

Register 9/2/94.

UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir—I am sorry that "Justinian" or any other reader of the Register should have thought that my remarks to your reporter the other day were "a veiled threat against the governing body of the University." Nothing was farther from my mind. Your reporter asked me to tell him of any matters of interest which were being discussed in the educational circles at home, and I naturally referred to the dismissal of my friend Professor Aldis, of Auckland, and the consequent resignations of Professors Brown and Thomas. I gave no opinion on the subject, but merely made a brief statement of facts which have appeared in English papers. I had no opportunity of taking part in the controversy, even had I wished to do so, for I do not know the details sufficiently, and I was just leaving England when it took place. Besides, it is a purely New Zealand question.

I am, Sir, &c.,
F. W. PENNEFATHER.

The University, Adelaide, February 6.

Register 5/2/94.

PROFESSOR PENNEFATHER'S INTERVIEW.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir—In your issue of to-day I notice that Professor Pennefather in the course of an interview stated that "the insecurity of tenure of office, i.e., of Professors at the Universities in Australasia, has been noted, and the matter has gone so far that a combination has been formed amongst the learned people in London and Cambridge to boycott colonial vacancies when they occur." It would have given some satisfaction if the Professor had told us what course he adopted to counteract the workings of this unjustifiable combination. He knows that the Professors hold office in terms of contracts to which they are consenting parties, and he knows also that in no case has there been any breach of covenant. The Professor would have been able to furnish a splendid illustration of the generous treatment accorded to himself by the University of Adelaide, which has allowed him to absent himself from his duties during two out of the past three years. The learned gentleman no doubt took good care that this excessively generous treatment of himself, as well as the ever honourable way in which he and his brother Professors at Adelaide have been treated, to be publicly known. It is to be regretted that no mention was made of his action in this regard in the interesting report of the interview which your reporter had with Dr. Pennefather, who, as we all know, would be the very last to do or to say anything that would tend to belittle the institution in whose service he is; nor would he allow any others to do this without entering his strong protest against any such disparagement. As the report stands in your issue Professor Pennefather's remarks have just a suspicion of a veiled threat against the governing body of the University, which was surely not intended.

I am, Sir, &c.,
JUSTINIAN.

February 2.

Register 20/2/94.

UNIVERSITY TEXTBOOKS AND THE ROMAN CATHOLICS.

"Justinian," Adelaide, writing on the senior history textbook prescribed by the University authorities for this year, says—"It is utterly unfair to require Catholic candidates for the senior examination to study the epoch of the crusades from such a poisoned source as that of the Rev. G. W. Cox." He remarks further:—"That the rev. gentleman is imbued with the bitterest feelings of hostility towards the Papacy, Monasticism, or anything emanating from the Roman Catholic Church is sufficiently apparent from every page of 'The Crusades.' In support of this contention our correspondent quotes and comments upon several of the objectionable passages, but unfortunately the demands upon our space render it impossible for us to publish these at the present time. "Justinian" adds that the whole tenor of the work is not only anti-Catholic but anti-Christian. In conclusion he says:—"The sympathies of the writer are plainly with Omar and Ketboza, but not with Urian and the Gregories, with the Turks, but not with the Christians. He can see no good whatever in the crusades. He details the unnumbered excesses of the wretched rabble that went forth blessed by the Vicar of Christ, but is silent about the many, especially amongst the leaders, who acted with moderation and a dignity worthy of the cause they defended. Such is the textbook which Catholics have to study in order to pass the senior examination. I am sure it must appear to any reflecting mind highly improper that Catholics should be compelled to study a book like this, so much out of harmony both with truth and their religion. I would suggest that whenever the University authorities are pleased to appoint an epoch of history to be studied, such as 'The Crusades' or 'Reign of Elizabeth,' which treat so extensively of vexed religious questions, no book be prescribed, but each one be free to study the facts of history from sources in harmony with his creed."

Advertiser 22/2/94.

ROMAN CATHOLICS AND THE UNIVERSITY.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir—Having had many evidences of the courtesy of the press towards Roman Catholics, I feel confident that you will allow space in your valuable paper for the ventilation of a grievance. The senior history text-book prescribed by the University authorities for this year is entitled "The Crusades," by Rev. G. W. Cox, M.A. That the writer is imbued with the bitterest feelings of hostility towards the Papacy, monasticism, or anything emanating from the Roman Catholic Church, is sufficiently apparent from every page of "The Crusades." But his antipathy to Catholicism might be easily passed over had he kept within the bounds of truth. Certainly in compiling his sketch he was at no pains about consulting the most impartial authorities; and if truth and impartiality are not the characteristics of a historian, his authority has very little weight. It is not my purpose to engage in any discussion, for which I have neither time nor inclination; but to show by some quotations or references how utterly unfair it is to require Catholic candidates for the senior examination to study the epoch of the crusades from such a poisoned source as that of the Rev. G. W. Cox. I shall not comment on the lecturing we get in the first chapter on the Christianity of St. Paul, nor on the mere statement that Constantine universally misapprehended to the last the teaching of the Divine Redeemer; but pass on to a very sweeping statement in cap. 11, p. 20, in which the writer, referring to the vast power of the Papacy, tells us that "Gregory the Great was a monk, therefore also a Manichean." Here we have reproduced three more of those groundless charges against this great and good pontiff, and which have been so often refuted. The writer can hardly have reflected upon the full import of his statement or I am sure he would have hesitated to involve the present and past illustrious monastic orders in the infamous doctrines and practices of the Manicheans. A great deal of bigotry is apparent in his remarks on Hildebrand (pp. 23-25). We are here given the usual Protestant view of Hildebrand's efforts after "Universal Theocracy." No doubt Catholic historians admit that Hildebrand had very advanced views on ecclesiastical government, but it is necessary to study calmly Gregory VII. and his time to see the qualifications for the assertion that "the civil rule was the mere development and working of the civil principle." That the assertion was qualified is certain, since even the Protestant historian Reader admits that "Gregory recognised the kingly authority as also ordained by God." As for the statement on p. 21 "that Gregory VII. whilst thanking the Sultan of Morocco for some indulgences granted to the Christians in his territories assured him that they held the same faith," &c., it must be treated with the