

## The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$1.50 per annum.  
United States & Europe. \$2.00  
Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.  
Editor, Rev. James T. Foley, B.A.  
Associate Editors: (Rev. D. A. Casey,  
H. F. Mackintosh.)

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance to accompany the order.  
Approved and recommended by Archbishops of Canada, the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Ogdensburg, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.  
Messrs. P. J. Neven, E. J. Broderick, M. J. Haggarty, J. Ray Clancy, D. J. Murray, George B. Hewitson, Mrs. W. E. Smith, Miss Sara Hanley, Miss L. Heinger and Miss Bride Saunders are authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for THE CATHOLIC RECORD.  
Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents.  
Subscribers changing residence will please give old as well as new address.  
In St. John N. B., single copies may be purchased from Mrs. M. A. McGuire, 349 Main Street, John J. Dwyer and The O'Neill Co. Pharmacy, 109 Brussels street.  
In Montreal single copies may be purchased from Mr. E. O'Grady Newsdealer, 106 St. Viateur street west, and J. Milloy, 241 St. Catherine street west.

LONDON, SATURDAY, SEPT. 19, 1914

### THE "PROPHECIES" OF ST. MALACHY

St. Malachy, whose family name was O'Morgair, was born in Armagh in 1094. After a long course of studies he was ordained priest in 1119. He was chosen Abbot of Bangor in 1128, a year later was consecrated Bishop of Connor, and in 1132 he was promoted to the primacy of Armagh. He died at Clairvaux in the arms of St. Bernard in 1148. St. Malachy was a great man, a great bishop, and a great saint; but here we are considering not St. Malachy's life, and work, but the so-called prophecies which have been attributed to him and have recently been freely quoted in connection with the Holy See.

It is hardly necessary to say that no such private revelations or prophecies, even when genuine and authentic, are matters of faith. If the writer had lived a life of heroic sanctity one may without superstition regard such revelations with pious belief provided they do not conflict with the teachings of God's Church. As indicated in Deuteronomy, xviii: 22, fulfillment is the only real test.

"Thou shalt have this sign: Whatsoever that same prophet foretelleth in the name of the Lord, and it cometh not to pass: that thing the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath forged it by the pride of his mind: and therefore thou shalt not fear him."

The "prophecies" of St. Malachy concerning the popes are a series of mottoes which are supposed to indicate the occupants of the Holy See and purporting to be written before the election of Celestine II. in 1143. Arnold Wion, a Benedictine monk, first published them at Venice in 1595, that is 447 years after St. Malachy's death. Wion himself thought that the alleged prophecy was a forgery only a few years old. Bearing in mind the intimate friendship between St. Malachy and the great St. Bernard and that the latter wrote a "Life of St. Malachy" without the remotest reference to the "prophecies," it is not surprising to find that no serious Church historian attached any weight to them. If they were written over four hundred years after their reputed author died, the fact would explain why the first 74 popes are clearly and unmistakably indicated; indeed up to 1590 the mottoes are simple plays or puns on papal Christian or family names. If written by St. Malachy three were strikingly fulfilled before the author's death; and a fourth before the death of St. Bernard. Yet St. Bernard makes no reference to them either in the Life of St. Malachy or in the funeral sermon which he preached over the remains of his dearly loved friend.

After their publication the mottoes are often far from being appropriate. "The interpreters," says the Marquis of Bute who studied the question seriously, "have been obliged to abandon many in despair, and in the case of many others their explanations are remarkable for ingenuity rather than force."

Pius II., 1459 1464, is indicated by the motto, *De Capra et Albergio*; in English, from a she-goat and a tavern. He had been secretary successively to Cardinals Capranico Albergati; Capra, a she-goat, and Albergio a tavern. Looking backwards the writer could indicate Pius II. clearly enough by such a motto, which if written some centuries previously could not throw much light prophetic or otherwise on that pontificate. Again, Julius II., 1503-1513, also before the "prophecies" were written, or at least before they saw the light of day, is indicated by the astonishing device: *Fructus Jovis jusebit*, the fruit of Jove will

help. In the arms of Julius was an oak tree which in pagan mythology is sacred to Jupiter. Many consider that this is a clear indication that the writer was so steeped in the paganism of the early renaissance that he was not even aware of the impropriety of thus describing the Vicar of Christ whose arms he well knew bore an oak tree.

