

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

ART. V.—IRELAND ECCLESIASTICALLY CONSIDERED.

PART I.

The misfortunes of a nation are not always the faults of her conquerors; they are sometimes vengeance resulting from her own crimes.—LAMARTINE.

OF all the Western Churches, the Church of Ireland was the last that recognised Papal authority. This took place in the twelfth century. Our thoughts are naturally carried back to the days of "Saint" Patrick. We need go no higher, for it cannot be contested that Christianity was planted in Ireland long previous to the date of the mission attributed to St. Patrick, A.D. 422.¹ I adopt the term "saint" by custom; but when Patrick obtained that brevet-rank in the celestial hierarchy is nowhere, to my knowledge, recorded. Biographers, however, are not wanting who have recorded wonderful miracles alleged to have been performed by him, the theory of development being wonderfully prominent the further we get from the time when the "saint" is said to have lived; while the curious fact stands undenied that he himself, although he is said to have solemnly recorded the history of his own life and labours in his "Confessions" (at least attributed to him, and said to have been written shortly before his death), abstains from taking credit to himself for the possession of miraculous powers. Joslin, in the twelfth century, introduced many additional fables in his "*Vita Patricii*" (*Acta SS. Mart.*).

The Roman Catholic Church celebrates the festival of St. Patrick on March 17 in each year. The Roman Breviary tells us: "By Divine admonition he was called to the salvation of the Irish; and the liberty of preaching the Gospel being committed to him by St. Celestine, the Pope, and being consecrated Bishop, he proceeded to Ireland. He constituted, by the authority of the Roman Pontiff, the See of Armagh the metropolis of the whole of Ireland." The Breviary proceeds to tell us: "Having been appointed to feed the flocks, he gave a proof of his future sanctity; for, being filled with the spirit of faith and of divine fear and love, he rose with activity before day, through snow, and frost, and rain, to pour forth prayers to God, being accustomed to pray one hundred times through the day, and one hundred times in the night." All this took place when he was a youth. After he was made Bishop of Armagh, we are told: "Besides his daily care of the Church, he never relaxed his unwearied soul from prayer, for they say that he was accustomed to recite daily the whole Psalter, together with the Canticles and hymns, and two hundred

¹ See Lanigan's "*Ecclesiastical History*," vol. i., pp. 1-9. Dublin, 1822.

prayers; that every day he worshipped God three hundred times on bended knees, and in every canonical hour of the day fortified himself one hundred times with the sign of the cross. Distributing the night into three parts, he spent the first part in running over one hundred Psalms and two hundred genuflections; the second in going through the remaining fifty Psalms immersed in cold water, and with his heart, eyes, and hands raised towards heaven; but the third he gave to light slumber, stretched on the bare stones."

Every Roman priest is bound to read these monstrous fables on every 17th of March, on pain of committing a mortal sin. And all these "ecclesiastical gymnastics" are, no doubt, placed to his credit in the celestial Bank of Merits, called "The Treasure of the Church."¹

The above is an adaptation from the "Confessions," attributed to Patrick, in the "Book of Armagh." The earliest date given to the "Book of Armagh" is A.D. 807, which purports to contain the "Confessions" and other writing,² and the "Memoirs" of the "saint." It is written in ungrammatical Latin, and many works attributed to Patrick are undoubtedly spurious. The "Memoirs" speak of displays of miraculous powers of the "saint," to which he nowhere refers in writings attributed to him; in fact, these are fables of much later date.

St. Patrick is said to have come from the Clyde, and, born A.D. 372, to have become Bishop A.D. 433, and to have fixed his residence in Armagh. Notwithstanding the statement made in the Breviary, he never was a member of the Church of Rome in doctrine or in fact, nor did he derive his mission from the Bishop of Rome. The same Breviary tells us that Patrick was an Englishman, while the Jesuit Dr. Weniger, in his "Lives of the Saints," p. 334, says St. Patrick was a native of France.

In his "Confessions,"³ he is represented as telling us that "the Lord chose him to teach the barbarous nations"—that "he was sent by God as an Apostle, even as Paul, to the Gentiles." He "was chosen by God to watch over the people of God"; "the Saviour ordained him for his merits"; "Christ chose him to be His Vicar on earth"; but there is not one word of the idle tale of his supposed consecration, or appoint-

¹ I quote from the Roman Breviary, edit. 1786, "revised by the decree of the Council of Trent," by command of Pope Pius V., and revised by the authority of Popes Clement VIII. and Urban VIII." Spring portion, p. 547. The Dublin edition, 1845, has the same tale.

