

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

Release date: July 28, 2011 [EBook #36883]

Language: English

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

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

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD

[253]

MARCH, 1865.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE BIBLE.
THE SEE OF DOWN AND CONNOR.
DR. COLENZO AND THE OLD TESTAMENT.
LITURGICAL QUESTIONS.
CORRESPONDENCE.
DOCUMENTS.
NOTICES OF BOOKS.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE BIBLE.

There are few so foolish as to close their eyes against the brilliant rays of the mid-day sun, and, at the same time, to assert deliberately that the sun is not yet risen, and that the world is still enveloped in darkness.

Nevertheless, something like this has been done quite recently by an estimable Protestant nobleman, who has assured his Irish fellow-countrymen that the Catholic Church, before the Reformation, "neither furthered the interests of science nor disseminated the knowledge of God's written word". 1 There was a time, indeed, when such a calumny would have been received by the British public with applause, and when it would have been echoed from Protestant pulpits by the predecessors of Colenso, and by the ancestors of many who now hold a place in the councils of her Majesty. But that calumny has been long since abandoned, even by the enemies of our holy faith. Our assailants have laid aside the mask, and revealed to the world the important fact, that whilst they clamoured for the Bible, they were themselves its true enemies; and that, combating the Church, their secret aim was to sap the foundations of inspired truth, and thus undermine the very citadel which they pretended to defend. It is not in England alone, but in France and Italy, and throughout the whole continent, that this striking fact is seen. Everywhere society presents the singular phenomenon of a sifting of its elements; and whilst all that aspires to the supernatural life, or clings to revelation, virtue, or truth, is gathered into the bosom of our holy Church, all that is without the Catholic pale is hurried down the inclined plane of Protestantism, and cast into the abyss of infidelity and rationalism. And yet, in the face of this social miracle, a

[254]

Protestant peer is bold enough to assert that the Catholic Church is opposed to the progress of science and inspired truth;—thus insulting the memory of his own illustrious forefathers, and outraging the feelings of his fellow-countrymen. It is not, however, as a matter of controversy that we wish to enter on the present inquiry: we wish to view it merely as a matter of pure historic truth. In a future number we hope to consider the relations of the Church to science; our remarks to-day will only regard her solicitude during the ante-Reformation period to diffuse among her children a salutary knowledge of inspired truth as contained in the Holy Scriptures.

1. The first question that naturally suggests itself is, did the Church seek to remove the sacred volume from the hands of her own ministers, that is, of those whom she destined to teach her faithful children, and to gather all nations into her hallowed fold? The whole daily life of these sacred ministers of itself responds to such a question. Ask their diurnal hours, or any page of the daily Liturgy of the Church; ask those beautiful homilies which were delivered day by day in the abbeys of Bangor, Westminster, or Certosa, all of which breathe the sweet language of the inspired text; ask the myriad children of St. Columban, who in uninterrupted succession, hour by hour, chanted the praises of God in the accents of holy writ; ask the countless sanctuaries which decked the hills and valleys not only of our own island, but of every land on which the light of Christian faith had shone—the peaceful abodes of those who renounced the world's smiles and vanities to devote themselves to the service of God, and whose every orison recalled the teaching and the words of inspired truth. Ask even the medieval hymns published by the present Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, which, though shorn by the editor of much of their Catholic beauty, yet bear in each remaining strophe a deep impress of the language and imagery of the Bible, and prove to conviction that, so devoted was the Church of the ante-Reformation period to the study of the inspired text, that the very thoughts of her clergy, their language, their daily life, seemed to be cast in its sacred mould.

2. About 1450, long before Lutheranism was thought of, the art of printing appeared in Europe. Now some of the first efforts, as well of the wooden types of Gutenberg, as of the more perfect models of Faust and Schoeffer, were directed to disseminate accurate editions of the Bible: "No book", says one of the leading Rationalists of Germany, "was so frequently published, immediately after the first invention of printing, as the Latin Bible, more than one hundred editions of it being struck off before the year 1520". ² And yet the number of editions thus commemorated is far below the reality. Hain, in his late *Repertorium Bibliographicum*, printed at Tübingen, reckons consecutively *ninety-eight distinct editions* before the year 1500, independently of *twelve other editions*, which, together with the Latin text, presented the glossa ordinaria or the postillas of Lyranus. Catholic Venice was distinguished above all the other cities of Europe for the zeal with which it laboured in thus disseminating the sacred text. From the year 1475, when the first Venetian edition appeared, to the close of the century, that city yielded no fewer than *twenty-two complete editions* of the Latin Bible, besides some others with the notes of Lyranus. Many other cities of Italy were alike remarkable for their earnestness in the same good cause, and we find especially commemorated the editions of Rome, Piacenza, Naples, Vicenza, and Brescia.

[255]

3. Italy, however, was not only remarkable for the number of its editions; it deserves still greater praise for the solicitude with which it compared the existing text with that of the ancient manuscripts, and endeavoured to present to the public editions as accurate as the then known critical apparatus would allow. One or two editions deserve particular notice, and in our remarks we will take the learned Vercellone for our guide, in his *Dissertazioni Accademiche* (Roma, 1864, pag. 102, seq. 9).

The most famous edition of the fifteenth century was that of Rome in 1471. It was published under the guidance of John Andrew de Bossi, Bishop of Aleria, and was dedicated to Pope Paul II. The printers were Conrad Sweynheym and Arnold Paunartz. Their press was in the princely palace of the illustrious Massimi family. Five hundred and fifty copies were struck off in the edition; and on the death of Pope Paul II., his successor, Sixtus IV., was its zealous patron.

The Venice edition of 1495 is also of great critical importance. The religious superior of the Camaldolese of Brescia superintended its publication. It consisted of four volumes in folio, and presented, together with the Latin Bible, the gloss and notes of Lyranus. This great work was dedicated to Cardinal Francis Piccolomini, who was soon after raised to the popedom under the name of Pius III. From its preface we learn that not only the best preceding editions, but also *five ancient manuscripts*, were made use of in preparing this edition.

[256]

Still more accurate, however, is another edition, published without name of place in 1476, but which Pauzer and Vercellone refer to the city of Vicenza. Its editor was the learned Leonard Acate. He first sought out with great care the most ancient and correct manuscript of the Latin text, and then he devoted all his care to have it accurately printed. In a short preface, he merely says: "Lector, quisquis es, si Christiane sentis, non te pigeat hoc opus sanctissimum ... Codex practiosissimus in lucem emendatissimus venit"; and it must be confessed that this statement was not made without reason, since, notwithstanding all the critical researches of the last four centuries, that edition still holds its place amongst the most accurate and most conformable to the ancient Latin text.

4. Thus, then, in regard to the Latin text at least, Lord Clancarty must admit that the Church in the ante-Reformation period was not negligent in disseminating the Bible. And here we must remark that Latin was the literary language of that age, and that whosoever could read at all, was sure to be versed in the Latin tongue. How justly, then, does Mr. Hallam, when speaking of

this period, state: "There is no reason to suspect any intention in the Church of Rome to deprive the laity of the scriptures"; 3 and how truthful are the words of another eloquent man: "The Catholic Church is not the enemy of the Bible. I affirm it, and I shall prove it.... She has been the guardian of its purity and the preserver of its existence through the chances and changes of eighteen hundred years. In the gloom of the Catacombs, and the splendour of the Basilica, she cherished that holy book with equal reverence. When she saw the seed of Christianity sown in the blood of the martyrs, and braved the persecutions of the despots of the world, and when those despots bowed before the symbol of Redemption, and she was lifted from her earthly humbleness, and reared her mitred head in courts and palaces, it was equally the object of her unceasing care. She gathered together its scattered fragments, separated the true word of inspiration from the spurious inventions of presumptuous and deceitful men, made its teachings and its history familiar to her children in her noble liturgy; translated it into the language which was familiar to every one who could read at all; asserted its divine authority in her councils; maintained its canonical authority against all gainsayers; and transmitted it from age to age as the precious inheritance of the Christian people. The saints whom she most reveres were its sagest commentators; and of the army of her white-robed martyrs whom she still commemorates on her festal days, there are many who reached their immortal crowns by refusing on the rack and in the flames to desecrate or deny the holy book of God". 4 And yet, if we are to believe Lord Clancarty, it is precisely this holy Church that is opposed to science and to the dissemination of the written word of God!

[257]

5. But perhaps Catholics were in dread at least of the original text of the sacred Scriptures, and placed some obstacles in the way of its diffusion. Here, again, we appeal to the testimony of facts. The only editions of the Old Testament which appeared in the original Hebrew language in the fifteenth century, were all printed beneath the shadow of the Inquisition in the Catholic land of Italy. Soncino, near Cremona, in 1488, Naples in 1491, and Brescia in 1494, are the cities to which belongs the glory of thus giving birth to the first editions of the Hebrew text. Bologna, too, was privileged in being the first to publish the Chaldaic paraphrase of Onkelos: its edition appeared in 1482; and for the next two editions, which appeared towards the close of the century, we are indebted to Catholic Portugal. 5

As to the Greek text of the New Testament, its first edition was printed in 1514, under the auspices of an illustrious Spanish Franciscan, Cardinal Ximenes. Though the New Testament is only the fifth volume in the great Polyglot of Ximenes, yet it was first of all in order of time, its text being completed on the 10th of January, 1514. Five other editions followed in quick succession, in 1516, 1519, 1522, 1527, 1535, all bearing the name of Erasmus. 6 The only portions of the Greek text of the Old Testament that were printed in the fifteenth century all had their origin in Italy, and bear the date of 1481, 1486, and 1498.

6. It is time, however, to refer to the first great Biblical Polyglots—those vast repertoires devised by master minds, and which, presenting in parallel columns the original texts of the Old and New Testaments, together with the various ancient versions, are an incalculable aid in the study of Biblical criticism and in the interpretation of the sacred books. Even in the publication of these great works Protestants only came to glean where the Catholics had already reaped an abundant harvest. It was the privilege of the illustrious order of St. Dominick to give to the world the first Polyglot edition of a portion of the sacred text. It was entitled "*Psalterium Hebraicum Graecum, Arabicum, et Chaldaicum cum tribus Latinis Interpretationibus et Glossis*". From the dedication we learn that its author was "*Fr. Augustinus Giustiniani ord. Praed. Episcopus Nubiensis*", who inscribes this fruit of his learned labours to the reigning pontiff, Leo X. It was in the Giustiniani palace in Genoa that this Polyglot was printed, under the immediate superintendence of the bishop himself, and from the same city he addressed its dedication to Pope Leo on 1st August, 1516. An extract from this dedicatory letter will best serve to show that the sentiments of the Catholic bishops of the ante-Reformation period were far different from what the Earl of Clancarty would wish us to suppose. It thus begins:

[258]

"Scio Pater Beatissime, perlatum ad aures tuas jam diu laborasse nos quo utrumque sacrae legis instrumentum quinque praecipuis linguis in unum redactum corpus ederemus: opus nimirum ut meis viribus impar ita nostrae professioni vel maxime congruens. Nihil enim aeque sacerdoti convenit quam sacrarum litterarum expositio et interpretatio.... An vero noster hic labor fructum aliquem sit pariturus in Catholica matre Ecclesia cui ipse digne praesides libuit periculum facere hoc Davidico psalterio quod ex toto opere nunc quasi delibamus tuo dicatum nomini".

The learned linguist, Baptista Fliscus, was requested by Giustiniani to revise the text of the oriental versions, and sending his list of corrections, he prefaces it with the following words:

"Tu vero perge divinum complere negotium et quod Psalterio Davidico tribuisti confer caeteris quoque sacrae Scripturae partibus ut eâ tot nationum auribus accommodatâ invitetur universus orbis ad tantarum rerum notitiam.... Tum Leo ipse Pont. Max. cui tu opus ipsum dicasti pro sua erga omnes benignitate et munificentia non deerit tibi quoque in cunctis operi necessariis praesertim adeo utiliter navanti operam ei cujus vices gerit in terris".

Surely such expressions breathe sentiments far different from those of hostility to the dissemination of the genuine text of the Sacred Scriptures.

7. The second and far more important Polyglot was prepared under the guidance and published at the expense of a Franciscan prime minister of Spain, the illustrious Cardinal Ximenes. This

great work, which was begun in 1502, was completed only a few weeks before the death of the Cardinal in 1517. When the son of the printer entered the apartment of Ximenes, "bearing the last sheets of the Polyglot, the aged Cardinal exclaimed: "I give thee thanks, O Lord! that thou hast enabled me to bring to the desired end the great work which I undertook". And then turning to those around him, he added: "Of the many arduous duties which I have performed for the benefit of the country, there is nothing on which you ought to congratulate me more than on the completion of this edition of the Bible". 7 This Polyglot comprises all the books of the Old and New Testaments in their original text, together with various ancient versions. Its expense was wholly defrayed by the Cardinal, who spared no pains to render it as complete as human efforts could effect. His biographer especially commemorates how on one occasion he gave the sum of £2,000 for *seven ancient Hebrew manuscripts* which were made use of in printing the Hebrew text; and the whole expense of the publication amounted to £25,000, which at that period was equivalent to four times that sum at the present day. "He made researches on all sides", writes Hefele, "for manuscripts of the Old and New Testaments, and sometimes was obliged to purchase them at an enormous expense, while others generously hastened to lend them for his use, amongst whom must be mentioned Pope Leo X. This pontiff honoured and revered Ximenes, and still more he loved the fine arts. He therefore generously supported him in the publication of the celebrated Polyglot. In return Ximenes dedicated the work to his Holiness, and in the introduction gave him public thanks in these words: 'Atque ex ipsis exemplaribus quidem, Graeca Sanctitati Tuae debemus, qui ex ista Apostolica Bibliotheca antiquissimos tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti codices perquam humane ad nos misisti': *i.e.* 'To your Holiness we are indebted for the Greek manuscripts. You have sent us with the greatest kindness the copies both of the Old and New Testament, the most ancient that the apostolic library possessed". 8 In the introductory remarks to the various volumes, the learned editor more than once acquaints us with the motives which impelled him to this gigantic undertaking, and repeats the same expression of gratitude to the reigning pontiff for the kind assistance afforded him. Thus in the prolegomena he writes: "No translation can fully and exactly represent the sense of the original, at least in that language in which our Saviour himself spoke. It is necessary, therefore, as St. Jerome and St. Augustine desired, that we should go back to the origin of the sacred writings, and correct the books of the Old Testament by the Hebrew text, and those of the New Testament by the Greek text. Every theologian should also be able to drink of that water 'which springeth up to life eternal', at the fountainhead itself. This is the reason, therefore, why we have ordered the Bible to be printed in the original language with different translations. To accomplish this task we have been obliged to have recourse to the knowledge of the most able philologists, and to make researches in every direction for the best and most ancient Hebrew and Greek manuscripts". Again, in the preface to the New Testament, we read: "Illud lectorem non lateat non quaevis exemplaria impressioni huic archetypa fuisse sed antiquissima emendatissimaque ac tantae praeterea vetustatis ut fidem eis abrogare nefas videatur quae sanctissimus in Christo Pater et Dominus Noster Leo X. Pontifex Max. huic instituto favere cupiens, ex Apostolica Bibliotheca educta misit ad Reverendissimum D. Cardinalem Hispaniae".