Coming to some of the popes after the publication of the prophecies:

Benedict XIV., 1740-1758, is "foretold" by the cryptic motto *animal rurale*, a country beast. No explanation seems to be offered. "The expression itself is so very odd as to convey the idea of a joke, in which respect it can hardly be said to stand alone."

His immediate successor Clement XIII. is designated as *Ursus Velox*, a swift bear; no interpretation is attempted. Nor is any solution offered for *Canis et Coluber*, a dog and an adder, by which Leo XII., 1823 1829, is designated.

On the other hand, Pius VI., 1775-1799, *Peregrinus Apostolicus*, the Apostolic pilgrim, made a journey to Vienna in the early part of his reign; and towards its close was forcibly taken from Rome, first to Sienna then successively to Florence, Parma, Piacenza, Turin, Grenoble, and finally to Valence where he died. Pius VII., *Aquila Rapax*, an eagle carrying away, was carried away into France by Napoleon on whose arms was the Imperial eagle. Pius IX., *Crux de cruce*, a cross from a cross. Dr. Neale interpreted this as indicating the arms of the House of Savoy—gules a cross argent—a cross which was a heavy cross—Pius IX. Perhaps it is needless to recall the fact that it was the House of Savoy despoiled the Pope of the papal states.

Leo XIII., *Lumen in coelo*, a light in the sky, had on his arms an irradiated and fiery star. *Ignis Ardens*, a burning fire, was the motto attributed to the zealous Pope just called to his reward.

The fitness of the last three mottoes following the instances of Pius VI., Pius VII., has had much to do in the present day with reviving the interest and half-belief in the "prophecies." The present pontificate is characterized by the words *Religio depopulata* which has been variously translated or mistranslated.

Vance Thompson's article of three years ago has been reproduced in the press. Though Thompson is a Protestant he was on many things well-informed, on others easily misled by his unconscious Protestant bias, and on others again egregiously astray. However, that is another story. He closes his article thus:

"A melancholy heritage; St. Malachy foresaw it; the next pontiff (if that prophecy be true) will be the Pope of a depopulated church—the high priest of an empty tabernacle."

As we have seen it is altogether improbable that St. Malachy had anything whatever to do with the "prophecies" attributed to him. But whether the writer was an impudent forger, or a real prophet himself, does not affect the meaning of *religio depopulata*. While it is possible to take from it the significance given to it by Mr. Thompson, it is not at all likely that such was intended by the writer. "Religion" even in English was ordinarily used in the middle ages to denote the monastic life. "Religious persons" meant monks and nuns. Dispensation from "his religion" meant release from monastic vows, or permission to travel and study which otherwise would be incompatible with such vows. "In religion" and "religious" are still commonly used by Catholics in this sense. But in the middle ages the context alone distinguished "religion" in the sense of monasticism from the ordinary meaning of the term. The Marquis of Bute, therefore, Englishes *Religio depopulata* as "monasticism plundered," which in all probability is the correct rendering of the Latin of the medieval writer.

It matters very little in any case. Bute thus summarizes the conclusions of his study of the question: "The case may be summed up thus: These so-called predictions are utterly destitute of any support from external evidence; on the contrary, every external circumstance is strongly against them, beginning with the silence of Bernard of Clairvaux. The internal evidence is also very heavily against them in almost every conceivable way, with two exceptions—viz., their apparently striking fulfillment in some recent cases, and, in the eyes of one school, the remarkable piece of chronology

which has just been pointed out above."

The "remarkable piece of chronology" referred to is a calculation determining the inauguration of the millennium, and its agreement with the "prophecies of Malachy," basing the duration of future pontificates on the average of the past.

All such accurate calculations based on Scriptural prophecy seem to have a fascination for certain minds, but are not given much credence by well-balanced pious persons. For ourselves Christ's answer to the Apostles is quite satisfactory:

"They, therefore, who were come together, asked him, saying: Lord, wilt thou at that time restore the kingdom to Israel? But he said to them: It is not for you to know the times or moments which the Father hath put in his own power." (Acts I, 7.)