² See the paper in the "Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy," iii., pp. 316-324.

³ Edit. Villaneuva, pp. 193 *et seq.* Dublin, 1835.

ment by Celestine. His alleged consecration by Celestine is admitted by two learned Romish writers, Drs. Lanigan and Coglan, to be wholly apocryphal.¹

The first intimation we find of Patrick's journey to Rome, or of his Papal mission to Ireland, is in "Hericus Vita S. Germani," i. 12 (Art. SS. Jul. vii.), written about the year 860.

Prosper Aquitanus, who was a notary of the Roman See, and friend of Celestine, in his "Annals of the Church," refers to Palladius being sent by Celestine, but that his mission was utterly sterile—in fact, a complete failure. But, what is very remarkable, Prosper makes no mention of St. Patrick, who, as is said, went to Ireland the very next year, though alleged to be sent by Celestine. Patrick himself, in the works attributed to him, neither directly nor indirectly alludes to his supposed connection with Rome—except in one spurious work, called "Charta de Antiquitate Avellonica," which the editor, J. L. Villaneuva, himself a Roman Catholic, admits to be such. Neither is any allusion found in the Hymn of St. Sechnall (Secundinus), composed in praise of St. Patrick; neither does it appear to have been known to the Irish writer, Murchin Macen Machteri, who wrote the Life of St. Patrick in the seventh century; nor in the much-relied-on historian Bede, who wrote his history early in the eighth century. In compiling his history, Bede was, as he tells us, supplied with materials for it from the archives of Rome. Bede records the mission of Palladius to Ireland, and often refers to the affairs of the Irish Church, but never once mentions even the name of Patrick! Indeed, there are historians who gravely doubt whether such a person as St. Patrick ever existed.² As a fact, he is mentioned by no authentic writer of a date anterior to the ninth century; he is entirely unnoticed by Bede, Cogitosus, Adarnan, and Cumman, who could not have omitted to name so distinguished a missionary had the fact ever reached them. The silence of early Roman writers about him is additional evidence that he had nothing to do with Rome.

O'Halloran, a historian of credit, says: "At a very early period Christianity was preached in Ireland. The constant enmity between this country [Ireland] and ancient Rome prevented any kind of friendly intercourse."³ He names Palladius as having undertaken a mission to Ireland, but which is admitted to have been an utter failure. It lasted only two months! Cardinal Baronius, the "Annalist," went

¹ Lanigan, vol. i., p. 194. Dublin, 1822. Coglan, "Trias Thaumaturga," p. 253.

² See Gordon's "History of Ireland, from the Earliest Accounts," etc., vol. i., cap. iii., p. 29. Dublin, 1805.

³ Vol. i., cap. iii., p. 29. Dublin, 1805.

so far as to assert that for the latter half of the sixth century "the Bishops of Ireland were all schismatics, separated from the Church of Rome."¹ And O'Halloran further tells us that "from this period [the seventh century] to the middle of the twelfth Rome and Ireland had no communication or correspondence." In describing the state of Ireland in the twelfth century, he says: "It does not appear that the Popes had ever enjoyed any direct authority over that Church [the Irish]. No proof whatever can be produced that the Popes nominated to the bishoprics amongst us."²

The candid priest Dr. Charles O'Connor, in his third letter, entitled "Columbanus ad Hibernos," says: "It will appear evident from the Irish annals, as well as from letters of the ancient Fathers, published by Usher in his 'Sylloge,' and from the lives of Jonas, that the Irish always appointed their own bishops, without so much as the knowledge of Rome."³ Dr. Lanigan again informs us that no Papal legate ever appeared in Ireland to exercise any spiritual jurisdiction in "that country until the twelfth century"; and the canonized saint of the Roman Church, esteemed as the last of the Fathers—St. Bernard—said: "Gilbert, Bishop of Limerick, in the twelfth century, was the first who discharged the duties of Apostolic legate in Ireland."⁴

