

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

Release Date: March 3, 2011 [EBook #35465]

Language: English

Credits: Produced by Bryan Ness, Josephine Paolucci and the Online Distributed Proofreading Team at <https://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, FEBRUARY, 1865 ***

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

[Pg 201]

FEBRUARY, 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

[CARDINAL CONSALVI AND NAPOLEON BONAPARTE.](#)
[THE SEE OF ACHONRY IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.](#)
[THE ETERNAL PUNISHMENT OF THE WICKED.](#)
[CATHOLIC EDUCATION—DISENDOWMENT OF THE PROTESTANT ESTABLISHMENT.](#)
[LITURGICAL QUESTIONS.](#)
[DECREES ON THE HOLY MASS.](#)
[DOCUMENTS.](#)
[NOTICES OF BOOKS.](#)

CARDINAL CONSALVI AND NAPOLEON BONAPARTE.

[Concluded from page 167.]

This laconic answer produced on Napoleon an extraordinary effect. He started, and fixed on the Cardinal a long and searching look. The man of iron will felt that he had to deal with another will, which, while it matched his own for firmness, surpassed it in the power that ever springs from self-control. Taking advantage of the Consul's surprise, Consalvi went on to say that he could not exceed his powers, nor could he agree to terms in opposition to the principles of the Holy See; that it was not possible in ecclesiastical matters to act as freely as was allowable in urgent cases wherein only temporal matters were concerned. Besides, in fairness the rupture could not be laid to the Pope's charge, seeing that his minister had agreed to all the articles with one single exception, and that even this one had not been definitely rejected, but merely referred to the judgment of his Holiness.

Somewhat calmed, the Consul interrupted, saying that he did not wish to leave after him unfinished works; he would have all or none. The Cardinal having replied that he had no power to negotiate on the article in question as long as it remained in its present shape, Napoleon's former excitement flashed out once more as he repeated with fire his resolution to insist on it just as it was, without a syllable more or less. "Then I will never sign it", replied the Cardinal, "for I have no power to do so". "And that is the very reason", cried the other, "why I say that you wished to break off the negotiations, and that I look on the business as settled, and that Rome shall open her eyes, and shall shed tears of blood for this rupture". Then almost rudely pushing his way through the company, he went about in every direction, declaring that he would change the religion of Europe; that no power could resist him; that he would not be alone in getting rid of the

[Pg 202]

Pope, but would throw the whole of Europe into confusion: it was all the Pope's fault, and the Pope should pay the penalty.

The Austrian minister, the Count de Cobenzel, full of consternation at the scene, ran at once towards the Cardinal, and with warm entreaty, implored of him to find some means of averting so dreadful a calamity. Once more had the Cardinal to hear from lips to which fear lent most earnest eloquence, the harrowing description of the evils in store for religion and for Europe. "But what can be done", he replied, "in the face of the obstinate determination of the First Consul, to resist all change in the form of the article?" The conversation was here interrupted by the summons to dinner. The meal was short, and was the most bitter the Cardinal had ever tasted in his life. When they returned to the saloon, the Count resumed his expostulations. Bonaparte seeing them in conversation, came up to the Count, and said that it was a loss of time to try to overcome the obstinacy of the Pope's minister; and then, with his usual vivacity and energy, he repeated his former threats. The Count respectfully answered that, on the contrary, he found the Pope's minister sincerely anxious to come to terms, and full of regret at the rupture; no one but the First Consul himself could lead the way to a reconciliation. "In what manner?" asked Bonaparte, with great interest. "By authorising the commissioners to hold another sitting", replied the Count, "and to endeavour to introduce some such modification of the contested point as might satisfy both parties". These and other remarks of the Count were urged with such tact and grace, that after some resistance, Napoleon at last yielded. "Well, then", cried he, "to prove to you that it is not I who seek to quarrel, I consent that the commissioners shall meet on to-morrow for the last time. Let them see if there be any possibility of an agreement; but, if they separate without coming to terms, the rupture may be looked on as final, and the Cardinal may go. I declare, likewise, that I insist on this article just as it stands, and I will allow no change to be made in it". And so saying, he abruptly turned his back on the two ministers.

These words, ungracious and contradictory as they were, nevertheless contained the promise of a respite. It was resolved at once to hold a sitting the next day at noon in the usual place, in the hope that, having come to some agreement between themselves, they might win the First Consul's consent, through the influence of his brother Joseph, who had a great regard for De Cobenzel, and who was desirous of peace. [Pg 203]

That night, following a day of such anxiety, and preceding a day of dreadful struggle, brought but little repose to Cardinal Consalvi. But when the morning came, a circumstance occurred which filled to overflowing the cup of bitterness he had been condemned to drain. At an early hour Mgr. Spina came into his room with sorrow and embarrassment in his countenance, to report that the theologian, P. Caselli, had just left him, after having announced that he had spent the night in reflecting on the incalculable mischief likely to follow from such a rupture; that its consequences would be most fatal to religion, and, as the case of England proved, without a remedy; that, seeing the First Consul inflexibly bent on refusing any modification of the disputed article, he had come to the determination of signing it as it stood; that in his opinion, it did not touch doctrine, and the unparalleled character of the circumstances would justify the Pope's condescendence in such a case. Mgr. Spina added that since this was the opinion of P. Caselli, who was so much better a theologian than he himself, he had not courage enough to assume the responsibility of consequences so fatal to religion, and that he, too, had made up his mind to receive the article and sign it as it was. In case the Cardinal believed that it was not competent for them to sign without him, they would be under the necessity of protesting their acceptance of the article, thereby to save themselves from being responsible for the consequences of the rupture.

This declaration, coupled with the thought that he was now alone in the conflict, deeply affected the Cardinal. But it did not shake his resolution nor take away his courage. He set himself to the task of persuading his two friends of their mistake, but his endeavours were in vain. Perceiving that all his arguments were counterbalanced by the dread entertained of the consequences, he ended by saying that he was by no means convinced by their reasons, and even single-handed he was resolved to persevere in the conflict. He therefore requested them to defer the announcement of their having accepted the article until the conference was at an end, if it should be necessary to break off negotiations. They willingly assented, and promised to give their support to his arguments in the course of the debate, although they were resolved not to go as far as a rupture.

Precisely at noon the sitting was opened at the residence of Joseph Bonaparte. It lasted twelve hours, the clock having struck midnight as they arose from the table. Eleven hours were devoted to the discussion of the article of the Concordat which had been the cause of so many disputes. It is now time to redeem our promise to enter somewhat into detail concerning this famous question. [Pg 204]

At Rome two things were considered as absolutely essential to the Concordat, of which they were declared to be conditions *sine quibus non*. One of these was the free exercise of the Catholic religion; the other, that this exercise of religion should be public. The Head of the Church felt it indispensable that these two points should be proclaimed in the Concordat, not only because it was necessary to secure for religion some solid advantage which might justify the extraordinary concessions made by the Holy See, but also because the spirit of the secular governments both before, and much more after, the French Revolution, ever tended to enslave and fetter the Church. Besides, it had become quite evident in the earlier stage of the negotiations, that the government of France was obstinately opposed to the recognition of the Catholic religion as the religion of the State. That government had ever met the exertions made by Rome to gain this point by reciting the fundamental principle of the constitution, which asserted the complete

equality of rights, of persons, of religions, and of everything else. Hence it was looked upon as a great victory, and one for which Cardinal Consalvi deserved high praise, when he succeeded in extorting the admission that stands at the head of the Concordat, to the effect that the Catholic religion in France was the religion of the majority of the citizens. Another reason there was to insist upon these two points. That universal toleration, which is one of the leading principles of the *jus novum*, had long been proved by experience to mean toleration for all sects, but not for the true Church. The Cardinal had not much difficulty in obtaining the recognition of the free exercise of the Catholic religion. Perhaps the government already had thought of the famous organic laws which it afterwards published, and which effectually neutralised all its concessions on this point. But a whole host of invincible difficulties was marshalled against the demand made for public exercise of the Catholic worship. It was urged with some reason, and no doubt in a good measure with sincerity, that circumstances had made it impossible to carry out in public with safety to the general peace, all the ceremonies of religion, especially in places where the Catholics were outnumbered by infidels and non-catholics. These latter would be sure to insult and disturb the processions and other public functions performed outside the churches; and it was not to be expected that the Catholics would bear these outrages with patience. Hence, not being willing to sanction an indefinite right of publicity, the government expressed its views in these terms:^[1] "The Roman Catholic Apostolic Religion shall be freely exercised in France: *its worship shall be public, regard being had, however, to police regulations*". This is the article the discussion of which had occasioned so much labour and anxiety.

[Pg 205]

Cardinal Consalvi discovered in the article thus worded two fatal defects: firstly, it tended to enslave the Church by placing her at the mercy of the civil power; and secondly, it implied on the part of the Church a sanction of the principle which would serve to legalise such enslavement. For many years, court lawyers had spoken but too plainly concerning the supposed right of the crown to regulate external worship; and so far had this right been extended in practice, that the Church found herself almost, or even altogether, the slave of the civil power. "I had good reason, therefore", says the Cardinal, "to entertain a sovereign dread of that indefinite and elastic phrase 'regard being had to' (*en se conformant*)". Besides, many things pointed to the probability that in virtue of such a convention signed by the Holy See, the police, or rather the government, would interfere in everything, and submit everything to its own will and pleasure, without the Church being able to object, her liberty being tied up by the expression in the treaty. No doubt the Church frequently finds herself in such circumstances, as lead her to tolerate *de facto* violations of her rights and laws, such toleration being recommended either by prudence, or by charity, or by lack of power, or by other just motives. But she never can authorize by a solemn engagement the principle from which such violations spring.

Whilst fully decided never to accept at any risk an article so fraught with mischief to the Church, Consalvi was too loyal and too honest to deny the force of some of the arguments brought into the field by the French commissioners. Hence he proposed various expedients by help of which the dreaded dangers to the public peace might be turned away. One of these expedients was a Papal Bull to the French clergy, commanding them to abstain for some time from certain public ceremonies in places where those hostile to Catholicism were numerous or intolerant; another was, to insert an additional article limiting the duration of the proposed exception, and determining the cases in which the police might interfere: but all was in vain; the government obstinately clung to its idea. The Cardinal tells us that he would have preferred to omit all mention of the right to publicity of worship, and thus cut the knot it was so troublesome to unravel; but his orders from Rome to include that point were too decided, and he was not allowed to send a courier to solicit fresh instructions from the Holy Father on the subject. He felt, therefore, that, even at the cost of a rupture between the two contending parties, he was bound by his most solemn and sacred duty to refuse his sanction to the obnoxious proposition.

[Pg 206]

With these convictions Consalvi took his place at the meeting, on the result of which hung the spiritual interests of so many millions of souls. We shall not follow out in detail the shifting phases of the negotiation, but we will come at once to its closing passage. The French commissioners declared that the state had no wish to enslave the Church; that the word *police* did not mean the government, but simply that department of the executive charged with the maintenance of public order, which order was as much desired by the Church as by the state. Now it was absolutely necessary to preserve public order, and no law could stand in the way of such a result. *Salus populi suprema lex*. It was impossible, they said, for public order to last throughout parts of France, if unrestricted publicity were once permitted in religious ceremonies; and as no other power save the government could judge where such publicity might be safe and where dangerous, it should be left to the discretion of the government to impose, for the sake of peace, such restrictions as the general good required. The Cardinal admitted that public tranquillity was by all means to be preserved, but he contended that the article did not restrict, either in point of object or of time, the power it assigned to the government; that such unrestricted power was dangerous to the Church; and therefore some clause should be added to determine more plainly the precise nature and bearing of the authority to be given to the police to regulate public worship. At length he urged a dilemma which completely vanquished the commissioners. "I objected", says he, "thus: either the government is in good faith when it declares the motive which forces it to subject religious worship to police regulations to be the necessary maintenance of public tranquillity, and in that case it cannot and ought not refuse to assert so much in the article itself; or the government refuses to insert such an explanation; and then it is not in good faith, and clearly reveals that its object in imposing this restriction on religion is to enslave the Church".

Caught between the horns of this dilemma, the commissioners could only say that the explanation required was already contained in the word *police*, police regulations being in their very nature regulations directed to secure public order. "I replied", continues the Cardinal, "that this was not true, at least in every language; but even supposing it to be true", said I, "where is the harm in explaining it more clearly, so as to remove any mistaken interpretation which may be prejudicial to the liberty of the Church? If you are in good faith, you can have no difficulty about this; if you have difficulty, it is a sign you are not in good faith". Pressed more and more by the force of this dilemma, and unable to extricate themselves, they asked me "what advantage do you find in this repetition you propose?" (for they continued to hold that the word *police* expressed it sufficiently). "I find in it a very signal advantage", replied I; "for by the very fact of restricting in clear and express terms the obligation of making public worship conform to the police regulation, we exclude restriction in every other ease, for *inclusio unius est exclusio alterius*. Thus the Church is not made the slave of the lay power, and no principle is sacrificed by the Pope, who in that case sanctions only what cannot be helped, for *necessitas non habet legem*".

[Pg 207]

This reasoning overcame the commissioners, who had no further answer to make. It was resolved to add to the article an explanatory phrase, which should narrow its meaning, and preclude the possibility of unfair interpretations in after days. The amended article read as follows: "The Roman Catholic Apostolic religion shall be freely exercised in France: its worship shall be public, regard being had, however, to such police arrangements *as the government shall judge necessary for the preservation of the public peace*" (quas gubernium pro publica tranquillitate necessarias existimabit). The Concordat was thus finally agreed to by the commissioners of the two contracting parties; and although Bonaparte had declared himself determined to allow no change to be made, his representatives resolved to sign the document, modified as it was. To this step they were strongly urged by Joseph Bonaparte, who, with keen insight into his brother's character, declared, that if before signing they should again consult Napoleon, he would refuse to accept the amendment, whereas, if the Concordat were brought to him already completed, he would be reluctant to undo what had been done. Joseph charged himself with the task of endeavouring to secure the First Consul's consent. On the stroke of midnight the six commissioners placed their signatures to the important document. Not a word was said about any other articles save those contained in the Concordat itself.

Another anxious night followed. In the morning Cardinal Consalvi learned from Joseph Bonaparte that the First Consul had been at first extremely indignant at the change which had been made, and had refused for a long time to approve of it; but that at length, thanks to his brother's entreaties and reasons, after protracted meditation and a long silence, which later events sufficiently explained, he had accepted the Concordat, and ordered that the Pope's minister should be at once informed of his consent.

[Pg 208]

Universal joy followed the announcement of the signing of the Concordat. The foreign ambassadors, and especially the Count de Cobenzel, came to congratulate the Cardinal, and offer their thanks, as for a service rendered to their respective countries. On the following day Bonaparte received the six commissioners with marked courtesy. Ever true to his duty, the Cardinal took care, on this occasion, to make Napoleon observe that the Holy See had not uttered a single word about its temporal concerns throughout the whole course of the negotiations. "His Holiness has wished to prove to France, and to the world, that it is a calumny to accuse the Holy See of being influenced by temporal motives". He also announced his own speedy departure within a few days.

Next day he was suddenly summoned to an audience of the First Consul. For some time he could not detect the object Napoleon had in view in engaging him in conversation, but at length he was able to perceive that it was the Consul's intention to appoint some of the constitutional bishops to the new sees. With much difficulty the Cardinal convinced him that the appointments of these men would never receive the sanction of the Holy See, unless they made a formal declaration of having accepted the Pontifical decision on the civil constitution of the clergy.

