

THE EXPLORATION OF BENEDICTINE IDENTITY AMONG ENGLISH BENEDICTINES IN THE EARLY 1880s

Luke Beckett OSB, Ampleforth Abbey

General Introduction

The aim of this paper is to look at the exploration of Benedictine identity among English Benedictines in the early eighteen-eighties at the beginning of the Constitutional Controversy, focussing on the early years of that controversy as it led up to the Roman rescript *Cliftonien* (1883). I attempt to engage with the opinions of those who entered the lists of argument, and to ask what counted as arguments and evidence in this early stage.

The context is important. At a local level, in the year 1880 Dom Edmund Ford returned from Belmont to Downside. In the same year Mgr Weld preached the Downside retreat. Dom Aidan Gasquet was Prior and put Ford in as Prefect of Studies – and he began to reform things in the life of the school at Downside. 1880 was the fourteen hundredth anniversary of St Benedict, and also the year in which the building of Fort Augustus Abbey was completed. In 1881 *Romanos Pontifices* was promulgated, settling a number of disputes between the bishops and the regulars, on the whole in a way more pleasing to the bishops than the regulars. Also in that year (on June 11) Dom Boniface Krug, Prior of Monte Cassino was appointed Apostolic Visitor to the English Congregation. There was general alarm among the “mission” party, led by Fr Bury, Provincial of York, and opposition began. When Krug visited Downside (his first port of call) he interviewed the community and made his own view (which was strongly in favour of a renewed monastic impulse and opposed to mission work) clear. This led to difficulties during the rest of the Visitation, and the issue of a pamphlet by Dom Benedict Snow, the Provincial of York, entitled *The Missionary Work of the Benedictines*, which was followed by an Italian pamphlet, designed to influence the Roman Curia *Le Consequenze Funeste alla Congregazione Anglicana della Perdita delle sue Missioni*, (though formally anonymous, this was by Dom Austin Bury). Shortly after this another Italian pamphlet appeared, putting the reform case: *I Benedettini Inglesi*, by Mgr Weld. This engendered a response: *Notes on the Pamphlet “I Benedettini Inglesi”*, which was also

issued anonymously (though the author was Dom Bede Prest), and a follow up *A Reply to 'The Missionary Work of the Benedictines.'*, likewise anonymous, but issued under the patronage of Weld. Finally I want to note a public letter issued by Snow, which was the last pamphlet before *Cliftonien*. These pamphlets are the primary sources from which I will attempt to recover the senses of Benedictine identity that were in play at the time.

What was the argument for the missions?

1. *The argument from history*

Snow offered a brief and broadbrush account of the monastic role in the conversion of Europe: his key claim was that “Black Monks were ever engaged in an active life, in which Missionary labour was a constituent accompaniment.” (*Missionary Work*, p10.) As a consequence although the circumstances of the world may have changed the essential missionary task remains the same: the salvation of souls. To accomplish this, the monks must accommodate themselves to the changed world. But the heart of Benedictine life must be the mission.

2. *Other monasteries being in mission work demonstrates that this work is monastic*

Snow uses the recently published *Album Benedictinum* (1880) to divide the monastic world into those who have Cloistered Missions and those who have Missioners who live apart from the Cloister. This point is that the latter category is not just include the English Congregation, but also the Swiss, the Bavarian, the American Cassinese and the Swiss American, along with a number of Austrian and other abbeys. Indeed, he uses some evidence as he can find to show that even the more obviously cloistered monasteries did have missions: for example the Beuronese monastery at Erdington in England served its local parish (he does concede that this is an example of what he refers to as “cloistered missionary activity”, by which he means that the monks working in the parish live in their monastery).

He sums up this argument in the following words: “These Missions are then the elements of a regular system of Missionary work, in which in order to perform the duties more completely and perfectly, the Monks who serve them live in the midst of their flock. Since there is no Congregation or independent Abbey that rejects Missionary work, and the great majority adopt it as part of their special system and vocation, the inference is clear and definite that Benedictines do not consider that Missionary work is opposed to the Rule of St Benedict, is not antagonistic to the monastic spirit, and is not a departure from the

traditions of the Order, but that it is more reasonable to assert that the Order is engaged in the same work now under the altered circumstances, that has occupied it from its very foundation. As Missionary work has ever accompanied the Black Monks from the sixth century during the irruption of the barbarians, through the middle ages to the time of the Reformation, so now it should be a source of gratification and a sign that they are true to the instincts of the Order, to find that they are still mainly engaged in the work of their forefathers." (*Missionary Work*, pp.13-14.)