[259]

[260]

Such, then, were the sentiments, such the solicitude, of the reigning Pontiff and of the Franciscan Cardinal in publishing the great *Complutensian Polyglot*—for it is thus it was styled, from the city of *Complutum*, better known by the modern name of *Alcalá*, in which it was printed. Still, if we are to credit the assertion of Lord Clancarty, they were the enemies of science, and opposed to the dissemination of the Word of God! How far more justly was the character of Ximenes appreciated by the two Protestant historians, Robertson and Prescott. The former writes: "The variety, the grandeur, and the success of his schemes, leaves it doubtful whether his sagacity in council, his prudence in conduct, or his boldness in execution, deserve the highest praise". The latter, still more to the point, observes: "The Cardinal's Bible has the merit of being the first successful attempt at a Polyglot version of the Scriptures ... Nor can we look at it in connection with the age, and the auspices under which it was accomplished, without regarding it as a noble monument of learning, piety, and munificence, which entitles its author to the gratitude of the whole Christian world". 9

8. Even these two great works did not suffice for the Catholic Biblical scholars of that age. Another still more perfect Polyglot soon followed the Complutensian edition. It was published at Antwerp in 1569-1572, under the auspices of Philip II. of Spain, and under the superintendence of Cardinal de Spinoza. The most learned men of the age concurred to complete this edition, and amongst its editors are named *Sanctes Pagnini, Arias Montanus, Raphaelengius*, and others.

9. The Polyglot of Le Jay, published at Paris, though later in point of time, surpassed all preceding editions in magnificence, and is generally reputed one of the most costly and splendid works that ever issued from the press. The booksellers of London offered the editor large sums of money, besides other advantageous terms, on condition that it should be called the London Polyglot. This offer, however, was contemptuously received by Le Jay, and this immense work appeared at his own individual expense solely, under Catholic auspices, and for the first time, in addition to the other texts, presented to the world the Samaritan Pentateuch.

[261]

10. Now all these great works appeared before a single attempt was made by Protestants to publish a Polyglot Bible; they all appeared under the patronage of the clergy, and show the ever active solicitude of the Catholic Church to promote a true Christian interpretation, and to diffuse an accurate text of the Sacred Scriptures. Even in regard to versions into the various modern languages, Catholics were ever foremost in the field. Of these we will speak on a future day, but we cannot close this article without commemorating another characteristic Biblical work of the ante-Reformation period, which might be justly styled the "*Polyglot of the illiterate*", and which is

commonly known by the name of *Biblia Pauperum*. This consisted of a series of prints presenting the facts of prophecy of the Old law, and generally accompanied with the representation of their fulfilment in the facts of the New Testament. Some of the very first xylographic efforts were devoted to diffuse these *Biblia Pauperum*, and several editions appeared in the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century. ¹⁰ Even before the art of printing was discovered, this ingenious sort of Polyglot, suited to the illiterate, of whatsoever nation they might be, was diffused through the monasteries and Catholic sanctuaries of Europe. It was indeed a tedious labour to achieve such a work with the pen; but for the monks of the middle age such works were a labour of love. It was only in our own day, however, that the existence of such manuscripts has been fully proved. The learned Heider, in his *Christian Typology* (Vienna, 1861), first announced their discovery in the Viennese archives; and in 1863 a complete edition was published by him, aided by Albert Camesina, from a manuscript of the fourteenth century.

ALPHA.

[262]

THE SEE OF DOWN AND CONNOR.

The united dioceses of Down and Connor present many themes of special interest to the student of the ecclesiastical history of our island, and have engaged more than any other diocese of Ireland the attention of Irish antiquarians. Suffice it to mention the learned work of Dr. Reeves, entitled *Ecclesiastical Antiquities of Down, etc.*, published in 1847, and presented by the author to the Irish Archaeological Society. Nevertheless, even in this favoured see, the succession of bishops, as published by Ware and Harris, and subsequently adopted, with few variations, by Reeves and Cotton, abounds with errors and anachronisms; and hence, that the reader may learn to receive with caution the statements even of our most esteemed antiquarians when they are unsupported by ancient records, we propose to present a more accurate list of the bishops of this see, from the arrival of the English, down to the close of Elizabeth's reign.

When De Courcy invaded Ulster in 1177, he found the Diocese of Dundalethglas, *i.e.* Down, governed by a Bishop Malachias, who was third in succession from the great St. Malachy. This Bishop subsequently accompanied De Courcy into England, and was instrumental in the donations made by that nobleman to the Abbey of St. Werburga in Chester, and to other religious houses. He died in 1201.

Ralph, Abbot first of Kinloss and afterwards of Melross, in Scotland, was chosen his successor, and was confirmed by Cardinal John de Salerno, legate of Pope Innocent III. in 1202. Having governed this see for eleven years, he had for his successor, in 1213, Bishop Thomas, during whose episcopate many donations were made by Hugh de Lacy to the monastery of Dundalethglas. Matthew Paris records some facts connected with this prelate, and especially his having held an ordination in the great monastery of St. Alban's; he also consecrated there three churchyards, and dedicated an altar to St. Leonard. He died in 1242.

A contest then arose between the abbeys of Down and Bangor as to which belonged the right of electing the bishop of the see. The Abbot of Bangor claimed it as an ancient privilege of that great monastery, whilst on the other hand the Benedictine Monks of Dundalethglas put forward their claim, as constituting the chapter of the Cathedral Church. Rome referred the question to the decision of the Archbishop of Armagh, who, with his suffragans, in 1243, pronounced judgment in favour of the abbey of Down, and this sentence was ratified by Pope Innocent IV., on the 3rd of the Nones of March, 1243/4—(Theiner, *Monumen. Vat.*, page 42).

Randal (in Latin Ranulfis) was then appointed bishop of this see. He died in 1253, and the chapter of Down chose, without delay, a successor in the person of Thomas Liddell, who is styled in the brief of his appointment *Rector Ecclesiae del Rathlonge, Carnotensis* (a mistake for Connorensis) *Dioecesis*. King Henry III. refused to sanction this election, and nominated Reginald, Archdeacon of Down, to the vacant see. The chapter could not be induced to ratify this nomination; nevertheless, the king issued a writ, commanding the Archbishop of Armagh to consecrate Reginald, who took possession of the see in 1258. The chapter appealed to the tribunal of the successors of St. Peter, and after a long and tedious examination of the whole controversy, judgment was given by Pope Clement IV., in 1265, declaring that Dr. Liddell was the canonically elected bishop, and that the appointment of Reginald had been from the beginning null and void. Reginald submitted with alacrity to the decree of Rome, and was soon after appointed to the Diocese of Cloyne. The Holy See, moreover, was pleased to confirm all the parochial appointments which Reginald had made during the period of his disputed appointment, adding only the clause, that the clergy thus appointed by him should otherwise be free from all canonical impediments, and capable of discharging the functions confided to them. The brief of Pope Clement IV. granting this favour is dated from Perugia, the 30th April, 1265, and begins: "Tuae devotionis promeretur affectus, ut petitionibus tuis, quantum cum Deo possumus, favorabiliter annuamus"—(*Mon. Vat.*, page 96). Two months later the bull sanctioning the appointment of Dr. Liddell to the See of Down, was published with due solemnity in Viterbo, where the Pontiff then resided. It begins with the statement of the controversy which had deprived that diocese of a chief pastor for so many years, and terminates with the hope that "eadem Dunensis Ecclesia per tune circumspectionis industriam salubria in spiritualibus et

[263]

temporelibus suscipiat incrementa"—(*Ibid.*, page 101). Thus, then, the name of Reginald, which stands so prominent in the lists of Ware, Reeves, and Cotton, must be cancelled from the canonical order of episcopal succession in the See of Down.

In 1276 Dr. Liddell was summoned to his eternal reward, and had for his successor, the same year, Nicholas, who, from being Prior of the Monastery of Down and treasurer of Ulster, was elected bishop by the chapter, and confirmed by Rome. During his episcopate a controversy was carried on, as to the rights of the Archbishop of Armagh whilst performing the visitation of his suffragan sees. Pope Nicholas III., in 1279, commissioned the Bishop of Clonfert to examine into the various allegations which had been made, and authorised him to cite the Archbishop to Rome, should it be discovered that the visitation of the see had been uncanonically performed. From this letter of the Holy Father it incidentally results that the Archbishop of Armagh had the privilege not only of personally making the visitation of the suffragan episcopal sees, but also, "should any necessity so demand", of deputing a simple clergyman to make similar visitation in particular churches or districts of such sees—(*Mon. Vatic.*, pag. 121).

[264]

Dr. Nicholas died in 1304. His successor was Thomas Kittel, pastor of Lesmoghlan, who received possession of the temporalities of the see on the 1st of July, 1305, and died in 1313. The chapter of St. Patrick's, according to their no-longer disputed privilege, made choice of Thomas Bright, prior of the cathedral, who received consecration at the hands of Roland De Jorse, Archbishop of Armagh, in 1314. He was, in 1322, nominated by the Holy See to inquire into the various accusations which had been made against the Primate by the English government and others. He died in 1327, and was buried in his own cathedral of St. Patrick.

Reeves commemorates as his successor John of Baliconingham, rector of Arwhyn, and there is no doubt that this prelate was chosen by the English king, and held for some time possession of the temporalities of the see. However, he never was Bishop of Down. Ralph, or Rodulfus, of Kilmessan, in the diocese of Meath, a Franciscan friar, was appointed by Pope John XXII. on the 12th of December, 1328, and consecrated in Avignon by Bertram, the Cardinal Bishop of Tusculum. Even the English government made no opposition, and he received the temporalities of the see on the 1st of April, 1329. The above pastor of Arwhyn was, however, promoted by the same pontiff to the See of Cork, and when, towards the close of 1329, both bishops petitioned the Holy Father to be allowed to exchange their sees, a letter was addressed from Rome to the Archbishop of Armagh, dated the Nones of January, 1330, empowering him to grant this favour to these bishops, should they persist in desiring it, and should he deem it beneficial to their respective sees—(*Mon. Vatican.*, pag. 249). Stephen Segrave then held the primatial see, and he seems to have judged such an exchange of dioceses inopportune or unnecessary, and hence Bishop Rodulfus continued to hold the See of Down till his death in 1353.

In the first year of Pope Innocent VI. (1353) it was represented that the See of Down was vacant by the death of Rodulfus: "dicta Ecclesia per obitum Rodulphi, qui in partibus illis, Praedecessore nostro vivente, debitum naturae persolvit"; and hence Gregory, provost of Killala, was appointed bishop on the 29th January, 1353, and was consecrated at Avignon by Cardinal Peter, Bishop of Palestrina. The infirm Bishop Rodulfus, however, was not yet deceased, and Gregory was immediately promoted to some titular bishopric. When Rodulfus finally passed to a better world, in August, 1353, the clergy and chapter of Down petitioned to have Richard Calf, who was prior of the monastery, advanced to the vacant see. This petition was readily granted, and the appointment of Dr. Richard was registered on the 2nd of the Nones of December, the same year. A few days later he was consecrated in Avignon, by order of his Holiness, and on the 23rd of December the following beautiful letter was addressed to him by the Holy Father:

[265]

"Pridem Dunensi Ecclesia Pastoris solatio destituta, Nos ad personam tuam claris virtutum titulis insignitam nostrae mentis aciem dirigentes, te de fratrum nostrorum consilio eidem Ecclesiae in Episcopum praefecimus et pastorem, curam et administrationem ipsius Ecclesiae tibi in spiritualibus et temporalibus plenarie committendo prout in litteris nostris inde confectis plenius continetur. Cum autem postmodum per ven. fratrem nostrum Petrum Episcopum Bottentonensem tibi fecerimus apud Sedem Apostolicam munus consecrationis impendi, fraternitati tuae per apostolica scripta mandamus, quatenus apostolicae sedis beneplacitis te conformans, ad praedictam Ecclesiam cum nostrae benedictionis gratia te personaliter conferens, sic te in administratione ipsius, diligenter et sollicite gerere studeas, ut utilis administratoris industriae non immerito gaudeat se commissam, ac famae laudabilis tuae odor ex tuis probabiliter actibus latius diffundatur, et praeter aeternae retributionis praemium nostrae benevolentiae gratiam et favorem exinde uberius consequaris"—(*Mon. Vatic.*, p. 306).

Dr. Richard governed the diocese till his death in 1365. His successor, the Archdeacon William, hold the see only three years, and died in August, 1368. Ware and subsequent writers commemorate John Logan as the next bishop. However, the bull of appointment of Richard, prior of the Benedictine monastery of Down, which is dated 19th February, 1369, styles him the immediate successor of William, and thus leaves no room for Dr. Logan. The chapter was unanimous in presenting the name of Richard to the Holy Father, and the proofs which were added "de religionis zelo, litterarumque scientia", rendered delay unnecessary in appointing him to the vacant see—(*Mon. Vatic.*, p. 332). He ruled the diocese till his death on the 16th of May, 1386. *Joannes Rossensis*, from being prior of the monastery, was next elected by the chapter, and confirmed by the Holy See. He died six years after his consecration, and had for his successor John Dougan, who, in 1394, was translated to this see, not from *Derry*, as Ware imagined, but

from the diocese of the Isle of Man, the Latin name for which see, *i.e. Sodorensis*, led the learned author into this error. The Archives of Rome preserve several documents connected with this prelate, some of which were published by my esteemed friend Professor Munch, in his learned notes to the *Chronicle of Man*, edited for the Royal University of Christiania, in 1860. The first letter which we find regarding him is a brief of Urban V., dated January 23rd, 1367, which commences: "Probitatis et virtutum merita super quibus apud nos fidedignorum commendaris testimonio, nos inducunt ut tibi reddamur ad gratiam liberales". It subsequently addresses Dr. Dougan as *Pastor of Camelyn*, in the Diocese of Down, and appoints him Archdeacon of the see, the former Archdeacon, *William*, having been elevated to the episcopacy early in the preceding year. The office of Archdeacon of Down is further described as having attached to it the care of souls, and as usually conferred on persons not belonging to the cathedral chapter. Its annual revenue, too, is described as not exceeding forty marks. Soon after, we find this Archdeacon appointed Apostolic Nuncio for Ireland, and on 13th March, 1369, the privilege was granted to him of choosing as his confessor any member of the secular or regular clergy. The brief according this privilege thus begins: "Benigno sunt tibi illa concedenda favore per quae sicut pie desideras conscientiae pacem et salutem animae, Deo propitio consequi merearis. Hinc est quod nos tuis devotis supplicationibus inclinati tibi Apostolica auctoritate indulgemus ut quamdiu nostri et Ecclesiae Romanae servitiis institeris aliquem idoneum et discretum in tuum possis eligere confessorem, etc." (Dat. Romae ap. S. Petrum, 3^o Id. Martii, Pontif. N. an. septimo).

