be named in the *A cunctis*. This has been clearly laid down in a reply of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, dated September 12th, 1840, to a question almost identical in terms to No. 1. :—

“Sacerdos celebrans in oratorio publico, vel privato quod non habet Sanctum Patronum vel Titularem, an debeat in Oratione *A cunctis* ad literam *N*. nominare Patronum vel Titularem Ecclesiae parochialis intra cujus fines sita sunt dicta oratoria, vel Sanctum Patronum Ecclesiae cui adscriptus est, vel potius ulteriorem nominationem omittere?”

Resp. “Patronum civitatis vel loci nominandum esse.”

By the *Patronus loci* as the Sacred Congregation stated on the same occasion in reply to a further question, “intelligendus est praecipuus Patronus tantum vel dioecesis, si habeatur, vel oppidi similiter.” It seems clear, therefore, that in the cases mentioned by “Subscriber” the name of the Patron of the diocese is to be inserted in the *A cunctis*, although De Herdt (*Sac. Lit. Praxis*, vol. i., n. 84, 4°). limits the insertion of the name of this Patron to the case in which there is a custom of making a commemoration of him in the office.

From what has been already laid down, the answer to

question No. 2 may be easily deduced. For if the Blessed Virgin is the principal Patron of the Church, her name only is to be mentioned in the *A cunctis*, and as it is mentioned at the beginning of the Prayer, it is not to be repeated at the letter *N*. If, however, St. James is equally as much principal Patron of the Church as is the Blessed Virgin, his name is to be inserted at the letter *N*., since, as has been already stated, the names of all the Patrons are to be mentioned in this Prayer when all are equally principal. What holds for the insertion of the names in the *A cunctis* holds for the commemoration in the *suffragia sanctorum*, that is, if St. James be only a secondary Patron no commemoration is made of him, if he be a principal Patron a commemoration is made.

IV.

SHOULD THE ANTIPHON OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN BE ALWAYS SAID TWICE IN THE OFFICE?

“DEAR SIR,—A question has arisen among some priests, and they would like to have your opinion upon the matter in dispute.

“How many times should the Antiphon of the Blessed Virgin be recited by one who says the entire Office without any interruption—from Matins to Compline inclusively? One maintains that it should be said twice, once immediately after None, and again after Compline. The other maintains that once only—after Compline—is sufficient.

“Very respectfully yours,
“M.”

We are of opinion that the Antiphon of the Blessed Virgin should be said but once in this case.

The Rubric runs thus: “Dicuntur (Antiphonae B. Mariae) autem extra chorum tantum in fine completorii, et in fine Matutini dictis Laudibus, si tunc terminandum sit Officium, alioquin si alia subsequatur Hora, in fine ultimae Horae.” This Rubric contains two directions; the first orders the saying of the Antiphon at the end of the Compline in *every case*, even though the Office for the Dead, or Matins for the next day should follow immediately; the second orders it to be said at the end of Lauds, if the recitation of the Office is to conclude there, and if not there, why then at the end of the Hour where the recitation does close.

From this it seems plain that in the case you make of the continuous recitation of the whole Office, the Antiphon is not to be said before Compline, unless you suppose that Vespers and Compline are not Hours. The important words of the Rubric are “in fine ultimae Horae” (in qua terminandum est Officium). Vespers and Compline are Hours, and in the case stated Compline is the first Hour at which the recitation of the Office ceases. Guyetus, the greatest authority on such points, seems to be clearly of this opinion. He writes: “Extra chorum praedicta terminatio (Ant. B. Mariae) locum habet duntaxat in fine Laudum, si ibi terminat quis Officium. Quod si pergat ulterius, dicto Versu *Fidelium animae*, statim subditur principio Primae *¶Pater*, &c. Ibidem si post Primam immediate sequatur Tertia, et post Tertiam Sexta, &c., adeo ut *qua primum vice* post Laudes terminatur Officium impendatur praedicta terminatio tota.”—(Lib. iii., cap. xix., q. 4, *De Forma Officii*.)

V.

EXTENDING THE CORPORAL AT BEGINNING OF MASS.—CARRYING THE CHALICE TO THE ALTAR.

“Will you kindly give place in the RECORD for the two following questions:—

“1. Is it right to extend to the full the corporal at the beginning of Mass? As far as your correspondent knows, it is the usual practice to leave one fold of the corporal unextended till the Offertory?

“2. What is the authority for turning up on the chalice the front part of the veil, when the chalice is carried to or from the altar? It perhaps looks smart, but old ways ought to be respected, if not wrong.”

Answers:—1. Yes, it is correct to extend the corporal in full from the beginning of Mass. This is supposed in the Rubric of the Missal which describes what is to be done “Tunc ascendit ad medium altaris, . . . extrahit corporale de bursa quod extendit in medio altaris.” (*Ritus servandus in Cel. Missae*, ii.) The custom of leaving the front division unfolded till the Offertory was introduced into this country

from France or Belgium, where it is still, I believe, followed. It was intended by this means to meet the danger of sweeping away the minute particles which may remain on the corporal, if the veil rests on the front fold. But this danger can be met consistently with the observance of the Rubric by not allowing the veil to hang so far down as to touch the corporal. This is what is done in Rome and other countries where the corporal is fully extended from the beginning of Mass.

2. I am not aware of any authority founded on the Rubrics for the practice you describe of turning the veil back so as to hold it with the hand laid on the chalice. Some priests coming from Rome bring the custom with them, but the Roman Rubricists like Baldeschi, Martinucci, Foppiano, &c., do not support or allude to any such practice.

D. O'LOAN.

THE CHURCH ABROAD.

HOW TO ADDRESS FOREIGN ECCLESIASTICS AND LAYMEN.

WE have been requested to explain in an early number of the RECORD the various forms in which letters are addressed to ecclesiastics and to some classes of the laity in the foreign countries with which we are brought more or less into communication. The curious mistakes which foreigners sometimes make when writing to people in this country are not unfrequently commented upon, and the foreign newspapers that speak of Lord Parnell and Lord Healy and Sir Gladstone, are said not to be worthy of imitation, at least in these apparently unimportant details.

In these matters, as in many others, fashion has a good deal to say, and the forms of courtesy which are always such excellent things in themselves, and which tend so much to elevate and dignify the intercourse of life, are only too often modified by change and by that tyrannical usage—

“*Quem penes arbitrium est et jus et norma loquendi.*”

The philosophy of change in such matters is not, we believe, very

deep or far to seek. One feature of it has been exquisitely touched by Manzoni in his *Promessi Sposi*. It is in one of the last conversations between the good and simple Agnese, and that very worldly-minded philosopher Don Abbondio, who takes such narrow-minded views of the duties of life, but yet who is not wholly devoid of a sort of circumscribed shrewdness which stands him in his narrow sphere.

“Benissimo,” disse Don Abbondio, “e io vi servirò; e voglio darne parte subito a sua Eminenza.”

“Chi è sua Eminenza?” demandò Agnese.” “Sua Eminenza,” rispose Don Abbondio “è il nostro signor Cardinale Arcivescovo, che Dio conservi.”

“Oh, in questo mi scusi,” replicò Agnese, “che sebbene io sia una povera ignorante, le posso certificare che non gli si dice così; perchè quando siamo state la seconda volta per parlargli, come parlo a lei, uno di quei signori preti mi tirò da parte e m’insegnò come si doveva trattare con quel signore e che gli si doveva dire ‘Vossignoria Illustrissima’ e ‘Monsignore.’”

“E adesso,” rispose anche Don Abbondio, “se vi dovesse tornare a insegnare, vi direbbe che gli va dato dell’ ‘Eminenza:’ perchè il Papa, che Dio lo conservi anche lui, ha prescritto, fin dal mese di giugno, che ai Cardinali si dia questo titolo. E sapete perchè sarà venuto a questo risoluzione? Perchè l’ ‘Illustrissimo’ che era per loro e per certi principi, adesso vedete anche voi, che cosa è diventato, a quanti si dà! E che volevate fare? Togliergli a tutti? Richiami, rancori, guai, dispetti e per soprappiù continuar come prima. Dunque il Papa ha trovato un buonissimo ripiego. A poco a poco poi si comincerà a dar dell’ eminenza ai vescovi: poi lo vorranno gli abati, poi i prevosti; perchè gli uomini son fatti così. Sempre vogliono andare innanzi, sempre innanzi; poi i canonici.”

“E i curati,” disse la vedova.

“No. No”—riprese Don Abbondio, “i curati a tirar la carreta del ‘reverendo’ fino ‘alla’ fine del mondo. Non abbiate paura che gli avvezino male i curati. Piuttosto non mi stupirei che i cavalieri i quali sono assuefatti a sentirsi dar dell’ illustrissimo, a esser trattati come i cardinali, un bel giorno volessero dell’ eminenza anche loro. E se la vogliono, vedete, troveranno chi gliene darà. E allora il Papo che si trovera allora, penserà qualche altra cosa pei cardinali.”

We shall commence now with the French, which, perhaps, we have most occasion to use, and which is best known besides even outside of France. We shall take in order the “super-scription” or outward address on the envelope, the address, “en

vedette" at the commencement of the letter, and the "subscription" or conclusion in its various forms.

The envelope or outward address of any ordinary gentlemen who has no particular position or title may be written as follows, for instance :—

Monsieur N——,
30 Rue St. Honoré,
Paris.

In former times it was customary to commence the address with the preposition *À*—*À Monsieur*. It is still placed before certain titles such as *À Sa Sainteté*, but it is now generally suppressed before *Monsieur*, *Madame* and *Mademoiselle*. Nor very long ago in France it was rigorous etiquette to double the *Monsieur*, *Madame* and *Mademoiselle*, and to write *Monsieur Monsieur*, &c. Most people now-a-days avoid the repetitions which seem to become more and more antiquated. Yet there remains a fair number of persons who, faithful to the old traditions of French politeness, stick to the customs of their early years and are not blamed by any one.

Taking the ecclesiastical hierarchy in order, when addressing a letter to a Cardinal we write, *e.g.* :—

A Son Eminence
Le Cardinal Langénieux,
Archévêque de Rheims,
Rheims,

Aisne.

To an Archbishop who is not a Cardinal we write, *e.g.* :—

A Sa Grandeur
Monseigneur Richard,
Archévêque de Paris,
Paris.

To a Bishop we write, *e.g.* :—

A Sa Grandeur
Monseigneur l'Evêque d'Orléans.
En son Palais Episcopal,
Orléans,
Loiret.

In the last mentioned case we might place in the second line the name of the Bishop, and proceed as in the case of the Archbishop and *vice-versa*.

The address to a Canon is as follows, *e.g.* :—

Monsieur l'Abbé Maynard,
Chanoine de Poitiers,
Poitiers.

If writing in the diocese in which the Canon lives, we should write :—

Monsieur le Chanoine Maynard,
Poitiers, &c.

A Vicar-General is addressed, *e.g.* :—

Monsieur l'Abbé Lagrange,
Vicaire Général d'Orléans,
Orléans.

The address to a Parish Priest is, *e.g.* :—

Monsieur l'Abbé N.,
Curé de Saint Goddard,
Rouen.

A Curate is addressed, *e.g.* :—

M. l'Abbé N.,
Vicaire à Saint Roch,
Paris.

A Superior of a Seminary is addressed, *e.g.* :—

Monsieur le Supérieur
du Grand Séminaire,
Bourges (Cher) .

A priest of a religious order is addressed "Au Révérend Père N., &c.

The Abbot of a Monastery is written to :—

Au Révérend Père N.,
Abbé du Monastère de N., &c.

In the case of the Laity a Cabinet Minister is written to, *e.g.* :—

A Son Excellence
Monsieur le Ministre de la Justice,
Paris.

Counts, Marquises, Viscounts, Barons are addressed "Monsieur le Comte," "Monsieur le Marquis," "Monsieur le Viscomte." "Monsieur le Baron," &c., as for instance :—

Monsieur le Comte de Mun,
Chateau de N., &c.

Merchants, traders, shopkeepers, when addressed on matters of business generally get the qualifications of their office, as for instance:—

Monsieur N.,
Négociant,
Rue du Bac, *or*
Monsieur Chertier,
Chasublier
Rue Férou.

The language of the French Bar has been seriously modified in modern times. The old respectable “Maitre” and “Messire” have passed away. Judges are written to:—

Monsieur N.,
President du Tribunal N., &c.
Counsellors are addressed, *e.g.*:—
Monsieur N.,
Avocat,
Paris.

And those universal gentlemen called “Notaires” who interfere so largely in the business life of poor official-trodden France, are addressed, *e.g.*:—

Monsieur N.,
Notaire,
Bourg. Ain.

This much, we imagine, is sufficient for the envelope address or superscription. We shall now turn to the second part of our task, viz, to give the forms employed at the opening or commencement of a letter, the words which are written “in view” or *en vedette* in the first line. The Holy Father himself is addressed, “Très Saint Père.” When *we* would employ the words, “May it please your Eminence” in addressing a Cardinal, the French use the simple word *Eminence*. This, however, is of late years falling into desuetude and the more deferential expression “Eminentissime Seigneur” is almost universally substituted for it. This latter expression is of Italian origin, and was introduced to France through the pulpit. Great preachers when speaking in presence of a Cardinal opened their discourses with the words, “Eminentissime Seigneur,” and thence they passed into epistolary use. The old form “Eminence” is still sometimes used. It is invariably used in conversation with a Cardinal when we address him directly; where in direct conversation we say “Your Eminence,” the French say simply “Eminence.” Of course when it is part of a phrase that follows they would then say, “Votre Eminence,” as *e.g.*,

“Your Eminence knows,” &c., “Votre Eminence sait,” &c. The Papal Nuncio is addressed “Excellence.” Archbishops and bishops and prelates of the Pope’s household are addressed “Monseigneur.” In the body of a letter addressed to an archbishop or to a bishop, when *we* use the words “Your Lordship” the French use the words “Votre Grandeur” there being no distinction in this respect between archbishops and bishops. In conversation the French say always “Monseigneur.” The title “Votre Grandeur” is not given to Domestic Prelates. Neither is it given to Mitred Abbots to whom we should say “Votre Révérence.” One Bishop writing to another with whom he is on intimate terms often uses the form, “Mon cher Seigneur.” We address a Vicar-General, “Monsieur le Vicaire Général.” Of course a bishop who knows him or an intimate colleague in the ministry might address him by his name, “Cher Monsieur N.” A Canon is addressed “Monsieur le Chanoine.” The Rector Magnificus of Louvain University should be addressed “Monsieur le Recteur,” and in the body of the letter “Votre Magnificence.” This would be the proper title of the rectors of Catholic Universities in France, but on account of their present position it is not used.

When writing to an aged and venerable ecclesiastic with whom we may be acquainted we might use the form “Monsieur et très Vénéré Père” or “Très Vénéré Monsieur.”

The Superior of a Seminary is addressed “Monsieur le Supérieur” and a Professor or (as they are generally called) a Director of a Seminary is addressed “Monsieur le Directeur.”

A Parish Priest is addressed “Monsieur le Curé,” or if a person is slightly intimate, “Cher Monsieur le Curé.” The Bishop or Vicar-General of the diocese can address him “Mon cher Curé.” A Curate is addressed “Monsieur le Vicaire.” Chaplains are addressed “Monsieur l’Aumônier,” or “M. le Chapelain” according to the institution in which they serve. Chaplains of Convents, Hospitals, and all charitable institutions of poor children, &c. are called “Monsieur l’Aumônier” and Chaplains of literary institutions, lyceums or even private families are for the most part termed “Chapelains.” Yet we not unfrequently hear of “l’aumônier du Lycée,” “L’aumônier du Chateau,” &c. When we do not know the title of an ecclesiastic, it is quite correct to write “Monsieur l’Abbé.” Indeed this is the title which is generally given to clerical professors, although of course it is by no means confined to them. All secular ecclesiastics who wear a soutane, even those who have not yet received the tonsure may be addressed, “Monsieur l’Abbé.” It

is not only quite polite, but has an air of distinction when used by well-bred persons who have a true idea of the respect due to the priestly character, whereas persons who have little reverence for the clergy often use it and even pronounce it in a manner that conveys something excessively trivial and worthless.

The ordinary form of addressing a layman, corresponding to our "Sir," and "Dear Sir," is "Monsieur," "Cher Monsieur." In olden times the King of France not being able to confer titles upon all his subjects, but at the same time, anxious to show the great respect which he entertained for each individual citizen, made a rule that his own eldest son should be called "Monsieur," and his eldest daughter "Madame." Hence we have in Paris in the old Latin quarter the "Rue de Monsieur," and the "Rue de Madame." Since that time it has been always deemed perfectly polite to address any gentleman who has no special title, or of whose special title we are ignorant, by the simple title, "Monsieur." When people have special titles, however, they should be given, as, for instance, when writing to a Minister of State, he should be addressed, "Monsieur le Ministre," and spoken of in the course of the letter, as "Votre Excellence." Dukes, Counts, Marquises, Viscounts, Barons, are addressed, "Monsieur le Duc," "Monsieur le Conte," "Monsieur le Marquis," "Monsieur le Baron," &c. In conversation it would not, however, be necessary to repeat "Monsieur le Duc," or "Monsieur le Marquis," at every moment. "Monsieur" used in the polished sense above given to it is quite polite provided the full title be repeated from time to time. People who are intimate often write, "Monsieur et Cher Ami." The editor of a newspaper is addressed, "Monsieur le Rédacteur." Some distinguished laymen who have made great names for themselves either in the political world or in the world of literature, art or science might get some very special qualifications before the word "Monsieur." For instance, it would be quite proper, especially when writing from a foreign country, to address such men as the late Monsieur Louis Veillot, of the *Univers* or the present distinguished Catholic leader, M. Chesnelong, or M. Jules Simon, as "Illustre Monsieur," or "Très illustre Monsieur." It is also becoming the usage to address gentlemen who have acquired a certain reputation not quite so great, but still much above the ordinary, as "Très Honoré Monsieur." When writing to a Prefect of a department, we say, "Monsieur le Préfet." Unlike the German usage, however, his wife is not "Madame la Préfète," which is regarded as a vulgarity in France. Unmarried ladies, whatever be their rank,

are always addressed simply, "Mademoiselle," unless they belong to a family of a prince, when they are addressed, "Madame." A member of the Upper House of Parliament is addressed, "Monsieur le Sénateur," and a member of the Lower House, "Monsieur le Député." Physicians and surgeons are, "Monsieur le Docteur." This title is never given to persons who have taken their degree in theology or philosophy.

We shall now finally add a few indications regarding the conclusions of the letter. In the epistolary communications of ancient Greece and Rome, this was exceedingly simple; in Greek, "χαίρε," and in Latin, "Vale." Modern civilisation has introduced more elaborate endings. During the great revolution in France an effort was made to do away with the expressions of regard with which letters are now usually concluded, and to substitute for them the short compliments of "Salut et Fraternité." Fortunately they were no more successful in that attempt than in the more recent one of making "Citoyen" take the place of "Monsieur."

The most polite form of ending a letter is to offer one's "sentiments de considération," or "de haute considération," or "de parfaite considération," or "de considération distinguée," or, finally, "de haute et respectueuse considération."

It must be remembered, however, that the use of these expressions is confined to certain well-defined circumstances. The words "considération" and "estime" mean much the same thing in French, (the latter word corresponds entirely to our word "esteem.") Yet "considération" implies something much more noble, more elevated, and more distinguished. Hence it supposes in the person to whom it is addressed a rather elevated position in society, and on the part of the person who uses it that he should be at least the equal in position of the person to whom he addresses it. It is generally addressed in the ecclesiastical world to Bishops, Vicars-General, Canons, and Parish Priests of important parishes by their equals in the hierarchy. The inferior of a Bishop and *a fortiori* of an Archbishop or a Cardinal would, therefore, write not "considération" but "profond respect," *e.g.* :—

"Permettez moi de vous offrir, Monseigneur, l'hommage du profond respect avec lequel,

"Je suis,

De Votre Grandeur,

Le très humble serviteur," &c.

In the former case the termination would be, *e.g.* :—

“ Je vous prie de recevoir, Monsieur, l'assurance de la parfaite considération avec lequel,

“ Je suis

Votre très humble et dévoué serviteur,” &c.

We should not forget to mention that the word “ Daignez ” is most suitable in the conclusion of a letter to a Bishop, an Archbishop, and a Cardinal, *e.g.* :—

“ Daignez recevoir, Eminentissime Seigneur, l'hommage du profond respect avec lequel j'ai l'honneur d'être,

“ de Votre Eminence,

le très-humble et très-obéissant serviteur.”

To an Archdeacon, a Vicar-General, a Dean, or a Parish Priest, a proper form might be :—

“ Veuillez recevoir les sentiments de respectueux dévouement avec lesquels je suis,

“ Monsieur l'Archidiacre, &c.,

Votre très humble serviteur,” &c.

Persons who are intimate and who are in habitual correspondence often write simply “ tout-à-vous,” with the signature. The expression “ agréez l'assurance,” &c., used to be very frequent, but the word “ agréez ” is commencing to sound rather vulgar, and to be confined almost exclusively to business people. When writing on matters of business to shopkeepers, traders, &c., the French often use the form “ Recevez, Monsieur, mes salutations empressées ; ” or if we wish to make it still more polite, “ Recevez, Monsieur l'expression des sentiments d'estime avec lesquels je suis,” &c. Another modification would be “ haute estime,” or “ sincère estime.” When writing to persons we wish to oblige we could say, “ Croyez, Monsieur, à l'entier dévouement avec lequel je suis,

“ Tout-a-vous,” &c.

Other qualifications of “ dévouement ” might be “ respectueux,” “ affectueux,” “ cordial.”

Of course the relative position and degree of intimacy of the correspondents might modify the conclusions almost indefinitely. We have given the principal ones which come into most general use. In a future number of the RECORD we shall endeavour to give the corresponding forms in German and Italian. Indeed, we feel that we owe an apology for obtruding these details upon the readers of the

RECORD. We should not have thought of doing this ourselves, but as we stated at the outset, we were requested to do so by an eminent Irish prelate who, though fully conversant with these various languages, yet humbly confesses that even he is sometimes at a loss for the proper form to use. We trust that this may save us from the imputations of "bad taste," which might justly be cast upon us if we were to volunteer to anybody information of the kind.

J. F. HOGAN.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE ECONOMIC DOCTRINE OF MR. HENRY GEORGE.

SIR—I rejoice to find Mr. Henry George's doctrine discussed in your pages. Nothing can well be more interesting and important than the doctrine itself, and the man is inspiring so much enthusiasm in New York that he may possibly be elected Secretary of State before the year is out. It seems unwise, therefore, that there should be such profound silence here about the man himself and his teaching. The mere papers of news, the Irish National organs, and the religious journals, are alike empty of either criticism or information. Let thanks then be given to you, Sir, and to "Economist."

But, would not your contributor have done better to begin at the beginning. He makes our mouths water for all those millions of revenue, and yet has nothing to say about the lawfulness of the system which would give them to us. Ought he not first to examine principles, and then come to practice and details? Let him attack those two propositions named in the end of his interesting letter. His views about the second of them I should be very eager to study. Does the land of a country belong in his opinion to the angels? Or to the *pecora campi*?

If we do leave, like "Economist," the consideration of what may be philosophically true, or theologically lawful, for the consideration of what may be politically prudent, I am sure most people would be of opinion that it would not be expedient to make the National Government the direct administrator or "agent" of the land of the

country. I think Mr. George does not use the word "nationalization" throughout the whole book, *Progress and Poverty*. I am sure that his proposal in the region of practical politics is the "single tax" system, that is to say, a tax on land values (not on land, which would be different). And the word "parochialization" or "baronialization" would better express his meaning than "nationalization." This is worthy of special note by "Economist," who will perceive that the present enormous expenses of tax gathering would be done away with by the single tax system. Of course the revenue from customs and excise would be needless. Lastly, if I may say it without seeming very wild, I would ask "Economist" not to take it for granted, either that there is an obligation to pay off what is called the National debt, or that those who now live on it would need to continue to live on it in more prosperous times.

A PRIEST IN ENGLAND.

DOCUMENTS.

DECREE OF THE S. CONGREGATION OF INDULGENCES ON VARIOUS POINTS RELATING TO THE BLESSING OF SCAPULARS AND THE INDULGENCES AND PRIVILEGES OF SCAPULAR CONFRATERNITIES.

SUMMARY.

1. The making of the sign of the cross and the sprinkling with holy water will not suffice for the blessing of scapulars. The prescribed form must be used.

2. For admission into the Scapular Confraternities a form of words must be used.

3. For admission into the Confraternities it is enough if the conditions of initiation are substantially observed.

4. When one is enrolled in different scapulars on the same occasion a separate blessing and form of admission are required for each scapular, unless the priest has a special indult permitting him to use a common form for all scapulars.

In all cases each scapular must be composed of two pieces of cloth, hanging, one on the breast, the other between the shoulders.

It will not suffice to have different scapulars sewed to the front of one and the same piece of cloth. The string, however, may be common to all.

5. Persons receiving and wearing the blue or red scapular do not form Confraternities.

6. Members of the Confraternities of the Holy Trinity, Mount Carmel, and Seven Dolours do not gain by a visit to the confraternity church all the indulgences attached to a visit to the church of the religious Order to which the scapular belongs.

7. This is illustrated by reference to the devotions of the Forty Hours, Masses, Offices, Preaching, &c.

8. In places where there is no church of the Order or Confraternity, a member may gain by a visit to the parochial church the indulgences attached to a visit to a church of the Order or Confraternity.

9. A priest who has received faculties to receive persons into the Confraternity of the Holy Trinity can communicate all the privileges especially in places where there is no church of the Order or Confraternity.

10. This decision also applies to the Calced and Discalced Carmelites in reference to the Confraternity of Mount Carmel.

11. The Plenary Indulgence to be gained on one Wednesday each month by members visiting a church of the Carmelites in the way laid down by Benedict XIII. in his Brief "*Alias pro parte*" is authentic.

12. The Plenary Indulgence granted by Popes Honorius III. and Nicholas IV. can be gained only once a year, as decided by S. Cong. on the 15th March, 1852.

13. Any approved confessor can, in the absence of the director of the Confraternity, give the General Absolution to members of the Confraternity of Mount Carmel *in articulo mortis*.