During the ensuing three or four days the Cardinal had no private audience. On the eve of his departure from Paris he saw Napoleon at a review at which he and the rest of the diplomatic body assisted according to custom.

It was his intention to address, by way of leave taking, a few words to the First Consul before they left the saloon; but when that personage proceeded to make the round of the room, and began by conversing with the members of the diplomatic body, at the head of which stood Consalvi, he looked for a moment fixedly at this latter, and passed on without taking the slightest notice of him, or sending a word of acknowledgment to the Holy Father. It was probably his intention to show by this public slight how little he cared for a Cardinal and for the Holy See, now that he had obtained all he required from them, and to make this insult the more remarkable, he delayed for a considerable time to converse on indifferent topics with the Count de Cobenzel, who came next after Cardinal Consalvi, and then with the other ambassadors in turn. The Cardinal retired without awaiting his return from the review. When he had just finished his preparations for his departure, which had been fixed for that evening, the Abbé Bernier made his appearance at the hotel to announce that it was the will of the First Consul that between them they should come to some understanding about the Bull which, according to custom, was to accompany the treaty. It was in vain to refuse, and this new labour imposed on the Cardinal another sitting of eight hours. He rose from the table to enter his carriage, and after travelling day and night he reached the Eternal City on the 6th August, more dead than alive, overcome by fatigue, and with his legs so swollen that they were unable to support him. The Pope received

[Pg 209]

him with indescribable tenderness, and expressed his perfect satisfaction with all that had been done. A special consistory of all the Cardinals in Rome approved of the Concordat, which was solemnly ratified thirty-five days after it had been signed at Paris.

Thus was completed the great act which has been fruitful of so many blessings to Europe, and for which, under God, the Church is indebted to the wisdom of Pius VII. and the firmness of Cardinal Consalvi.

It was long before the Concordat was published at Paris, and when at length it did appear, what was the pain of the Holy Father to find, together with the treaty and under the same date, a compilation of the so-called *organic laws* which were put forth as forming part of the Concordat, and included in the approbation of the Holy See! Of the organic laws it is enough to say, that they almost entirely overthrew the new edifice which Cardinal Consalvi had found so difficult to erect. In spite of the solemn protestations of the Popes these laws still remain, but they remain as a standing proof of the dishonesty which Cardinal Consalvi has shown to have marked the entire conduct of Napoleon Bonaparte in the negotiations for the Concordat.

FOOTNOTES:

- [1] Art. i. §. 6. Religio Catholica Apostolica Romana libere in Gallia exercebitur: cultus publicus erit, habita tamen ratione ordinationum quoad politiam.

THE SEE OF ACHONRY IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

Few dioceses of Ireland present so uninterrupted a succession of bishops as Achonry in the sixteenth century. Thomas Ford, Master of Arts, and an Augustin Canon of the Abbey of Saint Mary and Saint Petroc, in the diocese of Exeter, was appointed its bishop on the 13th of October, 1492, and after an episcopate of only a few years, had for his successor Thomas O'Congalan, "a man in great reputation, not only for his wisdom, but also for his charity to the poor". He, too, was summoned to his reward in 1508, and a Dominican Father, named Eugene O'Flanagan, was appointed to succeed him on the 22nd December, the same year. The Bull of his appointment to the See of Achonry is given by De Burgo, page 480, and it describes Dr. Eugene as "ordinis fratrum Praedicatorum professorem ac in Theologia Baccalaureum, in sacerdotio et aetate legitima constitutum cui apud Nos de Religionis zelo, literarum scientia, vitae munditiâ, honestate morum, spiritualium providentia, et temporalium circumspectione, ac aliis multiplicium virtutum donis, fide digna testimonia perhibentur". The learned historian of the Dominican order gives two other Briefs of the then reigning Pontiff, Julius the Second, by one of which the newly-appointed bishop was absolved from all irregularities and censures which he might perchance have incurred during his past life, whilst the other authorized him to receive episcopal consecration from any Catholic bishop he might choose, having communion with the Apostolic See. Dr. O'Flanagan was present in Rome at the time of his appointment to the see of Saint Nathy, and before his departure received from the Holy Father commendatory letters to King Henry the Seventh, from which we wish to give one extract, in order to place in clearer light the relations, so often mistaken or misrepresented, which subsisted between the English monarchs and the occupants of our episcopal sees. After stating that by Apostolic authority he had constituted Dr. O'Flanagan bishop of the vacant See of Achonry, Pope Julius thus addresses the English king:

"Cum itaque, Fili charissime, sit virtutis opus, Dei ministros benigno favore prosequi, ac eos verbis et operibus pro regis aeterni gloria venerari, serenitatem Vestram Regiam rogamus et hortamur attente quatenus eundem Eugenium electum, et praefatam Ecclesiam suae curae commissam, habens pro Nostra et Apostolicae Sedis reverentia propensius commendatos, in ampliandis et conservandis juribus suis sic eos benigni favoris auxilio prosequaris, ut idem Eugenius electus, tuae celsitudinis fultus praesidio in commisso sibi curae Pastoralis officio, possit, Deo propitio prosperari ac tibi exinde a Deo perennis vitae praemium, et a Nobis condigna proveniat actio gratiarum".

Dr. O'Flanagan had for his successor a bishop named *Cormac*, who seems to have held this see for about twelve years, and died before the close of 1529. During his episcopate a provincial synod was held in Galway the 27th of March, 1523, and amongst the signatures appended to its acts was that of "Cormacus Episcopus Akadensis manu propria". It was in this synod that the famous will of Dominick Lynch received the sanction of the western bishops. This will is memorable in the history of the period, not only as showing the affluence of the burgher class, but also on account of the testator's munificence to the Church, as an instance of which we may mention that among his various bequests there is one item assigning a legacy *to all the Convents of Ireland*. (See *Irish Arch. Miscel.*, vol. i. pag. 76 seq.). Dr. Cormac was succeeded by a Dominican Father, named Owen, or Eugene, who, as is mentioned in a manuscript catalogue of Dominican bishops, held this see in 1530, and by his death in 1546, left it vacant for Fr. Thomas O'Fihely, of the order of Saint Augustine. This bishop was appointed on the 15th of January, 1547, as appears from the following consistorial record: "1547, die 15 Januarii S.S. providit Ecclesiae Achadensi in Hibernia vacanti per obitum Eugenii de persona P. Thomae Abbatis

monasterii S. Augustini Mageonen. cum retentione monasterii". Dr. O'Fihely governed this see for eight years, till his translation to Leighlin, as we find thus recorded in the same consistorial acts: "1555, die 30 Augusti: S.S. praecepit Ecclesiae Laghlinensi Thomam Episcopum Acadensem cum retentione parochialis Ecclesiae Debellyns, Dublinensis Dioecesis". This translation to Leighlin is also commemorated by Herrera in his "Alphabetum Augustinianum", pag. 450. The Elizabethan Chancellor of Leighlin, Thady Dowling, in his Annals under the year 1554, gives the following entry: "Thomas Filay, alias Fighill, Minorum frater auctoritate Apostolica Episcopus Leighlinensis". (I.A.S. 1849, part 2nd, pag. 40.) The apparent discrepancy between this entry and the consistorial record may, perhaps, be referred to the well-known inaccuracy of the Anglo-Irish annalists, or perhaps the bishop himself exchanged the Augustinian order for that of St. Francis—similar changes from one religious order to another not being unfrequent in the sixteenth century.

Cormac O'Coyn was appointed his successor in the See of Achonry in 1556, and died in 1561. This prelate belonged to the order of Saint Francis, and was probably the same as "frater Cormacus, guardianus conventus fratrum Minorum de Galvia", who signed the decrees of the provincial synod of 1523 (I.A.S. Miscell., vol. i. pag. 81). The next bishop was appointed on 28th January, 1562, as is thus registered in the consistorial acts:—

"1562, die 28 Januarii: Referente Cardinale Morono Sua Sanctitas providit Ecclesiae Achadensi vacanti per obitum bon. mem. Cormaci O'Coyn nuper Episcopi Achadensis extra Romanam curiam defuncti de persona D. Eugenii O'Harth Hiberni ordinis praedicatorum Professoris, nobilis Catholici et concionatoris egregii commendati a R. P. Davide".

The *Pater David* here referred to, was David Wolf, of the Society of Jesus, who was sent to Ireland as Apostolic Delegate in 1560, and received special instructions from the Holy See to select the most worthy members of the clergy for promotion to the various ecclesiastical preferments. One of the first thus chosen by Father Wolf and recommended to the Sovereign Pontiff, was Eugene O'Hart. The result more than justified his choice, for during the whole long reign of Elizabeth, Dr. O'Hart continued to illustrate our Church by his zeal, learning, and virtues. One of the good Jesuit's letters is still happily preserved. It is dated the 12th of October 1561, and gives us the following interesting particulars connected with the See of Achonry and its future bishop, Eugene O'Hart:—

[Pg 212]

"Bernard O'Huyghin, Bishop of Elphin, has resigned his bishoprick in favour of a Dominican Father, the Prior of Sligo, named Andrew Crean, a man of piety and sanctity, who is, moreover, held in great esteem by the laity, not so much for his learning as for his amiability and holiness.... Father Andrew is accompanied by another religious of the same order, named *Owen* or *Eugene O'Harty*, a great preacher, of exemplary life, and full of zeal for the glory of God: he lived for about eight years in Paris, and I am of opinion (though he knows nothing of it, and goes thither on a quite different errand) that he would be a person well suited for a bishoprick. And should anything happen to Father Andrew, for accidents are the common lot of all, Father Eugene would be a good substitute, although the present bishop did not resign in his favour. Should it please God, however, to preserve Father Andrew, and appoint him to the See of Elphin, his companion might be appointed to the See of Achonry, which diocese has remained vacant since the demise of Cormac O'Coyn of happy memory, of the order of Saint Francis. The Cathedral Church of Achonry is at present used as a fortress by the gentry of the neighbourhood, and does not retain one vestige of the semblance of religion; and I am convinced that the aforesaid Eugene, by his good example and holy life, and with the aid of his friends, would be able to take back that church, and act with it as Dr. Christopher (Bodkin) did in Tuam". (See *Introd. to Abps. of Dublin*, pag. 86 seq.)

From this passage we learn that the Statement of De Burgo in regard of Dr. Eugene, is inexact: "from being Prior of the Convent of Sligo", he says "he was made Bishop of Achonry". (*Hib. Dom.*, 486.) Dr. Eugene's companion, however, was the Prior, and not Dr. Eugene himself. His was a still higher post amongst the illustrious fathers of the Dominican Order, as we will just now learn from another ancient record.

The published writings of Rev. John Lynch, Archdeacon of Tuam, throw great light on the history of Ireland during the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century. He was known, however, to have composed other works, which till late years were supposed to be irretrievably lost. It was only two or three years ago that a large treatise "on the History of the Irish Church", by this learned archdeacon, was discovered in the Bodleian Library, and we learn from a few extracts which have been kindly communicated to us, that it is a work of paramount importance for illustrating the lives of some of the greatest ornaments of our island during the sad era of persecution. As regards the appointment of Dr. O'Hart, this work informs us that he was nephew of the preceding bishop, whom he styles *Cormack O'Quinn*, and when young, took the habit of the order of Saint Dominick in the convent of Sligo. In after years he was chosen Prior of this same convent, from which post he was advanced to be Provincial of the order in Ireland. It was whilst he discharged the duties of this important office that the sessions of the Council of Trent were reopened in 1562, and he was unanimously chosen by his religious brethren to proceed thither as their procurator and representative. Father Wolf, however, made him bearer of letters to the Pope of still more momentous import, "*ut eum ad Episcopalem in Achadensi sede dignitatem*

[Pg 213]

evehere!". Dr. Lynch adds, regarding his companion on this journey: "On his journey to Trent he was accompanied by another member of the convent of Sligo, Andrew O'Crean, who fell sick in France, and not being able to proceed further, there received letters from the Pope, appointing him Bishop of Elphin".

It was probably in Rome that Dr. O'Hart was raised to the episcopal dignity, and on the 25th of May, 1562, and accompanied by Dr. O'Herlihy, Bishop of Ross, and MacConghail, Bishop of Raphoe, he took his place amongst the assembled Fathers of Trent. The metrical catalogue of the bishops of this great Council describes these three ornaments of our Church as

"... Tres juvenes quos frigida Hibernia legat
Eugenium, Thomamque bonos, justumque Donaldum
Omnes ornatos ingens virtutibus orbis
Misit ut hanc scabiem tollant, morbumque malignum
Sacris omnes induti tempora mitris".

The votes and arguments of Dr. O'Hart are especially commemorated in the acts of the subsequent sessions of the Council. Thus, on the question of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, some were anxious to expressly define that episcopal jurisdiction was derived immediately from God. This opinion, however, was warmly impugned by the Bishop of Achonry, who assigned the three following motives for rejecting it:—"1st, Were this jurisdiction derived immediately from God, we would have innumerable independent sources of authority, which would lead to anarchy and confusion. 2nd, Such an opinion leads towards the heretical tenets, and seems to favour the Anglican opinion, that the king is head of the Church, and that the bishops being consecrated by three other bishops, receive their authority from God. 3rd, Were such a doctrine once admitted, the Sovereign Pontiff could not deprive bishops of their jurisdiction, which is contrary to the prerogatives of the Holy See, and repugnant to the primary notion of the Christian Church". The opinion of Dr. O'Hart was embraced by almost all the other bishops, and the historian of the council adds: "Quae sententia omnibus placere maxime visa fuit". Even the Papal legates, when subsequently dealing with this controversy, expressly refer to the reasoning of our bishop. On another occasion, when the question of episcopal residence was discussed, an Irish bishop, who was probably Dr. Eugene, stated the following curious fact:—

[Pg 214]

"Est necessarium ut Praelati intersint in conciliis regum et principum, alias actum esset de religione in multis regnis. Nam in Hibernia cum ageretur concilium reginae Mariae et duo contenderent de Episcopatu, alter Catholicus, alter haereticus, dixit advocatus Catholici, adversarium esse repellendum quia obtinuit Episcopatum a rege schismatico Henrico VIII.; tunc statim praefecti consilio judicaverunt illum reum esse laesae majestatis. Ille respondit: rogo ut me audiat; nam si Henricus fuit Catholicus, necesse est ut regina sit schismatica aut e contra; eligite ergo utrum velit. Tunc praefecti, his auditis, illum absolverunt et eidem Episcopatum concesserunt".