We are often reminded that "Saint" Columbanus recognised the supremacy of the Pope. The two epistles of Columbanus to Gregory I. and to Boniface (607), Bishops of Rome, tell a different tale. M. Languet, the eminent French Jesuit and historian, censures Columbanus as being heterodox, and declares from these epistles that "It is plainly saying that he [Columbanus] would not submit to the decision of Pope Boniface asked for, unless it agreed with his own principles."⁵ In fact, he challenged Gregory's orthodoxy, and also that of Boniface: "Seeing that many entertain doubts of the purity of your faith"! On this subject I would refer to the eminent Roman Catholic writer, Montalembert, in his work "Monks of the West," vol. ii., pp. 408, 409, 441, 442, etc. Here we have various quotations from the writings of Columbanus, "appealing to the judgment of the 150 Fathers of the Council of Constantinople, who judged that the Churches of God among the barbarians should live according to the laws taught them by their fathers." The British and Irish bishops refused to accept laws from Rome.

¹ "Annales," ad an. 566, tom. vii., p. 577; and ad an. 604, tom. viii., pp. 195, 196. Antwerp, 1611.

² Edit. as above, pp. 116, 395.

³ P. 43. Buckingham, 1812.

⁴ "Oper.," tom. i., p. 674. Benedictine edition.

⁵ "Hist. de l'Eglise Gallic.," liv. ix., l'an 602, tom. iii., p. 371.

The alleged fact (supposing the passage be genuine), that Columbanus addressed Gregory and Boniface, in a letter which apparently recognised their supremacy, is beside the question. Such language proves nothing, for Usher shows that the titles "Summus Sacerdos" and "Summus Pontifex," now exclusively claimed by the Church of Rome for her chief Bishop, were accorded to the Bishop of Kildare. But such language does not convey any such exclusive meaning as is proposed to be attached to it. What do Romanists say of Gregory Nazianzen, who said of Athanasius that, "on being made Bishop of Alexandria, he was made Bishop of the whole world";¹ and of Basil, who speaks of Athanasius as "having the care of all the churches, as much as that which was particularly committed to him"?²

As to St. Patrick, there is not a single trace in his "Confessions" that he recognised the authority of the Bishop of Rome. A canon of a synod said to have been presided over by St. Patrick is reported to have been passed that "the greater causes should be referred to the Apostolic See." Modern writers add the words "of Rome." The passage, however, attributed to St. Patrick is: "Si quæ causæ oriuntur in hac insulâ, ad sedem Apostolicam referantur"; but not a word about Rome. There can be no doubt that the See of Armagh was referred to, as that was called the Apostolic See of Ireland even so late as A.D. 1014.³ The alleged original canon is given in the Appendix No. 117 of O'Curry's "MS. Materials for Irish History." But here, again, the Roman Catholic historian, Dr. Lanigan,⁴ first quotes the words of St. Patrick as given above, then as to O'Curry's expanded version, he says: "I suspect this canon, as now quoted, is not quite as ancient as St. Patrick's time, and that it is a paraphrastic explanation of the original short one of St. Patrick, yet conveying its true meaning." That, of course, is his private opinion as a Roman Catholic. But we are dealing with *facts*, not *opinions*. He gives a cogent reason for branding it as spurious. "It seems," he says, "to allude to Scottish churches out of Ireland, which also should have recourse to the See of Armagh. Now, there were no such churches in St. Patrick's days."

The "Book of Armagh" has a historical interest as being the earliest record relied on, and deserves special notice. The translation of the canon in question, as given by O'Curry, is

¹ Orat. xxi., tom. i., p. 377. Edit. Morrell. Paris, 1630.

² Ep. 69, tom. iii., p. 161. Benedictine edition.

³ See Usher's "Religion of the Ancient Irish," cap. vii., p. 585. Cambridge, 1835.

⁴ "History of Ireland," cap. xv., p. 391. Dublin, 1822.

as follows: "Also, if any cause shall arise very difficult and unknown to all the judges of the Scotch, it ought properly to be referred to the chair of the Archbishop of the Irish—that is, of Patrick—and to the examination of this Primate. But if the cause is such that it cannot be easily decided in this court, with the assistance of his wise men, then we determine that it must be sent to the Apostolic See—that is, to the chair of St. Peter the Apostle, which has the authority of the City of Rome." A marvellous expansion!

