

The Project Gutenberg eBook of The Irish Ecclesiastical Record, Volume 1, August 1865, by

This ebook is for the use of anyone anywhere in the United States and most other parts of the world at no cost and with almost no restrictions whatsoever. You may copy it, give it away or re-use it under the terms of the Project Gutenberg License included with this ebook or online at www.gutenberg.org. If you are not located in the United States, you'll have to check the laws of the country where you are located before using this eBook.

Title: The Irish Ecclesiastical Record, Volume 1, August 1865

Release Date: September 12, 2010 [EBook #33708]

Language: English

Credits: Produced by Bryan Ness, Josephine Paolucci and the Online Distributed Proofreading Team at <http://www.pgdp.net>. (This file was produced from images generously made available by The Internet Archive/Canadian Libraries.)

*** START OF THE PROJECT GUTENBERG EBOOK THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD,
VOLUME 1, AUGUST 1865 ***

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

[Pg 505]

AUGUST, 1865.

Transcriber's Note: Minor typos have been corrected and footnotes moved to the end of the article. Table of contents has been created for the HTML version.

CONTENTS

[THE SEE OF DROMORE.](#)

[DR. COLENZO AND THE OLD TESTAMENT.](#)

[RICHARD FITZ-RALPH, ARCHBISHOP OF ARMAGH.](#)

[MR. BUTT AND NATIONAL EDUCATION.](#)

[LITURGICAL QUESTIONS.](#)

[CORRESPONDENCE.](#)

[DOCUMENTS.](#)

[NOTICES OF BOOKS.](#)

THE SEE OF DROMORE.

The see of Dromore, though founded by St. Colman, seems for several centuries to have comprised little more than the abbey of that great saint and its immediate territory. In the synod of Rathbreasil (A. D. 1118), in which the boundaries of the various dioceses were defined, no mention is made of Dromore, and the territory subsequently belonging to it was all comprised within the limits of the see of Connor. The acts of the synod of Kells held about fifty years later, are also silent as to a bishop of Dromore; and Cencius Camerarius, compiling his list of sees in 1192, again omits all mention of this see. Nevertheless, the abbot of the monastery, "de viridi ligno", which gave name to the town of Newry, ruled this diocese with episcopal authority during the later half of the twelfth century, and a bishop of this see named Uroneca (*alias* O'Rony) is mentioned in a charter of donations to the abbey of Neddrum, about the year 1190 (see Reeves' *Ecclesiastical Antiquities*, pag. 192).

The last episcopal abbot of this great monastery was *Gerard*, a Cistercian monk of Mellifont, who, in 1227, was chosen bishop, and died in 1243. A controversy then arose between the chapter of Dromore and the monastery of Newry. Each claimed the right of electing the successor to the deceased bishop; and the Archbishop of Armagh gave judgment in favour of the former. The matter being referred to Rome, all controversy was set at rest by Pope Innocent VI., who by letter of 5th March, 1244, addressed "to the dean and chapter of Dromore", confirmed the decision of the Archbishop of Armagh, and sanctioned the right of the canons of Dromore to elect the bishops of the see (*Mon. Vatic.*, pag. 42). Andrew, archdeacon of Dromore, was accordingly elected bishop, and consecrated in 1245, and the episcopal succession continued uninterrupted till the latter half of the fifteenth century.

[Pg 506]

Ware, in his *Bishops* of this see, and Dr. Reeves, in his *Ecclesiastical Antiquities of Down and*

Connor (pag. 308), tell us that on the death of the Carmelite bishop, *David of Chirbury*, in 1427, the see was held by Thomas Scrope, who resigned before 1440; that his successor, Thomas Radcliffe, also resigned before 1461; that the next bishop was George Brann, appointed about 1487; and that the see was held in 1500 by another bishop named William Egremond.

The actual succession of bishops, however, was far different. On the death of David of Chirbury, Dr. Thomas Radcliffe was chosen his successor in 1429, as the historians of the Augustinian order expressly attest. Thus, for example, Herrera writes:

"Thomas Sacrae Theologia professor a Martino V. in Registro Pontificio an. xii. Pontificatus et Christi 1429. prid. Kal. Feb. in Hibernia sub Archiepo. Armacano Epus. Dromorensis instituitur. Hic est ille quem registra ordinis die 19 Martii an. 1426. magistrum Thomam Radclef provinciae Angliae appellant eique Prior Generalis concedit ut in conventu Oxoniensi perpetuo stare possit ut eum fratribus destitutum juvet".

Elsius makes a similar statement (*Encomiast.* page 662), and also tells us that there is a "Thomas Radclyf, Redcliff, sive Radcliffus, Anglus, S.T.D., in Anglia natus nobilissimâ familiâ ex qua comites Sussessiae ante an. 1369, prodierunt", who is commended in the records of the order as illustrious by his virtues and writings. "Intuitu virtutum", he adds, "Episcopalem Lincolniensem aut Leicestrensem accepit dignitates", which words acquaint us with the English see to which Dr. Radcliffe was promoted some few years after his appointment to Dromore.

As the dates of Herrera are taken from the consistorial records and other official documents, we may rest assured that 1429 was the year of Dr. Radcliffe's appointment. We cannot fix with the same certainty the year in which he renounced this see. It is probable, however, that about 1434 he was translated to the diocese of Lincoln in England, and we next meet with a Dominican Father who was also named *Thomas*, already in possession of the see of Dromore in 1437. The following is the letter of Eugene IV., from the papers of Luke Wadding, Rome, which makes known to us for the first time this worthy successor of St. Colman:—

"Eugenius, etc., ven. fr. Thomae, Episcopo Dromorensi salutem, etc.

"Personam tuam nobis et apostolicae sedi devotam, tuis exigentibus meritis paterna benevolentia prosequentes illa tibi libenter concedimus quae tuis commoditatibus fore conspicimus opportuna. Cum itaque sicut exhibita nobis pro parte tua petitio continebat propter bellorum discrimina quae partes illas diutius affligerunt prout affligunt etiam de praesenti, Ecclesia et Episcopalis mensa Dromorensis cui praeesse dignosceris adeo sit in suis facultatibus diminuta quod ex illius fructibus redditibus et proventibus vestrae decentiam Pontificalis dignitatis sustentare et alia Tibi incumbentia onera commode nequeas supportare: Nos ne in dedecus Episcopalis dignitatis mendicare cogaris volentes Te qui etiam in Theologia Magister existis ob virtutum tuarum merita quibus Te illarum largitor altissimus insignivit favoribus prosequi gratiosis, tuis in hac parte supplicationibus inclinati, tecum ut quodcumque Beneficium Ecclesiasticum cum cura vel sine cura ... dummodo dignitas hujusmodi in cathedrali major post Pontificalem, aut in Collegiata Ecclesia hujusmodi, principalis non existat, si tibi alias canonice conferatur, seu assumaris vel eligaris ad illud una cum dicta Ecclesia Dromorensi quamdiu illi praefueris, in Commendam recipere et retinere libere et licite valeas, quod ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum professor existis, ac constitutionibus apostolicis, necnon bonae memoriae Octonis et Octoboni olim in Regno Angliae Sedis Apostolicae Legatorum, statutis quoque et consuetudinibus Ecclesiae in qua hujusmodi beneficium forsitan fuerit, juramento, confirmatione Apostolica vel quacumque firmitate alia roboratis, caeterisque contrariis quibuscumque nequaquam obstantibus, auctoritate Apostolica, tenore praesentium de speciali dono gratiose dispensamus, ita quod hujusmodi durante commenda, fructus, redditus et proventus beneficii hujusmodi percipere et habere, illosque in tuos et hujusmodi Beneficii usus et utilitatem convertere et alias de illis disponere et ordinare libere et licite valeas, etc., etc.

[Pg 507]

"Datum Bononiae anno Incarnat. Dom. 1437, 19^o Kal. Februarii anno 7mo".

This Dominican bishop only held the see till 1440, for, in that year Dromore is described as vacant in the register of archbishop Swain of Armagh. We may incidentally here mention that amongst the same Wadding papers there is another brief of Pope Eugene IV., dated at Florence, 11th of the kalends of December, 1439, confirming the bull of Alexander V., which commenced *Etsi pro cunctorum*: it is addressed "ad Praedicatorum Hibernos, scilicet ad Vicarium Generalem et alios fratres".

Thomas Scrope, a Carmelite, was Bishop of this see^[1] before the close of the pontificate of Eugene IV., who died in 1447. He was remarkable for the practice of almost incredible austerities, and it is especially commemorated of him that he had led an eremitical life for several years before he was summoned to the onerous duties of the episcopate. He subsequently was sent by Pope Eugene as apostolic delegate to the Knights of Rhodes; and Leland adds that "whatever he received out of his revenues or could get from rich persons, he bestowed among the poor, or laid out on pious uses". He resigned his see after his return from Rhodes, and acted as vicar-general of the Bishop of Norwich: he died at a very advanced age in 1491.

[Pg 508]

We next meet with a Bishop of Dromore named *Richard Myssin*, a Carmelite, who on the 29th July, 1457, was advanced to this see, as appears from the Consistorial acts of Pope Callixtus III. (*Biblioth. Carmelit.*, ii. 965). He was remarkable for the sanctity of his life, and for his great proficiency in learning.

William Egremond was probably his immediate successor, being appointed to the see in 1462, as Herrera and the other Augustine writers attest.^[2] The country, however, was so disturbed that this diocese had few attractions for an English bishop; and hence he abandoned it in 1467, and lived for many years as suffragan of the archbishop of York. His monument, erected in the cathedral of York, bore the following inscription:—

"Hic Egremond Will'mus Dromorensis Episcopus olim
Marmore pro nitidis tectis utrinque mitris.
Pavit oves Cithiso qui sub bis Praesule bino
Atque lupi rabiem movit ab Aede trucem.
Ungvine quot sanxit pueros, quot Presbyterosque
Astra nisi scirent, credere nemo valet.
Ante prophanus erat locus hic quem dextra beavit
Ejus, et hinc pro se dicito quisquis Ave".

The next mention we find of this see is in a petition of the Archbishop of Armagh, Octavian de Palatio, addressed to Henry VII. about the year 1487, in which he writes that, "the fruits, rents, and revenues, as well spiritual as temporal (of Dromore), extend not above the sum of £40 of the coin of this your land of Ireland, which is less by one-third than the coin sterling; and that for the expense and poverty of the same, the see is void and desolate, and almost extinct, these twenty winters past and more, insomuch that none will own the said bishoprick or abide thereupon".

Nevertheless, in that very year, 1487, George Brann was appointed to this see by Pope Innocent VIII. He had lived for several years in Rome as procurator of the Hospital of the Santo Spirito, and had also proceeded to Ireland to establish a branch house of that institute. He held the see till his translation to Elphin on the 18th of April, 1499.

The first bishop of Dromore whom we find commemorated in the sixteenth century is *Galeatius*, whose death is registered in 1504. Of his successor, John Baptist, we only know that he was appointed on June 12th, the same year. *Thaddeus*, a Franciscan friar, was next advanced to the see on 30th April, 1511. He is commemorated in Archbishop Cromer's register, as still ruling the see in 1518, and we find no other bishop mentioned till the appointment of *Quintinus Cogleus* (*i.e.* Con MacCoughlin), of the order of St. Dominick, in the year 1536 (*Hib. Dom.*, p. 486). This bishop, however, seems to have held the see only for a short time, for in the Consistorial Acts we soon after find the following entry:—"An. 1539. Sua Sanctitas providit Ecclesiae Dromorensi in Hibernia *de persona* Rogerii".

[Pg 509]

Ten years later Arthur Magennis was chosen by Pope Paul III. to govern the diocese of St. Colman. On the 10th of May, 1550, he surrendered his bulls to the crown, and had in return "a pardon under the great seal for having received the Pope's bull, and for other misdemeanours". (Reeves' *Eccles. Antiq.*, p. 308. V. Morrin, *Pat. Rolls*, i. p. 205). Nevertheless, there can be but little doubt as to the orthodoxy of this prelate. Even Cox (i. 288) attests his devotion to the Catholic cause. He, moreover, specially names him as an instance of a *Catholic bishop*, and adduces the fact of his being allowed by the crown to hold peaceable possession of his see as a proof that "the Reformation made but small progress in Ireland" at this period. In 1551 he gave a public proof of his devotedness to the Catholic faith. Edward VI., in the beginning of February, sent an order to the viceroy, Sir Anthony St. Leger, commanding the use of the English liturgy in all the churches of Ireland. On the 1st of March the same year this order was communicated to the archbishops and bishops assembled in council for that special purpose; but no sooner had St. Leger made his discourse, commending the royal prerogative, and extolling the liturgy now proposed to the Irish clergy, than Dr. Dowdall of Armagh opposed it with all his zeal, and denounced the measure as anathematized "by the Church of St. Peter, the Mother Church of Rome". It must ever remain a special glory of the province of Armagh, that, as Cox informs us (p. 290), one only of the suffragan bishops of the primatial see—viz., Dr. Staples, who held from the crown the revenues of Meath—could be found to support the proposal of the government, whilst all the others adopted the sentiments of Dr. Dowdall. The year of Dr. Magennis's death is uncertain; he seems, however, to have survived some years the accession of Queen Elizabeth, and on his death the see of Dromore became canonically united with Ardagh.

The name of this illustrious bishop recalls our attention to Dr. Magennis, bishop of Down and Connor, of whom we treated in the March number of the *Record*. An esteemed correspondent, in a highly interesting letter, published in May (p. 385 *seq.*), contends that that prelate, in his public acts at least, deviated from the path of orthodoxy, and allied himself to the enemies of our holy faith. His reasons, however, are far from sufficient to justify such a serious charge.

[Pg 510]

1. In the first place, he argues from the fact of the bishop of Down having surrendered his bulls to the crown. However, the bishop of Dromore did the same, and, nevertheless, no one questions his orthodoxy. Long before the dawn of Protestantism we find the same course pursued by some bishops, as, for instance, by the celebrated Oliver Cantwell, bishop of Ossory, towards the close of the fifteenth century (*Ware*, p. 414). In fact, the surrendering of the bulls was regarded as a purely civil ceremony, which secured to the canonically appointed bishop the peaceful possession of the temporalities of his see.

2. The learned correspondent lays special stress on the bulls being described as "obtained from *Paul, Bishop of Rome, not His Holiness*". However, it is in the letter of the king that this form of expression is used (*Morrin*, i. 91), and any insult which it may involve must be referred to the good taste of Henry VIII., and not to the bishop of Down.

3. It is added: "*It is an oversight to suppose that about 1541 and 1543 the northern chieftains who submitted to Henry VIII. were exempted from all pressure in matter of religion*". The statement which we made on a former occasion (p. 268) had reference only to 1543; and it was not without historic grounds that we asserted that, "the northern chieftains who *then* submitted were exempted from all reference to religion when professing their allegiance to the government". It is true that in 1541 O'Donnell and O'Neil, and other chieftains, acknowledged the king's supremacy; but it is equally true that this submission of the Irish princes was an illusory one, and their profession was so lavish of loyalty that even the government felt that no reliance could be placed on such declarations. To similar professions, made in 1537, the King "replied by his letter to the lord deputy, that their oaths, submissions, and indentures, were not worth one farthing". (*Cox*, p. 253, ad. an. 1537). In fact, we find O'Donnell, in 1542, sending to Rome a commissioner (whom we shall have to commemorate again as bishop elect of Raphoe), humbly asking pardon for the guilt of perjury which he had incurred. However, in 1543 it was far different. The government feared the reconstruction of the confederation of the Irish chieftains; and hence, when *the great O'Neil*, as he is styled by Cox (p. 257), sailed in this year for England and surrendered his estate to the king, the conditions imposed on him, howsoever humiliating to his national pride, were wholly silent in regard of religion. These conditions are given in full by Cox (p. 275).^[3] About the same time, O'Breene made also his submission, and the articles exacted from him omit all reference to the royal supremacy or other matters of religion. The letter of the King, March 5th, 1543 (*Morrin*, i. 99), giving instructions to the Deputy regarding O'Neil Connelaghe, nephew of the earl of Tyrone, in like manner makes no mention of the religious articles. On the 24th of May an agreement was made with the Magennis, as Cox informs us, yet without the obnoxious clauses; and on the 9th of July, 1544, these clauses were again omitted, when several grants in Dublin, including 140 acres of the beautiful "Grange of Clonliffe" (*Morrin*, i. 103), were made to the earl of Desmond. These examples sufficiently prove that the government in 1543 was anxious to conciliate the Irish princes, and hence was not particular in exacting the obnoxious declaration of supremacy.

