

## THE BULL OF POPE ADRIAN.

(Concluded.)

V.—In the Remonstrance addressed by the Irish princes and people to John XXII., about the year 1315, repeated mention is made of the Bull of Adrian. But then it is only cited there as a conclusive argument *ad hominem* against the English traducers of our nation: "Lest the bitter and venomous calumnies of the English, and their unjust and unfounded attacks upon us and all who support our rights, may in any degree influence the mind of your Holiness." The Bull of Adrian IV. was published by the English, and set forth by them as the charter-deed of their rule in Ireland, yet they violated in a most flagrant manner all the conditions of that Papal grant. The Irish princes and people in self-defence had now made over the sovereignty of the island to Edward de Bruce, brother of the Scottish King; they style him their adopted monarch, and they pray the Pope to give a formal sanction to their proceedings. Thus throughout the whole Remonstrance the Bull of Adrian is used as a telling argument against the injustice of the invaders, and as a precedent which John XXII. might justly follow in sanctioning the transfer of the Irish Crown to Edward Bruce. But in all this the historian will find no grounds for asserting the genuineness of the supposed Bulls of Adrian and Alexander. We will just now see that at this very time the Irish people universally regard these Bulls as spurious inventions of their English enemies.

VI.—Baronius, the eminent ecclesiastical historian, inserts in his invaluable *Annals* the Bull of Adrian IV. "from a Vatican Manuscript." This is the sixth argument advanced by Mr. O'Callaghan.

It is not my intention to question in any way the services rendered by Cardinal Baronius to the cause of our Church History; but at the same time no one will deny that considerable progress has been made in historical research during the past three hundred and fifty years, and many documents are now set aside which were then accepted as unquestioned on the supposed reliable authority of preceding chroniclers.

In the present instance we are not left in doubt as to the source whence Baronius derived his information regarding Adrian's supposed Bull. During my stay in Rome I took occasion to inquire whether the MSS. of the eminent annalist, which are happily preserved, indicated the special "Vatican Manuscript" referred to in his printed text, and I was informed by the learned archivist of the Vatican, Monsignor Theiner, who is at present engaged in giving a new edition, and continuing the great work of Baronius, that the *Codex Vaticanus* referred to is a MS. copy of the History of Matthew Paris, which is preserved in the Vatican Library. Thus it is the testimony of Matthew Paris alone that here confronts us in the pages of Baronius, and no new argument can be taken from the words of the eminent annalist. Relying on the same high authority, I am happy to state that in where in the private archives or among the private papers of the Vatican or among the *Resgesta*, which Jaffe's researches have made so famous, or in the various indices of the Pontifical Letters, can a single trace be found of the supposed Bulls of Adrian IV. and Alexander III.

VII.—The last argument advanced by Mr. O'Callaghan will not detain us long. The insertion or omission of such ancient records in the *Bullarium* is a matter that depends wholly on the critical skill of the editor. Curious enough, in one edition of the *Bullarium* as may be seen in the references of Dr. Lanigan, Adrian's Bull is inserted, whilst no mention is made of that of Alexander; in another edition, however, the Bull of Alexander is given in full, whilst the Bull of Adrian is omitted. We may well leave our opponents to settle this matter with the conflicting editors of the *Bullarium*. They, probably like Baronius, merely copied the Bull of Adrian from Matthew Paris, and erred in doing so. Labbé, in his magnificent edition of the Councils, also publishes Adrian's Bull; but then he expressly tells us that it is copied from the works of Matthew Paris.

We have thus, as far as the limits of this article will allow, examined in detail the various arguments which support the genuineness of the supposed Bull, and now it only remains for us to conclude that there are no sufficient grounds for accepting that document as the genuine work of Pope Adrian.

Indeed the Irish nation at all times, as if instinctively, shrunk from accepting it as genuine, and unhesitatingly pronounced it an Anglo-Norman forgery. We have already seen how even Giraldus Cambrensis refers to the doubts which had arisen regarding the Bull of Pope Alexander; but we have at hand still more conclusive evidence that Adrian's Bull was universally rejected by our people. There is, happily, preserved in the Barberini archives, in Rome, a MS. of the fourteenth century containing a series of official papers connected with the Pontificate of John XXII., and amongst them is a letter from the Lord Justiciary and the Royal Council of Ireland forwarded to Rome under the Royal Seal, and presented to His Holiness by William of Nottingham, Canon and Precentor of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, about the year 1325. In this important, but hitherto unnoticed, document the Irish are accused of very many crimes, among which is insidiously introduced the rejection of the supposed Bull: "Moreover, they assert that the King of England under false pretences and by false Bulls obtained the dominion of Ireland, and this opinion is commonly held by them,"—" *Asserentes etiam Dominum Regem Angliæ ex falsa suggestione et ex falsis Bullis terram Hiberniæ in dominium impetrasse ac communitè hoc tenentes.*" This national tradition was preserved unbroken throughout the turmoil of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; and on the revival of our historical literature, in the beginning of the seventeenth century, it was registered in the pages of Lynch, Stephen White, and other writers.

