

inexcusable by the fact that (a) on the very same page of the report the Pope's position is expressly stated to be, not that of one who is absolutely supreme, but that of the representative, vicar, or delegate of Another; and (b) that his teaching and executive authority is not direct, but derived, and is for 'the Christian society' which Christ founded 'on earth.'

(c) The last sentence given in the Choral Hall version of the 'Manning extract' is a misquotation and mistranslation from the Bull *Unam Sanctam*, of which not a trace is to be seen anywhere in the *Tablet* report.

(d) Moreover, it is not true, as alleged by Mr. Gibb, that Manning's reported words are, or profess to be, statements of 'Catholic doctrine.'

On July 27, a fortnight after the date of his Choral Hall speech, and when the controversy was already in full swing, the Rev. Mr. Gibb introduced incidentally into the controversy a fresh and, of course, second-hand version of the 'Manning extract.' It was alleged to have been taken at second-hand from a book by a

Rev. Mr. Lilley,

and, like the Choral Hall extract, was said to have been taken from the London *Tablet* of October 9, 1864. It does not, however, alter the words 'civil superior' to 'civil power,' nor omit the words 'on earth' in the connection referred to above, nor add the tag from the Bull *Unam Sanctam*. The wording of this new extract did not enter into the doctrinal discussion, and I contented myself with saying in regard to it that the Rev. Mr. Lilley 'has blundered, at least in his references, here.' This is now admitted both by the Rev. Mr. Gibb and the Rev. Mr. Lilley.

The Rev. Mr. Gibb in his letter of yesterday (Friday) evening states that I described the Rev. Mr. Lilley's version of the 'Manning extract' as 'an impudent fabrication.' I did no such thing. The words were used in my letter of July 20 regarding the Choral Hall edition of the extract, exactly a week before the first publication of the Lilley version. In my letter of July 31 I explained that in the high-pressure speed at which your publishing arrangements compelled me to write my letter of July 20 the words "impudent fabrication" had escaped my too hurried censorship, and I expressed my willingness to regard the Choral Hall extract as due to 'a reporter's blunder and an editorial oversight.' I am now satisfied that the word 'fabrication' is by no means too strong to stigmatise that dishonorable specimen of the ungentle art of the quotation-rigger.

The Rev. Mr. Lilley's letter to the Rev. Mr. Gibb makes painful reading. (a) In his book ('Principles of Protestantism,' p. 235) he professed to quote the London *Tablet* of October 9, 1864. In his letter to the Rev. Mr. Gibb he admits that he did no such thing, but that he had 'the precise date of the sermon' * (and presumably the extract as well) 'from a ministerial friend in Scotland.' This reminds one strongly of the Rev. Mr. Gibb's statement, when challenged by me some time ago, that he had heard a certain

Absurd Story

about a papal brief from a man who had read about it in a newspaper fourteen or fifteen years ago. (b) The Rev. Mr. Lilley admits that the date of the *Tablet* (1864) is erroneous. Moreover (c) his freshly-revised version confirms the statement published by me in the NEW ZEALAND TABLET of October 10, 1901, that he had dissected thirty-three words out of the body of his second-hand quotation without giving the smallest indication of this form of garbling. † (d) Again: He tore the quotation from its proper context. ‡ And (e) the very latest version of the 'Manning extract' given by this 'scholarly' clergyman in his letter to the Rev. Mr. Gibb alters two words of the text (though not so as to alter the general sense), and, by a trick of punctuation, constructs a sentence in such a way as is highly calculated to mislead the unwary reader. § I am strongly inclined to believe that the Rev. Mr. Lilley is, like the Rev. Mr. Gibb, still quoting at second-hand. I am not, like the Rev. Mr. Lilley and the Rev. Mr. Gibb, quoting at second-hand, but with the *Tablet* report of Manning's words open before me. I am, of course, unable to say whether Manning ever used the precise words attributed to him in the report. Some of them are not carefully selected, but they are of course, not statements of 'Catholic doctrine,' but expressions of personal opinion or inferences delivered during a period of anti-papal storm and fury. In a moment of political and religious calm, the Rev. Mr. Gibb himself pleaded in the Choral Hall that 'in the heat of public utterance' he might 'overstate his case,' and invited his audience to 'make a liberal reduction' for 'the fervor of the platform.'

Let me assure the Rev. Mr. Gibb that the necessary exposure of the unworthy methods of controversy of those whom he has trusted not wisely, but too well, has been a painful task to me. But I shall be satisfied if it teaches a few well-meaning but uncritical opponents to learn at least a Catholic child's penny catechism before setting up as 'authorities' on Catholic doctrine, to verify their references, and not endeavour to gain a spurious reputation for scholarship by giving, as the results of first-hand research, second-hand extracts and garbled quotations.—I am, etc.,

EDITOR 'N.Z. TABLET.'

March 8,

* 'The precise date of the sermon,' as stated in the *Tablet* report (p. 601), was Sunday, October 3, 1869. No reference to the 'date of the sermon,' whether 'precise' or otherwise, was made by the Rev. Mr. Lilley in his curiously blundering book (so far as Catholic matters are concerned). The reference is only to the alleged date of the publication of the report of the sermon—which is obviously quite a different thing. Here is the full and only reference given by Rev. Mr. Lilley to his mutilated version of the 'Manning extract': 'Sermon, *Tablet*, October 9, 1864.' As a matter of fact, the *Tablet* report of Manning's sermon did not appear for five years later, so that the Rev. Mr.