[266]

The Bull appointing John Dougan, Archdeacon of Down, to the See of Man, is dated November 6th, 1374, and addressed to "Joanni electo Sodorensi". It mentions as a chief motive for this appointment, that the clergy and people of Man had earnestly solicited it: "pro quo etiam dilecti filii, clerus civitatis et Dioecesis Sodorensis per eorum patentes litteras nobis super hoc humiliter supplicarunt". The Cardinal who consecrated Dr. Dougan was the celebrated Simon de Langham, who held successively the posts of Prior and Abbot of Westminster, Bishop of London and of Ely, Chancellor of England, Archbishop of Canterbury, Cardinal Priest of S. Prassede, and at the time of which we speak was Cardinal Bishop of Palestrina. Of our prelate, it is recorded in the *Chronicle of Man* that he was elected Bishop on the feast of Corpus Christi, was confirmed by the Pope on the feast of St. Leonard, and was consecrated on St. Catherine's Day. When returning to his diocese he was arrested and thrown into prison in the city of Boulogne, and only after several months was liberated on the payment of a fine of five hundred marks. The motive of this imprisonment has not been recorded. It was probably in connection with his office of papal Nuncio, for he continued, even when Bishop of Man, to exercise the duties of Nuncio of the Holy See for Ireland—(*Mon. Vatican.* pag. 365: *Munch*, loc. cit. pag. 31). In 1395 Dr. Dougan was, by Bull of Pope Boniface III., translated to Down. He received many favours from King Henry IV., and on the 16th of September, 1405, we find a commission addressed to him (published by Rymer), authorizing him and Jenico d'Artois to negotiate a peace between the Irish northern chieftains and the "Lord of the Isles". Dr. Dougan died in 1412.

[267]

The next Bishop of Down was John Sely, who had hitherto been a Benedictine monk, and prior of the Cathedral of St. Patrick. He governed this diocese from 1413 to 1441, when it was united to the See of Connor. The bishops of both sees had more than once represented to the king and to the Holy See the inadequacy of their respective revenues to support with due decorum the episcopal dignity. On the 29th of July, 1438, a royal decree was published permitting these bishops to sue in Rome for a union of their sees: it states as the motive for granting this permission that both sees, "uti fidedigna relatione suscepimus, adeo tenues sunt et exiles ut ipsarum neutra in suis fructibus et proventibus decentiae sufficiat Episcopali". Pope Eugene IV. lent a willing ear to the petition of the Bishops, and no sooner had the Bishop of Down resigned his see than John, Bishop of Connor, was by a special brief constituted at the same time Bishop of Down, and in the following year a papal constitution was published, instituting a real and perpetual union of both sees. Many controversies subsequently arose, especially in regard to the temporalities of the See of Down; Bishop John, however, continued in undisturbed possession of the united dioceses till his death, in 1450, and his successors have ever since retained the title of Bishops of Down and Connor.

The chapter of the united dioceses elected Robert Rochfort to fill the vacant see. He was also strongly recommended to the Holy Father by Primate Mey, who, writing to Pope Nicholas V., on 10th of April, 1451, mentions among his other good qualities that he was "lingua Anglicana et Hibernicâ facundus". Pope Nicholas, however, had already chosen another pastor for that fold, and Richard Wolsey, of the order of St. Dominick, was appointed Bishop of Down and Connor by brief of 21st June, 1451. In this brief the See is described as vacated by the demise of "Thomas, last Bishop of the canonically united Dioceses of Down and Connor". It is added that the new bishop, Dr. Wolsey, was a professed member of the order of St. Dominick, remarkable for his zeal, and prudence, and other virtues—(*De Burgo*, pag. 474). He held the see for more than five years, and had for his successor Thomas, prior of St. Catherine's, Waterford, who was consecrated by Archbishop Mey on the 31st of May, 1456. His Episcopate lasted for thirteen years, and we find a letter of Paul II. addressed to him on the 16th of April, 1469, empowering him to grant to the friars observant of St. Francis some houses which had been abandoned by the conventual branch of the Franciscan order. This beautiful letter thus begins: "Inter caeteros ordines in agro dominico plantatos sacrum ordinem beati Francisci gerentes in visceribus caritatis, ad ea ex pastoralis officio nobis Divina dispensatione commisso libenter intendimus, per quae ordo ipse ad laudem Dei et exaltationem fidei Catholicae ubilibet refloueat"—(*Mon. Vatic.*, page 461).

[268]

He was succeeded by *Thadeus*, who was consecrated at Rome, in the Church of St. Mary *Supra*

Minervam, on the 10th of September, 1469. His death is registered in the year 1486, and his successor, *Tiberius*, during along and eventful episcopate, governed this see till his death in 1519. Ware, indeed, supposed that his episcopate continued till *circa an.* 1526; but Reeves discovered an ancient record which describes the see as vacant by our bishop's death in 1519—(*Ec. Antiq.*, page 160).

The historians of the Augustinian order mention a Bishop Thadeus, who seems to have succeeded in 1520, and held the see till 1526. Robert Blyth, a Benedictine and abbot of the monastery of Thorney, in Cambridgeshire, received this diocese *in commendam* by royal privilege in 1526. Dr. Cromer, Archbishop of Armagh, refused to give his sanction to this commendatory jurisdiction, and appointed to various benefices of Down and Connor, assigning as his motive the absence of the bishop, "in remotis agentis sine licentia summi Pontificis aut Metropolitanani sui". Dr. Blyth, however, continued to administer the diocese till 1540, when he resigned this charge, and had for his successor Eugene Magennis, who was proclaimed in consistory Bishop of Down and Connor in 1541. This Bishop submitted his Bulls to the crown in 1542, and hence was admitted not only to the temporalities of the see, but received in addition other ecclesiastical benefices. On May 9th, 1543, a further writ of pardon was issued in his favour (see *Morrin*, i. 91); but in all these acts of submission no mention is made of the royal supremacy. The position of his see rendered his submission in temporals too important to the crown to introduce any such embittering clause, and, in fact, the northern chieftains who submitted at the same time were exempted from all reference to religion when professing their allegiance to the government. At all events, no doubt can be entertained of the orthodoxy of this prelate, and in addition to the proofs adduced by other writers, we may mention the consistorial record for the appointment of his successor, in which the see is described as vacant, not by the apostacy or deposition, but simply as is usual in regard of the Catholic bishops, *per obitum Eugenii Magnissae*.

[269]

The precise date of Dr. Eugene's death cannot be fixed with certainty. There is a petition addressed from Carrickfergus to the crown, printed by Shirley (page 132), which is generally supposed to fix the see as vacant in 1563. This petition, however, merely sets forth the desire that, "for the better establishment and countenance of the religion of the Gospel", her Majesty might prefer "some worthy learned man to the Bishopric of Down, a goodly benefice, within the Pale ... who might with special severity establish order in the Church". No mention is made of the death of Dr. Eugene, or of the vacancy of the see; and the desire of the petitioners to have a Protestant bishop, without mentioning such a vacancy, seems to us rather to be a proof that the orthodox bishop was still living. However, the petition bears no date, and Shirley merely marks it as, "*supposed date, 1563*", under which heading he includes the first month of 1564.

Miler M'Grath, the next bishop, was appointed in consistory of 12th Oct., 1565: "Referente Eminentissimo Cardinali Simonetta, Ecclesiae Dunensi et Connorensi vacanti per obitum Eugenii Magnissae, praefectus fuit fr. Milerius Macra eodem loco Dunii oriundus professus ord. S. Francisci conventualium Presbyter", etc. The appointment of M'Grath had been earnestly opposed by the holy Primate Dr. Creagh, as he himself attests in his depositions made in the Tower of London. Indeed the only recommendation which seems to have been made was from the northern princes, many of whom solicited his appointment to the see, because he was foster-brother of their cherished chieftain, Shane O'Neill. This relationship between O'Neill and M'Grath is expressly mentioned in a Vatican paper, and is the sole key to many documents of the period which hitherto have been an enigma to our ecclesiastical historians. Though M'Grath after a few years embraced a schismatical connection with the Elizabethan government, Rome, through respect for his family, and in hopes that reflection would bring him back from his iniquitous course to the path of truth, delayed sentence of deposition against him till the close of 1578/9. We make this statement on the authority of a Vatican list of Irish sees, drawn up in 1579 or 1580, which expressly describes the See of Down as vacant, "per depositionem Milerii ab hac sancta Sede factam anno praeterito".

Donatus O'Gallagher was appointed his successor, being translated from the See of Killala to Down, in the first months of 1580. In less than two years he was summoned to his eternal crown, and on 27th of April, 1582, we find the following entry in the consistorial record: "Cardinalis Senonensis proposuit Ecclesiam Dunensem et Connorensem vacantem per obitum, de persona Cornelii O'Duibened ord. min. de observantia, praesentis in curia". Much might be said of the merits of this great bishop. Whilst as yet a simple religious, he displayed an ardent zeal for the conversion of souls to God. When consecrated bishop, this ardour was increased an hundredfold. More than once he was subjected to the hardships of imprisonment; nevertheless, he lived to witness the triumph of the Irish Church over all the efforts of Elizabeth, and having handed down to more youthful pastors the sacred deposit of faith, his life of devotedness and charity merited for him the martyr's crown, which he happily attained on the 11th of February, 1612.

[270]

We must now give a glance at the claims of those whom the Established Church reveres as its first fathers in this ancient see. It suffices merely to state their claims, to discern whether they are to be reckoned amongst the true shepherds of the flock, or amongst those wolves whose mission it is to rend and scatter the sacred fold of Christ.

On the 6th of January, 1565, instructions were sent to the Lord Justice of Ireland to advance James MacCaghwell to the bishopric of Down. It was, however, too perilous an experiment for a nominee of Elizabeth to appear as bishop within the territory of Shane O'Neill; and hence we find Loftus of Armagh, and Brady of Meath, petitioning Sir William Cecil, on 16th May, 1565, to have MacCaghwell provided with some other see, since "he durst not travel to Down through fear of bodily harm"—(Shirley, pag. 192).

For this reason it was not deemed expedient to have MacCaghwell consecrated for the See of Down, and as Dr. Mant, the late Protestant occupant of the see informs us, John Merriman was its first Protestant bishop (vol. i., pag. 296). He was chaplain to Queen Elizabeth, and in 1568 was consecrated by Lancaster of Armagh, in St. Patrick's, Dublin. As there was already a canonically appointed bishop holding the See of Down, no doubt can be entertained as to the true nature of Dr. Merriman's mission. He died in 1572, and Queen Elizabeth wrote to the Lord Deputy Sydney, on 6th November, 1572, commanding him "*to prefer one Brown, if he knew no better, to these sees*"—(Harris' Ware, pag. 205). Hugh Allen, however, a colonist of the Ards, was the individual selected by the Lord Deputy, and in the month of November, 1573, he was constituted successor of Dr. Merriman. The canonical bishop, however, still held the see, and Dr. Allen must again be stigmatized as an intruder. On his translation to Ferns, in 1582, the crown did not even attempt to nominate a Protestant bishop till the year 1593; and Dr. Mant adds that this vacancy shows "a neglect on the part of the government rather to be lamented than explained".

[271]

Thus, then, Dr. O'Deveny was not only the canonically appointed bishop, but was for ten years in possession of his see, and engaged in feeding there the flock of Christ, when Edward Edgeworth was nominated by Elizabeth, in 1593, Bishop of Down and Connor. This dignitary, indeed, seems never to have even seen his see; other crown nominees, however, soon followed in rapid succession—John Charldon, in 1596; Robert Humston, in 1602; and John Todd, in 1606, who, as Ware informs us, was, in 1611, deposed for his public immorality and other crimes, and "soon after died in prison in London, of poison, which he had prepared for himself"—(Harris' Ware, pag. 207). The true pastor, Dr. O'Deveny, was all this time at his perilous post, in season and out of season, ruling, by divine authority, the spiritual fold assigned to his charge; and whilst the Protestant nominee was so unhappily terminating his earthly career, the faithful shepherd was in the very same year laying down his life for his flock. We will conclude this hurried sketch with the words of the Four Masters when commemorating the death of this holy bishop: "There was not a Christian in the land of Ireland whose heart did not shudder within him at the terror of the martyrdom which this chaste wise divine, and perfect and truly meek righteous man suffered for the reward of his soul. The faithful of Dublin contended with each other to see which of them should have one of his limbs; and not only of his limbs, but they had fine linen in readiness to prevent his blood from falling to the ground, for they were convinced that he was one of the holy martyrs of the Lord"—(iii. p. 2,371).

DR. COLENZO AND THE OLD TESTAMENT.

NO. I.

The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined. By the RIGHT REV. JOHN WILLIAM COLENZO, D.D., Bishop of Natal. London: Longman and Co., 1862-64.

For three hundred years the Catholic Church has been denounced as the enemy of the Bible. This cry was first raised by Luther; it was taken up by Protestant sects of every denomination; it resounded through Germany, through France, through England; it passed from generation to generation; even at the present day its echoes are still ringing in our ears. No defence would be admitted; no arguments would be heard. The calumny, when once disseminated, was received by the enemies of the Church as a fact so patent, so elementary, that any inquiry would be superfluous, any proof unnecessary. It was taught by the preacher in his pulpit, by the divine in his writings, by the pedagogue in his school. Little children learned it on their mothers' knee; young men found it interwoven with history and romance; old men clung to it as a truth impressed upon their minds in tender infancy, and confirmed in the ripener years of manhood.