It will be well also, whilst forming our judgment regarding this supposed Bull of Adrian, to hold in mind the disturbed state of society, especially in Italy, at the time to which it refers. At the present day it would be no easy matter indeed for such a forgery to survive more than a few weeks. But at the close of the Twelfth Century it was far otherwise. Owing to the constant revolutions and disturbances that then prevailed, the Pontiff was oftentimes

obliged to fly from city to city; frequently his papers were seized and burned, and he himself detained as a hostage or a prisoner by his enemies. Hence it is that several forged Bulls, examples of which are given in *Cambrensis Eversus*, date from these times. More than one of the grants made to the Norman families are now believed to rest on such forgeries; and that the Anglo-Norman adventurers in Ireland were not strangers to such deeds of darkness, appears from the fact that a matrix for forging the Papal Seal of such Bulls, now preserved in the R. I. Academy, was found a few years ago in the ruins of one of the earliest Anglo-Norman monasteries founded by De Courcy.

The circumstances of the publication of the Bull by Henry were surely not calculated to disarm suspicion. Our opponents do not even pretend that it was made known in Ireland till the year 1175, and hence, though publicly granted with solemn investiture, as John of Salisbury's testimony would imply, and though its record was deposited in the public archives of the kingdom, this Bull, so vital to the interests of the Irish Church, should have remained dormant for twenty years, unnoticed in Rome, unnoticed by Henry's courtiers, still more, unnoticed by the Irish Bishops, and, I will add, unnoticed by the Continental Sovereigns so jealous of the power and preponderance of the English monarch. For such suppositions there is no parallel in the whole history of investitures.

It is seldom, too, that the hand of the impostor may not be detected in some at least of the minor details of the spurious document. In the present instance more than one ancient MS. preserves the concluding formula of the Bull, *Datum Romæ*, "Dated from Rome." Now, this simple formula would suffice of itself to prove the whole Bull to be a forgery. Before the news of the election of Pope Adrian to the Chair of St. Peter could reach England, that Pontiff was obliged to seek for safety in flight from his capital. Rome was in revolt, and Arnold of Brescia sought to renew there a spectre of the old Pagan Republic. John of Salisbury, in his *Polyorations*, faithfully attests that on his arrival in Italy the Papal Court was held not in Rome but in Beneventum; it was in this city he presented to Pope Adrian the congratulations of Henry II., and he mentions his sojourn there during the three months that he remained in Italy. This is further confirmed by the Italian chronicles. Baronius saw the inconsistency of the formula, *Datum Romæ*, with the date 1155, and hence, in his *Annals* he entered Adrian's Bull under the year 1159; but if this date be correct, surely then that Bull could not have been brought to Henry by John of Salisbury, and the passage of the *Metalogicus* referring to it must at once be admitted a forgery. Other historians have been equally puzzled to find a year for this supposed Bull. For instance, O'Halloran, in his *History of Ireland*, whilst admitting that the Irish people always regarded the Bull as a forgery, refers its date to the year 1167, that is, eight years after the death of Pope Adrian IV.

There is only one other reflection with which I wish to detain the reader. The condition of our country and the relations between Ireland and the English King, which are set forth in the supposed Bull, are precisely those of the year 1172; but it would have required more than prophetic vision to have anticipated them in 1155. In 1155 Ireland was not in a state of turmoil, or verging towards barbarism; on the contrary it was rapidly progressing and renewing its claim to religious and moral pre-eminence. I will add that Pope Adrian, who had studied under Irish masters, knew well this flourishing condition of our country. In 1172, however, a sad change had come over our island. Four years of continual warfare, and the ravages of the Anglo-Norman filibusterers, since their first landing in 1168, had well-nigh reduced Ireland to a state of barbarism; and the authentic letters of Alexander III., in 1172, faithfully describe its most deplorable condition. Moreover, an expedition of Henry to Ireland, which would not be an invasion, and yet would merit the homage of the Irish princes, was simply an impossibility in 1155. But owing to the special circumstances of the kingdom, such in reality was the expedition of Henry in 1172. He set out for Ireland not avowedly to invade and conquer it, but to curb the insolence and to punish the deeds of pillage of his own Norman freebooters. Hence, during his stay in Ireland he fought no battle and made no conquest; his first measures of severity were directed against some of the most lawless of the early Norman adventurers, and this more than anything else reconciled the native princes to his military display. In return he received from the majority of the Irish chieftains the empty title of *Ardrigh*, or "Head Sovereign," which did not suppose any conquest on his part, and did not involve any surrender of their own hereditary rights. Such a state of things could not have been imagined in 1155; and yet it is one which is implied in the spurious Bull of the much maligned Pontiff, Adrian the Fourth.

Defeat is exasperating the anti-Catholic party in Belgium. That right to freedom of opinion which they are always claiming for themselves they are at present denying to the majority of their fellow-countrymen. Toleration is a virtue to be practised by their opponents, but not by themselves. In Brussels mobs have been assembling before the Chamber of Deputies for the purpose of intimidating the Government, and Ministers have been insulted as they walked through the streets. Such is the self-restraint of Continental infidelity.—*Nation*, August 23.

The Very Rev. Abbe Hogan, of Paris, sailed on the 16th August, from Liverpool on the Guion Steamer Alaska for New York. The Abbe has been for twenty-five years one of the directors of the Grand Seminaire at Paris. Father Hogan is one of the best known priests in this country who has never visited it. His name is held in veneration by the hundreds of priests throughout the whole American Continent, who have been pupils of his at St. Sulpice. He is now on his way to Boston to take charge of the new Sulpician Seminary, recently established for the use of the Archdiocese of Boston. The Seminary will be opened on the 22nd of September by Archbishop Williams. It is situated in Brighton, and will be under the direction of the priests of the Congregation of St. Sulpice. In our next issue will be printed the address, presented to the Very Rev. Abbe by the priests of Paris, previous to his departure from that city.—*Pilot*.