The genuineness of this canon has been questioned by Dr. Lanigan in his "History of Ireland"; but he, with Roman controversialists in general, takes for granted that this appeal to the Roman See had reference to ecclesiastical matters. There is not the slightest evidence of anything of the sort. The presumption is entirely the other way—"if any cause," and that was to be referred to the *judges*. Wynn, in his "General History of Ireland,"¹ to which Dr. Lanigan refers, leading on to this canon, observes: "In these transactions we do not find the Pope interfering, and we further read that the Irish bishops went on consecrating one another, and that there were no archbishops there till a certain legate of the Pope, seven hundred years afterwards, brought four palls thither—a custom which was, till that time, unknown in Ireland. There were, in fact, no archbishops in Ireland."

In a note, Wynn refers to the "Book of Armagh" as one of a series of "venerable manuscripts preserved to the present time." In a previous part of the note we are informed that the subjects under discussion were questions of genealogy, and of pedigree; more probably, one would think, attaching to titles to land and other secular matters. These subjects were said to be recommended to St. Patrick for examination by the King. The chronicles and genealogies were submitted to him, "but the saint modestly refused to act in a matter of this importance upon his own judgment."

It was, as alleged, on Patrick's recommendation that a convocation was summoned by the royal mandate of the "principal clergy, historians and antiquaries of the kingdom; writs to express the time and place of these meetings were issued." "By this learned committee, of which St. Patrick was one, were the genealogies of the principal families and the ancient records of the kingdom carefully examined and purged of all spurious relations, and then deposited in the archives of the island. These archives were entrusted to the care of the prelates of the kingdom, and among them is enumerated the 'Book of Armagh.'"

¹ Vol. i., pp. 103, 104. London, 1772.

But if this be the true explanation, the "difficult questions" were clearly not theological, but merely secular; and therefore it is not only highly improbable, but absurd, to suppose that the See of Rome was consulted—the authority of the Bishop of Rome was in no way recognised; but the canon even as now presented to us, as amended, is disputed.

I cannot close this part of my subject without drawing attention to a very curious and unexpected circumstance. We know when certain parties fall out honest men come to their rights. I refer to the book entitled "*Primatus Dubliensis*," by Peter Talbot, the Roman Archbishop in Dublin, published in 1764. An unseemly ecclesiastical squabble took place between two rival archbishops. Talbot claimed for himself the primacy of Ireland as Archbishop of Dublin; Dr. Oliver Plunkett, the Roman Archbishop in Armagh, wrote a book to prove that he (Plunkett) was Primate of Ireland as successor in the See of St. Patrick. Talbot demolished Plunkett's pretensions. Dr. O'Halloran and Dr. O'Connor, as I have shown, asserted that the Popes of Rome did not appoint or invest Irish bishops. Talbot undertook to prove, in the work mentioned, that the Pope did not make archbishops in Ireland before the twelfth century. At page 10 he writes: "It appears from St. Bernard's words that the Pall and the Primacy of St. Patrick were fabulous"! After quoting St. Bernard's words that "the Pall was wanting from the beginning," he concludes: "This was wanting from the beginning to the See of Armagh, and to all Ireland, as appears from the words of St. Bernard." In page 17 he says: "St. Patrick never was a Primate, nor even Archbishop, since he had not the Pall." In page 41 he adds: "I have consulted what authorities I could, and I have considered the annals treating of the matter, and I here seriously declare that I have fallen on no authority of credit who produces even a probable conjecture that, even at any time, the See of Armagh obtained the primacy of Ireland from the Apostolic See." A see claiming to be of Apostolic origin, and the claim to primacy, are two very different things. Rome claims to be apostolically founded, so did Antioch and other Eastern churches; but this fact did not confer a primacy. Talbot then claimed a primacy for his see, Dublin (page 26), on the plea that the Pall, or the insignia of the office of an archbishop, was first given to the See of Dublin by the Pope; and this estimable gift was conferred in the year of grace 1152, at the Synod of Kells. So that, according to this Romish Archbishop in Dublin, we are deliberately informed that Ireland never had an archbishop or primate until the middle of the twelfth century, and that neither Patrick himself nor any of his successors, until that period, ever was or were lawful

primates, or even bishops (according to the present Roman theory or requirement), simply because the Pope of Rome had not made them such. Bishops of the Irish Church were appointed by laymen, that is, by the Kings of Ireland, according to the discipline of the early Church. It was pointed out by the Roman priest, Dr. Charles O'Connor,¹ that King James I. was the legitimate descendant of the Kings of Ireland and the Kings of England. The crowns of England and Ireland were thus clearly united by legitimate descent, and since that day the crown of England and Ireland thus united has rested no longer on forgery or violence, but on a lawful title. According to Dr. O'Connor, our Queen is the descendant of the old Kings of Ireland, of Heber and Hereman, as well as of the Kings of England. The right of investiture or appointment of bishops was by ancient ecclesiastical and national custom practised in Ireland, and vested in the King many centuries before Papal usurped rule existed in that country, and it became vested in Queen Victoria.