The internal evidence, therefore, which depends on determinations of the times and the moments of the millennium, does not give the "prophecies of St. Malachy" any greater credibility unless, perhaps, "in the eyes of one school."

### TURKEY?

"This war is Turkey's opportunity" is the ominous remark of Rustom Bey, Turkish Ambassador at Washington.

By the Treaty of Berlin each subject of the fourteen states enumerated, resident in Turkey, acquired extra territorial standing (that is he is placed out of the reach of the law of the country) together with his servants and dependents. They were tried by their own judges, diplomatic representative or consuls. Now Turkey informs the nations of the world that all such rights are abrogated. The Sultan of Turkey is regarded as the successor of the Prophet and the spiritual head of Islam. Germany has openly threatened to stir up the millions of Mohammedan subjects in Egypt and India to revolt. Such a rising would be regarded by Mohammedans as a holy war. A writer in the Nineteenth Century a couple of years ago when it was feared that the Balkan war might inflame Mohammedan religious zeal, said:

"Their loyalty (to the Sultan) is a religious sentiment, extending far beyond the Turkish Empire into ours. The world of El Islam is still what Christendom has ceased to be, one mind, one body for religion. . . . Upon the Turks, with their prestige as fellow-tribesmen and companions of the Caliph, as liberators of the realm, rests all the hope of the Islamic world. The indignation felt by Moslems everywhere at their unjust treatment by the Powers of Europe is immeasurable, and may at any moment become dangerous. . . . And who can say how far the flames may spread."

Hence the comment of the Turkish Ambassador in Washington may have an ominous and awful significance.

### ROUMANIA

That Roumania may join in the great European war is a contingency now discussed by the papers. A good many readers are asking where is Roumania and few, indeed, would be disposed to regard her action as an important factor in the gigantic struggle.

During the first century after Christ the Eastern frontier provinces of the Roman Empire were frequently ravaged by the powerful barbarian tribes of Dacia. In 101 A. D., Trojan led an army against them and conquered their country. To protect their Eastern border against the teeming millions of the East the Romans then created a large military settlement in Dacia on the lower reaches of the Danube. The Roumanians of the present day are the direct descendants of these Roman settlers, their language is a Latin language. Racially they are akin to the Italians, the French and the Spaniards, and they are quite as distinct from the Slaves as any of these. They are small, wiry, alert, in striking contrast with their large-bodied, heavy and phlegmatic Slav neighbors.

In the beginning of the Russo-Turkish war in 1877 Russia in a very offensive tone declined the aid of Roumania. Later, however, after suffering disastrous defeats at Plevna the Russian Grand Duke Nicholas urgently sought Roumanian assistance, which saved the Russian army from defeat, perhaps from annihilation. The war over, Russia treated Roumania with shameless and brutal ingratitude. Roumania was not allowed to take part in the peace negotiations at San Stefano. The territory Russia took with Roumania's

assistance from Turkey was given to Bulgaria. Russia insisted on taking from Roumania Southern Bessarabia. Though Prince Charles appealed in vain at the time to Germany and Austria, Russia's treatment exasperated the Roumanians and left among them a deep and abiding resentment. Roumania became a supporter of the Austro-German alliance. Moreover King Charles is by birth a German and the tendency given by Russia was strengthened by dynastic and personal ties which connect the Roumanian, German and Austrian ruling houses.

Other considerations, however, may determine the side Roumania will take in the struggle now going on. The Roumanian population is thus distributed amongst the following States:

In Roumania	8,000,000
In Austria-Hungary	3,500,000
In Russia	1,500,000
In Turkey	400,000
In Servia	350,000
In Greece	50,000
Total	13,900,000

The territories of Roumania and the territories of Austria-Hungary and Russia, inhabited principally by Roumanians, have the following extent:

In Roumania	131,353 sq. kilometres
In Austria-Hungary	147,340 "
In Russia	20,000 "
Total	298,693

If Russia were defeated Roumania would in all probability regain Bessarabia. If Austria-Hungary should be defeated and dismembered Roumania might double her territory and add to her population 3,500,000 Roumanians living near her border as well as 2,000,000 people of other races who live among them. These considerations may induce Roumania, with an army on a war footing of 500,000 men, to join the Triple Entente. A glance at the map will show how formidable an enemy this little known country might be on the flank of either Russia or Austria-Hungary. Doubtless the war of diplomats is being fiercely waged to secure her co-operation. Doubtless, also, Roumania will wait until the fortunes of war indicate pretty clearly which side will be able to implement diplomatic promises.