DECRETUM S. INDULGENTIRUM CONGREGATIONIS.

Die 27 Aprilis 1887.

Postquam Romani Pontifices benigne indulserunt ut sacerdotes tum saeculares tum regulares facultate potirentur simul benedicendi imponendique quinque Scapularia nempe SSmae Trinitatis, B. Mariae Virginis de Monte Carmelo, Immaculatae Conceptionis et septem Dolorum ejusdem B. Mariae Virginis, nec non rubrum Passionis D. N. J. C., nonnullae exortae sunt quaestiones et difficultates circa modum supradictae facultatis exercendae. His accesserunt dubia

nonnulla quae respiciunt communicationem ecclesiis Confraternitatum SSmae Trinitatis, B. Mariae Virginis de Monte Carmelo, ac septem Dolorum omnium Indulgentiarum, quae ecclesiis Ordinum ejusdem nominis sunt adnexae, nec non commutationem visitationis ecclesiae eorundem Ordinum, sive Confraternitatum, ubi ea desit, in visitationem ecclesiae parochialis. Alia demum sunt proposita dubia, quae agunt de reciproca communicatione Indulgentiarum et Privilegiorum Confraternitatum SSmae Trinitatis, et B. Mariae Virginis de Monte Carmelo sive a Fratribus Calceatis, sive Excalceatis utriusque Ordinis erectarum; ac in specie de Indulgentiis visitantibus ecclesias Ordinis Carmelitici, aliquibus anni diebus concessis, et de generali absolutione in mortis articulo impertienda confratribus et consororibus s. scapularis Carmelitarum.

Quae omnia Fr. Pius Seerburg Ordinis Capuccinorum concionator in Conventu Monasteriensi Provinciae Rhenano-Vestphalicae suorum confratrum nomine, qui sacris Missionibus operam impendunt, sequentibus dubiis huic S. Congregationi Indulgentiarum et SS. Reliquiarum propositis complexus est :

I^m. An ad validitatem benedictionis sufficiat signum Crucis manu efformatum super scapulare absque ulla verborum pronuntiatione, et aquae benedictae aspersione ?

II^m. An receptio in confratrem valeat, si fiat simplici intentione concepta animo, ac verbis nullis adhibitis ?

III^m. An declaratio s. Congregationis de servandis substantialibus in adscriptione fidelium Confraternitati B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo debeat etiam, atque eodem sensu, intelligi quoad cetera scapularia ?

IV^m. An pro induendo fideles quinque scapularibus, totidem etiam benedictiones, impositiones ac receptiones requirantur, vel unica tantum, et quae sufficiat ?

V^m. An suscipientes et gestantes scapulare caeruleum B. M. V. Immaculatae, aut rubrum Passionis D. N. J. C. Confraternitates constituent ?

VI^m. An in ecclesiis Confraternitatum SSmae Trinitatis, B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo ac septem Dolorum acquiri valeant omnes Indulgentiae, quas lucrantur fideles visitando ecclesias Ordinum respectivorum ?

Et quatenus affirmative :

VII^m. An communicatio istiusmodi valeat etiam quoad certas devotiones in ecclesiis Ordinum haberi solitas, uti orationem 40 horarum, missas, officia divina, litanias, Dei verbi praedicationem, etc., quando quis iisdem devotionibus intersit in ecclesia respectivarum Confraternitatum ?

VIII^m. An in locis, ubi nulla adest ecclesia neque Ordinis neque Confraternitatis SSmae Trinitatis, aut B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo vel a septem Doloribus, fideles qui sunt adscripti Confraternitati SSmae Trinitatis erectae etiam a Fratribus calceatis, vel Confraternitati B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo, aut septem Dolorum, acquirere respective possint omnes Indulgentias adnexas dictarum ecclesiarum visitationi visitando ecclesiam parochialem?

IX^m. An sacerdos, qui facultatem obtinuit a Fratribus Calceatis recipiendi fideles in Confraternitatem SSmae Trinitatis, valeat communicare praeter Indulgentias, quae reperiuntur in Summario approbato pro Confraternitatibus erectis a Fratribus calceatis, etiam eas, a praedictis diversas quae reperiuntur in summario approbato pro Confraternitatibus erectis a Fratribus Discalceatis, ac vice versa, in locis praesertim ubi proprii Ordinis, aut Confraternitatis ecclesia non existit?

X^m. An idem sit constituendum de gratiis et Indulgentiis, quae sunt concessae Confraternitatibus erectis a Fratribus Calceatis aut Discalceatis Ordinis B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo?

XI^m. An constet de authenticitate Indulgentiae Plenariae quae concessa fertur pro unaquaque feria quarta cujusque anni hebdomadae christifidelibus visitantibus ecclesiam Ordinis B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo?

XII^m. An constet de authenticitate Indulgentiae Plenariae, quae traditur concessa ab Honorio III. et Nicolao IV. pro unaquaque anni die, in qua visitetur ecclesia Ordinis praedicti?

XIII^m. An omnibus confessariis ab Ordinario approbatis indulta sit facultas impertiendi Absolutionem generalem confratribus et consoribus B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo in articulo mortis constitutis, quoties deficiat sacerdos potestate praeditus munia directoris Confraternitatis exercendi?

Emi et Rmi Patres in Congregatione generali habita in Palatio Apostolico Vaticano die 25 Martii 1887 rescripserunt?

Ad I^m. Negative, sed benedictio danda est juxta formulam praescriptam, ad normam Decreti 18 Augusti 1868.

Ad II^m. Negative.

Ad III^m. Affirmative.

Ad IV^m. Affirmative ad 1^{am} partem: Negative ad 2^{am}, nisi ex speciali Indulto S. Sedis, et ea formula, quae in eodem conceditur, et ad mentem. Mens est, ut qui sacerdotes utuntur Indulto Apostolico induendi christifideles quinque scapularibus non benedicant scapularia, nisi ea sint distincta, id est vere quinque scapularia, sive totidem sive

duobus tantum funiculis unita, et ita ut cujuslibet scapularis pars una ab humeris, alia vero a pectore pendeat, non vero unum tantum scapulare in quo assuantur diversi coloris panniculi, prout ab hac s. Congregatione jam cautum est.

Ad V^m. Negative.

Ad VI^m. Negative.

Ad VII^m. Negative.

Ad VIII^m. Affirmative ex Brevi Pii Papae IX. 30 Januarii 1858 pro Confraternitate SSmae Trinitatis, et ex Brevi ejusdem Pontificis 45 Januarii 1855 pro Confraternitate B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo; et supplicandum SSmo pro extensione indulti ad Confraternitatem B. M. V. a septem Doloribus.

Ad IX^m. Affirmative, facto verbo cum SSmo.

Ad X^m. Affirmative.

XI^m. Ex deductis non constare nisi de Indulgentia Plenaria in una ex quartis feriis cujuslibet mensis et juxta modum expressum in Brevi Benedicti XIII "Alias pro parte" 4 Martii 1727.

Ad XII^m. Negative, sed Indulgentia plenaria in casu ita intelligenda est, ut semel in anno tantum ab unoquoque christifideli acquiri possit, sicut in una Maceraten. 15 Martii 1852 Confraternitatis SSmae Trinitatis.

Ad XIII^m. Affirmative.

Facto vero de iis omnibus relatione in audientia habita ab infrascripto Secretario die 27 Aprilis 1887, Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Leo Papa XIII responsiones Patrum Cardinalium approbavit, et ad dubium VIII benigne annuit pro petita Indulti extensione, quo in locis ubi nulla adest Ecclesia neque Ordinis Servorum B. Mariae Virginis, neque Confraternitatis septem Dolorum, qui sunt eidem Confraternitati adscripti, acquirere valeant omnes Indulgentias dicti Ordinis ecclesiis adnexas, visitando respectivam parochialem ecclesiam.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria ejusdem S. Congregationis die 27 Aprilis 1887.

Fr. THOMAS M. Card. ZIGLIARA, *Praef.*

ALEXANDER Episcopus Oensis, *Secret.*

DECREE OF THE CONGREGATION OF RITES REGARDING THE
ALTAR OF EXPOSITION ON HOLY THURSDAY.

SUMMARY.

1. The Altar of Exposition used on Holy Thursday is representative not of the burial of our Divine Lord, but of the institution of the Blessed Eucharist.

2. When the word "Sepulchre" is found in the decrees of the Congregation of Rites applied to this altar, the Congregation merely adopts the common description of the altar, and does not intend to convey that it represents the burial of our Lord.

3. It is not allowable to furnish the altar with emblems of mourning or memorials of the burial of Christ.

DECRETUM S. RITuum CONGREGATIONIS SUPER ALTARI EXPOSITIONIS
IN FERIA V. MAJORIS HEBDOMADÆ.

RÓMANA.

Academia Liturgica Romana, in altero ex suis conventibus pertractavit quaestionem "an Altare in quo Feria V. in Coena Domini augustissimum Eucharistiae Sacramentum publicae Fidelium adorationi exponitur, quod vulgo *Sepulcrum* nominatur, dici possit et haberi tamquam Christi sepulcrum representans." Academiae Censores, perpensis quae ad rem habentur in Caeremoniali Episcoporum, Missali Romano et in Decretis editis a Sacrorum Rituum Congregatione, unanimi voto censuerunt ejusmodi Altare habendum et esse revera representativum, non sepulturae Domini, sed institutionis augustissimi Sacramenti.

Placuit vero hanc sententiam iudicio Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis subijcere, ac simul ab ea edoceri quid sentiendum sit de certo modo exornandi praedictum Altare, qui in aliquibus locis in usu est. Quamobrem praefatae Academiae Moderator, suo atque Academicorum nomine, Sacrae Congregationi humillime sequentes proposuit quaestiones :

1°. "An Altare in quo Feria V. majoris hebdomadae publicae adorationi exponitur augustissimum Sacramentum, licet in capsula reconditum, sit representativum sepulturae Domini, an potius institutionis ejusdem augustissimi Sacramenti?"

2°. "An quoties Decreta Sacrae Rituum Congregationis nominantur *sepulcrum* vel locum *sepulcri* idem Altare, designaverint illud esse repraesentativum Dominicæ sepulturae, an potius vulgari tantum denominatione uti voluerint?"

3°. "An praeter lumina et flores, liceat ad exornandum praedictum Altare adhibere Crucem cum panno funereo, vel Christi demortui effigiem, vel scenicas decorationes, statuas, nempe Beatae Virginitis, Sancti Joannis Evangelistae, Sanctae Mariae Magdalenae et militum custodum, picturas, arbores aliaque ejusmodi?"

Sacra vero Congregatio ad relationem infrascripti Secretarii,

rebus mature perpensis, et inhaerendo Decretis jam alias editis in **Lauden.** die 22 Januarii 1662; in **Alben.** die 8 Augusti anni 1835; in **Narnien.** die 7 Decembris anni 1844; et **Salten.** die 26 Septembris anni 1868; et consideratis quae deducta fuerunt ab altero ex Caeremoniarum Apostolicarum Magistris in **Salten.** respondendum censuit:

Ad. I. *Negative ad primam partem: Affirmative ad secundam.*

Ad. II. *Negative ad primam partem: Affirmative ad secundam.*

Ad. III. *Negative, et flores non disponendos esse, ac si Altare esset in viridario.* Atque ita declaravit et servari mandavit.

Die 14 Maii 1887.

D. Cardinalis BARTOLINIUS, S.R.C. Praefectus.

LAURENTIUS SALVATI, S.R.C. Secretarius.

S. CONGREGATION OF THE COUNCIL REGARDING THE OBLIGATION OF A PARISH PRIEST TO OFFER MASS FOR HIS SEPARATE PARISHES.

SUMMARY.

The parish priest charged with the pastoral care of two distinct parishes is bound to say Mass for each parish on the suppressed holidays, unless he is legitimately dispensed from the obligation.

NIVERNEN. MISSÆ PRO POPULO.

Die 5 Martii, 1887.

Sess. 23, cap. I. de Reform.

Compendium facti. Episcopus Nivernensis sacratissimo Principi exposuit: "in sua dioecesi plures adesse parochos, quibus, ob sacerdotum penuriam, duplicis parociae cura incumbit; atque a longo jam tempore, sive ob legis ignorantiam, aut oblivionem, sive potissimum, recentioribus hisce annis, ob redditus omnino insufficientes secundae parociae, cujus cura pergrave onus sine proportionato beneficio secum fert, invaluisse morem non celebrandi missam pro populo hujus secundae parociae diebus festis in Gallia jam suppressis."

"Ideoque rogavit, I. An data vera indigentia parochorum suae dioecesis, in supra enunciatis casibus, lex canonica de applicatione missae secundae parociae diebus festis in Gallia suppressis urgeri debeat, vel potius usus contrarius tolerari possit."

2. "In casu, quo talis usus aboleri deberet. Episcopus orator a

Sanctitate Sua indultum imploravit apostolicum, virtute cujus facultas ipsi concedatur, nomine Sanctae Sedis, pronuntiandi absolutionem et condonationem super talibus omissionibus."

DUBIUM.

An rectores duarum parocciarum in diebus festis suppressis possint a celebranda missa pro populo favore alterius parocciae dispensari, et a praeteritis omissionibus absolvi in casu.

Resolutio. Sacra C. C. re cognita sub die 5 Martii, 1887, censuit respondere: "Praevia absolutione quoad praeteritum, pro gratia dispensationis quoad futurum ad quinquennium, facto verbo cum SSmo." S. C. C.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

COMPENDIUM THEOLOGIAE MORALIS. Redactum a Fr. Gabriele De Varceno, Two vols. Editio Octava. Augustae Taurinorum, A.D. 1887.

That Fr. Varceno's *Compendium*, should, in about adozen years pass through eight successive editions is we think a very high testimony to its merit. He proposes to give a systematical summary of the moral teachings of Thomas En Charmes, Scavini and Gury, and whenever these writers disagree he professes to adopt the view that seems to him most in harmony with the teaching of St. Alphonsus Liguori. To this design we think Fr. Varceno has faithfully adhered. And the result is, that while his *Compendium* cannot be said to contain anything that is new to ordinary theological students, it puts forward clearly, simply, and systematically, a very sound, and practically safe, and reliable course of Moral Theology. Fr. Varceno's reasons are necessarily brief, but they are always clear, and generally satisfactory. We notice that in the treatise on the *Obligations of States*, Fr. Varceno deals at considerable length with those points that have special reference to the Religious Orders. This is explained by the fact that he is himself a Capuchin, and Professor of Theology in his own order, and that, moreover, his work is primarily intended for his own students. This feature of the work renders it specially useful to members of religious communities, and will we think

recommend it, also, to such secular priests, as are, in the exercise of their ministry, brought into contact with religious. The author is also connected with several Roman Congregations; and with the skill of an expert he embodies the most recent Roman decrees into his work. But the Censure Treatise is, we believe, far and away, the best part of Fr. Varceno's *Compendium*. In treating of censures *in specie*, he takes up section after section of the *Apostolicae Sedis*, and gives, what we believe to be, an excellent commentary on its text. There is no mistaking his opinions, so clearly does he state them, and he quotes, as he proceeds, the very best theologians as bearing out his conclusions. Here we think he has been eminently successful, and the book would be more than worth its price, and would richly repay perusal for this part alone. J. M.

THE LIFE OF ST. CUTHBERT. By the Venerable Bede. Translated from the Original Latin, by the Rev. Joseph Stevenson, S.J.; under the direction of the late Right Rev. John William Bewick, Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle. London: Burns & Oates (Limited). New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. 1887.

This *Life* is divided into forty-six chapters; each chapter relates some incident in the saint's career, beginning with his youth, and continued till the end of his life; and though some of the events related appear within the ordinary operation of the natural law, as we read on to the end we feel that a specially supernatural influence overshadowed the great saint from early youth till death. The *Life* concludes with an account of a few miracles, properly so called, which were performed through the intervention of the saint in his dying moments and after death.

Every thing that appeals to the best affections, and found in the other costlier and more voluminous *Lives*, is found in this; for all subsequent *Lives* are substantially only an enlargement of the body of facts recorded by Venerable Bede.

This priceless little volume, the subject of our notice, does not of course, as being written by a contemporary of St. Cuthbert, allude to the wanderings of his body, nor to its far-reaching influence in the creation of cities and sees through the north of England; but as a *Life* of the saint it is unsurpassed. The material finish of the little volume is as faultless as the literary.

Our gifted author, in dealing with the superstitious practices to which the newly converted resorted in order to stave off death, uses

amulet as a translation for *alligaturas*, and says that this in a corresponding passage of Bede's History is equivalent to *phylacteries*. It occurs to me that *ligature* would more accurately give the meaning than *amulet*, which generally implies suspension rather than *ligature*. Besides, if, as there is reason to think, *phylacteries* during the Middle Ages had the same material as those in the days of the Gospel Pharisees—a piece of parchment on which some characters were written—this was not essential to a *ligature*. For this may have been made of grass or cloth. Thus some old canons forbade: “*Ligaturam in herbas vel quolibet ingenio malo incantaverit et super Christianum ligaverit;*” again, “*filecteria diabolica vel erbus vel sacino (saccum) suis vel sibi impendere;*” and once again, “*praecantationibus sive in characteribus, vel in quibus-cunque rebus suspendis atque ligandis.*”¹

We may be hypercritical, but if so it is because of the faultlessness of the valuable *Life of St. Cuthbert*, for which we predict many a new edition before the next century. S. M.

THEOLOGIA MORALIS. Auctore Augustino Lehmkuhl, S. J.
Vol. 1. Editio 4^{ta}, ab auctore recognita. Freiburg:
B. Herder.

The fourth edition of the first volume of Fr. Lehmkuhl's excellent *Moral Theology* is now for some months in the hands of clerical readers. We welcome its appearance with a feeling of keen satisfaction. That four issues from the press of a work so full on modern questions and points of acknowledged difficulty, so scholarly and scientific throughout should be called for within a period numbering fewer years, speaks highly for the earnestness with which the study of Moral Theology is being pursued as well as for the manifest merits of Fr. Lehmkuhl's Text-book. The changes in this edition on details are judicious and pretty numerous. We trust the author will at some future time expand one or two treatises that are at present somewhat too condensed. When his method has become familiar we are confident he will be a universal favourite with students of the “*ars artium.*” Fr. Lehmkuhl's work is a marked advance on previous class-books.

MEMOIR OF FATHER FELIX JOSEPH BARBELIN.
By Eleanor C. Donnelly.

More than once before now we had the pleasure of commending to the public a work from the ready pen of this gifted writer. Every fresh effort seems to distance its predecessors in grace and usefulness.

¹ Wasserscheleben, *Die Bussordnungen der abendlandischen Kirche* pp. 240, 394, 545.

The "Life of Father Barbelin" must prove a choice literary event to the reader. He will follow its course with the feeling of intense interest that is generally associated with reading a work of clever fiction. Yet from first to last it is a description of a priest's ministry among his people! But his pastoral visits were discharged in the spirit of an apostle, and both time and place enhance the narrative. Fr. Barbelin came to Philadelphia when our holy religion could not show its head in public without provoking ignorant riot. He lived to see the city studded with the stately forms of almost numberless Catholic institutions. In this grand transformation he added a part of saintly heroism. It is therefore fortunate that the work of describing his life and labours has fallen into such eminent hands.

P. O'D.

WHERE WAS ST. PATRICK BORN? By Rev. Sylvester Malone, M.R.I.A. *Dublin Review*, October, 1887.

This is a remarkable essay. It contains a notable discovery as to the meaning of the famous word, *Beneventaberniæ*, by which St. Patrick describes in his *Confessions* the town where lived his father, Calpurnius, the site of *Beneventaberniæ* has been, however, a subject of learned discussion among Patrician writers up to the present. As we have no doubt that this essay will have an important bearing on this controversy in future, we shall summarize its most salient points for the benefit of the readers of the I. E. RECORD.

To appreciate fully the scope and contents of the article, it is useful to bear in mind that the writers of the Lives of our National Saint aimed at harmonizing them with the "Confession" of the Saint. In this the Saint states that his father dwelt in *Beneventaberniæ*, where he was made captive. Many of the Lives and their scholiasts explain these words by "the plain of tents or encampments," while the biographers of the present century see in them, besides the encampments, a reference to some "river's mouth." The ancients and moderns have substantially accepted the division of the words in the Confession into Bonevem or Benevem Taberniæ. The first article in the *Dublin Review* undertook to show that the statements and hints in the old Lives were not consistent with France or Scotland being the Saint's birth-place, but England or Wales, and that, besides, their rendering of the Saint's words in the Confession were not consistent with a translation from either the Irish, British, or Latin language. The present article complements the former by showing that the condition of society of Kilpatrick, claimed as the Saint's

birth-place by ancients and moderns was inconsistent with the oldest Lives, and the statement in the Confession. Furthermore, and in this its absorbing interest lies, the article insists that the reading in the *Book of Armagh* and its rendering by the biographers are faulty, and maintains that the words in the Confession should be read as *Beneventa Burrii* or *Burria* which means the town of Usk in Wales.

Various instances of a wrong division of syllables occur in the *Book of Armagh*. Thus, two brothers who met in combat are represented as burying their "wood of contention in *terra more campi*," instead of *terram ore campi*. And the Bollandists' Life of our Saint exhibits a deeper corruption than *Tabernæ* in the words *thabur indecha*. The article goes to show that *ha* in the last word was faintly separated from the next word which appears as *ut* instead of *haut* in the phrase *haut procul a mari nostro*. The article suggests how it happened that the scholiast and old Lives were quoted in favour of Alclyde; but whether their authority was fairly or otherwise quoted it should weigh only as dust in the balance against the testimony of the Saint himself. The article sums up by showing on the one hand that violence is offered to the historical context, and to the reading and rendering of the words found in the Confession to support the theory of a Scottish birth-place. On the other hand, it is contended that text and context necessitate the adoption of Usk, or rather Caerleon on the Usk, and that there are focussed the statements and hints in the Lives—the tower in which he was born, the Roman encampments, the not far-distant Irish sea, the proximity of the Senate house, the presence of a well organized Catholic Church, and the fabled abode of giants.

SERMONS FROM THE FLEMISH. Translated by a Catholic Priest.

We wish once more to draw the attention of the clergy to these excellent sermons. The first series—"The Sundays of the Year"—is now complete in seven volumes. They contain a mine of spiritual wealth, and are admirable in clearness of treatment, solidity of instruction, and practical suitability to the wants of every age and rank.

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

DECEMBER, 1887.

POPULAR SPEAKING AND PREACHING.

“Pronunciatio est vocis et vultus et gestus moderatio cum venustate.”—*Tull.*

A WELL-KNOWN writer once conceived the strange conceit of dividing the entire human species into two groups—those who can play the fiddle, and those who cannot play the fiddle. Perhaps, with greater reason we might divide mankind into those who live chiefly by reason, and those who live chiefly by sense. The latter will be found to be in the overwhelming majority, and to represent over ninety-nine per cent. of the whole race. In most persons the purely intellectual powers are not nearly so fully developed as the more animal powers of feeling and emotion. And though it is often imagined by the unreflecting portion of mankind that both they and the multitude generally are influenced and moved by reason rather than by sentiment, yet nothing could really be further from the truth. Man, for the first seven years of his life, is entirely directed and controlled by feeling, and is so little under the dominion of reason that he is not even held responsible for his actions by either the civil or the moral law. It is only when he advances beyond this age that reason slowly dawns, and he begins to weigh and judge for himself. But feeling is still dominant, and an appeal to motives of pain and pleasure is found more efficacious in enforcing obedience than any appeal to pure reason. And this natural propensity to follow one's emotions rather than one's sober judgment remains in most persons, not merely when reason has developed, but even unto old age and decrepitude. Hence to be successful, popular, and impressive,

as an orator, preacher, or writer, and to obtain a power over the masses, it is far more necessary to be able to put things graphically and vividly, than logically and tersely. To attract attention by a brilliant style, to amuse them by strange conceits of oratory, to excite their curiosity by lucid yet unfamiliar metaphors, and to win their good will by the thousand arts of a practised rhetorician, is a far more effective way of gaining the suffrage of a mixed audience than to lay down the truth according to the most rigid laws of logic and good sense.