[272]

Meanwhile we were told that the Bible had found a home and a refuge in the heart of the Protestant Church. From the Bible, as from a pure fountain, the Protestant drank in the refreshing waters of divine faith; in the Bible he discovered a sure antidote against the idolatry and superstitions of Popery. To the Protestant, therefore, the Bible became an object of that religious veneration which was due to its sacred character. Not alone did he receive its doctrine, its history, its facts of every kind, but every word, every syllable, every letter, he regarded as stamped with the impress of Eternal Truth.

But a great change seems to be now impending, and has, indeed, already commenced. The teaching of the first Reformers is forgotten, or neglected, by their disciples. The Bible has lost its charm. As Protestantism has advanced in years it has increased in boldness. The same spirit which three centuries ago *protested* against the authority of the Pope, rises up to-day to *protest* against the authority of the Bible. And once again it devolves on the Catholic Church to defend that sacred book, which has been preserved to the world by the blood of her martyrs, and illustrated by the eloquence of her confessors and her doctors.

As in the great revolt of the sixteenth century, so likewise in our time, the first murmurs of rebellion are heard in Germany. It is there that the spirit of free inquiry is first let loose; it is there that the Bible is first suspected and brought to trial. The various human sciences are, in turn, summoned as witnesses against it. It is hastily judged and rashly condemned. Little heed is paid to the venerable antiquity of the book, to the consent of all civilized nations, to the voice of

immemorial tradition. True it is that the simple story of the Hebrew lawgiver contains a more profound wisdom than the proudest productions of Greek and Roman philosophy. True it is that, when the whole world was buried in darkness and error, it gave to man a religion which alone was pure and bright and holy. True it is that for ages it has withstood unshaken the attacks of hostile criticism. Yet must we now abandon it for ever as false and delusive, because, forsooth, it seems to clash with the scarcely intelligible babblings of infant sciences.

[273]

The contagion of these principles has, within the last few years, reached the shores of England. They seem to touch a secret chord of sympathy in the Protestant bosom. They have met with a ready welcome from the press. They have penetrated into the hallowed solitudes of the universities. And now, to the glory of free-thinkers and the shame of all orthodox believers, they have duly taken their place on the episcopal bench.

Amongst the advocates of the new opinion in England, there is none more popular in his style, none more plausible in his arguments, none more earnest in the cause, than John William Colenso, Protestant Bishop of Natal. Distinguished among his clerical brethren for his eminent skill in figures, he became, some few years ago, the chosen candidate for the see over which he now presides. He set out for his new mission armed with the Bible, and full of zeal for the conversion of the Zulus. His first thought was to make himself master of their tongue, and then to give them a translation of the Bible. While engaged in this latter task, he is asked by a "simple-minded but intelligent native, 'Is all that true?' 'Do you really believe that all this happened thus?'"—(Part 1. Preface, p. vii.). This very captious and subtle question seems to have taken the bishop by surprise. He is led to reflect and to examine; and the result of his labours is laid before us in the book to which, for a brief space, we invite the attention of our readers.

The position assumed by Dr. Colenso is simply this:—That the traditional reverence with which the Bible has hitherto been received, is no reason why it should not be submitted to the test of critical and scientific investigation: that he has himself applied that test to the Pentateuch and the Book of Josue: that by that test he has proved the leading facts in both these books to be false: that the narrative, in general, cannot be regarded otherwise than as fabulous and legendary; nay, that, even as a fable, it is inconsistent, impossible, and self-contradictory. So much for those parts of the Bible to which the bishop's researches have hitherto extended. He means to proceed with his studies in the same spirit through the rest of the sacred books; and he is quite prepared for any consequences to which these studies may lead him.

Such is the general scope and character of a work which we cannot but regard as one of the most remarkable productions of the age. It has gained for its author a wide-spread celebrity. His ingenious arguments are discussed in every literary circle; they find an honoured place in our own periodical press; they are not unknown on 'change; and even in our clubs they have been for a time the topic of the day. It is meet, therefore, that a Catholic should be furnished with the means of defence, and thus, in the language of St. Peter, be "ever ready to give a reason of the hope which is in him".

[274]

But what an arduous task this would seem even to the most learned; how utterly beyond the reach of the simple and lowly! Here is an able and accomplished scholar, who presses into his service Hebrew, and Greek, and statistics, and history, and books of travels. These are formidable weapons, which few possess, and fewer still are skilled to use. Yet we need not, therefore, shrink from the encounter. The Catholic Church has provided a defence for all; for the unlettered mechanic, no less than the learned theologian. The one may take shelter beneath the protecting shield of an infallible authority; the other need not fear to venture into the open field, and meet the foe upon his own ground and with his own weapons.

Every Catholic firmly believes that, in virtue of a divine promise, the Church is reserved free from all error in her teaching. Now, on the subject before us, the Church has pronounced her judgment in clear and simple words. In the Council of Trent it is defined that "God is the author of all the books of the Old and of the New Testament"—(sessio quarta). And, surely, it would be nothing short of blasphemy to ascribe to God such a book as the Bible would be in the theory of Dr. Colenso. Therefore, that theory cannot be true, and the arguments by which it is supported must be false and delusive.

It may be that the unlettered Catholic cannot cope with these arguments in detail; cannot tell whether it is that the facts are untrue, or that the logic is unsound. But he well knows that the grace of faith was meant for all, though all have not the learning or the power to unravel the sophistry of error. He may, therefore, in safety cling fast to that Church which is "the pillar and the ground of Truth", and pass by unheeded the eloquence and the subtlety of those who would fain draw him into the arena of controversy. Conscious that he has truth upon his side, he has nothing to fear from the progress of human learning. New sciences may, in their infant struggles, seem for a time to clash with that Revelation which, in God's design, they were meant to confirm, to illustrate, and to adorn. But he may calmly await the issue of the conflict, with a firm conviction that, in the end, the cause of truth must triumph; that, when proof shall have taken the place of conjecture, when theories shall have been tested by facts, when doubt and uncertainty shall have been dispelled by new discoveries, science will then prove to be, as she has ever been, not the enemy of religion, but her friend, and faithful ally.

[275]

It is not fit, however, that all should remain idle spectators of the struggle between science and Revelation. There are many whose intellectual acquirements, and whose opportunities, will permit them to gird on their armour, and to go forth to battle in the cause of truth. The rich treasures of learning and science which they have amassed cannot be better employed, than for

the ornament and defence of the Church of God. Such men, if we may borrow a beautiful figure from the early Fathers, are like the Hebrews of old, who, having carried away the precious spoils of Egypt, laid them, with a profuse generosity, at the feet of Moses for the service of the Tabernacle. As for ourselves, we are sensible that, from our scanty means, we have little to offer. But, in the temple of God, each one may contribute according to the measure of his abilities. While others, therefore, bring their gold, and their silver, and their precious stones, we may humbly venture to make our simple offering at least of hair and skins. 11

We do not mean to examine in detail all the views of Dr. Colenso, nor to refute all his arguments. Such a task would trespass too much on our limited space, and perhaps we may add also, on the patience of our readers. It will be more satisfactory to select a few examples, which may fairly represent the general tone of his book and the peculiar character of his reasoning. He is undoubtedly an agreeable and a plausible writer. His style is graceful and simple; his logic is homely and forcible; his manner is frank and earnest. Above all, he possesses that peculiar tact of a clever and experienced advocate,—when his cause is weak he can disguise its weakness; when it is strong he knows how to exhibit its strength with clearness and vigour. Yet we hope to satisfy our readers that his arguments cannot stand the test of rigid scrutiny. They may indeed attract and amuse that numerous class which is ever in search of what is novel and startling; they may bewilder and perplex the superficial and careless reader; they may even bring conviction to the minds of many who hold the gift of faith with an infirm grasp, and who, in the words of the Apostle, are "carried about by every wind of doctrine". But when submitted to a minute and careful analysis, they will be found to be made up, for the most part, of false assumptions and unsound reasoning.

Let us, in the first place, clearly understand what is the issue we are called upon to discuss. It must be remembered that we have the most convincing, unanswerable proofs that the Pentateuch is a trustworthy history; nay, more, that it is the Word of Eternal Truth. These proofs have for ages stood the test of critical inquiry, and have been accepted as valid by the great bulk of the civilized world. They are not impugned by Dr. Colenso; they are left unshaken, untouched. But he says the history cannot be true, for it contains "many absolute impossibilities", and "a series of manifest contradictions and inconsistencies"—(Part i. p. 11).

[276]

Now we certainly admit that if any history relate as a fact that which is *absolutely impossible*, or if it relate two facts which are *manifestly inconsistent* with each other, it is so far untrue. And if these impossibilities and contradictions are of frequent occurrence, it must forfeit the character of a truthful narrative. But it would be a great mistake to reject as impossibilities those facts which we are simply unable to explain. It often happens that we cannot tell *how* an event took place, though we are quite sure that it *did* take place. No one, for example, has ventured to explain *how* Franz Müller made his escape from the railway carriage on the evening that he murdered Mr. Briggs; and yet all must admit that he *did* escape. When a fact is established by indisputable proof, we must accept that fact, even though we may not be able to point out the means by which it was accomplished. This is a principle so simple and plain that our readers may, perhaps, wonder why we stop to enforce it so strongly. We can only say in reply, that, plain and simple though it is, this principle is often overlooked by Dr. Colenso, as the sequel of our paper will show.

Again, while we reject as false what is *absolutely impossible*, we must not regard as *impossible* what is only *improbable*. Every one is familiar with the common axiom, that it is *very probable* a great many *improbable* things will come to pass. History abounds with examples to confirm the truth of this saying. Take, for instance, the exploits of the first Napoleon, or the career of his nephew, the present Emperor of the French, or the vicissitudes of the ill-fated Louis Philippe. Here the history of a single country, and for a very short period, presents to us a tissue of startling improbabilities. And yet, we all accept the leading facts of that history, because the evidence by which they are established is convincing and overwhelming. Now, the evidence in support of the Pentateuch is of the same character, and of equal weight. Hence, nothing less than an "absolute impossibility", "a manifest contradiction", can at all shake our belief in the truth of the story. If Dr. Colenso prove that such impossibilities and contradictions are to be found in the Pentateuch, he has established his point; if he fail in this, he has done nothing.

The first charge against the historical accuracy of the Bible which we propose to examine, is found in chap. ix. part. i. of Dr. Colenso's work. We shall let the author speak for himself:—

[277]

"*The children of Israel went up harnessed out of the land of Egypt*"—(Ex., xiii. 18).

"The word אֲרֻמָּה , which is here rendered 'harnessed', appears to mean 'armed', or, 'in battle array', in all the other passages where it occurs. * * * It is, however, inconceivable that these down-trodden, oppressed people should have been allowed by Pharaoh to possess arms, so as to turn out at a moment's notice six hundred thousand armed men. If such a mighty host—nearly nine times as great as the whole of Wellington's army at Waterloo—had had arms in their hands, would they not have risen long ago for their liberty, or, at all events, would there have been no danger of their rising? * * Are we to suppose, then, that the Israelites acquired their arms by 'borrowing' on the night of the Exodus? Nothing whatever is said of this, and the idea itself is an extravagant one. But, if even in this, or any other way, they had come to be possessed of arms, is it conceivable that six hundred thousand armed men, in the prime of life, would have cried out in panic terror, 'sore afraid' (Ex., xiv. 10), when they saw that they were being pursued?"—(pp. 48, 49).

He afterwards proceeds to argue on other grounds that, according to the Scripture narrative, the Israelites must have been possessed of arms when they went up out of Egypt:—

"Besides, if they did not take it with them out of Egypt, where did they get the armour with which, about a month afterwards, they fought the Amalekites (*Ex.*, xvii. 8-13), and 'discomfited them with the edge of the sword'? It may, perhaps, be said that they had stripped the Egyptians whom they 'saw lying dead upon the sea-shore' (*Ex.*, xiv. 30). And so writes Josephus (*Ant.*, ii. 16, 6):—'On the next day Moses gathered together the weapons of the Egyptians, which were brought to the camp of the Hebrews by the current of the sea, and the force of the winds assisting it. And he conjectured that this, also, happened by Divine Providence, that so they might not be destitute of weapons'. * * The Bible story, however, says nothing about this stripping of the dead, as surely it must have done if it really took place. * * * And even this supposition will not do away with the fact that the stubborn word חָמוּשִׁים exists in the text before us. Besides, we must suppose that the *whole body* of six hundred thousand warriors were armed when they were numbered (*N.*, i. 3) under Sinai. They possessed arms, surely, at that time, according to the story. How did they get them unless they took them out of Egypt?

"If, then, the historical veracity of this part of the Pentateuch is to be maintained, we must believe that six hundred thousand armed men (though it is inconceivable how they obtained their arms), had, by reason of their long servitude, become so debased and inhuman in their cowardice (and yet they fought bravely enough with Amalek a month afterwards), that they could not strike a single blow for their wives and children, if not for their own lives and liberties, but could only weakly wail and murmur against Moses, saying: 'It had been better for us to serve the Egyptians than that we should die in the wilderness' (*Ex.*, xiv. 12)—(pp. 50, 51.)

[278]

The substance of this objection may be compressed into a few words. It is stated in the Pentateuch that the Israelites went up *armed* out of Egypt. Furthermore it is stated that the number of armed men among them was 600,000. But these statements are utterly inconsistent with other facts contained in the same book. Therefore the narrative cannot be regarded as historically true.

To estimate the value of this argument, it will be necessary to inquire if Dr. Colenso has proved that these two statements are really to be found in the Pentateuch. We maintain that he has not. For the first, he appeals to the words of *Exodus*, xiii. 18: "The children of Israel went up harnessed out of the land of Egypt". This text is indeed conclusive, if it be shown that the Hebrew word חָמוּשִׁים (*Chamushim*), which is here translated *harnessed*, must mean *armed*, and can mean nothing else. But has Dr. Colenso adduced any satisfactory evidence to establish this point, so essential to his argument? Far from it. In the whole Hebrew language there is not a single word of which the meaning is more uncertain. It occurs but four times in the Old Testament, and never later than in the Book of Judges. We must, therefore, be content to conjecture its meaning partly from its etymology, partly from the authority of early versions, and partly from the context of those passages in which it is found. We do not, however, mean to inflict upon our readers the dry details of a philological discussion. Nor could we presume to set up our own judgment in these matters against the opinion of Dr. Colenso. It will be less tedious, and more satisfactory, to appeal to the authority of those who have made the Hebrew language the subject of their special study, and who have availed themselves of all the means which the science of philology can supply, to determine the precise signification of every word in the Bible.