Snow goes on to compare the English Congregation to others which have missions, and seeks to show that the proportions of monks working on missions, and in particular the number of single missions, is roughly equal across the monasteries which have missions. He argues that there are few large missionary priories for a number of reasons. One is financial – a priory must depend on the people for its support, and so the numbers that can be resident are regulated by the revenue. Another is the amount of work available. Another is the difficulty of life in small communities and the low quality of choir office in them. His summary of this argument claims, in a punchy phrase, that: "Missionary Priories belong to the imaginative rather than to the practical view of Benedictine Missions." (*Missionary Work*, p.20.) The EBC is not exceptional in not having them. He went on to offer a similar analysis of the statistics given for single missions (i.e., those served by a single monk living on his own); these he argues to be numerous, and what is more they are also claimed to have the seal of antiquity – which must demonstrate that they have not led to scandal. Indeed, the largest number of single missions is found in the most flourishing communities.

This is a substantial argument, and Weld's Reply addressed it in similar detail. He began by asserting that it is a fallacy to assume that the majority is necessarily right (*Reply*, p.2). In the Church preference is given to the *sanior pars* not the *maior pars* (*Reply*, p.4). St Benedict was a reformer, and his activity fits into the general pattern of decline and then renewal in the Church. Small beginnings should not be a surprise, and when we see that the monasteries without single missions are but few, this should not lead us to conclude that they are in the wrong. Indeed, the presentation of statistics in *Missionary Work* is criticised, and Weld offers detailed arguments to show that some of the individual abbeys are not quite as they were assumed to be.

More fundamental is his critique of the notion of mission. The method of conducting missions is not, Weld replied, the great distinguishing feature that Snow asserts – between the English and Swiss Congregations there are more fundamental differences than this similarity. He also criticises the notion of missioner, which suggests the conditions of "mission countries", the notion of living out of the cloister (which has a variety of different

forms), and most fundamentally, that although the notion of the mission is of all consuming interest and importance in England it is not so abroad. Abroad the parishes are held as a result of the benefice system, as part of the means of support of the abbey, not as something desirable in themselves (as they are seen by English monks). Hence he surveys the proportions of monks living out of the monastery, and finds that they are particularly high in England. This leads him to the point that the English Congregation is very different from all the others, who look upon the mission as a matter that should not be allowed to interfere with monastic observance. Whereas, he argues that a careful analysis of the “general characteristics of the English ‘Mission’ may be classed under four heads: 1. The entire separation of the missions from the monasteries, and their erection into an independent body, with separate superiors, separate legislation, separate finances and general interests. 2. The pre-eminence of the missionary interest, which subordinates to itself what may be called monastic interests. 3. The permanence of missionaries apart from the cloister, and the practice of sending nearly all on the mission for the greater part of their lives. 4. The privation of monastic observance on missions, and the almost complete conformity of the lives of missionaries with that of the secular clergy.” (*Reply*, p.14)

Finally, he points out that there are many ways of exercising mission which are different from those of parish and College: “by special apostolate they exercise among the pastoral clergy who come to them for direction and retreats, and over who they exercise a powerful influence, probably does more good among the souls of the faithful than all the missionary labours of the uncloistered missionaries together” (*Reply*, p.17).

3. *The test of vitality*

With respect to this note Snow, again using the *Album Benedictinum*, contrasts the relative numbers, especially of vocations, in houses in which there is observance of choir and the discipline of the Cloister, and those in which the monks are sent out to lead uncloistered lives. He argues that you would expect that these latter, because they do not live up to the spirit of the order, would not be sent vocations by God, and that they would consist of old men who gradually pass away their time as their community disappears. The figures he presents show, by contrast, that the strength of the Order lies those monasteries where the Missionary work is more completely carried out and that therefore the fact of Monks living outside their Monastery, and apart from the discipline of the Rule, is not incompatible with a vigorous, healthy Monastic spirit; “that it is not in opposition to the Rule of St Benedict, or otherwise we could not expect that God would bless it with vitality and strength.” (*Missionary Work*, p.15) This is not merely a question of modern numbers, but also of the longevity of communities. He presses the analysis on to look at the recently professed

members of communities and here too he argues that the proportion of young men is greater in monasteries that engage more completely in missionary work, and since exhibit “the greater vitality and vigour.” Snow corrects this with a general perception that in his day the vast majority of vocations are given to active orders.