Lilley's 'precise' information is a double-barrelled blunder. He has completely set aside Rev. Mr. Gibb's theory that the error was the work of the printer, for he states in the letter published above that he gave the date in his book just as he got it from his unnamed 'ministerial friend in Scotland.' Thanks to the Rev. Mr. Gibb and his Arbroath friend, we have now got to the origin of the various garbled or 'faked' versions of the notorious 'Manning extract.' It will be remembered that, in our very first letter in reply to Rev. Mr. Gibb's Choral Hall outbreak, we stated that 'October 9, 1864, fell *fell on a Sunday*.' Can it be possible that this information has something to do with the Rev. Mr. Lilley's statement regarding 'the precise date of the sermon?' At any rate, the Rev. Mr. Lilley was evidently napping when he penned that curious letter to Rev. Mr. Gibb.

† The Rev. Mr. Gibb guaranteed the 'accuracy' and 'scholarship' of his confrère of Arbroath. But in this, as in a number of other cases, the Rev. Mr. Lilley's 'scholarship' did not rise to the point of consulting the authorities from whom he professed to quote at first-hand; and his idea of 'accuracy' is such that he describes the mutilation of the Manning report mentioned above by the euphemistic term 'slight condensing'! It is really very hard for Catholic apologists to deal patiently with 'accuracy' such as this.

‡ The Rev. Mr. Lilley 'quoted' and manipulated a mere fragment of the peroration of Manning's discourse. That peroration is practically the summing up of the whole previous discourse, and to understand it properly, it is necessary to peruse all that precedes it; and this, though very much condensed, occupies 134 lines of the same width and of the same kind of type as the column above this footnote. The peroration, like the rest of the discourse, is set 'solid.' It occupies 51 lines of these; the garbled and 'faked' extract quoted at second-hand by the Rev. Mr. Lilley occupies, in its complete form, less than nine lines, taken out of 'solid' matter, and violently torn from the qualifying and explanatory text which precedes and follows it.

§ Rev. Mr. Lilley deals in a drastic way with the punctuation of the passage. For instance, he inserts five semi-colons where in the *Tablet* report there are none, he suppresses three dashes, and he puts a full point after the word 'kingdoms' where there is in the *Tablet* a dash. The *Tablet* thus connects the words 'I am sole last supreme judge,' etc., with the previous sentence, beginning 'I acknowledge.' But the cunning insertion of the full point instead of the dash makes a completely new sentence of the words 'I am sole last supreme judge,' etc., and thus detaches them from the governing and qualifying words 'on earth,' which appear in the same sentence in the *Tablet* report. The Pope's claim, as stated by Manning, is to be 'supreme judge on earth' in the matters belonging to his sphere, which are expressly stated to be matters of 'conscience,' 'right and wrong,' the evils of godless education, etc., of 'divorce,' 'Christian marriage,' the Church's teaching authority, interpretation of the Christian faith, etc. Of course the Rev. Mr. Lilley makes no mention of all this.

TO THE LANDS OF THE EVENING.

LYDDA and Jaffa, or Joppe, are linked in earliest memories and traditions of the Apostolic age. Jaffa, or Joppe by the sea, shrinking in its dark valleys from attack of the boisterous waves, rushing out on its rude rocks and natural battlements in defiance of the waves, brings us back to the patriarchal ages. Was it not at Joppe that Jonas 'found a ship going to Tharsis?' The storm cloud broke, white-faced fear was strong among the mariners, they cast lots for a victim, and the lot falling on the faithless prophet, they cast Jonas into the raging sea. But 'a great fish swallowed him, and he was in the belly of the fish three days and three nights.' So runs the sacred record. When the student of the higher criticism was impressing the recorded fact, the irreverent listener put up cheap dissent by asking if the story will ever be put beyond yea or nay, 'Well, when I go to heaven, I will ask Jonas himself,' meekly said the narrator. 'Suppose Jonas is not there,' was the cynic's thrust. But the retort was courteous and neat and effective. 'In that case,' quietly added the biblical champion, 'you can ask him.' And the student of higher criticism scored off the cynic's bat. St. Peter 'came down' from the hills of Samaria 'to the saints who dwelt at Lydda, and Sharon saw him and turned to the Lord'; and 'as Lydda was nigh to Joppe, he rose and went thither' to comfort the disciples mourning for the death of Tabitha or Dorcas whom he raised from the dead, and 'there he tarried many days with the tanner Simon, whose house was by the sea-side.' (Acts of the Apostles). On the flat roof of that house overlooking the restless sea, that still dashes in wanton merriment its battery of flashing waves against the rock-bound coast, was given to Peter the vision that opened to the nations lying in barbaric darkness at the horizon of the western sea, the light of faith, the heritage of the kingdom of peace. At Joppe was inspired the resolve to move onward and onward the landmarks of the kingdom of heaven; at Joppe was sealed the divine command to go forth without scrip or purse to the uttermost ends of the earth; at Joppe was marshalled the divine procession of militant apostles who claimed the world as their appanage—'All power is given to me, go forth and teach all nations.' North to Haifa and the land of the Samaritans, south to Gaza and Hebron, and the lonely desert, west over the blue waves to hardy nations ripe for the message, the little band went, strong in their charter, to gain unto Jesus Christ the souls that panted for light, and truth, and law, and grace. In the Roman garrison of Caesarea was enlisted the first gentile convert to Christianity. Here too, be it noted, across the plain of Sharon by Lydda and Joppe, St. Paul was led under cover of night to Antipatris, and in the strong-