It is quite clear, notwithstanding the ingenious shifts of Dr. Colenso, that the authors of the English Protestant version regarded the word חָמוּשִׁים (*Chamushim*) as one of obscure and doubtful meaning. In the text it is here rendered *harnessed*, and elsewhere (*Jos.*, i. 14; *Jud.*, vii. 11) *armed*. But in the margin a very different idea is suggested,—"by five in a rank", "marshalled by five". The Septuagint is by far the oldest translation we possess of the Hebrew text. It dates almost from a time when the Hebrew was still a spoken language; and therefore the biblical scholars by whom it was produced must have enjoyed many advantages, which all the learning and research of modern times cannot supply. No one, certainly, will maintain that, if the meaning of an important Hebrew word were clear and certain, that meaning could have remained unknown to the authors of this celebrated version. Yet the seventy interpreters appear to have been curiously perplexed about the very word on which Dr. Colenso is so flippant and so confident. Four times it occurs in the text, and each time we find a different translation. Nay, of the four translations, not one corresponds with the translation of Dr. Colenso. First it is rendered *in the fifth generation*— πέμπτη δὲ γενεᾷ (*Ex.*, xiii. 18). Next, *girt as for a journey*— εὐζωνοὶ (*Jos.*, i. 14). Then, *prepared, furnished*— διεσκευασμένοι (*Jos.*, iv. 12). And in the fourth place it is translated *of the fifty*— τῶν πεντήκοντα (*Jud.*, vii. 11).

[279]

Perhaps, however, Dr. Colenso would appeal to the authority of modern Hebrew scholars. If so, we can assure him he would appeal in vain. Amongst lexicographers we may refer to GESENIUS. Under the root חָמוּשׁ (*Chamash*) we find the following explanation:—"Hence, part. pass. plur. חָמוּשִׁים (a word the etymology of which has long been sought for) *i.e. the eager, active, brave, ready prepared for fighting*". Again, ROSENMÜLLER in his Commentary, though he does not reject *armati*, seems to prefer the interpretation generally adopted by the Jews, and supported by the

authority of their paraphrasts. Here are his words: "Nec igitur rejiciendum, quod Hebraei ם'ש'ןן ad quintam costam;—i.e. circa lumbos accinctos proprie significare dicunt, et hoc Exodi loco Israelitas dici exiisse expeditos et accinctos paratosque omnibus ad iter necessariis. Quod ipsum expresserunt Onkelos et duo reliqui Chaldaei paraphrastae", etc.

It would be easy to cite a host of distinguished authorities unfavourable to Dr. Colenso's interpretation. But we may well be content with these two. They certainly deserve a place in the very foremost rank of Hebrew scholars. Moreover, their testimony on the present question is above all suspicion; for it is well known that they share largely in the opinions of Dr. Colenso and his school. Nothing, therefore, could be farther from their purpose than to sacrifice the principles of philology with a view to defend the historical accuracy of the Bible. We beg to remind our readers that we express no opinion as regards the genuine meaning of this disputed word. Our position is simply this: Dr. Colenso's argument is *totally devoid of foundation* unless he *prove* that the word must mean *armed men*; and we maintain that he has utterly failed to do so; that, after all he has written, the meaning of the word still remains uncertain.

He attempts, however, to support his opinion by a fact recorded in the Pentateuch itself: "If they did not take it with them out of Egypt, where did they get the armour, with which, about a month afterwards, they fought the Amalekites (*Ex.*, xvii. 8-13), and 'discomfited them with the edge of the sword'?" Dr. Colenso undertakes to prove that the Israelites are represented by Moses to have gone up *armed* out of Egypt. And here is his proof. If they did not bring the arms with them, where did they get them afterwards? That is to say, after the lapse of thirty-three centuries, when we have nothing to assist us but the very brief and summary narrative of Moses, he asks us to explain in what way the Israelites were supplied with arms. And if, with such scanty means of information, we cannot tell him *how* that fact took place, he infers that it was therefore *impossible*. Such is the flimsy reasoning by which he vainly hopes to shake the foundations of Christian faith. [280]

It seems to us that nothing could be more satisfactory than the explanation suggested by Josephus, to whom Dr. Colenso has himself referred. But such conjectures, however probable in themselves, and well supported by authority, are unnecessary for our purpose. It is not for us to explain *how* the facts actually occurred, but for our adversary to make good his assertion, that they are *absolute impossibilities* or *manifest contradictions*.

If the first assumption in Dr. Colenso's argument is uncertain, the second is manifestly false. He maintains that, not only are the Israelites said to have been *armed*, but that they are represented as having 600,000 armed men. It is the existence of *such a mighty host—nearly nine times as great as the whole of Wellington's army at Waterloo—with arms in their hands*, that seems to him irreconcilable with the condition of a *down-trodden, oppressed people*. It is because the children of Israel had 600,000 *armed men in the prime of life* that he cannot conceive it possible they would have *cried out in panic terror "sore afraid"*.

Now let us grant, for a moment, the point which we have just been disputing, and let us suppose Moses explicitly to declare that the children of Israel went up armed out of Egypt. Would this statement convey that there were 600,000 armed men? We know, indeed, that this was the number of the adult male population. But when we say that a people is armed, we do not mean that every man of twenty years old and upwards is under arms. Within the last two years how often have we heard it said that the Poles were armed against Russia? And yet the number of Poles actually bearing arms was not one-twentieth part of the adult male population. Just in the same way, if it were said that the Israelites were armed, we should understand nothing more than that a certain proportion of the people was armed for the protection of the whole. It would, then, be no matter for surprise that such a collection of armed men, without organisation, without training, should be struck with terror at the sight of the numerous and well-disciplined troops of Pharaoh, fully equipped, and provided with horses and chariots and all the accoutrements of war. [281]

Dr. Colenso, as if anticipating this reply, next appeals to the Book of Numbers: "Besides, we must suppose that the *whole body* of 600,000 warriors were armed, when they were numbered (*Num.*, i. 3.) under Sinai. They possessed arms, surely, at that time, according to the story". Here we join issue with the bishop on two points. First, he insinuates that Moses makes mention somewhere of 600,000 *warriors*. Secondly, he asserts that, *according to the story*, all these warriors *possessed arms*. Now we challenge him to produce a single text from the Pentateuch in which there occurs any mention of 600,000 *warriors*. We are told that the Israelites numbered 600,000 *men* of twenty years old and upward. But where are these men called *warriors*? And again, where is it said that all *possessed arms*? These are points which certainly demand clear and unmistakable evidence. It would be a fact unparalleled in history that every single man over twenty years of age, in the entire nation, should have been *a soldier fully equipped for war*. Our author tells us, indeed, that *we must suppose* they were armed; that they *possessed arms, surely*, at that time. But when we look for his proofs, we find nothing but a naked reference to the third verse in the first chapter in Numbers.

Let us then look into this passage, and see if it corroborates the assertion of Dr. Colenso. Here is the text as we find it in the English Protestant version, to which we must suppose the bishop to have referred:—"Take ye the sum of all the congregation of the children of Israel * * from twenty years old and upward, all that are able to go forth to war in Israel"—(*Numbers*, i. 2, 3). The people were numbered accordingly by Moses and Aaron, and the result is given to us in the same chapter:—"So were all those that were numbered of the children of Israel * * from twenty years

old and upward, all that were able to go forth to war in Israel; even all that were numbered were six hundred thousand and three thousand and five hundred and fifty"—(vv. 45, 46). If we are to rely upon this version, it is clear that Moses does not say there were 600,000 *warriors*, nor 600,000 men *possessed of arms*, nor 600,000 men that *went to war*, but, simply, 600,000 men *fit to go to war*,—in other words, 600,000 men in the prime of life.

But perhaps Dr Colenso would prefer to be judged by the authority of the Hebrew text. Those who were numbered are described by the words $\text{כָּל־יֹצֵאֵי־צִבָּא}$ (*kol yotze tzaba*)—*every one going forth to the host*. In the opinion of Dr. Colenso this must mean every one belonging to the army—every *armed warrior*. Let us see if this interpretation is borne out by the use of the same phrase in other passages. We find it prescribed (*Numbers*, viii. 25) that at the age of fifty the Levites shall return from the *host* (צִבָּא —*tzaba*) of the service". Now, it is well known that the Levites were not permitted to serve in the army. Therefore, the word *host* (צִבָּא) does not here mean the *army*, but, as all commentators explain it, the body of Levites engaged in the active service of the Tabernacle. Again, we read (*Gen.* ii. 1). "The heavens and the earth were finished, and all the *host* (צִבָּא) of them". In this passage the word manifestly refers to the works of the creation which had just been completed. It is also frequently applied by the prophets to the heavenly bodies, 12 and to the choirs of angels. 13 This word, therefore, in its primary sense, would seem to represent a collection of men or things *marshalled in order*. Frequently, indeed, and most fitly, it was used to designate an army; but we deny that it was employed exclusively in that signification.

If, then, we seek to ascertain its exact meaning in the first chapter of *Numbers*, we must examine the context in which it is found, and the circumstances to which it refers. Moses is commanded by God to number the people, and the way in which he executed that command is accurately described. There is not a word, in this, or the following chapters, about soldiers, or arms, or warfare. The object of the census was simply to distribute the people of Israel, according to their tribes and families, around the Tabernacle which stood in the midst of the camp. The position of each tribe was clearly defined, with a view to the preservation of strict order and regularity. May we not, then, fairly infer that by the *host* is here meant the whole people of Israel *marshalled*, as they were, *in order* around the Tabernacle? It is probable that those only were numbered who were responsible members of the community, that is to say, all the fathers of families.

We conclude that the argument of Dr. Colenso fails to establish any inconsistency in the sacred narrative: first, because it is quite uncertain that the Israelites are said to have been *armed*; secondly, because it is simply false that they are represented to have had 600,000 *armed warriors*.

Our readers will perhaps be disappointed to find that they have reached the end of our paper, and that out of the many objections of Dr. Colenso, we have answered but one. We confess, indeed, we have done but little. Yet it is something if we have parried even a single blow that was aimed at the Ark of God. It is something if we have struck down even one of that daring and defiant host with which Dr. Colenso has essayed to storm the citadel of truth.

[283]

LITURGICAL QUESTIONS.

From among the many questions with which we have been favoured, our space allows us to attend in this number only to the following. For the others we shall find place next month.

I.

1º. Can *black* or *violet* vestments be used *indifferently* at *Requiem* Masses, as stated in the *Ceremonial* of Baldeschi, edited by Vavaseur? (page 14), *Paris*, 1859.

2º. "Rubrica de coloribus paramentorum non est praeceptiva, sed directiva, unde non inducit rigorosam obligationem; quia praeceptum S. Pii V. latum in bulla missalis, ex quo rubricae vim obligandi habent, non se extendit ad hanc rubricam de coloribus". Ferraris, in voc. *Paramenta Sacra*.

Can a priest, therefore, use at *Requiem* Masses vestments of any colour, when, on any occasion, the number of priests to celebrate are many, and the black or violet vestments few? Can we conclude that, in such circumstances, the obligation of the rubric ceases?

3º. Must the *ciborium* containing particles to be consecrated, be placed not merely on the corporal, but also on the altar stone? What is to be done when the altar-stone is too small to contain the chalice and large host? Can the ciborium be placed outside the stone, or should the particles be taken from the ciborium and arranged on the corporal, so as to rest on the altar-stone?

In reply to the first question, we beg to state that black or violet vestments, in our opinion, cannot be used indiscriminately. The Rubric of the Missal clearly lays down that black vestments are to be used, and we are not aware of any authoritative decree stating the general principle that one or the other can be used at discretion. The custom, no doubt, has been introduced of using the violet colour in many places; but in several instances this was done and sanctioned by authority, through a necessity which would justify a departure from the Rubric, inasmuch as there might not be a supply of black vestments; in other instances, it may have been done in consequence of the opinion gradually gaining ground that black or violet could be used indifferently. It appears to us more correct to say, that in case of necessity the violet can be used without much difficulty.

[284]

But our reverend correspondent gives, as his authority, the *Ceremonial* of Baldeschi, edited by Vavaseur, 1859. We have consulted this author, and we find that he refers the reader to the *Ordo Divini Officii*, Roma. In this ordo it is stated that the colour in Missa Defunctorum is niger vel violaceus. And the following note is appended: "S. R. C. Ann. 1670. 21 Jun. v. Cardellini in Nota ad quaest. 3. Decret. 4440. Cujus tamen coloris (violacei) parcus admodum erit usus, et fortasse solum in aliquali necessitate; sic Cavalieri". The decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites here referred to, is as follows: Oritana—"Sacra Congregatio censuit servandum esse decretum vicarii in Ecclesia Cathedrali ne in posterum celebrentur Missae defunctorum nisi cum colore nigro vel saltem violaceo ... Hoc die 21 Junii, 1670".

The word *saltem* appears to us not to allow the indiscriminate use of black or violet, but rather the use of the violet, when the black vestments are not at hand.

It may not be out of place to observe here, that there are two decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences which illustrate this subject.

Dub. 1. "Utrum qui privilegium habet personale pro quatuor Missis in hebdomadis singulis debeat cum paramentis coloris nigri celebrare diebus non impeditis ut possit indulgentiam Plenariam pro Animabus Defunctorum lucrari?"

Dub. 2. "Utrum qui celebrat in Altari Privilegiato pro singulis diebus debeat semper uti paramentis nigris diebus non impeditis ut indulgentiam Privilegii consequatur?"

"Ad primum dubium resp. Affirmative. Ad secundum pariter ut in primo.

"Ita decrevit sub die 11 Aprilis, 1840".

From these two decrees it is quite clear that it is indispensable for a priest to celebrate in black vestments on the days allowed, of course, in order to gain the plenary indulgence, *ut possit indulgentiam plenariam pro animabus defunctorum lucrari*. If the black or violet could be used indifferently, there exists no reason for confining this important privilege of a plenary indulgence to a Requiem Mass said in black vestments. We are of opinion, therefore, that, as a general rule, the black vestments are to be used, and the violet only *ex aliquali necessitate*, as has been remarked in a directory which we have before us. 'We must, however, observe that in the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* it is stated that the bishop assisting at a Requiem Mass can use a black or violet cope: "Si Episcopus noluerit celebrare, sed hujusmodi missae pro defunctis per alium celebratae interesse eadem norma in omnibus servabitur, quae expressa est in capite praecedenti; ipse vero Episcopus cum cappa, vel cum pluviali nigro seu violaceo facta confessione cum celebrante ibit cum suis assistentibus ad sedem suam"—*Caeremoniale Episcoporum*, libro 2^o, cap. 12, no. i.