With great changes in the map of Europe impending the national aspirations of 14,000,000 Roumanians may be deeply stirred. On her action may depend the issue of the European conflict. Will this "Romanic island in a Slavonic ocean" be sufficiently in dread of the onrush of victorious pan-Slavism to throw in her lot with the Teuton? That would be disastrous if Russia won out. It is pretty safe to say that any announcement of Roumania's decision is as yet premature. When she does take part it will be when her action may have a decisive influence in the final issue of the war. If it be true that she has already decided, and against Germany, then the end is in sight.

### THE TIMES ON PIUS X.

The kindly and sympathetic tone as well as the deep insight of the Times' editorial tribute to Pope Pius X. is another sign of changed conditions in the attitude of the non-Catholic English-speaking world toward the Catholic Church. With regard to painful development of ecclesiastical affairs in France the Times remarks: "Unprejudiced judges cannot blame a Pope for rejecting all compromise with a policy which, on the admission of its authors, was deliberately aimed at the destruction of the faith it was his mission to uphold." Again, in appreciating the work of the late Pontiff: "It is in the internal affairs of that vast and elaborate institution that he has done a work which promises to leave its mark upon the ages." With regard to Modernism The Times sympathizes not at all with the shallow critics of Pius X. "Few persons familiar with the elementary doctrines of the Roman Church could suppose that the tendencies of the new school were compatible with them. To the downright plain sense of the Pope the desperate efforts of the men who had explained away the content of historical Christianity to present themselves as orthodox Roman Catholics were simply disingenuous."

Again, the true democracy of the Church is thus appreciated: "The elevation of Giuseppe Sarto, (the child of the laborer and the dress-maker,) to the most ancient and most venerable Throne in Europe is a striking illustration of the democratic side of the Roman Church to which she has largely owed her power. The story of the Popes who have risen from

obscurity and poverty to the Chair of Peter is one of the great romances of history."

If the tone of the great English newspaper suggests something quite different nearer home it is consoling to know that The Times represents a large and constantly increasing body of English non-Catholic sentiment. In another column we reproduce the entire article.

### ST. MALACHY AND IRELAND

Besides the prophecies attributed to St. Malachy concerning the Popes, which as we have seen lack all bases of authenticity if not credibility, there is a prophecy of his concerning Ireland. This prophecy is said to have been copied from an ancient manuscript preserved at Clairvaux and transmitted by the learned Benedictine Mabillon (1632 1707) to his contemporary the martyred successor of St. Malachy, the venerable Archbishop Oliver Plunket. This prophecy is to the effect that beloved Ireland would undergo at the hands of England, oppression, persecution and calamities of every kind, during a week of centuries; but that she would preserve her fidelity to God and to His Church amid all her trials. At the end of seven centuries she would be delivered from her oppressors who would in their turn be subjected to dreadful chastisements, and Catholic Ireland would be instrumental in bringing back the British nation to that Divine Faith which Protestant England had, during three hundred years, so rudely endeavored to wrest from her.

Taking into account the intimate personal friendship and cordial relationship that subsisted between St. Malachy and St. Bernard of Clairvaux there is no positive reason to doubt its authenticity. History bears witness to its evident partial fulfillment. Are we on the eve of its entire realization?

### MR. REDMOND

Mr. Redmond's historic speech in the House of Commons, immediately following the declaration of war, reported in full in the RECORD, proclaimed him a statesman of the very first rank. No mediocre politician, no mere agitator, could so have risen to the great occasion. Centuries of evil memories and hoary prejudices might have deterred a lesser man from taking the bold step that signified a genuine union of hearts between the Irish and the British people. But true statesman that he was, Mr. Redmond knew that the hour had struck, and not all his splendid strategy of the past momentous years so entitles him to our respect and admiration as his dignified offer of assistance in England's hour of need. In one brief moment he sealed his oft-repeated professions of loyalty in return for freedom. England had reason to rejoice, and Ireland to be thankful that at such a crucial hour her destiny was in such capable hands. A disloyal Ireland, possibly welcoming the German invader, would be a supreme peril to Britain. Mr. Redmond's eloquent assurance laid that spectre. In Ireland itself things had come to such a pass that nothing short of a miracle could have prevented civil strife. But does anyone believe that the war-scarred veterans who have fought side by side against the Meuse will ever again line up on opposite sides of the Boyne?