The fact is that men yield far more readily to their feelings than to their convictions. To follow reason often needs an effort, and a hard struggle with the most rooted inclinations of the heart. But to follow feeling is the natural instinct of man, and the spontaneous impulse of every creature. Who, therefore, succeeds in enlisting the feelings on his side, will carry the bulk of the people with him, and be the champion of the hour, far more certainly than the most skilful dialectician that ever lived, unless he can work on the feelings also. Let us exemplify this truth from real life. Is it not a fact that ninety-nine persons out of a hundred will bestow an alms far more readily on a poor starving man who meets them in the street and turns his piteous eyes upon them, than upon an individual twice as wretched and impoverished whose want and hunger are merely attested by another? Yet this is not according to reason. On the contrary, reason would suggest that the poorer man should be the recipient of the gift rather than the less poor; but solely because the latter has not been able to appeal so forcibly to feeling, the alms is bestowed upon the beggar whose misery is witnessed rather than upon the beggar who in reality has most need of it. This truth is so well recognised that a practised pleader will do his utmost to make up for such deficiency by the most graphic and harrowing description of the absent sufferer whose cause he wishes to espouse. He will describe in glowing language and in the most minute detail the horrors of hunger. He will depict the look of despair on the sufferer's blanched face; the scraggy and emaciated limbs, the eyes bulging out of

their sockets, the tongue dry, parched, and protruding, the sense of abandonment and hopeless fear at the approach of an agonizing death. To bring out the misery of the situation into still greater relief, and to fill his audience with feelings of greater commiseration, he will go on to contrast the penury and destitution of this unhappy sufferer, with the opulence, the comforts, and the luxuries that are enjoyed by so many thousands of this world's favourites. Nor will he stop here. He will seek to arouse feeling still more deeply by a fervent appeal to parental instincts. "What would be your feelings," he will ask, "if such a man were a son of yours." He will entreat his hearers to put themselves in the situation of a mother or a father witnessing the sufferings of a son. Nor will it satisfy him that it should be a son—it must be more—it must be an only son, a beloved child, a favoured one. Thus period after period will flow on, each one stirring and exciting more and more deeply the emotions of the audience, till at last they will pour out their feelings in generous donations. Yet, observe, in all this there has been little appeal to reason. The whole force of the charge has been directed against the citadel of the heart, and it has been taken by assault with the happiest of results. Indeed, the masses care very little about closely reasoned discourses. If the preacher touches on the deeper mysteries of life, or seeks to reason out the foundations of Christianity, few of his hearers will be able to follow him, or to feel any interest in what to them is so much learned nonsense. If a man be popular, if he can manage to win the favour and enthusiastic admiration of an audience, he need not trouble much about his arguments. Indeed, he will hardly be believed in the wrong, however illogical his discourse, provided it be a little beyond the average mental reach, and flattering to the opinions of his audience. We have heard such a one in a lecture-hall cover an objector with confusion, and score the most complete and decisive victory before a large audience, by merely exclaiming with an emphasis and peremptoriness which seemed to embody the strength of fifty arguments:—Nonsense! Humbug! Fiddle-sticks! Indeed, metaphysics, like the higher forms of music and painting, need an

education and a training which the great multitudes neither have nor can be expected to have. The consequence is that they do not even see the force of many of the profoundest objections raised against some of the articles of our faith; and if they cannot rightly estimate the full force of the objections, how much less can they be expected to appreciate the value of their solutions. Close reasoning needs close application and concentration of mind, and such qualities are rarely found in persons who form the great bulk of a casual audience. Hence, it is not the metaphysician, nor the calm reasoner, nor the deep thinker that makes the successful and telling speaker, but the imaginative, the sensitive and the quick-witted. If, indeed, we examine the most popular speakers of modern times, we shall find that a lightness and airiness of style, a pleasant and familiar language, a vein of humour, and a sense of the ludicrous, are general characteristics. There may be great power and depth of mind also; and there often are. We do not deny that; all we affirm is that these are no necessary conditions of success, and may be dispensed with. In many, solidity of proof and strength of argument are by no means conspicuous characteristics. But it needs little penetration to see that any such want is amply supplied by greater powers of sympathy, a livelier imagination, a sprightlier wit, and a more careful attention to voice and gesture; while if the speaker be a bit of a buffoon, he will only add to his popularity and draw a larger crowd. Perhaps this is why some may still be found so ready to follow out the injunctions of an old divine of the sixteenth century to a young bachelor of arts:—"Percute cathedram fortiter; respice Crucifixum torvis oculis; nil dic ad propositum, et bene prædicabis."

There is no doubt but that it is the mere casing—the mere *entourage*—of a sermon that chiefly draws. The dramatic attitude, the depth of passion depicted upon the facial lines, the play of the arms and hands, which interpret the feelings, the tremor of the voice, the inflections and alterations of tones, and the look of sorrow, joy, surprise, that is expressed in the eyes, would be enough of itself to attract notice and arrest attention. When to this is added not merely a

pleasant voice and gracious manner, but also a readiness of expression, a fluency of language, and a good presence, one may say—if not “*nil ad propositum*”—at all events nothing very remarkable or profound, and yet be classed among the most popular of preachers.

Well do we remember one who began his missionary career with the firm determination to take the greatest pains with his sermons. He considered nothing so deserving of attention and careful study. Being an excellent theologian and university man (for he was an Oxford convert), his efforts were eminently successful. That is to say, his sermons were profound, well reasoned, full of true doctrine, and sound sense. Priests would come and listen to his words with special delight, and speak of his theological essays—for such they seemed to be—with unfeigned pleasure. But the people? They cared little about his most carefully prepared disquisitions. He, on his part, was somewhat mortified; but he felt he must change his tactics. The people, he urged, don't want arguments, they want conclusions. They will come where they may be amused as well as instructed; where they may contemplate familiar truths if you will, but contemplate them in a new dress; where they may hear them put in a striking way, with a wealth of metaphor and interesting illustration. What puts an audience to sleep is not the matter, but the manner of a discourse. What was the result? He altered his method. He came down from his professorial chair, and spoke familiarly to the half empty benches. But, as he continued to adopt the familiar style, the benches became every Sunday better filled, and people began to delight in “such a charming orator.” He no longer knit his discourses together with iron bands of irrefragable logic and steel rivets of hard reasoning; he gave up all attempts at explaining the profounder dogmas of the faith; he never sank into the depths of metaphysics, nor gave answers to difficulties which only one in fifty could appreciate. He opened out a vein of fancy; he indulged in imagery and illustration; he caught the passing event as it flew by, and made it exemplify the truth he wished to convey. He spoke of the last great crime known to the poor through the *Police News*, and to the rich

through the society papers, and used it to enforce a lesson or to point a moral. He began to trust more to feeling than to reason, and waxed warm with indignation or swooned away with emotion, as the occasion served. At one time his voice would re-echo angrily through the aisles, or sound stern and menacing like the rumble of a distant storm; at another it would be choked with emotion or broken by irrepressible sobs. He compelled the audience to weep and to laugh in turns, and to thrill under his touch as a Stradivarius in the hands of a Paganini. The smart sayings, the epigrammatic distichs, even the witticisms which he introduced into his sermons, proved far more attractive than all the sound sense and real learning that characterised his earlier productions. In *Tit Bits* and *Great Thoughts* and *Things not Generally Known* he discovered mines of inexhaustible treasures, by the aid of which he was able to bespangle his discourse with the most interesting and delightful illustrations which startled and aroused the listening crowd. At such moments, indeed, even the somniferous pricked up their ears, and the most indolent smiled and looked pleased, a result which was not without its effect upon the reverend preacher himself, who felt encouraged if not intoxicated with his success, however indefensible may have been some of the means employed in securing it.

It was not so much that the anecdotes were new or unknown; it was rather that they were told with such an exquisite touch of pathos, and given with so natural a rendering. Even those who had spelt them out painfully but yesterday at their kitchen firesides, hardly recognised them in their new dress, and were as charmed as the rest. In this way the reverend preacher began to gain an ascendancy over the hearts of the people which he had never before possessed, and became one of the greatest pulpit favourites of the day. Crowds flocked to hear him. He filled churches wherever he was announced, and persons who would not go ten yards to hear another, would go ten miles to hear him; and, what may perhaps seem at first sight yet more singular, he made many converts by his harangues. We say at first sight, because on maturer reflection this should hardly

be deemed a matter of surprise. For there are multitudes of persons who fall away from the practice of their religion merely through lethargy and indolence, and not at all from any seriously reasoned-out conviction. Since, therefore, it is not their lack of discrimination, but their weakness of purpose which has resulted in their fall, it is not their intellects that want illuminating, but their feelings and emotions that want rousing. Now such preachers as the above begin by exciting the curiosity of the indolent, and then very little effort is needed to induce them to come to the church. Once there, they fall under the spell, and soon grow sensible of an ardour and a fervour which are as invigorating to their consciences, as they are new to their experience. They are moved by the earnestness of the appeal, and anxious to satisfy this fresh born desire for a better life and higher aims. And to whom will they go so naturally as to the man whose voice has stirred an echo in their hearts? Or if not to him, at all events to one of his *confrères*. Their change of life may not be a matter of conscious reason at all; but a mere sense of satisfaction, which must always arise from the full perception of the truth, between which and the mind there is a very strong natural affinity. The motives may be utterly worthless, yet a man of small reflective powers may arrive at a very certain truth by a wholly irrelevant process; like the old lady of Camperdown who became a Catholic, or as she styled it, "a Romanist," because "she felt bound to admit that the Romanists must be right, since St. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans." If such be the case, it requires no great effort to believe that a popular preacher, such as we have described, may not only fill churches, but may likewise brace up many lukewarm Catholics, and convert many well-disposed unbelievers, and thus do much good for religion in the land.

II.

The only question is how far this emotional preaching may advantageously be cultivated. It may perhaps be contended that to move hearts and to stir up seared consciences is the very end of preaching; that this end is fully obtained by the sensational style. *Ergo*, etc., Q.E.D.

Great stress has been laid upon this point; and it is, of course, an argument which would be quite unanswerable did the end justify the means. But since none will go so far as to allow that, the question still awaits an answer, and may perhaps be discussed to some purpose. Though to arouse the indifferent is, no doubt, one of the great objects a preacher must propose to himself, yet not any or every means may legitimately be employed. The drum and bugle of the Salvation Army, and the comicalities of such men as Moody and Sankey for instance, will find no countenance with us, even though many a lukewarm heart has been kindled and set on fire by their martial strains. At least, so it has been affirmed. A story is also told with all the appearance of truth, of a priest in a small hamlet in the Tyrol, who drew his scattered flock together, when every other means had failed, by playing a series of variations on the cornet after the Gospel of the Sunday Mass in place of the usual sermon. When the church had been filled by means of the sweet melody, he began little by little to address a few words, and then a short exhortation, and finally to instruct and convert the people with some success. Still it would hardly be a precedent to follow, and few would be bold enough to advocate such a course even for the best possible purpose. But to come down to the more ordinary sensational sermons, which one hears from time to time in our largest churches. Are they preached in the style that is best suited to the dignity and solemnity of the divine message which it is the duty of the preacher to deliver? Is not the additional *éclat* and the increased popularity dearly purchased by the loss of seriousness and sobriety? Who would expect to hear divine warnings and truths of the most vital interest presented in a way to make men merry? Or who can bring himself to believe that our Divine Lord or His Apostles would ever have condescended to flavour their discourses with a verse from a comic song, or the refrain of the last street ditty? Yet such startling methods are not altogether obsolete, and examples of them might be instanced from preachers of the day did we not wish to avoid all personal allusion. The intense importance of the lessons to be taught and the wholly

unparalleled gravity of the interests at stake would seem to suggest more seriousness and self-restraint, and to demand an altogether different treatment. And though a preacher might not please so many, nor excite so easily those emotions and sensibilities which all like to have stirred, he would, nevertheless, leave upon them a deeper and more abiding impression, and his audience, if not so large, would probably be far more intimately convinced of the paramount importance of their religious obligations.

Yet it is a difficult matter to decide, and many advocates will be found for the more flippant and glittering style, as well as for the more serious and solemn. Those especially who are by nature frolicsome and frisky, and whose minds are in a constant state of flutter and excitement, and who are born actors and mimics, and have acquired a certain facility of amusing and diverting their friends in private by a thousand humorous extravagances, will certainly find plenty of specious reasons to defend a more or less loose style of oratory in the pulpit. Their drolleries and ludicrous sketches, their flippant remarks and pungent sayings, in a word, all those humorous qualities which win for a man the reputation of a *farceur*, and make him a favourite in society, will, of course, be thought valuable auxiliaries even in propounding the eternal truths of the Gospel. How far such an opinion may be accepted and acted on, we are not prepared to say; the only fallacy that needs combating is that its attractiveness is of itself a sufficient justification. This would be a deplorable mistake, and might lead to the countenancing of many other forms of attraction which would be most certainly undesirable.

There is a danger of making one's greater or less popularity a criterion of true merit. So long as one can gain a patient hearing and draw a large audience one is disposed to feel satisfied. If experience proves that men will listen to Fr. Simkins for an hour and a half without any symptoms of weariness, while poor Fr. Timkins cannot rivet their attention for more than half that time, we are at once disposed to conclude not merely that Simkins is the more interesting preacher of the two, which would probably be true, but also

that he is the more instructive and profound, which would probably be untrue. Indeed the majority of people are not drawn by what is intrinsically best. In spiritual, no less than in material food, they think more of what is palatable than of what is nourishing.

Take at haphazard a thousand ordinary Catholics as they stream forth from kitchen and cellar, from shop and store, from factory and mill. Consider their condition of mind after six days of monotonous drudgery and close application to trade or business, and ask yourself how many will go out of their way to clamour and push at the church door to get a good place to listen to Sober Erudition. For one who desires merely to be instructed, a dozen will desire to be aroused, enlivened, and entertained as well. Indeed the instructive element is taken for granted. *All* sermons are, to their minds, instructive. This is not, therefore, a matter in which any great distinction can be drawn. Their attention is rather directed to distinctions of manner, delivery, and style. They will go where they may get their feelings worked upon, and curiously enough not only where they may be amused and entertained, but even where they may be horrified, frightened, saddened, or pained.

George Ramsay, the philosopher, very justly remarks that "clergymen who terrify their audience are generally more popular than those who deliver sensible but cold discourses. Such fiery preachers are much run after because they excite emotion, though, if their hearers were to bring home to themselves what is said, many ought to feel rather uncomfortable." Indeed it is much the same thing as in reading. A novel or romance which sets on edge all the emotions of the soul is sure to have the widest circulation, and to meet with the most enthusiastic reception. There is a positive pleasure, not only in the inward rising of admiration and sympathy for some successful and gallant hero, but even in the tears shed over the unhappy and perhaps tragic fate of a less successful favourite. Well do we remember coming once upon a young lady, crumpled up on a sofa, and sobbing over a story of the day, yet drying her eyes in delicious agony that she might see to read on, and so keep her heart steeped in the sweet bath of sorrow.

Well, the same kind of satisfaction is often sought in listening to a sermon, and if the preacher only possesses the art of touching his hearers on the quick he will be in high requisition. It is difficult to understand exactly why people find so much pleasure in the exercise of their feelings of fear, horror, compassion, sorrow, or surprise; but that the pleasure is considerable can hardly be doubted, and this fact must be taken into account by any one who has to address a large gathering.

Why is Lord Randolph Churchill such a popular speaker? It is not because he is an able man: for there are many men we might point to who possess as much ability without possessing anything like as much influence; and who are as learned and as good politicians, yet whose speeches are neither listened to nor reported as his are. The difference lies in the way he has of putting things; in the fantastic illustrations which he employs, and in that peculiar form of humour in which he so freely indulges. Indeed his anecdotes, personal allusions, and racy style, serve as floats to what is more weighty, and, like the pollen on the seed, bear many a strong argument and telling fact to sink and fertilize in remote parts of the country which they would otherwise never reach; and so it will ever be so long as man remains what he is. The speaker who can put the lessons he wishes to teach in a manner to please and amuse will be listened to and applauded, while the dry scholar of twice his knowledge and ability will be left to hum and haw to vacant benches and empty churches.

This essay has already outrun its proper limits, so that little room remains for any practical suggestions. Let us then content ourselves with the following:—

Our first duty, it appears to us, is to bear in mind the words of Demosthenes, viz., “eloquence is as much in the ear as in the tongue;” and to seek therefore to realize more fully the condition of mind and the special psychological character of our people, so as to employ a method and style which may reach and move them. Too many of us, by a very natural mistake, aim at what is best *in se*, and not at what is best *ad finem*.

Secondly, we should do well to inform ourselves as far as possible upon all subjects of general interest, so as to keep ourselves supplied with abundant material for striking, apt, and *new* illustrations, which are equally useful to attract as they are to enlighten an audience.

Thirdly, we should attach a far greater importance than is generally done to the clear interpreting of our words. The words we speak are, in themselves, like the words in a book—often obscure to the uninitiated. It is the expression of the face, the attitude of the body, and above all the tone and inflection of the voice, that are the skilled interpreters and expositors of their precise meaning. What “more light” is to the material eye, in studying the anatomy of an Amæba, that “tone and gesture” are to the mind’s eye, in studying the truths of divine teaching—they illuminate and bring out into prominence a thousand vital points and details of structure which would otherwise escape observation, and make no impression.

Fourthly, all excess, or unseemly trifling, or too great familiarity, should most carefully be avoided, lest we detract too much from the dignity of the pulpit, which, in these days especially, seems rather to need sustaining and fortifying.

Lastly, we must be on our guard against the danger of seeking merely or even mainly to please; and should constantly bear in mind that neither the fulness of a church nor the enthusiasm of a congregation can be a true criterion of the spiritual worth of a sermon, as weighed in the balance of the sanctuary, since both may sometimes result from very trivial causes indeed.

Such are our conclusions. How far they may be endorsed by our *confrères* in the ministry we cannot say. For our own part we gladly submit them to their wider experience, deeper knowledge, and maturer judgment.

JOHN S. VAUGHAN.

RECENT AUGUSTINIAN LITERATURE.

IT is quite taken for granted by the unbelievers of the day, that the world has so completely rejected the great doctrines of Christianity, that controversies on religious, or as they would call them, sectarian topics, are utterly unknown; for that now-a-days no one is in the least degree interested in the subtleties of theological discussions, which at one time set empire against empire, and engaged the best faculties of the ablest thinkers throughout Europe. The contempt so freely lavished on the metaphysical discussions that were held throughout the universities of Europe in the Middle Ages has broadened into a disdain for the supporters of doctrines, which to mediæval theologians, and indeed, to all Christian believers, were absolutely incontrovertible; and it is supposed that outside the walls of Catholic colleges, which with rigid conservatism still cling to scholastic forms, no one feels the least interest in the ghosts of past and buried controversies. Thus in the September number of the *Nineteenth Century*, Mr. Justice Stephen says:—

“The doctrine of the Trinity, for example, has ceased to interest the great mass of mankind, and it is difficult to imagine in these days a controversy about original sin or the sacraments attracting much attention.”

In flat contradiction to this theory comes the fact, that within the last year, no less than seven publications have issued from the British and American press, dealing with the life and doctrines of St. Augustine; and following this series comes review after review, treating exhaustively of these publications and the many most interesting questions they deal with and suggest. Nor are these questions altogether of that purely metaphysical nature that would be tolerated and even welcomed by the freethinking spirit of the age. For it admits there is one subject it has not quite tired of, that is, the existence of a Supreme Being, and the abstruse questions that cluster around the great central mystery of the universe. These it is always prepared to discuss, especially as they lead out from the company of musty Christians, and into the society

of glorious Greek heathens, and the mystics of the majestic East. But the main subjects discussed in recent Augustinian literature are such antiquated and commonplace controversies as those which agitated the world in St. Augustine's time—controversies with Manicheans and Pelagians about Divine predestination and human freewill, between necessarians and supporters of liberty; and, alas! there is not a word about the dialogues of the divine Plato, but a great deal about the *Institutes* of half-forgotten Calvin. Still more singular is it that three of these publications have come to us from America, and that, as a writer in the *Church Quarterly Review* for July tells us, "while the price to which the Parker Society's series has sunk appears to prove that the Reformers are but a drug in the market, and the library of Anglo-Catholic Theology stands, we fear, at a figure not much higher, the Fathers afford material for repeated publishing speculations." It is quite clear the world is not so enlightened after all. The scorn of Pascal,¹ and the sarcasm of Renan² have not been quite so deadly as was supposed. Or, perhaps there is something in these old Fathers and their despised controversies not quite so obsolete and worthless as the wits of France and the pamphleteers of England would have us suppose.

The most ambitious of these works on St. Augustine are the Hulsean Lectures for 1885, embodied by the writer, W. Cunningham, B.D., Trinity College, Cambridge, in a work which bears the title, *St. Austin and His Place in the History of Religious Thought*. The most useful and interesting to us is the *Historical Study of St. Augustine, Bishop and Doctor*, written by a Vincentian Father, and already favourably noticed in the RECORD. The former has been subjected to a good deal of unflattering criticism. The latter has passed through the Reviews, not only unscathed, but frequently and warmly recommended, and, we hope, will soon be issued in a second edition. Perhaps the learned author will pardon us if we call his attention to a remarkable exemplification of the truths conveyed in that chapter of his book in which he

¹ *Lettres Provinciales*, II.

² *New Studies of Religious History*. Art. *The Congregations "de Auxiliis."*

lays down certain rules which must be observed by professional or other readers of the works of St. Augustine.

It has passed into the ordinary canons of criticism that the works of any great author, ancient or modern, must be studied in their entirety, with such light as contemporary publications throw upon them, and with a fair amount of deference for the opinions of those commentators, who, from one motive or another, have made these works the study of their lives. The violation of any of these canons is apt to lead to singular mistakes; and it will be found that nearly half the books of the world are written to support arguments in favour of certain views which are supposed to be contained in the great works of the world's literature. The subjectivity, to use a hackneyed word, of our minds is so strong, that we are continually projecting our own ideas on the page we are supposed to be studying with illumination independent of that which is cast by other minds; and language is so very flexible, particularly when it embraces abstract and indefinite ideas, that we can derive from almost any author texts to support doctrines which we know very well would be most repugnant to that author's mind. We know that Bacon in the English school, Reid in the Scottish school, and Descartes in the french school of Philosophy, have been the originators of ideas, which have been pushed to conclusions which they would have decidedly condemned; and to ascend higher, it is well-known that St. Paul has been cited in support of most contradictory doctrines—to-day he is a Calvinist, to-morrow an idealist, and the climax has been reached by proving him a pantheist from the words, "in ipso enim vivimus, movemur et sumus." Now, there never was an author that required to be studied with keener discrimination than St. Augustine. His mind was so subtle, and he analysed ideas in such a manner that none but the strongest and best trained intellects can follow him; and then he was essentially a dialectician, and possessed such a phenomenal power over the Latin tongue, that he uses phrases and expressions that actually bewilder in their apparent contradictions. Even that little work, his *Confessions*, which apparently was thrown off without premeditation, and, therefore, should be

marked by all the directness and simplicity of a plain categorical statement, is in reality a philosophical treatise containing the pith and marrow of all he had thought and read, and full of those transcendental ideas which have been the despair of those who have attempted to analyse and explain them. The neglect of these primary rules, and let us add, the absence of real theological training, which is common to all Protestants, have led the Hulsean lecturer into many serious errors. Some of these have already been noticed in the *Tablet* for February, 1887, particularly the assertion, which probably will astonish some readers, that the Church of England fully represents, and has always represented, St. Augustine's teaching. But anyone who has had the least acquaintance with contemporary history in England will know that one of the most exasperating features of Ritualism in England is, that in the face of history, in defiance of contemporary declarations on the part of the Anglican bishops, and contemporary decisions of the Ecclesiastical Law Courts, it proclaims the identity of the English Church of to-day with the Apostolic Church and the pre-Reformation Church in England, and maintains doctrines which are reprobated by the Bishops and three-fourths of the Anglican Communion, and uses ceremonies which are condemned by its formularies, and prayers which are declared blasphemous and rites which are declared idolatrous. But long before the English Church had advanced so far in apostacy from itself, and irreconcilability with Rome, (for the nearer it approaches us in externals, the farther is it removed in spirit), the appeal to the Fathers was a favourite one. It was made by all the great High Churchmen of the past, it was made by the Oxford men in the time of the great revival, with the result that they passed directly into union with the Catholic Church. But until some one can define what the English Church is, and declare authoritatively its teaching, the assumption of its identity with any other community can neither be contradicted nor refuted. It is not a concretè body about which anything can be affirmed or denied. One section of its members proclaims its dogmatic adhesion to every doctrine and ceremony of the Catholic Church, if we except

that of Papal Supremacy. Another, representing a good deal of the best thought and feeling of the communion, is quite content to exercise a civilising influence on the masses by the example of irreproachable lives, and the preaching of a secular ethical system, without committing itself to any dogma whatsoever, leaving even the personality of God open to the choice of its followers. "If some very distinguished members of the Church of England," says Mr. Justice Stephen, quoted above, "living or lately dead, could be, or could have been put into a witness box, and closely cross-examined as to their real deliberate opinions, it would be probably found that they not only acknowledged the truth of principles advocated by Mr. Mivart, which, indeed, most of them notoriously and even ostentatiously did and do, but were well aware that they involved all the practical consequences which are pointed out above; yet some of them held, and others still hold, an honoured place in the Church of England, and without giving any particular scandal, discharge in it duties of the highest importance, and give advice, and make exhortations which are highly appreciated by a large number of important persons." To say, therefore, that the English Church represents the teaching of St. Augustine, is to make the latter responsible for "wide divergencies" of belief, a devout Catholic to-day, to-morrow a Socinian or Agnostic. But when the lecturer takes the other side, and instead of telling us what the Church of England teaches, declares the actual opinions which he supposes St. Augustine held, declares, for example, that St. Augustine considered unity no essential mark of the Church, and knew absolutely nothing of the Sacrifice of the Mass, he comes boldly out into the open and it must be admitted that he is very brave. And when he says that the "*libertas indifferentiæ*" is a Pelagian doctrine, and that man has no such liberty, and that this is the teaching of St. Augustine, we can bring him down, even in this abstruse and most difficult matter to the words of the great Doctor himself, and to the exposition of these words which was made by his followers and commentators. To select a few sentences out of thousands, in his dialogue with Evodius about free will, he uses the following

words:—"Si natura vel necessitate iste motus existit, culpabilis esse nullo pacto potest" (Lib. iii., cap. 1); and in the following chapter comparing the motion of the will to that of a stone which is cast, he says:—

"Verumtamen in eo dissimilis est, quod in potestate non habet lapis cohibere motum, quo fertur inferius; animus vero, dum non vult non ita movetur, ut superioribus desertis, inferiora diligat: et ideo lapidi naturalis est ille motus, animo vero iste voluntarius."

