

for Saunco, who lived towards the end of the thirteenth century, and Libertus de Beka, who lived at the beginning of the fourteenth. Of these, de Saunco wrote on the multiplication of the Order in the East, and the subsequent destruction of the monasteries there, and De Beka, or Debeke, treated of the Carmelite Rule. Ribot's work has nothing original in it. It is a mere compilation. It treats of the institution of the Order, of its gradual advance, of its history in Palestine, of its transference to Europe, of its Rule, of the proper shape and meaning of the habit, of the official privileges derived from various Popes. But there is not a word in it of what we may call the devotional side of the Carmelite Rule, of Carmelite confraternities, any more than in the writers from which it is derived. St. Simon Stock is, as far as we have seen, nowhere mentioned in its pages. It is simply a dry record of historical facts or discussion of the various laws and customs pertaining to the Order. To have dragged in the apparition would have been as much out of place in Ribot's work (5) as in that of Thomas of Walden.

(4.) Our third author, whose silence is conclusive against the Scapular, is Joannes Chimelensis, who, we suppose, is to be identified with the Joannes Chimetensis of M. Launoy. But who was Joannes Chimetensis? We are sorry to disparage the "wonderful learning" of M. Launoy, but after many inquiries we are driven to the conclusion that the writer whom he calls Joannes Chimelensis, is none other but Joannes de Ciminetho, who lived in 1333, and belonged to the convent at Metz, and therefore bore the name of *Metensis*. M. Launoy apparently muddles up the two names. The *Catholic Dictionary*, as usual, follows him blindly, except that it introduces the additional inaccuracy of changing his name to Chimelensis. Now, when we turn to the account of the work of this Joannes de Ciminetho in the *Speculum Carmeliticum*, we find that it is a brief history of the Order, and seems to be a mere repetition in another form of the facts given by Ribot and other early Carmelite writers. The editor of the *Speculum* gives as his reason for not inserting it, that all that is contained in it has been given already by

(5) Ribot's work is inserted in the *Speculum Carmeliticum* of Father Daniel, pars. i. p. 229.

the authors. Hence there is no more reason why John of Metz should tell the story than Philip of Catalonia, or any other of those who wrote the history of the Carmelite Order, or the account of its official privileges, (6.)

It seems that Launoy never could have seen the work, much less the writer in the *Catholic Dictionary*. Yet the latter does not hesitate to discredit an author whose work is clearly unknown to him, Chimelensis—the imaginary Chimelensis—was the author of "two books specially designed to glorify the Order." We must protest against the groundless insinuation against the good Carmelite, which we read between the lines. If the motive attributed to a writer is "to glorify the Order" to which he belongs, the grounds of our confidence in him are cut away from under our feet. It implies to such an one the interests of truth are secondary to the glorification of the body of which he is a member. It implies that if the story about which he is silent had not been utterly unknown in his day, he would have thrust it, *pectus et uolens*, into his book. We now come to the positive evidence in favor of the apparition, evidence which establishes its authenticity by proof so irrefragable, that nothing but ignorance or a determined theological bias could fail to be convinced by them. (1.) The document in which Swaynton wrote at the dictation of St. Simon Stock was, as we have seen, preserved in the archives of the Carmelites at Bordeaux, and printed for the first time by Father John Cheron, when the controversy arose which the enemies of the Carmelites stirred up against the Scapular. Father Cheron was Prior of the Convent, and though we have no particulars of his life, yet the fact of his election by his religious brethren to this important office, is sufficient proof of the high esteem in which he was held. Our adversaries would have us believe that this document never existed at all. They would have us accept the utterly improbable, the ludicrous, hypothesis, that a distinguished man, high in his office in his order, or one of his fellows, forged this manuscript narrative, and that it has been accepted from that day to this by the Christian world, has been quoted over and over again, approved by Popes, sanctioned by Roman congregations, spread abroad among the faithful by written documents, and by continual sermons and exhortations, although all the while it was a fraud and imposture.

(6) *Spec. Carm.*, pars. 2. p. 236. N. 885. The work of Joannes de Ciminetho was printed at Venice in the *Speculum Magnum Ordinis Carmelitani*, fol. 59 seq.