Weld, in his *Reply*, points out that the examples given by Snow are from periods of monastic decadence, and that reform efforts have stood against the practice. Longevity on its own is not enough: what we should look for is the zealous living out of the monastic vocation. Moreover longevity on its own can be misleading as for long periods the incorporated parish would have been supplied by a secular priest, not by a monk. Detailed study of parishes belonging to Krems Abbey is used to make the point. Weld’s *Reply* also looks at the figures concerning professions made in the last 10 years, which suggest the conclusion that the rate of increase is highest in where monks are not sent out of the cloister to work as missioners. Only the French, Beuronese and American monasteries are growing at a rate commensurate with the growth in the population. By contrast, the wealthy, old and famous Austrian monasteries are not recruiting novices. And even the EBC is not growing at the same rate as the Catholic population of England (by which increase it should be three times its present size).

By way of contrast, an argument from decadence: The titular prelacies argument

Weld suggests that far from brimming with vitality, the EBC of his day was decadent. The ridiculous nature of the present arrangement for the Government of the EBC could be seen in the number of titular abbots and priors, who do not have houses or communities. All these titles used to express the hope of a return to the medieval position. Now (by which he seems to mean, in the period after the restoration of the Hierarchy) either they are childishness and vanity or the expression of a sense of the nearness of return to the normal Benedictine state.

“The Monasteries are like the Abbots. They show the world all the insignia of Abbatial government – Mitres, Crosiers, Crosses and Rings. Little children look all such things as so many realities; but grown-up people are not to be taken in, for they know that there is not life in, and that they have never had the Abbatial Blessing, and that they have neither Monasteries, nor Monks, nor Jurisdiction: they are but phantoms which deceive children; but make men laugh, and bring discredit on Religion.” (*Reply*, p.14)

4. *The test of education.*

Snow asserts that education has been a leading work of Benedictines since Maurus and Placid came to St Benedict, and has continued down the centuries. So he points out that the entirely cloistered monasteries have few colleges and few pupils, whereas those with Missions have many more. This flourishing collegiate apostolate he describes as a definite sign of life and vigour, that the two Benedictine works – Missionary work and the work of education – progress equally. *Funeste Consequenze* also makes the point that the Colleges depend for their recruitment on the missions. This is especially true for those who come as Church students.

5. *The argument from the foundation*

Snow goes on the claim that the reason for the existence of the English Congregation was missionary work, and it was founded especially for this purpose. The constitutions were framed and approved by the Holy See for this purpose. “Monasteries were founded to furnish Missioners; it was not that the Monasteries were founded and the Missions taken up afterwards, but the Missions and Missioners were already there, and the Monasteries were founded to supply a succession of Missioners.” (*Missionary Work*, p.22). Since single missions were the majority from the earliest days they can claim to be part of the purpose of the Congregation, and vocations can be seen as for the reason of missionary work. This claim is also made in Bury’s *Funeste Consequenze* (although lack of a deep sense of Congregational history in that pamphlet means that this theme is not prominent).

Prest (in his *Notes on the Pamphlet “I Benedettini Inglesi”*) comments that the “special end and distinguishing characteristic” of the EBC is the Conversion of England. This builds on the common Benedictine work of *cura animarum*, but lives it out in the context of a non-Catholic country. Prest sees three characteristics of EBC life. Firstly, non-claustral life, imposed by the necessity of pastoral work. This is based on the missionary oath and the permission given in Plantata to fulfil this oath, which means that no-one would be admitted to monastic life who did not take the oath. Secondly, is the nature of the monasteries as not providing perpetual claustral life (in this case the Italian and Spanish monasteries would have been enough). They exist to provide trained missioners, and when they leave for the mission they leave the Prior behind and come under the Provincial. The third feature is the necessity of single missions. These are common in the Benedictine world, and can be seen even in Catholic Countries, so are *a fortiori* permissible in England. Moreover, there is a reason special to the English situation, which is one of development. The country needs the ability for a community to grow from a simple mission station to a