And again:—

"Audi ergo primo ipsum Dominum ubi duas arbores commemorat, quarum mentionem ipse fecisti: audi dicentem, aut facite arborem bonam, et fructum ejus bonum, aut facite arborem malam, et fructum ejus malum. Cum ergo dicit, aut hoc facite, aut illud facite, potestatem indicat, non naturam. Nemo enim nisi Deus facere arborem potest; sed habet unusquisque in voluntate aut eligere quae bona sunt, et esse arbor bona; aut eligere quae mala sunt, et esse arbor mala. Hoc ergo Dominus dicens, aut facite illud, aut facite illud, ostendit esse in potestate quid facerent." (*In Actis cum Felice, Manichaeo* Lib. ii., cap. 4).¹

We pass here from the lecturer to the *Church Quarterly* reviewer, who is inclined to differ from Mr. Cunningham in his opinion of St. Augustine's Rule of Faith, for he states that the latter took the Sacred Scriptures for the recorded and established representatives of Divine Truth on earth, adding that, "although Church authority is to him the immediate practical medium by which he obtains access to Scripture, and is led to believe it, yet every element and constituent of Church authority, whether the individual teaching of Fathers, or the united voice of Councils is to him capable of mistake. It is Scripture alone in which he has decided to find no error." This is rather a strange assertion about the saint, who declared that he accepted the Scriptures only from the hands of the Church; and it is more strangely supported by the quotation given in the note from the Saint's letters to St. Jerome. This note is simply a distinction which St. Augustine draws between the Canonical books of Scripture and those which were considered doubtful or apocryphal, or were the works of individual writers—"Fateor

¹ St. Hilary (in Psalm ii.), St. Optatus (Lib. adv. Parmen vii.), St. Bernard (*de Gratia et lib. arb.*) agree with St. Augustine

charitati tuæ solis eis Scripturarum libris qui jam *Canonici* appellantur, didici hunc timorem honoremque deferre, ut nullum eorum auctorem scribendo aliquid errasse firmissime credam. Et si aliquid in eis offendero literis quod videatur contrarium veritati, nihil aliud quam vel mendosum esse codicem, vel interpretem non assecutum esse quod dictum est, vel me minime intellexisse, non ambigam. *Alios* autem ita lego ut quantalibet sanctitate doctrinaque praepolleant, non ideo verum puto quia ipsi ita senserunt; sed quia mihi vel per illos auctores *Canonicos*, vel probabili ratione, quod a vero non abhorreat persuadere potuerunt.”¹

It is quite clear that here there is no distinction made between Scripture and Church authority, but between the Canonical books and the works, however learned, of individuals; and it would rather appear that St. Augustine favoured the absolute authority of the Church in these matters when he acknowledges two classes of books, those called Canonical, which are presented to the faithful with the supreme *imprimatur* of the Church, and in which the saint says, “firmissime credam;” and those whose contents can only be accepted when there is proof of their consonance with the teaching of the Canonical books, “quia mihi vel per illos auctores *Canonicos* vel probabili ratione quod a vero non abhorreant persuadere potuerunt.” But let us hear St. Augustine himself in that very book which the reviewer has cited, but not quoted, (*Lib. contra Faustum*, xi.) “Si non de aliqua particula, sed de toto audies contradicentem et clamantem, falsus est; quid ages? quo te convertes? quam libri a te prolati originem, quam vetustatem, quam seriem successionis testem citabis? Nam si hoc facere conaberis, et nihil valebis; et vides in hac re quid *Ecclesiae Catholicae*

¹ The quotation, as given by the *Church Quarterly* reviewer, and quoted accurately in the text, is, however, truncated. For St. Augustine adds, “Nec te, mi frater, sentire aliud existimo; prorsus, inquam, non te arbitrator sic legi tuos libros velle, tanquam *Prophetarum* vel *Apostolorum* :” which bears out still more fully our contention, that no contrast was intended between Scriptural and Church teachings, between which no discrepancy can exist; but between the writings of individuals, even those to whose learning and sanctity St. Augustine bears such warm testimony, as in his *Opus Imperfectum*, iv., 112, and the inspired teachings of Scripture and the teachings of the infallible Church.

valeat auctoritas, quae ab ipsis fundatissimis sedibus Apostolorum usque ad hodiernam diem succedentium sibimet Episcoporum serie et tot populorum consensione firmatur." And again, "Quisquis falli metuit obscuritate quaestionis, *Ecclesiam de illo consulat*, quam sine ulla ambiguitate Sacra Scriptura demonstrat," (Lib. i., *contra Cresconium*, c. 33); and that well-known expression, "Ego vero Evangelio non crederem, nisi me Ecclesiae Catholicae commoveret auctoritas," (cap. 8, *contra Epistolam Fundamenti*.) We shall not dwell on the statement that St. Augustine's belief in the Sacred Scriptures arose from his determination to recognise some authority, and in the "circumstances of inability to criticise which existed for him in the ignorance of the original languages, and the possibility of error in the particular MSS. to which he had access." But it is in just these particular cases that St. Augustine recognises the necessity of a living and infallible authority, and, therefore, reposes his final faith in the *magisterium* of the Church. And as to the superior advantages we possess in the facilities for studying Scripture critically by aid of philological and exegetical research, they have resulted in an issue which was very far from the lofty faith and sublime hope of St. Augustine—the rationalism of modern Europe.

In the same way the reviewer, whilst doubting about Mr. Cunningham's success in proving logically that the Calvinistic doctrines are quite different from the Augustinian, lapses into some mistakes. He cannot understand, for example, in what the Augustinian doctrine of man's inability to work out his own salvation differs from the Calvinistic doctrine of man's total depravity, forgetting that inability to perform supernatural acts without the efficacious help of the Most High is very different from the incapacity to receive such help owing to the total depravity of nature. He ignores the distinction made by Catholic theologians between positive and negative reprobation—the former abstracting altogether from the malice of the sinner, and insisting that the reprobate were created with a view to eternal punishment; the latter, meaning the prescience of God foreseeing the commission of sin, and the necessary subsequent punishment.

“Providentia summi Dei, non fortuita temeritate, regitur mundus,” says St. Augustine, “et ideo nunquam esset istorum aeterna miseria, nisi esset magna malitia;” and again in another place, “omnis poena, si justa est, peccati poena est, et supplicium nominatur.” (Lib. iii., *de lib. arb.*, cap. 18.) As to the case of Pharaoh, and the words of St. Augustine, of which the Calvinists have made so much, “Operari Deum in cordibus hominum ad inclinandas eorum voluntates, quocunque voluerit, sive ad bona pro sua misericordia, sive ad mala pro meritis eorum;” a sufficient explanation is found in the words of St. Thomas, when speaking of this passage he says:—“Nam ad bonum inclinatur hominum voluntates directe et per se, tanquam auctor bonorum; ad malum autem dicitur inclinare, vel suscitare homines occasionaliter; in quantum scilicet Deus homini proponit vel interius, vel exterius, quod quantum est ex se, est inductivum ad bonum; sed homo propter suam malitiam perverse utitur ad malum.” (*Epist. ad. Rom.* c. ix., 17.) And again, “Deus instigat hominem ad bonum, puta regem ad defendendum jura regni sui, vel ad puniendum rebelles; sed hoc instinctu bono malus homo abutitur secundum malitiam cordis sui. Et hoc modo circa Pharaonem accidit; qui cum a Deo excitaretur ad regni sui tutelam, abusus est hæc excitatione ad crudelitatem.”

With the conclusions, however, of the reviewer, we can almost entirely agree. The principal conviction which the study of Augustinian doctrines has brought home to him is, that where the doctrine of predestination is too exclusively regarded, without any application of external sacramental aids, it can only result in a morbid Pharisaism, which placidly condemns the larger portion of mankind to eternal punishment, or a still more morbid despair, which ends in a total disregard of duties which even the natural law imposes. For it is clear that the recourse to the sacraments ought to imply a belief that there is a necessity for spiritual assistance derivable from external sources, and a corresponding belief that such sources can adequately supply what is wanting to the weakness of nature. And though prayer must always have a very large place in any scheme of spiritual economy,

as being one of the easiest and readiest means of approaching our Maker, still we require some facilities of access to channels of Divine Mercy, whence grace will infallibly flow to us, if no obstacle is raised by the perversity of nature. We will not stop here to ask the reviewer what spiritual assistance a merely commemorative ceremony such as the "Lord's Supper" can impart; and what other sacrament is provided for adults in ordinary Protestantism? But when he traces the infidelity which unhappily does exist in Catholic countries to a multiplicity of sacramental forms, that is, to too many visible means of approaching the Unseen, we cannot quite follow him. The same odd fancy has struck the mind of another writer, whose latest work, *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*, has attracted considerable attention in this country and in America. In two chapters of this work entitled "Semi-parasitism" and "Parasitism," Professor Drummond traces the apostasy of Catholics to the fact that "the Catholic Church ministers falsely to the deepest needs of man, reduces the end of religion to selfishness, and offers safety without spirituality. . . . No one who has studied the religion of the continent upon the spot has failed to be impressed with the appalling spectacle of tens of thousands of unregenerate men sheltering themselves, as they conceive it, for eternity, behind the Sacraments of Rome."¹ The Professor draws a parallel from Nature, in which he compares ordinary Catholics to those parasitical animals, which deriving strength and safety from superior organisms rarely develop into healthy conditions of life, and never put forth those organs which belong to their nature, and which are provided by necessary laws as a means of sustenance or defence. And although he is careful to state that the teachings of the Catholic Church do not promise safety or moral perfection except to those who correspond with the graces of which she is the depositary, yet he breaks out constantly into angry invective against the system, and places in the same category of contempt the Evangelical who believes in

¹ Page 329, *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

his unconditional salvation through the merits of the atonement, and the Catholic who trusts for his salvation to the efficacy of prayer and the sacraments. But a more acute thinker would perceive that there is this wide distinction, that the Evangelicals trust implicitly in the merits of redemption to the positive exclusion of all merit and of all effort on our part, these latter being to them but "filthy rags," whereas the Church most positively insists that in most of the sacraments the grace received is proportioned to the state of the soul which receives it. It is the obvious distinction of grace received *ex opere operantis* and *ex opere operato* which is so familiar to Catholic students, but quite unknown to the Protestant professor. But the parallel between organic and spiritual life is in these chapters carried a little too far. For either the professor admits the supernatural, and then he must of necessity admit the operation of grace either in the Catholic or Evangelical sense, and thus he admits external assistance apart from internal effort and uncontrolled by it; or, what is more likely, he denies the supernatural element altogether in the spiritual life, and speaks of ordinary natural laws in the development of moral and mental energies. In this latter case, the analogy between the lower organisms and the human mind does not hold, because the contention is that organs and powers are developed by a principle of natural law which adapts organisms to their necessities. This supposes a struggle for existence, and a contest of the weaker with the stronger powers of Nature. But abstracting from the supernatural, what contest goes on in man that can develop and strengthen his *moral* powers? No doubt his *mental* energies are developed in his struggle against Nature, and he puts forth strength that will save him against the uncontrolled forces which seek his destruction. Thus he ascends from the flint-fire and the friction-fire of the forest to the patent stove and electric lamp of civilisation, and from the coracle or canoe to the steamboat. But morally speaking, there being no danger, there is neither struggle nor contest, therefore no development, and therefore he must remain the primitive barbarian, rather enervated, but not at all exalted by his sense of safety in civilisation. The

application of natural law to the spiritual world is here, therefore, entirely at fault, and, indeed, we might say that the whole work is fanciful rather than logical. But writers of this kind must always break a lance with the Catholic Church; it adds to their honour to be defeated.

Apart, therefore, from the perversities of individuals for which no system can be held responsible, it would be difficult to conceive a more perfect supernatural system, and one better accommodated to spiritual necessities and spiritual growth than that which is presented by the Church. It holds the golden mean between the extremes of Evangelicalism and Rationalism. It neither promises salvation without effort nor salvation without assistance. It neither preaches vicarious sanctification nor human perfectibility. But after declaring the high moral precepts that are contained in the absolute commandments of the Most High, and the counsels of perfection in the Gospels, it leads its members by individual effort on their part, and by the strength supplied by the sacraments to such possibilities of perfection as are compatible with the limits of a fallen nature. It allows grace and free will to work harmoniously. They are the centripetal and centrifugal forces that keep the soul in its perfect orbit round the central sun of its existence. It does not encourage pride or overweening consciousness in our own powers; neither does it paralyse effort by promising absolute security through the merits of the Redemption. To say, therefore, that "Roman Catholicism opens to the masses a molluscan shell. They have simply to shelter themselves within its pale, and they are safe," is palpably absurd. And so is the typical case which the professor gives of the Catholic convert who said:—"I used to be concerned about religion, but religion is a great subject. I was very busy. A Protestant, my attention was called to the Roman Catholic religion. It suited my case. And instead of dabbling in religion for myself, I put myself into its hands. Once a year I go to Mass." This is not serious reasoning at all. It is *bouffonnerie*. To whatever causes, therefore, the infidelity of Catholic countries is attributable, it certainly cannot be traced to the sacramental system in the Church. A system that has been

adopted by such minds as St. Augustine and St. Thomas, and which has produced those marvels of sanctity, who have been raised by the veneration of the people, or by the voice of the Church in thousands upon her altars, cannot be so enervating as our Protestant friends would have us suppose. It is the only system which is in strict accord with the words of Holy Scripture—the only one that can adapt itself with ease to those difficult passages that seem to be irreconcilable in Holy Writ, the only system that meets the wants of men when pride is weakened—

“ And the helpless feet stretch out
To find in the depths of the darkness
No footing more solid than doubt.”

And there are only two classes that can possibly reject it. The religious fanatic who believes he has got “religion,” and attributes a play of emotions to the breathing of the Spirit of God; and the Rationalist who rejects all supernatural agencies, and thinks that man can raise himself by unaided effort to the full stature of moral perfection. The emotional and exciting religion of the former, however repulsive to refined minds, will always find adherents amongst the classes, who prefer a play of feelings to that elevation of mind and heart towards God which is taught by the Catholic Church; the latter will command the assent of that large and ever-growing class, which with intolerant pride strives to match its puny strength against “principalities and powers, against the rulers of the world of this darkness, against the spirits of wickedness in the high places.”

We have been tempted into this rather discursive paper by the pleasing fact that Augustinian doctrines are to-day commanding the attention and reverence of so many thoughtful men throughout the world. And it is a satisfaction to know that the *Church Quarterly* reviewer adds an unbiassed testimony to the excellence of the Catholic work (*A Historical Study*), and its superiority in all biographical respects to the other publications we have mentioned. This book, therefore, must become the standard work on St. Augustine, and we have thrown out the above hints in the hope that they may catch the eye of the learned author, and perhaps elicit from

him an explanatory chapter in the shape of an "Appendix." Nor should we be surprised to find that in time a good deal of Augustinian literature will cluster around this work which has come to us so modestly, and has been received in so welcome a manner. For the subject is practically inexhaustible. The writings of St. Augustine touch on all those problems that will ever have a lasting influence on the human mind. Mr. Cunningham skimmed in one sentence a subject that could be easily built into a treatise, when he said:—"Just as it is true that he may well be compared to Descartes in regard to the problems of the certainty of knowledge, so it is true that he seems to have anticipated Kant in proclaiming the true freedom of the will;" and a whole library might be constructed out of his suggestions, just as devastating heresies arose from the misinterpretation of his words. If it were true that he anticipated Descartes and Kant, the philosophy of the present would possess very little that would be original, and the philosophy of the future would have but a limited field for research. This is but saying that the best intellects of the world have been employed, consciously or otherwise, in seeking to make clear those mysteries that would never have dawned on the human mind but through the illumination of the Holy Spirit.

P. A. SHEEHAN, C.C.

MEMOIR OF DR. PATRICK COMERFORD, O.S.A.,
BISHOP OF WATERFORD AND LISMORE, 1629-
1652.

I^N presenting to the readers of the IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD for the month of August last a notice of "N. D. De Miséricorde," in connection with a memoir of Dr. Robert Barry, Bishop of Cork and Cloyne, a notice of Dr. Comerford, his intimate friend and companion in exile, seemed necessary. Happily the materials to fulfil this task are abundant owing to the labours of His Eminence Cardinal Moran and the

Rev. C. P. Meehan, who have in their valuable works, brought before the public the life of this eminent Confessor of the Faith and distinguished ornament of the Order of St. Augustine.

In this notice I will collect materials from all available sources so as to present as clear, concise and full a memoir as possible.

The family of Comerford was established in the Co. Wexford since the time of Strongbow. It, with many other Anglo-Norman families, settled in Wexford at this period and spread itself into the adjoining counties of Kilkenny and Waterford. The Comerfords of Callan, Co. Kilkenny, were Palatine Barons of Dungannon. Lord Desart is now the owner of the property they possessed. In Callan Protestant church, originally belonging to the Canons Regular of St. Augustine, is a mural tablet with the arms of the family. In each of the three counties the Comerford family held good positions, as well as in the city of Waterford.

Nicholas Comerford, uncle of the subject of our present notice, studied at Oxford, where he took out his degree in 1562. Returning to Waterford, his native city, he was ordained priest. Refusing to conform to the new religion, he went to Louvain, where he was honoured with the degree of Doctor of Divinity. From there he went to Madrid where he joined the Society of Jesus and died after composing several works, which showed him to be a man of high intellectual culture. His brother, Robert, father of the future Bishop, was an opulent merchant of Waterford who claimed descent, through his mother, from the Walshes. His wife was Anastasia White, who was closely related to the Butlers; so that from both sides they were allied with the best families of Waterford. No doubt they took great care of the education of their children, which devolved, principally, on the mother. At an early age Patrick, who was born about the year 1586, determined to embrace the ecclesiastical state. His father having died when he was young, the home of his widowed mother was always open to receive and shelter the devoted priests who suffered for the Faith. They in turn instructed her son in the rudiments of learning and trained his heart to piety.

One of these, Father Dermot O'Callaghan, an active, zealous priest, who had taken great pains to restore the churches of the city to Catholic worship on the death of Elizabeth, was pursued with special enmity by the heretics and was obliged to fly to the Continent. He was mainly instrumental in establishing the Irish College at Bordeaux in the year 1603, Cardinal de Sourdis, Archbishop of that city, providing the necessary funds, and drew up for its direction rules and statutes which he got approved of by the Holy See. Young Comerford accompanied his preceptor to Bordeaux, where, one of its first pupils, he distinguished himself in humanities and proved himself a clever writer of Latin verse. Owing to weak health, he was obliged to return home. When his health permitted, he set out again, for Lisbon, where he studied philosophy. At the completion of his studies in philosophy, he maintained a public thesis in that branch of learning which won him universal applause.

After this he entered the novitiate of the Hermits of St. Augustine at Lisbon and took in religion the name of Patrick "Ab Angelis," and having made his religious profession, he was sent by his superiors to their house at Angra, in the island of Terceira, capital of the Azores. He there professed rhetoric for four years. At the close of that term he was recalled to Portugal and studied theology at Coimbra. At its close he defended a thesis comprising the entire cycle of divinity. He was a poet as well as an orator, and was remarkable for his great stature and suavity of manners. Though young, he was deemed fit to fill the professor's chair in any of the departments of science then cultivated. He was secretary to the Provincial of his order in Portugal, and councillor for the Azores. Having attained his twenty-fourth year, Comerford was ordained priest in the year 1610, and, as his services were required in Brussels, he went to that city, where he was appointed on his arrival to a professorial chair in the convent of his order. He taught there philosophy and theology. Summoned from there to attend a general chapter of his order in Rome, he was made definitor and procurator of his order in the Eternal City. He was appointed by Pope Paul V. Perpetual Prior of Callan in

Ossory. On his way back to Ireland he visited Florence where he received the degree of Doctor in Theology. Having arrived in Ireland, Father Comerford applied himself to the care of his priory and administered the sacraments to the people under his care, acting under the sanction of the illustrious Dr. Roth, Bishop of Ossory. He also consoled and encouraged the people of Waterford who were suffering under the tyranny of the penal laws.

Fr. Comerford's labours were soon to be transferred to another sphere. Already there was a question at Rome of appointing him to the vacant Bishopric of Derry, as appears from a letter from the Earl of Tyrconnell, November 18th, 1628, preserved in the Irish College, Paris, who, for local, not personal reasons, opposed the appointment. Providence had other designs for him which were brought about by strange and unforeseen circumstances. His brother being captured by pirates was taken by them to Morocco. Fr. Comerford set out for Spain, secured the aid of the Trinitarian monks, and with moneys collected among his friends, had the consolation of seeing his brother released on the payment, however, of a large ransom. On landing in Spain, his brother was very soon carried off by the plague. This, however, did not dishearten the good priest, for it is recorded that he procured from the Moors the release of one hundred slaves.

After passing some time in Spain, Fr. Comerford proceeded to Rome on business of the Augustinian Order. He had not been long in the Eternal City when on the petition of Laurence Lea, V.G., on behalf of the clergy of the united dioceses of Waterford and Lismore, he was promoted by Pope Urban VIII. to the pastoral charge of those sees, the late Bishop, Dr. Walsh, having died in 1578, and also the Cistercian Abbot of Iniscaunacht or *de Suir*, who died before the receipt of the papal brief nominating him to that see. On March 18th, 1629, in the Church of St. Sylvester on the Quirinal, he was consecrated Bishop by Cardinal Bentivoglio, assisted by two other bishops. Luke Wadding, his fellow citizen, and whom he styles his "very loving and kind cousin," assisted at the ceremony, as also a large assemblage of the Irish exiles then in Rome.

On the occasion of Dr. Comerford's consecration, Christopher Chamberlain, alumnus of the Irish Seminary, Rome, composed a small 12^{mo} vol. with the following title and dedication. A copy of this is in the Archives of the Dublin Franciscans:—

Titulum.

Coronatae · Virtuti · Revmi · D.
Patritii · Quemerfordii · ex · sacro ·
Eremit · D · Augustini · ordine.

EPISCOPI.

Waterfordensis · et Lismorensis ·
Inaugurati · plausus ·
Seminarium · Hibernorum · de · urbe.

Dedicatio.

Patritio · Quemerfordo ·
Viro · ad · religionis · ornamentum · nato ·
Ad · Ecclesiae · emolumentum · destinato ·

Qui

Ingenio · scientiarum · omnium · capaci ·
Animo · dignitatis ·
Virtutis · merito · patriae · voto ·
Bonorum · omnium · applausu ·
Ad Sacri · honoris · verticem · evectus · est ·

Qui · muneri · amplissimo ·

Parem · adferens · eruditionem ·
Parem · eruditioni · pietatem · adjungens ·
Inter · summos · doctrina · enitet ·
Inter · doctos · autoritate · eminet ·
Inter · utrosque · pietate · emicat ·
Qui · reciproca · et virtutis · luce · honorem ·

Et · honoris · virtutem · illustrat ·

Ut · magis · tamen · honor · virtute ·

Quam · virtus · honore ·

Videatur · ornata ·

Virumq · dignitati · non · dignitatem ·

Collatam · viro ·

Publica · foelicitas · aggratuletur.

De Courcey, another student of the same house, wrote the following on the armorial bearings of Dr. Comerford,

The symbolism of the double cross, the rose and thorns, were almost prophetic.

“In Quemerfordii gentilitia Stemmata Epigramma”

Quid tibi cum canibus, quid vult crux bina rosarum,
Quae praefers signis, vir venerande tuis ?
Symbola quippe tuae sunt haec et in se virtutis,
Officii summam continere tui ;
Nam canis (ut veterum monstrant enigmata) vatem
Qui summi novit pandere sacra notat.
Significat doctum, vigilem, gratumq fidelem,
Denotat obsequium, militis umbra canis,
Quid Rosa spinarum stimulis circumdata? virtus
Obsessa innumeris, quae solet esse malis.
Haec tibi quam juste quadrant Insignia, praesul,
Cui, populi sacrum pandere dogma datur,
Cujus onus Christi tutari fortiter arcem,
Hostis et adversas vi cohibere minas,
Cujus inoffenso virtus splendore nitebit,
Sit licet innumeris obtenebrata malis.

(I may remark that these armorial bearings are not those of the Comerford family, and must have been selected by Dr. Comerford himself.)

Dr. Comerford set out for Ireland soon after his consecration, having had previously an audience of Pope Urban, who charged him with special care of the Augustinian Order in Ireland, and appointed him Apostolic Vicar-General of the Regular Canons of St. Augustine in this country. Returning to Waterford, Dr. Comerford laboured strenuously for the faith, and such was his success in refuting heretics that he was called, like his father in religion, St. Augustine, *Malleus Hereticorum*. During the Confederation he published a controversial work which he composed at that time. His life was often exposed to risk from the pursuit of the enemies of the faith, and he had often to seek for safety in concealment or flight. When the Catholics of Waterford joined the movement of 1641, and Atherton, their bitter enemy, ended his career by a disgraceful death on the scaffold, Dr. Comerford restrained the violence of the populace who were disposed to execute summary vengeance on those Protestants at whose hands they had suffered, not for disloyalty to the State, but for fidelity to the religion of their forefathers.

Being summoned to assist in framing the oath of associa-

tion and establishing the Confederation in Kilkenny, he took an active part in all those preliminaries, and was one of the first of the Irish Prelates to declare that the war which the Catholics were about to wage, was not only just in the sight of heaven, but necessary for the welfare of the Irish Catholics.

In 1641 the Supreme Council, of which he was a member, succeeded in reducing the fort of Duncannon, and he was restored to the temporalities of his see, which had been so long in the hands of Anglican intruders. He lost no time in reconciling the Cathedral Church of the Holy Trinity, and replacing the altars and sacred furniture which had been removed by the reformers. He was assisted by the generosity of the people of Waterford in the necessary moneys for this object. He restored the ritual of the Church in her ceremonies, and so exactly were they performed that the nuncio attested he had no where seen the usages of Rome so faithfully reproduced. By pontifical authority, the bishop attached to the Cathedral, the Church of St. Catherine, of old belonging to the Canons Regular of St. Augustine, and in exchange gave to the religious of his Order the Chapel of the Blessed Virgin, hitherto dependant on the Cathedral. This was a happy change for the good bishop, but, alas, one of short duration. We shall retrace our steps a little, and see what Dr. Comerford's feelings were on his coming to Ireland as bishop. He had spent the greater portion of his life in Portugal and her colonies, or in Brussels, where the Catholic religion was free and exempt from poverty and persecution.

Dr. Comerford on his return to Ireland, wrote from Waterford to Fr. Luke Wadding, 29th November, 1629 :—

“It is the moistiest, the stormiest, the poorest, and the most oppressed country that I saw since I left it until I returned . . . As for trading or stirring in mercantile affairs, which is the support of this kingdom, it is so much forgotten that scarce a man doth know of what colour is the coin in this miserable island. The dearth of the two last years, the universal sickness, the oppression of soldiers, besides other incumbrances, have made Ireland to seem to be in very deed a land of ire. At sea a merchant cannot navigate two days when he is taken by a Hollander, or a Dunkirk, or a French pirate, or a hungry Biscayner. The weather is so rainy and drowsy continually, that it doth imprint and indent in a man's heart a certain saturn quality of heaviness, sluggishness, lazyness, and perpetual sloth. Our (Lord) Deputy is gone for England, and in his stead do govern

the kingdom the Lord of Cork and the Lord Chancellor. What is their mind we know not yet, but if they will not expel us out of the kingdom, I know not what other punishment can they inflict upon us, for money or means they cannot find in any place in Ireland."