[Pg 511]

4. That a portion of the diocese of Down and Connor was subject to the English government in the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, admits of no doubt; but it is equally certain that the greater portion of it remained under the control of O'Neill. Hence, a Vatican paper, written about 1579, adds to a list of the Irish sees, the following important note:

"Ex praedictis Dioecibus duae sunt in quibus libere et sine periculo possunt Episcopi vel Vicarii; residere. Una est Ardfertensis, quod sita sit in ea Desmoniae parte quae Kierri nominatur in qua Comes Desmoniae omnino liber est et jus plane regium habet. Altera est Dunensis et Connorensis quae in ditione est O'Nellorum qui continenter contra reginam bellum habent, suntque Catholicissimi principes".
—*Ex Archiv. Vatican.*

5. As regards the year of Dr. Macgennis's demise, the letter of the Queen, dated 6th of January, 1564, appointing his successor, though at first sight it seems so conclusive an argument, nevertheless, is far from proving that our bishop had died in 1563. For at the period of which we treat, January was not the first month of the year 1564, but was rather one of its concluding months; according to our present manner of reckoning it would be the 6th of January, 1565. (See Shirley, *Original Letters*, page 132).

[Pg 512]

6. The last and weightiest remark of the esteemed correspondent concerning Dr. Macgennis is, that he "*assisted in consecrating by the vitiated rite of king Edward*" the unfortunate John Bale of Ossory. However, we must remark that Dr. Macgennis is certainly not responsible for the appointment of this unworthy apostate to the see of St. Canice; and the antecedent character of Bale seems to have been wholly unknown in Ireland, especially in the *Irish* districts of the island. Much less is the bishop of Down responsible for the use of the new-fangled vitiated rite; for, it was Bale himself that at the very time of the consecration insisted on the new liturgy being employed.^[4] and this event supplies us with an additional argument in favour of the orthodoxy of Dr. Macgennis, for, it is expressly recorded that, "in union with the clergy of Dublin", he entered his solemn protest against this heretical innovation. We shall return again to this subject when speaking of *the Bishops of Ossory*. In the mean time we may conclude that there is no sufficient proof of Dr. Macgennis having swerved from the rule of orthodoxy; whilst on the other hand the silence of the advocates of the new creed, who never even whispered his name in connection with their tenets—the omission of the supremacy clause in his submission to the crown—his union with Dr. Dowdall in repudiating the English liturgy when proposed by the viceroy—his protest on the occasion of Bale's consecration—his retaining the see of Down and Connor during the reign of Queen Mary—the consistorial entry which subsequently describes the see as vacant *per obitum Eugenii Magnissae*, seems to us to place beyond all controversy the devotedness of this worthy prelate to the Catholic cause.

But to return to the diocese of Dromore. On the death of Dr. Arthur Macgennis, it was united with the see of Ardagh, and for the remaining years of the sixteenth century seems to have shared the trials and sufferings of that diocese. In the consistorial acts the appointment of Dr. Richard MacBrady is registered on the 16th January, 1576, and it is added that his see was the

"*Ecclesia Ardacadensis et Dromorensis in Hibernia*". On his translation to Kilmore on 9th of March, 1580, Doctor Edmund MacGauran was chosen his successor, and thus our see is entitled to a special share in the glory which this distinguished bishop won for the whole Irish Church by his zealous labours and martyrdom.

The first Protestant bishop of the see was John Todd, who was appointed to Down and Connor on 16th of March, 1606, and received at the same time the diocese of Dromore *in commendam*. We shall allow the Protestant writers Ware and Harris to convey to the reader an accurate idea of the missionary character of this first apostle of Protestantism amongst the children of St. Colman. Ware simply writes:

[Pg 513]

"In the year 1611, being called to account for some crimes he had committed, he resigned his bishoprick, and a little after died in prison in London, of poison which he had prepared for himself" (pag. 207).

To which words Harris adds:

"The crimes of which he was accused were incontinence, the turning away his wife, and taking the wife of his man-servant in her room; to which may be added subornation of witnesses. It doth not appear that he resigned his bishoprick voluntarily, but was convented before the High Commission Court in England in the tenth year of king James I., and degraded. His case is cited in the long case of the bishop of Lincoln. Before his deprivation he made a fee-farm lease of the tithes of his see in the territory of Kilultagh to Sir Fulk Conway at a small rent", etc. (*Ibid.*, pag. 208-9).

We already had occasion to mention this unfortunate man, when treating of the see of Down and Connor in the March number of the *Record* (page 271); and surely no words of ours are required to make the reader fully appreciate the true character and mission of the Establishment in our see, the life of whose first apostle is described in such language by the great Protestant historians.

FOOTNOTES:

- [1] Stephens, *Monast. Anglican.* 175, dates his appointment from 1446. This may be the true date: we have not wished to adopt it, however, not knowing the authority from which Mr. Stephens derived his information.
- [2] "Guillelmus Egremont (Herrera writes) erat anno 1462 et 1464 in Regesto Pontificio Episcopus Dromorensis in Hibernia et Guillelmi Archiepiscopi Eboracen suffraganeus".
- [3] They were as follows:—"1st, To renounce the name of O'Neil; 2nd, That he and his followers should use English habit, language, and manners; 3rd, That their children should learn English; 4th, That they should build houses and husband their land in English manner; 5th, That they should obey English laws and not cess their tenants, nor keep more gallowglasses than the lord deputy allow; and 6th, That they should answer all general hostings, as those of the Pale do, and shall not succour any of the king's enemies".
- [4] Mant. *History of the Irish Church*, vol. i. page 218, seqq.

DR. COLENSO AND THE OLD TESTAMENT.

NO. III.

We have reserved for the last place a difficulty on which Dr. Colenso has expended all his powers of persuasion and all his skill in figures—"the number of the Israelites at the time of the Exodus". Here is his argument in a few words:—Jacob and his family numbered seventy persons when they came down into Egypt. His descendants sojourned in that country 215 years, and they went out with Moses in the fourth generation. According to the Scripture narrative, when they were leaving Egypt they numbered 600,000 men of twenty years old and upwards, representing a population of about 2,000,000: but this is absolutely impossible. Dr. Colenso assures us that "the multiplied impossibilities introduced by this number alone, independent of all other considerations, are enough to throw discredit upon the historical character of the whole narrative" (part i. p. 143.) This bold assertion he endeavours to establish by an elaborate argument extending over several chapters. We must be content to present it in a condensed form to our readers; but, in doing so, we shall adhere as closely as possible to the language of the author.

[Pg 514]

As the groundwork of his objection he lays down:—

"That it is an indisputable fact, that the story as told in the Pentateuch intends it to be understood—(i.) that they came out of the land of Egypt about 215 years after they went down thither in the time of Jacob; (ii.) that they came out in the *fourth* generation from the adults in the prime of life, who went down with Jacob" (p.

He next proceeds to estimate the average number of children in each family:

"In the first place, it must be observed, that we nowhere read of any *very large families* among the children of Jacob or their descendants to the time of the Exodus.... We have no reason whatever, from the data furnished by the Sacred Books themselves, to assume that they had families materially larger than those of the present day.... The twelve sons of Jacob had between them fifty-three sons, that is, on the average, 4-1/2 each. Let us suppose that they increased in this way from generation to generation. Then, in the *first* generation there would be 53 males (or rather only 51, since Er and Onan died in the land of Canaan, *Gen.*, xli. 12, without issue); in the *second*, 243; in the *third*, 1,094; and in the *fourth*, 4,923; that is to say, instead of 600,000 warriors in the prime of life, there could not have been 5,000....

"The narrative itself requires us to suppose that the Hebrew families intermarried, and that girls, as well as boys, were born to them freely in Egypt, though not, it would seem, in the land of Canaan.

"Yet we have no ground for supposing, from any data which we find in the narrative, that the whole number of the family was on that account increased. On the contrary, etc.... If we take all the families given in Exod. vi. 14-25, together with the two sons of Moses, we shall find that there are 13 persons, who have between them 39 sons, which gives an average of 3 sons each. This average is a fairer one to take for our purpose than the former; because these persons lived at all different times in the interval between the migration into Egypt and the Exodus. We may suppose also, that the average of *children* is still as large as before, or even larger, so that each man may have had on the average six children, three sons and three daughters....

"Supposing now the fifty-one males of the *first* generation (Kohath's) to have had each on the average three sons, and so on, we shall find the number of males in the *second* generation (Amram's) 153, in the *third* (Aaron's) 459, and in the *fourth* (Eleazar's) 1377, instead of 600,000.

"In fact, in order that the fifty-one males of Kohath's generation might produce 600,000 fighting men in Joshua's, we must suppose that each man had forty-six children (twenty-three of each sex), and each of these twenty-three sons had forty-six children, and so on!—of which prolific increase, it need hardly be said, there is not the slightest indication in the Bible" (pp. 102-5).

[Pg 515]

From this he concludes,

"That it is quite impossible that there should have been such a number of the people of Israel in Egypt at the time of the Exodus as to have furnished 600,000 warriors in the prime of life, representing at least two millions of persons of all ages and sexes; that is to say, it is impossible, *if we will take the data to be derived from the Pentateuch itself*" (p. 101).

Lastly, he anticipates an explanation which some interpreters have proposed, "that there may be something wrong in the *Hebrew numerals*". Such a suggestion, he very fairly observes, will not avail here; because "this number is woven, as a kind of thread, into the whole story of the Exodus, and cannot be taken out without tearing the whole fabric to pieces" (pp. 141, 143).

Such is the elaborate structure which Dr. Colenso has reared with an ability and an earnestness worthy of a better cause. In reply, we purpose to demonstrate that the foundation on which that structure rests, though it may have the outward semblance of solidity, is hollow and unsubstantial within. He assures us that the facts upon which his argument is based are "derived from the Pentateuch itself". We hope to satisfy our readers that they are not contained in the Pentateuch; that they cannot be proved from the Pentateuch; nay, that they are contrary to the evidence which the Pentateuch affords.

I. Let us commence with the "indisputable fact" that the Israelites "came out of Egypt in the fourth generation". By a generation Dr. Colenso understands *a descent from father to son*: and he maintains that there were but four such descents in all the Hebrew families during the period of sojourn in Egypt. In support of this opinion he appeals (p. 96) to the words of God to Abraham:—"in the *fourth* generation they shall come hither again" (*Gen.*, xv. 16). Our readers will naturally inquire what is the precise meaning of the word "generation" in this passage. Does it denote a descent from father to son? Or does it signify a lengthened period of time? On this point our author observes a profound silence. He found the word in the English text; it suited his purpose, and he at once pressed it into his service. We are left to suppose that it can have but one meaning, and that this meaning is the one which he has adopted.

Now, we beg to assure our readers that this is very far from the truth. The Hebrew word דור (dor), which is rendered "generation" in the authorized version, admits of various meanings. It corresponds almost exactly with the Latin word *saeculum*. Sometimes it signifies the *circuit* or *period of a man's life*; sometimes, the *collection of those who are living at the same time*; sometimes, a *period of a hundred years*.^[5] As regards the passage in question, the opinion of the

[Pg 516]

best Hebrew scholars is directly opposed to Dr. Colenso. We pass by the authority of Catholic writers, for whom he would probably have little respect, and we appeal to men of his own school: we appeal to Gesenius,^[6] Bunsen,^[7] Fürst,^[8] Rosenmüller,^[9] Knobel,^[10] who certainly cannot be suspected of any undue prepossession in favour of the Bible. Every one of these distinguished scholars expressly asserts that, in *Gen.*, xv., 16, the word *רור* must be understood to mean *a hundred years*. We leave our readers to choose between their deliberate judgment on the one hand, and the gratuitous assumption of Dr. Colenso on the other.

If we look to the context we shall find that the meaning of the whole passage, as explained by these writers, is simple, clear, harmonious; as explained by Dr. Colenso, it is forced and unnatural. Abraham had just heard from God that his seed should be "a stranger in a foreign land" four hundred years (v. 13.) Then it is added: "but the *fourth generation* (*רור*) they shall return hither".^[11] That is to say, in our view, *the men belonging to the fourth century* shall return. In this sense the connection will be clear; the prophecy will be perfectly true, and the meaning easily understood. The four centuries are to be counted from the time of Abraham, and correspond exactly with the four hundred years of exile which had just been predicted. But, according to Dr. Colenso, by "the fourth generation" is meant the fourth descent in *the family of Jacob* (who was not yet born), counting from *the adults in the prime of life who went down with him to Egypt*. Now there is nothing in the whole chapter about *Jacob* or *Jacob's family*, or *the adults in the prime of life who went down two hundred years later into Egypt*. Under these circumstances we think few persons will be able to persuade themselves that the prophecy was understood by Abraham in the sense in which it is understood by Dr. Colenso.

He next appeals to the genealogies of the Bible to establish his theory of the "Exodus in the fourth generation":

"If we examine the different genealogies of remarkable men, which are given in various places of the Pentateuch, we shall find that, as a rule, the contemporaries of Moses and Aaron are descendants in the *third*, and those of Joshua and Eleazar in the *fourth* generation, from some one of the *sons*, or *adult grandsons* of Jacob, who went down with him into Egypt. Thus we have:—

[Pg 517]

	1st. Gen.	2nd. Gen.	3rd. Gen.	4th. Gen.	5th. Gen.	
Levi	Kohath	Amram	Moses	E. vi, 16, 18, 20.
Levi	Kohath	Amram	Aaron	E. vi. 16, 18, 20.
Levi	Kohath	Uzziel	Mishael	L. x. 4.
Levi	Kohath	Uzziel	Elzaphan	L. x. 4.
Levi	Kohath	Izhar	Korah	N. xvi. 1.
Reuben	Pallu	Eliab	Dathan	N. xxvi. 7-9.
Reuben	Pallu	Eliab	Abiram	N. xxvi. 7-9.
Zarah	Zabdi	Carmi	Achan	Jo. vii. 1.
Pharez	Hezron	Ram	Amminadab	Nahshon	...	Ruth iv. 18, 19.
Pharez	Hezron	Segub	Jair	1 Ch. ii. 21, 22.
Pharez	Hezron	Caleb	Hur	Uri	Bezaleel	1 Ch. ii. 18, 20.

"The above include *all* the instances which I have been able to find, where the genealogies are given in the Pentateuch itself". (pp. 96, 97).

We shall presently see that these examples are by no means what Dr. Colenso would represent them to be, and that so far from proving his theory to be *true*, they prove it to be *false*. But first we would direct attention to the *character* of the argument, which seems to us, from its very nature, unsound. According to the Mosaic narrative, there were about 2,000,000 of Israelites at the time of the exodus. If we allow ten to each family, there must have been about 100,000 families. Here, then, is the argument:—In eleven families out of 100,000, there were just *four generations* during the sojourn in Egypt; therefore there must have been *four generations*, neither more nor less, in the remaining 99,989 families. Our author would have us suppose that during a period of 215 years, there must have been exactly the same number of generations in every family. He does not explicitly say this; much less does he attempt to prove it; he silently *assumes* it.