[285]

This, however, only applies to the bishop.

Again, the *Caeremoniale*, in the same book, chapter 25th, no. vi., treating of the function of Good Friday, says: "Episcopus et omnes utuntur paramentis nigris si haberi possint et deficientibus nigris coloris violacei".

We now come to the second question, and in our answer we shall probably have to make some observations closely connected with the subject matter of the first question. We hold that the rubric de coloribus paramentorum is *praeceptiva*. There are two decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites bearing on this subject.

1. "Inter postulata a Reverendissimo Episcopo Vicen. in visitatione ad Limina transmissa unum extat, quo ipse jure conqueritur de confusione colorum in paramentis sacrosancto Missae sacrificio, aliisque functionibus deservientibus, quae etiamsi sacris ritibus opposita in dicta tamen civitate et in ceteris Episcopatus Ecclesiis conspicitur. Huic propterea abusui providere, imo de medio tollere volens, humillime supplicavit idem Episcopus pro opportuno remedio. Et Sac. Rituum. Congregatio in ordinario coetu ad Vaticanum coacto respondendum censuit *Serventur omnino rubricae generales*: facta tamen potestate Episcopo indulgendi ut in Ecclesiis pauperibus permittat illis uti donec consumantur". 19 Decemb., 1829. in Vicen.

2. "Potestne continuari usus illarum Ecclesiarum quae pro colore tam albo, quam rubro, viridi et violaceo utuntur paramentis flavii coloris vel mixtis diversis coloribus, praesertim si colores a rubrica praescripti in floribus reperiantur? Resp. Servetur strictim Rubrica quoad colorem indumentorum, 12 Nov., 1831. Marsor. ad dub. 54. Vide *Manuale Decretorum S. Rituum Congregationis*".

In these two decrees, the observance of the Rubric with regard to the colour of the vestments is prescribed, "*servetur strictim Rubrica quoad colorem indumentorum*". Such a form of words appears to us inconsistent with the opinion that the said rubric is merely *directiva*.

We may also observe that even the use of many colours, or rather the mixture of them, is laid down as an abuse to be abolished, and power is granted to the bishop to allow the use of such vestments in *poor churches* until they shall be no longer fit for use. If it be an abuse to use many colours, how much greater the abuse if a colour be used quite opposed to the rubric! It therefore seems to us that the opinion of Ferraris is at variance with what the Sacred Congregation of Rites lays down on this subject. He holds that the bull of St. Pius V., "*non se extendit ad hanc rubricam de coloribus*", and the Congregation of Rites says, "*servetur strictim Rubrica quoad colorem indumentorum*". Indeed we must say that all discussion appears to us to be set aside on this point by these decrees, particularly if we keep in view a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites dated 23rd. May, 1846, which was afterwards approved and confirmed by the present Pope on the 17th July, 1848, and which is as follows: "Decreta a Sacra Congregatione emanata et responsiones quaecumque ab ipsa propositis dubiis scripto formiter editae, eadem habeant auctoritatem, ac si immediate ab ipso summo Pontifice promanarent, quamvis nulla facto, fuerit de iisdem relatio Sanctitati Suae". We hold, therefore, that the rubric is *praeceptiva*, and ought not to be departed from unless in such cases where a real necessity would warrant us to do so; and we may add that we would not consider it lawful to use white vestments in a Requiem Mass, inasmuch as we cannot conceive what necessity could turn up to justify such a departure from the rubric. Much better would it be, in such a case, to say the Mass of the day occurring, or some other votive Mass.

[286]

With regard to the third question, we beg to say that the ciborium or particles ought to be placed on the altar-stone, and that not only during the consecration, but to the communion. The chalice and host must be placed on it, according to the rubric; of the missal, and we see no reason why the same thing is not to be done with the small particles which are to be consecrated. St. Alphonsus Liguori is clearly of this opinion: "Non igitur licet ante communionem ponere particulas consecratas extra aram". La Croix, treating of the same subject, says: "Post communionem sacerdotis possunt parvae hostiae ab eo consecratae poni extra aram in corporali"; and he gives the following reason: "Quia omnes sunt unica victima et per modum unius offeruntur". Indeed La Croix, for the same reason, states that it would be unlawful to have a second altar-stone, in case the one would not be large enough to hold the small particles together with the chalice and host: "Si unum portatile non possit cum hostia et calice capere omnes particulas consecrandas, illicitum esset has collocare et consecrare in alio portatili vicino". The best, and indeed the only remedy we can suggest, especially where there are many communicants, is to procure a large altar-stone. We have heard of some bishops declining to consecrate any stone that was under fourteen inches in length, and twelve inches in width, at least. It is unnecessary to observe that there is great danger, and irreverence too, in placing a large number of particles on a very small space or corner of an altar-stone, where an accident, and that of the most serious nature, is likely to take place at any moment. Perhaps it may not be amiss to remark, also, that those theologians who hold the opinion that the rubrics are merely *directivae*, except always such rubrics as are closely connected with the Most Blessed Sacrament, and maintain that those are *praeceptivae*. We conclude, therefore, that the ciborium or particles ought to be placed on the altar-stone, and if the altar-stone be too small for the chalice and host, it ought not to be used.

[287]

II.

1º. At High Mass, ought the celebrant to elevate the Host before the choir has terminated the singing of the Sanctus and following words?

Answer: The *Caeremoniale Episcop.* lib. ii. no. 70, gives the answer: "Chorus prosequitur cantum usque ad *Benedictus qui venit* exclusive: quo *finito et non prius* elevatur sacramentum. Tunc silet chorus et cum aliis adorat. Organum vero, si habetur, cum omni tunc melodia et gravitate pulsandum est". The celebrant ought to proceed slowly with the canon, so as to give time to the choir to terminate their part before he comes to the elevation. The choir ought to be cautioned not to protract the singing of the Sanctus too much.

2º. At High Mass, when the celebrant has sung "Et ne nos inducas in tentationem", in the Pater Noster, is he bound to wait until the choir has finished singing "Sed libera nos a malo", before he says Amen?

Answer: According to a ceremonial much esteemed in Rome, published by a missionary of St. Vincent, in Bologna, 1854, l. iv. no. 1484, the priest is bound to wait. The choir *agit partem ministri* in its answers at High Mass, and on that account the priest must wait until it responds to him, as on other occasions he waits until the server or clerk terminates his answers.

After the priest has sung "Pax Domini sit semper vobiscum", he must also wait until the choir has sung "Et cum spiritu tuo", before he says "Haec commixtio", etc.

3º. When the deacon has sung "Ite Missa est", can the celebrant, without waiting for the choir to answer "Deo gratias", turn to the altar and say the prayer "Placeat"?

Answer: The *Caeremoniale*, Ep. l. ii. c. viii. no. 78, says: "Diaconus vertit faciem ad populum,

[288]

renes autem celebranti ... et cantat (Ite missa est) ... quo dicto, *ipse et celebrans simul* vertunt se per latus epistolae ad altare, et celebrans dicit (Placeat tibi, S. Trinitas, etc)". As the singing of "Deo gratias" occupies so short a time, it will terminate before the priest can turn to the altar; in any case, he ought not to commence the Placeat until the choir has responded.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Kilkee, February 7th, 1865.

To the Editors of the Irish Ecclesiastical Record.

GENTLEMEN,

Be pleased to allow me to bring under your notice a slight mistake noticeable in the January issue of your *Record*, and in doing so I may be permitted to express my great satisfaction, and that of all those who spoke to me on the subject, with the interesting and varied matter in your *Record*. Your high character, not to speak of stronger reasons, will secure for your statements a ready acceptance with Catholics, and this, coupled with the very faultless character of your extensively read periodical, renders me anxious to have it the medium of correction to its own mistakes, however slight. The learned writer on the Irish sees of the sixteenth century, speaking of the vicissitudes of Clonmacnois, and of its subjection to the metropolitical see of Tuam, says, in p. 158 of the *Record*: "This change probably took place during the episcopate of Bishop Symon of the Order of St. Dominick, who, though omitted in the lists of Ware and De Burgo, was appointed to the see on the death of Dr. Henry in 1349". Now, Symon was never Bishop of Clonmacnois. Indeed, as remarked by the learned writer in the *Record*, Theiner gives, in page 291, the bull of his appointment. But the appointment was null, as the see was not vacant by the death of Dr. Henry. Hence, by looking to the next page of Theiner, you will see how good Pope Clement VI. acknowledges and rectifies the mistake by appointing Symon to the see of Kildare, then vacant. The report of Dr. Henry's death was unfounded; therefore, as the bull of Pope Clement declares, Symon was not, and in the circumstances could not have been, Bishop of Clonmacnois. "Cum autem sicut postea vera relatio ad nos perduxit", etc., the Pope says, addressing Symon, "tu nullius Ecclesiae remansisti".

I remain, Gentlemen,
Your obedient servant,

SYLVESTER MALONE.

[289]

[We feel much obliged to our learned and reverend correspondent for the interest he takes in the success and the accuracy of the *Record*, and we beg to assure him that the greatest attention will be paid to every communication and suggestion from him, or from any other promoter of the study of Irish ecclesiastical literature or antiquities. In publishing the *Record*, our only desire is to illustrate and uphold truth, and thus to promote the interests of religion.

We regret that, our colleague who treated of the See of Clonmacnoise in the January number being at present absent, we have not been able to communicate to him the remarks contained in the above letter; we can therefore only state that, as he was not treating of the fourteenth century, he referred only incidentally to the appointment of Bishop Symon in order to fix the period at which a change had been "*probably*" effected in a matter of ecclesiastical jurisdiction connected with the See of Clonmacnoise, and that he had no intention of giving the history of the bishops of that diocese, or of entering into a question which was not connected with his subject; so that, having fixed the date in question with accuracy—as he does by referring to the appointment of Bishop Symon to Clonmacnoise, as given by Theiner—it did not appear necessary for him to proceed farther.

However that may be, we can safely promise in the name of our colleague, that he will be happy to correct any mistake into which he may have fallen. He will be able to do so the more readily because he has been requested to publish in a separate volume all he has written on the succession of the Bishops in the various Sees of Ireland. When corrected and completed, these articles will be a valuable accession to our ecclesiastical history, whilst they will supply a triumphant answer to an assertion of the learned Dr. Todd in the preface to his *Life of St. Patrick*, viz.: that the original Irish Church, having merged into the Church of the English Pale, adopted the Reformation in the sixteenth century. That assertion undoubtedly was made hastily and without sufficient reflection. Any one who reads the articles of the *Record* will find that it has no foundation in fact. Penal laws, indeed, and brute force were employed to propagate the Reformation in Ireland, but the true faith was so deeply rooted in the minds of the clergy and laity of the "original Irish Church" that all the powers of Hell could not exterminate it.

As to Bishop Symon, mentioned by our correspondent, it appears that he was appointed in 1349

by Clement VI. to Derry, not to Kildare. According to Ware, there was no vacancy in that year in this last see, as it was occupied from 1334 to 1365 by Richard Hulot and Thomas Giffard. But in the list of the Bishops of Derry given by Ware, a Bishop Symon, of some order of friars, is mentioned as filling that see in 1367 and 1369. The historian states that he could not discover to what religious order that prelate belonged, or what was the date of his consecration. The valuable documents published by the Archivist of the Vatican, F. Theiner, show that Bishop Symon was of the Order of St. Dominick, that he was consecrated by Talleyrand, Bishop of Albano, that he was appointed to Derry in 1349, and that he succeeded a Bishop Maurice who was unknown to Ware. A copy of the brief appointing Bishop Symon to Derry, was sent to the Archbishop of Armagh, as appears from Theiner, p. 292. This shows that the *Ecclesia Darensis* conferred on Bishop Symon belonged to the province of Armagh. Kildare, indeed, was called by the same name, but it belonged to a different province. Theiner gives the appointment of a Bishop of Kildare at page 261, in which reference is made to his metropolitan of Dublin. At page 64 *Ecclesia Darensis* is mentioned again, but it is stated to belong to the metropolitan of Armagh. Thus, although Derry and Kildare went by the same name, it is not difficult to determine to which see the papal Bulls regarding them belong, because mention is generally made of the metropolitan to whose suffragan the document is addressed.]

[290]

DOCUMENTS.

I.

LETTER OF THE IRISH BISHOPS TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE HENRY GRATTAN, M.P.

We publish the following letter, addressed by the Irish Bishops to Mr. Grattan in the year 1795. It shows how anxious those Prelates always were to unite education and religion, and to preserve the sources of knowledge from being contaminated by error and infidelity.

Sir,

We, the under-written Roman Catholic prelates of Ireland, having, on behalf of ourselves and absent brethren, already expressed our wants and wishes respecting clerical education, in the minutes submitted to your revision and correction, take the liberty at present to explain some of them more particularly, in order to remove misapprehensions which may furnish an occasion of perplexity or equivocation. As the principle of our application to parliament seems universally admitted, we shall confine ourselves to those parts only of the detail to which, as we hear, objections have been made.

[291]

It is said, that as our plan extends to the education of the laity, the appointment of professors to lecture on philosophy, mathematics, rhetoric, and the languages, which are common to clergy and laity, should not be vested in the bishops only, because these branches of learning are not intimately connected with religion and morality, and much less with the peculiar duties of ecclesiastics.

We cannot subscribe to this position, as experience has convinced us of the fatal impressions made on youth in all times and places, particularly in France, by infidel, seditious, or immoral professors even of grammar, and proved the necessity of scrupulous attention to the principles and conduct of every teacher previous to his admission into any seminary or school. It is always more advisable to prevent evil in this manner, than punish the whisperers of atheism and Jacobinism by a controlling power in the bishops to expel them. Moreover, the exercise of this control will appear odious to many, must occasion clamour, and would frequently excite disputes between the bishops and lay friends of those unworthy professors or lecturers.

These observations, as you will perceive, are grounded on a supposition that the intended colleges are to be regulated on the precise plan presented to your consideration. We extended it to *general instruction* on the suggestion of our zealous and patriot agent at London, who constantly assured us, that it was the earnest wish of the Duke of Portland, Earl Fitzwilliam, Mr. Burke, and others, that the laity should not be excluded from the benefit of public instruction in the proposed colleges.

It appears from our printed memorial to Lord Westmoreland, of which we enclose a copy, that our original views were confined to clerical education only.

This continues to be the great object of our anxious wishes and solicitude; and as no one, to our knowledge, controverts the exclusive competency of the bishops to superintend and regulate it, we are perfectly satisfied to arrange the education of persons not destined for the sacred ministry on another proper plan, to be hereafter concerted.