"Patrick of Waterford" writes, "*e loco Mansionis Nostrae*," March 12th, 1631, to Luke Wadding, his "very loving and kind Cousin" :—

"The country here doth begin a little to respire after the tedious wars, dearth, and sickness with which it was afflicted all these six years past. As yet we see no great persecution since the peace was proclaimed, although we may not presume much upon this little toleration, fearing such another devastation and desolation as came upon us the last year. This, your native place, *caput exerit undis*, as if it were after a long storm; and if any place of the kingdom have any stirring or trade, this will not overslip it."—*Wadding MSS.*

These extracts give us an idea of Dr. Comerford's feelings on his arrival, and after some stay in Waterford. He had also other difficulties. The Protestant bishops, Boyle and Atherton, by levying fines for recusancy and other means hindered the priests in the discharge of their duties. Notwithstanding all their efforts he succeeded in governing his flock, and held synods of his clergy, confirmed numbers of the young by day and night, either in private houses or in the woods, where he had to betake himself to perform those functions without interruption. The change was a great one to the bishop, from this secret performance of his duties and thwarted by persecution to an open one, free and surrounded by the full ceremonial of the Church. To obtain this for the entire island, and also a Catholic viceroy for the people, the majority of whom were Catholic, was the object of the nuncio and also of Dr. Comerford, who was one of those who most strongly supported the nuncio's policy. On the nuncio's departure from Kilkenny he spent many months of the year 1647 in Waterford with Dr. Comerford. The excommunication pronounced by the nuncio he caused to be strictly enforced in his diocese. The churches were placed under interdict and the celebration of Mass was forbidden. On a remonstrance being forwarded to him by the members of the Supreme Council, he returned a firm and dignified reply and paid no heed to their threats to deprive him of the temporalities of his see. The nuncio having established himself in Galway and finally taken leave

of the country, and Cromwell having taken possession of Waterford, Dr. Comerford was ordered to quit the country within three months. He set sail for S. Malo, where he arrived in August, 1650, but, on the way, was twice seized by pirates and stripped of everything he had. Writing to the Archbishop of Fermo, on the 23rd of March, 1651, he states that after his exile from Ireland "the few priests who had survived the pestilence and concealed themselves among the remnants of the Catholics, were banished . . . I hear the plague has begun its ravages again, and is carrying off the few Catholics that remained. Since my departure my nephews, Paul Carew and John Fitzgerald, and several others have died. The same tale of misery comes to us from Dublin, Wexford, Kilkenny, Ross, Clonmel, and the adjoining districts." He writes from S. Malo, 3rd March, 1651, to Rinuccini, stating he suffers from much debility, that though suffering many inconveniences he will remain here until the end of the war. If things succeed well he will return to his diocese at once; if badly, he knows not where to go. He, with his friend Robert Barry, Bishop of Cork, went to Nantes where they were received with great joy, and the States of Brittany made ample provision for their support. His chequered life was soon to end.

Worn out with sorrow and suffering he resigned his soul into the hands of his Master on Sunday, March 10th, 1652. His remains were interred in the Cathedral Church of Nantes, in the chapel of St. Clair, where his obsequies were celebrated with great pomp. Ten years subsequently, when the same vault was opened to receive the remains of Dr. Barry, his body was found quite incorrupt.

EPITAPH OF DR. COMERFORD.

[From the Rinuccini MSS., *Spic. Ossor.*, Page 89, Vol. 3.)

Quid hic stas viator?
Lactum aliquid quaeris
abi

Funus narro
acerbum, indignum, lachrymabile.
Aliquid prisicum?
Heu pietas, heu prisca fides
Alumnum hic vestrum et parentem
Vindicem et martyrem
situm agnoscite
Patricium Comerford

Waterfordiensem juxta ac Lismoriensem
Praesulem Illustrissimum
domo Ibernum, genere nobilem, eruditione spectabilem
Doctorem Laureatum
Sacri Eremitarum S. Augustini ordinis et instituti
Olim clientem, lumen et columnen egregium
Visitoris munere in eodem perfunctum non semel.
Quid tunc ?
Illum, illum haereticorum malleum, schismaticorum
fulmen, vitiorum clavum, patrem patriae, centum
olim captivorum vindicem et assertorem
longe meritissimum
Illum verbi divini praedicatione Apostolum
exilii patientia martyrem
pietatis studio confessorem
Virtutis inclytae, fidei invictae, constantiae immobilis.
Quid, inquam, rogitas ?
Ah, quoniam alios nunc vultus, aliaque ora contueor,
dicam confidentius.
Catholicae veritatis defensorem fortissimum
Libertatis Ecclesiae vindicem acerrimum
Sedis apostolicae propugnatorem strenuissimum
Britannia major expulit
Britannia minor excepit
Deinceps vel hoc solo nomine major futura :
Patriam fugit
Etenim nulla fides terrae et crudelibus Anglis
Naanetos venit
Nimirum sunt haec sua praemia laudi
Sunt lachrymae rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt.
At O rerum vices !
Finis alterius mali
Gradus est futuri.
Excidium patriae, exilium attulit innocentiae
Hoc denique exitio vitae fuit.
Quippe luctu et maerore calamitatis
Publicae et privatae
Suorum civium, suorum ovium
Civis optimus, pastor bonus
Infra paucos menses confectus extinguitur
Extinctum
Venerabilis insignis hujus Ecclesiae decanus et
Canonici celebri pompa et funere extulerunt
Et antiquo illustrissimorum Praesulum sepulchro considerare
Conclamatum est, abi
Votis modo et precibus fave
Avunculo benemerenti, nepotes maerentes,
Patritius Hacquet et Nicolaus Geraldinus
Sic parentebant.

This epitaph, however, from any tradition at Nantes, does not appear to have been inscribed on the tomb of Dr. Comerford. What the inscription on it was, up to the time of the great French Revolution, when it suffered the fate of so many others from profane hands, appears from the following extracts:—

Archives Municipales, Série gg, Registre de la Paroisse de St. Nicholas—Sépultures—1646-1655, fol. 171, (Nantes.)

“Le quatorzième jour de mars mil six cent cinquante deux a esté commencé une octave à haulte voix pour deffunct Monseigneur l’Illustrissime et Reverendissime Père en Dieu Messire Patrice Comerford, vivant évesque de Waterford et de Lismore en Hybernie, frère religieux de l’ordre des Eremites de Saint Augustin. Lequel décedé en la communion de notre mère Sainte Eglise le Dimanche dixiesme des dicts mois et an, et le mardy ensuivant, son corps fut solennellement inhumé en l’église Cathédrale de Saint Pierre du dicts Nantes.

“J. BOULLERY, *Recteur.*”

“Le vingt et uniesme jours de mars mil six cent cinquante deux a été fait le service d’octave de deffunct Messire Patrice Comerfort, vivant évesque de Waterford et de Lismore.”

Archives du Chapitre de la Cathédrale de Nantes (Registres des Conclusions Capitulaires.)

“Le Lundy treizième jour d’Octobre, 1670, Messieurs Boylesve, Du Brail, Le Bigot, Carisve, Toulblanc, tous Chanoines.

“Le Chapitre a fait delivrer à un prestre hybernois un extrait de la conclusion du lundy ije Mars 1652, touchant l’enterrement d’un évesque d’Irlande en cette eglise.”

The author of *L’Histoire lapidaire de Nantes*, in manuscript, has seen the tombs of Dr. Comerford and Dr. Barry in the Chapel of S. Clair, Cathedral of S. Pierre at Nantes, and copied the inscription. That of Dr. Comerford on a brass (*Table de Cuivre*) was as follows:—

“Ici repose très Révérend père en Dieu Patrice de Commersford, évêque de Waterford et de Lismore en Irlande. Persécuté dans son pays par les factieux d’Angleterre, il se retira en France, où il trouva sûreté et protection. Plein de confiance dans les bontés de l’Eternel, il vécut avec patience et supporta les malheurs de cette vie avec résignation. Il mourut l’an du Seigneur 1652.

“Archives du Chapitre de la Cathédrale de Nantes (Conclusions Capitulaires.)

“Du Vendredi. 29me Octobre, 1779.

“Présents messieurs, de regnon Doyen, de chevigné archidiacre de Nantes, de la tullais archidiacre de la Mée, soldini chantre dignitaire

de paris, de remaceul, phelipon, de vay, de charbonneau, bouissineau, de herré, de melient, doriard, de juge irvoi, tous chanoines.

“Aiant ce jour été présenté à la compagnie une requête tendante à ce que la plaque sur laquelle est inscrit l'épitaphe de monsieur de Comersfort, évêque de Waterford et de Lismore, inhumé du moi de mai de l'année mil six cent cinquante deux, dans le caveau de messieurs les évêques de Nantes ne fut point confondie avec le carrelage, mais mise dans un lieu apparent, pour perpétuer la memoire du dit seigneur évêque; le chapitre faisant droit sur la ditte requête a consenti et consent que la susdite plaque soit et reste placé comme elle l'etoit cy devant dans un lieu apparent et addossée au pilier de la chapelle de la sainte épine pour y rester a perpétuité.”

I have done my part in reviving the memory of these noble confessors of the Faith, Dr. Comerford and Dr. Barry. Their sufferings for the Faith and devotion to the Blessed Virgin has merited for them the grateful memory of the people of Nantes. Many other glorious Confessors of the Faith in Ireland remain without their history being recorded. I would humbly submit that if each priest did a little, we should soon have materials for a history to edify and to instruct.

PATRICK HURLEY.

THE ORAL SYSTEM OF TEACHING THE DEAF AND DUMB.

THE interest that has been taken by some of your readers must be my apology for asking to be allowed to address you again regarding the charges that have been brought against the oral system by the distinguished author of “Claims of the Uninstructed Deaf-Mute to be admitted to the Sacraments.”

He has issued a rejoinder in the September and October numbers of the RECORD. Your readers will scarcely look upon it as a reply; for he declines to notice, much less does he meet any of the arguments or instances by which I endeavoured to clear the oral system from the charges he brought against it. He alleges as his reason that “Father Dawson would seem to rely but little, or rather not at all on my personal experience or knowledge.”

I think your readers will see his mistake. What I complained of throughout was that he had advanced his observations without basing them or confirming them on his personal experience and personal knowledge. So true is this, that in his four letters, extending over forty-five pages of the RECORD, he gives only one small instance regarding the oral system from personal knowledge.

However, since he maintains that his original statements remain good and retain all their force, I will endeavour again to meet them.

His observations included two most grievous charges against the teachers and patrons of the oral system.

1st. "The teacher *has* to expose his entire chest and neck to the view of his pupils, so that the latter, partly by sight and partly by manual feeling, may observe how the vocal organs are exerted from the lungs upwards."

"Female deaf-mutes are doomed it would seem to undergo the same process as males, whether in separate or mixed schools."

"Religious communities *are thereby* excluded, and it is not seen how female teachers can avail themselves at all of such training."

2nd. "The oral system does not pretend to concern itself much about the religion of its pupils." In the oral schools there is a "sad void."

Thus did the writer, addressing himself to an exclusively Catholic audience, cast suspicions regarding morality and religious instruction against the religious communities that teach, and the bishops and ecclesiastics that are responsible for all the Catholic oral schools in Europe. I do not think there has been found a Catholic in this century who has ventured to issue publicly such imputations against religious or ecclesiastics. To my knowledge his words were understood by readers in their worst sense, and carried with them the weight of conviction by virtue of the high reputation of the name whose signature attested them.

He seemed to place too much confidence in the words of other writers; for, grave as these charges were, they were merely asserted, without a shadow of proof, or explanation, or experience to support them.

In my reply, I was not satisfied with declaring them from my experience of the system, both in the school at

Boston Spa and the other oral schools in England, to be absolutely false, but I showed at considerable length physical reasons why the objectionable practice he described was not only not necessary, but useless and even detrimental to the process of acquiring true tone of voice, and therefore that it could not be part of the oral system.

A grain of fact is worth a ton of speculation, and surely the living fact that the children in Catholic oral schools throughout Europe are being taught to speak without those exposures, and are being brought up in the full knowledge and practice of their religion, ought to have outweighed any ideas that he might have formed from reading the *International Review* or other pamphlets.

In the whole of my reply I was careful to make no assertion which I did not know to be true from personal knowledge. How different is the motive of credibility in my opponent. He does not profess to lay before us what he has seen, or knows to be a fact, nor even what he has read; but merely "observations that were suggested by the perusal of the *International Review on the Instruction of the Deaf and Dumb.*" If he had collected together facts and statements out of the *Review* and presented them to us as he there found them, we should all have derived instruction from them; but observations arising from them, like comments on the Bible, must not claim to have the high authority of the original.

When, therefore, I dispute the truth of his observations, I am not, as he would represent, guilty, in my zeal for the oral system, of overlooking the high authority of the *Review* and its respectable committee; but I am asserting my personal knowledge against his deductions. The inference of course is, that his observations are not correctly drawn; and I shall show that in the one instance in which he specially gives a reference, viz., the subject "le toucher," there is nothing in the *Review* that suggest the idea of, much less insists on, the necessity for the evil practice which he describes with so much colour. *Ex uno disce omnes.*

Moreover, in his September letter he gives us nothing from personal knowledge, but a mass of extracts carefully selected according as they would suit his purpose. Given a

brief, and a collection of speeches expressing various opinions, such as will be found in the Reports of the Conferences of Teachers of the deaf and dumb, it is not difficult to make a selection that will appear to establish a good case. But a judicial mind would require to know the value of the opinions cited; and if they were out of date, or strongly partisan, he would not allow them to be of much weight.

Now the oral system of teaching the deaf and dumb, as applied to a *whole* school, is of late growth. Each step in this difficult art has had to be discovered by experiment, so that difficulties and defects that existed thirty, twenty, and even ten years ago, have since been removed. During the period of its development discussion ran high and bitter between the adherents of the sign system, and the advocates of the oral system. It is therefore necessary before accepting any testimony on the subject, to consider both the date and partisan character of the utterance. In fact, on the question of what can and what cannot be done under the oral system, the testimony to be of any value at all must be drawn from the experiences of the present day.

What then is the general value of that collection of extracts wherein your correspondent, with one exception, avoids all contemporary evidence; draws the greater part of his support from the Report of the Conference held in London ten years ago, when the system was comparatively so little known in England that not a single English school had yet adopted it; neglects the Conferences held in 1881 and 1885; draws no evidence from Catholic oralists; none from the oral schools on the Continent; quotes statistics fifty years old to show what proportion of children can *now* be educated under the oral system; and even presses into his service the experiences of Weld and Day, who made their tour of inquiry forty years ago.

I appeal to your readers, is this the policy of a person who wishes the public, in the interests of the deaf and dumb, to know what can be done to lessen their sad affliction? Does it not rather argue a determination to discredit the oral system and its teachers. Such certainly is the tendency of his letters, and the effect of his calumnies, if unrefuted, would be anything

but beneficial to the deaf and dumb. For by discrediting the managers that adopt the oral method, he is directly withdrawing public confidence and public support from those institutions.

Let us now examine his rejoinder on the subject of the objectionable practices. I challenged him to say that any Catholic institution used them, or to name any respectable authority that insisted on their necessity. He is silent about any Catholic institution; but for the justification of his serious charge against all the teachers of the oral system, he refers us to the *International Review*, and to two statements by Mr. Arnold, one in the *English Quarterly Review*, and the other in the Report of the Brussels Congress.

Fortunately, I have all three by my side. He says, "the practice occupies a large space in the *International Review*, being continued in several numbers of that periodical as an accredited adjunct of the system."

These words would lead one to suppose that the process was being continually urged by a number of responsible persons. But what is the fact? After careful examination of all the numbers, I find the only thing of any moment is an essay on "le toucher" in the first three numbers of the *Review*, viz., April, May, and June of 1885, by Marius Dupont, and another short one in the following December. Your readers will be surprised to hear that there is not even mention or suggestion of the all-important point, "exposure of the chest." The dissertation is on the use of the sense of touch in its widest sense, including also sensation, and aims at showing, at least theoretically, the extent to which it may be used for acquiring correct articulation. M. Dupont would have the pupils train their sense of touch to such delicacy as to be able not only to perceive the resonance of the chest, the vibration of the bones of the head, the movements of the larynx, and the currents of air from the mouth, but to be able to distinguish the different characters of these vibrations, movements and currents, when caused by different vocal sounds.

The sense of touch is to be applied, not to the exposed chest, not in the way of manual feeling, and making the

fingers pursue the action of the vocal organs, from the lungs upwards, but in noticing the general resonance of the chest. This, of course, can be done without any disarrangement of the dress, and as its object is to learn the production of *voice*, it is only required in the pupil's earliest days.

The other authority advanced by your correspondent is, "Mr. T. Arnold, who advocates the practice not only at home in England (*Quarterly Review*, Oct., 1886), but also at the International Congress at Brussels, and who sustains his views on scientific principles, which he developed extensively on the occasion."

Your readers will be again surprised to learn that in neither of those places is there any mention of the all-important point "exposure of the chest."

In the first reference, which is an article not written by Mr. Arnold, but by Mr. A. Farrar, who often quotes him, the word chest is only once mentioned. I extract the full sentence to prove that Mr. Arnold's intention goes no further than M. Dupont:

"So in order that the learner may have *voice* suggested to him, Mr. Arnold would make a large use of touch, to enable him to compare his own sounds with those of his teacher—in the case of 'a' touching each other's glottis and chest."

In the second reference, Mr. Arnold's dissertation before the Brussels Congress, the chest is never once mentioned. It is a scientific dissertation on the sense of touch and sensation in relation to sound-vibrations, and partakes much more of the nature of an essay on physics than an instruction upon the practical teaching of articulation.

If such then are the grounds upon which my opponent says he charges the oral system with requiring improper practices, I think we may justly charge him with grossly misrepresenting his text book, and with throwing out a most serious imputation against sacred persons on most slender grounds. And if his comment on this, the gravest of all his points, is so unfaithful to the text-book, his other observations may justly be regarded with suspicion until their truth is confirmed.

The religious, whose charity urges them to devote

themselves to the education of the deaf and dumb, have undertaken a work which requires more patience and fact than that of any other teachers. Truly do they deserve our gratitude and consideration. Your correspondent, however, without a kind word for those whom he had wounded, closes his rejoinder on the above subject with these remarkable words :

“ I referred to it chiefly to point out how it excluded, *so far as it was employed*, female teachers and female pupils from all participation in the oral system, and of course *to that extent* narrowed its application.”

Yes! If that saving clause “so far as it was employed” had been inserted in the February letter it would have taken all force out of the objection. For it would have implied that the objectionable practices might or might not be employed, that they were not essential to the system, and therefore that there was no fear of their being used in any Catholic institution.

But I cannot believe that any such qualification was intended by him, for his words were absolute, “the teacher *has* to expose,” “religious communities *are* thereby excluded.” Nor can I think that even now he shows any modification of his original accusation, for the last words of this remarkable sentence, “and to that extent narrowed its application,” if I rightly understand them, take all meaning out of the earlier part. If these words mean that the *touch practice* in its objectionable form narrows the application of the oral system to the cases in which it is employed, he is still affirming that it must be employed wherever the oral system exists.

I will now consider whether my opponent has produced any better defence of his second great charge against the oral system, viz., that it is “unsuited to impart religious instruction.”

In February he said, “the oral system does not pretend to concern itself much about the religion of its pupils;” and he spoke of there being a “sad void” in this respect in the oral schools.

This sweeping assertion casting such a slur upon the bishops, priests, and religious communities who were

concerned in, and teaching the Catholic oral schools throughout Europe, was put forth without the slightest attempt at proof, reason, or illustration. It was not an abstract question or a matter of scientific discovery, but it deeply affected the character of individuals, and deserved to be firmly met. I declared it to be a calumny that showed the writer's ignorance of what is done in Catholic oral schools. Would any priest show the slightest consideration for a person who publicly dared to declare that the ordinary Catholic schools in England and Ireland are so conducted that the children cannot be instructed in their religion, and that the managers do not concern themselves much about it? Such a statement would alone convince us that he had neither visited nor made himself acquainted with what is done in those schools. I might have claimed to have replied to a bare statement by a bare denial; but flattering myself that his representation would be quashed for ever by the logic of facts, I explained in detail how the children at Boston Spa were being thoroughly instructed in the truths and practices of their religion. I brought our children before him, showed them answering questions in catechism and doctrine every Sunday, receiving instruction daily, frequenting the sacraments regularly, and confraternities holding meetings every Sunday. But how does he receive this living testimony? With a sneer, he seems to say, "Don't believe him, the thing is impossible;" for after quoting the words of my statement, he says: "In accepting this statement from Father Dawson, we have simply to believe that by extraordinary zeal and exertions he has made the *impossible* possible, in overcoming the difficulties which *all* others find *insurmountable*." (The italics are my own). I confess, I was not prepared for this kind of argument—it is magisterial indeed, but neither courteous nor logical. I repeat that the children at Boston Spa are thoroughly well instructed in their religion, and that the instruction is given by the oral method.

What he writes upon this subject in his rejoinder, on pages 837 and 838, is full of the same kind of high-handed declaration without proof. But the readers of the RECORD will not allow assumptions to stand for proof. He says,

“I object to the oral system as being unsuited to impart religious instruction. I find nothing short of a consensus on this all-important point. The advocates of the oral system even in Germany as well as in America admit and confess it.”

May we not be astonished at seeing these three statements so boldly proclaimed without any attempt to prove that it is unsuited for religious instruction, without showing that there is this consensus, and without giving the name or words of a single oralist in support of what he affirms. If he had favoured us with references, we might have found them to be as misunderstood, or as as groundless as those which were supposed to have proved that the system was immoral.

Three times in that paragraph on page 837, he repeats that the oralists “yield,” and “confess,” and “admit,” the necessity of signs for religious instruction. He is utterly wrong. I challenge him to produce the name of a single oralist who admits the necessity.

My opponent asserts that the oral system is unsuited for religious instruction; nay, he uses the words “impossible” and “insurmōutable.”

Where I ask is the difficulty? Why does he not *show* that it is impossible? We all receive our instruction through the medium of language of one kind or another. Every language is but a system of signs representing ideas. These signs may reach us through the ears, as is the case with spoken words; or through the eyes as is the case with writing, oscillations of a telegraph needle, manual alphabet, signs, movements of lips and other visible organs of speech, &c., &c. But where a person is trained to any one of these systems of language, whether it is English or Latin, hieroglyphics, writing, shorthand, manual alphabet, speech that can be heard, or speech that can be seen, it is to him a means of receiving and conveying ideas, impressions, and knowledge.

Would any one say that French or Russian was unsuited for religious instruction; still more foolish would it be to say that spoken language was less suited than signs. How do ordinary people receive their religious instruction? Is it

not by word of mouth? And how is it that we understand the instruction? It is because we know the meaning of the words that are used. Similarly does our deaf-mute through the sense of sight see and understand the words of his instructor; and I can vouch for it that such words convey to our pupils a more definite, correct, and spiritual impression, than signs used to do.

There is another most important factor in the religious education of the deaf and dumb which is quietly ignored by your correspondent though it is the very foundation upon which, with so much ability and charity for these afflicted people, he built up the "Claims of the Uninstructed Deaf-Mute to be admitted to the Sacraments." In that estimable work he has shown that a deaf-mute, without any instruction at all can by merely living in a Catholic home, imbibe sufficient knowledge of the supernatural to be fit to receive even the Sacrament of Holy Eucharist. But the advantages of a deaf-mute who is living in a religious house are greater than he would have at home. He there breathes the very atmosphere of religion. In the chapel, the solemnities of Mass and Benediction, the beautiful statues and pictures, and above all the reverence and pious demeanour of his teachers and schoolmates, teach him the presence of some Power superior to all, yet unseen. Religious emblems, religious practices, and religious motives are pressing upon him at every turn, so that it is impossible that he should not be imbibing a strong religious sense, and a not inconsiderable idea of the supernatural world. He is thirsting to know what is this unseen Power. What do these statues and pictures mean? What is the crucifix? Who died? Why did He die? Presently the answers are unfolded to him. The child is eager to know and believe. The explanations fall on prepared soil. No matter whether they are in English or German, in signs, writing, or spoken words, they are eagerly caught up; and difficulties in doctrine have no existence where there is such confidence and simplicity of faith. Just as religious instruction is given to ordinary children by word of mouth, and no instructor would dream of trying to give more correctness to their ideas of an

immaterial thing by substituting a sign for a word, so does the deaf child under the oral system see the words spoken by his teacher, and grasp the ideas that those words represent.

Notwithstanding the incredulity of my opponent, I assure your readers that children trained by the oral method do understand what is spoken to them. Almost all their instruction in every subject is given by word of mouth. When therefore verbal instruction can be assisted by a free use of pictures, and illustrated by stories from history and instances from every day life, it seems unreasonable to doubt that these children can be instructed in and properly impressed by the truths of religion.

Let me now examine the testimonies which my opponent produced in apparent support of his assertion that the "oral system is unsuited to impart religious instruction." I must remind your readers that though he said that "the advocates of the oral system admit and confess, and yield the necessity of signs for religious instruction," he does not produce the name of a single one who does so, though he quotes whole pages from those who were interested in the retention of the sign system.

The only testimony which on examination seems to bear upon the exact question is that of our own revered founder, Mgr. de Haerne, who at the London Conference ten years ago, in support of the *combined* method, said "the eyes were much used in religious instruction, even at Berlin, because it is not enough to speak to the mind, you must also speak to and from the heart." Now, your readers will observe that Mgr. de Haerne does not say that the signs are necessary for religious instruction, but simply that they are used in some schools. Again, the reason which he gives, viz., "that we must speak to the heart," cannot be regarded altogether as requiring a system of signs; for everyone can and does by their manner and visage speak to and from the heart when occasion requires by adding expression to their words, not by using signs in place of words. Indeed, for the positive teaching of religion, signs are quite inferior where words are understood; and for the sentimental teaching of religion, emotion and passion could be expressed only by such natural

accompaniments as are in no way opposed by the oral system. So that these words of Mgr. de Haerne do not in any way support my opponent.

The Rev. M. Joseph Lemann is evidently no oralist, but a stout defender of the sign method. Yet he does not venture to say that the oral method is unsuited for religious instruction but that "with the help of the language of signs, the knowledge of this august sacrament (Holy Communion) is imparted with greater certainty to their understandings, its truth reaches them in a manner more profound and impressive." I may ask whether this priest had had a fair experience of religious instruction by the oral method. For our experience at Boston Spa of twelve years under the sign system, followed by five years under the oral system, gives the verdict already in favour of the latter.