Now it is scarcely necessary to observe that such a supposition is in the highest degree improbable. It cannot be true, unless the members of each family married at the same age as the members of every other family, and unless this uniformity was continued from generation to generation for upwards of two centuries. This, however, would be contrary to what we know of the family of Abraham *before* the sojourn in Egypt; it would be contrary to what we know of the people of Israel *after* the sojourn in Egypt; it would be contrary to the testimony of all genealogical record; it would be contrary to what we see every day with our own eyes. One man has children born to him at the age of twenty; another, at the age of forty; another, at the age of sixty. The children of the last might easily be contemporaries with the grand-children of the second, and with the great-grand-children of the first. Thus, in the short period of sixty years, there might be, in one family, three descents from father to son, in another two, in another only one. This is, perhaps, an extreme case; but it shows at least how far the disparity may be extended, without exceeding the bounds of possibility. The present Emperor of the French had reached the age of forty-eight, when the Prince Imperial was born: whereas her Majesty Queen Victoria became a grandmother at forty-one. Thus, in the royal family of England we find two

[Pg 518]

descents in forty-one years; in the imperial line of France only one descent in forty-eight years. It is, therefore, quite preposterous *to take for granted* that, in *all the families of a whole nation*, the number of descents were exactly the same during a period of 215 years.

But this assumption is especially inadmissible, when we consider the peculiar circumstances of the case before us. The first generation, according to Dr. Colenso, was composed of the fifty-one grandsons of Jacob. They were already grown up, and some of them even had children when they came into Egypt. Therefore the whole of the first generation was already in existence, and the second had begun to be born some years, let us say three, before the descent. If we add the 215 years of sojourn in Egypt, we shall have 218 years from the beginning of the second generation to the Exodus. Now, according to Dr. Colenso, all those who were twenty years of age at the Exodus, belonged to the fourth generation. Therefore the fourth generation was not complete until twenty years before that time, or 198 years after the second had begun. Consequently, only three generations, the second, third, and fourth, came into existence during a period of 198 years. In other words, the length of each generation, according to Dr. Colenso's calculation, was sixty-six years. Hence it follows, that we cannot accept his argument, unless we are prepared to *take for granted* that *all the males in all the Hebrew families* were without issue until they had reached the age of sixty-six.

Let us now look into the examples of Dr. Colenso in detail. It is important to ascertain what generation is to be reckoned as the *first*. In his argument he allows but fifty-one males to the *first generation*; "supposing now *the fifty-one males of the first generation*" (p. 105). Since Jacob had fifty-one grandsons living at the time of the descent into Egypt, it follows that the *first generation*, according to the argument, was composed of the grandsons of Jacob, *and of them alone*. That this is the position assumed by Dr. Colenso, is also evident from another passage, where, replying to his opponents, he asserts: "The Scripture states that there were 600,000 warriors in the fourth generation from Jacob's *sons*" (p. 119). It is true that, when *proving* his theory of "the Exodus in the fourth generation", Dr. Colenso counts indifferently from "the *sons* or *adult grandsons* of Jacob, who went down with him into Egypt" (p. 96), just as it suits his purpose. But, when he employs this conclusion to demonstrate that the number of the population at the time of the Exodus was impossible, he assumes that there were only four generations from the *sons* of Jacob.

[Pg 519]

If we now turn to the examples adduced by the same author, we shall find that seven are counted from the *sons* of Jacob; namely, from Levi and Reuben; three from the *grandsons* of Jacob; namely, from Zarah^[12] and Pharez; and lastly one, Bezaleel, in order to be brought back to the *fourth generation*, must be counted from Hezron, the great grandson of Jacob; consequently, upon the bishop's own showing, out of his eleven examples only seven prove for the *fourth generation*, three prove for the *fifth*, and one proves for the *sixth*. What must we think, then, when he afterwards quietly assures us, "the scripture *states* that there were 600,000 warriors in the *fourth* generation from Jacob's *sons*"? We are at least justified in saying that the examples adduced, not only fail to prove that his assertion is *true*, but demonstrate that it is *false*.

There is another point on which these examples fail. It is plain that to ascertain the number of generations between the Descent and the Exodus, we must not only commence to reckon from the *first*, but we must end with the *last*. The last generation must include all those who had reached the age of 20 at the time of the Exodus. And it is necessary for Dr. Colenso to prove that this last generation is counted in the examples he lays before us. On this point, however, he is silent. When he comes to the fourth generation he stops short, and leaves his readers to infer that it must be the last in point of fact, because it is the last on his list. Let us see if this assumption derives any probability from scriptural facts. At the time of the exodus Moses was 80, Aaron, 83. Mishael, Elzaphan, and Korah were their first cousins. It is, therefore, not improbable that they were as old, or even older. These are the first five names we find on the list of Dr. Colenso; and they belonged to the *third generation*. Their grand-children, therefore, would belong to the *fifth*. Is it improbable that among five men of 80, some had grand-children who had attained the age of 20?

[Pg 520]

Again, Nahshon was in the *fifth generation*, counting from the sons of Jacob: Judah, Pharez, Hezron, Ram, Amminadab, Nahshon (*Ruth*, iv. 18-20.) His sister was the wife of Aaron. Since his brother-in-law was therefore 83, it is not unreasonable to suppose that he himself may have been at least 60; if so, his sons might surely have been numbered among the 600,000 men of 20 years old and upward. This would give us *six* generations in the family of Nahshon. And yet, strange to tell, this very family is adduced by our author to prove his theory of "the Exodus in the *fourth generation*." Lastly, we would invite attention to the family of Joseph. He saw the children of his son Ephraim to the third generation (*Gen.*, l. 23). Therefore, the fourth generation in that line had commenced before Joseph's death. But this is an event of which we can fix the date with accuracy. When Jacob settled in Egypt, Joseph was about 39, and he lived to the age of 110. His death, therefore, must have occurred about 71 years after the Descent. Consequently, at that time the posterity of Joseph had already reached the fourth generation. One hundred and forty-four years yet remained before the Exodus. Surely during that period there was abundance of time for at least four generations more of the same average length.

It was our intention to analyze the argument of Dr. Colenso more fully by a critical examination of the genealogies from which his examples are derived. But we fear that we have already overtaxed the patience of our readers, and we are sure they will pardon us if we forbear to enter into the complicated details which such an inquiry would involve. We cannot, however, dismiss the subject without one general observation. It is assumed by Dr. Colenso that there are exactly

the same number of *descents* in each family as there are *links in the genealogy* of that family as it is recorded in the pages of Scripture. This would indeed be true if he could prove that *every link* in the chain of descent is preserved in the Scriptural genealogies. But it is well known to all Biblical scholars that such was not the usage among the Hebrew people. Every one is familiar with the genealogy of our Lord in the first chapter of St. Matthew's gospel. Three links are manifestly omitted in the eighth verse, between Joram and Ozias—namely, Ochozias, Joaz, and Amasias. We cannot suppose that St. Matthew, himself a Jew, could have been in error about the genealogy of the house of David. Much less can we suppose that he would have attempted, on this point, to deceive the Jews, for whom he wrote his gospel. Above all, it is plain, that if he had fallen into such an error; it would have been at once discovered and have been proclaimed to the world by the enemies of the Christian religion. We must infer, therefore, that it was perfectly conformable to the usage of the Jewish nation to say, "Joram begot Ozias", although in point of fact three generations had intervened between them. Now, Dr. Colenso must admit that his examples will prove absolutely nothing, if omissions of this kind were made in the genealogies from which they are taken. *We* do not assert that such *was* the case; but we challenge *him* to prove that it was *not*.

[Pg 521]

Take, for example, the text: "And the sons of Pallu, Eliab" (*Num.*, xxvi. 8). Can he show that no intervening links are omitted between these two names? He will find, on a close examination of the Pentateuch, from which he professes to derive his data, that Pallu must have been over 110 years of age when Eliab was born. It is, therefore, most likely that there were two or perhaps three links omitted in this genealogy between Pallu and Eliab. If so, we should add two or three generations in the examples which Dr. Colenso has adduced from the family of Pallu. He cannot argue that Pallu was the *immediate father* of Eliab, because it is said that Eliab was the *son* of Pallu: for do we not also read: "The Book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the *son of David*, the *son of Abraham*"? (*Matth.*, i. 1).

II. Dr. Colenso next assumes that the 600,000 men of the exodus were *all* descendants of Jacob. We contend, as a far more probable opinion, that amongst them were counted, not only the descendants of *Jacob himself*, but also the descendants of his *servants*. If we take up the book of Genesis, and glance through the brief history of the Patriarchs, we shall find abundant reason to believe that, when Jacob was invited by Joseph to come down into Egypt, he must have had a goodly retinue of servants. His grandfather, Abraham, had been able to lead forth an army of 318 servants "*born in his house*" (*Gen.*, xiv. 14). It is not unreasonable to suppose that, according to the custom of those times, he had other servants not born in his house, but "*bought with money*".

[13] At all events the number was considerably increased by a present from Abimeleck, who "took sheep, and oxen, and *men-servants*, and *women-servants*, and gave them unto Abraham" (*Gen.*, xx. 14). Upon his death this immense household passed into the possession of his Son Isaac; for "Abraham gave *all that he had* to Isaac" (*Gen.*, xxv. 5). Isaac, too, we are told, "increased, and went on increasing, until he became very great; and he had possessions of flocks, and possessions of herds, and a *numerous household*; and the Philistines envied him" (*Gen.*, xxvi. 13, 14). As to Jacob himself, he was sent by Isaac to Padan-Aram, where he served his father-in-law Laban for twenty years. While there, it is said, he "increased exceedingly, and had many flocks, and *women-servants*, and *men-servants*, and camels, and asses" (*Gen.*, xxx. 43). All these he took with him when he set out from Padan-Aram to return to Canaan (*Gen.*, xxxi. 18; xxiii. 5, 7). In addition to this large retinue, Jacob must also have inherited, in virtue of his birthright, a double portion (*Deut.*, xxi. 17) of the household which his father had accumulated. Thus, it seems clear that, within ten years^[14] of the Descent into Egypt, the number of servants who looked up to Jacob as their head and master, must have been very large indeed.

[Pg 522]

Now we maintain that, according to the narrative before us, these servants were *a part of the chosen people of God*, and *sharers in His Covenant* with Abraham. This assertion is easily proved. They had all received the rite of circumcision, and circumcision was the mark of the chosen people; it was the *sign* of God's Covenant. "This is my covenant which you shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee; every male child among you shall be circumcised. And you shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a *sign* of the Covenant between me and you. And the son of eight days shall be circumcised among you, every male child in your generations, *he that is born in the house or bought with money of any stranger, that is not of thy seed. He that is born in thy house and he that is bought with thy money* must needs be circumcised" (*Gen.*, xvii. 10-13). It is clear, therefore, that Abraham and his posterity were commanded to circumcise not only their *children*, but their *servants* and their *servants' children*, who thus became sharers in the promises of God.

Is it not likely then that, when Jacob came down into Egypt, he took with him not only his lineal descendants, but also his servants and their families? Let it be remembered that he was invited by his son, Joseph, whom God had made "as a father to Pharaoh, and lord of all his house, and ruler throughout all the land of Egypt" (*Gen.*, xlv. 8): that Pharaoh himself had promised, that to Jacob and his household he would give "the good of the land of Egypt", and that they should "eat the fat of the land" (*Gen.*, xlv. 18). Are we to suppose that when the venerable patriarch heard this joyful intelligence, he took with him *his flock*, and *his herds*, and *all his possessions*, but left behind his faithful servants with their wives and children? Would he, in his old age, when prosperity smiled upon him, desert those trusty followers who had come with him from a distant country, and had clung to him in all his varied fortunes? Would he abandon now those men of loyal heart whom he had known from a boy, and who had grown up with himself in his father's house? He knew that they were the chosen people of God: would he have come down into Egypt with his children to "eat the fat of the land", and have left them to perish of hunger in the land of

[Pg 523]

But Dr. Colenso objects, "there is no word or indication of any such *cortège* having accompanied Jacob into Egypt" (p. 114). We reply that our supposition is still possible and probable, even though no mention were made of it in the brief summary of Moses. It has been well remarked that, when it suits his purpose, Dr. Colenso is at no loss to supply the omissions of the sacred text. Thus, in treating of the "march out of Egypt"—(pp. 61, 62), he supplies *aged, infirm, infants, women in childbirth*, of whom there is "no word or indication" in the narrative. It happens, however, in the present instance, that there is a pretty clear "indication" in the text, that Jacob was accompanied by "such a *cortège*". We are informed that "Israel set out *with all that he had*" (*Gen.*, xlv. 1). It has been shown that he had a large retinue of servants, and we know that it is the usage of the Pentateuch to reckon *men-servants and women-servants* amongst the possessions of the patriarchs. Therefore, we are justified in supposing that this phrase included not only the family, cattle, and goods, but also the servants of Jacob.

Again, it is said that "Joseph nourished his father and his brethren and *all his father's house*, with bread" (*Gen.*, xlvii. 12). And when Joseph went to bury his father in Canaan, we are told that with him went "all the house of Joseph, and his brethren, and his *father's house*; only their little ones and their flocks, and their herds, they left in the land of Goshen" (*Gen.*, l. 8.) What can be the meaning of the *house of Jacob* thus distinguished from *his children and their little ones*? Does it not seem obviously to point to his *retinue of servants*? Unless, therefore, we set aside the evidence of the Pentateuch itself; unless we can believe that Jacob, in the decline of his life, suddenly snapped asunder the strongest ties of natural affection and of religious duty, we must admit that he brought down into Egypt a very large number of servants. We have seen that, according to the Divine command, their descendants would all receive the rite of circumcision, and be reckoned among the chosen people of God. They would, therefore, be numbered with those who, at the time of the Exodus, went out with Moses into the desert.

[Pg 524]

It is not true, then, that, in the narrative of the Pentateuch, 2,000,000 of Israelites are represented as having sprung from 70 persons in 215 years. Neither is it true, as we have shown, that only *four generations*, in the sense of Dr. Colenso, intervened between the sons of Jacob and the adult Hebrew population at the time of the Exodus. There yet remain many serious errors, and gross blunders, and palpable misrepresentations, in the argument of Dr. Colenso; but these we must reserve for a future number of the *Record*.

FOOTNOTES:

- [5] See Gesenius, Fürst, or, indeed, any of the larger Hebrew Lexicons.
- [6] *Hebrew and English Lexicon*; London: Baxter and Sons.
- [7] *Egypt's Place in Universal History*; London: Longman and Co., vol. i., p. 172.
- [8] *Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*; Leipzig: 1852.
- [9] *Scholia in Pentateuchum*.
- [10] *Die Genesis Erklärt*; Leipzig: 1852.
- [11] This is the literal translation of the Hebrew text, see Pagnini, Rosenmüller etc.
- [12] Our readers are no doubt aware that the proper names of the Bible are differently spelled in the different versions. The orthography uniformly followed by Catholics is derived from the Septuagint, which was in general use throughout the Church in the very earliest ages. Among Protestants, on the other hand, an attempt is made to approach more closely to the orthography of the Hebrew text. Dr. Colenso has naturally taken the proper names as he found them in the English authorized version, and to avoid confusion in answering his arguments, we shall follow the spelling which he has adopted.
- [13] In fact it is quite clear from several passages that Abraham had servants of both classes. See, for example, *Gen.*, xvii. 12, 13, 23, 27.
- [14] The death of Isaac must have taken place just ten years before the Descent into Egypt. Isaac was 60 when Jacob was born (*Gen.*, xxv. 26); and Jacob was 130 when he went down to Egypt (*Gen.*, xlvii. 9): therefore Isaac, if then living, would have been 190. But we know that he died at the age of 180 (*Gen.*, xxxv. 28); that is to say, ten years before.

RICHARD FITZ-RALPH, ARCHBISHOP OF ARMAGH.

§ VI. HIS NOMINATION TO THE SEE OF ARMAGH.

The see of Armagh became vacant by the death of David O'Hiraghty, which took place, according to the *Annales Nenaghtenses*, on the 16th May, 1346. Dr. O'Hiraghty had been Dean of Armagh, and was elected by the chapter of Armagh, *quasi per inspirationem divinam*, as John XXII. mentions in the bull by which, on July 4th, 1334, he ratified the election.^[15] He was consecrated at Avignon, and having ruled his diocese for nearly twelve years, died in 1346. On the 31st July, 1346, Clement VI., *jure provisionis*, appointed to the vacant see Richard Fitz-Ralph, then Dean of

Lichfield. The bull of nomination contains that the chapter of Armagh had already unanimously elected the same Richard, and that he had given his consent to the election.^[16] The Four Masters place in the year 1356 the death of Farrell (son of Jeffrey) MacRannall, Primate of Armagh and representative of St. Patrick. This, as Dr. O'Donovan remarks, is evidently a mistake of the Four Masters, as Richard Fitz-Ralph was certainly not one of the Mac Rannalls. We may say that, besides the mistake in the names, there is also a mistake in the dates. It was precisely in 1356 that Archbishop Fitz-Ralph set out upon that visit to London which was the occasion of his controversy with the Franciscans. The mistake made by the Four Masters is all the more incomprehensible for this reason, that of all the primates who sat at Armagh since the days of St. Francis of Assisi, no one was more likely to be remembered by the Franciscans than Archbishop Fitz-Ralph.