The Acts of the Council register Dr. Eugene's name as follows:—"Eugenius Ohairt, Hibernus, ordinis Praedicatorum, Episcopus Acadensis". The synod being happily brought to a close, the good bishop hastened to his spiritual flock, and during the long eventful period of Elizabeth's reign, laboured indefatigably in ministering to their wants, and breaking to them the bread of life. He enjoyed at the same time the confidence of the Holy See, and several important commissions were entrusted to him. When in 1568 Dr. Creagh wrote from his prison to Rome, praying the Holy Father to appoint without delay a new bishop to the see of Clogher, Cardinal Morone presented his petition, and added: "Causa committi posset in partibus D. Episcopo Acadensi et aliquibus aliis comprovincialibus Episcopis". Amongst the papers of the same illustrious Cardinal, who was at this time "Protector of Ireland", there is another minute which records the following resolutions regarding our Irish Church: "The administration of the see of Armagh should be given to some prelate during the imprisonment of the archbishop, and should the Holy Father so approve, this prelate should be the Bishop of Achonry. The sum which is given to assist the Primate of Armagh should be transmitted through the President of the College of Louvain. In each province of Ireland one Catholic Bishop should be chosen by the Apostolic See, to give testimonials to those of the clergy who come to Rome, viz., in Ulster, the Bishop of Achonry, during the imprisonment of the Metropolitan; in Munster, the Bishop of Limerick; in Connaught, the same Bishop of Achonry; and in Leinster, too, the Bishop of Limerick" (*Ex Archiv. Sec. Vatic.*). A few years later we find a brief addressed to "Eugenio Accadensis", granting him some special faculties, and moreover, authorizing him to make use of them throughout "the whole province of Tuam". The only other notice I have met with regarding Dr. Eugene connected with this period of his episcopate, is from the Vatican list of 1578, which gives the names of the clergy who were actually engaged in the mission in Ireland. The first name on the list is "Reverendissimus Edmundus Episcopus Corchagiensis, pulsus tamen Episcopatu". Next comes "Episcopus Rossensis doctus qui interfuit concilio Tridentino et ipse exulans". The third name is that of Dr. O'Hart, "Episcopus Accadensis ex ordine Praedicatorum".

[Pg 215]

Our Bishop was subjected to many annoyances and persecutions whilst Bingham administered the government of Connaught. This governor was a worthy agent of Elizabeth, imbued with her principles, and animated with her hatred of the Catholic faith: his cruel exactions and barbarity became proverbial in the West, and he reaped a rich harvest of maledictions from the good natives of that province. In Dowera's narrative, published by the Celtic Society in 1849, mention is incidentally made of an excursion of this governor to the episcopal town of Dr. Eugene: "he

passed the mountain", says this narrative (pag. 207), "not far from an abbey called Banada, and encamped at night at O'Conroy (Achonry) a town of the Bishop Oharte". It seems to have been in some such excursion that Dr. Eugene was arrested in the beginning of 1585, and sent a close prisoner to Dublin Castle. Sir John Perrott, who was then Lord Deputy, commissioned the Protestant Archbishop of Armagh, Dr. Long, to visit him, and a fulsome letter of this dignitary to Walsingham, dated 4th June, 1585, reveals to us the important fact that the hopes and desires of the government of that period were precisely like those of the soupers of our own days. Dr. Long's letter is as follows: "Owen O'Hart, Bishop of Achanore, alias Achadensis, committed unto me by his Lordship to be conferred with, who was at the Council of Trent, is brought by the Lord's good direction to acknowledge his blindness, to prostrate himself before her majesty, whom he afore agreed to accurse in religion. So persuaded, I doubt not of great goodness to ensue by his means. He has resigned his Bishoprick and *no doubt* (void of all temporizing) is thoroughly persuaded that the man of sin sitteth in Rome. I assure your honour if we used not this people more for gain than for conscience, here would the Lord's work be mightily advanced". (*Record Office, Ir. Cor.*, vol. cxvii.) The Protestant primate soon found that these his desires and hopes were as groundless as his tenets, and hence, as soon as the circumstances permitted, Dr. Eugene was deprived of his temporalities, and a crown nominee was appointed to administer the see of Achonry. Perrott, however, was for the present anxious to conciliate the powerful septs of the Western Province, most of whom were closely allied to the O'Harts, and hence he gave full liberty to our Bishop on his acknowledging the sovereignty of Elizabeth. In an indenture made on 23rd September, 1585, the various members of the O'Hart family and other Western septs submitted to hold their lands from the crown, and amongst the favours granted in return by the lord deputy, we find it decreed "that the Lord Bishop of Aghconry shall have four quarters of land adjoining his house or town of Skrine in the barony of Tireragh, free, and six quarters as a demesne to his house or town of Achonry in the barony of Magheraleyny, free" (*Morrin's Calendar*, ii. pag. 150; and publications of I. A. S. 1846, pag. 345). In another inquisition which was held in 1558, we find it further mentioned that the Bishop of Achonry was allowed to hold one quarter of land in Kilmore in the barony of Belaghanes, commonly called Mac Costello's country (*Morrin*, *ib.*, pag. 141). There is also a State Paper of 1586, which not only mentions Dr. O'Hart as Bishop of Achonry, but further adds that the friars then held in peace their abbeys and houses throughout all Sligo and Mayo. As soon, however, as the government found itself sufficiently strong to despise the O'Harts and their dependants, a Protestant Bishop was appointed to hold this see. Dr. Mant, indeed, is of opinion that Miler McGrath, appointed in 1607, was the first crown nominee to Achonry. Archdeacon Cotton is more discreet in his statement: "Queen Elizabeth", he says, "appears to have neglected filling up this see, as well as some few others, during great part of her reign". Ware, too, only obscurely hinted that, besides the Catholic Bishop Eugene, there was another contemporary of the same name holding from the crown the see of Achonry. Nothing more, however, was known about this Bishop till the manuscript history by Archdeacon Lynch, above referred to, disclosed to us some remarkable features of his ministry. This contemporary Protestant Bishop of Achonry was Eugene O'Connor, who, from being dean of this see, was appointed by letters patent of 1st December, 1591, Bishop of Killala and administrator of Achonry. Dr. O'Hart had been in early life the friend and school companion of this court favourite, and hence easily persuaded him not to interfere in the spiritual administration of the diocese, engaging, on the other hand, to pay him annually one hundred and eighty marks, that is, the full revenue of the see. One passage of this narrative is so important, that we must cite the original words of the learned Lynch: "Id etiam commodi ex episcopatus Achadensi et Alladensi Eugenio O'Connor ab Elizabeth Regina collatis hausit, ut ab illa sede sua minime motus fuerit, utpote cui arcto amicitiae nexu ante religionis mutationem devinctus fuerat, sed centum et octaginta marcarum censu veteri sodali quotannis persoluto quietem sibi et functiones episcopales intra suae Dioecesis fines obeundi potestatem comparavit. Et alter ille Eugenius ideo tantum a fide descivit, ut se fluxis et caducis divitiis et voluptatibus expleret". By this means Dr. O'Hart secured peace for his diocese during the remainder of Elizabeth's reign; if the temporalities were lost, his spiritual fold, at least, was preserved from the wolves that threatened it, and the good Bishop was enabled to continue undisturbed to instruct his faithful children, and dispense to them the blessings of our holy faith. It was in 1597 that the Franciscan Superior, Father Mooney, visited the western convents of his order. During this visitation he met with Dr. O'Hart, and in the narrative which he subsequently composed, he describes our good bishop as being then venerable for his years, and still not deficient in strength and energy, "grandaevus, robustus tamen". For six years more Dr. O'Hart continued to rule the see of Achonry, till at length, having survived the arch-enemy of his Church and country, he, in 1603, yielded his soul to God, having attained the forty-third year of his episcopate, and the one-hundredth of his age. He was interred in his cathedral church, and Lynch describes his place of sepulture as being "prope aram principalem suae Ecclesiae in cornu Evangelii".

[Pg 216]

[Pg 217]

THE ETERNAL PUNISHMENT OF THE WICKED.

Eternal Punishment and Eternal Death. An Essay. By James Barlow, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Dublin. London: Longman and Co., 1865.

There is a class of writers at the present day, who believe themselves good Christians, and yet whose spirit contrasts very strangely with the spirit of the Gospel. It was a maxim of St. Paul, that every understanding should be made "captive unto the obedience of Christ".^[2] But in the

nineteenth century Christian philosophers are found who presume to sit in judgment on the doctrine of Christ, and to measure it by the standard of human reason. Mr. Barlow's book, we regret to say, partakes largely of this spirit, equally at variance with the faith of the Catholic Church and with the maxims of Inspired Scripture. It is fit, therefore, that the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* should raise its voice to expose the dangerous tendency of his principles and the fallacy of his arguments.

[Pg 218]

The Apostle Paul was "rapt even to the third heaven", and was there favoured with those mysterious revelations "which it is not granted to man to utter".^[3] Nevertheless, when he looked into the profound depths of God's decrees, and saw at the same time the littleness of human reason, he was forced to exclaim: "How incomprehensible are His judgments, and how unsearchable His ways!"^[4] Not so Mr. Barlow. He has ventured to sound those depths which St. Paul could not fathom; he has been bold enough to scrutinize those judgments which St. Paul could not comprehend. The decree of eternal punishment, pronounced by Jesus Christ against the wicked, does not harmonize with Mr. Barlow's notions of morality.^[5] He has weighed the malice of sin in the scales of human philosophy, and he has pronounced that it does not "deserve" eternal torments. Therefore, he concludes, must this "detestable dogma" (p. 135) "be struck from the popular creed" (p. 144). Such is the general scope and tenor of a book on which we propose to offer a few remarks.

Our readers are well aware that the eternal punishment of the wicked is the unmistakable doctrine of Sacred Scripture. It is foreshadowed in glowing imagery by the Prophets; it is set forth in simple and emphatic words by Jesus Christ; it is borne to the farthest end of the earth by the burning zeal of the Apostles. We need not be at any pains to search for texts. The following are familiar to us all. "Then shall He say to them also that be on His left hand: Depart from me, you cursed into *everlasting* fire which was prepared for the devil and his angels". "And these shall go into *everlasting* punishment; but the just into life *everlasting*".^[6] Let it be observed, that the punishment of the wicked is here declared everlasting, in the very same sense as the happiness of the good is said to be everlasting. On another occasion our Divine Lord thus admonishes His disciples: "If thy hand or thy foot scandalize thee, cut it off, and cast it from thee. It is better for thee to go into life maimed or lame, than, having two hands or two feet, to be cast into *everlasting* fire".^[7] Or, as St. Mark has it: "To be cast into *unquenchable* fire; where their worm *dieth not*, and the fire *is not extinguished*".^[8] This dreadful judgment of the wicked had been already announced by St. John the Baptist to the multitude who flocked around him in the desert of Judea. Speaking of Christ, whose coming he announced, he said: "He will gather His wheat into His barn, but the chaff He will burn with *unquenchable* fire".^[9] And long before, it was written by the prophet Isaias: "And they shall go out, and see the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me; their worm *shall not die*, and their fire *shall not be quenched*".^[10] Again, we read in the Apocalypse: "And the devil, who seduced them, was cast into the pool of fire and brimstone, where both the beast and the false prophet shall be tormented day and night *for ever and ever*.... And whosoever was not found written in the book of life, was cast into the pool of fire".^[11] These passages speak plainly for themselves; they stand in need of no commentary from us. True, it is an awful doom; and he who ponders well upon that fire which shall never be quenched, that worm which shall never die, must look forward to the great accounting day with "fear and trembling". But we must not hesitate to accept a doctrine which comes to us from the lips of Eternal Truth, in language so clear, so simple, so divine.

[Pg 219]

Indeed, some of the texts we have adduced seem to Mr. Barlow himself so very conclusive, that he candidly admits he can offer no satisfactory solution. "I trust I shall not be misunderstood to assert that there are no passages in the New Testament relating to the question, which present formidable difficulties. This would be simple dishonesty. Such passages exist, and though the difficulties involved in them may be much extenuated, they cannot be wholly removed"—p. 86. The "difficulties", indeed, are "formidable", and "cannot be wholly removed", because in these passages it is simply asserted that the punishment of the wicked will be eternal, whereas Mr. Barlow maintains that it will *not*.

So far the testimony of Scripture. As for Tradition, we shall content ourselves with Mr. Barlow's own admission. He tells us that "the eternity of future punishments has been, in truth, the immemorial doctrine of the great majority of the Church"—*Preface*, p. v. And in another place, he speaks of "a longing to make out a doctrine of everlasting punishment, which has in all ages characterized the genuine theologian"—p. 86. Such, then, are the overwhelming odds against which this intrepid writer boldly takes his stand, the clear and obvious meaning of the sacred text, "the immemorial doctrine of the great majority of the Church", and the teaching of "the genuine theologian in all ages". Surely he is a dauntless warrior, and must come forth to the conflict armed with mighty weapons, and clad in impenetrable armour. Not so, indeed; but his understanding, which should have been made "captive unto the obedience of Christ", has shaken off that sweet and gentle yoke; he has looked with too curious a scrutiny into the mysterious decrees of God, until at length his dizzy reason has become the dupe of false principles and fallacious arguments.

[Pg 220]

"The civilization of the nineteenth century jars with a belief in everlasting torments, to be inflicted by the All-Merciful on the creatures of His hand"—*Preface*, p. iv. This is the sum and substance of Mr. Barlow's difficulty. The words of eternal truth, and the faith of the universal Church, are weighed in the balance against the civilization of the nineteenth century; they are found wanting, and they must be cast aside. We cannot contemplate this sentiment without a

feeling of horror and amazement. One would think that, if such a contradiction did really exist, it would be the duty of a Christian writer to elevate modern civilization to the standard of revealed truth. But this is not the principle of Mr. Barlow. He looks down, as it were, from the vantage ground of the nineteenth century, and he proposes to reform the faith of Christ, and to raise it up to the level of his own philosophy.

We are satisfied that this dreadful principle contains the germ of all that Mr. Barlow has written against the doctrine of eternal punishment. But it does not always appear in its naked deformity. Sometimes it assumes the grave and imposing garb of philosophical argument; sometimes it is adorned with the graces of rhetoric; and thus for a time it is made to appear plausible, and even attractive. In the following passage it may be recognized without much difficulty: "I cannot conceive any finite sin *deserving* such a doom. I cannot conceive it proceeding from a *merciful* being. The sentence appears to be clearly repugnant not only to mercy, but to justice. It surely requires some explanation. The *onus probandi* rests upon its supporters; let us see what they have to allege on its behalf".^[12]

Mr. Barlow "*cannot conceive* any finite Sin deserving such a doom!" Mr. Barlow "*cannot conceive*" eternal punishment proceeding from a merciful being! That is to say, one of the "incomprehensible decrees" of God exceeds the limits of Mr. Barlow's conception, and this is a sufficient reason "to strike it from the popular creed" (p. 144), and to reform the venerable symbols of Christian faith.^[13] He adds, indeed, that "the sentence appears to be clearly repugnant not only to mercy, but to justice". But when we look for a proof of this daring assertion, we are told that the *onus probandi* rests upon us. Now, this is a simple issue. Does the *onus probandi* rest with us or with Mr. Barlow? Let our readers judge for themselves. Mr. Barlow professes to believe in the Bible. We urge upon him the solemn declaration, so often repeated by Christ and His Apostles, that the wicked "shall go into everlasting punishment". True, he replies, I cannot gainsay these words; but "I believe that the doctrine is untenable" (*Preface*, p. iv.), because it is repugnant to the attributes of God. Surely it devolves upon him to prove this alleged contradiction between the attributes of God and the words of Christ. As for us, we have nothing to prove. We cling fast to the words of eternal truth, with a firm confidence that they cannot be shaken by the arguments of human wisdom, nor even by the boasted civilization of the nineteenth century.