In further support of his statement he "refers me to the Report of the London Conference in 1877." I have the report by me, and I have no hesitation in saying that whatever testimony can be drawn from it is of little value on the point under discussion for the following reasons:—

1. This Conference of the teachers of the deaf and dumb in England was held ten years ago, at a time when the oral system had been so lately introduced into the country that no public school in England had yet adopted it, except the three small schools that had lately been founded by foreigners. The English teachers therefore at that time had not had sufficient experience of it as a system to be competent to give a judgment.

Since that time, so many have changed their opinions that now most of the English schools have adopted the oral system.

2ndly. Those who touched the subject, of whom the Rev. S. Smith was the most prominent, did not ground their remarks on the difficulty of imparting religious instruction to children in institutions, but to adult deaf-mutes who had either had no education, or were conversant only with the language of signs. This objection would have special force in the mind of this clergyman; for he had for a long time been the acknowledged missionary of the adult deaf-mutes in

London, for whose benefit he held regular services in a chapel specially provided for them in Oxford-street. Since the death of this truly charitable man, his son, who is headmaster of the public institution at Bristol, has adopted the oral system for his school.

3rdly. Evidence of the unsuitability of the oral, or indeed of any other system of education for imparting religious instruction in a Protestant institution, does not prove what might be the result of the same in a Catholic institution. What is there in a Protestant institution that compares with the atmosphere of religion that presses upon a child in a Catholic school, where there is the habit of prayer, religious motives, presence of the Blessed Sacrament, and where his teachers are devoting themselves mainly and unceasingly to turning his heart towards God and his holy law?

With regard to the other objections raised by my opponent against the oral system, it was never my intention to say much. My interest in this correspondence is centred in those two points which, from a Catholic point of view transcend all others, viz., morality and religious instruction. I will, however, venture to throw a little light on them, so that your readers may be in a better position to see how far those objections exist against the oral system at the present time.

First objection.—*More time is required, as compared with the sign teaching school.*

This I consider to be the best and almost only real objection that can be raised against the oral system. Signs are so much more quickly learned than words, that the sign system has the advantage over the oral system of being able to impart an amount of knowledge in less time; so that a pupil might perhaps acquire as much *knowledge* in the first four years under the one, as in six years under the other. But there is no doubt that the orally taught deaf-mute acquires a more correct knowledge of language as it is spoken and written. As explained in my letter of July, the language of signs has altogether a different mode of thought from that of our ordinary spoken language; the ideas are mostly in the reverse order, and there is an absence of all connecting words, cases, tenses, number, conjugation, prepositions, &c.;

so that the sentences of a deaf-mute trained by the sign system are often so up-side-down and defective in words, that they cannot be understood. Whereas the deaf-mute who is accustomed to seeing language only as it is spoken and written, acquires the idioms and general mode of thought and expression of that language. Hence arises his superiority over the other, even in the matter of knowledge; for though the sign-taught deaf-mute leaves his school with a greater stock of knowledge, the other has in greater perfection the instrument for increasing his knowledge year after year. Not only does his art of lip-reading enable him to acquire much by seeing the conversation or speech of others, but having a better acquaintance with language he will be better able to read books—which of course are an unlimited storehouse of information. I would compare the two pupils to two young men who start in life, one with £1,000 and a slow business, the other with only £500 but a much better business. In time the latter will be the richer man.

On the point of time, my opponent glories in the short period in which pupils under the sign system can be prepared for the sacraments. "They are able to come to confession before twelve months, and make their First Communion before eighteen months." (Does he mean eighteen months from entrance, or from the first confession?) Of course the superiors of the children here alluded to will be the best judges of what is best in their case; but my own opinion would generally discountenance rapidity in this matter. Where a priest has to deal with children who may soon leave his school, he will try to bring them to the sacraments early; but where children are fixed to remain for some time under his care, their abiding reverence for the sacraments, and habit of carefully preparing themselves ever afterwards before receiving them, will be best secured by allowing time for the growth of a solid religious feeling, and a longing for these heavenly gifts. With us in England an early First Communion would work great mischief, for when that great act has been accomplished many parents care little for the further education of their children and begin to agitate for them to return home and earn money.

I sympathize deeply with the authorities of Cabra on account of the practice mentioned by your correspondent of some Boards of Guardians in Ireland removing their children after three years. It is a grievous evil, which I am happy to say is never experienced by us in England.

Second objection.—*The oral system requiring a longer time, also entails a proportionate increase of expense.*

This objection is made the most of by my opponent who assumes two years as the extra time required, and £20 a-year the cost of each pupil.

The objection is specious rather than real. If the child were not in the institution, his maintenance would still be a burden on the parents or guardians. But it is not an unmixed evil, for the extra two years will have been a gain to the pupil himself, inasmuch as he not only carries away with him another faculty, that of lip-reading, and probably also of speech, but the lengthened stay in a religious house will have more firmly established his moral and religious training.

Third objection.—*Endless divergences in the views of its teachers and advocates.*

I cannot see that variety in detail can affect the truth of a principle. The divergences are perhaps less than the objector supposes. All advocates of the oral system agree in requiring that language shall be learnt from the lips, not from signs, and in rigidly excluding, at least in the school-room, any system of sign language or the use of a sign in place of a word. Scarcely any forbid the use of the natural motions that are in use amongst ordinary people, such as waving the hand to a person to shut the door, pointing to a thing which you wish to be brought to you, &c., &c.

Fourth objection.—*The oral system is wanting in adaptability to a very large number of deaf-mutes who can be taught by the sign system.*

Your correspondent proves this with, I suppose, mathematical accuracy from printed statistics. Contemporary evidence, however, is for him a dangerous rock, and therefore he keeps clear away from it.

But his readers will, I am sure, not allow themselves to

be drawn into the same grievous error when they know the date of his statistics. He has unearthed them from a book of Mgr. de Haerne's, printed thirty-two years ago, who there gives them on the authority of Mr. Weld, as the results obtained in two institutions during the period between 1826 and 1845, that is to say, between forty-two and sixty-one years ago! There is no fear that anyone will accept statistics of sixty years ago in condemnation of an art that has been advancing ever since that date. There will always be found a number of deaf-mutes who, on account of their defective intelligence, will under any system of education require exceptional treatment. They form a class apart, and scarcely any children would be in that class in an oral school that would not also be in it in a sign-teaching school. Our present statistics at Boston Spa show that out of a total of sixty boys and sixty girls there are four quasi-imbeciles on each side of the house, and that all the rest, except four boys and three girls, or one in sixteen, are following the ordinary course.

Fifth objection.—*It is cruel and unnatural to deprive a deaf-mute of his natural language which is that of signs.*

The answer to this is easy. The deaf-mute is never deprived of his natural language. Their natural aptitude for expressing themselves by signs, and of quickly becoming conversant with even any conventional system of signs, is so great that no length of exile from signs can impair it. Our opponents allow this when they allege that the deaf and dumb who have been educated under the oral system on leaving school fall back upon signs and finger alphabet.

It is well to bear in mind that the true position of a deaf-mute is that of a foreigner in a strange land. He has a language of his own, but he *has* to mix with those who use quite another language, and it is with them that throughout life, and for the business of life, he has to be able to converse.

Is it then cruel to take ordinary means during a few years of childhood, that his future prosperity and happiness may be the better secured? If so, I would say it were also cruel to make children sit and study so many hours of the day in a school at a time of life when their whole nature is urging them to be in the open air and at play.

A letter has reached me this morning from Mr. Elliott, whose opinions, as expressed at the London Conference of 1877, were the principal evidence which my opponent brought forward in condemnation of the oral system. By virtue of his ability, energy, and prudent judgment, he holds the foremost position in England amongst the teachers of the deaf and dumb. With painful conscientiousness he studied the question of the two systems. When to these advantages is added the vast experience of 25 years' headmastership of the largest institution in England, your readers will welcome the expression of his opinions as more valuable than those of perhaps any other living authority. With his permission I give his letter in full, and here tender my heartfelt thanks to him for this favour :—

“ 4, GROSVENOR-TERRACE, MARGATE,

“ 14th November, 1887.

“ MY DEAR MR. DAWSON.—In answer to your letter, I have no difficulty at all in repeating what I said at the last Conference, in 1885, viz., that my opinions in regard to the oral system have been considerably modified from those I expressed in 1877. In 1882, in a paper I read to the Conference of that year, I recommended that in view of the results which had been shown at Milan, ‘ thorough and impartial trial of the system ’ should be made in this country. The committee of the institution over which I have the honour to preside endeavoured to carry out this recommendation so far as their own school was concerned, and were so much satisfied with the results obtained that they passed a resolution upon which we are now acting, that ‘ all capable of being taught by the oral system should be in future taught by it.’

“ In reading the extracts from my paper of 1877, to which you call my attention, with the light which more extended and intimate acquaintance with the oral system has given me, it seems to me that at that time I judged of it more by its results as a medium of intercourse than a medium of education. This is the common view that is taken of it by those not personally and intimately acquainted with it in its latter aspect. Its real value lies in its superior educational efficiency. Because a certain proportion of those who are educated orally fail to speak in pleasing tones and with invariable intelligibility, or require some words and sentences to be reiterated when a communication is made to them, the system which produces such results is held to have failed. The real point, however, as regards the two systems is this—by which does the intelligence of the deaf become the better developed, and by which are their intellectual faculties the more effectually trained as the result of a proper period of education. Making every allowance for what ‘ signs ’ and the manual alphabet can do

in this direction, my later experience leads me to give the answer decidedly in favour of the oral system. If a deaf child can be got to understand spoken utterances, and to answer in the same way, he must be qualifying himself to use ordinary language as an ordinary child does; and if this process be persistently and consistently carried on throughout the whole course of his education, he will approximate to a hearing child who has had an equal period of a similar training. And if he, by this means can accomplish that hitherto immensely difficult task to the deaf, the use and understanding of ordinary and idiomatic language, what obstacle is there in his way to the attainment of any degree of eminence in literature, science, and art for which his natural capacities may fit him? Now, an average deaf child, well taught, *can* understand his teacher speaking to him in the various stages of his progress in the language appropriate to each, and without the intervention of 'signs,' and thus 'language' becomes the medium of his intellectual training. And language must be in itself a more effectual means of such training than signs, or we who hear would adopt the latter in our own case; and my pupils exemplify this, for they are generally far more intelligent as orally taught than their sign-taught predecessors were. Then as a means of intercourse in the world; supposing in after school periods—and this is an extreme supposition—the speech of an orally and properly taught pupil is wholly unintelligible, he can in this case, equally with the sign-taught, resort to writing, or if he and his friends prefer it, and in the society of his own class, to 'signing' and finger-spelling. Both these latter means he acquires very easily. My contention is only that signs and finger-spelling should be banished as agencies of instruction with those orally taught. I need not enter upon a consideration of the conditions necessary for complete success; but I may say that if these are so attenuated as to be inadequate to produce a fair amount of ability in speaking and lip-reading, in the earlier years of instruction, I should consider the sign system to be the one which on the whole it would be the wisest to follow. I find, in regard to religious instruction, that provided it be graduated according to the child's knowledge of language and capability of understanding, there is no greater difficulty in imparting it than by signs. In the latter periods of instruction, where the language is more fully developed, as it is by the oral system, points can be elucidated by ordinary spoken or written language, which it is difficult, if not impossible, to convey by our rude undeveloped 'sign language.' And there is no question that for mere learning by rote, the lessons in spoken words are learned with much greater facility than when the separate letters of the words are spelled on the fingers. I admit that until there is ability to combine the separate sounds into words no definite religious instruction can be given. But the observance of outward forms and ceremonies, as in the case of the hearing, have their value as educative agencies. I see no reason to forbid a judicious participation in these, nor the presentation of facts and stories by pictures, or even by natural

signs. The sign system can really do little, if any more, than the oral at this early stage.

“For the majority, and with such conditions as your Church can so well supply in the devoted labours of ‘the religious,’ I think the system which teaches by speech is the superior system. For the semi-intelligent and those who must necessarily have only a very inadequate period for instruction, signs, as following up what has already been begun by the child himself, may produce more immediate effect than a system of instruction which cannot commence real education until a means of communication has been effectually established.

“I am, very truly yours,

“RICHARD ELLIOTT.”

I cannot conclude my share in this discussion without expressing my admiration for the excellent results that have been attained under the sign system by the Christian Brothers and Dominican Nuns at Cabra. I was pleased to see them stated so fully by your correspondent in February, for I knew every word to be true. It was my privilege to be present at the public examination in the Rotunda in 1881, and I came away with the conviction that in the matter of education, as well as perhaps in all other matters, it stood first among all the public schools for the deaf and dumb in the kingdom. What the same teachers would have effected under the oral system is an interesting problem. In a few years time, there will probably be some data from which to form a judgment; for Mr. Walsh, who was for many years the head-teacher at Cabra, became head-master of the institution at Bombay in 1883, and though none knew better than he the power of signs, he has there adopted the oral system.

In concluding this controversy, I trust that your correspondent will permit me to express my regret at having been called upon to enter into it. I did so with all respect to him whose great zeal and learning require no commendation of mine, and solely in the interests of the deaf and dumb whose sad affliction surely demands all Christian sympathy.

I thank the Editor of the RECORD for kindly allowing me so much space in his valuable magazine, and must express my regret and apology that I have not been able to make the subject more interesting to its readers.

EDWARD W. DAWSON,

Chaplain of St. John's Institution, Boston Spa.

HAYNES' OBSERVATIONS ON THE STATE OF IRELAND IN 1600.

[The manuscript volume which contains these *Observations* is a royal quarto, bound in vellum, comprising ninety-two pages of *The Description of Ireland as it is in hoc anno 1598*, and fifty four pages of *Haynes' Observations on the State of Ireland in 1600*—both specimens of the same exquisite penmanship. It bears on the first page the autograph of Father Betagh, after whose death it passed, with *The Irish Warr of 1641*, the *Macariae Excidium*, and his other MSS. to his distinguished pupil, Father Kenny, by whom it was deposited in Clongowes Wood College. From the watermark of the Dutch firm of *Blauw*, established in 1756; from the autograph of Father Betagh, who died in 1811; from “*sunt*” put for “*sinit*” in “*non sunt esse feros*;” and from “*quid*” put opposite an obscure word, “*dim*;” I gather that our transcript was made between the years 1756 and 1811, by a scribe unacquainted with Latin, not from the original, but from a copy written by one learned in the Latin tongue. Where the original is I know not; but I have ascertained from Mr. John M. Thunder's MS. *History of the Ancient Kingdom of Meath*, that among the MSS. of James, Duke of Chandos, No. 1751, there was a second copy, perhaps the original, of the companion treatise, *The Description of Ireland, and the state thereof in 1598*; and I hope this learned gentleman, or some of my readers, will be able to discover the original or other copies of the *Observations*.¹ These are six or seven times shorter than Spenser's *View*; and they are so like it, that either Haynes has given an abridgment of Spenser's MS. or taken his *Observations* from the same source—thus exhibiting the bare and grim skeleton, which the “Poet of Poets” merely draped with the Coan vesture of his “pure English (undefiled?).” Haynes was, to all appearance, an Englishman, and a rather extreme coercionist, who thought

¹ Transcripts of the Clongowes MS. are in the Royal Irish Academy, and the British Museum.

that "the best of all ways" to improve Ireland was to plunder, starve, and murder the Irish. Yet his treatise contains, in such a short compass, so many curious things about Ireland, that it invites editorial attention, and may excite the interest and sometimes the astonishment of the Irish reader. In his defence, I will state, in the words of Spenser, that Ireland was then "*as it was handled*, a land of war;" and I may say of him what Mr. Hales writes of Spenser: "He was not in advance of his time in the policy he advocates for the administration of Ireland. He was far from anticipating that policy of conciliation, whose triumphant application it may perhaps be the signal honour of our own day to achieve. The measures he proposes are of a vigorously repressive sort; they are such measures as belong to a military occupancy, not to a statesmanly administration . . . Such proposals won not an unfavourable hearing at that time. They have been admired many a time since."¹

I have not meddled with the spelling, and as little as possible with the punctuation; but I have appended some short notes, which I hope will be useful. The English notes, for which no reference is given, have been taken from Spenser's *View of the State of Ireland*.]

EDMUND HOGAN, S.J.

CERTAIN PRINCIPALL MATTERS CONCERNING THE STATE OF
IRELAND, COLLECTED BREIFLIE OUT OF SONDRIE WRITERS
AND OBSERVED AFTER SOME OPINIONS.

THE evils that principally afflicte the quiett estate and
coñmon weall of Ireland are of three kyndes, viz. :

In the Laws, Customes, and Religion.

The Irishe doe especiallie regarde a Lawe of their owne called the Brehon² Lawe, nothings at all affectinge or obeyinge the Laws or Statutes of Englande.

The Brehon Lawe is a certeyne rule of righte unwritten and delivered by tradicion from one to another, and there is in it y^t. sometyme greate sheue of Equitie. But in manie things not agreable with the Lawes of God, nor man.

¹ Memoir prefixed to Mr. Morris' edition of Spenser's works, p. lii.

² brehoun; *ḃreḃon*, seat of a judge (*Bk. of Armagh*). Our Lord is called "the true Brehon," *ḃreḃon* (*Stokes' Ir. Glosses*, p. 46.)

Brehon what
yt meaneth. As when a man is murdered, the Brehon that is the Judge, will by his Power and authoritie compownde between the Murtherer and the Friendes of the partie murdered, that for some recompence which they call Iriach,¹ the Murtherer shall go without punishment, which causeth manie vyle Murthers in that Countrey.

This Lawe is at this daie in manie places used, for that there be manie places in Irelande, where the Lawes of Englande yett never tooke place; and where they seeme to yeld a kind of subieccion to the English Authoritie, they use this Lawe privelie, where all Irishe dwell togeather who conceale amongst themselves manie crimes that never come to the knowledge of the Englishe Governors.

Ireland sub-
mitteth to H. 8. The Realme did in sorte submitt themselves in Parlyament unto Kinge Henry 8, and did acknowledge him their liege Lord, and yett, as some say, they received their anciente priviledge and their seignories inviolate by Sr. Anthony St. Leger, then Lo. Deputie.

But because a good course and sounde establishment of the good Lawes that were made was not contynued amongst them, they tooke their old Libertie and brake into newe disobedience; and the posteritie of them that yelded themselves doe nowe utterlie refuse to obey, because they saie that nowe holdeth but a personal Estate which they call Thamistry,² that is for Life onlie, which is Thamist, because they are admitted to their Lande by Eleccion of the Country, and therefore are not bounde to obeye that their Predecessors doe.

The Lawes of Englande being unpossessed on the Irishe, did not worke the intended effecte, beinge the Englishe and the Irish are of differente dispositions, customes and behaviour, and, therefore, the Lawes oughte to be made accordinge to the inclynacion of the people.

¹ breaghe; breaeth, judgment; eime is a fine for bloodshed.

² tanistih; t  n  ir   or t  n  ir  te, successor elect; t  n  ir  teacht or t  l  ghe t  n  ir  te, law of succession; t  n  ir  tar, he succeeded (*Chron. Scot.* pp. 6, 8); t  n  ir   means "secundus" in Zeuss, p. 309.

Licurgus Licurgus knowinge the Lacedemonians to be most bente to Warre made Lawes for the Trayning of them in the same even from their Cradles.

Solon And yett Solon perceavinge the Athenians inclyned unto Warre, made Lawes to trayne them upp in Learninge and Science, so that to bringe Irelande to Civilitie there must be Lawes made to reduce them to a more civill course of Life first, and then the Lawes of Englande will be the better received amongst them.

The presence of the prince amongst a Stubborn People is the greatest meane to bringe them to conformitie, for his worde more prevayleth then the Sworde of an inferryor Magistrate.

The nature of the Irysh is never to yield as longe as he can stande by his own strength, and when he is brought to misery by power, he then crowcheth and humbleth himselfe, suing for favor till he begett newe power, and then betaketh out againe into his former mischief.

The waie therefore to bringe them to obedience is to keepe them in contynuall Subjection.

If the Lawes of Englande had beene fullye Executed and followed, in the tyme of the conquest by Strongbowe in King H. the 2^d. tyme, amonge the Iryshe as that was then amonge suche Englishe as were planted in their steade that fledd, It might have wrought great good amorge them; But after their Submission the Englishe used them as Vassalls and made their owne Willes a Lawe to keepe them to Civilitie.

They contynued thus as vassalls and under subieccion and force by the English untill the Controversie of the Two Royall Houses of Lancaster and Yorke, when the nobles, that had possessions in Irelande, came to helpe the parties whom they favored of the Two Howses and to save their possessions in Englande; and when the men of greatest power were gone, the Irishe brake oute into newe Rebellion and gayned a Libertie by their Sworde and a Superioritie over the Englishe that were before their Lordes.

Theis Countries especiallie were thus perverted and revolted after the departure of the Englishe.

Munster.

The Landes aboute Leugh Loghur.¹
Arloe & the Bogge of Allon.

All the Landes in Conaught.

1. In LEMPSTER.²

Borderinge on the Oollners.³

Elbonora.⁴

Orourk's Contrye.

2. In ULSTER.

All the Landes neighbouringe unto
Glanmalor⁵ mountains unto Shile,
Lagh and Polomotes.

All the Countries neere unto Tyr-
connell, Tyrron, Tertelagh, and
the Scottes.

The Irish Fugitives thus retorninge and subduinge theis partes, yt followed that by little and little they became maisters of muche of the Inland. Soe that afterwards Ed. 4th. sente the Duke of Clarence his Brother to redress theis wronges, and onlie cooped them upp in Certeyne narrowe Corners. But subdued not them untill he was called home by practise of wicked ones aboute the Kinge and so made awaie, and then the North parte of the Countrye merely revolted againe, and sett upp O'Neill for their Capitaine, a man before of slender power or Accompte.

And about Thomonde there arose one of the OBryen's called Murrogh, who with a Trowpe of the vileste Irish prevayled soe farre, that he came through the Countrye prevaylinge, att least⁶ proclaymed himselfe Kinge of all Irelande, and was amonge them soe called, wherefore yt was denyed⁷ into 4 or 5 kingdoms att once, unlesse it were when Edward

¹ Slew Loghir, *Slabh Luachra*.

² Leinster, *Leisim* (*Bk. of Armagh*).

³ culuers; O'Mores? O'Connors?

⁴ Mointerolis; *mumter-eolair* in Leitrim.

⁵ Glaunmaleerih mountains unto Shillelagh, unto the Briskelagh and Polmonte; *Glenn-maolughra*;

⁶ at last.

⁷ divided.

LeBruz made himsef Kinge in Edw^d. 2. tyme, who con-
tynued soe but one yeare, and was overcome by the Lo.
John Bremingham who was sente thither by the Kinge.

The olde English Pale when LeBruze invaded the
Countrye was chieflie in the North from the pointe of Don
Luce and beyonde into Dublyn, having in the midst of yt
Knockfergus, Belfast, Armagh and Carlingford, which are
now the most outbounds and abandoned places in the
Englishe Pale.

The Englishe Pale stretcheth now butt to Dundaske,¹
towards the North. The old Pale was a most fruitfull
countrye, the Ornament of the Lande, and yelded unto the
Kinge of Englande 30000 Marks of old money by the yeare,
besides manie thowsande men able to serve in the Warres, and
and where besides manie other Commodities as Woodes and
Timber Trees fitt for Shippinge, a thinge materyall and to be
regarded.

The Countrye beinge in a dangerous waye by their Rebel-
lion to cast off all obedience of late yeares were yett curbed
and kept back by the grave devyses and politique carriage
of the most noble Lo. Graye.

At sondry tymes before that manie particular partes of
the Realme were indangered and disturbed as the Country of
the Birnes and Tooleys² near Dublyn by the outrages of
Feagh MacHugh.

The Countries of Carlow, Wexford, and Waterford by the
Cavenaghes.

The Countries of Liex,³ Kilkenny, and Kildare by the
Moores.

The Countries of Cavan and Louth by Oreilies, Kelges,
and others.

The Countries of Offalie, Meath, and Longford by the
Conhurs.

The Comon Lawes of Englande not fitt in all points for
Irelande; one cause is, for that Tryalls are to be Made by
xii Jurates, who beinge Irishe as most must of necessitie bee,

¹ Dundalk.

² Tooles; Ο'Туαχαιλ.

³ Leix, Λαοιγχιρ.

⁴ Kellyes

they care not of an Oath to deceave the quene or an Englishman of his right, and therefore another course must be had for Tryall or this in better sorte provyded for.

This inconveniencie extendeth to the preiudice of the Quenes right in Attaynder, Wardshipps, Escheates, all pleas of the Crowne and inquiries whatsoever.

An Irishman, yea almost anie, will forswear himself for his Lordes, and hold and maintayne yt not onlie Lawfull but Commendable and as a dutie.

To remove this inconveniencie, yt must not be done by extreme punishments but by working in them a more rype understandinge of the truth with the feare and knowledge of God.

The Excepcions which the comon Lawe alloweth to followe doth also muche hurte in Irelande, because he maie challenge the inquest without shewing anie cause, whereby through the partiall dealinge of suche as he shall wynne into his Jurye the malefactor is most comonlie acquitted.

Another mischiefe is this, that where the common Law cannot execute an accessory in Fellonie, one that receiveth stolne Goodes without the apprehension of the principall, It falleth out in Irelande, that the Rebell or outLaw stealeth and bringeth it unto another Gent. or Husbandman of good worth, who, beinge apprehended, imprisoned, arraigned and indyted, cannot be put to death because the principall is not taken, and soe the Theefe and receavor encouraged, the people disturbed, and the Quene abused.

And this cannot be reformed by Acte of Parliament there, because yt must be done by the Piers, Gent., Freeholders, and Burgesses of that place, who will never consente to anie Acte preiudiciall to themselves or their Friends.

There is another thinge much hinderinge her Majesty's Revenewes, and which giveth Scope to Traytors and Rebels to preserve their Landes unto their Heyres, notwithstandinge they fall to Treasons or Rebellions, and that is, because they make over and convey their Landes to ffeoffees in trust which standeth good, notwithstanding their notorious crymes whereby their Landes are to come to her Majestie.