Dr. Fitz-Ralph was consecrated at Exeter on the 8th of July, 1347, by John Grandison, Bishop of Exeter, and three other bishops.^[17] If this date be correct, the Primate found himself engaged in the onerous duties of his new office even before his consecration. On the 10th of April, 1347, Clement VI. appointed him, together with the Archbishop of Cashel, to make inquiry on the part of the Holy See into some charges brought against the Archbishop of Dublin by the Bishop of Ossory.^[18] On the 12th of July of the same year he received faculties from the Holy See to dispense in a case of invalid marriage, the parties belonging to the diocese of Armagh.^[19] The bishops of Ardagh and Cloyne were appointed on the 29th August, 1347, to give him the pallium.^[20]

[Pg 525]

§ VII. THE ACTS OF HIS EPISCOPATE.

One of the most striking characteristics of Archbishop Fitz-Ralph's pastoral life was his assiduity in preaching the word of God to his people. His sermons on the principal festivals, still extant in MS. in the university libraries of Dublin, Oxford, and Cambridge, and in the British Museum, would fill a large volume. Already as Dean of Lichfield he had been remarkable for his fervour in preaching, but as successor of St. Patrick in the see of Armagh, he seemed to have received a double spirit of zeal and diligence. A volume of his sermons, once in the possession of Ware, and lately purchased for the British Museum at the sale of the Tenison library, includes sermons preached at Avignon, London, Drogheda, Dundalk, Trim, and other places of the province of Armagh. The fame of his eloquence preceded him to the Holy See, and when at Avignon he was frequently admitted to the high honour of preaching before the Holy Father and the cardinals and prelates of his court. He loved to make our Blessed Lady's virtues the subject of his discourse. *De Laudibus S. Deiparae* is the title of many of his sermons. There are also special sermons on her Conception, Visitation, and Assumption. His sermons are generally constructed on a uniform plan. After quoting his text, it was his custom to begin with some short prayer like the following, which occurs in a sermon preached at Avignon on the feast of All Saints, 1358: *Pro edificandi gratia impetranda, devote, si placet, matrem gratiae salutemus, dicentes Ave Maria.* And in a sermon preached before Innocent VI. on the feast of the Epiphany, after the text *Videntes stellam Magi*, he begins with the invocation, *O Maria stella Maris, Mater stellae solaris.* After the introductory prayer he repeats the text in the vernacular, and then proceeds with the division of the subject. In dividing his discourse he generally employs the rigour of the scholastic method; each member of the division being complete in itself, and forming as it stands a finished whole. Hence, the great feature of his style is its singular clearness; a clearness which, however, never becomes hard or cold, so tender is the unction that pervades the entire. He appears to have had a singular devotion to St. Catherine the Martyr and to St. Thomas of Canterbury, among the saints; three or four different sermons are to be found in the collection in honour of each. It is much to be regretted that those beautiful sermons have never been printed.

[Pg 526]

Anxious to secure efficient pastors for his flock, he took care that his clergy should have the benefit of the highest literary and ecclesiastical training it was within his power to procure. With this view he sent four of his priests to the University of Oxford, where he himself had spent so many happy years of profitable study. He also acquired for his diocese from the Benedictines of St. Mary of Lenley's in Normandy, the priory and houses of St. Andrew in the Ardes, belonging to that order. Besides this, he was diligent in visiting every portion of his province. Among the rolls of Edward III., there is a letter of 28th April, 1356,^[21] addressed by that King to the Archbishop, at a moment that the latter has actually engaged in his visitation of the diocese of Meath. Edward calls upon the Primate to return with all speed to Dundalk to treat with Odo O'Neill, who was advancing upon that town with a considerable army of Irish. Nor was it the first time that the Archbishop's virtues enabled him to discharge the blessed office of peacemaker in the disturbed state of society in which his lot was cast. As far back as 1348 he had received from the King full powers to treat for peace between the English and Irish.^[22]

While careful of the spiritual interests of his diocese, Archbishop Fitz-Ralph did not neglect to take care of its temporal concerns. He justified to the letter the description given of him in the bull which made him Archbishop: *in spiritualibus providum, in temporalibus circumspectum.*

On January 11th, 1351, he received from Clement VI. a favourable answer to his petition that he might be allowed to incorporate with the mensal funds of his see the income of four churches with care of souls, provided the ordinaries consented, and that the sum did not exceed the annual value of one hundred marks. The petition of the Archbishop set forth that the entire income of his see did not reach four hundred pounds sterling per annum. On the same day the Pontiff issued

letters requiring the Abbot of St. Mary's in Dynelek (Duleek), the Prior of St. Leonard's in Dundalk, and the Archdeacon of Armagh, together with the chapter of the cathedral, to examine how far it would be useful to exchange certain church lands, rents, and other immovable property, for others, which the Primate judged more likely to be advantageous to the see of Armagh.

[Pg 527]

Two documents preserved by Rymer show how careful Dr. Fitz-Ralph was not to sanction by any act of his the claims made to the primacy by the Archbishop of Dublin, to the detriment of Armagh. The first is dated 8th December, 1350, and is an order from Edward III., that the Archbishop of Armagh should not have his cross carried before him within the limits of the province of Dublin. Archbishop Fitz-Ralph was unwilling to cause disturbance by refusing to obey this order, but on the other hand he felt that to comply with it fully would be to prejudice the legitimate claims of his see.

He resolved in consequence simply to absent himself from Dublin. He procured a royal license which excused him from personal attendance at the parliaments held at Dublin, on the ground, that within the province of Dublin he was not permitted to have his cross borne before him. In 1349 he was charged by the same king to plead in the royal name before the Sovereign Pontiff Clement VI. for the grace of a jubilee on behalf of the people subject to the English crown. In Oxford there is a MS. entitled *Propositio ejusden (Ric. Rad. sive Fitz-Ralph Archiepiscopi Armachani) ex parte Regis Angliae Edwardi III. in consistorio Domini Papae, Avinione pro gratia jubilaei ejus Domino Regis populo obtinenda, anno 1349*. A similar heading is prefixed to another *propositio* of the same prelate, which, as we shall see, he urged in person at Avignon in 1357. Pope Clement VI. was engaged in anxious efforts to restore the oriental churches to union with Rome. The Armenians were in an especial manner the objects of his paternal solicitude. The remarkable series of questions which the Pope proposed to the bishops of that church are well known in ecclesiastical history. It was, probably, during this visit to the Holy See that Archbishop Fitz-Ralph became acquainted with the two Armenian prelates, Nerses or Narses of Manasgarda and John, Bishop elect of Clata, in Greater Armenia. These oriental bishops had long and earnest conferences with their Irish brother on the sad state of their once flourishing church, and at their earnest and oft-repeated requests, the Primate resolved to contribute his aid to the great work of bringing back the Armenians to unity. One circumstance connected with the occasion, though it narrowed his field of argument for the time, has given, nevertheless, to his writings a character which makes them valuable in modern controversy. In his *Questiones Armenorum* he was forced to defend the Catholic doctrine almost exclusively from the Holy Scriptures, seeing that his adversaries did not admit the authority of the Roman Church. Hence his position as a controversial writer does not differ from that which the Reformation has imposed upon modern theologians since the time of Bellarmine.

[Pg 528]

Before the publication of Theiner's *Vetera Monumenta*, there was but a single writer, Raphael of Volterra,^[23] to assert that Archbishop Fitz-Ralph had been created Cardinal. This solitary testimony, though positive, was not considered by Ware and others strong enough to counterbalance the negative argument drawn from the silence of all other writers on the subject, and especially from the fact that upon the elaborate catalogue of cardinals, drawn up by Panvinio and Ciacconio, the name of Fitz-Ralph is not to be found. Among the documents published by Theiner there is a consistorial process drawn up in 1517 on occasion of a vacancy in the see of Ardagh,^[24] in which mention is made, among other glories of Ireland, of the Cardinal of Armagh, who flourished in the year 1353. This is no other than our Archbishop Fitz-Ralph. It is curious that the statement in this process is made in words almost identical with those used by Raphael of Volterra. So close is the likeness between the two statements that one is clearly copied from the other. It is also to be observed that in the Papal documents he is never styled Cardinal, and that even as late as October, 1358, Archbishop Fitz-Ralph is styled by Innocent VI. simply Archbishop of Armagh, although in the same letter the Pontiff makes mention of the Cardinals appointed to examine into the questions at issue between our prelate and the Mendicant Orders. However this may be explained, we have the weighty authority of an official document drawn up at Rome and accepted by the Holy Father himself, for believing that the see of Armagh was honoured by the Roman purple in the person of Richard Fitz-Ralph.

§ VIII. HIS CONTROVERSY WITH THE MENDICANT ORDERS.

We now approach the grave controversy which was carried on for years between our Archbishop and the Mendicant Religious Orders. Even if the space at our disposal permitted it, we would not be willing to enter here into a detailed account of the dispute.

Had it been given to Archbishop Fitz-Ralph to see as clearly as history has enabled us to see, the blessings which our Church owes to the heroism of the religious orders in the days of persecution, far from opposing, he would have been the first to enlarge their privileges in Ireland. But, as it was, it is quite clear that in his opposition to them he was influenced solely by motives of an elevated nature. The whole struggle was simply a domestic misunderstanding, and of such character as that one may and must feel deep respect for both parties. We cannot do better than lay before our readers the explanation of his object and motives offered by the Archbishop himself to Pope Innocent VI. in person, at Avignon, 8th November, 1357.^[25]

[Pg 529]

"In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. 'Nolite judicare secundum faciem sed justum judicium judicate' (*Joan.*, cap. 7).

"Most Holy Father, I protest, at the very beginning of my discourse, that I do not intend to assert or rashly to affirm anything which may clash with Christian faith or Catholic doctrine, and that it is not my intention to solicit, or even to advise, the abolition or retrenchment of the mendicant orders approved by the Church or confirmed by the Sovereign Pontiffs. But rather, it is my desire that these same orders be brought back to the purity of their original institution, and in this, also, I am ever ready to submit to the correction of your Holiness. And to approach my subject without delay, coming to London, Most Holy Father, about certain matters connected with my Church of Armagh, I found a dispute going on between certain learned doctors concerning the mendicant state and the mendicity of Christ our Lord and Saviour. After repeated invitations to preach to the people, I there delivered, in the vernacular, seven or eight discourses, and, always under the above-made protest, I defended in public nine conclusions, on account of which, and for what else I then said, the friars have appealed, though without reason, to this Holy See".

The visit to London here alluded to took place in 1356, and, as we have seen, in 1357, the case was already under judgment at Avignon. For three whole years the archbishop remained at the Holy See, while a congregation of Cardinals, specially appointed for the purpose, took cognizance of the dispute. No official decision was given, but as the privileges of the mendicant orders were confirmed, and a letter sent to the English bishops commanding them to not interfere with the friars, it may be said that the Archbishop failed to make good his cause.

§ IX. HIS DEATH.

On the 16th November, 1360, according to Henry of Malmesbury, Richard Fitz-Ralph slept in the Lord at Avignon. "Of whom", says Fox,^[26] "a certain cardinal hearing of his death, openly protested that the same day a mighty pillar of the Church was fallen".

In Wadding's *Annals*, it is told that towards the end of his life, seeing it was not likely he could succeed in his struggle, he withdrew to Belgium, and there died in the mountains of Hannonia. The same account appears in the Camden Annals of Ireland. But Ware^[27] tells us that the Armagh copy of these annals agrees with other histories in placing the death at Avignon. In 1370, his remains were removed by Stephanus de Valle (who from the see of Limerick was translated to that of Meath by Urban V. in 1369), and brought back to his native town of Dundalk, where they were desposited in the church of St. Nicholas. The memory of his extraordinary merits soon attracted to his tomb crowds of the faithful. The usage of styling him St. Richard of Dundalk became quite general, and many miracles were ascribed to his intercession. Moved by the report of these prodigies, Pope Boniface IX. appointed John Cotton, Archbishop of Armagh, Richard Young, Bishop-elect of Bangor, and the Abbot of Osney, near Oxford, as commissioners to institute a judicial examination of the miracles. The result of their labours is not known. Stewart, in his *History of Armagh*, mentions^[28] that in a synod held at Drogheda in 1545, it was ordered that the feast of St. Richard of Dundalk should be celebrated in the diocese of Armagh with nine lessons, in *crastino Joannis et Pauli*.

[Pg 530]

§ X. THE WORKS OF ARCHBISHOP FITZ-RALPH.

(A.) Printed works:—

1. (a) *Richardi Archiepiscopi Armachani, Hyberniae Primalis, Defensorium Curatorum, adversus eos qui Privilegiatos se esse dicunt*, habitum Avinione in consistorio coram D. Papa Innocentio VJ. et D.D. Cardinalibus et Prelatis, anno Christi 1357, nunc recens excusum juxta vetus exemplar et ex fide codicis MS. diligentissime castigatum. Parisiis apud Joan. Libert, via D. Joan. Lateranens. e regione Auditorii Regii, MDCXXI. pagg. 1-136.

(b) The same is printed in the *Appendix ad Fasciculum Rerum expetendarum et fugiendarum opera et studio Ed. Brown Parochi Sandrigiae in agro Cantiano*. London: Chiswell, MDCXC. vol. ii. pag. 466 to 486.

(c) The same in Goldast's *Monumenta S. Romani Imperii*, vol. ii. p. 1391 to 1410.

2. *Summa Domini Armachani in quaestionibus Armenorum*, noviter impressa et correcta a magistro nostro Joanne Sudoris, cum aliquibus sermonibus ejusdem de Christi Dominio. "Jehan Petit, venales habentur in vico Divi Jacobi sub lilio aureo ... quinsième jour de Juillet mil cinq cens et douse., fol. clxxvii."

As this is the most important of all the writings of Dr. Fitz-Ralph, and as the printed book is very rare, it will please our readers to have a more detailed account of its object and contents. The work forms a real encyclopaedia of theological learning, and reveals the vast extent of the author's studies and acquirements. The introduction runs as follows:—

[Pg 531]

Reverendis in Christo patribus, Versi Manasgardensi, ac fratri Joanni electo Clatensi Majoris Armeniae, Richardus Radulphus Archiepiscopus Armachanus, Hiberniae Primas, per gratiam sitire justitiam donec hauriat aquas in gaudio de fontibus Salvatoris. Ex revelatione Vestrae sanctae devotionis accepi, ob defectum exercitii in Sacris Scripturis antiquas quasdam hereses a Sanctis Patribus reprobatas, et nonnullas contra S. Scripturas novellas assertiones erroneas in

vestris partibus pullulasse, propter quas per doctores Latinos ex sacris Literis reseccandas, eo quia earum patroni auctoritatem Ecclesiae Romanae non admittunt estimantes ejus auctoritatem ex Sacris Literis probari non posse, ad Romanam curiam zelus domus Dei et Christi charitas vos adduxit. Cum vero super ipsis erroribus vobis cum ibidem aliquoties contulisset, meam exilitatem devotius stimulastis ut super quaestionibus vestris illud vobis scriberem quod mihi dignaretur Dominus aperire. Cui Vestro tam accepto Deo desiderio resistere non audebam, exactiones spiritualis usurae formidans, si de bonis a Domino acceptis officium negligere institoris, et juxta ipsius promissa *qui evangelizantibus dat verba virtute multa* ardentem desideratis ampliora ob hoc recipite ut abundem magis. Nec debent indignari mihi majores, ex quo ipsi per quos melius perfici potuit illud penitus neglexerunt, et ego cum vidua evangelica cupiam minuta, quae habeo in Domini domum offerre, ipso teste confidens humilis orationis suffragio amplius quam subtilitate ingenii difficilia penetrare. Nec majorum correctionem renuo sed affecto, et ipsum opus, (cujus titulem volui esse *De quaestionibus Armenorum quod* in xix. particulas sive libros distinxit, singulis libris materiam fidei et ipsius causam premittendo), approbationi et reprobationi nostri Papae Patris Clementis VI. universalis Ecclesiae Summi Pontificis in toto et in parte committo. In primis quinque libris illa principalis quaestio Armenorum pertractabitur: numquid Christus habuit in se duas plenas naturas, scilicet, divinam et humanam ita quod propter unionem illarum duarum naturarum in ipso fuit Dominus IESVS Christus veraciter suppositum, persona, sive hypostasis in utraque natura verus Deus et verus homo.