[Pg 221]

The ingenious sophistry by which our author seeks to shift the burthen of proof from his own shoulders, may be exposed more clearly by the following illustration: God alone exists from eternity. This world, therefore, which we inhabit must have been created by Him *out of nothing*. This is an obvious and a certain conclusion. But some one might object: "This opinion is untenable if creation out of nothing is an impossibility; and 'I cannot conceive' that it is possible. How do you prove that it is consistent with the Divine attributes?" Mr. Barlow, we think, would give little quarter to such an objector. And yet this is the very course of reasoning he has himself pursued. The answer in each case is exactly the same. We *know* that creation is possible, because it has actually taken place. And so, too, we *know* that the doctrine of eternal punishment is in harmony with the attributes of God, because He that cannot deceive has told us that the doctrine is true. If we cannot *see* that harmony, it is because the judgments of God are incomprehensible, His ways unsearchable to our finite understanding.

But we must do justice to Mr. Barlow. Though he maintains that the burthen of proof rests with his adversaries, yet he does set himself to demonstrate that the doctrine of eternal punishment contradicts the attributes of God. Now, in this part of his task, we freely admit that much of his reasoning is cogent and indeed conclusive: but it falls very short of the conclusion which he labours to establish. Thus, for example, in the case of a little child that "cries about taking its medicine", Mr. Barlow cannot bear the idea that this trivial fault will be punished with eternal flames (pp. 19, 20). Or, "you fall asleep for a minute or two in church, at afternoon service on a hot day: of course you have not been attending to the service; but, honestly and truly, do you clearly see and feel that those two minutes' sleep *deserves at the hand of Infinite Justice* everlasting agony?" (p. 38, *note*). Again, "a quick little child of two years old, or even younger, knows very well that it is naughty to get into a passion and strike his mother or his nurse: his elders, however, do not think a great deal of this little ebullition of temper, and consider it amply expiated by sending him to bed. But the child may suddenly die in his sin. Will the 'All Merciful' consign him to everlasting tortures?" (p. 44). In another place (chap. v.) he adduces several texts to prove that "punishment after death, finite in duration, as the lot of *some*, is the unambiguous doctrine of Holy Scripture" (p. 116). There is nothing in all this to which we can object. But we maintain that such arguments are worthless in the cause of which Mr. Barlow is the advocate. He proves, indeed, that there are many sins which do not deserve eternal punishment. He proves too from the Inspired Writings, that, beyond the grave there is a state of expiation, in which many souls must needs be purged from such minor transgressions before they can appear in those mansions of heavenly purity where "nothing defiled shall enter".^[14]

[Pg 222]

Our readers will here recognize without difficulty the Catholic doctrine of venial sin, and the Catholic doctrine of purgatory. Unconsciously Mr. Barlow has become for a time the champion of Catholic faith. But the question at issue has not to do with the innocent little babe that beats its nurse, nor the wayward child that refuses its medicine, nor yet with the just man that, through human frailty, "shall fall seven times, and shall rise again".^[15] The controversy in which Mr. Barlow has engaged regards the future lot of the *wicked*—of those who, *with full deliberation*, have committed *grievous* sin; of whom St. Paul has said that they "shall not possess the kingdom

of God";^[16] in a word, of that unhappy band to whom the Great Judge will one day speak those dreadful words: "Depart from me, you cursed, into everlasting fire". It yet remains for Mr. Barlow to demonstrate that this fire will *not* last for ever, that it will one day be extinguished, and that the torments of the *wicked* will cease.

We may pass on, then, to other proofs. "How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, that bring glad tidings of good things".^[17] This is the sentiment of St. Paul and of the Prophet Isaias. But, argues Mr. Barlow, if the gospel of eternal punishment be true, he that goes forth to preach the gospel to the heathen is a curse and not a blessing. Now what are the practical results of our missions to the heathen? "Is not the testimony of all unbiassed witnesses who have travelled among them uniform? Success is infinitesimal, failure all but universal. What impression has been made by our associations on the hundred and fifty millions of India? Taking the estimates of the missionaries themselves, who are not unnaturally disposed to magnify the good results of their work, the nominal converts are barely one in two thousand, while the number of *bonâ fide* native Christians, 'possessed of saving faith', may be regarded as practically evanescent. Remembering, then, these facts, and assuming as a not improbable proportion, that a zealous missionary preaches the Gospel to a thousand who reject it for one whom he converts to Christ—God help him—the load of human misery which that man has brought about must surely weigh heavy on his soul.... Has any tyrant, a recognized scourge of the human race, brought down such storms of misery on his species as must be ascribed to the active missionary who has failed? And they have all failed—failed a thousand times over for once they have been successful" (p. 14, 15).

[Pg 223]

On reading this very remarkable passage we are struck with the ingenuous candour of the writer. It is nothing new for us to learn that Protestant missions in pagan countries have been all but absolutely barren. But it is something new to find a distinguished Protestant Divine, who frankly admits this inconvenient fact. Mr. Barlow must, indeed, find it difficult to persuade himself that the Church which sends forth such missions, is the same as that which Isaias addressed in those well known words: "Enlarge the place of thy tent, and stretch out the skins of thy tabernacles; spare not; lengthen thy cords and strengthen thy stakes. For thou shalt pass on to the right hand, and to the left, and thy seed shall inherit the gentiles".^[18] "And the gentiles shall walk in thy light, and kings in the brightness of thy rising. Lift up thy eyes round about and see: all these are gathered together, they are come to thee: thy sons shall come from afar, and thy daughters shall rise up at thy side. Then shalt thou see, and abound, and thy heart shall wonder and be enlarged, when the multitude of the sea shall be converted to thee, the strength of the gentiles shall come to thee". This magnificent prophecy, Mr. Barlow must confess, has no fulfilment in the Protestant Church.

But let that pass. It is not with the *fact* but with the *argument* that we purpose to deal. And first, it occurs to us that the argument, if valid, would prove not only against the doctrine which Mr. Barlow impugns, but also against that which he defends. He certainly will admit that a grievous sin against God is a dreadful crime; that it far transcends every other evil which exists or can be conceived. He maintains, moreover, that each one will receive, in the world to come, rewards and punishment "*according to his works*". Therefore, the punishment reserved for the sinner, even though it were not eternal, must yet be something dreadful to contemplate. And the missionary, the number of whose real converts, "'possessed of saving faith', may be regarded as practically evanescent", brings down this dreadful punishment on all to whom he preaches the gospel. Hence, if we accept Mr. Barlow's argument, even on his own doctrine of finite punishment, the missionary will be a curse to heathen nations; not indeed *so great* a curse as if the punishment of sin were eternal, but still a *curse* and *not* a blessing. He must therefore answer his own argument, or else he will be forced to maintain that there is no punishment for sin in the world to come.

[Pg 224]

To us his reasoning offers little difficulty. If the heathen, when he rejects the Christian faith, commits a deliberate grievous sin, he will certainly be punished accordingly. But this punishment must surely be ascribed to his own wickedness, and not to the labours of the missionary. The work of the missionary is a blessed work; it is the heathen himself that has changed it into a curse. We may illustrate this explanation from the pages of Sacred Scripture. The wicked servant in the gospel, if he had not received the one talent from his master, could not have buried that talent in the earth. And yet, for this fault he is "cast into exterior darkness", and condemned to "weeping and gnashing of teeth".^[19] Will Mr. Barlow say that the gift of his master was not a blessing but a curse? If so, he arraigns the conduct of God Himself, whom this master represents. Again, if our Divine Lord had not selected Judea for the scene of His public mission, the Jews would never have been guilty of the frightful crime of Deicide, nor would they have incurred the terrible chastisement with which that crime was punished. Yet who will deny that the presence of the Incarnate Word amongst them was a special favour—the last and greatest—vouchsafed by a loving Father to that unhappy people? We need only add that the words of holy Simeon, addressed to the Virgin Mother on the presentation of her Infant Son in the Temple, are still applicable to every zealous missionary: "Behold, He is set up for the fall and for the resurrection of many in Israel";^[20] for the resurrection of those who hearken to the glad tidings, and eagerly accept the grace which He brings; for the fall of those who spurn the one, and trample the other under foot.

The next argument to which we shall invite the attention of our readers, is founded on the condition of the blessed in Heaven. "But the terrible difficulty arising from the relations of the

saved to the lost cannot even be mitigated" (p. 22). This "terrible difficulty" is presented to us in two different forms. First, Mr. Barlow implicitly appeals to the divine precept of fraternal charity. Every one is bound to love his neighbour as himself. Now, if the blessed in Heaven fulfil this precept, they must be intensely miserable. For the proof of true charity is that we feel for our neighbour's sufferings, the same grief as if they were our own. Therefore the saints must experience the same internal anguish for the torments of the damned as if they endured these torments themselves.^[21] This argument may be dismissed in a few words. The precept of fraternal charity does not extend to the future life. The blessed inhabitants of Heaven *cannot* love the wicked in Hell; much less are they *bound* to love them. They see God face to face, and they love Him with a resistless impulse. Whatever else is good and pleasing to Him, that they love for His sake; whatever is bad and offensive in His sight, they *cannot* love, because they *see* that it is unworthy of their love. A divine precept to love the devil and his unhappy companions in misery, is an idea peculiar to Mr. Barlow.

The second form in which this "terrible difficulty" appears is more plausible than the first. Many a saint in Heaven will miss from the mansions of the blessed the friend of his bosom. Many a fond sister will look in vain for her gay and dissipated, but yet warm-hearted and affectionate brother. Many a loving mother will behold afar off the undying torments of her darling son. Are we to suppose that the generous affections of the human heart are extinguished in Heaven? If so, then man must be morally worse in Heaven than he was upon earth. And if not, it cannot be true that "mourning and sorrow shall be no more"^[22] in the City of God. Here is the argument as it is put by Mr. Barlow. "I firmly believe that if, in the fruition of the Heavenly Kingdom, a time should come when I shall be capable of forgetting that one who truly loved me in this world ... is alive in hopeless torment—scorched by the everlasting flame—gnawed by the undying worm—I must have sunk down lower in the moral scale before this came to pass. I must have become more deeply immersed in heartless selfishness than I am now. And this, which I believe of myself, I believe of every one else. There is only one explanation of this frightful difficulty. We must assume that the redeemed are morally worse in Heaven than they were on Earth" (p. 24).

This difficulty, which appeals more strongly to the feelings than to the judgment, is by no means peculiar to the doctrine of *eternal* punishment. It must be explained as well by those who say the torments of the damned will come to an end, as by those who say they will not. If the saints must grieve at the *eternal* punishment of their friends, they must certainly grieve at the *temporal* punishment of their friends. The latter grief will be less poignant, it is true; but it will still be inconsistent with *perfect* happiness. Let Mr. Barlow explain how the inhabitants of Heaven will be free from *all* sorrow, if the punishment of Hell be limited in duration, and it will be easy to show they will be equally free if the punishment be eternal.

As for us, we see no necessity for any explanation. God has promised to make His saints happy. Surely He is able to do it. Mr. Barlow thinks they will be weeping for their friends. But is it not written that "God will wipe away all tears from their eyes"?^[23] In what manner this will be done it is not necessary for us to explain. Yet we may be allowed to offer a conjecture, which, as it seems to us, is supported alike by reason and by revelation. We would say that, in the saints every affection that has not for its object what is good and pleasing to God, will be utterly extinguished; and therefore they will *cease to love* those unhappy souls that have been condemned to Hell. The reason is clear. The saints in Heaven see things as they are; and hence they *cannot* love that which is wicked and hateful in the sight of God. In Mr. Barlow's mind this severance of earthly ties must come from an increase of "heartless selfishness". To us it seems to flow from perfect love of God. Neither does it follow, as he supposes, that the saints have "sunk down lower in the moral scale". On the contrary, it is manifest they have been raised up immeasurably higher. On Earth their affections were often guided by mere human motives, and, at best, were governed by an erring human judgment; in Heaven, they are moulded with the most perfect fidelity after a Divine model.

With these remarks, we take leave of Mr. Barlow and his book. We cannot, however, close this brief paper without directing the attention of our readers to a very serious consideration which this book suggests. The Reverend Mr. Barlow is a Fellow of Trinity College. And there are many who would ask Catholic parents to entrust the education of their children to him and his colleagues. We have seen a specimen of his principles; in particular we have seen that, according to his views, "the civilization of the nineteenth century jars" with a doctrine which every Catholic is bound to believe. Is it safe, then, for a Catholic youth to gather his ideas of modern civilization from the lips of such a teacher as Mr. Barlow? We are told, indeed, it is for *secular education* alone that a Catholic student should go to Trinity College: that he may learn his religion from other sources. But, if we understand the words aright, secular education must surely include modern civilization, and modern civilization, as taught by Mr. Barlow, is contrary to Catholic faith. These are simple facts. Our readers may draw their own conclusion.

FOOTNOTES:

[2] II. *Cor.*, x. 5.

[3] II. *Cor.*, xii. 2-4.

[4] *Rom.*, xi. 33.

[5] See Mr. Barlow's book, pp. 37 (note), 38, 39.

- [6] *Matth.*, xxv. 41-46.
- [7] *Matth.*, xviii. 8.
- [8] *Mark*, ix. 42, 43, 44, 45, 47.
- [9] *Matth.*, iii. 12.
- [10] *Is.*, lxvi. 24.
- [11] *Apoc.*, xx. 9, 10, 15.
- [12] Pp. 38-39. The words in italics are so printed in Mr. Barlow's book.
- [13] See pp. 7-8, where this principle is advanced in a still more confident tone, and with even less regard for the maxims of the Gospel. We extract the following passage: "I do truly believe that if every man, before repeating the Athanasian Creed, would sit down quietly, and—say for five minutes—steadily endeavour to realize in his imagination, as far as he is capable of doing it, what the contents of the notion 'Eternal Torments' are, we should find an enormous increase of so-called heresy with respect to these portions [the "damnatory clauses"] of the Creed. The responses, 'Which faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly', would be nearly confined to the clerk". Five minutes' reflection is quite enough, in the estimate of Mr. Barlow, to convince every man that he ought to abandon the faith of ages.
- [14] *Apoc.*, xxi. 27.
- [15] *Prov.*, xxiv. 16.
- [16] *I. Cor.*, vi. 9, 10; *Gal.*, v. 21.
- [17] *Rom.*, x. 15; *Isaias*, lii. 7.
- [18] *Isaias*, liv 2, 3.
- [19] *Matth.*, xxxv. 30
- [20] *Luke*, ii. 34.
- [21] See Mr. Barlow's book, p. 22; also p. 17.
- [22] *Apoc.*, xxi. 4.
- [23] *Apoc.*, xxi. 4.

CATHOLIC EDUCATION—DISENDOWMENT OF THE PROTESTANT ESTABLISHMENT.

The last year terminated with the establishment in Dublin of an association, which, we trust, whilst protecting the material interests of the country, will contribute to put an end to religious oppression and intolerance, and to spread the blessings of Catholic education through all Ireland. Undertaking a task so meritorious in itself, and so much in accordance with the objects of the *Record*, the association will have our best wishes and co-operation. Its first meeting was held in the Rotundo on the 29th of December last, and a vast number of influential and respectable laymen, from city and country, many clergymen, and several archbishops and bishops attended. Its proceedings were most impressive, and the speakers all displayed great moderation accompanied with energy and firmness in their addresses. We may add that the speeches of the Archbishop of Cashel and the Bishop of Cloyne, on the claims of tenants for compensation for beneficial improvements, were most eloquent and convincing; that the Bishop of Elphin made an excellent and learned defence of the rights of Catholics to a Catholic system of education; and that the Archbishop of Dublin, supported by Mr. O'Neill Daunt, proved to the satisfaction of all present that the Protestant Establishment in Ireland is a nuisance and an insult, and ought to be abolished. We regret that the limits of this periodical will not allow us to enter fully into the various questions discussed at the meeting: we must restrict ourselves to a brief article on the topics most closely connected with the objects of the *Record*—we mean the question of education and of the Church. We cannot, however, but recommend our readers to assist the association by their influence, their counsels, and contributions, being full of hope that Ireland will derive great advantages, temporal and spiritual, from its labours.