And by that meanes fugytives beyonde the Seas

mainteyne themselves with the profitts of their Lands here, which should in right come to her Majestie.

It is unfitt in Irelande, that an Irishe should have the Warde or marriage of any there, because they make them fitte for all wickedness and disloyalties, and yett in regarde of the Knights service the comon Lawe alloweth yt and casteth yt upon them.

There are also certeyne places of priviledges and Counties Pallantyne, which at the conquest were graunted both to good uses and upon good consideracion to men deserving the trust; but now are converted to the danger of the State of the Lande, as the Countie of Tipperarye or Tiperay, the onlie Countie Pallantyne in Irelande, is abused soe as yt is the receptacle of all evill doers and of such as spoyle the rest of the Countrie.

The Townes Corporate have suche priveledges and Liberties, as howsoever afore they were thought fitt, are nowe most intollerable—as that they shall not be charged with Garrisons, they shall not be forced to travell out of their Franchises, they maie buy and sell with Theeves and Rebelles; all Fynes and [Amercyments laied upon them redownde to themselves againe, and are bound to noe other Governor then their owne, what then can there be more dangerous to this State of Irelande, then the Tolleration of theis Liberties.

Besides manie idle and frivolous Statute Laws, there be some verie inconvenient, as making a Distresse for Debte to be Felonie, yf the distresse prove unlawfull, and that whiche maketh Coyney and Livery to be treason. Coyney¹ is mans meate and Livery² is Horse meate, whiche the Lords were wont to take of their Tennants by an Ordinarie Custome, and now by this Statute they are inhibited and indaingered. Besides this kinde of Tennant's service there are this, Cuddy,³

¹ coynye; "placing men upon the country" (Dimmok). το ποσ κομμησασθ τρε οια μημτηρ, "he gave quarters to his men" (*Four Masters*, 1462). Ware is wrong here; κομμησασθ, billeting (*Chron. Scot. passim*).

² Liverye; an English word. Cf. "βησπορηρ, λιβηρε, ηρ σάμρε εκ' εσμερ" (*O'Connell's Dirge*, lxxx.); it is food for horse, "horse meat."

³ cuddeehih; curo orohche, share of the night supper.

Coshrey,¹ Bonnaght,² Straght,³ Jordin,⁴ and manie other like first supposed to be brought by the Englishe.

There is a custome called the Custome of Kincoughishe,⁵ which was a Statute that provided that every head of every Sept and everie cheeffe of every kinredd or Famelie should be charged with anie treasons, Felonies, or other haynous crime of this Sept or kyndered.

This State is dangerous, because yt strengtheneth the head of this Sept and cheiffe of the kynne, who by pretendinge a power over them, by this State may comande them to evill or good, especially the people beinge inclyned to evill and not to good, to Rebellion and not obedience.

Customes. Ireland was first inhabyted as yt is supposed by the Scithians in the North partes, by the Spanyards in the West, by the Gaules in the Southe, and by the Brittaines in the East towards Englande. Of theis nations they have taken and retayned sondrie Customes to this daye.

After the manner of the Scythians, they use to keepe and pasture their Cattle on the Mountaines in heardes and followe them, makinge their abode upon the Mountaines, and live by the Milks of their kyne and the Whitemeates the most parte of the Yeaere, and this kinde of usage they call Bollinge,⁶ and the Herdes and Herdesmen Bollegh.

Nowe this kinde of Bollinge or followinge theire heardes breedeth enormities to the Countrey's. For yf there be anie Malefactor or outlawe, he can betake himselfe amonge their Bolleys, and soe live and doe mischief without Suspicion or

¹ cosshirh; *cóirir*, a great feast; "feasts at Easter, Christmas, etc." (Dimmok).

² bonaught; *buana*, a billeted soldier, *buana air gach tigh*; *buanaacht*, quartering—*buanaacht na lochlannach air phearaib Eirenn*.

³ sragh; *rreácht*, *rúácht*, a tax.

⁴ Sorehim; from *rarruighim*, I extort, exceed; or *rsoaradh*, exemption: "An allowance over and above bonnacht, which the Galloglas exact" (Dimmok). *Taxatio quater in anno imposita libere tenentibus* (Ware). "Teignie are reare-suppers, or drinking in their chambers after or before dinner and supper" (Dimmok). Cf. *reightheadagh* "reare," last; or *teme fire*.

⁵ kin-cogish; I think, *cin-chómhfhogair*, crime of relationship. Cf. *Δ χιν φορ Δ φλατχ* (*Brehon Laws*, iv., p. 243). Davies is wrong here.

⁶ bolyes = herds and houses for cattle. *buale*, fold, cow-house; *buallacht*, a drove of cows; *buachaille*, of a cow-boy (*Bk. of Armagh*).

punishment, besides manie Stealeges¹ are made of Cattle and received of theis Bolleys, and manie murders and mischeifes are done by suche as follow theis Bolleys.

The wearinge of their Mantles and of their long Hayre, which they call Glibbs,² they have also from the Scythians, and the Mantle is a Weede which carryeth with it manie inconveniences; for yt is a Cloake for a Theeffe, and because they weare yt over head and Eares downe to their Feete a wicked villaine may goe through a Towne unknowne and under yt carrye anie offencive weapon to murder and do mischeiffe. The Glibbe or longe Bushe of Hair serveth a wicked doer to cover his countenance when he will not be known, and yf he will make himself more unlike himselfe then before he may cutt yt of and then he is not the man.

Another custome they have from the Scithians and that is to yeld and give a terrible outery at their cominge and wyninge of Battell, and crye uppon some valyannt Captaine or Soldier deceased, to breade the more Terror unto their Foes, and therefore call "Ferragh, Ferragh,"³ whereby they remember a Kinge or great Leader which fought and was fortunate against the Pictes, called Fergus or Feragus. Manie other rites and customes they reteyne to this daie which the Sciths did, with their shorte bowes and shorte arrowes with the shorte and barded heades, their broade Swordes, their goinge to Battell without Armour.

And as the Scithians swore coñonlie by their swordes and by Fire as by two principall matters of vengeance and Bloodshed, Soe doe the Irishe Connjure and charme their Swordes by makinge a cross on the Grounde with them, and thrustinge the pointe into the Grounde before they goe to Battaile holdinge yt a meane of better Successe; likewise they sweare by their Swordes, manie suche Supersticious rites they

¹ stealthes.

² a thick curled bush of hair hanging down over their eyes; ḡlib, pl. ḡlibeanna; shown in Albert Dürer's sketch of Irish soldiers.

Farrih, Farrih; I think this is *feraradh*, act, fight, "do" (or die), which O'Brien mistranslates "act like a man."—*feraradh* *caith*; a battle is fought (*Chron. Scot.* 320). See thirty Irish war-cries in *Ulster J. of Arch.* No. 11, as *pumpeóg*, the ash-tree (L. Delvin); *lámh lártaigh* (O'Brien, MacCarthy, FitzMaurice); *reabhac*, the hawk (O'Carroll), etc.

yet observe, which argueth them originally to proceede of the Scithians.

They likewise have the Fire and the Sunne in greate reverence; Soe have the Northern people, who are much troubled with Cold and Darkness; And contrarywise the Moores and Egyptians, because the heate of the Sonne annoyeth them, they, when the Sonne riseth, curse and damne yt as their notable Scourge and plague.

The Scithians likewise when they would combyne themselves together to doe mischeiffe they would drinke a Bowle of Bloude together, and soe doe the Northerne Irishe as Buchinan reporteth.

The Scithians use to sweare by the Kings hand, the Irishe use to sweare by the Lordes hande as Olaus Magnus affirmeth.

The Scithians did also use to Seeth the Flesh in the Hyde, and soe doth the Northern Irishe yett, and to Boyle the beaste livinge as the North Irish doe.

Manie other suche Customes they have from the Scithians. The Spaniards did onlie use to weare their Beardes on their upper Lipp, and cutt off that which grewe on the chynne; and soe did the Irishe till a Statute was made against yt.

Amonge the Spaniards the Women had the trust of household Affayres, and men of matters in the Feild, manie Spanishe tricks are yet used among the Irishe, as the Women ryde on the wronge side of the Horse, and the Bards came from the Gaules, as Cæsar saith, and from the Britton, and not altogether given over amonge them to this daie.

Their longe Dartes came from the Gaules, Their Wickare Targetts and longe Swordes.

The Gaules were won'te to drinck their Enemies Bloud, and to painte themselves with it, and soe were the old Irishe wonte to doe.²

(*To be continued.*)

¹ "An Englishman shall not use a beard upon his upper lip alone, and the said lip shall be once shaved at least in every two weeks; the offender to be treated as an Irish enemy" (Act of 1447). This Act was repealed in 1635. Portraits of Irishmen are given by Albert Dürer, a copy of which is in the British Museum; also by Ware, *Hib. et Antiq.*, p. 59; London, 1654.

² This is erroneous.

THEOLOGICAL QUESTIONS.

NEGOTIATIO AND THE ANNEXED CENSURE.

REV. DEAR SIR,—You are aware of course that in the year 1872, Pius IX. added to the Excommunications contained in the Bull *Apostolicæ Sedis*, a new one which concerned missionaries in America and Japan. Rather the Holy Father renewed the Excommunication contained in the Bulls or Constitutions of Urban VIII. and Clement IX. As much controversy has arisen regarding this Excommunication, and regarding those who are comprehended in it, I will respectfully ask your opinion on certain points. I will, however, before asking your opinion say that I have read the *Acta Apostolicæ Sedis* by Avanzini; also the Commentary on the Excommunications, by Penachius; also one by Bucceroni; and a treatise on Canon law, by the Faculty of St. Sulpice. I have, moreover, the opinion of more than one Professor of Theology. As I find these men divided in certain points, I would ask you kindly to treat the whole matter in the IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

As you are aware this Excommunication is important, as it obliges clerics to restitution, so that no one who has been engaged in *Negotiatio* and gained *lucrum* thereon can be absolved until he makes restitution of the *lucrum*.

Now let me ask, and the question is for practical purposes—

1st. How is the *Negotiatio* which is forbidden defined?

2nd. Does it include *real estate*? Very often persons—priests purchase property in cities of the U. S. in order to gain money. Property increases in value, and they purchase in the hope of becoming *millionaires*. Are such persons excommunicated? I might have remarked that the property in most instances remains unimproved until sold. In other words no change takes place in the property until sold, if even then.

3rd. Who incur the Excommunication? Do priests ordained *titulo missionis*? Do bishops? What do the words "*Quomodolibet Morabuntur*" mean?

4th. Is the *venditio* of the thing purchased necessary in order that the Excommunication be incurred? Or does the *emptio cum intentione lucri* suffice in order to bring one under the Excommunication?

In putting these questions, I may perhaps as well tell you that in our diocese there are many priests who have speculated on property.

They bought "lots" on which to build houses. Rather they bought "lots" not with the intention of building on them, but with the intention of selling them to persons desirous to build or speculate on them for a higher price. I have no doubt but that they bought in *bona fide*, and that consequently they cannot incur the Excommunication. Now I would like to know are they bound to restitution? A question was proposed to the Sacred Congregation, in the 18th century, regarding the matter as it concerned religious priests, and the answer was that persons who sold at a higher price, having purchased in *bona fide*, did not incur the Excommunication, but that that they were obliged to restore the *lucrum*—that is to say, if they became aware of the existence of the law of Excommunication before the *venditio*. This Decree I found in a book called *La Vida y honestad de los Clerigos*.

5th. What, therefore, is a priest to do if such priests with a knowledge of the law come to him to confession? Is he obliged to debar them from the Sacraments? If they retain the property with the intention of selling it at a future time, can he absolve them? Or are they bound in conscience to give or rather to sell the property at once, and make restitution of the *lucrum*, if *lucrum* there be?

These are a few of the questions which I would ask you kindly to answer in the IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD, so that American priests may know the law by which they are bound. Very many receive the RECORD. I can assure you that many souls are lost because of *Negotiatio*.
P. II.

Before directly replying to the important questions proposed by our correspondent, it may be well to give extracts from the Papal Constitutions which impose the censure and penalties here under consideration. They are not accessible to all; and no one can come to an independent conclusion on this subject until he has carefully examined their purpose and meaning. The Decree of the S. R. U. Inquisition only declares that the enactments of Urban VIII. and Clement IX. are still in force, notwithstanding what is said in the *Bulla Apostolicæ Sedis* about the discontinuance of pre-existing censures. Urban VIII's Constitution was published in 1633. It creates no difficulty for our correspondent as it does not touch the secular clergy. On the matter at issue it runs thus:—

“Religiosis omnibus cujuscunque Ordinis, et Instituti, tam non

mendicantium, quam mendicantium etiam Societatis Jesu, eorumque singulis tam in praedictis locis nunc existentibus, quam in futurum ad illa mittendis, omnem et quaecumque mercaturam, seu negotiationem, quocumque modo ab iis fieri contingat, sive per se sive per alios, sive proprio, sive communitatis nomine, directe, sive indirecte, aut quovis alio praetextu, causa aut colore interdiciamus, et prohibemus sub excommunicationis latae sententiae poena ipso facto incurrenda, ac privationis vocis activae, et passivae, officiorum, ac graduum, et dignitatum quarumcunque, etiam inhabilitatis ad ea et insuper amissionis mercium et lucrorum ex iis; quae omnia a superioribus Religionum, ex quibus delinquentes existent, reservanda erunt ad usum Missionum quas eadem Religiones habent, et habiturae sunt in futurum in praedictis Indiis, et non in alios usus; eisdem superioribus districte prohibentes sub iisdem poenis ut in hoc invigilent, et contra delinquentes ad praedictas poenas procedant, sublata iisdem facultate hujusmodi delinquentibus aliquid ex dictis mercibus et lucris quantumvis minimum remittendi aut condonandi?"

Although allusion is made in this stringent Decree to the migration of missionaries from America to the East, its special prohibition of *negotatio* regards that avocation as pursued in the East alone. Obviously, too, Urban VIII. speaks only of missionaries sent out by religious orders to preach the Gospel and administer the Sacraments. Neither limitation, however, remained after the Clementine Constitution.

We are told by Clement IX. that he was moved to legislate on this subject by the way in which the provisions of Urban VIII's enactment were being evaded or disregarded. As if, however, to make sure at the second attempt, the new Constitution extended the censure far beyond its former limits. America, north and south, was included; seculars as well as regulars come under the penalty; and clerics not enjoying the title of "missionaries," equally with those who received the name, were declared subject to the provisions of this enactment. It was published in 1669, and contains the following provisions:—

"Omnibus, et singulis personis ecclesiasticis, tam saecularibus, quam regularibus ejuscunque status, gradus, conditionis, et qualitatis, ac cujusvis Ordinis, Congregationis, et Instituti, tam Mendicantium quam non Mendicantium, etiam Societatis Jesu, et earum cuilibet, quae ad Insulas, Provincias, Regna Indiarum Orientalium, et praesertim provinciam Societatis Jesu de Japone nuncupatam, et in partes Americae, tam Australes quam Septentrionales a Sede Apostolica, vel Congregatione Venerabilium Fratrum nostrorum

S. R. E. Cardinalium negotiis Propagandae Fidei praepositorum, aut ab earum superioribus sub nomine Missionariorum aut quovis alio titulo pro tempore missae fuerint, aut in illis partibus quomodolibet morabuntur sub excommunicationis latae sententiae ac privationis vocis activae et passivae, et officiorum, dignitatum, graduum quorumcumque per eas obtentorum, et inhabilitatis ad illa, et alia quaecumque in posterum obtinenda, nec non amissionis mercium et lucrorum omnium ipso facto incurrendis, ac aliis Nostro, et Romani Pontificis pro tempore existentis vel praedictae Cardinalium Congregationis arbitrio imponendis, poenis tenore praesentium destriete prohibemus pariter et interdiciamus, ne mercaturis et negotiationibus saecularibus hujusmodi quovis praetextu, titulo, colore, ingenio, causa occasione, et forma, etiam semel, per se, aut median-tibus ministris, seu aliis personis subsidiariis, directe vel indirecte . . . qualitercumque se ingerant, vel imminiscant. Ac ex nunc prouti ex tunc . . . lucra quaecumque . . . in usus, et commodum pauperum, Hospitalium, Seminariorum Ecclesiasticorum, ac Operariorum (non tamen Religionum Congregationum, et Societatum, etiam Jesu, seu Instituti eorundem, qui in praemissis, vel circa ea deliquerint) sed aliorum non delinquentium harum serie applicamus, qui teneantur consignare merces et lucra hujusmodi locorum Ordinariis . . . vel Apostolicis Vicariis seu Provincialibus."

It will be observed that a single transgression against this law entails the penalty of excommunication. What wonder that its interpretation should be anxiously canvassed, or, looking to the vast change in ecclesiastical organization in America since it first appeared, as well as to the natural intricacy of the subject, that its present application strikes different minds in different ways? For ourselves, we should much prefer learning the views of American Canonists on the questions raised by our correspondent to explaining our own. This especially holds with reference to his all-important consideration of what custom may have determined. We shall be glad if by our remarks some one of those who are more intimately acquainted with the working of the law in America should be induced to throw further light on the matter at issue.

I.—"How is the *Negotiatio* which is forbidden defined?"

As a general definition we can give nothing better than to say that the forbidden *Negotiatio* consists in making oneself through ownership a medium for exchanging property between man and man with a view to gain on the transaction.

The proceeding, however, which is by name condemned in special Canons, is that in which a person buys with the intention of selling at a dearer rate without change in the goods or property. But obviously, any other form of barter is as objectionable in this connection as buying and selling. Besides, although *cambium* or money-exchange, which our writers not uncommonly speak of as a distinct kind of *Negotiatio*, long escaped a formal condemnation, it really has nothing in its favour to put it on a different footing from the more cumbrous exchange of ordinary goods or rights, and accordingly, as a matter of fact, it was declared to be a branch of genuine *Negotiatio* by Clement XIII.

A complete act of the *Negotiatio* so far described will bring down the censure of excommunication on the missionaries and others for whom this penalty was intended. But there is some room for doubt when we come to consider another species placed in large measure under our general definition, and usually considered by modern Canonists as a second kind of this forbidden avocation. It is that in which one buys to sell at a profit, after change, improvement, or manufacture of the thing purchased, has been effected through an agency or means, hired or bought for that purpose. From various decisions of the Sacred Congregation, and from the opinions of approved writers, it is plain that the general prohibition against *Negotiatio* has been made to apply to this species. What wonder? Is not the improvement here under consideration brought about mainly by an exchange also, or a series of exchanges, and not by art, handiwork, or resources, independently, and previously possessed by the person in question as his own. If one be skilled in carving, he may buy the rough marble, fashion it according to his fancy, and sell his statues. But whether skilled or unskilled, he may not employ an artist on bought material for the purpose of selling works of art at a profit over the price of marble and rate of wages. Similarly, a priest may buy cattle to fatten them on his own land and sell at a profit; but under the general law he may not take land for a season and buy stock for it with the same intent. Now the question arises whether the *Negotiatio* thus prohibited

would entail the penalties already mentioned on missionaries in America and the East. It is, no doubt, difficult to find any door for escape. The wording of the law with respect to *Negotiatio* is very comprehensive, and, moreover, the phrase *seu mercatura* is added. Hence, we think judgment, in all probability would go against the delinquent *in foro externo* if the case came up for trial before an ecclesiastical court. But as this sort of traffic is not strictly the *Negotiatio* which is so often forbidden in the Canons, we consider the censure somewhat doubtful, although the prohibition under sin be certain enough. D'Annibali, however, we are bound to add, holds that the words *seu mercatura* are fully verified wherever the material is *naturaliter mutata*, as in the case of animals, by opposite comparison with painting or carving.

II.—“ Does it include real estate ? ”

We are not aware of any valid reason for excepting real property.

III.—“ Who incur the excommunication ? Do priests ordained *titulo Missionis* ? Do Bishops ? What do the words *quomodolibet morabuntur* mean ?

In the first place Bishops, as such, are not exempt from this Decree. The text of law declaring on their behalf a privilege of not being the subjects of censures unless when specially mentioned, speaks only of suspension and interdict. Hence, as the penalty in question is that of excommunication, imposed without restriction on account of dignity, bishops seem liable to incur it equally with priests.

Secondly, these special constitutions do not affect natives of America at all. They seem to have in view none but priests from Europe. In the third place, they would appear to have no application in dioceses which do not need to draw on any European country to recruit the ranks of the sacred ministry. On this and the preceding inference, we submit the reasoning of Avanzini :

“ Utraque enim constitutio contra eos dirigitur, qui titulo fidei propagandae aut quomodolibet promovendae ex Europa in dicta loca transeunt, ibique negotiationibus, et mercaturis distracti scandalum indigenis pariunt lucrum quaerentes Quamobrem si ecclesiastica Hierarchia in illis locis constitueretur vel constituta

esset ita ut dioceses canonice institutae ad normam sacrorum canonum regerentur per clerum indigenum, neque amplius Missionariis Europaeis indigerent ejusmodi peculiaris constitutiones per se cessarent cum cessaret earum materia quae in missionariis consistit ex Europa desumptis."

Lastly, in our opinion the phrase "quomodolibet morabuntur" may be fairly restricted to those who have temporary missions or transitory employment in a diocese. *Morari* we think, in a penal statute, is not to be construed so as to apply to those who through affiliation or otherwise are of the *clerus dioecanus*, that is, to those who are permanently attached to the mission in a particular diocese or vicariate. And thus the subjects of these penalties are reducible to a comparatively small class.

IV.—"Is *venditio* of the thing purchased necessary in order that the excommunication may be incurred, or does *emptio cum intentione lucri* suffice?"

The censure is imposed for a single violation of the law but, to be incurred, the transaction must be complete. This, we think, it is not until the design of selling is carried into effect. The question of guilt is an entirely different matter.

V.—"What therefore is a priest to do if such priests come to him to confession, &c.?"

Hitherto, we have attempted little more than to interpret the law as it was enacted. Our correspondent's last question bears on its concrete application in the present. He does not, of course, speak of those penitents who would intend pursuing a line of conduct so unworthy as to amount to mortal guilt under the divine law or the general law on *Negotiatio* as binding in a particular place. He alludes rather to those who purpose completing an act, which, as above, is forbidden to them in particular under pain of excommunication, or who, at least, would appear to come under the words of Clement IX's Decree. Well, if at the present time they be truly liable to incur the penalties of that Decree, it is obvious enough that that *lucrum* and its *seeking* must be surrendered before a confessor can give absolution. But the difficulty is to know whether a particular penitent is in truth the subject

of this law or not. For how does the censure stand as viewed in connection with existing customs?

The general prohibition against *Negotiatio* is founded in the natural law. Such occupation consumes the time intended by God for spiritual concerns, it fosters a worldly, if not an avaricious spirit, and scandalizes the faithful who have a right to receive edification instead. For these reasons the Church from an early age has interdicted *Negotiatio* to priests, and the tendency of her decisions on new issues as they came forward under this heading at different times is decidedly in the direction of enlarging the compass of the forbidden occupations. Still, if the evils which *Negotiatio* usually brings with it be absent, as might be readily conceived in particular places with regard to some of the things prohibited, the ecclesiastical law might plainly suffer some abatement owing to contrary custom.

Now the same would appear true in respect of the special legislation in force for America and the East. Contrary custom might set aside the penalties of excommunications and restitution, whatever is to be said about the guilt of the condemned proceedings. We suggest these considerations because the Decree of 1872 does not interfere with existing customs. Its purport is to declare that the Constitutions of Urban VIII. and Clement IX. are in force notwithstanding what is said in the Bulla *Apostol. Sedis* about censures not enumerated therein. The Constitutions of those Popes have not been withdrawn, but, beyond a declaration to this effect, the Decree of the Inquisition gives them no force different from what they possessed before Pius IX. legislated on censures. Accordingly, if custom had set aside the obligations we are discussing before 1872, there is no room to suppose a revival of them as springing from the Decree of that year. Hence, no matter how much we reprobate the unpriestly practice of *Negotiatio* the penalties of censure and restitution are not incurred in the circumstances we have contemplated, that is, when a long custom of general non-observance can be clearly established. It is for those who know the facts, as they exist in different parts, to speak on the actual condition of things. Of course, the Bishops or Vicars Apostolic, are

the safest referees for our correspondent on the question how the Constitutions of Urban VIII. and Clement IX. have been observed. The late American Council, we notice, whilst vigorously enforcing the general law against *Negotiatio*, does not allude to the special legislation we have been considering. Perhaps the state of things in which these constitutions would apply no longer exists within the great Republic.

P. O'D.

LITURGICAL QUESTIONS.

CARRYING THE CHALICE TO THE ALTAR.

In our last number (November, p. 1035) in reply to a correspondent who asked "what is the authority for turning up on the chalice the front part of the veil, when the chalice is carried to or from the altar," we said that we "were not aware of any authority founded on the Rubrics for the practice."

As this answer has been called in question by more than one subscriber, it will be useful to quote the only passages in the Rubrics which refer to the covering of the chalice with the veil and the carrying of the chalice to or from the altar. They are the following:—

1. "Ponit super illud (*os calicis*) patenam . . . et eam tegit parva palla, tum velo serico; super velo ponit bursam." (*Ritus serv. in celeb. Missae* N. 1.)

2. "Sacerdos . . . accipit manu sinistra calicem ut supra prae paratum, quem portat elevatum ante pectus, bursam manu dextra super calicem tenens." *Ibid.* 2.

3. "Quibus omnibus absolutis . . . sacerdos accipit sinistra calicem, dextram ponens super bursam, ne aliquid cadat." *Ibid.* xii., 6.

Now in these passages of the Rubrics which describe the mode of carrying the covered chalice, there is no allusion to the practice mentioned above, and for this reason we said that it is without foundation in the Rubrics.

