

of Canterbury, under William the Conqueror and William Rufus, respectively.

The latest work on this question of such absorbing interest to members of the Irish race, is from the pen of Stephen J. McCormick, the scholarly editor of the San Francisco *Monitor*. In reviewing Mr. McCormick's book, the *Catholic World*, of September, 1889, says: "The *Bullarium Romanum* contains a Bull of Adrian IV. Conferring upon Henry II. of England the Sovereignty of Ireland, and another Bull of Adrian's successor, Alexander III, confirming the grant. Both Bulls are of suspicious brevity and obscurity, were never known to the public till several years after their supposed issue, and were claimed and used by one of the most unscrupulous and brutal, though one of the ablest, of the Norman monarchs—the murderer of St. Thomas Becket. A document of this sort, unused and unknown until twenty years after its date, should be void from staleness, and that would be a sufficient answer to its allegation as anything in the nature of a grant of power. But the controversy runs deeper than pleas to the validity of the Bull; it concerns its genuineness. Mr. McCormick has collated the authorities on the subject, has investigated the question at the Vatican library itself, and has established a fair historical doubt—that, at least; an impartial mind, will, we feel certain, readily concede that the Bulls were forgeries." Of Cambrensis, it thus speaks: "Geraldus Cambrensis has been the chief reliance of those who have accepted the Bull, he being a contemporary writer, or almost contemporary with the seizure of Ireland by Henry. * * * The fulsome laudation of Henry, by this work, is enough to cast suspicion on him: 'the Alexander of the west, 'the invincible,' 'the Solomon of his age,' 'the most pious of princes,' 'who had the glory of representing the fury of the Gentiles, not only of Europe, (that must mean the Irish) but likewise of Asia beyond the Mediterranean,' are specimens of his 'loquubar in conspectu regum.'" But when the king was dead, the *Courtier Chronicle* abused him with an extravagance of condemnation and invective in excess of his previous flattery. It is clear that Cambrensis was a mendacious, perhaps a bribed, witness,

as is fully enough gathered from his preface to the book, "*The Conquest of Ireland*."

On the one hand, then, we have the sanctity of Adrian's life, and his scrupulous conception of the obligations of his sublimic office. We have the notorious character of Henry II., his unenviable reputation at the Roman Court, and the utter absurdity of his being sent by the Vicar of Christ as delegate apostolic to reform the Irish Church. In addition, there is the impossible date (1154) by some assigned to the Bull. There is the firm belief in the falsity of the Bull, ever current among the Irish themselves. Finally there is the stubborn fact that the Church in England under Henry II., stood in greater need of reform than did the Church in Ireland. On the other hand, what? The altogether unreliable works of Giraldus Cambrensis, the suspected testimony afforded by the *Metalogicus* of John of Salisbury, and a papal rescript of as doubtful authenticity as the Bull it is said to confirm. This is the question in brief. Many additional proofs are given demonstrating to a nicety the forgery of the Bull, but the subject is too vast to be here considered at length. The student desirous of pursuing the question further will find it fully and most interestingly treated by Dr. Fredet, Cardinal Moran, Mr. McCormick, and especially Rev. Father Burke in his answers to Froude. Suffice it to say, that these fearless defenders of Catholic Truth present a weight of evidence in support of their statements that cannot fail to convince the impartial mind and force it to subscribe to these emphatic words of the famous Irish Dominican above named, wherein, having demanded whether it were likely that the Supreme Pontiff should have sent as Apostle to Ireland, "the murderer of bishops, the robber of churches, the destroyer of ecclesiastical liberty, and of every form of liberty that came before him," he answers: "No, I never will believe that the Pope of Rome was so very short-sighted, so unjust, as by a stroke of his pen, to abolish and destroy the liberties of the most faithful people that ever bowed down in allegiance to him."