The Lord Mayor, by whose influence and authority the meeting had been convened, having taken the chair, the Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Cullen, was called on to propose the first resolution. Before doing so he explained the objects of the association, and showed that they were so moderate, so reasonable, and so necessary, that no liberal minded man could refuse to support them.

"It is proposed", said he, "to protect liberty of religion by relieving the great majority of the inhabitants of this country from an oppressive and degrading burden, forced on them for the maintenance of the Protestant Establishment, which they look on as a galling and permanent insult; it is proposed to encourage the growth of learning, by holding out equal hopes to every class, and putting on a footing of equality all who engage in the career of letters and science; and finally it

is proposed to restore prosperity to this country, by giving inducements to the people to invest their capital in useful and permanent improvements".

Having thus stated the reasons for founding the new association, the Archbishop briefly alluded to the necessity of a good education, to the services of the Catholic Church in promoting science and letters, and to the glorious mission of carrying the light of the gospel and true civilization to pagan nations, which was given to Ireland for centuries after her conversion. That mission was interrupted by Danish and Anglo-Saxon invasions. Continued attempts to force the Reformation on our forefathers, the prohibition of Catholic schools, and a most galling system of penal laws, afterwards reduced our country to a state of misery and degradation, in which it was impossible for the masses of the people to approach the fountains of knowledge, or to render services to other countries. As soon, however, as liberty began to dawn, active efforts were made by the Catholic laity and clergy to repair the ruins of past times, and within the present century innumerable schools, colleges, convents, and other educational establishments, have been called into existence, which are rendering great services to the country, and preparing to make it again what it once was—a land of sages and saints. The exertions and sacrifices made in this holy cause are a proof of the zeal of the Catholics of Ireland for education, and reflect the greatest honour on their charity and generosity.

Let us now look to what government has done in regard to Catholic education. In the first place, our rulers in past times prohibited all Catholic schools under the severest penalties, determined, it would appear, to sink the people into the degrading depths of ignorance, or to compel them when acquiring knowledge to imbibe at the same time Protestant doctrines. Secondly, a Protestant university and Protestant schools were founded and richly endowed with the confiscated property of Catholic schools or monasteries, and all possible privileges and honours were lavishly conferred on them by the state, in order to give them weight and influence, and to render them more powerful in their assaults on the ancient creed of Ireland. Thirdly, these institutions are still preserved, and possess immense property, nearly all derived from public grants. Besides other vast sources of income, Trinity College holds about two hundred thousand acres of land, and the several endowed schools are worth seventy or eighty thousand a year and own a great deal of landed property. Fourthly, it is to be observed that the management of these schools is altogether in Protestant hands, the teaching Protestant, and their atmosphere thoroughly impregnated with Protestantism. If any Catholic be admitted into those institutions, his faith is exposed to great danger, and unhappily it is too true that many who ventured to run the risk, perished therein, so that we find it recorded that several Catholics, when passing through the ordeal of Protestant education, lost their faith and became ministers and preachers of error. At present there are Protestant bishops and archdeacons, and other dignitaries, now enemies of the ancient faith, who commenced their career in Trinity College as very humble members of the Catholic Church. I say nothing of the many Catholics who, in consequence of the training received in Trinity College, never frequent any sacrament of their Church, and neglect all religious duties. The parents who expose their children to such dangers cannot be excused from a grievous breach of the trust committed to them by God. Can they be admitted to sacraments?

[Pg 229]

Keeping in mind the facts just stated, may we not ask, were not Protestants provided with everything they could desire for educational purposes? was it necessary to adopt other measures in their favour?

Now such being the case, had not we a right to expect that when new educational arrangements were to be made, the past sufferings of Catholics, the spoliation of their property, and their actual wants, should be taken into account? Was it to be supposed that *their* claims should be overlooked in order to give further advantage to Protestantism? Reason and sound policy would have prohibited such suppositions. But "aliter superis visum". Instead of repairing past injustice and making some compensation for the confiscations of times gone by, the government, in all new measures for promoting education, seemed to forget the Catholics, and to think only of Protestant interests, just as if they were not abundantly provided for already. Thus, when the Queen's Colleges were projected, it was determined to establish them, and to endow them at the expense of the Catholics of the country, and on principles so hostile to Catholicity, that the Sovereign Pontiff and Irish bishops were obliged to condemn them as dangerous to faith and morals, whilst a Protestant statesman admitted that they were a gigantic scheme of godless education. Hence, no Catholic parent, though taxed for their support, unless he be ready to immolate his children to Baal, can send them to institutions thus anathematised. Have not Catholics great ground to complain upon this head?

[Pg 230]

The national system was also founded on bad principles, and to protect the consciences of Protestant children, even in schools where they never attend, Catholic instruction was prohibited in them during the common hours of class.

To illustrate the effects of this prohibition, the Archbishop refers to part of his own diocese—the county Dublin—in which there are 145 so-called National Schools, frequented by 36,826 Catholic children, without the intermixture of one single Protestant, and asks is it not most unjust and insulting to banish Catholic books, Catholic practices, the history of the Catholic Church, from such schools, and to treat them as if they were mixed or filled with Protestants? If the case were reversed—if there were so large a number of Protestant children in schools without any mixture of Catholics, would Protestants tolerate any regulation by which every mention of their religion would be banished from such schools? Why apply one rule to Catholics and another to Protestants? The Archbishop then adds:

"Let me repeat it: Catholic children in purely Catholic schools must pass the greater part of the day without any act or word of religion, lest they should offend Protestants who are present only in imagination. No crucifix, no image of the Blessed Mother of God, no sacred pictures, no religious emblems, though experience teaches that such objects make excellent impressions on the youthful mind, are tolerated in National schools, even when no Protestant frequents them. No Catholic book can be used, and even the works of such men as Bossuet, Massillon, Fenelon, the most eloquent writers of modern times, must be excluded because they were Catholics and inculcate Catholic doctrines. The only books used by Catholics in these schools have been compiled by the late rationalistic Archbishop of Dublin, by Dr. Carlisle, a Presbyterian, and other Protestants, and are tinged with an anti-Catholic spirit. It is to be added, that the history of our Irish saints and missionaries and of the ancient Church of Ireland and its doctrines, as well as the sad narrative of our sufferings and persecutions, is completely ignored. Were it necessary to throw still greater light on the spirit of the mixed system, we could show that the late Dr. Whately, one of its great patrons, declared in his last pastoral charge to the clergy of Kildare, that his object in introducing certain Scripture lessons into the schools was to shake the religious convictions of the people, and to dispel what he is pleased to call their *scriptural darkness*. When things are thus conducted, have we not here again great reason to complain?"

The Archbishop also urges against the national system, its tendency to throw the education of this Catholic country into the hands of a Protestant government, whose past history proves that it has been always hostile to Catholic interests. Model and training and agricultural schools, which are completely withdrawn from Catholic control, have this tendency. Are not inspectors and other managers of the system altogether government nominees? When books were to be selected, was not the same object promoted by deputing to compile them Protestant archbishops, Presbyterian ministers, and other Protestants, who banished from them everything Catholic and national, and made them breathe a spirit of English supremacy and anti-Catholic prejudice? May not the experience of past ages be appealed to to prove that education under such government control becomes hostile to true religion, tends to introduce a spirit of despotism, and to rob the subject of his liberty? This was the tendency of all government enactments on education in Ireland for centuries. The Archbishop observes:

[Pg 231]

"Robespierre and other French despots fully understood all this, when they proclaimed that all children were the property of the state, to be educated under its care, at the public expense. When the instruction of the rising generations and the direction of schools falls under the absolute control of the ruling powers of the Earth, that sort of wisdom which Saint Paul calls earthly, sensual, diabolical, soon begins to prevail; the wisdom from above falls away, and neither religion nor true Christian liberty can be safe".

Having examined in this way the present defects and shortcomings of education in Ireland, as far as it receives aid from the state, the Archbishop insisted that Catholics have a decided claim to a Catholic university, with every privilege and right conferred upon Protestant universities, to Catholic training and model schools, and to a system of education under which the faith and morals of Catholic children would be safe from all danger. In England^[24] the schools for the people supported by government are denominational, and the Catholics, though only a fraction of the population, have all the advantages of a Catholic system of education. Why should Ireland be deprived of rights which are freely granted to every class of people not only in England and Scotland, but in all the British colonies? Are the Catholics of this country to be degraded and insulted on account of their religion? Would such a mode of acting be in conformity with the liberality of the present age?

Since the Archbishop made the foregoing observations, the Holy Father, our supreme guide in matters of religion, has published a series of propositions which he had condemned and reprobated on various occasions. We insert three of those propositions which bear upon education:

[Pg 232]

The forty-fifth is as follows:

"XLV. The entire government of public schools in which the youth of any Christian state is educated, except (to a certain extent) in the case of episcopal seminaries, may and ought to appertain to the civil power, and belong to it so far that no other authority whatsoever shall be recognized as having any right to interfere in the discipline of the schools, the arrangement of the studies, the conferring of degrees, in the choice or approval of the teachers".

The forty-seventh adds:

"XLVII. The best theory of civil society requires that popular schools open to the children of every class of the people, and, generally, all public institutes intended for instruction in letters and philosophical sciences, and for carrying on the education of youth, should be freed from all ecclesiastical authority, control, and interference, and should be fully subjected to the civil and political power, at the pleasure of the rulers and according to the standard of the prevalent opinions of

the age".

The forty-eighth bears on the same subject:

"XLVIII. Catholics may approve of a system of educating youth, unconnected with Catholic faith and the power of the Church, and which regards the knowledge of merely natural things, and only, or at least primarily, the ends of earthly social life".

Let our readers attentively consider these propositions. They undoubtedly reprobate what is called mixed education, or the system which endeavours to separate education from religion, as the Queen's Colleges profess to do. They appear to us also most distinctly to condemn the principles on which the National Schools are founded. In many of those schools all religious education is excluded, and in those which are under Presbyterian and other similar patrons, as well as in model and training schools, the rights of the bishops of the Catholic Church, to whom Christ gave the power of teaching all nations, are completely ignored. In every National School the teaching and practice of religion are strictly prohibited during the hours of class. Such a system appears to fall under the condemnation of the Holy See. We shall return to this matter again on some future occasion. In the mean time, we shall merely add, that if we wish to be true children of the Church, we must receive with humility, and in a spirit of obedience, the decisions of Christ's vicar on Earth, and reprobate and condemn from the inmost of our hearts the propositions which he, using the power given to him by the Eternal Shepherd of our souls, reprobates and condemns. The only view his Holiness proposed to himself in censuring the propositions we refer to was, to secure for the rising generations the greatest blessing that can be conferred on them—a good religious education, and the preservation of their faith from danger. As dutiful members of the true Church we ought to act on the lessons of wisdom that have been given to us.

[Pg 233]

Having treated at some length of the education question, the Archbishop next directed the attention of the meeting to the condition of the agricultural and manufacturing interests of Ireland, showing that it is the duty of those in power to apply immediate remedies to the evils of the country, which menace us with universal ruin, and then proceeded to examine the proposed disendowment of the Protestant Establishment. History informs us that the Irish Protestant Church had its origin in an act declaring Henry VIII. head of the Church, which was passed by the Irish parliament in 1536, and in another act of the same parliament by which a similar dignity was conferred on Queen Elizabeth. A statement on this subject made by Dr. Gregg, Protestant Bishop of Cork, in a late pastoral charge, is altogether at variance with history. His Lordship's words are:

"She (the Protestant Church) sprang from the truth, was nurtured in truth, laden with truth, in truth she delights, to the truth she appeals, and by God's gracious blessing, in mighty truth shall she stand".

These are emphatic words; but, if he wished to speak correctly, the writer should have said that the Church he eulogises sprang from the passions and despotism of Henry VIII.; was nurtured by the avarice, hypocrisy, ambition, and corruption of Elizabeth; derived spiritual powers from a body of men who had no such powers themselves; that to the sword, the gibbet, and penal laws she owes her propagation; that her existence still depends upon brute force; and that, so little does she stand on or uphold truth, that she is not able to defend the Gospel any longer, or to support the doctrines and ordinances of religion. She could not restrain the late Protestant Archbishop of Dublin from explaining away the fundamental mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation, nor Dr. Colenso from denying the inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures, nor Rev. Mr. Barlow, a Fellow of Trinity College, from impugning the eternity of punishment in another world. She affords so little light to her children, that, according to a report of the Church Pastoral Aid Society, signed by several dignitaries of the Establishment, millions of those children are pining away *in worse than pagan vice and ignorance*. Finally, so far from resting on truth, her only support is the arm of the State, whose creature she is, and at whose nod she may cease to exist.

[Pg 234]

Having obtained spiritual authority by an act of the temporal power, much in the same way as the Roman emperors obtained divine honours by decrees of the senate, Henry VIII. and Elizabeth set about their new functions, and determined to show themselves worthy leaders of the Reformation. There were many richly endowed monasteries in Ireland at the time of Henry, and several continued to exist even till the days of Elizabeth. The inmates of those institutions passed their time in prayer and study; they had rendered great services to literature by copying and preserving the works of classical antiquity, whilst their labours for religion and the poor were worthy of the highest praise. There were also many convents of religious ladies, who devoted their lives to the service of God and their neighbour, to the education of youth, and who edified the world by the sweet odour of their virtues. By the new heads of the Church, and the new patrons of the Gospel, those merits were looked on as crimes, and all religious orders were suppressed.

In Ireland there was an ancient institution founded by St. Patrick, which for more than a thousand years had maintained its connection with the Apostolic See, the true rock on which Christ built His Church, and had always preserved the integrity and purity of the Catholic faith. The existence of that venerable Irish Church was not consistent with the supremacy of the crown in spiritual matters, and its destruction was decreed.

At the same time, a religion, with new doctrines, a new ceremonial, new liturgical books, and

forms of prayer in the English language, then almost unknown in Ireland, was proclaimed, and all the sanction was given to it that could be derived from an act of parliament or a royal decree. It was pretended that this religion was to restore liberty of conscience to the world; but history shows that it enforced its teaching by penal laws, by fire and sword, and by every sort of violence.

The monasteries of men, the convents of nuns, the episcopal sees, and the parochial churches, were possessed, at that time, of considerable revenues. This property was not the gift of the English government. In great part it was of ancient origin, as we may conclude from the fact that in the year 1179, shortly after the English invasion, Pope Alexander III. confirmed to St. Laurence O'Toole nearly the same possessions which are still held by the see of Dublin, and which he had inherited from his predecessors who lived before English rule began in Ireland. It was also private property, belonging to monasteries and convents, and to the Church, so that neither king nor parliament had any claim on it. But ancient rights and justice and prescription were no longer to be respected; the reforming monarchs did not hesitate to change the law of God and of nature, and to ignore the maxim that every one should have his own. Hence, all ecclesiastical property was confiscated. A large portion was given to the agents and minions of royal despotism, and another portion was devoted to the support of bishops and ministers of a new creed and religion, and turned away altogether from the purposes for which it had been destined by the donors; so that what was originally given for the support of the Catholic Church was now handed over to an establishment just called into existence, whose principal aim has always been to decry and misrepresent the ancient Church, to persecute its ministers, and to uproot it, if possible, from the soil.