His House of Commons speech placed Redmond in the front rank of Empire statesmen. A later address of his to the Maryborough Volunteers proves him to be no less an Irish patriot with a full knowledge of the great responsibility that is his. After telling his auditors that the government were about to arm and equip the Volunteers he spoke these sane and noble words: "Now, mark you, that means a grave responsibility. A body of men armed, if it is not steady and sober and disciplined and obedient to orders without questioning, is a danger to itself and a danger to the community. I give you this word of advice. Any man in your ranks who gives way to intemperance, turn him out ruthlessly. Any man who is merely playing at this work, coming out on a glorious evening like this simply for a sort of picnic, but who is not in earnest, turn him out of your ranks. Any man who will not undergo the hard work of steady and continuous drill, turn him out of your ranks. You can only be of assistance to your country if you are a sober, steady, hard-working and disciplined force."

It is such words as these that make us proud of Mr. Redmond. The arming of a nation is a serious business, but in Mr. Redmond the Irish nation

has a wise and capable Commander-in-Chief. He will see to it that the Volunteers are a danger, not to themselves, but to the enemy. And when the hour of their testing comes, though God forbid that that hour should ever strike, Mr. Redmond will take care that history does not repeat itself in as much as drink will never again "bring them down."

Mr. Redmond is equally worthy of our respect as a Catholic. "All that I am," he once declared at a St. Patrick's Day Banquet in London, "I owe to the Jesuits." At the century Banquet at Clongowes College this summer he reiterated that statement. Broad-minded and tolerant almost to a fault he is unyielding as adamant when there is question of Catholic principle. We have not forgotten that he was publicly thanked by the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster for his championing of the cause of the English Catholic schools. Much as we admire Parnell's matchless leadership it is a source of genuine satisfaction to us to know that the bright diadem of liberty will be placed upon Erin's brow by Redmond's stainless hands.

COLUMBA

### NOTES AND COMMENTS

DISCUSSING WITH a friend, during the interregnum, the possible successor in the Pontificate of the valiant soldier of Christ who has just been called to his reward, we were led to express the hope that upon whomsoever the choice of the Holy Ghost might fall (for it should not be forgotten that in this great office the Sacred College is in truth and in effect but the instrument of Divine Providence) one of the great historic names of the past, long disused, might, in his person, be revived.

WITH THE single exception of Gregory XVI. (1831 1846), all of the Popes since the beginning of the nineteenth century have borne the names, Pius or Leo—names, we hasten to add, of high significance, and reminiscent in themselves of the glories of the Papacy. But men have grown so used to these two names in this connection as to (the unreflecting at least) have lost sight of the Innocents, the Clements, the Urbans, the Pauls, the Johns, the Adrians and the Benedicts, all of which have had many representatives in the long line of Peter's successors, and have each contributed their share to its blessed memories. In the selection by the new Pontiff of the name Benedict XV. our wish has been abundantly gratified. It may not be unacceptable to our indulgent readers if we devote a few paragraphs to his predecessors of that venerable name.

FOR THE FIRST Benedict we have to go back a period of over thirteen hundred years. He was called to the Supreme Pontificate in the year 574 and died in 578. Like all his successors of the name, down to Benedict VII., he was by birth a Roman, and, as we are told by the chroniclers of the time, ever held his birthright in high esteem, and by his beneficence to the poor of Rome, and his patriotic defence of the city against its enemies, earned the love and gratitude of its people. Platina, the historian of the Popes, who was not always tender to their memories, says of Benedict I. that "he was adorned with all the princely accomplishments of clemency, justice, piety, religion, wisdom, resolution, and unshaken fortitude." His lot was cast in troublous times, and because of the calamities which befel Rome and all Italy, is said to have died of grief after a pontificate of four years and two months.