Primus itaque liber contra heresim Nestorianam, a quodam Nestorio introductam, affirmantem in Christo naturam humanam duntaxat, ita ut Christus homo fuerit et non Deus; quam heresim secuti sunt Cherintus, Armerintus, Theodocio, et etiam excaecati Judaei, et multae Orientalium nationum usque in prasens, patefacto primitus quis sensus sit literalis Sacrae Scripturae censendus, ex Scriptura N. T. juxta sensum literalem ipsius ostendit Christum quem colimus esse Deum. Secundus liber contra Judaeos specialiter ex V. T. juxta literalem sensum ipsius, probat Christum sive Messiam in sua Scriptura promissum Deum esse debere.

Tertius liber ex eadem V. Scriptura ostendit Christum nostrum quem colimus esse sive fuisse illum qui erat Judaico populo in ipsa Scriptura promissus.

In quarto libro tractantur objectus Judaici populi contra ostensa in lib 2^o et 3^o et dantur et probantur in ipso regulae certae istos objectus, et omnes alios objectus Judaicos dissolvendi.

In quarto libro contra heresim Arii et Apollinarii affirmantem quod in Christo anima humana non fuit, divinitas loco animae in Christo erat: ad hoc, contra heresim Manichaei dicentis Christum non verum corpus humanum sed corpus fantasticum habuisse Scripturae testimonia adducuntur, et consequenter contra heresim ponentem corpus humanum in Christo fuisse et divinitas veluti indumentum ac vestem sicut in angelis cum corpora humana assumi; et contra heresim Dioscori affirmantis naturam humanam in Christo in divinam fuisse mutatam ex utroque Testamento testimonia proferuntur.

[Pg 532]

Sextus liber ex Scripturis utriusque Testamenti ostendit Spiritum Sanctum a Filio sicut a Patre procedere, quod a Grecis et ab Armenis plerisque negatur.

Septimus liber probat ex Scriptura quod Romana Ecclesia sit caput totius Ecclesiae Christianae.

Octavus liber de Sacramento baptismi et ejus forma plures Armenorum quaestiones absolvit.

Nonus liber de Sacramentis Corporis Christi et Sanguinis, Confirmationis et Unctionis plures quaestiones eorum tractat.

Decimus liber de modis illicitis, conferendi et acquirendi et detinendi dona Dei gratuita ac praeposuras Ecclesiae quaestiones eorum pertractat, et an requiratur gratia Dei ad habendum dominium.

Undecimus^[29] liber de potestate absolvendi simplicis sacerdotis, et de punitione animarum hominum impiorum ante finale iudicium quaestiones ipsorum dissolvit.

Duodecimus liber quaestiones Armenorum pertractat de beatitudine animarum quorundam justorum et de purgatione aliquarum animarum ante finale iudicium.

Liber decimus-tertius, quem propter Athanasium Graecum qui negat Purgatorium adjeci, quatuor pertractat articulos, de satisfactione, debita pro peccatis in vita et etiam post hanc vitam.

Liber decimus-quartus tractat quaestiones Graecorum et Armenorum de visione nuda atque clara divinae essentiae a vere beatis quam negant plerique eorum.

Liber decimus-quintus objicit contra auctoritatem nostrae Scripturae per

contingentiam futurorum praenuntiatorum in ipsa quae possint non fore, et occasione cujusdam novelli erroris asserentis omnia futura ex necessitate sive inevitabiliter evenire, quare offendit libertatem contradictionis in voluntate humana tam ex physicis scripturis quam ex divinis in multiplici ratione, et contingentiam futurorum.

Liber decimus-sexthus ponit tres de pretactis objectionibus acceptis de infallibilitate scripturae divinae, a divina praesentia immutabili, a voluntate divina omnipotente invincibili et etiam efficaci; et solvit eosdem ex propriis principiis evidenter ostendens contingentiam futurorum et libertatem contradictionis voluntatis divinae et humanae.

Liber decimus-septimus residuos sex ponit objectus de Dei coöperatione speciali cum voluntate hominum operante; de sustentatione rerum intrinseca ab omnipotenti divina potentia; de divina coöperatione generali eum omni agente creato; de necessitate eventus actuum intrinsecorum nostrorum, etc.

[Pg 533]

Liber decimus-octavus ostendit auctoritatem Legis Antiquae et Novae, et probat utrumque Testamentum ex lege Saracenorum firmari; et cum in multiplici ratione affirmat Legem nostram traditam in suis majoribus articulis non fuisse aut esse corruptam.

Liber decimus-nonus comparat Legem nostram quoad sacramenta et ceremonias cum lege Judaeorum. Pertractat etiam de miraculis Apostolorum, et ostendit Legem nostram robur amplius habere quam ratio naturalis, aut aliqua secta gentilium et hoc totum opus consummat.

Quia vero per interrogationem et responsionem modus tradendi videtur multis facilius, licet sit aliquantulum prolixior, unum de nostris, mihi discipulum predilectum, quasi mecum disputantem accepi. Ita ut Joannes vicem gerere quaerentis, et Richardus intelligatur vicem gerere docentis licet potius respondentis. Vos igitur, Reverendi Patres, opus accipite quod petistis, orationis si placet mercedem mihi pensantes pro labore hoc.

(B.) Works in Manuscript:—

1. (a) *Summa contra Armenos*, lib. xx., fol. 126, xc. New College. Oxford.
- (b) *Responsio de Armenorum Heresi*, fol. 218, xviii. Lincoln Coll., Oxford.
- (c) *Armachanus de Questionibus Armenorum*, Cod. 250, n. 4. St. Benedict, Cambridge.
- (d) *Scriptum Armachani de Questionibus Armenorum*, Cod. 224. Pembroke, Cambridge.
- (e) *Richardi Armachani lib. xix., Questionum adversus Armenos*. Trin. College, Dublin.
2. *Ricardi Radulphi Armachani Opus in P. Lombardi sententias in questiones xxix.* distributum, praevio sermone super idem. xv. Oriel College, Oxford.
3. (a) *Ricardi Rad. Armachani, Propositio facta in consistorio coram Domino Papa et Cardinalibus ac Prelatis super materia mendicitatis ac privilegiorum mendicantium contra Fratres de ordinibus quibuscunque, apud Avinion. die 8 mensis Novemb. Anno Domini MCCCLVIII., fol. 54, xxxviii.* Magdal. Coll. Oxford.
- (b) *Propositio ejusdem facta in consistorio coram Papa, Cardinalibus et Prelatis, ad utilitatem cleri ac populi Christiani super materia mendicitatis ac privilegiorum contra fratres de ordinibus mendicantium quibuscunque apud Avinion. 8 Nov. 1357, fol. 184.* St. John Bapt., Oxford.
- (c) *Ric. Filii Radulphi, Archiep. Cantuar. (sic) sermo habitus Avinionae viii. die mensis Novembris A.D. 1357, in istud Nolite judicare secundum faciem, etc., fol. 53.* Corpus Christi Coll., clxxxii., Oxford.
4. *Propositio Ric. Armachani ex parte Regis Angliae Edwardi III., in consistorio D. Papa Avinione pro gratia jubilaei ejus D. Regis populo obtinenda, anno 1349, fol. 177.* S. J. Bap., Oxford.
5. *Rich. Fil. Rad. Armachani de paupertate Christi libri septem, cum prologo ad Innocentium Papam VI. et titulo capitulorum cuique libro praevio, fol. 143.* King's Coll. Oxford, cxviii.
6. *Objectiones ejusdem contra seipsum in Materia de Mendicitate et aliis cum suis solutionibus, fol. 196, S. Q. B., lxxv.* Oxford.
7. *Responsio ad objectiones Mendicantium.* British Museum.
8. *Excerpta varia ex Ricardo Fitz-Rauf; a) excerpta ex testamento S. Francisci contra fratres Minores; b) excerpta notabilia ex quodam libro qui vocatur Summa Summarum; c) excerpta ex libro Copiosae charitatis.* Bodl.
9. *Rich. Radulphi Armachani Primatis Dialogus vel Disputatio de Rebus ad S. Scripturam pertinentibus.* Lincoln, 75.
10. (a) *Sermones Domini Richardi Dei gratia Archiep. Armach. Hiberniae, habiti Avinione et aliis locis quampluribus de diversis Sanctis et temporibus.* S. John B. lxxv. Oxford.

[Pg 534]

(b) *Ric. Rad. sive Fitz-Ralph, Archiep. Armach. sermones de tempore et de sanctis, per totum annum.* New Coll., xc.

(c) *Sermones tam de tempore quam de sanctis.* Trin. Coll., Dub.

(d) *Sermones V. ad crucem Londinensem, an 1356, et alii de laudibus S. Deipariae.* Ibid.

(e) *Sermones Richardi filii Radulphi de Dundalk, Archiepiscop. Armachani.* Ibid.

FOOTNOTES:

- [15] Theiner's *Vetera Monumenta*, n. 517, p. 263.
- [16] *Vet. Monum.*, n. 270, p. 286.
- [17] *Annal. MSS.*, in Bibl. Cotton.
- [18] *Vet. Mon.*, n. 271, p. 286-7.
- [19] *Ibid.*, n. 272.
- [20] *Ibid.*, n. 273.
- [21] *Claus. 29-30, Ed. III.*
- [22] *Pat. 29, Ed. III.*
- [23] *Commentar. Urbanor, lib. 3.*
- [24] *Vet. Mon.*, p. 521.
- [25] *Defensorium Curatorum.*
- [26] *Acts and Monuments*, i. p. 465, seq.
- [27] *De Scriptoribus*, lib. i. p. 10.
- [28] *Dowdall Register.*
- [29] Cardinal Bellarmine warns his readers that our author is *caute legendus* in the 4th cap. of the 10th, and the 4th cap. of the 11th books. The Cardinal does not approve of his doctrine, *de potestate presbyterorum*, nor of his teaching on the mendicant state.

MR. BUTT AND NATIONAL EDUCATION. [30]

No Irish Catholic can examine the system of National Education without being filled with alarm for the safety of our faith in Ireland.

The tendency of the national system is to give a full control over the education of the rising generations in Ireland to the English Government, thus affording them an opportunity of undermining true faith, and of effecting by favours, promises, gifts, and influence, what they sought in vain to obtain by penal laws, by confiscation of property, and by fire and sword. The system also tends to weaken pastoral authority, to deprive the successors of the apostles, who were sent by Christ to teach all nations, of their lawful influence, and to separate priest and people. Such consequences necessarily follow from the operation of model and training schools, and from the vast powers given in all educational matters to a body of commissioners appointed by the government, and dependent on it—commissioners, many of whom are openly hostile to the religion of the people of Ireland, whilst others have given proof that they are either unable or unwilling to defend it or support its rights and interests. But even if the commissioners were most anxious to do justice to Catholics, the nature of the system which they have bound themselves to carry out would frustrate their good intentions. The mixed system proposes to collect into the same school teachers and pupils of every religious denomination, Catholics, Anglicans, Presbyterians, Methodists, and Jews, and to do nothing and to teach nothing in the school, and to publish nothing in the schoolbooks, offensive to any of them. Hence all prayers, the catechism, all teaching of the special doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church, must be banished from the school during the hours of teaching, and the books placed in the hands of children which are calculated to exercise great influence on their after life, must be compiled in a style of indifference to every religion. Indeed we could not expect to find anything good or religious in books composed by a Protestant archbishop of rationalistic and latitudinarian views, who does not appear to have believed in the Trinity or the Divinity of Christ, who raised himself to the episcopal dignity by publishing the *Errors of Romanism*, and who terminated his career by admitting that his object in compiling some of the books introduced into the national schools was to dissipate the darkness in which the Irish people are sitting, or, in other words, to spread among them his own dangerous principles, and to undermine their faith.

[Pg 535]

Whilst the national system is beset by so many dangers, we cannot but be anxious that its character and tendencies should be accurately examined, and the objections to which it is liable fairly stated to the public. We are now happy to be able to say that all this has been done by a Protestant barrister, Mr. Isaac Butt, late M.P. for Youghal. This learned and eloquent gentleman

has just published a treatise entitled *The Liberty of Teaching Vindicated*, in which he gives the history of the system of National Education, and discusses its merit. The writer appears to have studied the subject with the greatest care, and to have made himself acquainted with all its bearings. His treatise is written with great clearness and moderation; his views upon education are liberal and accurate; and his arguments against allowing the education of Ireland to pass into the hands of a hostile government, are most powerful and unanswerable. Mr. Butt has rendered us an immense service by publishing so valuable a treatise. We recommend all our friends to provide themselves with it, and to peruse it most carefully.

We shall now give some few extracts from it to show the spirit in which it is written. The treatise is dedicated to Mr. Gladstone, and in the dedication Mr. Butt calls on that great statesman to apply to Ireland the principles of justice and liberality, which he had so often advocated in the case of other nations, principles unhappily ignored in the management of Irish affairs by those who have the reins of power in their hands.

[Pg 536]

"Most of our departments are managed as if the chief art of Irish government consisted in a dexterous thwarting, or, at least, ignoring of all local and national wishes, as they are represented by the class with whom the department has to deal. In no country in the world, not even in the Austrian provinces of Venetia, are national feeling and sentiment so completely excluded from any control over the management of national affairs"—(p. viii.)

Applying what he had stated to the question of national education, he adds:—

"The House of Commons, with an almost prodigal, but a wise liberality, has placed at the disposal of the Irish Government large and ample funds for the purposes of national education. These funds are administered on a plan opposed to the feelings of all creeds and all classes of the Irish nation. Ninety-nine out of every hundred Irishmen condemn it. There is not an Irish constituency from Bandon to Derry in which any man could be returned as an advocate of the national system, if the question were purely one of its approval or disapproval. There is not a parish in Ireland in which the inhabitants, if they had their choice, would adopt it as the system of their parish school. Right or wrong, the present system is one forced, by official coercion, on the Irish people. It is a national system, maintained and supported in defiance of the sentiment of the nation"—(p. viii.)

Looking at the national system in a religious point of view, Mr. Butt adds, that it is in antagonism with the wishes and feelings of all classes of the Irish people.

"There is no nation on earth who cherish religious feelings with a more deep and enthusiastic devotion than do the Irish. They are the very last people among whom the experiment of an education, which excludes the fulness of religious teaching, should be tried. The result of the experiment has been, that by all creeds and classes of Irishmen, the 'national' system is condemned. All who avail themselves of it do so grudgingly and of necessity. It is a system forced upon the people by their rulers.... It is for the Irish nation themselves to judge of the education which is suited to the wants of the Irish poor. The system which is condemned by the universal suffrage of the Irish nation, is unfit for Ireland, because it is so condemned"—(p. ix.)

"If we are driven to justify our opinions, we have only to refer to the example of England. In England, every school that receives aid from the funds of the State, is a school avowedly teaching the doctrines of some religious body. Full and unrestricted religious instruction is made an essential part of national education in England. In Ireland, a school which adopts that instruction as its rule, is consequently placed under a ban, and denied all assistance from the national funds. It matters not whether the instruction be Protestant or Catholic, it equally condemns the school in the eyes of our rulers"—p. x.