In disestablishing and disendowing the Irish Church, the very ancient rights have been taken from the crown by the act of Mr. Gladstone. Ireland was, until the twelfth century, equally independent of the Pope and of the Roman Church, and was equally independent of England. She was national in her Church and State.

The least politic part of Mr. Gladstone's Act, in depriving the Irish Church of her endowments, was that out of her revenues he gave £300,000 to perpetually endow Maynooth College, established for the education of Roman Catholic priests—educating them in thorough hatred of English rule, furnishing Ireland, at the present day, with the leaders of revolt, and for the separation of Ireland from the jurisdiction of Great Britain, placing her again practically under the dominion of the Pope and of the Roman Church. Previous to that confiscation an annual subsidy was granted to that institution in the estimates—the Budget—to be renewed only on their good behaviour. They were thus emancipated from control, and perpetually endowed from the revenues of a Protestant and State Church.

It now becomes necessary to show how Ireland became subject to Papal rule, and with it subject to England. It was the joint action of Popes Adrian IV. and Alexander III., striking an iniquitous bargain with our King Henry II.

I have briefly shown that Ireland was independent of Rome down to the twelfth century. To echo the words of Dr. Leland

¹ "An Historical Address," No. 2, p. xlvi. Buckingham, 1812.

in his "History of Ireland from the Invasion of Henry II.": "All ecclesiastical authority in Ireland had, until about four years before the accession of Henry II., been by her own prelates."¹

We need not repeat here the particulars of the quarrel between Henry II. and the rebellious Thomas à Becket. The haughty à Becket, though appointed by Henry first his Chancellor and then Archbishop, resisted the authority of the King, and would only acknowledge that of the Pope. Complications followed, which ended in the tragic fate of à Becket. He was murdered in his own cathedral. This had such an effect on the mind of Henry that a superstitious awe seized him, and resulted in his complete and servile submission to the Pope. He did penance by submitting to be lashed by monks. Once again the Pope obtained ecclesiastical dominion over England, and Henry became his abject slave. The Pope rewarded him in return. It was in this state of things in England that Henry turned a covetous eye towards Ireland, and conceived the idea of making a conquest of the country. The Pope, not by Divine right, but on the alleged authority of a forged gift called "The Donation of Constantine," claimed a supremacy over, and the right of disposal of, all islands throughout the world. Henry sent John of Salisbury to seek, at the hands of the Pope, a concession to him of Ireland. John of Salisbury, as he himself has left on record, obtained from Pope Adrian a concession of Ireland, "to be possessed by Henry by a hereditary right. For," continues the writer, "of ancient right all islands are to belong to the Roman Church by virtue of the Donation of Constantine, and he [Constantine] founded and endowed her [the Roman Church]."² The Pope sent by John "a golden ring, which the investment of law, in conveying Ireland should be made."

Dr. Lanigan, a Roman priest, in his "Ecclesiastical History of Ireland," of this forged Donation of Constantine" says: "This nonsense of the Pope being head owner of all Christian islands had been partially announced to the world in a Bull of Pope Urban II., dated A.D. 1091, in which, on disposing of the island of Corsica, he said the Emperor Constantine had given the island to Peter as his vicar."³ Pope Adrian, in recompense for Henry's submission, granted him the concession of Ireland by solemn Bull. This Bull authorized Henry to raise an army,⁴ to conquer and take possession of Ireland, and

¹ Vol. i., cap. i. London, 1773.

² *Metalogus*, lib. v., cap. ult., pp. 240, 241. Paris, 1610.

³ Vol. iv., p. 166. Dublin, 1822.

⁴ For the text of this Bull, see Appendix A to this article.