stable mission to a two or three man mission. The世俗s would not grow a mission to hand it over to us, and to rule out single missions would mean that we could not take part. He shows how the larger missions have grown and have thrown up daughters. (*Notes*, pp.21-22). An example would be the mission at Whitehaven. From 1707 to 1840 there was one priest. 1840 to 1882 there were two priests. In 1810 a new mission was founded at Workington. This at one priest from 1810 to 1874, then a second priest in 1874, and a third in 1882. From Workington a mission was founded in Maryport in 1841 with one priest, to which a second was added in 1882. Workington also ran a station in Harrington. Likewise, also from Whitehaven, a mission was founded in 1853 at Cleator with one priest to which a second was added in 1860, and a third in 1882. From Cleator new missions have also been founded at Frizington and Egremont. Thus from a situation in which there was one church and one priest in 1810, by 1882 there were four double missions, two single missions and one station with 12 priests.

6. *The authority of the Constitutions*

Snow looks at the texts of the papal documents establishing and approving the Congregation to show that these approve its structures and give it the power to vary the details of those constitutions. Thus no one can claim that the present state of the Constitutions is not approved by the Holy See. This approval by the Holy See was of vital importance to those defending the status quo, as can be seen in Prest's comment: "By what Theological epithet, then, should an author be stigmatised, who maintains that the effect of a system solemnly approved by the Holy See is to "secularise Monks," and to "bring death to monastic life?" (*Notes*, p.4)

Weld's first response to this claim (in *I Benedettini Inglesi*) argues that the original spirit of the EBC is evidenced by the recent re-issue of Fr Baker's *Sancta Sophia*. This great spiritual work authoritatively states the spirit, scope and special vocation of the EBC from its origins – and it is not the Mission. He goes on to develop the argument in his *Reply*, saying: "we may here repeat that 'the fact of performing missionary work alone, out of the cloister,' is 'opposed to the Benedictine Rule,' for it breaks the vow of stability, and therefore requires special reasons and special sanction to authorise it. That sanction was once given to the English Congregation; but as the reasons no longer exist, the authority which gave it now wishes to see it recalled. It is also 'contrary to Benedictine spirit and the traditions of the Order.'" (*Reply*, p.28)

"The Rule is not abrogated by the Constitutions. It is only applied, explained, or temporarily dispensed. It still remains in force as the 'Jus' of the monastic body. When a

privilege, especially a privilege ‘contra jus’, such as those granted to the English Congregation, loses the necessity or reason for which it was first granted, it ceases to exist. It is surely in the power of the Holy Father to inquire whether those reasons do or do not exist at the present day; and at his command it is equally allowable to members of the Congregation to reconsider the circumstances in which they find themselves, and to inquire whether it is not high time that the Constitutions should be abandoned and a return made to the plain precepts of the Rule.” (*Reply*, p.29)

Weld develops this further to offer an additional argument on the evils of the present system of Government, which he asserts to be a consequence of the times of persecution, when someone in England needed to be given authority – the Provincials. The persecution is now over and the monasteries are all back in England. But the present governing body is almost exclusively composed of missioners, who have lost sympathy with the Monastic Life and look on monasteries as seminaries.

7. *The practical or economic argument*

Bury, in *Funeste Consequenze*, adds a further claim that there are too many missioners to be supported by the Houses, and so to compel single missioners to return to monasteries would leave them with secularisation or leaving the country (as the rhetoric winds up this becomes death). This is a consequence of the poverty of the monasteries, whose goods were confiscated at the French Revolution and which depend on students’ fees. The monasteries could only support small communities. The situation of English monks is that “those who do not work, may not eat”. (*Funeste Consequenze*, p.6) It would be impossible to find more students to support larger communities, so the proposal of a gradual withdrawal from single missions is simply a plan for slow death. To this Weld replies: “The Holy Father, therefore, has no need of offering Secularisation or Death. This death happened to each Benedictine Father, through his President General, the day it was intimated to him to leave his Monastery, never to return to it – they never do return. That command is death to the Monastic Life, which each of them had so much longed for, and which, as he hoped, was to be his possession for ever.” (*Reply*, p.15) He goes on to address the financial argument directly, by pointing out that more monks back in the monasteries would mean the need to employ fewer lay teachers. In addition, many of those returning would bring back with them their *peculium*, and this could be bolstered by the *Commune Depositum*.