[Pg 537]

Treating of the difference between the systems prevailing in England and Ireland, Mr. Butt adds:

"In point of principle, no reason can be assigned for the difference between England and Ireland. If it be wrong in Ireland to endow and aid a purely Roman Catholic school, it is equally so in England. The difference established between the two countries can neither be justified nor accounted for upon any rational principle. It fosters the belief in the mind of every Irishman that his country is treated as an inferior. In many Irishmen it promotes the belief that religious instruction, which is free in English schools, is placed under restriction in Ireland, because the faith of the majority of the Irish people is proscribed"—(p. xi.)

And may we not ask has not the Irish Catholic sufficient grounds for adopting this opinion? Has not all the legislation of the country for centuries been directed to the destruction of Catholicity?

The question is next referred to of the tendency of the national system to throw the whole education of the country into the hands of the government.

"I do not shrink from inviting your consideration to the complaint—that the Irish national system, as now constituted, is one gigantic contrivance for bringing the

whole education of Ireland under government control. I appeal with confidence to you, as an English statesman, against the attempt to 'Anglicise' the education of the Irish people—against the project of bringing up, in government academies, an army of schoolmasters, who, in school, and still more out of school, are to form for government a moral and intellectual police—against the system of lavish bribery by which it is plainly proposed to attract all talent in the humbler classes of Irishmen into the service of an anti-Irish Board—against the institution in our country of a great system of universal education, subject to influences that are not Irish, and administered in a spirit of distrust of the whole Irish people, their national prejudices, and their religion"—(p. xii.)

In the course of the work, proofs are given of the way in which it was sought to establish government influence. In the beginning, according to the letter of Lord Stanley, only one model school was to be erected in Ireland, and the minor schools through the country were to remain quite independent. In 1835, the commissioners began to manifest more extensive designs, and in a report to Lord Mulgrave, it was proposed to establish a model school in each county, to take the training of all the teachers of the kingdom into the hands of the Board, and, at the same time, the plan was adopted to introduce books treating of common Christianity, and compiled by Dr. Whateley, and, in fact, to make the authority of the commissioners paramount in everything connected with the education of the future generations in Ireland. On this Mr. Butt observes:—

[Pg 538]

"In no country ought such a system to be tolerated—least of all in Ireland, where—it ought not, it cannot be disguised—there still exists the antagonism between the English government and the thoughts and feelings and sentiments of the nation. I would not write the truth if I did not say, that any one who knows Irish affairs must expect the administration of such a system to be anti-national. He would be informed, without surprise, that from the lessons of history there was carefully excluded all that would remind Irishmen of their distinctive nationality—that the whole tone and tendency of the literature were English—and that, in drawing up the lesson-books in which Irish children are to be taught, Englishmen and Scotchmen were the only persons worthy of the confidence of the Irish National Board.

"I am content to be accounted of narrow and provincial feelings when I thus point to the anti-national character of the system. From the invasion of Henry II. to the present time, English rulers have been engaged in one device or another to destroy the distinctive nationality of Irishmen. The attempt is as unwise as it is unjust. It can only be effected by the destruction of public spirit and the demoralization of the country. The empire in which we are associated gains no more by the destruction of the individual nationality of its component parts, than society would gain by the destruction of all distinctive character in those who compose it. If even the Irish people are to be taught to love England, they must be taught to love Ireland first, and to feel that there is no inconsistency between the most intense Irish feeling and attachment to the empire of which Ireland forms a part. There is a waste of energy in every attempt to extirpate national prejudices and feelings, which makes the attempt a blunder as well as a crime. Russia has not yet Russianized Poland, and the Irish are as far from being West Britons as they were in the days of James I.

"It must be remembered that the effect of such a proposal was to substitute for the varying forms of individual energy and local exertion one great uniform system. While the education of the people was eked out by the sacrifices of the people themselves, or supplied by the desultory efforts of individuals, there was always room for the play of national and local feelings. So far as a plan like that propounded in this report was successful, it destroyed all other industrial energies among the lower orders. The old hedge schoolmaster could no longer make out his bread. The poor scholar could no longer wander from house to house, teaching the old history of Ireland in return for the food and lodging he received. All the lower orders of the people were to be taught by masters trained in a government college, and drilled in a system from which all national feeling was excluded—masters, of whom it was put forward as their chief merit that they would be political and moral agents of the government, inculcating order on a lawless, and teaching civilization to a barbarous, people.

[Pg 539]

"The report of 1835 suggested, of necessity, the question of religion. The masters, according to its proposal, were plainly to be indoctrinated in matters from which religion could not be separated. They were to be instructed in mental philosophy by a professor, specially appointed for that purpose. This training must be given them that they may be qualified to direct 'the thoughts and inclinations of Irish children in a right direction'. Would it have been unreasonable, is it unreasonable now, that the guardians of the faith of any portion of the Irish people should feel anxious to have some security for the character of the 'mental philosophy' in which the teachers of the people were trained?

"Comparing the plan announced in Lord Stanley's published letter with that which was carried into effect, under the joint operation of the interpolated passage and the report of 1835, it is obvious that those who might be perfectly satisfied with

the arrangements of the first, either as to religious or national feeling, might yet be wholly dissatisfied upon the very same points with the second.

"Under the covert and guarded language of the report of 1835, we can clearly trace the inauguration of a new system—a system wholly unlike anything that had preceded it or had ever been recommended—a system which was to establish in every parish a government agent, under the name of a national schoolmaster, and which was also to become a great government university for the teaching of the middle classes.

"This last was to be accomplished by the medium of the model schools. One of these was to be established in each county. The master was to be a person of superior attainments, with a salary very far above that of any curate of the Established Church, and in these schools a superior education was to be conveyed. We shall see how steadily the plan, first broached in the annual report of 1835, has been carried out.

"In 1837, the report tells us that 'they had added to their normal establishment in Dublin a scientific department and a school of industry, in the immediate neighbourhood of Dublin, with work-rooms and a farm of from forty to fifty acres attached to it'. In the same report they propose to appoint a superintendent for each of twenty-five districts—residing at the model school, and having £125 a-year, with apartments and allowances. The head master of each model school was *'to be authorised to receive a limited number of boarders at such charge to their parents and friends as the commissioners might think proper, having regard to local circumstances'*.

"At the same time, they stated their intention to establish, generally, schools termed secondary, in which 'scientific instruction' and 'instruction in manual occupation' should be given;—a portion of land for garden husbandry to be an indispensable adjunct to each secondary school.

[Pg 540]

"In 1839 they modestly announce a model farm, near Dublin, as only in its infancy, with twelve agricultural pupils, 'deriving much benefit from the judicious system of farming which they see practised there'.

"In 1840 they determine to establish twenty-five agricultural model schools—each of them in connection with an elementary national school. They subsequently establish twelve pupil-teacherships in their central agricultural institution—scholarships, in fact, which are competed for by the most promising students in their rural agricultural schools.

"I have referred to these establishments in proof of the assertion that the national system has been gradually expanded into a vast educational institution, absorbing and controlling the education of the poorer classes, and, to a great extent, that of the middle classes of the country.

"The extent to which this has proceeded will be understood by a reference to the last report of the Commissioners, that for the year 1864.

"It appears by this report that there are at present in operation twenty-six model schools (classing the three metropolitan schools as one establishment). The expenditure within the year upon these model schools amounts to nearly £25,000.

"In addition to the Albert Model Farm at Glasnevin, near Dublin, there are in connection with the Board thirty-six agricultural schools; nineteen of these are under the exclusive management of the Board—seventeen partly under local control.

"The sums expended on this agricultural department amount in the year to more than £10,000. It will complete this statement to add that in the same year, 1864, the training institution of Dublin was maintained at a cost, in its several branches, of £4,500.

"The cost of the inspection department of the institution amounts to no less a sum than £23,000.

"The cost of the official establishment in Marlborough Street is £15,457.

"In addition to this, a very considerable sum, amounting, probably, to nearly £10,000, appears to be annually distributed, at the discretion of the Board and its inspectors, in the shape of gratuities of one kind or other to the persons engaged in the teaching of the national schools.

"It appears from this report (excluding the item last mentioned), that upon the official staff of this great educational institute there is annually expended a sum of £49,000; and upon model and agricultural schools, wholly foreign from the original objects, a further sum of £33,000, making an expenditure of £82,000, one shilling of which does not reach one of the schools, to support which the grant for Irish education was originally made.

"The whole of this immense sum, amounting to nearly one-third of the grant, is really spent upon a machinery for bringing the education of the people under the entire and absolute control of the Board.

"I do not stop to argue whether £15,000 be not an extravagant expenditure for official expenses. That which is of importance to observe is, that the tendency and effect of the costly, but most effective, system of inspection is, in reality, to convert inspection into superintendence, and to extend the direct influence of the Board over all the schools in connection with them. The training or normal establishment is instituted for the express purpose of indoctrinating the masters in the views prescribed by the Board. But the influence does not end here. By a system of examinations, conducted in connection with the inspection, the Board contrives to direct the studies and mould the train of thought of the masters. Their salaries are increased at the pleasure of the Board. A graduated system of promotion and a scale of rewards are established, dependent entirely on their recommending themselves to the inspectors. Under such a system the power nominally left to the local patrons of selecting the schoolmaster, in reality does not give to these patrons any substantial control. Every national schoolmaster adopts, or professes to adopt, the opinions of his real masters, and learns to reflect the opinions which he knows to be in favour with the Board.

"The model schools are established partly to complete the training of the masters, and partly to force upon the country the entire system of the Board. Of these schools the commissioners themselves are the patrons, and in these they have full power of enforcing their own views. What they 'earnestly recommend' to others, they are able to adopt in their own schools. Money is lavished upon these model schools, so as to make them establishments of a superior order. The model school in Marlborough Street is maintained at an expense of £3,500. One in Belfast costs very nearly the same sum. Most of this money is expended in the salaries and maintenance of pupil teachers, so that these model schools are, in effect, colleges, with their exhibitions to attract students. Over these model schools the commissioners have absolute control, and through them, and by means of them, they exercise an almost absolute influence over the whole system of education in connection with the Board. This is, in effect, the carrying out of the plan indicated in the report of 1835. Centralization is secured by an array of schoolmasters, trained under the Commissioners. No man can attain the rank of a first-class national schoolmaster who has not gone through a training in an establishment conducted after the most approved fashion of the Board—a training by which he becomes thoroughly indoctrinated in all the maxims of that fashion. He is not sent to a model school merely to see the best mode of arranging classes or maintaining the discipline of the school. He is sent there to reside as the student of a college, to learn various departments of knowledge. He is taught, in his training, history, political economy, mental philosophy, and scriptural history—and he learns them all in lesson books prepared to order for the Commissioners, and by catechetical instruction, in which he is drilled by professors and inspectors appointed at their sole nomination.

"I pass, for the present, from this part of the subject, with this one observation—that this sum of £80,000 is annually expended upon a portion of the system with which local exertion or local influence has nothing whatever to do. It is wholly, absolutely, and unreservedly under the direction and control of the central authority.

"In England, I may observe, the state assumes no such power. The training institutions for schoolmasters are left entirely under the control of the authorities of the respective denominations. In Ireland, the rule is that the masters should be trained by government, and accept at once their theology, their morals, and their science of teaching at the hands of the officials of the state. It is only the resolute opposition of the Catholic prelates that has prevented this project from being completely carried into effect"—(p. 87-96.)

We regret that our space will not allow us to give more copious extracts from the book now before us. But again we recommend our readers to read and study the whole treatise. It will open their eyes to the dangers with which mixed education, falsely called *national*, menaces our Church and our country.

FOOTNOTES:

- [30] Mr. Butt's work is entitled *The Liberty of Teaching Vindicated, Reflections and Proposals on the subject of National Education*. Dublin. Kelly, Grafton Street, 1865.

The few questions which were answered in the last number of the *Record* have given occasion to other questions of a practical nature in connection with the Office and Mass for the Dead. There is a variety of practice in some points—for instance, 1st, at the end of the absolution, if the office and mass be celebrated for one person, should *requiescat in pace*, or *requiescant*, be said?

2nd, Should the *Anima ejus et animae omnium*, etc., be said, and is there any definite rule about it?

3rd, When is the *De profundis* to be said, and when is it to be omitted?

With regard to the first question we beg to quote the following decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, which settles the question.

"Dec. 2709. An dicendum sit in fine absolutionis mortuorum *requiescat vel requiescant*?

"Resp. Quando absolutio est pro uno defuncto, in singulari; pro pluribus, in plurali. In missa vero semper *requiescant*. Die 22 Januarii, 1678".

In reply to the second question, it appears to us that the Rubrics of the Ritual will lead us to a safe conclusion. The Ritual clearly lays down that, if the remains for any reason are not carried to the cemetery immediately after the office, the Benedictus, and the prayer, etc., having been said, the *Anima ejus et animae*, etc., is also to be said. In such a case there is no doubt, inasmuch as the Ritual lays down the entire order of the ceremony, and ends with the words *Anima ejus*, etc., in full without any comment. If the remains are brought to the cemetery the same practice is to be observed, for at the sepulchre the same prayers are prescribed by the Rubrics, and there is no change mentioned. Hence, we consider we are correct in stating that the *Anima ejus*, etc., is to be said at the end of the prayers for burial, praesente corpore, whether these are recited in the church or in the cemetery. But is the verse *Anima ejus* to be said at the end, after the *Requiescant in pace*, if the remains are not present? There is no mention of this in the Ritual nor in the Missal, and it is certain that on All Souls' Day, when the remains, as a rule, are not supposed to be present, the *Anima ejus* is not to be said. There is a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites referring to this subject.

[Pg 543]

"Dec. 2924. An post absolutionem quae fit super cadaver in die obitus, vel supra tumulum in die anniversario aut super lecticam seu castrum doloris in die commemorationis omnium fidelium defunctorum, dicto versiculo *requiescant in pace*, subjungi debeat *Anima ejus et animae omnium*, etc.

"Resp. Servetur Rituale: et in commemoratione omnium fidelium defunctorum nihil superaddendum. Die 2 Decembris, 1684".

We do not mean to say that this decree decides the point clearly in our favour, but the Ritual certainly does not prescribe it. We have before us an excellent ceremonial published in Bologna by a missionary priest of St. Vincent, and he is clearly of opinion that the *Anima ejus* absente cadavere ought not to be said, and adduces the decree above quoted referring to the office on All Souls' Day.

With regard to the third question, it is well we should observe, in order to avoid any misunderstanding, that we are speaking of the *De profundis* which is said after Mass at the end of the absolution, when the clergy are proceeding to the sacristy. The Rubrics are clear as to when the *De profundis* is to be said at the end of Lauds: "Psalmus lauda anima mea in vesperis similiter et Psalmus *De profundis* in fine laudum non dicuntur in die commemorationis omnium fidelium defunctorum, neque in die obitus seu depositionis defuncti". We think that much the same answer is to be given about the *De profundis* at the end of the absolution, as was given above about the *Anima ejus et animae omnium*, etc. This opinion is held by the author above quoted, and it is only in case the corpse is present that the Ritual prescribes the *De profundis*. "Deinde a sepultura in ecclesiam vel in sacristiam revertentes dicant sine cantu antiphonam si iniquitates etc. cum Psalmo, *De profundis*, etc.", and there is a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites which appears to confirm our views.

[Pg 544]

"Dec. 4543. Antiphona et Psalmus *De profundis* nec non versiculus animae eorum in die commemorationis omnium fidelium defunctorum post absolutionem ad tumulum sunt omittenda juxta. Decr. 2 Decembris, 1684".

"Die 28 Julii, 1832".

We must add that the practice in Rome is, even absente corpore, to say the *De profundis*, and hence our readers will perceive there is some difficulty in settling the question.

We wish, however, to state that, being pressed for time, we were not able to examine this question as fully as we would wish, and we hope soon to return to it; and if, in the mean time, any light were thrown on the subject by any of our learned readers who study such matters, we shall be very glad to receive any remarks or suggestions that may be forwarded to us.

GENTLEMEN,

May I beg you to insert in your widely-circulating journal the following list. It may be useful to the clergy for the information of youths, in whose higher education they take an interest, and especially now, when we may hope that to have studied under a Catholic system will no longer be an obstacle to advancement.