[Pg 235]

The heads of the Irish Protestant Establishment, Henry and Elizabeth, having commenced their spiritual rule by an act of robbery and spoliation, continued to propagate their new religion by intimidation, by violence, and penal enactments. The old nobility of Ireland, both of Norman and Irish descent, were persecuted and robbed of their possessions in order to convince them of that Gospel truth which first beamed from Boleyn's eyes; for the same purpose whole provinces were laid desolate, and torrents of blood inhumanly shed. In such proceedings we find a great deal to remind us of the persecutions inflicted on the early Christians by the Roman emperors and a singular resemblance to the system adopted by Mahomet for the propagation of the impure doctrines of the Koran; and as that impostor spread desolation through the most flourishing regions of the East, so did the founders of the Protestant establishment reduce the blooming fields of Erin to the condition of a howling wilderness, and like him they became the votaries of ignorance, and carried on a long and destructive war against Catholic schools and education.

There was, however, something worse in the mode of propagating the doctrines of the Reformation than in that which was adopted for the maintenance or introduction of Paganism and Mahometanism. Those forms of worship openly avowed their designs, and publicly professed their enmity to the Christian religion. The proceedings of those who promoted and supported the Church Establishment were, on the contrary, marked by the vilest and most degrading hypocrisy. They pretended and professed to be the sincere friends of liberty of conscience, and of the progress of education and enlightenment, whilst at the same time they were the most dangerous enemies of every kind of freedom and progress, and endeavoured to establish the most galling despotism, and to spread ignorance through Ireland.

Innumerable proofs are at hand of the despotic tendencies of the Establishment. We merely give one instance, related by Mant in his *Ecclesiastical History* at the year 1636, in which the Protestant bishops, with Usher at their head, made the following declaration:—that

[Pg 236]

"The religion of the Papists is superstitious and idolatrous; their faith and doctrine erroneous and heretical; their Church, in respect to both, apostatical. To give them, therefore, a toleration, or to consent that they may freely exercise their religion and profess their faith and doctrine, is a grievous sin."—*Mant*, vol. i. p. 510.

And recollect that this declaration was made against the ancient religion of the country, a religion established in it for more than one thousand years, and that it was made for the purpose of excluding millions of the people from every office of trust and emolument. Nothing worse can be found in the annals of Paganism or Mahometanism. The Archbishop continues:

"But, passing over a remoter period, have we not to regret that the spirit which then prevailed still continues to manifest itself in our own days? And, indeed, were not the heads of the Protestant establishment the most active opponents of Catholic Emancipation? Who were the great promoters of the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill? Was not the head of the Establishment, in this city, most anxious, a few years ago, to put convents and monasteries under police control, and to give every annoyance to the holy and pious virgins who devote themselves to the service of God and the poor? And are not the principles acted on by the Establishment still embodied in Protestant oaths? and can we be surprised that dissensions exist in this country, and that it is reduced to so deplorable a state as it is now in, when we reflect that by such oaths and declarations discord is excited in the country, rulers and subjects placed in a state of hostility, and the people divided into factions and parties?"

As to education, we shall merely observe that the supporters of the Establishment left no means untried to banish it altogether from among the masses of the people in Ireland. Catholic schools

were suppressed, and their property confiscated; the erection of new schools prohibited; no Catholic parent allowed to give a Catholic education to his children at home, and he was subjected to the severest penalties if he sent them to foreign schools. What more could be done to suppress the knowledge of the Christian religion by a Julian or a Mahomet? Yet, those who acted in that way cry out that they alone are the friends of progress and enlightenment, and that Catholics seek for nothing but darkness. Was there ever a more decided manifestation of recklessness and hypocrisy?

Having given in detail some other instances of the violent and persecuting measures which were used for the propagation of Protestantism, the Archbishop proceeds to examine the results obtained by them:— [Pg 237]

"Let us now ask", says he, "what have been the fruits of so much bigotry, of so much violence, and of so many penal laws? The late census tells us that every effort to introduce Protestantism has been a complete failure, and that notwithstanding so many persecutions and sufferings, the old Catholic faith is still the religion of the land, deeply rooted in the affections of the people. Without entering into details which would occasion too much delay, I shall merely state that all the members of the Establishment in this kingdom are under seven hundred thousand; that out of the two thousand four hundred and twenty-eight parishes into which Ireland is divided, there were, in 1861, one hundred and ninety-nine parishes containing no members of the Establishment, five hundred and seventy-five parishes containing not more than twenty, four hundred and sixteen containing between twenty and fifty, three hundred and forty-nine containing between fifty and one hundred—in all, one thousand five hundred and thirty-nine parishes, each with fewer than one hundred parishioners. I will add that, according to the same census, the parish of St. Peter's, in Dublin, contains more Catholics than the eleven dioceses of Kilmacduagh, Kilfenora, Killala, Achonry, Ossory, Cashel, Emly, Waterford, Lismore, Ross, and Clonfert contain Protestants: and that the Catholics of the diocese of Dublin exceed by thirty-five thousand all the Protestants of the Established Church in twenty-eight dioceses of Ireland; indeed, in all the dioceses of Ireland, excepting those of Armagh, Clogher, Down, and Dublin. Whilst such figures show that all the protection of the State, the persecution of Catholics, the confiscation of their property, the suppression of Catholic schools, the lavish endowment of Protestant schools, and innumerable penal laws, have not been able to establish Protestantism in Ireland, they must convince us at the same time, that it is most unreasonable, and contrary to the interests of the people and to a sound policy, to keep up a vast and expensive ecclesiastical establishment for the sake of so small a minority, and in opposition to the wishes of the great mass of the population".

The Archbishop next quoted several authorities from Protestant writers condemnatory of the Anglican establishment, and among others, that of Lord Brougham, who, confirming his own views by those of the celebrated Edmund Burke, says:

"I well remember a phrase used by one not a foe of Church Establishments—I mean Mr. Burke. 'Don't talk of its being a church! It is a wholesale robbery!'... I have, my lords, heard it called an anomaly, and I say that it is an anomaly of so gross a kind, that it outrages every principle of common sense, and every one endowed with common reason must feel that it is the most gross outrage to that common sense as it is also to justice. Such an establishment, kept up for such a purpose, kept up by such means, and upheld by such a system, is a thing wholly peculiar to Ireland, and could be tolerated nowhere else. That such a system should go on in the nineteenth century; that such a thing should go on while all the arts are in a forward and onward course, while all the sciences are progressing, while all morals and religion too—for, my lords, there never was more of religion and morality than is now presented in all parts of the country,—that this gross abuse, the most outrageous of all, should be allowed to continue, is really astonishing. It cannot be upheld, unless the tide of knowledge shall turn back, unless we return to the state in which things were a couple of centuries ago". [Pg 238]

After quoting several other authorities similar to that of Lord Brougham, the Archbishop called on his hearers to unite with him in calling for the abolition of the Establishment.

"When you consider", said he, "the reasons and the weight of authority which I have alleged, I trust you all will admit that an establishment which traces back its origin to the lust, the avarice, and the despotism of Henry VIII. and his daughter; an establishment introduced by force and violence, and that has no support save in the protection of the state, of which it is the creature and the slave; an establishment that has been the persevering enemy of civil and religious liberty; that has called for penal laws in every century from the days of Elizabeth to the passing of the Ecclesiastical Titles Act; that has never failed to oppose every proposal for the relaxation of such laws, not only in the days of Strafford and Clarendon, but even when there was question of emancipation in the midst of the liberality of the present century; an establishment that has inflicted great evils on Ireland by depriving the mass of the people of all the means of education, by persecuting schoolmasters, and seizing on and confiscating schools, and that has

been always the fruitful source of dissensions in the country—when you consider all these things, you will undoubtedly agree with me, that such an establishment ought not to be any longer tolerated in this country—that it ought to be disendowed, and its revenues applied to purposes of public utility".

FOOTNOTES:

- [24] In the report of the Endowed Schools Commission of 1858, p. 284, there is an excellent letter of Baron Hughes on mixed education. Having observed that in England Protestant bishops and noblemen are opposed to it, he says: "I am convinced that the mixed system is wrong in principle, and cannot, even if right, be carried out in Ireland. I believe that the separate system is sound in principle; and if that is doubted, I think it is worthy of being submitted to a fair trial, as the only alternative the state can adopt".

LITURGICAL QUESTIONS.

In answer to the request made in our last number, some of our reverend friends have addressed to us several most interesting questions on Liturgical points. Owing to the great pressure this month on our limited space, and to the necessity of completing the series of decrees on the Holy Mass, we are not able to attend to them for this month. In our next issue we hope to be in a position to satisfy our respected correspondents.

DECREES ON THE HOLY MASS.

[Pg 239]

[Concluded from page 190.]

Ad §. IX. *Post Consecrationem usque ad Orationem Dominicam.*

1. Dum Sacerdos dicit orationem "Supplices te rogamus", et orationes ante Communionem, *servandae sunt rubricae, quae jubent manus ponendas esse super altare, non intra corporale.* 7. Sept. 1816 in u. Tuden, ad 35.
2. Qui in Canone Missae post consecrationem, in oratione "Nobis quoque peccatoribus", nominatur Joannes, est s. Joannes Baptista, et ideo caput est ad hoc nomen inclinandum, dum Missa dicitur aut commemoratio fit de s. Joanne Baptista; *non* vero quando Missa dicitur aut commemoratio fit de s. Joanne apostolo et evangelista. 27. Mart. 1824. in u. Panormit. ad 2.

Ad §. X. *De Oratione Dominica usque ad factam Communionem.*

1. Signum cum patena faciendum a sacerdote a fronte ad pectus, dum dicit orationem "Libera nos quaesumus Domine", debet esse *integrum signum crucis*; et post dictum signum crucis *est deosculanda patena.* 13. Mart. 1627 in u. Panorm.—Cum Celebrans dicit: "Da pacem Domine in diebus nostris", *patenam in extremitate, seu oram patenae, congruentius osculatur.* 24. Jun. 1683 in u. Albingan. ad 5.
2. *Pax, dummodo adsit consuetudo*, in Missa pro sponso et sponsa dari potest; attamen *danda est semper cum instrumento, numquam vero cum patena.* 10 Jan., 1852 in u. Cenoman. ad 8.
3. Pars *inferior* hostiae *praecidi debet*, non superior, quando dicitur: "Pax Domini sit semper vobiscum". 4 Aug. 1663 in u. Dalmat. ad 6.
4. *Tolerari potest* consuetudo pulsandi campanulam a ministro in Missa non solum ad verba "Sanctus", etc. et in elevatione Sanctissimi, sed etiam ad verba "Domine non sum dignus" ante sumptionem, et quoties administratur Communio fidelibus, ad praedicta verba. 14 Mai. 1846 in u. Ord. Min. ad 9.
5. Sacerdos scipsum signans cum hostia et calice consecratis ante sumptionem Ss. Sacramenti, ad verba "Jesu Christi" debet caput inclinare *juxta rubricas.* 24 Sept. 1842 in u. Neap. ad 1.
6. In quaestione: an Sacerdos post sumptionem pretiosissimi sanguinis debeat parumper immorari in adoratione, prout fit post sumptionem sacrae hostiae? *serventur rubricae.* 24 Sept. 1842 in u. Neap. ad 2.
7. In quaestione: an pro abluendis vino et aqua pollicibus et indicibus in secunda purificatione post Communionem debeat Sacerdos e medio altaris versus cornu epistolae recedere? *serventur rubricae pro diversitate Missae.*^[25] 22 Jul. 1848 in u. Tornac.

[Pg 240]

8. *Ante versiculum quod dicitur "Communio", coöperiendus est velo calix in anteriori parte, prout ante confessionem.* 1 Mart. 1698 in u. Prag. ad 1.—*Tam in principio Missae quam post Communionem calix velatus esse debet totus in parte anteriori.* 12 Jan. 1669 in u. Urbinat.—In quaestione: an deceat corporale retinere extensum super altare toto tempore, quo celebrantur

Missae, et donec ab ultimo in eo celebrante reportetur ad sacrarium (sacristiam); et an conveniat corporale extra bursam deferre? *episcopus incumbat observantiae et executioni rubricarum.* 13 Sept. 1704 in u. Ravenat.

9. De Communionem fidelium intra Missam:

Consuetudo dicendi: "Ecce Agnus Dei", et: "Domino non sum dignus", idiomate vulgari, *est eliminanda*, utpote contraria Rituali et Missali Romano. 23. Mai. 1835 in u. Ord. Min. Capuc. Helv. ad 5.

Sacerdos *debet* semper, etiam communicando moniales habentes fenestrellam in parte evangelii, pro Communionem distribuenda *descendere et reverti per gradus ante riores, et non laterales altaris.* 15 Sept., 1736, in u. Tolet. ad 8.

Dum Celebrans administrat sacram Communionem in Missa privata, minister *non* debet eum comitari cum cereo accenso; sed quum purificationem, utpote quae pro populo non est in usu, [26] non praebeat, nec mappam Communionis, utpote cancellis affixam, ante communicantes sustineat, tunc debet manere genuflexus in latere epistolae. 12 Aug. 1854 ad 72. (Anal. II p. 2188 sqq.)

Servetur consuetudo dividendi consecratas particulas, si adsit necessitas. 16 Mart. 1833 in u. Veron. ad 1.

In Communionem quae inter Missae sacrificium peragitur, *minister sacrificii, non ratione praeeminentiae, sed ministerii, praefendus est ceteris quamvis dignioribus.* 13 Jul. 1658 in u. Galliar.

Patenae suppositio per sacerdotem cotta indutum in Communionem generali, quae per Dignitates agitur, retinenda est. 3 Sept. 1661 in u. Andrien.—*Non potest sacerdos sanctam Communionem sive intra sive extra Missam administrans tenere patenam inter digitos manus sinistrae, quae sacram pixidem gestat, ut eam sic mento communicantium supponat, sed cura et solertia sacerdotis supplere debet, ut praecaveatur sacrorum fragmentorum dispersio.* 12 Aug. 1854 ad 21 et 22 loc. cit.

[Pg 241]

Ad §. XII. *De benedictione in fine Missae, et Evangelio Sancti Joannis.*

1. *In fine Missae ad quodcumque altare celebratae, fit reverentia Cruci infra gradus, capite discoöperto.* 13 Febr. 1666 in decret. ad Missal. ad 9.

2. *Arbitrio et prudentiae Ordinarii* relinquitur inducere praxim lavandi manus in fine Missae, postquam Celebrans exuerit vestes sacerdotales, in dioecesim, in qua non est in usu; *sed non* inducatur *per modum praecepti.* 12 Aug. 1854 ad 28 (Anal. II. p 2193).

FOOTNOTES:

[25] *Missae diversitatem*, de qua decretum loquitur, ita intellexerunt ac suo tempore exposuerunt ipsius decreti auctores h. e. doctores Romani a. 1848, ut in *Missis solemnibus numquam* sit e medio altaris recedendum ad abluendos digitos; in *Missis non solemnibus* e contra *semper* e medio sit ad cornu Epistolae progrediendum (licet rubrica de hoc progressu sileat). Haec sententia ipsorum auctorum decreti atque interpretatio praeclare confirmatur ex universali ac constanti omnium totius Urbis ecclesiarum praxi. Cf. Attestat. Romani s. Theologiae Professoris apud Falise p. 77: "Dum revertitur e cornu Epistolae in medium altaris, digitos purificatorio abstergit".