As four hundred *clerical* students are absolutely necessary to preserve the succession

of Roman Catholic Clergy in this kingdom, we have, after very mature deliberation, judged it expedient to establish one house in each province for their education. It is needless now to enter into a detail of our motives. They are many and weighty. We shall mention one. By our having a college in each province, the opulent and religious Catholics will be more strongly excited to grant donations to an establishment in their own neighbourhood, than they would be to others at a great distance, which many of them may view with jealousy, and feel hurt at not being equally accommodated.

We confidently hope that these four colleges will equally partake of the national bounty in whatever time it may be granted by Parliament. It never was our wish or intention that you should introduce our plan of education or any part of it into Parliament, until the Bill on general Emancipation shall be disposed of, as we always considered the success of this to depend in a great measure on that of the other.

[292]

We understand that the appointment by us of a Medical and Chymical Lecturer is objected to from our incompetency to judge of his knowledge in these sciences.

It was our design to consult learned professional men on the choice of such lecturers, after ascertaining their principles and conduct; neither did this measure of a Chymical or Medical Professor originate with us. It was likewise suggested by our agent at London to Government from motives of humanity. We shall most readily give up that point, if required, as it made no part of our own plan.

With the firmest reliance on your brilliant exertions in promoting the measure we have so much at heart for the advantage of society in this kingdom, and with due deference to your instructions in conducting it on our parts, we have the honour to remain, etc.

Dublin, 2nd February, 1795.

Signed by eighteen Prelates.

- ✠ JOHN THOMAS TROY, of Dublin.
- ✠ THOMAS BRAY, of Cashel.
- ✠ FRANCIS MOYLAN, of Cork.
- ✠ GERARD TEAHAN, of Kerry.
- ✠ WM. COPPINGER, of Cloyne and Ross.
- ✠ JAMES CAULFIELD, of Ferns.
- ✠ DANIEL DELANY, of Kildare and Leighlin.
- ✠ DOMINICK BELLEW, of Killala.
- ✠ EDMUND TRENCH, of Elphin.
- ✠ RICHARD O'REILLY, of Armagh.
- ✠ BOETIUS EGAN, of Tuam.
- ✠ P. J. PLUNKETT, of Meath.
- ✠ HUGH O'REILLY, of Clogher.
- ✠ MATT. LENNAN, of Dromore.
- ✠ JOHN CRUISE, of Ardagh.
- ✠ M'MULLEN, of Down and Connor.
- ✠ CHARLES O'REILLY, Coadjutor of Kilmore.
- ✠ DILLON, Coadjutor of Kilfenora and Kilmacduagh.

[293]

II.

LETTER OF CARDINAL ANTONELLI TO THE ARCHBISHOPS OF IRELAND IN 1791 REGARDING THE CHANGE IN THE CONSECRATION OATH OF BISHOPS.

PER-ILLUSTRES ET REVERENDISSIMI DOMINI UTI FRATRES,

Ex literis vestris sub die 17 Novembris anni 1789 scriptis summopere Vos commoveri intelleximus, quod cum in lucem prodierit quidam libellus a Pseudo-Episcope Cloynensi conscriptus, *De praesenti Statu Ecclesiae*, occasionem inde ceperint obtrectatores nostri, veteris calumniae adversus Catholicam Religionem acrius refricandae nullo scilicet, modo posse hanc, salva Regum, ac Rerumpublicarum incolumitate, consistere. Cum enim, inquirunt, Romanus Pontifex omnium Catholicorum Pater ac Magister sit, ac tanta praeditus auctoritate, ut alienorum Regnorum subditos a fide, ac Sacramento Regibus ac principibus praestito relaxare possit, eumdem facili negotio turbas ciere, ac publicae regnorum tranquillitati nocere posse propugnant.

Miramur his vos querelis turbari potuisse, cum praesertim praeclarissimus iste Frater vester, et consors Apostolici muneris Archiepiscopus Caselliensis, aliique strenui jurium Apostolicae Sedis Defensores maledica ista convicia egregiis scriptis refutarint plane ac diluerint. Quid igitur proderit, novam nunc quemadmodum petitis, edi ab hac Apostolica Sede declarationem, ut sua jura tueatur, explicet, atque a criminationibus vindicet? Nihil hoc esset aliud, quam adversus ipsammet Catholicam Fidem novos excitare hostes. Ea enim est hujus nostri temporis improborum hominum

mens, atque animus, ut dum certare se simulant adversus Apostolicae Sedis jura, contra ipsam tamen Fidem intentant aciem, eamque unitatem, quam Catholicae universi Orbis Ecclesiae cum Apostolica Petri Cathedra firmissime retinent, convellere, ac labefactare conantur.

Itaque ad hujusmodi conatus nolite expavescere; jam enim toties eorum calumniae repulsae sunt, ut nihil nunc agant, quam vetera ut nova proponere, instaurare disjecta, detecta retexere. Probe jam noverat Sanctissimus ille, nec sapientia minus, quam pietatis laude clarissimus Antistes Franciscus Salesius, nonnisi ad ciendas turbas, atque ad imbecilles animos commovendos, agitari haec passim, ac in vulgus jactari. Qua de re luculentissimum ille testimonium edidit epistola 764, tom. 6, edit. Parisien., an. 1758; quam vobis, non perlegendam modo, sed ut providam adhibendae moderationis normam, prae oculis habendam valde consulimus. Eodem exemplo, vos quoque insidias detegite, et populos vestrae sollicitudini commissos docete, quae recta sunt, ut a laqueis, quos ante pedes struunt, declinare discant, ne in transversum agantur. Id sane cum vestra pietate dignum, tum etiam a vestra auctoritate profectum, multo magis Fidelium vestrae Pastoralis curae concreditorum mentibus insidebit atque ab obtrectatorum calumniis vindicabit. Minime enim vobis pro vestra doctrina ignotum esse arbitramur, quatenus sint Apostolicae Sedis jura, quibusque argumentis propugnare possint. In hac causa illud accuratissime est distinguendum, quae sibi jure optimo vindicet Apostolica Sedes ab iis, quae ad inferendam calumniam a Novatoribus hujus saeculi eidem affiguntur. Nunquam Romana Sedes docuit haeterodoxis fidem non esse servandam, violari quacumque ex causa posse juramentum, Regibus a Catholica communione disjunctis praestitum; Pontifici Romano licere temporalia eorum jura, ac dominia invadere. Horrendum vero, ac detestabile facinus etiam apud nos est, si quis unquam, atque etiam religionis praetextu in Regum ac Principum vitam audeat quidpiam, aut molitur. Non haec consecraria sunt ejus auctoritatis, qua valeat Romanus Pontifex in extremo religionis discrimine, jurisjurandi vinculum solvere, quam tamen satis vobis compertum est nec inter fidei dogmata recenseri, nec pro haereticis haberi, qui ab ea dissentiunt.

[294]

Verum neque etiam in nullo pretio haberi voluit postulationes vestras Sanctissimus Pontifex Pius VI. ut enim omnis carpenti, ac calumniandi eradicetur occasio, quam quidam, ut scribitis, sumunt ex iis verbis formulae juramenti obedientiae Apostolicae Sedi praestandae et ab Episcopis in eorum consecratione adhibendae, *Haereticos pro posse persequar et impugnabo*, et quam quasi classicum ad bellum iis indicendum, et tamquam hostes persequendos, atque impugnandos malevole interpretantur, non intelligentes, eam persecutionem, atque impugnationem, quam contra haereticos Episcopi suscipiunt, ad illud studium, ac conatum referri, quo eos ad saniores mentem perducere, ac Ecclesiae Catholicae reconciliare nituntur, Sanctitas Sua benigne annuit, ut loco precedentis juramenti formulae, altera subrogetur quae ab Archiepiscopo Mohiloviensi, tota plaudente Petropolitana Aula, ipsaque Imperatrice adstante palam perlecta est, quamque his litteris alligatam ad vos transmittimus.

Ceterum Praesules Amplissimi, qui isthic agitis excubias Domini florentissimasque istas Hiberniae Ecclesias, divina gratia adspirante ex Apostolice Sedis gratia administrandas suscepistis, huic Petri Cathedra in qua Dominus posuit verbum veritatis, firmiter adhaerete, praedicate Evangelium Christi in omni patientia, ac doctrina: in omnibus praebete vosmetipsos exemplum bonorum operum, in doctrina, in integritate, in gravitate, verbum sanum, irreprehensibile. Haec si feceritis, quemadmodum jam fecisse, et deinceps incensus facturos non dubitamus, non modo vestra virtute, ac constantia male contextas calumnias propulsabitis, verum etiam qui *ex adverso sunt verebuntur, nihil habentes malum dicere de vobis*.

Enim vero, quis est, cui non perspicua sint illa, quae Ecclesia Romana omnium mater et magistra de praestanda a subditis saeculi potestatibus obedientia, praedicat, docet, ac praecipit?

Ab ipso nascentis Ecclesiae exordio Apostolorum Princeps B. Petrus, Fideles instruens, ita eos hortabatur—*Subjecti estote omni humanae creaturae propter Deum: sive Regi, quasi praecellenti, sive Ducibus, tamquam ab eo missis ad vindictam malefactorum, laudem vero bonorum, quia sic est voluntas Dei, ut beneficientes obtumescere faciatis imprudentium hominum ignorantiam*. His praeceptis instituta Catholica Ecclesia, quum Gentiles furentibus odiis adversus Christianos, tamquam Imperii hostes, debacharentur, praeclarissimi Christiani nominis defensores respondebant—*Precantes* (Tertul. *In Apologet.*, c. 30) *sumus omnes semper pro omnibus Imperatoribus, vitam illis prolixam, imperium securum, Domum tutam, exercitum fortem, senatum fidelem, populum probum, Orbem quietum*—Id ipsum saepius Romani Pontifices Petri successores inculcare non destiterunt, praesertim ad missionarios, ne ulla Catholicae fidei cultoribus, ab hostibus Christiani nominis crearetur invidia.

[295]

Praeclarissima in hanc rem veterum Romanorum Pontificum monumenta proferre pretermittimus, quae vos ipsi non ignoratis. Verum nuperrimum sapientissimi Pontificis Benedicti XIV. monitum vobis in memoriam revocare arbitramur, qui in iis regulis, quas pro Missionibus Anglicanis observandas proposuit, quaeque vobis etiam communes sunt, ita inquit—*Sedulo incumbant Vicarii Apostolici, ut missionarii*

saeculares probe honesteque in omnibus se gerant, quo aliis bono exemplo sint, et in primis sacris officiis celebrandis, opportunisque institutionibus populo tradendis, atque infirmis opera sua sublevandis praesto sint, ut a publicis otiosorum coetibus, et cauponis omnimode caveant ... at potissimum ipsimet vicarii, omni qua possunt ratione, severe tamen illos puniant, qui de publico regimine cum honore sermonem non habent.

Testis autem ipsamet Anglia esse potest, quam alte istius modi monita in Catholicorum animis radicitus egerint. In nupero enim, qua tota fere America conflagravit bello, cum florentissimae Provinciae, in quibus universa fere gens a Catholica Ecclesia disjuncta immoratur, Magnae Britanniae Regis imperium abjecissent, sola Canadensis Provincia, quae Catholicis pene innumeris constat, quamquam callidis artibus tentata, atque etiam aviti Gallorum dominii haud immemor, in obsequio tamen Anglorum perstitit fidelissime. Haec vos, egregii Antistites, crebris usurpate sermonibus, haec Episcopis Suffraganeis vestris saepius in memoriam revocate. Cum ad populum pro concione verba facitis, iterum, atque iterum illum admonete, *omnes honorare, fraternitatem diligere, Deum timere, Regem honorificare*. Quae quidem Christiani hominis officia cum in omni Regno, atque imperio colenda sunt, tum maxime in isto vestro Britannico, in quo Regis sapientissimi, aliorumque praeclarissimorum Regni procerum ea est in Catholicos voluntas, ut non asperum, ac grave jugum imponant cervicibus vestris, sed leni, ac blando regimine ipsi etiam Catholici utantur. Hanc agendi rationem si unanimes retinueritis, si omnia vestra in charitate fiant, si id unum respexeritis in regenda plebe Domini, salutem nimirum animarum; verebuntur (iterum confirmamus), adversarii quidpiam dicere de vobis, ultroque fatebuntur, Catholicam fidem non modo ad beatam vitam assequendam, sed etiam (Epis. 138) ut B. Augustinus inquit in epistola ad Marcellinum, ad terrenae hujus Civitatis firmissimam pacem, atque ad Regnorum columnen, ac praesidium tutissimum a caelo esse delapsam: *qui doctrinam Christi, verba sunt S. Doctoris, adversum dicunt esse Reipublicae dent exercitum talem, quales doctrina Christi esse milites jussit, dent tales provinciales, tales maritos, tales conjuges, tales parentes, tales filios, tales dominos, tales servos, tales reges, tales judices, tales denique debitorum redditores, et exactores ipsius fisci, quales esse praecipit doctrina Christiana, et audeant eam dicere adversam esse Reipublicae, imo vero non dubitent eam confiteri magnam, si ei obtemperetur, salutem esse Reipublicae*. Hujus porro salutaris doctrinae constantem, ac firmam integritatem non nisi in Catholica Societate consistere, ac vigere, quae videlicet communionem cum Romana Sede velut sacro unitatis vinculo divinitus adstricta per totum Orbem diffunditur, ac sustentatur, idem S. Doctor, caeterique unanimi consensu Ecclesiae Patres invictis plane argumentis apertissimè demonstrant. Deus Opt. Max. Vos incolumes diutissime servet quemadmodum enixe optamus pro summo nostro erga vos studio ac voluntate. Valete.

[296]

Amplit. Vestrarum. Romae 23 Junii 1791.

Uti Frater Studiosissimus.
L. CARD. ANTONELLUS, Praef.

A. Archiep. Adven. Secretarius.

Dominis Archiepiscopis Regnis Hiberniae.

III.

RESCRIPT PERMITTING A LOW MASS DE REQUIEM TO BE SAID EVEN ON DOUBLES
PRAESENTE CADAVERE.

PERMISSIO LEGENDI MISSAM DE REQUIEM IN FESTIS DUPL.