I remain, Gentlemen,
Your faithful servant,
BARTH. WOODLOCK,
Rector.

Catholic University, Dublin,
31st July, 1865.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY EXHIBITIONS.

TO BE COMPETED FOR IN OCTOBER, 1865.

General Regulations.

1. The following Exhibitions will be offered for competition in the University on Tuesday, October 10th, and following days.
2. The Examinations will commence each day at 10 A.M.
3. Candidates are required to send in their names and commendatory letters from their University or Collegiate Superior, to the Secretary of the University, on or before the day preceding the Examination at which they propose to present themselves. [Pg 545]
4. They will not be awarded unless for distinguished answering.
5. The successful candidates, if not already matriculated, are required to matriculate within one week after the declaration of the award of the Examiners.
6. Every Exhibition is tenable for one year, unless where otherwise specified; but successful candidates are required to attend Lectures in the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters, or of Science, according to their standing, and can hold the Exhibitions so long only as they observe the regulations of the University.
7. No one, however, can hold two Exhibitions in the same matter;—*e. g.*, two Classical, or two Mathematical Exhibitions, or two Exhibitions in Physical Science, cannot be held by the same person.

EPISCOPAL EXHIBITIONS.

Special Regulations for the Episcopal Exhibitions.

1. No Student above twenty-two years of age, or of more than one year's standing in any University, will be allowed to compete for the Episcopal Entrance Exhibitions.
2. The Examinations for the Classical Exhibitions will take place on Tuesday, October 10th, and Wednesday, October 11th; and for the Mathematical Exhibitions, on Thursday, October 12th, 1865.
3. The Episcopal Exhibitions will be distributed among Students from the Ecclesiastical Provinces of Armagh and Cashel, Dublin and Tuam respectively; provided competitors from these provinces offer themselves, and comply with the other conditions prescribed.
4. The successful Candidates must attend the lectures of the First or Second Year.

I.—FOR ENTRANCE.

Open to all Students of not more than One Year's standing in the University.

Classical.—One Exhibition of £20, one of £15, and three of £10 each, for proficiency in the Classical and Literary matter of the Entrance Examination.

Candidates for these Exhibitions will be examined in Latin and Greek Grammar, and Latin Composition; in the elements of Ancient Geography, or Roman History (from the beginning of the Republic to the Battle of Actium), and of Greek History (from the Legislation of Solon to the death of Philip); and in the following books:—

Homer, *Iliad*, i.-iii.;
Euripides, *Alcestis*;

Special marks will be given for Latin verses and Greek composition.

[Pg 546]

Mathematical.—One Exhibition of £20, one of £15, and three of £10 each, for proficiency in the Mathematical matter of the Entrance Examination.

The Examination for these Exhibitions will not extend beyond the second book of Euclid, nor embrace matter which is not included in most Algebraical Treatises within the limits of Simple Equations.

II.—SECOND YEAR'S EXHIBITIONS.

Open to Students of the University, of not more than Two Years' standing, who have passed the Annual Examination of the First Year.

Classical.—One Exhibition of £25, one of £20, and one of £15.

Candidates for these Exhibitions will be examined in Latin and Greek Grammar and Composition; in the elements of Ancient Geography, of Roman History (from the beginning of the Republic to the battle of Actium) and of Greek History (from the Legislation of Solon to the death of Philip), and in the following books:—

Herodotus, vi.; Euripides, *Hippolytus*; and Sophocles, *Ajax*.

Horace, Epistles, including the Art of Poetry; Terence, *Heautontimoroumenos*; and Tacitus, Histories.

Special marks will be given for Greek and Latin verse.

Mathematical.—One Exhibition of £25, one of £20, and one of £15, for proficiency in Euclid, i.-vi. (definitions of Book v.); Algebra, including the Theory of Equations; Plane Trigonometry; Coördinate Geometry and Conic Sections.

EXHIBITIONS FOR AFFILIATED STUDENTS. [31]

Special Regulations.

1. These Exhibitions are open to all *Affiliated* Students of the University, who will have passed the Entrance Examination since the 1st June, 1863.

2. The Examination will be held in the University Buildings, 86 Stephen's Green, commencing each day at 10 A.M., as follows:—

Classical Exhibitions, on Tuesday and Wednesday, 10th and 11th October, 1865.

Mathematical Exhibitions, on Thursday, 12th October, 1865.

3. These Exhibitions are subject to the General Regulations given above.

4. They are tenable for two years; but can be enjoyed so long only as the holders attend those Lectures of the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters, or of Science, which are prescribed, according to their standing, in the University course of Studies, and observe the rules and regulations of the University. In every case they will cease at the end of the Session 1866-7.

[Pg 547]

Classical.—One Exhibition of £30, and one of £25.

The subjects of the Examination will be Latin and Greek Grammar, and Latin Composition; the Elements of Ancient Geography, of Roman History (from the beginning of the Republic to the Battle of Actium), and of Greek History (from the legislation of Solon to the death of Philip); and in the following books:—

Homer, *Iliad*, i.-vi.; and Herodotus, vi.

Virgil, *Aeneid*, i.-vi.; Cicero, *in Catilinam*, *pro Milone*, *Archiâ*, and *Lege Maniliâ*.

Special consideration will be given to Latin Verses and Greek Composition.

Mathematical.—One Exhibition of £30, and one of £25, for proficiency in Elementary Mathematics, viz.:—

Algebra (except the Theory of Equations); first six books of Euclid; Elements of Plane Trigonometry.

HIGHER UNIVERSITY EXHIBITIONS.

Regulations.

1. The following Exhibitions, tenable for one year, are open to all who present satisfactory

testimonials of conduct.

2. Former successful competitors may again compete for them.

3. But the Candidates cannot be above twenty-six years of age, or of more than five years' standing in any University.

CLOYNE EXHIBITIONS.

Founded by the Bishop and Clergy of the Diocese of Cloyne.

Cloyne Exhibition in Mental Science, £20:—Friday and Saturday, 13th and 14th October, viz.:—

Proficiency in Logic and the Elements of Mental Philosophy.

Cloyne Classical Exhibitions:—One of £30, and one of £20:—Monday and Tuesday, 16th and 17th October.

The subjects of Examination will be:—

Greek and Latin Grammar; Greek and Latin Composition, both prose and verse; Elements of Ancient Geography; History of the Peloponnesian War, from 431 to 404 B.C.; Roman History, from the outbreak of the Social War to the Death of Cicero; and the following books:—

Thucydides, i. ii.;
Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*;
Cicero, *de Oratore*, i. ii.;
Virgil, *Aeneid*, ix. xii.;

[Pg 548]

Cloyne Exhibition in Irish History, Literature, etc., £20:—Wednesday, 18th October:—

Irish History, from the English Invasion to the Plantation of Ulster; Elements of the Irish Language; Materials of Irish Literature.

LIMERICK EXHIBITIONS.

Founded by the Laity of the City and County of Limerick.

Limerick Mathematical Exhibition, £30:—Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, 19th, 20th, and 21st October.

For proficiency in the full University course of Pure Mathematics and Mathematical Physics (vide *Calendar*, pages 42, 43).

Two Limerick Modern Literature Exhibitions, £20 each, viz.:—

(a) Wednesday, 25th October—English Language and Literature; and English History from the Accession of James I., 1603, to the Death of George II., 1760.

(b) Thursday, 26th October—The Language and Literature of France, Italy, or Germany, at the option of the candidate; and the History of the country, the Language and Literature of which he presents, viz.:—

French History, from the Accession of Francis I., 1515, to the Death of Louis XIV., 1715;

Italian History, from the Death of Lorenzo de Medici, 1492, to the re-conquest of Naples by the Spaniards, 1733; or

German History, from the Accession of Charles V., 1519, to the Treaty of Westphalia, 1648.

CONOLLY EXHIBITIONS, £20 EACH.

Founded by John Conolly, Esq.

I. *Mathematics*:—Thursday and Friday, 19th and 20th October:—Coördinate Geometry, Differential and Integral Calculus.

II. *Mathematical Physics*:—Friday and Saturday, 20th and 21st October:—Mathematical Statics and Dynamics, and Elements of Mathematical Geography and Astronomy.

III. *Experimental and Kosmical Physics*:—Monday and Tuesday, 23rd and 24th October:—Heat, Light, Electricity, and Magnetism; Elements of Geology, Physical Geography and Climatology, and Astronomy.

IV. *Natural Sciences*:—Tuesday and Wednesday, 24th and 25th October:—Chemistry, Mineralogy, and Crystallogoly.

N.B.—Of these Exhibitions, Nos. I. and II. cannot be held by the same person; so also Nos. III. and IV. cannot be held simultaneously.

[Pg 549]

FOOTNOTES:

- [31] Affiliated Students are such as, having passed the Entrance Examination, pursue their studies in an approved college or school, with the view of completing the higher studies in the University (*Calendar*, page 48). For the purposes of the Examination for the above Exhibitions, all Students who will have been examined for Entrance by the University Examiner in one of the seminaries, colleges, or schools, connected with the University (vide *Calendar*, page 81), between the 1st June, 1863, and the 10th October, 1865, will be eligible.

DOCUMENTS.

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITIES OF BELGIUM AND OF IRELAND.

The Catholic University of Louvain has just been deprived by death of its first Rector, Mgr. Peter Francis Xavier de Ram. This illustrious prelate was called to the reward of his useful life on Sunday, the 14th of May, and his demise has caused a vacancy, not only in the University over which he presided with so much prudence and energy for over thirty years, but also in several other learned bodies, of which he was a most distinguished member. His death has been a severe loss to his native land and to the Catholic Church in Belgium. Let us hope the great work for which he lived will long continue to be a prolific source of every blessing to Catholic Belgium.

On hearing of the death of Mgr. de Ram, our Catholic University, which, in obedience to the advice of the Sovereign Pontiff, has ever looked on that of Louvain as its model and elder sister, hastened to hold a meeting of the Academic Senate, at which the following letter of condolence was unanimously agreed to:—

Illustrissimo et adm. Rdo. Dno. Vice Rectori; Illmis. D.D. Facultatum Decanis; et perillustribus D.D. in Universitate Cath. Lovaniensi Professoribus ornatissimis,

Universitas in Hibernia Catholica S. D.

Paucis abhinc diebus pervenit ad nos tristissima notitia mortis Illmi. et Rmi. D.D. Francisci Xaverii de Ram, istius Universitatis in Belgio Catholicae Magnifici Rectoris. Haud certe sine maximo cordium nostrorum dolore nuntium istum accepimus. Siquidem et inclytam Universitatem Vestram praecipuo lumine et ornamento destitutam conspicimus, et Supremo Capite et primo Rectore orbatam, qui res nascentis, imo potius renascentis Academiae summa humanitate, ornatissimus homo, est moderatus: qui miro ordine ita omnia paravit et instituit, ut antiquae illius in vestra civitate Universitatis decus et in scientiis laudem nova aemularetur, imo et superaret.

[Pg 550]

Ad consolandum igitur vos in casu isto, quo est gravissime afflicta Academia Vestra, Universitatem hanc nostram urget et communis fides, et praecipua dilectio qua nos complecti dignati estis, et nomen ipsum Universitatis Catholicae. Nam et inclytam vestram Academiam haec nostra haud passibus aequis insequi conatur, et vester proinde dolor, aerumnae vestrae nobis vobiscum sunt communes. Itaque et inter hos dies nostrum erit clarissimi viri, vestri quondam Rectoris Magnifici animae piaculari Sacrificio opitulari, publicisque Ecclesiae officiis, et illi requiem et ipsius Operi, Universitati scilicet Vestrae incolumitatem et in dies proventus adprecari.

Ex aedib. Univers. in Hib. Cath.

Datum Dublinii V. Kal. Junias, 1865.

BARTH. WOODLOCK, Rector Univer. Cath.

THOMAS SCRATTON, A.B. a Secretis Universit.

The Vice-Rector of the University of Louvain has returned the following answer:—

Louvain, de l'Université Catholique, le 9 Juin, 1865.

MAGNIFICE RECTOR,

Perquam gratae nobis fuere literae tuae plenissimae illa humanitate, proximis hisce diebus ad nos datae, in quibus Dublinensis Academiae nomine moerorem nostrum de obitu Viri illustrissimi Petri Francisci Xaverii de Ram, tuae doloris participatione levare voluisti, unàque significasti Dublinensem Academiam jam nunc hoc quoque curare, ut brevi, in suo coetu, oblato peculiari Sacrificio, publicis votis precibusque aeterna requies animae illustrissimi Viri a Deo expectatur.

Itaque facere non possum, Magnifice Rector, quin nostrae Academiae nomine tibi gratias quam maximas agam tam ob hoc germanae caritatis indicium quam ob illam doloris officiosam significationem.

Immanem profecto jacturam facimus in amissione Viri qui, ut recte dicis, Magnifice Rector, renascentis Lovaniensis Academiae quodam modo pater fuit, et

diuturno tempore gubernator prudentissimus, et praecipuum ejus lumen et decus et ornamentum; quem nos quidem eodem desiderio lugemus quo filii parentem.

Reliquum est, ut Dublinensi Academiae, quam tu, Magnifice Rector, sapientissime moderaris et nos praecipuo quodam amore complectimur, prospera quaevis exoptemus; quod magnam certe partem praestiterimus, si, quod enixe facimus, Deum precamur ut te illi Academiae quam diutissime servet.

VICE RECTOR UNIVERSITATIS.
T. A. NAMECHE.

Viro Eximio ac Reverendissimo Bartholomaeo Woodlock, Magnifico Rectori Universitatis Catholicae in Hibernia.

[Pg 551]

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

I.

History of the Catholic Archbishops of Dublin since the Reformation. By Rev. P. F. Moran, D.D. Vol. i. Dublin: James Duffy, 1865.

We are happy to announce the publication of the first volume of the *History of the Catholic Archbishops of Dublin since the Reformation*, by the Rev. Dr. Moran, of the Irish College, Rome, whose past services to the annals of our religion and country are well known. The first part of the volume now before us gives an account of the violent and tyrannical manner by which it was attempted to introduce Protestantism into Ireland under Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth. The arguments by which the Reformers propagated their opinions were fraud and treachery, fire and sword, penal laws and the confiscation of property. Dr. Browne and Dr. Loftus, two Englishmen, who received all the jurisdiction they enjoyed, as Archbishops of Dublin, from Henry and his daughter, Elizabeth, made themselves remarkable by their bigotry and their spirit of persecution. During their times no Catholic bishop, canonically appointed, could exercise spiritual powers in Dublin; but the wants of the faithful were provided for by vicars-apostolic, or administrators, lawfully appointed by the Holy See. Dr. Moran gives an interesting account of the labours of several of them, and especially of Father David Wolf, one of the companions of St. Ignatius, of Father Newman, and Father White. Towards the end of the sixteenth century a bishop, by name Donald, was appointed to Dublin by the Holy See, but nothing is known of his history. In the bull appointing Dr. De Oviedo, in 1600, it is merely mentioned that the see of Dublin was vacant by the death of Donald, late archbishop.

The history of Dr. De Oviedo and of the wars of the O'Neills is given at considerable length. After the death of that prelate, Dr. Matthews was translated from Clogher to Dublin in 1611, and governed this diocese with the zeal of an apostle down to the year 1623, when he died in Rome, esteemed and honoured by the Roman Pontiff. The labours of our prelate are fully described by Dr. Moran, and his provincial statutes, replete with wisdom and learning, are given in the appendix.