[26] Juxta Merati (Comment. ad hanc rubr. n. 34) haec purificatio retinetur solummodo "in aliquibus ecclesiis", Ubi illa non est in usu, ejusmodi consuetudo servanda est. 12. Aug. 1854 ad 23. loc. supra cit.

DOCUMENTS.

I.

DECREE OF THE SACRED CONGREGATION OF INDULGENCES.

Urbis et Orbis.—Cum non sit aliud Nomen sub coelo, in quo nos oportet salvos fieri, nisi Nomen Iesu in quo est vita, salus, et resurrectio nostra, per quem salvati et liberati sumus, idcirco Sixtus V. fel. rec. Pont. Max. sub die 11 Iulii 1587 in Bulla *Reddituri* Indulgentiam concessit quinquaginta dierum omnibus et singulis Christifidelibus qui quocumque idiomate sic se salutaverint: *Laudetur Iesus Christus*, vel responderint: *In saecula*, vel *Amen*, aut *Semper*; plenariam vero in mortis articulo iis qui hanc laudabilem consuetudinem habuerint, modo ore, vel corde (si ore non potuerint) Iesu nomen invocaverint.

Nonnullis deinde in locis cum mos invalisset Iesu Nomini et illud Mariae in se invicem salutando addere, Clemens PP. XIII. ad humillimas preces Generalis Ordinis Carmelitarum per Decretum die 30 Novembris 1762 benigne impertitus est pro Carmelitis eandem Indulgentiam

quingenta dierum quotiescumque in mutua salutatione verba usurpaverint: *Sia lodato Gesù e Maria.*^[27]

Nunc vero SS mus. Dominus Noster PIUS PAPA IX. nonnullorum Episcoporum precibus peramanter inclinatus, referente me infrascripto Sacrae Congregationis Indulgentiarum Cardinali Praefecto in Audientia diei 26 Septembris 1864, ut magis magisque Fideles utriusque Nominis Iesu et Mariae salutare percipiant effectus, et illa quam saepissime in ore et corde retineant, eandem concessionem ad omnes et singulos Christifideles extendit, ita ut qui se invicem salutando hac forma, in quocumque idiomate, utantur: *Sia lodato Gesù e Maria,*^[28] vel responderint: *Oggi e sempre,*^[29] aut similibus verbis, easdem plane Indulgentias, quae in praefata Bulla memorantur, consequi possint et valeant. Quam gratiam voluit SANCTITAS SUA perpetuo suffragari absque ulla Brevis expeditione.

[Pg 242]

Datum Romae ex Secretaria eiusdem Sacrae Congregationis Indulgentiarum Sacrisque Reliquiis praeposita. Die 26 Septembris 1864.

FR. ANTONIUS M. CARD. PANEBIANCO S. C. PRAEFECTUS.
Loco † Signi. A. Colombo Secretarius.

II.

LETTER FROM THE CARD. PREFECT OF PROPAGANDA TO THE BISHOPS OF IRELAND CONCERNING THE B. EUCHARIST.

The following letter on the manner in which, in missionary countries, the Blessed Eucharist is to be conveyed to the sick, is a fresh proof of the zeal of the Holy See in promoting devotion to the Most Holy Sacrament.

ILLUSTRISIME ET REVERENDISIME DOMINE,

Etsi sancta omnia sancte tractanda sint, propterea quod ad Deum pertineant qui essentialiter sanctus est, attamen augustissimum Eucharistiae sacramentum sicut sacris mysteriis omnibus absque ulla comparatione sanctitate praeeminet, ita maxima prae ceteris veneratione est pertractandum. Nil itaque mirum si tot Ecclesia diversis temporibus ediderit decreta, quibus Sanctissimae Eucharistiae delatio pro adjunctorum varietate vel denegaretur omnino, vel ea qua par esset reverentia admitteretur;^[30] cum nihil antiquius fuerit Ecclesiae Dei quam ut animarum profectum atque aedificationem debito cum honore divinorum omnium divinissimi mysterii consociaret. Haec porro prae oculis habens Sacrum hoc Consilium Christiano Nomini Propagando, cum primum intellexit in quibusdam istius regionis Dioecesibus consuetudinem seu potius abusum invaluisse, ut Sacerdotes Sanctissimum Sacramentum a mane usque ad vesperam secum deferrent ea tantum de causa quod in aliquem forte aegrotum incidere possent, ad Metropolitanos censuit scribendum, tum ut consuetudinem illam ab Ecclesiae praxi omnino abhorrere declararet, tum etiam ut ejus extensionem accuratius perveneret. Responsa Archiepiscoporum brevi ad Sacram Congregationem pervenerunt, ex quibus innotuit, multis in locis de abusu illo gravem admirationem exortam esse, cum aliqua in Dioecesi ne credibilis quidem videretur. Verum non defuerunt Antistites qui illius existentiam ejusque causas ingenue confessi sunt. Quare Eminentissimis Patribus Sacri hujus Consilii in generalibus comitiis die 28 Septembris elapsi anni habitis omnia quae ad hanc rem referebantur exhibita sunt perpendenda, ut quid Sanctissimi Sacramenti debitus honor ac veneratio postularent in Domino decerneretur. Omnibus igitur maturo examini subjectis, statuerunt Eminentissimi Patres literas encyclicas ad Archiepiscopos atque Episcopos istius regionis dandas esse, quibus constans Ecclesiae rigor circa Eucharistiae delationem commemoraretur. Voluit insuper S. C. ut singuli Antistites excitarentur, quemadmodum praesentium tenore excitantur, ad communem Ecclesiae disciplinam hac in re custodiendam, quantum temporis ac locorum adjuncta nec non inductarum consuetudinum ratio patiantur, ita tamen ut sedulam navent operam ad veros abusus corrigendos atque eliminandos. Quam quidem in rem censuerunt Patres Eminentissimi apprime conferre frequentem celebrationem sacrificii missae, quo videlicet Sacerdotes facile necessitati occurrere possunt Sanctissimam Eucharistiam secum per multos dies retinendi. Quae cum ita sint hortor Amplitudinem Tuam ut in eum finem rurales aediculas multiplicandas cures, atque talia edas decreta ex quibus delatio Sanctissimi Sacramenti ad urgentes tantum causas, atque ad actuale ministerii sacerdotalis exercitium coarctetur, injuncta vero presbyteris stricta obligatione semper in hisce casibus Sanctam Hostiam super pectus deferendi. Denique decreverunt Eminentissimi Patres ut de negotio isto gravissimo in Provincialibus Conciliis agatur, quo nimirum Antistites eam in suis dioecesibus communem normam inducere satagant, quam augustissimum Eucharistiae mysterium decere existimaverint. Tandem Amplitudini Tuae significare non praetermitto omnia et singula quae superius decreta sunt Sanctissimo D. N. Pio PP. IX. per me relata fuisse in audientia diei 3 Octobris elapsi anni, eaque a Sanctitate Sua in omnibus adprobata fuisse atque apostolica auctoritate confirmata.

[Pg 243]

Amplitudinis Tuae
Ad officia paratissimus
AL. C. BARNABO, Praef.

CAJET ARCHIEPISCOPUS THEBAR. Secretarius.

R. P. D. PAULO CULLEN,
Archiepiscopo Dublinensi.

1. *Ex dubiis propositis pro christianis Sinensibus.* Ad propositum dubium "An sacerdotibus Sinensibus liceat in itineribus quae longissima sunt secum deferre Eucharistiam ne ea priventur?" Resp. Non licere. Qualificatores S. O. die 27 Martii 1665, et Eminentissimi approbarunt die 15 April. 1665.

2. Pro Gubernatoribus navium Lusitaniae qui singulis annis in Indias orientales navigant, petentibus licentiam deferendi sacramentum Eucharistiae, ne nautae et Rectores sine Viatico decedant. Lecto memoriali et auditis votis Sanctissimus supradictam petitionem omnino rejecit; ita quod nec in posterum ullo modo de ea tractetur. S. C. S. O. die 13 Julii 1660.

[Pg 244]

3. Bened. XIV. *Inter omnigenas* "pro Incolis Regni Serviae et finitimarum Regionum". "At ubi (sicuti ibidem legitur) Turcarum vis praevallet et iniquitas, sacerdos stolam semper habeat coopertam vestibus; in sacco seu bursa pixidem recondat quam per funiculos collo appensam in sinu reponat et nunquam solus procedat, sed uno saltem fidei, in defectu Clerici, associetur".

4. Honorius III. in cap. *Sane* de celebratione Miss. expresse habet de delatione Eucharistiae quod si "in partibus infidelium ob necessitatem S. Viatici permittitur, tamen extra necessitatem permittenda non est, cum hodie Ecclesiastica lege absolute prohibitum sit ut occulte deferatur. Occulte deferre in itinere, nequit moraliter fieri absque irreverentia tanti sacramenti".

5. Verricelli de Apostolicis Missionibus Tit. 8. pag. 136. expendit, "An liceat in novo Orbe Missionariis S. Eucharistiam collo appensam secum in itinere occulte deferre etc. et quidquid sit de veteri disciplina concludit hodie universalis Ecclesiae consuetudine et plurimorum Conciliorum decretis prohibitum est deferre occulte S. Eucharistiam in itinere, nisi pro communicando infirmo, ubi esset timor et periculum infidelium, et dummodo ad infirmum non sit nimis longum iter sed modicum et unius diei".

6. Thomas a Jesu de procur. salut. omnium gentium lib. 7. "non auderem Evangelii ministros qui in illis regionibus aut aliis infidelium provinciis conversantes, si imminente mortis periculo secum Viaticum, occulte tamen, deferrent, condemnare".

III.

LETTER FROM THE CARD. PREFECT OF PROPAGANDA TO THE BISHOPS OF IRELAND ON THE *RESIDENCE* PRESCRIBED BY THE CANONS.

ILLUSTRISSE AC REVERENDISSE DOMINE,

Quandoquidem divino praecepto animarum Rectoribus mandatum sit oves suas agnoscere, easque pascere verbo Dei, sacramentis, atque exemplo bonorum operum, idcirco ii ad personalem in suis Dioecesibus vel Ecclesiis residentiam obligantur; sine qua injunctum sibi officium defungi per se ipsos minime possent. Porro pastoralis residentiae debitum quovis tempore Ecclesia Dei asserere atque urgere non destitit; cujus sollicitudinis luculenta exhibent testimonia non modo veteres canones, sed et sacrosancta Tridentina Synodus Sess. VI. cap. 1. de Refor. et Sess. XXIII. de Ref. cap. 1. ac novissime Summus Pontifex Benedictus XIV. qui Constitutione *ad Universae Christianae Reipublicae statum* edita die 3 Septembris 1746, residentiae obligationem et inculcavit sedulo et disertissime explicavit.

Quod si ubique locorum Pastores animarum pro officii sui ratione continenter in medio gregis vivere oportet, ad id potiori etiam titulo illi tenentur quibus animarum cura demandata est in locis Missionum. Cum enim fideles in Missionibus graviora passim subire cogantur pericula, dum minora ut plurimum iis praesto sunt adjumenta virtutum, peculiari ac praesentissima indigent vigilantia atque ope Pastorum. Haud igitur mirum si sacro Consilio Christiano Nomini Propagando nil fuerit antiquius quam datis etiam Decretis curare ut a se dependentes Episcopi Vicariique Apostolici in suis Missionibus, quoad fieri posset, absque ulla interruptione residerent. Quam quidem in rem eo usque pervenit Sancta Sedes, ut laudatis Praesulibus sub gravissimis poenis prohibuerit, ne Pontificalia munia in aliena Dioecesi vel Districtu etiam de consensu Ordinarii ullo modo peragerent.

[Pg 245]

At quoniam, hisce non obstantibus, haud raro contingit ut Praelati Missionum inconsulta Sede Apostolica et absque vera necessitate aut causa canonica perlonga suscipiant itinera, ex quo non

mediocria commissae illis Missiones pati possunt detrimenta, propterea Eminentissimi ac Reverendissimi Patres Sacrae hujus Congregationis in generalibus comitiis habitis die 21 Januarii hujus anni expedire censuerunt, ut in memoriam revocarentur praedictorum Praesulum canonicae sanctiones circa Pastorum residentiam, nec non Decreta quae circa ejusdem obligationem edita sunt pro locis Missionum, ne quis videlicet in posterum Dioecesim aut Districtum cui praeest vel ad tempus relinquat absque praevia licentia ejusdem S. Congregationis. Quod quidem dum Amplitudini Tuae significo ex mente Eminentissimorum Patrum, Decreta, de quibus supra, addere non praetermitto (Num. 1).

Praeterea Eminentissimi ac Reverendissimi Patres in iisdem generalibus comitiis statuerunt, ut universis Episcopis, Vicariis, ac Praefectis Apostolicis Missionum *Quaestiones* transmittantur pro relatione exhibenda Sacrae Congregationi de statu Dioecesum vel Missionum quibus praesunt. Cum enim ii omnes qui Missionibus praeficiuntur praedictam relationem statis temporibus subjicere S. Sedi teneantur, voluit Sacrum Consilium ut eam in posterum exigendam curent ad normam 55 Quaestionum quae in adjecto folio continentur (Num. 2), utque in iis praesertim accuratiores se praebeant, quae ad vitam, honestatem ac scientiam sacerdotum referuntur.

Datum Romae ex Aedibus S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide die 24 Aprilis 1861.

Amplitudinis Tuae
AL. C. BARNABO, Praef.

R. P. D. Archiepiscopo Dublinensi.

Num. 1.

Decreta et Declarationes S. Congregationis de Propaganda fide super Residentia praesulum in locis missionum.

I.

In Congregatione Generali coram Sanctissimo habita die 28 Martii Anno 1651.

"Sanctitas Sua decrevit quod Episcopi S. Congregationi de Propaganda Fide subordinati non possint exercere Pontificalia in aliis praeterquam in propriis Ecclesiis, etiamsi esset de consensu Ordinariorum sub poena suspensionis ipso facto incurrendae, ac eidem Pontifici reservatae, dummodo a praefata S. Congregatione non sint in certo loco destinati Vicarii Apostolici, seu Administratores alicujus Ecclesiae deputati".

[Pg 246]

Similia Decreta prodierunt ab eadem S. Congregatione die 26 Julii 1662 et 17 Julii 1715.

II.

In Congregatione particulari de Propaganda Fide habita die 7 Maii 1669.

Cum iteratis per S. C. decretis exercitium Pontificalium extra Dioeceses Episcopis ejusdem S. C. assignatas prohiberetur, quaesivit Episcopus Heliopolitanus.

"An dicta decreta intelligenda essent vim suam habere *intra* fines Europae tantum, an vero extenderentur etiam ad alia loca, per quae transeundum esset, cum ad suas Ecclesias proficisceretur".

"S. Congregatio respondit Decreta prohibentia dictum exercitium Pontificalium extendi ad omnia loca, etiam extra fines Europae".^[31]

III.

In Congregatione Generali habita die 10 Julii 1668.

Eminentissimi ac Reverendissimi Patres S. Consilii Christiano Nom. Propag. attentis expositis contra Episcopos ab eodem S. Consilio dependentes qui cum detrimento suarum Dioecesium eas deserebant ut Romam vel alia loca peterent, statuendum censuerunt.