A CENTURY elapsed before another Benedict ascended the Papal Throne, Benedict II. became Pope in 684, and lived for less than a year. His lot, too, was a troubled one, but he bore himself as a true shepherd of his flock and left behind him a holy memory. It is said of him that upon the death of Leo II., a Pope renowned for sanctity and learning, Benedict was by popular acclaim fixed upon as the only person competent to succeed him. The Emperor Constantine held him in the highest veneration. He was, during his short reign, assiduous in promoting learning and caring for the welfare of the poor, so that his early death was regarded as a calamity, not alone to Rome but to the entire Christian world.

THE THIRD Benedict did not arise until the year 855, and like his two predecessors of the name was destined to a short reign. Like them, too, he was a man of holy life and

great charity. It is told of him that when his election was announced to him, he with tears and prayers, calling upon God to witness the sincerity of his protestations, begged that he might be passed over, being, in his own estimation, utterly unworthy of so high a dignity and unequal to so great responsibilities. He was a frequent visitor to the sick, a nursing father to the poor, and a comfort to all. Amid the lamentations of all Rome, he died in 858, after a reign of a little over two years.

BENEDICT IV. became Pope in the year 900 and died in 908. He was of a mild and amiable disposition, but quite unfitted for coping with the license and turbulence of the time. It was a period of unrest, following upon the breakup of the Empire, and licentiousness and disorder prevailed. Yet, it is said of Benedict that in that turbulent age he bore himself with gravity and constancy. A Pope of more robust character and greater resolution might have stemmed the tide, but Benedict was unfitted by nature for such an undertaking. Of Benedict V., who came to the Papal Chair in 953 and reigned only six months, all that we know is that his election was disapproved of by the Emperor Otto, and that in the turmoil that succeeded he withdrew to Germany and died there.

ALL OF THE Popes of that period had a heavy cross to bear in the turbulence of the civil power. Most of them rose superior to their surroundings; some of them were helpless in its presence. Very few of them had a long reign. Benedict VI. was Pope for a year and a half only. Soon after his accession he was thrown into prison in the Castle of St. Angelo, that huge circular tower which still stands and is a conspicuous feature in pictures of the Vatican and its environs. It is said that he was strangled or starved to death. Certain it is that he did not regain his liberty, and had no opportunity, therefore, of showing what manner of man he might have been in that exalted office.

OF BENEDICT VII., who became Pope three years later, we know rather more. During his reign there was constant warfare between the Emperor Otto and Henry Duke of Bavaria, hostilities extending into the Rhine Provinces and to France. On the death of the Emperor there was much contention as to his successor, the choice falling eventually upon Otto III., son of the preceding. In this crisis the Pope, who was a man of great prudence and discernment, was assiduous in urging that in the decision regard should be had for the Church which needed a protector of virtue and diligence. In the event he gave his approval to the election of Otto III. He occupied the Chair of Peter for a little over eight years, dying in 983, much regretted by the people of Rome.

BENEDICT VIII., who was a Franciscan, was the first Pope of the name not a native of the City of Rome. He came to the Papal Throne in the year 1012, and—quite an unusual event in that seething age—reigned for eleven years. He had the good fortune to be contemporary with Henry Duke of Bavaria who had become Emperor on the death of Otto III. Henry was a man of great uprightness of character and of practical wisdom as well. His Empress, Cunigunda, shared with him these virtuous qualities. On Emperor Henry's death, however, the Pope's troubles began and for a time he was even in effect deposed. But the schism being terminated he was restored with honor, and died later in peace.

OF BENEDICT IX. the less said, perhaps, the better. His occupancy of Peter's chair extended over a period of eleven years, 1033 1044. He was a mere lad when thrust into this responsible office, and Canon Barry is responsible for the statement that "lower than Benedict IX. it was impossible that the Papacy should fall." His pontificate, however, was in a measure redeemed by the labors of several learned and godly men to whom it fell to keep the lamp of Faith burning through a period of almost universal decadence. And the reign of Gregory VII., the great vindicator of the Papacy, and a man after God's own heart, was not far off.

ERE ST. GREGORY VII. came to the chair of Peter in 1073, it was to see