8. *The need for single missions*

Funeste Consequenze claims that there is a need for two sorts of single mission: the growing city mission with over 1,000 people which will soon justify a second priest, and the small country mission of 100-200 people which serves as a retirement parish for those worn out by work in the cities. Bury offers the life story of Fr Austin Davey as evidence. At the time of writing Davey worked at Morpeth, a small village with around 600 Catholic inhabitants. He was sent there after 19 years of very hard work in the large missions of Liverpool, where his health had been shattered by this work and the unhealthy environment. Were he not able to live in this small country parish what would happen to him? Is monastery in Douai was too small and poor to give him lodging or maintenance – the only options are secularisation or death. However, the move to Morpeth and the changed environment had enabled him to work another 12 years for the Church, faithfully administering his small parish.

9. *The interior argument*

The debate did not remain on a purely exterior level. In a public letter of May 1882 Snow offered a wide-ranging attempt to provide a monastic theology of missionary life. It is worth quoting at length:

“The author betrays ignorance of the very elements of the monastic spirit: he cannot understand what a monastic missionary is: he looks at the skin and has not discovered the existence of the heart: his thoughts are occupied with external observance and the outward show of monasticism: obedience is obedience only when under inspection: “conversio” must be something that the world may see: unless there is some special ritual there is no monastic spirit: even stability is localised and make external: he has not realised the old adage “cucullus non facit monachum,” and hence a monastic missionary living apart from the cloister is, to him, no more than a secular priest. To find the monastic spirit we must probe beneath the cowl and the skin and seeks the heart, and then we shall see how far a monk on the mission differs from a secular priest. His frame of mind, his habit of thought, is tending to perfection make his life entirely different: all his actions are sanctified by obedience although no eye watches them, save His that reads the heart and its motive: he has vowed poverty, and his heart is withdrawn from the things of the world, he uses and administers them but merely as a trustee: his meditation, his mass, his divine office, his connection with the Blessed Sacrament have a different character from that of a secular priest, being elevated by the monastic training, and enriched by the graces of the monastic

state: he leads a life of routine and constant labour for which the routine of the cloister was a preparation; he has his “dura et aspera” privations, things irksome to nature of which little is known in the cloister, and which are borne in a spirit of religious obedience: in his dealing with souls, in the confessional, in the pastoral office, he is as far above a secular priest as the religious state is about that of ordinary priesthood: he is under religious discipline and monastic superiors, and is accountable for every act to his superior the Provincial, is under the cognizance of his Prepositus and the eye of his brethren: there is not a single internal practice of the monastic state that he cannot perform. If the circumstances of his missionary life render him unable to comply with some external observances, is he no monk? Has he lost his monastic spirit? Is he a secular priest? Far be it from me to undervalue external observances, I gladly welcome them wherever practicable, but the cowl is not the mark, nor can the monastic spirit be judged by the amount of external observance.”

The other side of this argument was advanced by Weld, first of all in *I Benedettini Inglesi*, where he argued that the scope of the EBC is to make the members monks. Missions depend for their true viability, which is theologically based, on their compatibility with that overall aim. Young men who join the Order at the moment are being deceived: they believe that they are entering the monastic state and thus avoiding the dangers of a Secular Priest’s life. But instead they are talked of by the world as being more secular than the世俗人. The present state of the EBC is such as to secularise the monks, so that there is scarcely ever an instance of one who has gone out onto the mission coming back to the monastery. Weld noted that the Visitor (Prior Krug) was proposing a gradual withdrawal from missions, with no-one being forced to come back. They are to be allowed to stay in “the ‘flesh-pots’ of Egypt”, in contrast to those in monasteries who enjoy the “heavenly manna” and who want to stay in the monastery even when they do missionary work. Weld points to a contrast between the monastic life seen by students in the colleges (which are the main source of vocations), a vision which attracts them into the monastery, and the mission life that they are then expected to lead when they have been in the monastery for a few years:

“The Order recruits its vocations almost exclusively from its Colleges: there the students see the monastic life in practice – Divine Office in Choir, religious Poverty, and strict Obedience, early rising, simplicity in diet and furniture of the cells. Thus taught a life of mortification and self-denial and that not by word alone, but also by example, students make up their minds to give themselves wholly to God; they hedge themselves by this means, against the comforts and luxuries which are excusable in a secular clergy, but which

might have an influence to divide their hearts between God and the World. But, how cruelly are they surprised, when, having taken the step, and it is too late to turn back, they find that they must return to the Egyptian feastings! I have said, that the vocations come, almost exclusively, from the Colleges. Persons who are outside (the Monasteries) only see the monks in their second station (the Mission); and, when they feel themselves drawn by God to Religion, it is to the Monasteries they turn, where they are sure to find Him. No, it is not the closing a few missions that will weaken the Colleges: what weakens, and almost ruins there is – the excessive number of the Missions, which must be kept up; it is the want of love which is in the Superiors for the Monastic Life; these, using all the influence they possess, call out the monks in such numbers and at the period of their religious life which is so youngly formed, that only a very limited number is left to go through not solely all the fatigues of collegiate duties, with all the duties too of the Monastic State.” (*I Benedettini Inglesi*, p.7). Similarly, he states that: “When monks go out onto the mission too early they have not fully imbibed the Monastic Spirit and so they soon lose it. The consequence is that a monk who has left the monastery is never heard of to return to it, unless by reason of sickness or age. The contemplative spirit has been destroyed. Going on the mission is looked on as a taking of ease on a bed of repose, the pleasantness of which will make a return, at any future time, to the Monastic Life, a difficulty.” (*I Benedettini Inglesi*, p.13)

Weld’s *Reply* develops this into an argument from the Rule. The Rule admits of altered circumstances, but not of being abdicated from in what is essential – whether by relaxation or over-strictness. Stability and therefore community life are part of that essence. Work is important, but no specific work is necessary. “Let the truth be plainly told. It is not the love for souls that draws the Benedictine out of his cloister; it is his own inability to dwell therein.” The modern need is for an example of the self-subjection necessary to live obediently in stability.

These two extracts show how the argument was based, in the eyes of those taking part, on visions of monastic life. But these visions are very partial. It is interesting to look at what is not present in any of these early contributions. There is no discussion of the Rule, or careful analysis of the text, let alone the pre-Benedictine tradition. There is no reference to the great commentaries on the Rule, though the tradition that had led from Smaragdus and Paul the Deacon through to Haeften, Martène and Calmet could have been deployed. There is no reference to that monument of erudition and Benedictine thought, Wolter’s *Elementa Praecipua* (despite the fact that it was published in 1880). There is no reference in depth to the classics of monastic spirituality, despite the 1875 Belmont translation of the Rule, the 1876 edition of Baker’s *Sancta Sophia* by Dom Norbert Sweeney, Dom Alphonsus

Morrall's *Manual of Devotions to our Holy Father St Benedict* (1861), and the general upsurge in interest in spiritual classics coming from Belmont (as recently described by Abbot Geoffrey Scott in his contribution to *Belmont Abbey*, pp. 87-98). The approach to monastic history was shallow and superficial – here one could point to the absence of reference to either Dom Gilbert Dolan's edition of Dom Benet Weldon's *Chronological Notes* or to the texts of the Papal Bulls of the early years (the study of Dom Cuthbert Butler on the early history lies several years in the future). The theological foundations are shallow. As evidence of this one could point to more absences. There is no reference to St Thomas (although *Aeterni Patris* was promulgated in 1879, and there was also Dom Bede Vaughan's (Prior of Belmont) *The Life and Labours of Thomas of Aquin*, which was published in 1871-2). There was no reference to liturgy, despite Gueranger and Dom Laurence Shepherd (1868 was the year of the first volume of the translation of *The Liturgical Year*).

Perhaps all these absences could be summed up by observing that no-one formed in the common novitiate at Belmont had yet spoken publicly, and that the fruits of that great work were yet to be harvested. *Cliftonien* was based on shallow foundations, and perhaps inevitably provided a solution which satisfied few and did not endure.

TEXTS

The Missionary Work of the Benedictines, Snow, 1881

Le Consequenze Funeste alla Congregazione Anglicana della Perdita delle sue Missioni, anon. [Bury], n.d. [1881]

I Benedettini Inglesi, Mgr Weld, 1882

Notes on the Pamphlet 'I Benedettini Inglesi', anon. [Prest], n.d. [1882]

A Reply to 'The Missionary Work of the Benedictines.', anon [linked to Weld], n.d. [1882]

Letter, Snow, May 1882