"Inhibeatur Episcopis S. Congregationi subjectis ne Romam sub quovis praetextu veniant, absque licentia Sacrae Congregationis. Decretum editum Anno 1626 renovarunt".

IV.

DECREE OF THE S. CONG. OF PROPAGANDA QUOAD USUM PONTIFICALIUM EXTRA DIOCESIUM.

Decree of the S. Congregation of Propaganda permitting the English Bishops to exercise Pontificalia within the Three Kingdoms.

Ex negligentia Antistitum circa onus residentiae si ubique mala gravissima obvenirent, potissimum id valet quoad regiones, in quibus ob admixtionem infidelium vel haeticorum gravioribus periculis fideles objiciuntur; proinde Episcopis et Vicariis Apostolicis regionum ad quos S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide sollicitudo extenditur, indictum haud semel fuit, ne extra propriam Dioecesim vel Vicariatum Pontificalia etiam de consensu Ordinariorum exercent.

[Pg 247]

Porro cum dubitari haud valeat de studio Episcoporum Angliae in hujusmodi residentiae lege servanda, iidemque postulaverint, ut tenor regulae hujusmodi in suum favorem relaxetur; S. Congregatio de Propaganda Fide in generali conventu habito die 5 Aprilis 1852 attento quod haud raro necessarium vel opportunum admodum existat, ut iidem admitti possint ad Pontificalia exercenda in aliis Angliae ipsius dioecesibus, aliquando etiam in proximis regionibus Hiberniae et Scotiae, censuit supplicandum Sanctissimo pro relaxatione memoratae inhibitionis in favorem Episcoporum Angliae quoad tria regna unita, in quibus proinde de consensu Ordinariorum Pontificalia iidem exercere valeant.

Hanc vero S. Congregationis sententiam Sanctissimo D. N. Pio PP. IX. ab infrascripto Secretario relatam in Aud. diei 6 ejusdem mensis et anni Sanctitas Sua benigne probavit, et juxta propositum tenorem facultates concessit, contrariis quibuscumque haud obstantibus.

In epistola data die 6 Feb. 1862. Eminentissimus Dominus Cardinalis S. Cong. de Prop. Fide Praefectus ad Archiepiscopum Dublinensem scribens declarat facultatem supra memoratam omnibus Hiberniae praesulibus eodem modo ac Angliae episcopis fuisse a Sanctissimo Domino N. Pio IX. concessam.

†PAULUS CULLEN.

FOOTNOTES:

- [27] "Praise be to Jesus and Mary".
- [28] "Praise be to Jesus and Mary".
- [29] "Now and for evermore".
- [30] Vid. quae in rem proferuntur in subjecta pagina.
- [31] *Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide cum comperisset generalem inhibitionem quae continetur in superioribus Decretis non mediocri quandoque incommodo esse, praesertim quum Antistites ob adversam valetudinem ad ea peragenda quae Episcopalis sunt potestatis vicinum aliquem Praesulem accersere coguntur, in gen. conventu habito die 2 Augusti 1819, censuit supplicandum Sanctissimo pro eorumdem Decretorum moderatione, ita ut quando rationabili causa vel urgente necessitate Episcopi seu Vicarii Apostolici ad alienas Dioeceses vel Vicariatus se conferunt, possint sibi invicem communicare facultatem Pontificalia exercendi, dummodo tamen semper accedat Episcopi seu Vicarii loci consensus, inviolatumque de cetero maneat residentiae praeceptum. Id autem Summus Pontifex Pius PP. VII. in Aud. diei 8 Augusti ejusdem anni ratum habuit ac probavit.*

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

I.

Imagini Scelte della B. Vergine Maria, tratte dalle Catacombe Romane.

[*Select pictures of the Blessed Virgin Mary, from the Roman Catacombs, with explanatory text by Cav. G. B. de Rossi. Rome, Salviucci, 1863.*]

The esteem in which the learned on both sides of the Alps and the sea have long held Cav. de Rossi, dispenses us from the duty which we would otherwise gladly discharge, of expressing in his regard our humble tribute of respect and admiration. But as great reputations can afford to do without small praise, we shall rather establish his claim to our readers' gratitude by availing ourselves of his remarks in the work under notice, to the end that we may show how unmistakably early Christian art bears witness to the veneration paid by the primitive Church to the ever glorious Mother of God. Living as we are in the midst of those who revile us for our devotion to our Blessed Lady, it will be most useful to have at hand, conducted with scientific accuracy, a proof of the antiquity of the sacred tradition we follow in this most cherished practice of our religion. Nor is it only among the vulgar herd of Protestants, or in the ranks of bigoted controversialists, that we meet assailants on this point. Even refined and graceful hands play at times, perhaps unconsciously, with weapons which are not the less dangerous because they come upon us by surprise, and wound us while we think but of taking our pleasure in the fair fields of art. Many causes which we will not here recite, have contributed of late years to diffuse among educated Catholics a knowledge of Christian art; but, among these causes, the late Mrs. Jameson's works have had a very wide range. From what table were her books absent? what library was considered complete without them? Who would think of visiting the Continental galleries without first making a preparatory course with the aid of Mrs. Jameson's pages? And

[Pg 248]

upon the whole, all this is a great gain; but it has its disadvantages as well. We do not now speak of Mrs. Jameson as a critic, or of her judgments on points of art, or of the accuracy of her information on purely technical matters, or of some minor mistakes caused by her ignorance of Catholic usages, as when speaking of the Pax of Maso Finiguerra, so well known in the history of engraving, she takes the Pax to mean the Pix, or vessel for containing the Blessed Sacrament. But in the two subjoined passages there are errors of a more serious character, and in the latter especially there is much which needs the correction contained in De Rossi's observations.

"The early Christians had confounded in their horror of heathen idolatry all imitative art and all artists; they regarded with decided hostility all images, and those who wrought them as bound to the service of Satan and heathenism; and we find all visible representations of sacred personages and actions confined to mystic emblems. Thus, the cross signified Redemption; the fish, Baptism; the ship represented the Church; the serpent, sin or the spirit of evil. When, in the fourth century, the struggle between paganism and Christianity ended in the triumph and recognition of the latter, and art revived, it was, if not in a new form, in a new spirit, by which the old forms were to be gradually moulded and modified. The Christians found the shell of ancient art remaining; the traditionary handicraft still existed: certain models of figure and drapery, etc., handed down from antiquity, though degenerated and distorted, remained in use, and were applied to illustrate, by direct or symbolical representations, the tenets of a purer faith".^[32]

"The most ancient representations of the Virgin Mary now remaining are the sculptures on the ancient Christian Sarcophagi, about the third and fourth centuries, and a mosaic in the chapel of San Venanzio at Rome, referred by antiquarians to the seventh century. Here she is represented as a colossal figure majestically draped, standing with arms outspread (the ancient attitude of prayer), and her eyes raised to heaven. Then after the seventh century succeeded her image in her maternal character, seated on a throne with the Infant Saviour in her arms. We must bear in mind, once for all, that from the earliest ages of Christianity the Virgin Mother of our Lord has been selected as the allegorical type of RELIGION in the abstract sense, and to this, her symbolical character, must be referred those representations of later times in which she appears as trampling on the dragon, as folding her votaries within the skirts of her ample robes, as interceding for sinners, as crowned between Heaven and Earth by the Father and the Son".^[33]

[Pg 249]

That these statements are very far from the truth, we now proceed to show.

That our Blessed Lady has been from the earliest ages selected as the type of the Church (not of *Religion in the abstract*, whatever that may mean), is quite true. The most learned Antiquarians recognize her in this character in the female figure in prayer, which in the very oldest portion of the catacombs is frequently a pendant to the group of the Good Shepherd. But this fact, which, though incidentally, yet clearly reveals the depth of the feelings of veneration towards Mary which suggested her as a fit type of the Spouse of Christ, is far from establishing her place in art to be purely symbolical, or her character as intercessor, etc., to belong to her only as inasmuch as she is a type of Religion in the abstract. A single glance at the chromolithographs to which De Rossi's text serves as a commentary, will convince every one that Mrs. Jameson's statements cannot be for a moment maintained. The subjects of these exquisite plates are representations of our Blessed Lady, six in number, selected from the many found in the Roman catacombs, and selected in such wise as that they constitute a series from the apostolic era down to the fourth century. The selection has been confined to works of one class. The Blessed Virgin is represented in ancient monuments, chiefly in two ways,—seated and with her Divine Son in her arms, or standing with outstretched hands in the attitude of prayer or intercession. Of the person represented in works of the first class there can be no doubt, especially when the other figures of the group show that it is Mary; the works of the second class are more obscure, although at times the name of Mary is written over the figure. Hence it would require a lengthened examination before we could safely say that a given specimen of this class undoubtedly represents the Blessed Virgin, and this consideration has recommended the selection of types of the first class only. In these monuments, Mary is represented with Jesus in her arms. The subject of the composition is determined by the Magi, who are generally present, though not in every case. When the Magi are absent, there are other marks to show that we look on the Mother of God with the Incarnate Word. Even when other signs are wanting, the very arrangement of the figures, identical with that employed in undoubted paintings of the Blessed Virgin, affords argument enough. The Magi appear standing before her in sculptures on sarcophagi, not only in Rome, but also in other cities of Italy and of France; in diptychs, and other ivories; in bronzes of the fourth and fifth centuries; in the mosaic placed at St. Mary Major's by Sixtus III. in 432. This composition came down from the earliest ages, and is first found in the paintings of the catacombs. From among these De Rossi has selected four specimens of various types, but all anterior to the days of Constantine. Our space will not allow us to describe more than one of these (tav. I.), but that one shall be the oldest, and under every respect the most interesting of them all.

[Pg 250]

On the Via Salaria Nuova, about two miles from Rome, the Irish College has its vineyard, formerly called the Vigna de Cuppis. In this vigna the excavation of the famous cemetery of Priscilla had its beginning, and from this it extended its intricate galleries in all directions, passing beneath the road, and far under the fields on the other side. The picture we are about to

examine is found over a loculus or grave in this cemetery of Priscilla. In it is depicted a woman, seated and holding in her arms an infant, who has his face turned towards the spectator. She has on her head a scanty veil, and wears a tunic with short sleeves, and over the tunic a *pallium*. The position of these figures and the whole composition are such as to convince any one who has had experience of this kind of paintings, that they are intended for the Virgin and Child. Indeed, all doubt of this has been removed by the painter himself. Near the top of the painting he has represented the star which is ever present when our Lady is described as presenting her Son to the Magi, or as seated by the manger. To the spectator's left, a man youthful in appearance, with a sparse beard, standing erect and robed only in the *pallium*, raises his right hand and points towards the Virgin and the star. In his left he holds a book. At the first sight of this figure it naturally occurs to the mind that it can be none other than Joseph, the chaste spouse of the Blessed Virgin, who is represented at her side on various sarcophagi in Italy and France, in diptychs, and in the mosaics of St. Mary Major's. Generally speaking, he is described as of a youthful appearance, and rarely with a beard. But it is unusual to paint him with the *pallium*, and with a book in his hand. De Rossi is of opinion that the figure in question is that of a prophet, it being quite usual to unite the figure from the Old Testament with the reality in the New. Besides, in a monument of the ninth century two prophets attired like our figure stand one each side of our Blessed Lady. He believes it to be Isaias, who so often foretold the star and the light that was to shed its rays on the darkness of the pagan world (*Isaias*, ix. 2; lx. 2, 3, 19; *cf. Luc.*, i. 78, 79). On one of the painted glasses explained by F. Garnieri, Isaias is represented as a young man. We have here, therefore, in the heart of the catacombs an undoubted representation of our Blessed Lady.

[Pg 251]

We now proceed to determine the age of this painting—a matter of the greatest importance to our present purpose. What canons of judgment ought to be followed in such an investigation? First, we should attend to the style of the painting, and the degree of artistic perfection it exhibits in conception and execution; secondly, we should confront the results of this first examination with such information as we may be able to collect from a close study of the history, topography, and inscriptions of each subterranean apartment, such a study being admirably calculated to assist us in fixing the date of the painting. To do all this in any given case, is not the work of a few pages, but of a bulky volume. As far as our painting is concerned, all the tests above mentioned serve to prove its extraordinary antiquity. "Any one can see", says our author (*page* 15), "that the scene depicted in the cemetery of Priscilla is treated in a manner altogether classical, and is a work of the best period of art. The very costume employed therein suggests a very remote antiquity; that is to say the *pallium*, without any under garment, the right arm bared in the figure of the prophet, and still more the short-sleeved tunic on the Virgin. The beauty of the composition, the grace and dignity of the features, the freedom and skill of the drawing, stamp this fresco as belonging to a period of art so flourishing, that, when first I saw it, I thought I had before me one of the oldest specimens of Christian painting in the Catacombs. I spoke of it to my master, the late celebrated P. Marchi, who proceeded to examine it in company with the illustrious Professor Cav. Minardi, now member of the Commission, of Sacred Archaeology, and both pronounced it to be a wonderful specimen of the very earliest Christian art. The learned and the experts in the study of Greco-Roman monuments who have seen this fresco, have declared it to be not later than the time of the first Antonines, and perhaps even prior to that epoch. It remains therefore to collect such proofs as may fix as closely as possible the age of this remarkable monument, which all admit to belong to the first years of Christianity. To this end I will first compare it with other paintings of more or less certain date, and then confront the results of the comparison with the history, topography, and inscriptions of the crypt". He then compares our fresco first with paintings in the cemetery of Callixtus, which it is admitted belong to the days of Popes Pontianus, Anteros, and Fabian, and finds that it is far superior to them in style and execution, and consequently belonging to an older and more classical school. He next compares them with the ornaments of the square crypt, discovered last year in the cemetery of Pretextatus, and belonging to about the year 162. These ornaments, better than the last mentioned, are still inferior to our fresco. Finally, in the cemetery of Domitilla, there is a *cubiculum* adorned with the finest stucco, on which a pencil more skilled in pagan than in Christian painting has drawn landscapes and figures that remind you of the houses at Pompeii and Herculaneum, rather than of the paintings of the catacombs. Compared even with these, our fresco loses nothing, but, if anything, surpasses them in composition and design. "Hence", concludes our author, "the painting in the cemetery of Priscilla, compared with those paintings, the date of which is more or less determined, is found to be as beautiful and valuable as the very oldest of them, or even more so; and allowing that some portion of its merit belongs to the artist and not to the period, we must still conclude that it is cotemporary with the very origin of Christian painting, or at least very little distant from it. In a word, the painting belongs to the period of the Flavii and of the preaching of the Apostles, or to that immediately following, namely, the period of Trajan (A.D. 98), of Hadrian (A.D. 117), and at the latest of the first Antonines" (A.D. 138). The truth of this result is confirmed on the application of the other tests mentioned above: by the style of the other ornaments of the place, which being in relief are never found in a crypt of the third century; by the history of the cemetery, which is clearly proved to have been the place of burial of the Christian family of Pudens, the first of whom were cotemporary with the Apostles; by the topography, for the spot where the painting exists was the very centre of the excavation; by the style of the inscriptions around it, which are of the most ancient form, and almost apostolical. All these arguments, taken together, are invincible, and prove beyond a reasonable doubt that this beautiful painting of our Blessed Lady was traced almost beneath the eyes of the Apostles themselves.

[Pg 252]

FOOTNOTES:

[32] *Lives of the early Italian Painters*. By Mrs. Jameson, p. 2.

[33] *Ibid.*, pag. 4.

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

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.