

to King Henry II. of England, then newly crowned, his Bull authorizing the invasion of Ireland. The authenticity of the Bull is now universally admitted, and both its preamble and conditions show how strictly it was framed in accordance with St. Bernard's accusations. It sets forth that for the eradication of vice, the implanting of virtue and the spread of the true faith, the Holy Father solemnly sanctions the projected invasion : and it attaches as a condition the payment of Peter's Pence for every house in Ireland."

McGee, it will be remarked, states that the authenticity of the Bull is universally admitted. His assertion, however, is too general, for many historians and men of research have long declared the Bull to be false, and have not hesitated to accuse Henry II. of having forged it. These writers, pursuing the aggressive policy of the historians included in our second class, have borne the war into the very heart of the enemy's position, and have brought the controversy to a triumphant issue. They have subjected the documents advanced in support of the authenticity of the Bull, the written request of Henry, and the Bull itself, to a most piercing criticism, and have brought to light such a mass of internal evidence of forgery, as scarcely requires the aid of the external testimony derived from other sources. Let us briefly glance at this aspect of the question.

The principal witnesses brought forward by the enemies of the Catholic Church and of Catholic Ireland, are John of Salisbury, Henry's ambassador to the Pope, and Giraldus Cambrensis. Now, John of Salisbury has left in his *Polycraticus* a record of his actions in Rome during his visit to the Holy Father. Yet, although he there records many most trivial affairs and occurrences, he nowhere speaks of the Bull. Nor does he make any mention of it in his *Metalogicus* until the last chapter, and this chapter is written in a style so markedly different from the rest of the work and from the general style of this writer, that there is every reason to believe it was not written by Salisbury at all, but was afterwards added by interested parties. As to Giraldus Cambrensis, his words are remarkable for their utter inaccuracy, both as to dates

and facts. In regard to the Bull itself, his text is altogether faulty. He states, likewise, that the Bull was first published at Waterford, in a synod held there for that purpose, yet the annals of Ireland contain no record of any such synod. Henry, indeed, might have summoned a council of the English bishops to whom he had given sees in Ireland, but why did he not publish the Bull before an assembly of the bishops and princes of the land, and how does it come to pass that the annals of Ireland fail to mention the convention of Waterford?

Again, the date of the Bull was given by some as 1154. Now it is well known that Adrian ascended the Pontifical throne in December, 1154. Thus it was impossible for Henry to receive the news of Adrian's election, send an ambassador to Rome, and obtain such an extraordinary favor before the close of the year 1154, that is to say within the short space of one month. Even now, in this age of the electric telegraph and the lightning express, it would be impossible for the sovereign of England to receive the news of the election of a new Pope, send an ambassador to Rome, set the machinery of the Roman Court in motion, and secure a like signal favor in a like period of time. If the Bull, therefore, actually bore the date 1154, this alone were sufficient to prove the forgery ; but, unfortunately, the original document has disappeared and the date may have been incorrectly placed upon the existing copies. At any rate, the many inconveniencies arising from such a date were recognized, and it was put aside for the less embarrassing one of 1155.

It is a significant fact, too, and one that must not be lost sight of, that a belief in the falsity of the Bull has always been current among the Irish themselves. A manuscript of the 14th century bearing evidence of this belief is still preserved at Rome. The document in question is a letter to the Pope written by the then Lord Justice of Ireland, wherein he accuses the Irish of many heinous crimes and states that they "reproached Henry II. with having conquered Ireland by means of false pretenses and of false Bulls."

But, you will ask, what about the rescript of Alexander III., mentioning