Dr. Fleming, son of the Baron of Slane, succeeded Dr. Matthews in 1623, and was equally distinguished as his predecessor for virtues and good works. During the first period of his episcopate, the Irish Church had to suffer a great deal from the persecuting spirit of the government, and especially from the hostility of Lord Strafford. Yet in such troubled times Dr. Fleming held several synods, and laboured assiduously for the establishment of ecclesiastical discipline. As Dr. Matthews had founded an Irish college at Louvain, so Dr. Fleming was most anxious to procure the means of education for the students, by establishing or encouraging other colleges in France, Spain, Belgium, and Italy. Speaking of the college of Antwerp, which had been endowed by Rev. L. Sedgrave and Rev. James Talbot, Dublin priests, Dr. Moran says:

[Pg 552]

"One of its collegiate rules will suffice to reveal to us the spirit of self-sacrifice and Christian heroism with which the youthful Levites were prepared for their missionary toils in Ireland: 'Each priest', thus the rule enacts, 'will offer to God with all possible devotion the Holy Sacrifice of the Altar, beseeching our Divine Redeemer to have mercy on our afflicted and persecuted country, and to strengthen our clergy with His sanctifying grace. To attain this end all the students will, moreover, on each Friday, observe a rigorous fast, and will recite every day at their evening devotions the penitential psalm, Miserere mei Deus'".

Dr. Fleming was also a great patron of the learned men, such as the Four Masters, Wadding, Harold, Colgan, and others, who at that time devoted themselves to the study of Irish history and antiquities.

The present volume brings the history of the Archbishops down to the memorable period of 1641. A copious and valuable appendix is added, in which many most interesting letters of Irish bishops, generally inedited, and other documents are published.

The succeeding volumes will appear without any undue delay.

II.

History of the Viceroy's of Ireland, with Notices of the Castle of Dublin, etc. By J. T. Gilbert, Esq. Dublin: James Duffy. 1865.

This work is a valuable accession to Irish history. The author has had access to the public records, and in this way has been able to fix the chronology of important events, and to throw great light on a period whose history had been written very inaccurately. The present volume gives the history of the Viceroy's from the Norman invasion in the twelfth century down to the death of Henry VII. in 1509. The work will be sought for with avidity by all who wish to become acquainted with the real state of Ireland in the period before the Reformation, and it will increase in interest as it comes down more closely to our own time.

*** END OF THE PROJECT GUTENBERG EBOOK THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD,
VOLUME 1, AUGUST 1865 ***

Updated editions will replace the previous one—the old editions will be renamed.

Creating the works from print editions not protected by U.S. copyright law means that no one owns a United States copyright in these works, so the Foundation (and you!) can copy and distribute it in the United States without permission and without paying copyright royalties. Special rules, set forth in the General Terms of Use part of this license, apply to copying and distributing Project Gutenberg™ electronic works to protect the PROJECT GUTENBERG™ concept and trademark. Project Gutenberg is a registered trademark, and may not be used if you charge for an eBook, except by following the terms of the trademark license, including paying royalties for use of the Project Gutenberg trademark. If you do not charge anything for copies of this eBook, complying with the trademark license is very easy. You may use this eBook for nearly any purpose such as creation of derivative works, reports, performances and research. Project Gutenberg eBooks may be modified and printed and given away—you may do practically ANYTHING in the United States with eBooks not protected by U.S. copyright law. Redistribution is subject to the trademark license, especially commercial redistribution.

START: FULL LICENSE

THE FULL PROJECT GUTENBERG LICENSE

PLEASE READ THIS BEFORE YOU DISTRIBUTE OR USE THIS WORK

To protect the Project Gutenberg™ mission of promoting the free distribution of electronic works, by using or distributing this work (or any other work associated in any way with the phrase “Project Gutenberg”), you agree to comply with all the terms of the Full Project Gutenberg™ License available with this file or online at www.gutenberg.org/license.

Section 1. General Terms of Use and Redistributing Project Gutenberg™ electronic works

1.A. By reading or using any part of this Project Gutenberg™ electronic work, you indicate that you have read, understand, agree to and accept all the terms of this license and intellectual property (trademark/copyright) agreement. If you do not agree to abide by all the terms of this agreement, you must cease using and return or destroy all copies of Project Gutenberg™ electronic works in your possession. If you paid a fee for obtaining a copy of or access to a Project Gutenberg™ electronic work and you do not agree to be bound by the terms of this agreement, you may obtain a refund from the person or entity to whom you paid the fee as set forth in paragraph 1.E.8.

1.B. “Project Gutenberg” is a registered trademark. It may only be used on or associated in any way with an electronic work by people who agree to be bound by the terms of this agreement. There are a few things that you can do with most Project Gutenberg™ electronic works even without complying with the full terms of this agreement. See paragraph 1.C below. There are a lot of things you can do with Project Gutenberg™ electronic works if you follow the terms of this agreement and help preserve free future access to Project Gutenberg™ electronic works. See paragraph 1.E below.

1.C. The Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation (“the Foundation” or PGLAF), owns a compilation copyright in the collection of Project Gutenberg™ electronic works. Nearly all the individual works in the collection are in the public domain in the United States. If an individual work is unprotected by copyright law in the United States and you are located in the United States, we do not claim a right to prevent you from copying, distributing, performing, displaying or creating derivative works based on the work as long as all references to Project Gutenberg are removed. Of course, we hope that you will support the Project Gutenberg™ mission of promoting free access to electronic works by freely sharing Project Gutenberg™ works in compliance with the terms of this agreement for keeping the Project Gutenberg™ name associated with the work. You can easily comply with the terms of this agreement by keeping this work in the same format with its attached full Project Gutenberg™ License when you share it without charge with others.

1.D. The copyright laws of the place where you are located also govern what you can do with this work. Copyright laws in most countries are in a constant state of change. If you are outside the

United States, check the laws of your country in addition to the terms of this agreement before downloading, copying, displaying, performing, distributing or creating derivative works based on this work or any other Project Gutenberg™ work. The Foundation makes no representations concerning the copyright status of any work in any country other than the United States.

1.E. Unless you have removed all references to Project Gutenberg:

1.E.1. The following sentence, with active links to, or other immediate access to, the full Project Gutenberg™ License must appear prominently whenever any copy of a Project Gutenberg™ work (any work on which the phrase “Project Gutenberg” appears, or with which the phrase “Project Gutenberg” is associated) is accessed, displayed, performed, viewed, copied or distributed:

This eBook is for the use of anyone anywhere in the United States and most other parts of the world at no cost and with almost no restrictions whatsoever. You may copy it, give it away or re-use it under the terms of the Project Gutenberg License included with this eBook or online at www.gutenberg.org. If you are not located in the United States, you will have to check the laws of the country where you are located before using this eBook.

1.E.2. If an individual Project Gutenberg™ electronic work is derived from texts not protected by U.S. copyright law (does not contain a notice indicating that it is posted with permission of the copyright holder), the work can be copied and distributed to anyone in the United States without paying any fees or charges. If you are redistributing or providing access to a work with the phrase “Project Gutenberg” associated with or appearing on the work, you must comply either with the requirements of paragraphs 1.E.1 through 1.E.7 or obtain permission for the use of the work and the Project Gutenberg™ trademark as set forth in paragraphs 1.E.8 or 1.E.9.

1.E.3. If an individual Project Gutenberg™ electronic work is posted with the permission of the copyright holder, your use and distribution must comply with both paragraphs 1.E.1 through 1.E.7 and any additional terms imposed by the copyright holder. Additional terms will be linked to the Project Gutenberg™ License for all works posted with the permission of the copyright holder found at the beginning of this work.

1.E.4. Do not unlink or detach or remove the full Project Gutenberg™ License terms from this work, or any files containing a part of this work or any other work associated with Project Gutenberg™.

1.E.5. Do not copy, display, perform, distribute or redistribute this electronic work, or any part of this electronic work, without prominently displaying the sentence set forth in paragraph 1.E.1 with active links or immediate access to the full terms of the Project Gutenberg™ License.

1.E.6. You may convert to and distribute this work in any binary, compressed, marked up, nonproprietary or proprietary form, including any word processing or hypertext form. However, if you provide access to or distribute copies of a Project Gutenberg™ work in a format other than “Plain Vanilla ASCII” or other format used in the official version posted on the official Project Gutenberg™ website (www.gutenberg.org), you must, at no additional cost, fee or expense to the user, provide a copy, a means of exporting a copy, or a means of obtaining a copy upon request, of the work in its original “Plain Vanilla ASCII” or other form. Any alternate format must include the full Project Gutenberg™ License as specified in paragraph 1.E.1.

1.E.7. Do not charge a fee for access to, viewing, displaying, performing, copying or distributing any Project Gutenberg™ works unless you comply with paragraph 1.E.8 or 1.E.9.

1.E.8. You may charge a reasonable fee for copies of or providing access to or distributing Project Gutenberg™ electronic works provided that:

- You pay a royalty fee of 20% of the gross profits you derive from the use of Project Gutenberg™ works calculated using the method you already use to calculate your applicable taxes. The fee is owed to the owner of the Project Gutenberg™ trademark, but he has agreed to donate royalties under this paragraph to the Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation. Royalty payments must be paid within 60 days following each date on which you prepare (or are legally required to prepare) your periodic tax returns. Royalty payments should be clearly marked as such and sent to the Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation at the address specified in Section 4, “Information about donations to the Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation.”
- You provide a full refund of any money paid by a user who notifies you in writing (or by e-mail) within 30 days of receipt that s/he does not agree to the terms of the full Project Gutenberg™ License. You must require such a user to return or destroy all copies of the works possessed in a physical medium and discontinue all use of and all access to other copies of Project Gutenberg™ works.
- You provide, in accordance with paragraph 1.F.3, a full refund of any money paid for a work or a replacement copy, if a defect in the electronic work is discovered and reported to you within 90 days of receipt of the work.
- You comply with all other terms of this agreement for free distribution of Project Gutenberg™ works.

1.E.9. If you wish to charge a fee or distribute a Project Gutenberg™ electronic work or group of

works on different terms than are set forth in this agreement, you must obtain permission in writing from the Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation, the manager of the Project Gutenberg™ trademark. Contact the Foundation as set forth in Section 3 below.

1.F.

1.F.1. Project Gutenberg volunteers and employees expend considerable effort to identify, do copyright research on, transcribe and proofread works not protected by U.S. copyright law in creating the Project Gutenberg™ collection. Despite these efforts, Project Gutenberg™ electronic works, and the medium on which they may be stored, may contain “Defects,” such as, but not limited to, incomplete, inaccurate or corrupt data, transcription errors, a copyright or other intellectual property infringement, a defective or damaged disk or other medium, a computer virus, or computer codes that damage or cannot be read by your equipment.

1.F.2. LIMITED WARRANTY, DISCLAIMER OF DAMAGES - Except for the “Right of Replacement or Refund” described in paragraph 1.F.3, the Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation, the owner of the Project Gutenberg™ trademark, and any other party distributing a Project Gutenberg™ electronic work under this agreement, disclaim all liability to you for damages, costs and expenses, including legal fees. YOU AGREE THAT YOU HAVE NO REMEDIES FOR NEGLIGENCE, STRICT LIABILITY, BREACH OF WARRANTY OR BREACH OF CONTRACT EXCEPT THOSE PROVIDED IN PARAGRAPH 1.F.3. YOU AGREE THAT THE FOUNDATION, THE TRADEMARK OWNER, AND ANY DISTRIBUTOR UNDER THIS AGREEMENT WILL NOT BE LIABLE TO YOU FOR ACTUAL, DIRECT, INDIRECT, CONSEQUENTIAL, PUNITIVE OR INCIDENTAL DAMAGES EVEN IF YOU GIVE NOTICE OF THE POSSIBILITY OF SUCH DAMAGE.

1.F.3. LIMITED RIGHT OF REPLACEMENT OR REFUND - If you discover a defect in this electronic work within 90 days of receiving it, you can receive a refund of the money (if any) you paid for it by sending a written explanation to the person you received the work from. If you received the work on a physical medium, you must return the medium with your written explanation. The person or entity that provided you with the defective work may elect to provide a replacement copy in lieu of a refund. If you received the work electronically, the person or entity providing it to you may choose to give you a second opportunity to receive the work electronically in lieu of a refund. If the second copy is also defective, you may demand a refund in writing without further opportunities to fix the problem.

1.F.4. Except for the limited right of replacement or refund set forth in paragraph 1.F.3, this work is provided to you ‘AS-IS’, WITH NO OTHER WARRANTIES OF ANY KIND, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR ANY PURPOSE.

1.F.5. Some states do not allow disclaimers of certain implied warranties or the exclusion or limitation of certain types of damages. If any disclaimer or limitation set forth in this agreement violates the law of the state applicable to this agreement, the agreement shall be interpreted to make the maximum disclaimer or limitation permitted by the applicable state law. The invalidity or unenforceability of any provision of this agreement shall not void the remaining provisions.

1.F.6. INDEMNITY - You agree to indemnify and hold the Foundation, the trademark owner, any agent or employee of the Foundation, anyone providing copies of Project Gutenberg™ electronic works in accordance with this agreement, and any volunteers associated with the production, promotion and distribution of Project Gutenberg™ electronic works, harmless from all liability, costs and expenses, including legal fees, that arise directly or indirectly from any of the following which you do or cause to occur: (a) distribution of this or any Project Gutenberg™ work, (b) alteration, modification, or additions or deletions to any Project Gutenberg™ work, and (c) any Defect you cause.

Section 2. Information about the Mission of Project Gutenberg™

Project Gutenberg™ is synonymous with the free distribution of electronic works in formats readable by the widest variety of computers including obsolete, old, middle-aged and new computers. It exists because of the efforts of hundreds of volunteers and donations from people in all walks of life.

Volunteers and financial support to provide volunteers with the assistance they need are critical to reaching Project Gutenberg™’s goals and ensuring that the Project Gutenberg™ collection will remain freely available for generations to come. In 2001, the Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation was created to provide a secure and permanent future for Project Gutenberg™ and future generations. To learn more about the Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation and how your efforts and donations can help, see Sections 3 and 4 and the Foundation information page at www.gutenberg.org.

Section 3. Information about the Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation

The Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation is a non-profit 501(c)(3) educational corporation organized under the laws of the state of Mississippi and granted tax exempt status by

the Internal Revenue Service. The Foundation's EIN or federal tax identification number is 64-6221541. Contributions to the Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation are tax deductible to the full extent permitted by U.S. federal laws and your state's laws.

The Foundation's business office is located at 809 North 1500 West, Salt Lake City, UT 84116, (801) 596-1887. Email contact links and up to date contact information can be found at the Foundation's website and official page at www.gutenberg.org/contact

Section 4. Information about Donations to the Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation

Project Gutenberg™ depends upon and cannot survive without widespread public support and donations to carry out its mission of increasing the number of public domain and licensed works that can be freely distributed in machine-readable form accessible by the widest array of equipment including outdated equipment. Many small donations (\$1 to \$5,000) are particularly important to maintaining tax exempt status with the IRS.

The Foundation is committed to complying with the laws regulating charities and charitable donations in all 50 states of the United States. Compliance requirements are not uniform and it takes a considerable effort, much paperwork and many fees to meet and keep up with these requirements. We do not solicit donations in locations where we have not received written confirmation of compliance. To SEND DONATIONS or determine the status of compliance for any particular state visit www.gutenberg.org/donate.

While we cannot and do not solicit contributions from states where we have not met the solicitation requirements, we know of no prohibition against accepting unsolicited donations from donors in such states who approach us with offers to donate.

International donations are gratefully accepted, but we cannot make any statements concerning tax treatment of donations received from outside the United States. U.S. laws alone swamp our small staff.

Please check the Project Gutenberg web pages for current donation methods and addresses. Donations are accepted in a number of other ways including checks, online payments and credit card donations. To donate, please visit: www.gutenberg.org/donate

Section 5. General Information About Project Gutenberg™ electronic works

Professor Michael S. Hart was the originator of the Project Gutenberg™ concept of a library of electronic works that could be freely shared with anyone. For forty years, he produced and distributed Project Gutenberg™ eBooks with only a loose network of volunteer support.

Project Gutenberg™ eBooks are often created from several printed editions, all of which are confirmed as not protected by copyright in the U.S. unless a copyright notice is included. Thus, we do not necessarily keep eBooks in compliance with any particular paper edition.

Most people start at our website which has the main PG search facility: www.gutenberg.org.

This website includes information about Project Gutenberg™, including how to make donations to the Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation, how to help produce our new eBooks, and how to subscribe to our email newsletter to hear about new eBooks.