BEATISSIME PATER,

Vicarii Apostolici Angliae atque eorum nomine Nicolaus Wiseman, Episcopus Melipotamensis et in districtu, centrali vicarii Apostolici coadjutor, ad pedes Sanctitatis Tuae provoluti humillime supplicant ut benigne dignetur concedere, indultum in Scotia jam existens ut scilicet in eis locis in quibus ob Sacerdotum inopiam missa cantari non possit, legi possint etiam in festis duplicibus missae privatae *de Requiem* praesente cadavere. Quare, etc.

EX AUDIENTIA SANCTISSIMI HABITA DIE 7 MARTII 1847.

Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Pius divina providenta PP. IX. referente me infrascripto Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide Secretario, perpensis expositis indultum jam alias concessum Vicariatus Apostolicis Scotiae, benigne extendit ad omnes

vicariatus Apostolicos Angliae servatis in reliquis tenore ac forma indulti memorati Contrariis quibuscunque non obstantibus.

Datum Romae, ex aedib. dic. Sac. Congregationis die et anno quibus supra.

Gratis sine ulla omnino solutione quocunque titulo,
JOANNES ARCH. THESSALONICENSIS, Secretarius.

LOCO ✠ SIGILLI.

[297]

BEATISSIME PATER,

Episcopi Hiberniae, ad pedes Beatitudinis Tuae provoluti, humillime supplicant ut facultatem concedere digneris, qua, in iis locis in quibus ob Sacerdotum inopiam Missa solemnis celebrari non possit, legi possint etiam in festis duplicibus Missae Privatae *de Requiem* praesente cadavere.

Quare, etc.

EX AUDIENTIA SANCTISSIMI HABITA DIE 29 JUNII 1862.

Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Pius Divina Providentia Papa IX. referente me infrascripto S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide Secretario benigne annuit pro gratia juxta preces, exceptis duplicibus primae vel secundae classis, festis de praecepto servandis, feriis, vigiliis, et octavis privilegiatis.

Datum Romae ex aedibus dictae S. Congnis. die et anno praedictis.

Gratis sine ulla solutione quovis titulo.

H. CAPALTI Secretarius.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Vetera Monumenta Hibernorum et Scotorum Historiam Illustrantia; quae ex Vaticanis, Neapolis, ac Florentiae Tabulis deprompsit et ordine chronologico disposuit Augustinus Theiner, etc. Ab Honorio Pp. III. usque ad Paulum Pp. III. 1216-1547. Romae, Typis Vaticanis, 1864.

When first we introduced to the notice of our readers Mgr. Theiner's *Vetera Monumenta*, we promised to make early return to the subject, and to furnish some account of the treasures of ecclesiastical history contained therein. That promise we now set ourselves to fulfil. The chief difficulty in the way of our present undertaking is created by the rich superabundance of the varied materials which Mgr. Theiner's industry has reunited and given to the world. A collection of one thousand and sixty-four documents, in which are registered the shifting phases of most of the important events in Church and State in Ireland and Scotland which occupied the attention of thirty-seven Roman Pontiffs, from 1216 to 1547, offers to research so vast a field, and so boundless, that we may well be pardoned if we feel puzzled where to begin. Our attention is, however, arrested on the very threshold of the work by a question than which few others are more interesting to Irishmen; namely, what position did the Roman Pontiffs take up in the questions between Ireland and England at the beginning of the thirteenth century? Did they, as has often been alleged, leave unproved the iniquities perpetrated in this country by the English, and, forgetful of their own proper duties as Fathers of Christendom, did they shut their heart against the cries wrung by oppression from a persecuted race? or did they, on the contrary, stand forth in defence of the weak against the strong, and here, as everywhere else, with apostolic justice, judge the poor of the people, and save the children of the poor, and humble the oppressor? The documents published in the first pages of the work under notice supply us with materials to answer this question in the sense most favourable to the Apostolic See. An examination of these documents shall form the subject of our present notice.

[298]

Before we enter upon the question we have selected, the dedication of the book claims from us some notice, and much gratitude towards the author. The work is dedicated to Archbishop Cullen, to whose frequent conversations on Ireland, during pleasant summer walks with the author in the neighbourhood of Tivoli, and to whose requests, oft repeated in after days, Mgr. Theiner declares his collection of Irish ecclesiastical documents to be due. He tells us, moreover, that the Archbishop's words found him a willing labourer for the sake of Ireland; deep feelings of admiration and compassion had long since touched his heart, and won his pen to the cause of that stricken nation. "Who can sufficiently admire", asks he, "that almost incredible piety and unflinching hereditary constancy in the profession of the Catholic faith, in which, from the earliest times, the Irish have been so firmly rooted that no assaults could ever weaken or shake

them, even though they had to struggle against tyrannical laws, or the violence and cunning of perverse men? How glorious a thing this is, all history is the witness; witnesses are our ancestors and ourselves; witnesses are all the nations of Europe, who with one accord proclaim the Irish nation a spectacle of fortitude, so that among all Christian peoples it is deservedly styled a nation of martyrs".

The troubles that clouded the early years of the reign of the youthful King Henry III. were watched with anxiety by Honorius III. In a letter to the Archbishop of Dublin (*Theiner*, n. 4, p. 2), that Pontiff enumerates the reasons why he felt so much solicitude for the welfare of the English monarch. The king was a vassal of the Roman Church, and a ward of the same; he had taken the Cross, and the Pope was apprehensive of aught that could impede the Crusade; besides, both his kingdom and his person had been solemnly confided to the protection of the Pope by his father, King John, when on his death-bed in the castle at Newark. The dangers that threatened the boy-king (he was but nine years of age when he succeeded) were of such a nature as to demand from his well-wishers strenuous exertions on his behalf. With the crown he had inherited a war with Louis, afterwards Louis VIII. of France, who on English soil had received the homage of the English barons at London, June 2, 1216; and to this was added the bitter hostility of the barons themselves, whom King John's perfidy had disgusted. These perils were increased by disturbances in Scotland, where Louis had allies, and in Ireland, where there existed a formidable party hostile to the king. On the same day, January 17, 1217, Honorius III. wrote to Scotland and to Ireland in the hope of calming these commotions by his authority, and of bringing into submission those who were in arms against Henry. In his letter to the Archbishop of Dublin he appointed that prelate delegate of the Apostolic See, with a command to use the powers which that position gave him to bring back harmony between the king and his subjects in Ireland. These legatine faculties were withdrawn by another letter (n. 34, pag. 15), dated July 6, 1220, in which the Pontiff states that as peace had been fully restored in the kingdoms of England and Ireland, it was no longer necessary that the Archbishop should continue to act as legate. But on the 31st of the same month letters were issued to the Irish prelates, announcing to them the appointment of a new legate for Ireland and Scotland, in the person of James, the Pope's chaplain and penitentiary. On the same day, and to the same effect, letters were issued to the King of Scotland, as well as to the Irish princes, who are addressed thus: *Regibus Ultonie, Corcaie, Limrith, Connatie, Insularum*. In one week after his appointment, the new legate was commanded to exercise his authority against the English king, on behalf of the Irish, in a matter of the greatest importance, the documents in connection with which we will now place before our readers.

[299]

We said before that on the 17th January, 1216, Pope Honorius III. had written to the Archbishop of Dublin appointing him legate during the then existing troubles. On the 14th January, 1217, just three days before the papal letter was written, Henry III., or his adviser, the Earl of Pembroke, wrote the following letter 14 to the justiciary of Ireland (*Rot. Pat. i. Hen. III, m. 14*):

"Rex, justiciario suo Hiberniae, salutem. Mandamus vobis quod, in fide quâ nobis tenemini non permittatis quod aliquis Hiberniensis eligatur vel praeficiatur in aliquâ ecclesiâ cathedrali in terra nostra Hiberniae, quoniam ex hoc posset terra nostra, quod absit, perturbari. Et quoniam, etc.... Teste ipso comite apud Oxoniam xiv^o die Januarii".

This most iniquitous design of excluding Irish ecclesiastics, no matter how fit they might otherwise be, from the government of the Irish sees, and from the spiritual care of their own people, provoked the indignation of the Pope, notwithstanding the deep interest he took in Henry's fortunes. As soon as he was informed of the plan, he at once wrote to the legate the letter alluded to above, commanding him to declare publicly that this law of the king was unjust, null, and void, and that, as heretofore, deserving Irish ecclesiastics should be proposed for vacant sees. The following is the text of the letter (*n. 36, p. 16*):

[200]

"Honorius Episcopus etc. Dilecto filio Magistro Jacobo Capellano, et penitentiario nostro, Apostolicae Sedis legato salutem etc. Pervenit ad audientiam nostram, quosdam Anglicos inauditae temeritatis audacia statuisse, ut nullus clericus de Ibernica, quantumcunque litteratus et honestus existat, ad aliquam dignitatem ecclesiasticam assumatur. Nolentes igitur tantae temeritatis et iniquitatis abusum surdis auribus pertransire, presentium tibi auctoritate mandamus, quatinus statutum hujusmodi publice denuntians irritum et inane, ac inhibens ipsis Anglicis, ne vel inherere illi, vel simile decetero attemptare presumant. Ibernenses clericos, quibus vitae ac scientiae merita suffragantur, denunties ad ecclesiasticas dignitates, si electi canonice fuerint, libere admittendos. Datum apud Urbemveterem, viii. Idus Augusti, Pontificatus nostri anno quinto".

What the result of the legate's condemnation may have been we do not know; what is certain is, that four years later Honorius III. found it necessary to condemn, by his own authority, the same abuse. His letter to the Irish clergy runs as follows (*Theiner*, n. 55, p. 23):

"Honorius Episcopus etc. Dilectis filiis Clero Ybernensi, salutem etc. Sicut ea, que rite ac laudabiliter fiunt, decet per Sedem Apostolicam roborari, ut solidius in sui roboris firmitate consistant, sic ea, que temere ac illicite presumuntur, infirmari convenit per eandem, ne processu temporis robor indignae firmitatis assumant. Sane nostris est jam frequenter auribus intimatum, quosdam Anglicos inauditae temeritatis audacia

statuisse, ut nullus clericus de Ybernia, quantumcunque honestus et litteratus existat, ad aliquam dignitatem ecclesiasticam assumatur: Nolentes igitur tantae presumptionis et iniquitatis abusum sub dissimulatione transire, statutum hujusmodi, omni juris et honestatis auxilio destitutum, presentium auctoritate decernimus irritum et inane, districtius inhibentes, ne quis vel inherere illi, vel decetero simile attemptare presumat. Nulli etc. nostrae constitutionis et inhibitionis etc. Si quis etc. Datum Laterani vi. Kalendas Maii P. n. an. octavo".

Thus did the Roman Pontiffs resist this attempt to enslave the Irish Church.

FOOTNOTES.

1 ([return](#))

Ireland, her present condition, and what it might be. By the Earl of Clancarty. Dublin: 1864.

2 ([return](#))

Ed. Reuss, "*Die Geschichte der heiligen schriften, N. T.*". Brunswick, 1853, pag. 458.

3 ([return](#))

View of Europe during the Mid. Ages.

4 ([return](#))

Speech of O'Hagan on the trial of F. Petcherine.

5 ([return](#))

See *Catalogo di opere Ebraiche, etc.*, by Gustavo Zaccaria, Fermo, 1863.

6 ([return](#))

Erasmus's edition of 1516 was the first *published* Greek Testament. Its dedication to Leo X., and its publication at the expense of the Archbishop of Canterbury, sufficiently disclose to us the Catholic auspices under which it appeared. In the dedication, which is dated the 1st of February, 1516, Erasmus commemorates the many glories of the house of Medici, and especially the zeal of Pope Leo in promoting religion and literature, and adds: "Quamquam ut ingenue dicam, quidquid hoc est operis videri poterat humilium quam ut ei dicandum esset quo nihil majus habet hic orbis, nisi conveniret, ut quidquid ad religionem instaurandam pertinet haud alii consecratur quam summo religionis principi et eidem assertori". As regards the Archbishop of Canterbury, Erasmus writes of him that he deservedly held the post of *legate* of his Holiness: "Cui meipsum quoque quantus sum debeo non modo universum studii mei proventum".

7 ([return](#))

Hefele, pag. 157, and *Gomez*, pag. 38.

8 ([return](#))

Pag. 140, seq.

9 ([return](#))

Chap. xxi., pag. 522.

10 ([return](#))

See Brunet. *Manuel de libraire*, Brux. 1888, tom. 2, pag. 444.

11 ([return](#))

St. Jerome, *Prologus Galeatus*.

12 ([return](#))

Isaias, xxxiv. 4 *Id.*, xl. 26. *Id.*, xlv. 12, *Jer.*, xxxiii. 22. *Dan.*, viii. 10.

13 ([return](#))

Ps., cxlviii. 2. III. *Kings*, xxii. 19. II. *Paral.*, xviii. 18.

14 ([return](#))

Shirley's royal and other historical letters illustrative of the reign of Henry III., vol. i., pag. 4.

Transcriber's Notes:

Minor obvious typographic errors have been corrected.

Inconsistencies in the usage of capitalization, accents and ligatures are preserved as printed.

A table of contents has been added for the convenience of the reader.

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

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

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

START: FULL LICENSE
THE FULL PROJECT GUTENBERG LICENSE
PLEASE READ THIS BEFORE YOU DISTRIBUTE OR USE THIS WORK

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- You provide, in accordance with paragraph 1.F.3, a full refund of any money paid for a work or a replacement copy, if a defect in the electronic work is discovered and reported to you within 90 days of receipt of the work.
- You comply with all other terms of this agreement for free distribution of Project Gutenberg™ works.

1.E.9. If you wish to charge a fee or distribute a Project Gutenberg™ electronic work or group of works on different terms than are set forth in this agreement, you must obtain permission in writing from the Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation, the manager of the Project Gutenberg™ trademark. Contact the Foundation as set forth in Section 3 below.

1.F.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 2. Information about the Mission of Project Gutenberg™

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

Volunteers and financial support to provide volunteers with the assistance they need are critical to reaching Project Gutenberg™’s goals and ensuring that the Project Gutenberg™

collection will remain freely available for generations to come. In 2001, the Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation was created to provide a secure and permanent future for Project Gutenberg™ and future generations. To learn more about the Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation and how your efforts and donations can help, see Sections 3 and 4 and the Foundation information page at www.gutenberg.org.

Section 3. Information about the Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation

The Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation is a non-profit 501(c)(3) educational corporation organized under the laws of the state of Mississippi and granted tax exempt status by the Internal Revenue Service. The Foundation's EIN or federal tax identification number is 64-6221541. Contributions to the Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation are tax deductible to the full extent permitted by U.S. federal laws and your state's laws.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 5. General Information About Project Gutenberg™ electronic works

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

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

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

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