“thus,” as the Bull proceeds, “to enlarge the borders of the Church, teaching the truth of the Christian faith to the ignorant and rude, extirpating the roots of vice from the field of the Lord.” And after asserting the ownership of the land, he declared that “therefore he was the more solicitous to propagate the righteous plantation of faith in that island, and the branch acceptable to God, and that the Christian faith may be planted and grow up.” In return he stipulated that each house throughout Ireland should pay “a yearly pension of one penny to St. Peter.” The people were to receive the King “honourably and with reverence as their head.” Not a single reference is made to the alleged mission of St. Patrick. Thus a mercenary and unrighteous bargain was struck between the Pope and Henry. With the Pope it was a simple matter of commercial transaction—a money bargain! O’Halloran gives a translation of this Bull as an authentic document.¹ Dr. Lanigan, in his “Ecclesiastical History of Ireland,” of this Bull says: “Adrian’s Bull is of so unwarrantable and unjustifiable a nature that some writers could not bring themselves to believe that he issued it, and have endeavoured to have it a forgery. But their efforts were of no avail, and never did there exist a more real authentic document.”²

Henry was not able to carry out his ambitious designs in Adrian’s lifetime; accordingly, in 1172, he obtained from his successor, Alexander III., “a confirmation and ratification of the Bull, provided that the abomination of the land being removed, that barbarous people, Christians in name, may by your means be reformed, and their lives and conversation mended, so that their disordered Church being thus reduced to regular discipline, that nation may, with the name of Christian, be so in act and deed; reserving to St. Peter, and to the Holy Roman Church, as well in England as in Ireland, the yearly pension of one penny for every house.”³

Popes Adrian and Alexander had no very exalted idea of the Irish in those days; at least, they did not entertain the modern notion that Ireland was the “land of saints.”

Under Papal authority and patronage Henry commenced his crusade; he conquered Ireland and levied “Peter’s pence”; and now, for the first time, the Irish nation was subjected to English rule, and the Church of Ireland to Papal rule. It was at the Synod of Cashel in 1172 that the Irish bishops, under

¹ “History of Ireland,” vol. ii., p. 360. London, 1778.

² Vol. iv., p. 164. Dublin, 1822.

³ O’Halloran (as above), vol. ii., p. 368; and Dr. Lanigan (as above), vol. iv., p. 223.

the influence of Henry II., were first made to acknowledge the authority of the Bishop of Rome. The forged decretals of the early Bishops of Rome were then believed in as true as the Gospels. Many, however, still held aloof. It was not until the thirteenth century that the Pope appointed an archbishop in Ireland.

Such, then, was the origin of England's rule and that of the Roman Church in Ireland. The latter based on a forged document, the former accomplished purely for a mercenary consideration, and obtained by conquest, to satisfy the ambition of a vacillating, superstitious, and time-serving monarch.

C. H. COLLETTE.

(To be continued.)

Reviews.

THE HIBBERT LECTURES.¹

- 1891.—*Lectures on the Origin and Growth of the Conception of God as illustrated by Anthropology and History.* By Count GOBLET D'ALVIELLA.
- 1892.—*Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion as illustrated by the Religion of the Ancient Hebrews.* By C. G. MONTEFIORE.
- 1893.—*Lectures on the Bases of Religious Belief.* By C. B. UPTON.
- 1894.—*Via, Veritas, Vita; being Lectures on "Christianity in its most Simple and Intelligible Form."* By JAMES DRUMMOND, LL.D.

BY the death of Mr. Robert Hibbert in 1849, a sum of money was bequeathed by him for the foundation of a trust fund, to be applied in a manner indicated in general terms by the testator himself, but with considerable latitude of interpretation to the trustees. For many years the funds were devoted to the higher culture of students for the Christian ministry, but subsequently it was deemed advisable to deflect the use of these funds somewhat, and employ them in the institution of a Hibbert Lecture, on a plan similar to that of the "Bampton" Lectures.

The trustees were fortunate enough to secure, as the first lecturer on the new foundation, the services of one of the most accomplished and learned scholars of this generation—Professor Max Müller. His lectures, on the "Origin and Growth of Religion as illustrated by the Religions of India," were delivered in the Chapter House of Westminster Abbey in 1878. Every student of comparative religion is tolerably familiar with these brilliant lectures, which manage to combine a maximum amount of information with the maximum amount of lucidity—a combination at all times not very common, but never absent from any work to which Max Müller has set his hand. The object of the Hibbert Lectures was, as the memorial drawn up previous to their establishment stated, "the capable

¹ All the volumes of the Hibbert Lectures are published by Messrs. Williams and Norgate.