We are, however, much obliged to our correspondents

who have pointed out an inaccuracy in saying that Baldeschi does not support the practice. He does in the following passages:—"Prepara poscia il calice, avvertendo . . . che la parte anteriore del velo sia rivoltata sopra la borsa." (*Art. I.*, n. 6.) And again: "Salito all'altare porra il calice dalla parte dell' Evangelio, e subito con ambe le mani calera abbasso il velo repiegato sopra la borsa." (*Art. III.*, n. 26.) Martinucci also, though he makes no allusion to the practice when describing the carrying of the chalice, supposes it to be followed, as is shown by the following: "Ascendat ad altare; calicem statuet versus cornu Evangelii, utraque manu demittet calicis velum quod reflexum erit super bursa." *Lib. I.*, cap. xviii., n. 24.

One of our correspondents adds that it is the general practice in Rome to fold the anterior part of the veil over the Burse.

In Rome the veil is usually much larger than the one in use in these countries, and covers the chalice almost equally on all sides.

ED. I.E.R.

II.

THE PREFACE TO BE SAID ON THE FEAST OF THE MOST HOLY REDEEMER.

"What Preface should have been said on 23rd ult., the Feast of the Most Holy Redemer? The *Ordo* says *de Nativitate*, the Missal *de Cruce*." P.P.

The *Preface de Cruce* as the Missal directs. The direction given in the *Ordo* is an oversight of the compiler, or, more probably, a misprint. If our correspondent takes the trouble of looking at the *Ordo* for 1886, he will find that it agrees with the Missal.

III.

CONSECRATING THE HOST ON THE GLASS LUNETTE.

"Where the glass lunette is still preserved is it lawful to consecrate on the glass?"

When a sufficient reason exists for preserving this form of lunette, we are of opinion, that, if care be taken to keep the lunette on the corporal over the altar stone, there is nothing wrong in consecrating the Host on the glass of it. The lunette should, of course, be opened as well during the consecration as during the offertory.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE ECONOMIC DOCTRINE OF MR. HENRY GEORGE.

REV. SIR,—It appears to me that Catholic writers have not been so silent regarding Mr. George as your correspondent, “A Priest in England,” in the last number of the *RECORD*, seems to think. Mr. George’s theory that private property in land is unjust, is discussed and refuted in the September number of the *Month*.

Mr. George’s second position, namely, the land of a country belongs to the people of the country, is not fully discussed anywhere. The principles, however, which determine this question are treated of in the *Lyceum* for October and November. It is easy, in the case of any particular country, to decide in whom is vested the ownership of land. For instance, it will, I presume, not be disputed that the five million peasant proprietors in France who have holdings under six acres, are the owners of their plots. In Ireland, since the Land Act of 1881, a great portion of the land is held by a system of joint ownership on the part of landlord and tenant. Another portion, for example, the portion purchased under Lord Ashbourne’s Act, is owned by the occupying farmers.

Those who hold that the land of a country belongs to the people of the country exemplify the saying: “the wish is father to the thought.” They may indeed contend that all land should be held by State ownership; but while striving to bring about such a result they implicitly admit that the ideal is not yet attained, and that the actual owners of land are precisely those persons whom the civil law and the common opinion of mankind recognise as the owners.

ECONOMIST.

 THE CHURCH ABROAD.

THE Italians deal largely in superlatives, and in this they are fairly rivalled by the Germans. Both have far more expansive terms in their addresses than we have. English speaking people are comparatively matter-of-fact in their epistolary language, and it is one of the merits of the classic age of Louis XIV. that, during his reign, the French language was reduced to almost philosophical exactness.

The language of a country is a great factor in its national life, and whatever may be said of the seventeenth century in France, it cannot be denied that it was during that great period that the French language was brought to that high degree of perfection which has

gained for it a world-wide prestige, and which still turns the attention of peoples in all parts of the world, from their early youth, towards the country where it is spoken. The fathers of French literature, Fénelon, Molière, Boileau, made a careful study of the Grecian models and strongly recommended them to their contemporaries.

“Vos exemplaria Græca

Nocturna versate manu, versate diurna.”

Grecian classics are like the edifices of Grecian architecture. In the latter we find very little useless decoration. The necessary parts are simple but well proportioned, and if there are sometimes fluted pillars and elaborate capitals, these ornaments are confined to the parts of the building which are absolutely necessary in its composition. There is nothing there to satisfy any fanciful imagination or romantic caprice. Everything is subservient to the utilitarian principle and must satisfy the stern demands of reason. In Gothic architecture, on the contrary, ranges of slender columns ascend into the skies. The immense vaults terminate in ogival arches that point still higher. Everywhere we have windows, carving, tracery, and a thousand kinds of ornamentation which to an ordinary observer, though they may seem very beautiful in themselves, appear to serve no practical purpose whatever. This romantic profuseness which came to France and Italy through Spain and Provence from Arabia, and found its way by still more devious paths into Germany, crept into the literature as well as the architecture of these countries. In France it was effectually clipped of many of its soaring propensities by Fénelon and Boileau, who submitted it to the ordeal of the Gallic file, and brought it definitely under the sway of reason and common sense. In this task they were powerfully assisted by that educated and highly refined society which the king fostered around him, and which, whatever may have been its merits and demerits from another standpoint, in this respect, at least, conferred a lasting advantage on the country. In these polished circles philosophy became fashionable. As they reasoned their thoughts so they reasoned their language, and as under the influence of Descartes and Pascal they laid aside many cherished notions, and made a “*tabula rasa*” on which to reconstruct the whole edifice of life and thought, so under the guidance of M. Dacier and the academicians, and the patronage of the great writers they took up this question of language. And as they were anxious that their ways and manners of life should live after them as models for their countrymen, so too they were ambitious that the language spoken by them should be such as future ages might be compelled to sanction. Old expressions that have so much of the vagueness of romance in

the writings of the good Sire de Joinville, of Froissart, and of Cardinal d'Ossat were brought into use again, but their windings were cut short, and their overgrowths paired down to a classic regularity. Each word was consecrated to a definite logical meaning which it has always since retained, and which notwithstanding the nonsensical aberrations of the literature of which Victor Hugo was the ornament, it is likely to retain for centuries yet to come.

This purifying process was not applied, as far as we are aware, in any organised or systematic form either to the Italian or German languages. Both of these were formed by the poets, and they are still to a great extent what the poets made them. German especially remains wholly unsubdued, and enjoys to the full its Gothic freedom and intricacy of design. It is true that Protestantism retarded its natural development for over two hundred years. Until the latter end of the eighteenth century its literature is almost a complete blank, if we are to except the immoral effusions of Hans Sachs, the cobbler of Nuremberg and poet of the Reformation, and a few elegant pages of Martin Opitz, in the commencement of the seventeenth century. In more recent times its great writers have been poets, and the conditions of modern German life, and of the double empire in which it is spoken have not favoured its perfection.

Italian has had a longer literary record than German, yet it has not been so ably managed as the French. The grammarians and academicians who flourished under the Medici and the Visconti, and around the Papal courts of Nicholas V. and Eugene IV. devoted all their attention to Greek and Latin. Poggio, Politian, and Pico della Mirandola wrote almost exclusively in these languages, and about them. In the fifteenth century Lascaris, who was himself a Greek, revived Italian interest in his native tongue, and the Scaligers who could have done much for Italian got lost, like so many others, in the rage for the old classics.

We do not wish in any sense to deny, or to make little account of the beauties of these languages. We should as readily reject the incomparable grandeur of some of the first cathedrals in the world; but we think that for perspicuity and terseness of expression, and for logical clearness not only as regards the highest conceptions of human thought and the most intricate reflections of mind, but also as regards the ordinary and most commonplace duties of the world, French has decidedly the advantage. We believe that amongst other details of the every day business of life, it has the advantage even in this matter of addresses with which we are at present occupied.

We are bound to apologise for this lengthened introduction to so

simple a subject. We shall now give the Italian forms, following the same order as in our last part, and commencing with the envelope address.

A Cardinal would be addressed, *v.g.* :—

A Sua Eminenza Rev^{ma}.
Il Signor Cardinale di Sanfelice,
Arcivescovo di Napoli,
Napoli.

Another form which is now also much used would be, *v.g.* :—

All' E^{mo}. e Rev^{mo}. Signore
Il Signor Cardinale Gaetano Alimonda,
Arcivescovo di Torino,
Torino.

The superlatives are almost always contracted E^{mo}., R^{mo}.; one, however, is sometimes written in full and the other contracted :—

All' Eminentissimo Rev^{mo}. Signore
Il Signor Cardinale G. Simeoni,
Pref. della Sac. Cong. della Propaganda,
Roma.

The patriarch of Venice if he were not a Cardinal would be addressed :—

All' Eccell^{mo}. Rev^{mo}. Signore,
Monsignor Domenico Agostini,
Patriarca di Venezia,
Venezia.

But of course as Mgr. Agostini is a Cardinal he would get the title "Eminentissimo." It may be noticed also that the All' at the commencement is sometimes left out, though it is more generally used. A Papal Nuncio would be addressed as follows, *v.g.* :—

A Sua Eccellenza Rev^{ma}.
Monsignor Giacomo Rotelli,
Nunzio Apostolico in Parigi,
Parigi.

An archbishop may be addressed as follows, *v.g.* :—

All' Eccel^{mo}. Rev^{mo}. Signore
Monsignor Salvator Magnasco,
Arcivescovo di Genova,
Genova.

In former times the titles "Eccellenza" and "Eccellentissimo" were exclusively reserved to Papal Nuncios and delegates, and to the Patriarchs of Venice, but we suppose on Don Abbondio's prin-

ciple they have now been for a considerable time applied to bishops also, and latterly they are freely given to domestic prelates. Hence a bishop is generally addressed also, *v.g.* :—

All' Eccel^{mo}. Rev^{mo}. Signore
Monsignor Geremia Bonomelli,
Vescovo di Cremona,
Cremona.

A prelate of the Pope's household is generally addressed, *v.g.* :—

All' Eccel^{mo}. Rev^{mo}. Signore
Monsignor Luigi Tripepi,
Prelato Domestico di Sua Santità,
Via delle quattro Fontane,
Roma.

The title "Eccellentissimo" is generally given to the prelates who are not bishops, but who hold high offices in the principal Congregations at Rome. This is natural enough, but the practice is spreading to the ordinary "Monsignore," and we think it is better to confine one's self in these cases to the "Ill^{mo}. Rev^{mo}." which is often recognized as quite enough even in the case of bishops.

A Vicar-General would be addressed, *v.g.* :—

All' Illustrissimo Rev^{mo}. Signore,
Monsignor Enrico Giovannini,
Vicario Generale di Bologna,
Bologna.

In Italy almost every Vicar-General is a Monsignore; if he were not we should only have to substitute "Il Signor" for "Monsignor." A Canon would be written to, *v.g.* :—

All' Ill^{mo}. Rev^{mo}. Signore,
Il Signor Adeodato Orlandi,
Canonico della Cattedrale di Orte, &c.

Of course, the "Signore" need not be doubled, but in Italy it is at present more polite to double it. We could also write, and those who live in the diocese, and who are acquainted with the Canon always do write :—

All' Ill^{mo}. Rev^{mo}. Signore
Il Signor Canonico Orlandi, &c.

But no more than in the case of the French "Chanoine" is there any hard and fast rule. A Parish Priest would be addressed, *v.g.* :—

Al Molto Reverendo Signore,
Il Signor Antonio Bartolini,
Parroco di San Girolamo,
Firenze.

A Curate is addressed :—

A Sua Reverenza,
Il Signor Francesco Gastaldi,
Vicario alla chiesa di San Marco,
Venezia.

Indeed, in both these cases the superlatives “ Ill^{mo.}” and “ Rev^{mo.}” are very freely given, and it is better, especially for a foreigner, to sin on the side of generosity than otherwise. We should not forget to say, that in the diocese of Naples and of Palermo, and in a good part of the Peninsula besides, the title “ Don ” is commonly given to priests. It is not quite the same as the French “ Dom,” as in “ Don Guéranger.” “ Dom Couturier.” The latter is a contraction of “ Domne,” which was the title the Carthusian and Benedictine monks gave one another in the Middle Ages. The Italian “ Don ” is of Spanish origin, though, perhaps, ultimately it has the same derivation. Hence, we could write for instance :—

All’ Ill^{mo.} Rev^{mo.} Signore,
Don Domenico Tinetti,
Direttore dell’ *Unità Cattolica*,
Torino.

Doctors of Divinity in Italy get the title of “ teologo ” theologian. Hence, Don Margotti, the late distinguished editor of the *Unità Cattolica*, was always addressed :—

All’ Ill^{mo.} Rev^{mo.} Signore,
Don Giacomo Teologo Margotti.

A Priest of a religious order is generally addressed,

Al Molto Reverendo Padre, or *A Sua Paternità*.

The latter is especially used when writing to people who are in authority in the community. A Clerical Professor in a University College or Lyceum should be addressed, *v.g.* :—

All’ Ill^{mo.} Rev^{mo.} Signore
Il Signor Professore Vespignani, &c.

With regard to the Laity, Royal Princes are addressed,

A Sua Altezza Ill^{ma.}

A Minister of State or an Ambassador,

A Sua Eccellenza Ill^{ma.}

A Marquis,

All’ Ill^{mo.} e Oss^{mo.} Signore.
Il Signor Marchese Crispolti,
Direttore dell’ *Osservatore Romano*,
14, Via del Nazareno,
Roma.

Any ordinary gentleman might be addressed :—

A Sua Signoria Ill^{ma}.

Il Signor N——.

All' Illustrissimo Signore,

Il Signor N——

It would be impossible to go through all the forms. There are so many variations of them that we are obliged to confine ourselves to those in most general use.

Passing to the second kind of address, at the commencement of a letter, the Holy Father is addressed (if His Holiness allows a letter to be delivered to him), "Beatissimo Padre." A Cardinal is addressed, "Eminenza." This form is still in very general use, especially in letters that are more or less private and familiar. Cardinals are often addressed by bishops and persons of high rank, "Eminentissimo Signor Cardinale." People of less importance would require something more elaborate on formal occasions such as :—

Emo. e Rmo. Signor Cardinale,

or,

Eminenza Illustrissima

Emo. e Revmo. Signor Cardinale.

Another form which is now general enough even among higher ecclesiastics is :—

Emo. e Remo. Signor Mio Ossmo.

The Ossmo. here being a contraction not of "Ossequiosissimo" as at the end of a letter, but of "Osservandissimo." Papal Nuncios, Archbishops, and Bishops are addressed: "Eccellenza" or "Eccellenza Illma." The same title, as we have said, is often given to Domestic Prelates, but we believe that with the exception of a few who hold important offices in the government of the Church, such as those who are Secretaries to the Congregations, or Auditors of a "Nunciatura," it would be better to confine oneself to "Monsignor Reverendissimo," or "Illmo. e Revmo. Monsignore," as even Bishops are often addressed in that way. Archbishops are sometimes addressed: "Illmo e Revmo Monsignor Arcivescovo." Bishops and prelates could also be addressed: "Molto Illustre Monsignore," or "Illmo. e Revmo. Signor Mio Ossmo." A Vicar-General would be addressed, if he were not a Monsignore: "Illmo. e Revmo. Sig. Vicario Generale," or "Egregio Signor Vicario Generale." A Canon might be addressed: "Molto Illustre Signor Canonico." A parish priest: "Molto Reverendo Signor Curato." A curate: "Caro Signor Vicario." A professor: "Caro Signor Professore." If they are in any way distinguished in science, literature, etc., the Italians willingly put them in the

superlative. Priests of a religious order are generally addressed: "Molto Reverendo Padre," and spoken of in the course of the letter as "la Sua Paternità." In lay circles a prince is addressed: "Altezza." A minister of State or an ambassador: "Eccellenza." A Grand Duke: "Serenissimo Signor Mio Ossmo." Marquises, Counts, Barons, etc.: "Illustrissimo Signor Marchese," "Illmo Signor Barone," etc. Ordinary lay gentlemen might be addressed: "Pregiatissimo Signore," or "Pregiatissimo Signor N.," or "Illustre ed Onorevole Signore" (if there is any particular reason), also "Stimatissimo Signore," or simply "Caro Signore." An author or distinguished writer or artist is often addressed: "Chiarissimo Signore." As the more familiar forms of address do not concern us we shall now give a few of the forms in which letters are terminated. It is here that the Italians display in full all the richness of courtesy in which they take such natural pride. A letter or memorandum addressed with permission to His Holiness could be terminated:

"Prostrato in terra bacio alla Santità vostra i beatissimi piedi e mentre ardisco esprimere i miei più profondi sensi di venerazione e di filiale affetto oso protestarmi

di Vostra Santità

Umil^{mo}. dev^{mo}. ubbed^{mo}. figlio."

A business letter to a Cardinal might be terminated,

"Chiedendo scusa, Eminentissimo Signore, del fastidio che le do, Le bacio umilmente la mano e passo a dirmi col più profondo ossequio di Vostra Eminenza Rma.

Umil^{mo}., dev^{mo}. servo."

The form which priests generally use is something as follows:—

"Rassegnandole i miei più profondi sensi di venerazione le bacio le lembe della sagra porpora e mentre imploro la sua benedizione paterna mi protesto

Di Vostra Eminenza Eccel^{ma}.

Umil^{mo}., dev^{mo}., ed ubbed^{mo}. servitore."

A simpler form would be

"Aggradisca, Emo e Rev^{mo}. Signore, l'espressione dei più profondi miei rispetti con che le bacio riverente la mano ed ho l'onore di protestarmi.

Di Vostra Eminenza Eccel^{ma}. Ill^{ma}.

Umil^{mo}., dev^{mo}., ubbed^{mo}. servo."

A letter to an archbishop might end as follows:—

"Assicurandole, Ill^{mo}. Rev^{mo}. Mgr. Arcivescovo, della mia

profonda venerazione e baciandole devotamente le mani mi rafferma

Di Vostra Eccellenza Rev^{ma},

Umil^{mo}, dev^{mo}, oss^{mo}. servo."

If we had to write to a bishop the end might be

"Approfitto poi di questo incontro per confermarle, Ill^{mo}. Rev^{mo}. Monsignore, i sensi dell' ossequio e della profonda riverenza con che le bacio la mano e mi soscrivo

Di Vostra Eccellenza Rev^{ma},

Umil^{mo}. dev^{mo}. servitore."

The form to a domestic Prelate is much the same as to a Bishop, but if we do not wish to give the title of "Eccellenza" at the end, we should say,

Di Lei, Monsignore Rev^{mo},

Umil^{mo}. Devot^{mo}. Servitore."

A letter to an ordinary Priest might end,

"Colgo, allo stesso tempo, molto reverendo Signore, l'occasione di professarmi coi sensi di piena stima ed ossequio.

di Vostra Reverenza

Umil^{mo}. Dev^{mo}. Servitore."

A distinguished lay gentlemen could be addressed as follows:—

"Aggradisca, Ill^{mo}. Signor Mio Oss^{mo}, l'espressione dei miei sensi di considerazione e d'alta stima onde mi soscrivo

Di Vostra Signoria Ill^{ma}.

Umil^{mo}. Rev^{mo}. Servitore."

We imagine that these general indications will be quite sufficient. The relative position and degrees of intimacy of the correspondents would make these forms vary "ad indefinitum." We could not give all the shades or difference, but most of them might be derived from the examples given.

The Italian superlatives may have their drawbacks, but the sentiments of respect which they convey, and on which they lay so much stress, are not only good but necessary. The Catholic Church, which is a model to civil society, in all that concerns the intercourse and dignity of life, has not only sanctioned those marks of deference and respect, but in one form or another has consecrated them by universal practice. The system which brought them to such a degree of refinement is the antipodes of that which comes to us from another quarter and loudly proclaims that "one man is as good as another." We are glad to think that the creed of which these words are the text, has had little success in Ireland. In the wholesome social sifting which

our country is now undergoing, it is well that a distinction is being made between those who are worthy of respect and those who are not. There is nothing more detrimental to the true spirit of respect, which the Church has always fostered, than that it should be confounded either with a spirit of base hypocrisy and self-interest or of servile fear. Under the new state of things for which we all are longing in this country, we are confident that there shall be no such confusion; but that while the conventionalities of life shall always be observed towards those who differ from us, the old spirit of mutual regard, of loyalty and devotion, for which the Irish people were always remarkable, will be as conspicuous in the future society of Ireland as it is in all the grades of the hierarchy of the Church which is the pattern and the model of respect not only for Ireland but for the whole world.

J. F. HOGAN.

DOCUMENT.

SACRED CONGREGATION OF INDULGENCES.

SUMMARY.

The Members of Institutes or Religious Congregations who have taken either perpetual or temporary vows, cannot become Associates of the Third Order of St. Francis.

DECRETUM,

VERONENSIS DE ADSRIPTIONE SODALIIUM INSTITUTORUM RELIGIOSORUM
TERTIO ORDINI SÆCULARI S. FRANCISCI ASSISIENSIS.

Divina charitate ac animarum zelo succensus S. Franciscus Assisiensis præter primum et secundum Ordinem Minorum Claustrali-um, tertium quoque Ordinem instituit pro personis in sæculo degentibus, ut et ipsæ pro sui status conditione ad tramitem consiliorum evangelicorum vitam componerent.

Innumera vero virtutum ac pietatis monumenta, quæ per tot sæcula Christifideles in Tertium Ordinem adsciti reliquerunt, nec non recentius aucta erga seraphicum Patrem devotio causa fuere, cur etiam religiosorum Institutorum sodales eidem Tertio Ordini adscribi expetiverint; et jam inde ab anno 1869 sub die 3 maii Ministro generali totius Ordinis Minorum tributa est facultas recipiendi in Tertium Ordinem franciscalem alumnos supradictorum Institutuum eisdem quoque concesso ex Brevi 7 aprilis 1867 speciali privilegio visitandi Ecclesiam vel Sacellum proprii Instituti, quoties ad

luernas Indulgentias visitanda foret Ecclesia primi vel secundi Ordinis Seraphici.

Quamvis autem SSmus Dominus Noster Leo Papa XIII edita Constitutione Apostolica "Misericors Dei Filius" diæ 30 maii 1883 ejusdem Tertii Ordinis legem novaverit attamen quum nihil omnino mutatum, inmo integrum remanere voluerit quod attinet ad præfati Tertii Ordinis, qui sæcularis dicitur, naturam, dubium oriebatur, an alumni religiosorum Institutorum, quibus singulari Dei munere datum est nuncupatis votis ad perfectiorem vitam contendere, amplecti quoque valerent Institutum Tertii Ordinis sæcularis S. Francisci.

Quare Emus et Rmus Episcopus Veronensis, instantibus nonnullis e sua diœcesi confessariis, ad omnem in hac re hesitationem e medio tollendam, S. Congregationi Indulgentiarum sequentia dubia dirimenda proposuit :

I. Utrum omnes utriusque sexus qui sunt membra alicujus religiosi Instituti, vel Congregationis, aut a Summo Pontifice aut ab Episcopo approbatæ, in qua vota emittuntur sive perpetua sive ad tempus, possint adscribi in Tertium Ordinem S. Francisci Assisiensis.

Et quatenus *Affirmative*.

II. Quibus conditionibus id illis liceat ?

Emi et Rmi Patres responderunt in generalibus Comitibus apud Vaticanum habitis die 25 junii 1887 :

Ad I^m *Negative*, facto verbo cum Sanctissimo.

Ad II^m Provisum in Primo:

Facta vero de iis omnibus relatione in audientia habita ab infra-scripto Secretario die 16 julii 1887, Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Leo Papa XIII, Patrum Cardinalium responsiones ratas habuit et confirmavit.

Datum Romæ ex Secretaria S. Congregationis Indulgentiis sacrisque Reliquiis præpositæ die 16 julii 1887.

FR. THOMAS M. CARD. ZIGLIARA, *Præfectus*.

✠ ALEXANDER, Episcopus Oensis, *Secretarius*.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

TALES OF EVENTIDE. Office of the *Ave Maria* Notre Dame, Ind.

THE fact that the tales have all appeared in the *Ave Maria* (from which they are now reprinted) is a guarantee of their pure and healthy tone.

Though written for children, many of them are calculated to arrest the attention of readers of advanced age, and some of them in simple language teach deep lessons, lessons that the wisest of us might learn with advantage.

CANONICAL PROCEDURE IN DISCIPLINARY AND CRIMINAL CASES OF CLERICS. A systematic Commentary on the Instruction S. C. Epp. et Reg., 1880. By Rev. Francis Droste; edited by Rev. Sebastian S. Messmer, D.D., Professor of Theology. New York: Benziger, Brothers, 1887.

THE form of Canonical trial appointed in 1884 for deciding Criminal and Disciplinary Ecclesiastical Causes of priests in the United States, was taken, with slight modifications, from the famous Instruction (L'Ordinario) sent in 1880 to the Bishops of Italy. In this Instruction the Holy See permits a Summary Procedure, somewhat new in form, to be used in Criminal Cases, where it would be inexpedient to observe all the formalities of an ordinary trial. The summary process thus sanctioned was manifestly suited to the wants and conditions of modern society, and as a consequence seemed destined to receive approval for a wide area in the Church. Foreseeing this, Father Droste, of Paderborn, wrote a short commentary on the Instruction, with a view to explaining in a simple way its practical application. His work, after a time, was translated into English. But for many reasons the book required recasting before one could say of it that it was well adapted as a hand-book on the Criminal Law which is now applied in the States. The task of re-arranging, modifying, enlarging, and adapting has been well discharged by the author of the volume before us. Dr. Messmer looks upon the Instruction of 1880 as establishing a new form of procedure, differing *quoad formam*, from the old summary trial. This, no doubt, is one of his reasons for not speaking of his compilation as a commentary on the Const. "Cum Magnopere" of 1884. Where these two documents differ, he is careful to point out the fact in a suitable manner.

To one not familiar with books on Canon Law, it will seem strange to find an author like Dr. Messmer speak of the long process he describes as a Summary Trial. The phrase, of course, only implies that some of the less needed formalities of an ordinary trial are dispensed with. It does not mean that the accused will be treated summarily, as some of the adversaries of the Church have thought or feigned. Dr. Messmer's book contains in a short space much excellent matter on the subject of Ecclesiastical Trials, and will, we are sure, be eagerly scanned for the new procedure. P. O'D.

IRISH Ecclesiastical Record.
July-Dec. 1887.
THIRD SERIES.

v.8 .

BX 801 .I68 1887 Pt.2 SMC
The Irish ecclesiastical
record 47085658

Does Not Circulate

